

## 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 166 E/01)

Treść	Strona
<b>E-004584/12</b> by Christel Schaldemose to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Revision of the directive on the recognition of professional qualifications	
Dansk udgave .....	13
English version .....	14
<b>E-004585/12</b> by Christel Schaldemose to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Revision of the directive on the recognition of professional qualifications	
Dansk udgave .....	15
English version .....	16
<b>E-004587/12</b> by Monica Luisa Macovei to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Enhancing monitoring capacity in the European Union's asset recovery regime	
Versiunea în limba română .....	17
English version .....	18
<b>E-004588/12</b> by Marek Henryk Migalski to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Euro 2012	
Wersja polska .....	19
English version .....	20
<b>E-004589/12</b> by Franziska Keller and Judith Sargentini to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Policy coherence for development and Dutch potato exports	
Deutsche Fassung .....	21
Nederlandse versie .....	23
English version .....	25
<b>P-004591/12</b> by Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Cross-border transport by taxi between France and Spain	
Version française .....	27
English version .....	29

<b>E-004593/12</b> by Oreste Rossi to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Slaughter of seals	
Versione italiana .....	31
English version .....	32
<b>E-004594/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Use of anti-depressants	
Versione italiana .....	33
English version .....	34
<b>E-004595/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Suicide attacks in Russia	
Versione italiana .....	35
English version .....	36
<b>E-004596/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Terrorist attack in Bajaur, region of Pakistan	
Versione italiana .....	37
English version .....	38
<b>E-004598/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The EU's interactive policy-making initiative	
Versione italiana .....	39
English version .....	40
<b>E-004599/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> An underestimated phenomenon	
Versione italiana .....	41
English version .....	42
<b>E-004600/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Seizure of a Chinese drug	
Versione italiana .....	43
English version .....	44
<b>E-004601/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Virus with pandemic potential	
Versione italiana .....	45
English version .....	46
<b>E-004602/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Job cuts	
Versione italiana .....	47
English version .....	48
<b>E-004603/12</b> by Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Impact assessment data on women entrepreneurs in the EU	
Wersja polska .....	49
English version .....	50
<b>E-004604/12</b> by Rachida Dati to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Apprenticeships: towards a job-rich recovery for young people	
Version française .....	51
English version .....	52
<b>P-004605/12</b> by Nicole Sinclair to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF)	
English version .....	53
<b>E-004606/12</b> by João Ferreira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Failure to produce Portuguese versions of important documents on the 2014-2020 multiannual financial framework	
Versão portuguesa .....	54
English version .....	55

<b>E-004608/12</b> by Patrick Le Hyaric to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Sodastream Drinks Maker and 'Made in Israel' labelling in France	
Version française .....	56
English version .....	57
<b>E-004610/12</b> by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Duration of illegal immigrants' custody at the Amygdaleza immigrant detention centre	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	58
English version .....	59
<b>E-004611/12</b> by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Protection and reforestation of the Mount Parnitha National Park in Attica	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	60
English version .....	61
<b>E-004612/12</b> by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Progress in implementation of the Operational Programme for Attica 2011	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	62
English version .....	63
<b>E-004613/12</b> by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Partial revision of operational programmes in Greece	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	64
English version .....	65
<b>E-004614/12</b> by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Construction of two detention and removal centres for illegal immigrants and six reception centres for asylum-seekers in Turkey	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	66
English version .....	67
<b>E-004615/12</b> by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Take-up of Community funds in Greece for 2011	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	68
English version .....	69
<b>E-004616/12</b> by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Utilising the guarantee fund in Greece with a view to reinforcing the audiovisual sector	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	70
English version .....	71
<b>E-004617/12</b> by Jens Rohde to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The Water Framework Directive	
Dansk udgave .....	72
English version .....	73
<b>E-004619/12</b> by Jim Higgins to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Impact assessments and guardrails for new road projects	
English version .....	74
<b>E-004620/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Retinitis pigmentosa	
Versione italiana .....	75
English version .....	76
<b>E-004621/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Trabucchi of Gargano	
Versione italiana .....	77
English version .....	78
<b>E-004622/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Direct funding programmes — city of Matera	
Versione italiana .....	79
English version .....	80

<b>E-004624/12</b> by Andrea Zaroni to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Potential threat of groundwater pollution due to the Morganello gravel pit mined below the water table and located between the municipalities of Ponzano and Paese (Treviso)	
Versione italiana .....	81
English version .....	82
<b>E-004625/12</b> by Godelieve Quisthoudt-Rowohl and Daniel Caspary to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Turkey's safeguard duties for certain apparel fabrics and medicinal products	
Deutsche Fassung .....	83
English version .....	85
<b>E-004626/12</b> by Jim Higgins to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Voting rights of Europeans living abroad	
English version .....	86
<b>E-004627/12</b> by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Recognition of Somaliland	
English version .....	87
<b>E-004629/12</b> by Debora Serracchiani to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> CO <sub>2</sub> storage facilities off the coast of Senigallia (Ancona)	
Versione italiana .....	88
English version .....	89
<b>E-004630/12</b> by Konrad Szymański to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Ukraine's discriminatory customs policy towards EU glass producers	
Wersja polska .....	90
English version .....	91
<b>E-004631/12</b> by Ioannis A. Tsoukalas to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Necessity for a common European programme of studies for skills in information and communication technology	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	92
English version .....	93
<b>E-004633/12</b> by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Impact of wind turbines on the temperatures of the areas where they are situated	
Versiunea în limba română .....	94
English version .....	95
<b>E-004634/12</b> by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Pasture situation	
Versiunea în limba română .....	96
English version .....	97
<b>E-004635/12</b> by Christine De Veyrac to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — EU-Ukraine relations	
Version française .....	98
English version .....	99
<b>E-004636/12</b> by Wojciech Michał Olejniczak to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Lifting of the European Union's requirements for blanket data retention of telecommunications data	
Wersja polska .....	100
English version .....	102
<b>E-004637/12</b> by Gianni Vattimo, Henri Weber, Sophia in 't Veld, Leonidas Donskis, Sarah Ludford, Alexander Alvaro, Nadja Hirsch and Nathalie Griesbeck to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Arrests of HIV-positive women, compulsory HIV testing and protection of personal and sensitive data in Greece and in the EU	
Deutsche Fassung .....	103
Version française .....	104
Versione italiana .....	105
Tekstas lietuvių kalba .....	106
Nederlandse versie .....	107
English version .....	108

<b>P-004638/12</b> by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Delay in the payment of POSEI/Madeira funds	
Versão portuguesa .....	109
English version .....	111
<b>E-004639/12</b> by Franck Proust to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Reimbursement of medical treatment within the European Union	
Version française .....	112
English version .....	113
<b>E-004640/12</b> by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Wasted food	
Versione italiana .....	114
English version .....	115
<b>E-004641/12</b> by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Human rights violations in Bahrain	
Versione italiana .....	116
English version .....	117
<b>P-004642/12</b> by Emma McClarkin to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European Central Bank soft low-interest loans	
English version .....	118
<b>E-004643/12</b> by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Turkey as a net contributor or a net recipient?	
Deutsche Fassung .....	119
English version .....	120
<b>E-004645/12</b> by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Spanish coastal law	
Deutsche Fassung .....	121
English version .....	122
<b>E-004647/12</b> by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Police identify HIV+ sex workers	
Deutsche Fassung .....	123
English version .....	124
<b>E-004648/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Abuse by Kenyan police	
Versione italiana .....	125
English version .....	126
<b>E-004649/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Albania's path towards Europe	
Versione italiana .....	127
English version .....	128
<b>E-004651/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Drug for neurodegenerative diseases	
Versione italiana .....	129
English version .....	130
<b>E-004653/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Incident at a fairground	
Versione italiana .....	131
English version .....	132
<b>E-004654/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Italian fishing boat held in Croatia	
Versione italiana .....	133
English version .....	134

<b>E-004655/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Programmes for direct funds, city of Potenza	
Versione italiana .....	135
English version .....	136
<b>E-004657/12</b> by Frieda Brepoels to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Tax exemption for combined transport	
Nederlandse versie .....	137
English version .....	138
<b>E-004658/12</b> by Frieda Brepoels to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Unfair competition between Brussels and Charleroi airports	
Nederlandse versie .....	139
English version .....	141
<b>P-004660/12</b> by Kristian Vigenin to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Inequality in remuneration in the Commission's Lifelong Learning Programme for 2012 based on national principles	
българска версия .....	143
English version .....	144
<b>E-004661/12</b> by Emma McClarkin to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Tax registration	
English version .....	145
<b>E-004663/12</b> by Marek Henryk Migalski to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> EU-Russia cooperation	
Wersja polska .....	146
English version .....	147
<b>E-004664/12</b> by Marek Henryk Migalski to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Press Law Amendment in Poland	
Wersja polska .....	148
English version .....	150
<b>P-004666/12</b> by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> State aid	
Versión española .....	152
English version .....	154
<b>E-004667/12</b> by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Payments to Turkey from EU budgetary funds	
Deutsche Fassung .....	156
English version .....	157
<b>E-004668/12</b> by Carlo Fidanza, Mario Mauro, Roberta Angelilli, Gabriele Albertini, Raffaele Baldassarre, Paolo Bartolozzi, Vito Bonsignore, Antonio Cancian, Lara Comi, Elisabetta Gardini, Erminia Mazzoni, Crescenzo Rivellini, Licia Ronzulli, Potito Salatto, Marco Scurria, Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris and Iva Zanicchi to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Defending Christians in Cyprus and protecting the Greek Cypriot population	
Versione italiana .....	158
English version .....	159
<b>E-004669/12</b> by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — The case of Yulia Tymoshenko	
Deutsche Fassung .....	160
English version .....	161
<b>E-004670/12</b> by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> University rankings in Europe	
Deutsche Fassung .....	162
English version .....	163

<b>E-004671/12</b> by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Return of EU budget funds to Member States	
Deutsche Fassung .....	164
English version .....	165
<b>E-004672/12</b> by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Action programme for customs and taxation 2014-2020 (Fiscus)	
Deutsche Fassung .....	166
English version .....	168
<b>E-004673/12</b> by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Article 5 of the action programme for customs and taxation 2014-2020	
Deutsche Fassung .....	166
English version .....	168
<b>E-004675/12</b> by Konrad Szymański to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Data Retention Directive and personal data protection	
Wersja polska .....	170
English version .....	171
<b>E-004676/12</b> by Emma McClarkin to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Graduate traineeships within the European institutions (budget line 15 01 61)	
English version .....	172
<b>E-004677/12</b> by Sergio Gaetano Cofferati to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Inflammatory bowel disease	
Versione italiana .....	173
English version .....	175
<b>E-004681/12</b> by Nuno Melo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Rise in metal theft in EU countries	
Versão portuguesa .....	177
English version .....	178
<b>E-004682/12</b> by Nuno Melo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The 'State of the World's Children 2012' report	
Versão portuguesa .....	179
English version .....	180
<b>E-004683/12</b> by Daniel Hannan to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Turkish as an official language of the European Parliament	
English version .....	181
<b>E-004684/12</b> by Barry Madlener to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Press freedom in Turkey: even worse than in Uganda	
Nederlandse versie .....	182
English version .....	183
<b>E-004685/12</b> by Ismail Ertug to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Education reform in Turkey	
Deutsche Fassung .....	184
English version .....	185
<b>E-004687/12</b> by Simon Busuttill to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Elections in Libya	
Verżjoni Maltija .....	186
English version .....	187
<b>E-004688/12</b> by Simon Busuttill to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Maternity leave in the education sector in Malta	
Verżjoni Maltija .....	188
English version .....	189

<b>E-004689/12</b> by Ole Christensen to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Lack of response from the Commission to an action brought by hourly-paid teachers	
Dansk udgave .....	190
English version .....	191
<b>E-004691/12</b> by Søren Bo Søndergaard to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Council Directive 93/104/EC	
Dansk udgave .....	192
English version .....	193
<b>E-004693/12</b> by Lucas Hartong to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Private jet made available to Mr Barroso, Baroness Ashton and Mr Van Rompuy	
Nederlandse versie .....	194
English version .....	195
<b>P-004694/12</b> by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Written commitments relating to the agreement reached at the EU summit of 26 October 2011	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	196
English version .....	197
<b>E-004695/12</b> by Metin Kazak to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> EU public procurement contracts awarded to third-country companies	
българска версия .....	198
English version .....	199
<b>E-004696/12</b> by Crescenzo Rivellini and Potito Salatto to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Geographical constraints, Expo 2015	
Versione italiana .....	200
English version .....	201
<b>E-004697/12</b> by Bogusław Sonik to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Data Retention Directive	
Wersja polska .....	202
English version .....	203
<b>E-004700/12</b> by Izaskun Bilbao Barandica to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Competition, CO <sub>2</sub> emissions tax and reliability of compensation indexes	
Versión española .....	204
English version .....	206
<b>E-004702/12</b> by Izaskun Bilbao Barandica to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Competition, CO <sub>2</sub> emissions tax and budget cuts in Member States	
Versión española .....	204
English version .....	206
<b>E-004703/12</b> by Izaskun Bilbao Barandica to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Competition, CO <sub>2</sub> emissions tax and the European electricity market	
Versión española .....	205
English version .....	207
<b>E-004701/12</b> by Izaskun Bilbao Barandica to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Competition, CO <sub>2</sub> emissions tax and Kyoto Protocol	
Versión española .....	208
English version .....	209
<b>P-004706/12</b> by Alain Cadec to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Expiry of the fisheries partnership agreement protocol between the EU and Mauritania	
Version française .....	210
English version .....	211
<b>E-004707/12</b> by Patrick Le Hyaric to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Huge hunger strike movement among Palestinian prisoners	
Version française .....	212
English version .....	213



<b>E-004711/12</b> by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Attacks against the Christian community in Nigeria and Kenya	
Versione italiana .....	214
English version .....	216
<b>E-004713/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Attack on Christian communities in Africa	
Versione italiana .....	214
English version .....	216
<b>E-004714/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Directive 2011/24/EU	
Versione italiana .....	218
English version .....	219
<b>E-004715/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Explosion at Istanbul University	
Versione italiana .....	220
English version .....	221
<b>E-004716/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Euro Leaf logo	
Versione italiana .....	222
English version .....	223
<b>E-004717/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> New meningitis B vaccine	
Versione italiana .....	224
English version .....	225
<b>E-004718/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Organic data network for better European organic market information	
Versione italiana .....	226
English version .....	227
<b>E-004720/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Attack involving sophisticated detonator thwarted	
Versione italiana .....	228
English version .....	229
<b>E-004721/12</b> by Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Overdue funds reimbursement for Guimarães, a 2012 European Capital of Culture	
Versão portuguesa .....	230
English version .....	231
<b>E-004723/12</b> by Jutta Steinruck, Udo Bullmann and Peter Simon to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Answers to the questions for written answer E-002800/2012 and E-002552/2012	
Deutsche Fassung .....	232
English version .....	233
<b>E-004724/12</b> by Hermann Winkler to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Removal of Directive 2000/84/EC on summer-time arrangements	
Deutsche Fassung .....	234
English version .....	235
<b>E-004726/12</b> by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Fuel price regulation	
Deutsche Fassung .....	236
English version .....	237
<b>E-004728/12</b> by Mario Borghezio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Request for clarification on payments	
Versione italiana .....	238
English version .....	239

<b>E-004730/12</b> by Louis Grech to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Fair trial rights: giving citizens the right to information in criminal and civil proceedings	
Verżjoni Maltija .....	240
English version .....	241
<b>E-004731/12</b> by Graham Watson to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Deir Istiya olive tree destruction	
English version .....	242
<b>E-004734/12</b> by Peter van Dalen and Corien Wortmann-Kool to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> High fines for lorry and coach company drivers in France	
Nederlandse versie .....	243
English version .....	245
<b>E-004735/12</b> by Mario Borghezio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Herbicides that cause birth defects in newborns	
Versione italiana .....	247
English version .....	248
<b>E-004738/12</b> by Marina Yannakoudakis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Protection of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people in third countries	
English version .....	249
<b>E-004740/12</b> by Marina Yannakoudakis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — The disappearance of M Ilias Ali of the main opposition party in Bangladesh	
English version .....	250
<b>E-004741/12</b> by Marina Yannakoudakis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — EEAS spending and Europe Day	
English version .....	251
<b>E-004742/12</b> by Marina Yannakoudakis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Commission spending to mark Europe Day	
English version .....	252
<b>P-004744/12</b> by Anne Delvaux to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement	
Version française .....	253
English version .....	254
<b>E-004747/12</b> by Bendt Bendtsen to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Project bonds	
Dansk udgave .....	255
English version .....	256
<b>E-004748/12</b> by Daciana Octavia Sărbu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Honey in schools	
Versiunea în limba română .....	257
English version .....	258
<b>E-004751/12</b> by Nikolaos Salavrakos to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Turkey's recent aggressive behaviour	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	259
English version .....	260
<b>E-004752/12</b> by Gaston Franco to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Improving the management of ski resorts and support for innovation in the interests of sustainable development	
Version française .....	261
English version .....	262
<b>E-004753/12</b> by Gaston Franco to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Aid in maintaining the landscape heritage in rural settings	
Version française .....	263
English version .....	264

<b>E-004754/12</b> by Andrea Zanoni to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> INCA laboratory — the only facility able to carry out sampling and analysis of POPs in north-east Italy — at risk of closure	
Versione italiana .....	265
English version .....	266
<b>E-004755/12</b> by Mario Borghezio to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> EU action on ‘archo mafia’ organisations in Serbia	
Versione italiana .....	267
English version .....	268
<b>E-004756/12</b> by David Campbell Bannerman to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> EU tender process	
English version .....	269
<b>E-004759/12</b> by Ana Miranda to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Research into Alzheimer’s disease	
Versión española .....	270
English version .....	271
<b>E-004760/12</b> by Marina Yannakoudakis to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Freedom of religion for Pakistan’s religious minorities	
English version .....	272
<b>E-004761/12</b> by David Casa to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Racism provoked by austerity measures	
Verżjoni Maltija .....	273
English version .....	274
<b>E-004762/12</b> by David Casa to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> European Citizens’ Initiative	
Verżjoni Maltija .....	275
English version .....	276
<b>E-004763/12</b> by David Martin to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Proven effectiveness of Commission Regulation (EC) No 245/2009 implementing ecodesign requirements for non-directional household lamps	
English version .....	277
<b>E-004764/12</b> by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Structural funding: special cases	
Versão portuguesa .....	278
English version .....	279
<b>E-004765/12</b> by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Structural funding: special cases	
Versão portuguesa .....	280
English version .....	281
<b>E-004766/12</b> by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Structural funding: special cases	
Versão portuguesa .....	282
English version .....	283
<b>E-004767/12</b> by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Structural funding: special cases	
Versão portuguesa .....	284
English version .....	286
<b>E-004768/12</b> by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Structural funding: special cases	
Versão portuguesa .....	284
English version .....	286

**E-004769/12** by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission*Subject:* Structural funding: special cases

Versão portuguesa .....	288
English version .....	289

**E-004770/12** by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission*Subject:* Structural funding: special cases

Versão portuguesa .....	290
English version .....	291

(Dansk udgave)

**Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-004584/12**  
**til Kommissionen**  
**Christel Schaldemose (S&D)**  
(4. maj 2012)

Om: Revision af direktivet om anerkendelse af erhvervmæssige kvalifikationer

Kommissionen fremsatte den 19. december 2011 et forslag til direktiv om ændring af direktiv 2005/36/EF om anerkendelse af erhvervmæssige kvalifikationer (KOM(2011)0883), også kendt som anerkendelsesdirektivet. Parlamentets Udvalg om Det Indre Marked og Forbrugerbeskyttelse er i gang med behandlingen af forslaget, og jeg har følgende spørgsmål vedrørende indholdet af Kommissionens forslag.

I forslaget lægges der op til, at selvstændige kan udføre tjenester uden forhåndskontrol, også selvom disse kan have konsekvenser for den offentlige sundhed og sikkerhed. Inden for byggeriet ansættes en stor del af den udenlandske arbejdskraft som selvstændige, og denne lempelse kan derfor have stor betydning for sikkerheden på byggepladserne.

Hvad er begrundelsen for denne lempelse, og hvilke krav stilles der i givet fald for at blive registreret som selvstændig?

**Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Michel Barnier**  
(25. juni 2012)

I direktiv 2005/36/EF om anerkendelse af erhvervmæssige kvalifikationer fremgår det allerede, at lovligt etablerede erhvervsudøvere, herunder også selvstændige, kan levere midlertidige og lejlighedsvis tjenesteydelser i en anden medlemsstat uden forudgående kontrol af erhvervmæssige kvalifikationer. Direktivets artikel 7, stk. 4, angiver en undtagelse fra denne regel: Medlemsstaten kan kontrollere den erhvervsudøvers kvalifikationer: »når formålet med kontrollen er at undgå alvorlig skade for tjenestemodtagerens sundhed eller sikkerhed«.

Kommissionens forslag til modernisering af direktivet har ikke til formål at fjerne denne undtagelse. Derimod er det blevet forslået, at medlemsstaterne skal udarbejde en liste over erhverv, hvis udøvelse vurderes at have konsekvenser for sundhed og sikkerhed, og giver konkrete begrundelser herfor. Dette vil skabe retssikkerhed og sikre ensartet gennemførelse samt forhindre unødvendig kontrol.

Hver enkelt medlemsstats nationale lovgivning bestemmer kravene i forbindelse med registrering som selvstændig erhvervsdrivende. Disse skal være ikke-diskriminerende, velbegrundede og forholdsmæssigt afpassede i henhold til EU-retten. Anerkendelsesdirektivet gør det muligt for medlemsstaterne at kræve, at erhvervsudøvere inden for grænseoverskridende tjenester proformaregistrerer sig hos det relevante faglige organ, således at de disciplinærbestemmelser, som er knyttet til erhvervmæssige kvalifikationer, kan gøres gældende.

Direktiv 92/57/EØF omhandler beskyttelse af arbejdstagernes sundhed og sikkerhed på midlertidige eller mobile byggepladser <sup>(1)</sup>. Selvstændige er underlagt nogle af bestemmelserne deri <sup>(2)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> EFT L 245 af 26.8.1992, s. 1.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://osha.europa.eu/fr/legislation/directives/sector-specific-and-worker-related-provisions/osh-directives/15>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004584/12  
to the Commission**

**Christel Schaldemose (S&D)**

(4 May 2012)

*Subject:* Revision of the directive on the recognition of professional qualifications

On 19 December 2011, the Commission submitted a proposal for a directive amending Directive 2005/36/EC on the recognition of professional qualifications and Regulation on administrative cooperation through the internal market Information System (COM(2011)0883), also known as the Recognition Directive. The Committee on the internal market and Consumer Protection is discussing the proposal, and I have the following question regarding the content of the Commission's proposal.

The proposal suggests that self-employed persons could provide services without prior checks, even where there may be implications for public health and safety. Within the building industry, a large proportion of the foreign workforce is self-employed, and this relaxation of the rules may be very significant for safety on building sites.

What is the reason for this relaxation of the rules and what are the requirements for registration as a self-employed person?

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

(25 June 2012)

Directive 2005/36/EC on the recognition of professional qualifications already sets out that a professional legally established in a Member State, including in a self-employed capacity, can provide services on a temporary and occasional basis in another Member State without a prior check of professional qualifications. Article 7.4 of the directive provides an exception from this rule: Member State can check the qualifications of a professional, 'where the purpose of the check is to avoid serious damage to the health or safety of the service recipient'.

The Commission's proposal for a modernisation of the directive does not seek to delete this exception. However, it is proposed that Member States should list the professional activities which are deemed to have health and safety implication and provide specific justifications. This will create legal certainty and ensure uniform implementation, as well as preventing unnecessary checks.

The requirements for registration as a self-employed professional are the subject of national legislation of each Member State. In accordance with EC law, they must be non-discriminatory, justified and proportionate. The Professional Qualifications Directive allows Member States to require *pro forma* registration with the relevant professional body in order to facilitate the application of disciplinary provisions linked to professional qualifications by professionals providing cross-border services.

Directive 92/57/EEC provides for the protection of the health and safety of workers on temporary or mobile construction sites <sup>(1)</sup>. The self-employed are subject to some of its provisions <sup>(2)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 245, 26.8.1992, p. 6.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://osha.europa.eu/fr/legislation/directives/sector-specific-and-worker-related-provisions/osh-directives/15>.

(Dansk udgave)

**Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-004585/12**  
**til Kommissionen**  
**Christel Schaldemose (S&D)**  
(4. maj 2012)

Om: Revision af direktivet om anerkendelse af erhvervmæssige kvalifikationer

Kommissionen fremsatte den 19. december 2011 et forslag til direktiv om ændring af direktiv 2005/36/EF om anerkendelse af erhvervmæssige kvalifikationer (KOM(2011)0883), også kendt som anerkendelsesdirektivet. Parlamentets Udvalg om Det Indre Marked og Forbrugerbeskyttelse er i gang med behandlingen af forslaget, og jeg har følgende spørgsmål vedrørende indholdet af Kommissionens forslag.

I den ny bestemmelse i artikel 5, stk. 1, lægges op til, at tjenesteydere uden erhvervs erfaring kan tilbyde ydelser til en person af samme nationalitet som tjenesteyderen i et andet EU-land. Vil denne bestemmelse betyde, at udenlandske bygherrer, entreprenører og underentreprenører vil kunne anvende hjemlandets arbejdskraft på hjemlandets vilkår?

**Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Michel Barnier**  
(19. juni 2012)

Den 19. december 2011 vedtog Europa-Kommissionen et lovmæssigt forslag <sup>(1)</sup> om ændring af direktivet om erhvervmæssige kvalifikationer <sup>(2)</sup>.

Den nuværende ordning for midlertidig mobilitet bestemmer, at tjenesteydere, der kommer fra en ikke-regulerende medlemsstat, skal have udøvet deres erhverv i mindst to år. Dette krav forekommer dog ikke berettiget ud fra forbrugerbeskyttelseshensyn, når tjenesteyderen ledsager tjenestemodtageren fra samme medlemsstat (f.eks. en underviser, der ledsager sin klasse til udlandet). I disse situationer kan direktivets krav til tjenesteydere gå imod forbrugernes eget valg.

Kommissionen foreslår derfor, at der ikke stilles krav om to års forudgående erhvervs erfaring, hvis tjenesteyderen ledsager tjenestemodtageren, forudsat at tjenestemodtageren har sædvanligt opholdssted i tjenesteyderens etableringsmedlemsstat, og erhvervet ikke er at finde på listen over erhverv, der kan have sundheds- og sikkerhedsmæssige konsekvenser.

Direktivet om erhvervmæssige kvalifikationer gælder kun for fysiske personer og ikke for virksomheder. Desuden omhandler direktivet kun anerkendelsen af erhvervskvalifikationer og beskæftiger sig ikke med selve udførelsen af erhvervet.

Under disse forudsætninger fritages en erhvervsdrivende i byggesektoren i henhold til artikel 5, stk. 1, litra b), som ændret ved Kommissionens forslag for kravet om to års forudgående erhvervs erfaring, hvis vedkommende tilbyder ydelser til en kunde, som ledsager vedkommende til værtsmedlemsstaten. Ved »kunde« forstås den endelige ydelsesmodtager eksklusive entreprenører og underentreprenører. Denne bestemmelse tillader ikke, at udenlandske bygherrer, entreprenører eller underentreprenører anvender arbejdskraft fra hjemlandet på hjemlandets vilkår.

<sup>(1)</sup> KOM(2011)0883 endelig.

<sup>(2)</sup> Direktiv 2005/36/EF om anerkendelse af erhvervmæssige kvalifikationer, EFT L 255 af 30.9.2005, s. 22.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004585/12  
to the Commission  
Christel Schaldemose (S&D)  
(4 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Revision of the directive on the recognition of professional qualifications

On 19 December 2011, the Commission submitted a proposal for a directive amending Directive 2005/36/EC on the recognition of professional qualifications and regulation on administrative cooperation through the internal market Information System (COM(2011)0883), also known as the Recognition Directive. The Committee on the internal market and Consumer Protection is discussing the proposal, and I have the following question regarding its content.

The new provision in Article 5(1) stipulates that service providers without professional experience would be able to offer services to a person of the same nationality as the service provider in another Member State. Does this mean that foreign developers, contractors and sub-contractors would be able to employ workers from their home countries under the home countries' terms and conditions?

**Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission  
(19 June 2012)**

The European Commission adopted on 19 December 2011 a legislative proposal <sup>(1)</sup> amending the Professional Qualifications Directive <sup>(2)</sup>.

The current regime for temporary mobility foresees a two years of professional experience requirement for professionals coming from non-regulating Member States. This requirement does however not appear to be justified on the grounds of consumer protection in the case of professionals moving together with their recipients from the same Member State (e.g. a teacher accompanying a school class abroad). In these situations, the conditions imposed on professionals by the directive might go against consumers' choice.

The Commission proposal therefore foresees that the two years of professional experience are not required if the service provider is accompanying the service recipient, provided that the service recipient's habitual residence is in the provider's Member State of establishment and the profession does not appear on the list of the professions with health and safety implications.

The Professional Qualifications Directive applies only to physical persons and not to companies. Moreover, the directive organises only the recognition of the professional qualifications and does not concern the exercise of the profession.

In these conditions, Article 5(1)(b) of the directive, as amended by the proposal, exempts a professional active in the construction sector from the two years of professional experience requirement if he provides services to a client with which he is moving on the territory of the host Member State. By client it is meant the final recipient of the service, excluding any subcontractor or contractors. This provision will not allow to foreign builders, contractors or subcontractors to use home country labour in the home country's terms.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2011) 883 final.

<sup>(2)</sup> Directive 2005/36/EC on the recognition of professional qualifications, OJ L 255, 30.9.2005, p. 22.



(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004587/12**  
**adresată Comisiei**  
**Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)**  
(4 mai 2012)

*Subiect:* Consolidarea capacității de monitorizare în cadrul regimului de recuperare a activelor al Uniunii Europene

Regimul de recuperare a activelor al UE este reglementat de patru decizii-cadru care acoperă mai multe domenii diferite: confiscare și sancțiuni penale pentru spălarea banilor în Decizia-cadru 2001/500/JAI; recunoaștere reciprocă între statele membre a ordinelor de înghețare a bunurilor sau a probelor în Decizia-cadru 2003/577/JAI; norme europene armonizate privind confiscarea în Decizia-cadru 2005/212/JAI; recunoaștere reciprocă a ordinelor de confiscare în Decizia-cadru 2006/783/JAI și crearea de oficii de recuperare a creanțelor din statele membre în Decizia-cadru 2007/845/JAI. Comisia însăși a subliniat că punerea în aplicare a acestor dispoziții a fost mai puțin decât satisfăcătoare. În comunicarea sa din 20 noiembrie 2011, Comisia a declarat că textele juridice existente au fost transpuse numai parțial în legislația națională. Comisia a propus, ca una dintre cele 10 priorități strategice ale acestui domeniu, o reformare viitoare a cadrului juridic existent pentru a îmbunătăți claritatea și coerența sa. Cu toate acestea, o coerență îmbunătățită nu înseamnă în mod automat un nivel mai ridicat de conformitate. Pentru a asigura eficacitatea normelor europene, Comisia trebuie să dezvolte instrumente mai rafinate de monitorizare a implementării acestora. Salută recursul la statisticile raportate direct de respondenți, menționate în textul propunerii de directivă privind înghețarea și confiscarea produselor provenite din săvârșirea de infracțiuni în Uniunea Europeană (COM(2012)0085). Statisticile sunt un bun instrument de utilizat pentru monitorizarea punerii în aplicare.

1. Cum va asigura Comisia că statisticile raportate direct de respondenți sunt exacte, complete și actualizate periodic?
2. Ce alte măsuri cantitative prevede Comisia pentru a crește eficiența procesului de monitorizare?

**Răspuns dat de dna Malmström în numele Comisiei**  
(16 iulie 2012)

În ceea ce privește statisticile anuale detaliate, din fiecare stat membru, privind confiscarea, Comisia va fi în măsură să verifice dacă toate informațiile prevăzute în propunerea de Directivă privind înghețarea și confiscarea produselor provenite din săvârșirea de infracțiuni în Uniunea Europeană [COM(2012) 0085] au fost furnizate, însă nu și exactitatea acestora. Într-o anumită măsură, exactitatea informațiilor poate fi evaluată prin verificarea încrucișată a concordanței dintre informațiile furnizate și cele provenite din alte surse (de exemplu, statisticile birourilor naționale de gestionare a activelor, pe care statele membre vor avea obligația de a le institui, în conformitate cu directiva propusă).

Pentru a monitoriza punerea eficientă în aplicare a propunerii de directivă și impactul acesteia asupra sistemelor naționale de recuperare a activelor, Comisia va pregăti un plan de punere în aplicare. Comisia va întocmi rapoarte periodice privind punerea în aplicare, primul raport urmând a fi publicat la trei ani de la intrarea în vigoare a directivei. De asemenea, Comisia va organiza ateliere pe tema transpunerii directivei (și, dacă este necesar, o serie de alte reuniuni de experți), pentru a discuta problemele legate de punerea în aplicare. Comisia va organiza ateliere pe tema utilizării directivei, destinate factorilor de decizie din administrațiile statelor membre, pentru a explica importanța activității de confiscare a activelor, pentru a spori gradul de utilizare a instrumentelor care permit confiscarea și pentru a crea o platformă pentru schimbul de cunoștințe și de experiență între specialiști. Schimbul transfrontalier de bune practici și de informații operaționale privind identificarea și urmărirea activelor provenite din săvârșirea de infracțiuni va continua să aibă loc în cadrul Platformei birourilor de recuperare a activelor din UE.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004587/12  
to the Commission  
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)  
(4 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Enhancing monitoring capacity in the European Union's asset recovery regime

The EU's asset recovery regime is governed by four framework decisions covering several different areas: confiscation and criminal sanctions for money laundering in Framework Decision 2001/500/JHA; mutual recognition between Member States of orders freezing property or evidence in Framework Decision 2003/577/JHA; harmonised European rules on confiscation in Framework Decision 2005/212/JHA; mutual recognition of confiscation orders in Framework Decision 2006/783/JHA; and creation of Asset Recovery Offices in Member States in Framework Decision 2007/845/2007. The Commission itself has pointed out that the implementation of these provisions has been less than satisfactory. In its communication of 20 November 2011, the Commission stated that the existing legal texts had only been partially transposed into national legislation. The Commission proposed, as one of the 10 strategic priorities in this field, a future recasting of the existing legal framework in order to improve its clarity and coherence. However, increased coherence does not automatically translate into higher levels of compliance. In order to ensure that European rules are effective, the Commission must develop more refined tools to monitor their implementation. We welcome the recourse to self-reporting statistics mentioned in the text of the proposal for a directive on the freezing and confiscation of the proceeds of crime in the European Union (COM(2012)0085). Statistics are a good tool to use in monitoring implementation.

1. How will the Commission ensure that self-reporting statistics are accurate, complete and regularly updated?
2. What other quantitative measures is the Commission envisaging with a view to increasing the efficiency of the monitoring process?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission  
(16 July 2012)**

Regarding the annual detailed statistics on confiscation from each Member State, the Commission will be able to check that all the data required by the proposal for a directive on the freezing and confiscation of the proceeds of crime in the European Union (COM(2012) 0085) have been provided, but not the accuracy of the data itself. To some extent the accuracy of the data can be assessed by cross-checking the information with other sources (e.g. statistics of the national Asset Management Offices that Member States would be required to establish under the proposed Directive).

In order to monitor the effective implementation of the proposed Directive and its impact on the national asset recovery systems, the Commission will prepare an implementation plan. The Commission will produce regular implementation reports, the first report being due three years after the entry into force of the directive. The Commission will also organise transposition workshops (and if necessary other expert meetings) to discuss implementation problems. The Commission will organise utilisation workshops for decision-makers in the Member States' administrations in order to explain the value of asset confiscation work, to increase the use of confiscation tools and to provide a forum for sharing knowledge and practitioner experience. The cross-border exchange of operational information on the identification and tracing of criminal assets and best practices will continue to take place within the EU Asset Recovery Offices Platform.

---

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004588/12  
do Komisji**

**Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)**

(4 maja 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Euro 2012

30 kwietnia br. rzeczniczka Przewodniczącego Komisji Europejskiej zadeklarowała, iż Jose Manuel Barroso nie zamierza uczestniczyć w wydarzeniach związanych z Euro 2012 na Ukrainie. Powoływała się wówczas na oświadczenie Wysokiej Przedstawiciel Catherine Ashton, w którym krytykowany był system sprawiedliwości na Ukrainie. Sam Przewodniczący Barroso również w wypowiedzi telewizyjnej zapowiedział, że nie zamierza pojechać na Ukrainę w czasie mistrzostw Europy.

Przyznając, iż sytuacja byłej premier Julii Tymoszenko wymaga ponownego zbadania, a informacje o jej traktowaniu w więzieniu są wysoce niepokojące, proszę o dodatkowe wyjaśnienie:

1. Dlaczego Przewodniczący Komisji nie zamierza wziąć udziału w uroczystościach związanych z Euro 2012 na Ukrainie? Proszę o podanie oficjalnego powodu i poinformowanie, czy jest to decyzja ostateczna.
2. Jeśli to fakt uwięzienia J. Tymoszenko wpłynął na jego decyzję, to dlaczego nie podjął tej decyzji wcześniej (wszak J. Tymoszenko przebywa w odosobnieniu już 9 miesięcy i wcześniej także skarżyła się na traktowanie w więzieniu)?
3. Dlaczego Przewodniczący nie wysuwa podobnych deklaracji w kontekście zimowych igrzysk olimpijskich w Soczi? Przecież ostatnie wybory parlamentarne w Rosji zostały określone przez Parlament Europejski w grudniu zeszłego roku jako „nieuczciwe i nie wolne”. Czy Przewodniczący ma zamiar wziąć udział w olimpiadzie w Soczi?
4. Czy decyzja Przewodniczącego jest stanowiskiem całej Komisji i czy była konsultowana z Wysoką Przedstawiciel?
5. Czy decyzja komisarz Viviane Reding była konsultowana z Wysoką Przedstawiciel?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu  
Komisji**

(3 lipca 2012 r.)

W stanowisku Komisji, uzgodnionym wspólnie i przy udziale Wysokiej Przedstawiciel Unii do Spraw Zagranicznych i Polityki Bezpieczeństwa Catherine Ashton jako Wiceprzewodniczącej Komisji, istnieje wyraźne rozróżnienie między kontynuowaniem normalnych stosunków roboczych z Ukrainą a odpowiedzią członków kolegium w przypadku otrzymania zaproszenia na wydarzenia sportowe w ramach EURO 2012. Według stanowiska przewodniczącego Barroso i kolegium komisarzy przyjmowanie takich zaproszeń w obecnej sytuacji nie jest stosowne. Decyzja komisarz Viviane Reding jest w pełni zgodna z tym podejściem.

Przewodniczący Komisji nie otrzymał zaproszenia na zimowe igrzyska olimpijskie w Soczi. Olimpiada ta ma odbyć się w 2014 r.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004588/12  
to the Commission**

**Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)**

(4 May 2012)

*Subject:* Euro 2012

On 30 April 2012, the European Commission President's spokesperson declared that President José Manuel Barroso was not going to participate in events related to Euro 2012 in Ukraine. She then referred to the statement made by High Representative Catherine Ashton that criticised the Ukrainian justice system. President Barroso himself also announced in a televised speech that he did not intend to go to Ukraine during the European Championships.

Acknowledging that the situation of former Prime Minister Yulia Tymoshenko requires re-examination, and that information on her treatment in prison is highly disturbing, I ask for further clarification of the following points:

1. Why does the President of the Commission not intend to participate in the ceremonies related to Euro 2012 in Ukraine? I ask for the official reason and information on whether the decision is final.
2. If the imprisonment of Yulia Tymoshenko has influenced his decision, then why did he not make this decision before (Yulia Tymoshenko has already been in isolation for nine months and previously also complained about her treatment in prison)?
3. Why does the President not put forward similar statements in the context of the Winter Olympics in Sochi? After all, the last parliamentary elections in Russia were described by the European Parliament in December last year as 'unfair and not free'. Does the President intend to attend the Winter Olympics in Sochi?
4. Is the President's decision shared by the entire Commission and was the High Representative consulted on it?
5. Was the High Representative consulted on the decision of Commissioner Viviane Reding?

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

(3 July 2012)

The Commission's position, which was agreed collectively and with the involvement of Baroness Ashton as a Vice-President of the Commission, distinguishes clearly between the continuation of normal working relations with Ukraine and the response by members of the College in the case that they receive invitations to the sporting events of EURO 2012. The position of President Barroso and the College is that it is not appropriate to accept such invitations in current circumstances. The decision of Commissioner Reding is fully in line with this approach.

The President of the Commission has not received an invitation to the Winter Olympics in Sochi. These games are scheduled for 2014.

---

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004589/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE) und Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE)**  
(4. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Politikkohärenz im Interesse der Entwicklung und niederländische Kartoffelexporte

Kenia besitzt einen gut entwickelten Kartoffelsektor, in dem 3,3 Millionen Menschen arbeiten, 800 000 Landwirte und 2,5 Millionen Händler. Im Rahmen mehrerer europäischer Projekte in der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit wird kenianischen Landwirten Fachwissen vermittelt. Durch diese Projekte wurde ein hoher Betrag an Finanzhilfe bereitgestellt, mit dem der Kartoffelsektor wiederbelebt und erfolgreich eine sehr wirksame autarke Saatmethode eingeführt wurde.

Es wurden folgende Saatentwicklungsprojekte für einen Gesamtbetrag von 6 Mio. USD durchgeführt:

- a. ein von USAID finanziertes 3G-Projekt (dritte Generation) mit einer Laufzeit von zwei Jahren und einem Budget von über 2,0 Mio. USD,
- b. ein CFC-Projekt (Common Fund for Commodities/Gemeinsamer Fonds für Rohstoffe) mit einem Gesamtbudget von 2,5 Mio. USD für drei Länder (Kenia, Uganda und Äthiopien), von denen über 0,33 Mio. USD der Saatproduktion in Kenia zugutekommen,
- c. ein GIZ-Projekt (Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit) zur Neubelebung des Saatuntersektors mit einem Budget von 1,2 Mio. USD,
- d. Haushaltsmittel der kenianischen Regierung für den Saatuntersektor in einer Gesamthöhe von 1,0 Mio. USD in den vergangenen drei Jahren,
- e. weitere Entwicklungsprojekte für Saatkartoffeln in einer Gesamthöhe von 1,0 Mio. USD (USAID-KHCP, CIP usw.),
- f. Der private Sektor, der jüngst auf diesen Untersektor aufmerksam geworden ist, hat über 1,0 Mio. USD in eine neue Technologien nutzende Saatproduktion investiert.

Im Jahr 2011 hat die kenianische Regierung mit der niederländischen Regierung eine Einigung über die Einfuhr von Kartoffelsaatgut erzielt.

Die Einzelheiten zu den an der Einfuhr von Saatgut nach Kenia beteiligten Unternehmen sind noch geheim, und die Vereinbarung zwischen der kenianischen Regierung und den Niederlanden ist den Interessenträgern des Sektors noch nicht zugänglich gemacht worden.

1. Teilt die Kommission die Auffassung, dass Einfuhren von europäischem Saatgut den kenianischen Kartoffelsektor dem Risiko von neuen, eingeführten Krankheiten aussetzen und dass die Konkurrenz durch billige Einfuhren die örtliche Wirtschaft zerstören könnte?
2. Wenn ja, betrachtet die Kommission dies als Verstoß gegen Artikel 208 AEUV zu Politikkohärenz im Interesse der Entwicklung?
3. Welche Maßnahmen sieht die Kommission zur Bekämpfung dieser Inkohärenz vor?

**Antwort von Herrn Piebalgs im Namen der Kommission***(26. Juni 2012)*

1. Die Einfuhr von niederländischem Saatgut gefährdet den kenianischen Kartoffelsektor nicht — im Gegenteil. Dadurch soll die Verfügbarkeit von zertifizierten Pflanzkartoffeln in Kenia erhöht werden. Kartoffeln sind Kenias zweitwichtigste Nahrungsmittelkultur und nach Angaben der FAO <sup>(1)</sup> für seine Ernährungssicherheit von zentraler Bedeutung. Kenia kann derzeit allerdings nur 2 % der gesamten Nachfrage der Landwirte an zertifiziertem Saatgut bereitstellen, was zu einem konstanten Rückgang der Produktion geführt hat. Angesichts des kontinuierlichen Bevölkerungswachstums, muss die Produktion jedoch intensiviert werden. Die Einfuhr von hochwertigem Saatgut, ein Projekt einer öffentlich-privaten Partnerschaft der niederländischen und der kenianischen Regierung, wird von der kenianischen Industrie unterstützt. Die Verfügbarkeit von hochwertigerem Saatgut führt letztlich auch zu höheren Erträgen, Einkommenssteigerungen für die Landwirte und Beschäftigungsmöglichkeiten sowie zur Förderung der Ernährungssicherheit in Kenia.

Obwohl Pflanzkartoffeln ein möglicher Träger von Pflanzenseuchen und -krankheiten sein können, sind der Kommission keine pflanzengesundheitlichen Risiken im Zusammenhang mit diesem speziellen Projekt bekannt. Sie ist auch nicht in der Lage, diese Risiken im Zusammenhang mit Saatguteinfuhren nach Kenia zu bewerten. Für eine solche Bewertung und die Einrichtung eines angemessenen pflanzenschutzrechtlichen Schutzniveaus sind die kenianischen Behörden zuständig.

2. und 3. Wie die vorliegenden Nachweise belegen, liegt hier offensichtlich kein Fall von Inkohärenz vor, da das Projekt auf die Verbesserung der Ernährungssicherheit abzielt und von der lokalen Industrie unterstützt wird. Im Einklang mit Artikel 208 AEUV setzt sich die Kommission weiterhin für die Förderung einer kohärenten Politik im Interesse der Entwicklung ein und überwacht diese Kohärenz, um mögliche Anzeichen negativer Auswirkungen auf die örtliche Wirtschaft oder Gefahren für die Ernährungssicherheit zu erkennen.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> FAO — Ernährungs- und Landwirtschaftsorganisation.

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004589/12**  
**aan de Commissie**  
**Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE) en Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE)**  
(4 mei 2012)

*Betreft:* Samenhang van het ontwikkelingsbeleid en uitvoer van Nederlandse aardappelen

Kenia kent een goed ontwikkelde aardappelindustrie, waarin 3,3 miljoen mensen actief zijn, waaronder 800 000 boeren en 2,5 miljoen mensen die optreden als distributeur. Verschillende Europese projecten voor ontwikkelingssamenwerking helpen om de Keniaanse boeren de nodige know-how te verschaffen. In het kader van die programma's werd een aanzienlijke hoeveelheid financiële bijstand geboden om de aardappelindustrie nieuw leven in te blazen en is men erin geslaagd om een bijzonder doeltreffend zelfondersteunend systeem voor pootgoed in te stellen.

Er werd voor 6 miljoen USD aan projecten voor de ontwikkeling van pootgoed uitgevoerd, zoals hieronder aangegeven:

- a) Een door USAID gefinancierd 3G-project (derde generatie) met een looptijd van twee jaar en een begroting van meer dan 2,0 miljoen USD.
- b) Een GFG-project (Gemeenschappelijk Fonds voor grondstoffen) met een totale begroting van 2,5 miljoen USD voor drie landen (Kenia, Oeganda en Ethiopië), waarvan 0,33 miljoen besteed wordt aan de productie van pootgoed in Kenia.
- c) Een GIZ-project (Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit) voor het dynamiseren van de subsector pootgoed met een begroting van 1,2 miljoen USD.
- d) Een begrotingstoewijzing van de Keniaanse regering aan de subsector pootgoed, voor een totaal van 1,0 miljoen USD over de afgelopen drie jaar.
- e) Andere ontwikkelingsprojecten voor pootaardappelen, voor een totaal van 1,0 miljoen USD (USAID-KHCP, CIP, enz.)
- f) De privésector, die sinds kort betrokken is bij de subsector, heeft meer dan 1,0 miljoen USD geïnvesteerd in de productie van pootgoed met behulp van nieuwe productietechnologieën.

In 2011 kwam de Keniaanse regering tot een overeenkomst met de Nederlandse regering over de invoer van pootaardappelen.

De gegevens van de bedrijven die betrokken zijn bij de invoer van pootgoed in Kenia worden nog steeds geheim gehouden, en de overeenkomst tussen de Keniaanse regering en Nederland is nog niet ter beschikking gesteld van de belanghebbenden in de sector.

1. Is de Commissie van mening dat de invoer van Europese pootaardappelen de Keniaanse aardappelindustrie blootstelt aan het risico van nieuwe, ingevoerde ziekten en dat de concurrentie van goedkope ingevoerde producten de plaatselijke economie kan vernietigen?
2. Indien ja, is de Commissie dan ook van mening dat dit een inbreuk vormt op artikel 208 VWEU inzake samenhang van het ontwikkelingsbeleid?
3. Welke maatregelen denkt de Commissie te treffen om dit gebrek aan samenhang aan te pakken?

**Antwoord van de heer Piebalgs namens de Commissie***(26 juni 2012)*

1. De invoer van Nederlandse pootaardappelen brengt de Keniaanse aardappelindustrie niet in gevaar, integendeel. Het doel ervan is de beschikbaarheid van „gecertificeerde” pootaardappelen in het land te verhogen. Aardappelen zijn er het tweede belangrijkste voedingsgewas en volgens de FAO <sup>(1)</sup> van groot belang voor de voedselzekerheid in het land. Het huidige Keniaanse aanbod van gecertificeerd aardappelpootgoed is goed voor maar 2 % van de totale vraag van boeren. Dit heeft een constante daling van de productie veroorzaakt. Om de voortdurende groei van de bevolking het hoofd te bieden, moet de productie echter worden geïntensiveerd. De invoer van pootgoed van hoge kwaliteit, een publiek-privaat partnerschapsproject van de Nederlandse en de Keniaanse regering, wordt door de Keniaanse bedrijfstaking gesteund. De beschikbaarheid van pootgoed van hoge kwaliteit zal leiden tot een verhoogd rendement, hogere opbrengsten voor boeren en meer werkgelegenheid. Het zal ook de voedselzekerheid in Kenia bevorderen.

Hoewel pootaardappelen plantenplagen en -ziekten kunnen verspreiden, zijn de Commissie geen aan dit project gekoppelde fytosanitaire risico's bekend. De Commissie kan de risico's in verband met de invoer van pootgoed in Kenia ook niet beoordelen. De Keniaanse autoriteiten dragen verantwoordelijkheid voor deze beoordeling, alsook voor een voldoende fytosanitaire bescherming.

2. en 3. Afgaande op de beschikbare gegevens is dit project niet in strijd met een consistent ontwikkelingsbeleid, aangezien het de voedselzekerheid bevordert en de steun van de plaatselijke bedrijfstaking geniet. Overeenkomstig artikel 208 VWEU zet de Commissie zich in voor beleidscoherentie voor ontwikkeling en houdt zij deze kwestie in het oog om mogelijke tekenen van verstoring van de plaatselijke economie of van dreiging voor de voedselzekerheid op te sporen.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> FAO = Voedsel- en Landbouworganisatie van de Verenigde Naties.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004589/12  
to the Commission  
Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE) and Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE)  
(4 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Policy coherence for development and Dutch potato exports

Kenya has a well-developed potato industry with 3.3 million people working in the sector, comprising 800 000 farmers and 2.5 million people working as marketing agents. Several European development cooperation projects are contributing to provide know-how to Kenyan farmers. They have given a significant amount of financial assistance to revive the potato industry and successfully put in place a very effective self-sustaining seed system.

There have been seed development projects totalling over USD 6 million, as detailed below:

- a. A USAID-funded 3G (three generation) project running for two years with a budget of over USD 2.0 million.
- b. A CFC (Common Fund for Commodities) project with a total budget of USD 2.5 million for three countries (Kenya, Uganda and Ethiopia), of which over USD 0.33 million is going to seed production in Kenya.
- c. A GIZ (Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit) project on revitalisation of the seed subsector with a budget of USD 1.2 million.
- d. A Kenyan government budgetary allocation to the seed subsector totalling USD 1.0 million over the last three years.
- e. Other seed potato development projects totalling over USD 1.0 million (USAID-KHCP, CIP, etc.).
- f. The private sector, recently attracted into the subsector, has invested over USD 1.0 million in seed production using new production technologies.

In 2011 the Kenyan government reached an agreement with the Dutch government on the import of potato seedlings.

The details of the companies involved in importing seed to Kenya are still secret and the agreement between the Kenyan government and the Netherlands has not been made available to stakeholders in the industry.

1. Does the Commission share the view that imports of European seedlings put the Kenyan potato industry at risk of new, imported diseases and that competition from cheap imports may destroy the local economy?
2. If so, does the Commission view this as a breach of Article 208 TFEU on policy coherence for development?
3. What measures does the Commission intend to take to address this incoherence?

**Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission  
(26 June 2012)**

1. The import of Dutch seedlings does not put the Kenyan potato industry at risk, on the contrary. It aims to raise availability of 'certified' seed potatoes in Kenya. Potatoes are Kenya's second most important food crop, and key for its food security according to the FAO<sup>(1)</sup>. However, the Kenyan present supply of certified seed is only 2% of the total demand from farmers which has led to a constant decline of production. In order to cope with the continuous population growth, the production must however be intensified. The import of high quality seeds, a Public-Private Partnership project of the Dutch and Kenyan Government, is supported by the Kenyan industry. The availability of higher quality seeds will lead to higher yields, income increases for farmers and employment opportunities, and will enhance food security in Kenya.

Although seed potatoes may be a potential pathway for plant pests and diseases, the Commission has not been aware of any phytosanitary risks linked to this particular project. Neither is it in a position to evaluate these risks associated with seed imports into Kenya. Kenyan authorities are responsible for such an evaluation, and for establishing an appropriate level of phytosanitary protection.

<sup>(1)</sup> FAO = Food and Agriculture Organisation.

2 and 3. According to available evidence, this does not seem to be a case of incoherence, as the project is aimed at improving food security and has the support of local industry. However, under Article 208 TFEU, the Commission remains committed to promoting Policy Coherence for Development, and is monitoring the issue to detect any possible evidence of disruption of the local economy or threat to food security.

---

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-004591/12**

**à la Commission**

**Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE)**

(7 mai 2012)

*Objet:* Circulation transfrontalière des taxis entre la France et l'Espagne

La région frontalière entre la France et l'Espagne, et spécifiquement entre le Languedoc-Roussillon et la Catalogne, est une région marquée par une forte mobilité. Les besoins en transports transfrontaliers sont nombreux. Dans certaines situations, les habitants ne peuvent ni utiliser leur propre voiture ni les transports en commun pour se rendre de l'autre côté de la frontière. Sont particulièrement concernés les personnes âgées et les habitants de zones rurales ainsi que les personnes se déplaçant le soir ou la nuit. Les résidents français font donc souvent appel à des services de taxi pour se rendre à l'aéroport espagnol le plus proche, ou pour rentrer chez eux. La réglementation française permet à un taxi de prendre en charge un client ayant préalablement réservé sa course dans n'importe quelle commune. Cette mesure offre une liberté de choix au client qui peut ainsi bénéficier d'un service plus adapté à ses besoins, son confort et sa sécurité. En revanche, la législation espagnole est plus rigoureuse et interdit à un taxi de prendre en charge des clients en dehors de sa commune d'affectation. Seuls les taxis catalans, disposant d'une autorisation espagnole de transport interurbain, peuvent exercer en dehors de leur commune, vers les ports et les aéroports catalans.

Ces restrictions, de fait, favorisent la prise en charge de passagers aux profits de seules entreprises catalanes, et ignorent la dimension transfrontalière du service de transport, pouvant constituer, en ce cas, une entrave à la libre prestation de services. Ainsi, le 27 janvier 2012 et le 16 avril 2012, deux artisans taxis français ont été verbalisés par les autorités espagnoles, l'un à La Junquera pour un montant de 1 001 euros, et l'autre à l'aéroport de Gérone pour un montant 1 501 euros.

L'article 56 du traité FUE dispose pourtant que: «les restrictions à la libre prestation des services à l'intérieur de l'Union sont interdites à l'égard des ressortissants des États membres établis dans un État membre autre que celui du destinataire de la prestation.» L'article 57 inclut dans la notion de service les activités artisanales.

De plus, comme l'a rappelé la Commission dans sa réponse à la question parlementaire du 28 octobre 2010 (P-9070/2010), les règles nationales doivent respecter les principes généraux du droit européen comme la proportionnalité, la non-discrimination et la liberté d'établissement. Ces règles sont censées assurer une certaine qualité de service, mais doivent être justifiées, proportionnelles et non discriminatoires.

— La Commission considère-t-elle que la législation catalane constitue une entrave à la libre prestation de services?

— La Commission européenne considère-t-elle que les amendes infligées sont proportionnelles?

— Si non, la Commission compte-t-elle intervenir auprès des autorités espagnoles pour obtenir l'annulation de l'acte et le remboursement des amendes?

— Si la Commission considère qu'il n'y a pas d'entrave à la libre prestation de services, entend-elle proposer un cadre juridique plus clair pour les services transfrontaliers de transports de moins de 8 personnes?

**Réponse donnée par M. Kallas au nom de la Commission**

(20 juin 2012)

Les services de taxi comprennent le transport de voyageurs par véhicules à passagers, c'est-à-dire par véhicules aménagés pour le transport de huit personnes au maximum. Ces services sont généralement fournis sur de courtes distances, contre rémunération.

Aucun acte législatif de l'Union européenne ne concerne spécifiquement les services de taxi. La législation de l'Union sur le transport routier ne porte que sur les services d'autobus et d'autocars, qui, par définition, sont assurés par des véhicules de transport de plus de huit personnes. Les services de taxi sont le plus souvent fournis à l'échelle locale ou régionale, plus rarement internationale. Ils sont de ce fait réglementés par la législation nationale ou régionale, et même, dans bien des cas, municipale. Les taxis sont par ailleurs exclus du champ d'application de la directive 2006/123/CE du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 12 décembre 2006 relative aux services dans le marché intérieur <sup>(1)</sup>, comme le précisent l'article 2, paragraphe 2, point d), et le considérant 21 de celle-ci.

<sup>(1)</sup> JO L 376 du 27.12.2006, p. 36.

Aux termes de l'article 58, paragraphe 1, du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne (TFUE), «*la libre circulation des services, en matière de transports, est régie par les dispositions du titre relatif aux transports*». Or, conformément à la jurisprudence de la Cour de justice de l'Union européenne, les dispositions du TFUE en matière de libre prestation des services ne sont pas applicables (arrêt de la Cour du 22.12.2010 dans l'affaire C-338/09, *Yellow Cab Verkehrsbetriebs GmbH*, point 30).

En outre, l'exemple cité par l'Honorable Parlementaire ne constitue pas une violation de la liberté d'établissement.

La Commission, tenant compte du principe de subsidiarité, n'entend pas, pour le moment, modifier le champ d'application du cadre juridique actuel, qui concerne le transport international de voyageurs par véhicules de transport de plus de huit personnes.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-004591/12  
to the Commission**

**Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE)**

(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* Cross-border transport by taxi between France and Spain

In the border area between France and Spain, and specifically between the Languedoc-Roussillon region and Catalonia, there is a high level of cross-border mobility. There is great demand for cross-border transport. In some cases, residents cannot use their own car or public transport to cross the border. This mainly applies to the elderly and people living in rural areas, as well as those travelling in the evening or at night. Residents of France therefore often use taxis to take them to the nearest Spanish airport or to take them home. French legislation allows a taxi to pick up a passenger who has made an advance booking in any municipality. This gives passengers freedom of choice and they can thus enjoy a service that is more tailored to their needs, comfort and safety. Spanish legislation, however, is stricter and bans taxis from picking up passengers outside their designated municipality. Only Catalan taxis with a Spanish intercity transport licence can operate outside their municipality, to serve Catalan ports and airports.

These restrictions effectively encourage only Catalan taxi firms to pick up passengers, and ignore the cross-border dimension of the transport service, which, in this case, potentially constitutes a barrier to the freedom to provide services. Consequently, on 27 January 2012 and 16 April 2012, two French private taxi drivers were fined by the Spanish authorities: one was fined EUR 1 001 in La Jonquera, and the other EUR 1 501 at Girona Airport.

Nevertheless, Article 56 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union lays down that: 'restrictions on freedom to provide services within the Union shall be prohibited in respect of nationals of Member States who are established in a Member State other than that of the person for whom the services are intended.' Services, as defined in Article 57, include activities of craftsmen (and hence of self-employed taxi drivers).

Furthermore, as the Commission stated in its answer to the parliamentary question of 28 October 2010 (P-9070/2010), national rules have to respect the general principles of EC law such as proportionality, non-discrimination and freedom of establishment. These rules are meant to ensure a certain level of service quality, but they must be justified, proportionate and applied on a non-discriminatory basis.

— Does the Commission believe that the Catalan legislation constitutes a barrier to freedom to provide services?

— Does the Commission believe that the fines imposed are proportionate?

— If not, does the Commission plan to make representations to the Spanish authorities to ensure that the fines are annulled and the money repaid?

— If the Commission believes that there is no barrier to freedom to provide services, does it intend to propose a clearer legal framework for cross-border transport services for fewer than eight passengers?

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

(20 June 2012)

Taxi services encompass the transportation of passengers with passenger vehicles, i.e. vehicles equipped to transport no more than eight passengers. The service is normally rendered over short distances against payment of a fee.

There is no specific EU legislation covering taxi services. European road transport legislation only addresses bus and coach services, which, by definition, are carried out with vehicles for the transport of *more* than eight passengers. In the vast majority of cases taxi services are offered on a local or regional scale; they are in general not carried out across borders. These services are thus regulated by national or regional legislation or often even on the level of municipalities. Taxi are also excluded from the scope of Directive 2006/123/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006 on services in the internal market <sup>(1)</sup> as established in its Article 2(2)d) and Recital 21.

As established in Article 58 (1) TFEU, 'the freedom to provide services in the field of transport shall be governed by the provisions of the Title related to transport'. As stated by the case law of the European Court of Justice the provisions of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union concerning the freedom to provide services are not applicable (judgment of 22.12.2010, *Yellow Cab Verkehrsbetriebs GmbH*, Case C-338/09, p. 30).

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 376, 27.12.2006, p. 36.

In addition, the situation referred to by the Honourable Member does not concern a violation of the freedom of establishment.

The Commission, taking into account the principle of subsidiarity, does not intend, for the time being, to modify the scope of the current legal framework, which covers the international carriage of passengers by vehicles carrying more than eight passengers.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004593/12**

**alla Commissione**

**Oreste Rossi (EFD)**

(7 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Strage di foche

La caccia alle foche viene praticata tutto l'anno, ma la stagione venatoria varia in base alla regione e alle specie. Il Canada, la Groenlandia e la Namibia rappresentano circa il 60 % delle 900 000 foche cacciate ogni anno. Tra gli altri paesi interessati figurano l'Islanda, la Norvegia, la Russia, gli Stati Uniti e, all'interno dell'Unione europea, la Svezia, la Finlandia e il Regno Unito. Esistono circa 30 specie di foche, che in genere vivono sulle coste delle regioni polari e subpolari del pianeta, di queste ne vengono cacciate circa la metà per un totale di 15-16 milioni di esemplari.

La Commissione ha adottato una proposta di regolamento che vieta di commercializzare all'interno dell'Unione europea, di importare nel suo territorio o di esportare prodotti ricavati dalle foche. Il commercio di questi prodotti può essere consentito solo se ci sono garanzie che le tecniche di caccia utilizzate rispettano standard elevati di benessere degli animali. Secondo il parere dell'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare (EFSA), vari metodi consentono di uccidere le foche in modo rapido ed efficace, senza causare loro inutile dolore, stress e sofferenza. I dati concreti indicano però che nella pratica ciò non sempre avviene.

Visto l'impegno assunto a livello europeo per tutelare la salute degli animali attraverso la campagna di sensibilizzazione 8hours e la direttiva 2010/63/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 22 settembre 2010, sulla protezione degli animali utilizzati a fini scientifici, può la Commissione comunicare se intende implementare le azioni esistenti al fine di garantire il benessere degli animali?

**Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione**

(29 giugno 2012)

La direttiva 2010/63/UE <sup>(1)</sup> sulla protezione degli animali utilizzati a fini scientifici attesta il costante impegno dell'UE a raggiungere standard elevati per il benessere degli animali. Tuttavia questa direttiva non affronta la questione dell'uccisione delle foche, a meno che queste ultime non siano catturate e utilizzate a fini scientifici quando ancora in vita.

Ai sensi dell'articolo 7, paragrafo 1, del regolamento (CE) n. 1007/2009 <sup>(2)</sup> del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio sul commercio dei prodotti derivati dalla foca, adottato il 10 agosto 2010, gli Stati membri sono stati invitati a presentare alla Commissione, entro il 20 novembre 2011, una relazione che illustrasse le azioni intraprese per dare attuazione a tale regolamento. La Commissione sta attualmente analizzando i risultati emersi da tali relazioni e, entro il 20 novembre 2012, riferirà al Parlamento europeo e al Consiglio in merito all'attuazione del regolamento.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> GUL 276 del 20.10.2010.

<sup>(2)</sup> GUL 286 del 31.10.2009.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004593/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Oreste Rossi (EFD)**  
(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* Slaughter of seals

Seals are hunted all year round, but the hunting season varies according to the region and the species. Canada, Greenland and Namibia account for around 60% of the 900 000 seals caught every year. The other countries concerned include Iceland, Norway, Russia, the United States and, within the European Union, Sweden, Finland and the United Kingdom. There are some 30 species of seal, which generally live on the coasts of the planet's polar and sub-polar regions, and around half of these are hunted, with a total of 15-16 million seals being caught.

The Commission has adopted a proposal for a regulation prohibiting the marketing within the European Union, the importing into EU territory or the exporting of products derived from seals. Trading in these products would only be permitted if guarantees are obtained that the hunting techniques used comply with high standards of animal welfare. In the opinion of the European Food Safety Authority, there are various methods that allow seals to be killed quickly and efficiently without causing them undue pain, stress or suffering. However, concrete data suggests that in practice this is not always the case.

In view of the commitment made at European level to protect animal welfare through the 8-hours awareness-raising campaign and Directive 2010/63/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 September 2010 on the protection of animals used for scientific purposes, can the Commission state whether it intends to implement the existing measures to guarantee animal welfare?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission**  
(29 June 2012)

Directive 2010/63/EU <sup>(1)</sup> on the protection of animals used for scientific purposes indeed confirms EU's continuous commitment for a high standard of animal welfare. However, this directive does not touch upon the killing of seals, unless these are captured and used for scientific purposes when alive.

In accordance with Article 7.1 of Regulation (EC) No 1007/2009 <sup>(2)</sup> of the European Parliament and of the Council on trade in seal products, which was adopted on 10 August 2010, the Member States were invited to submit to the Commission by 20 November 2011 a report outlining the actions undertaken to implement this regulation. The Commission will now reflect on the findings and will report back to the European Parliament and the Council on the implementation of the regulation by 20 November 2012.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 276, 20.10.2010.  
<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 286, 31.10.2009.



(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004594/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(7 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Utilizzo di farmaci antidepressivi

La crisi fa male alla salute, e quella degli italiani è sempre più a rischio, per colpa dei tagli, sempre più frequenti, da parte di servizi pubblici e regioni, sulla prevenzione. Ma l'effetto del dissesto economico porta anche a un'altra conseguenza: la quota di italiani che potrebbe «scivolare» sotto la soglia di povertà è salita a ben una famiglia su quattro, con un aumento del 7 % degli indigenti.

La salute degli italiani resta tutto sommato ancora buona, ma la crisi sta erodendo la «rendita» del paese anche sul versante sanitario. Nell'analisi è stato rilevato che c'è un disagio diffuso dilagante, scatenato dalle difficoltà socio-economiche. E lo si deduce da alcuni fattori, come ad esempio l'utilizzo di farmaci antidepressivi. Il dato è in aumento: da 8,18 dosi giornaliere per 1000 abitanti nel 2000 a 35,72 nel 2010 ed è sintomo della ricerca di una «cura rapida» al senso di malessere, anche se, avvertono gli esperti, non sempre sono rilevabili concrete motivazioni cliniche.

Alla luce di quanto precede, potrebbe la Commissione far sapere:

1. Se si riscontra una situazione analoga a quella italiana in altri stati dell'UE?
2. Se possiede dati, riferiti all'ultimo semestre, circa l'utilizzo di antidepressivi negli Stati membri?

**Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione**

(22 giugno 2012)

La Commissione non raccoglie dati sull'uso di antidepressivi negli Stati membri dell'UE. Soltanto due sostanze attive (agomelatina e duloxetina) sono autorizzate centralmente a livello di UE per il trattamento della depressione. Per tale motivo, il monitoraggio di quasi tutti gli antidepressivi rientra nelle responsabilità delle autorità competenti dei paesi in cui essi sono autorizzati.

I dati relativi ai diversi Stati membri sono reperibili nel rapporto e nella base dati «Health at a Glance» (Panoramica sulla salute) dell'OCSE in relazione al 2011. Da questi dati emerge che tra il 2000 e il 2009 (ovvero l'anno più recente) l'uso degli antidepressivi è aumentato significativamente in tutti e 16 gli Stati membri dell'UE inseriti nella base dati.

La Commissione non è a conoscenza degli sviluppi in tema di consumo di antidepressivi negli ultimi sei mesi.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004594/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* Use of anti-depressants

The crisis is harmful to health, and the health of Italians is increasingly being put at risk by the ever more frequent cuts to prevention being made by public bodies and regional authorities. However, economic instability is also having another effect: the percentage of Italians who might 'slip' below the poverty threshold has risen to as much as one family in four, with a 7% increase in those living in poverty.

On the whole, Italians are in good health but the crisis is eating away at the country's prosperity, including in health terms. Analysis has shown that socioeconomic difficulties have led to a widespread and rampant sense of anxiety. This can be deduced from a number of factors, such as the use of anti-depressants. This figure is on the rise: from 8.18 daily doses per 1 000 inhabitants in 2000 to 35.72 in 2010. This is symptomatic of the search for a 'quick cure' to the feeling of anxiety, even though, experts warn, there is not always an obvious concrete clinical justification.

In view of the above, could the Commission state:

1. Whether a similar situation to that in Italy has been noted in other EU States?
2. Whether it has data for the last six months regarding the use of anti-depressants in the Member States?

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

(22 June 2012)

The Commission does not collect data on the use of antidepressants in the EU Member States. Only two active substances (agomelatine and duloxetine) are centrally authorised at EU-level for the treatment of depression. Therefore, the monitoring of almost all antidepressants is under the responsibility of the national competent authorities, where they are authorised.

Data for a number of Member States can be found in the OECD's Health at a Glance report and database for 2011. These show that between 2000 and 2009 (or the nearest year) the use of antidepressants increased significantly in all 16 EU Member States included in the database.

The Commission is not aware of data on antidepressant consumption developments over the past six months.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004595/12  
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)  
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(7 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Attacchi suicidi in Russia

Attentatori suicidi hanno causato la morte di dodici persone e il ferimento di altre 110 in due attacchi contro un posto di blocco della polizia alla periferia della capitale della regione russa del Daghestan. Lo hanno riferito oggi investigatori sul posto e fonti della sicurezza.

Gli attacchi alle porte di Makhachkala sono i più sanguinosi degli ultimi mesi e stanno mettendo a rischio il lavoro delle forze di sicurezza russe per contrastare la ribellione dei fondamentalisti islamici nel Caucaso del nord vicino a Sochi, località in cui saranno ospitate le Olimpiadi invernali del 2014.

Il primo attentatore si è fatto esplodere quando la polizia ha fermato un veicolo per controllare i documenti e la seconda esplosione è avvenuta all'arrivo di pompieri e ambulanze, provocando altre vittime, secondo quanto riferito da una nota del Comitato nazionale anti-terrorismo.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante far sapere:

1. Se è a conoscenza della vicenda che ha interessato la regione russa?
2. Se non ritiene che sia utile prendere provvedimenti per tutelare i milioni di europei che visitano la Russia ogni anno?
3. Se nell'ambito della politica europea di vicinato possono essere intraprese operazioni che garantiscano una maggiore sicurezza agli Stati membri confinanti con la Russia (Estonia, Lettonia, Finlandia)?

**Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione**

(19 giugno 2012)

L'UE segue attentamente la situazione nel Caucaso settentrionale ed è a conoscenza degli attacchi ai quali l'onorevole parlamentare fa riferimento.

Tuttavia, le aree interessate non sono mete turistiche e l'UE non vede alcuna ragione per prendere provvedimenti specifici per proteggere i cittadini europei che partono per la Russia.

Nonostante la Russia non faccia parte della politica europea di vicinato/partenariato orientale, l'UE e la Russia collaborano nella lotta contro il terrorismo, anche nell'ambito del dialogo politico sulla lotta al terrorismo. L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente è cosciente del fatto che negli ultimi anni sono stati perpetrati alcuni attacchi terroristici a Mosca; ritiene, tuttavia, che queste azioni isolate non possano essere considerate minacce per la sicurezza degli Stati membri che confinano con la Russia.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004595/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)  
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)  
(7 May 2012)**

*Subject:* VP/HR — Suicide attacks in Russia

Suicide bombers caused the death of 12 people and injured a further 110 in two attacks against a police roadblock in the suburbs of the Russian region of Dagestan, according to reports by investigators at the site and security sources.

The attacks on the outskirts of Makhachkala are the bloodiest in recent months and are endangering the work being done by the Russian security forces to combat the rebellion by Islamic fundamentalists in the northern Caucasus near Sochi, where the Winter Olympics will be held in 2014.

The first bomber blew himself up when the police stopped a vehicle to check documents and the second explosion happened when the Fire Brigade and ambulances arrived, causing further victims, according to a report by the National Anti-terrorism Committee.

In view of the above, can the Vice-President/High Representative state:

1. Whether she is aware of the situation involving the Russian region?
2. Whether she considers it worthwhile to take provisions to protect the millions of Europeans who visit Russia every year?
3. Whether, under the European neighbourhood policy, operations can be undertaken to guarantee greater security for Member States that border with Russia (Estonia, Latvia, Finland)?

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

The EU is following the situation in the North Caucasus very closely, and is aware of the attacks to which the Honourable Member refers.

However, the areas affected are not tourist destinations and the EU sees no reason to take any specific measures to protect its citizens travelling to Russia.

Russia is not part of the European Neighbourhood Policy/Eastern Partnership, but the EU and Russia do cooperate on the fight against terrorism, *inter alia* in the framework of the political dialogue on counter-terrorism. The High Representative/Vice-President is aware that some terrorist attacks have been carried out in Moscow in recent years, but these isolated actions cannot be described as affecting the security of Member States bordering Russia.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004596/12  
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)  
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(7 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Attentato in Bajaur, regione pakistana

Cinque persone sono morte a Chamarkand, nel nordovest del Pakistan, per l'esplosione di due bombe piazzate per colpire anziani leader tribali attivi nella lotta contro i talebani. Lo rende noto un funzionario locale precisando che gli attacchi si sono verificati oggi nella regione tribale di Bajaur. La prima deflagrazione è stata causata da un ordigno piazzato sul ciglio di una strada ed esploso al passaggio di due leader tribali entrambi morti nell'attacco.

La seconda esplosione, in cui hanno perso la vita due soldati paramilitari e un ufficiale di polizia, si è verificata poco dopo, mentre le forze di sicurezza si dirigevano sul luogo del primo attacco.

Nessuna delle due esplosioni è stata ancora rivendicata, ma in passato i talebani hanno lanciato diversi attentati simili nell'area.

Alla luce di quanto precede, potrebbe il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante far sapere:

1. Se è a conoscenza della vicenda che ha interessato la regione pakistana?
2. Se ci sono attività che l'UE ha intrapreso nella regione tribale di Bajaur al fine di garantire la prosperità e difendere i valori democratici nonché i diritti umani?
3. Quali sono gli esiti della decisione 2010/649/UE del Consiglio, del 7 ottobre 2010, relativa alla conclusione dell'accordo fra la Comunità europea e la Repubblica islamica del Pakistan sulla riammissione delle persone in soggiorno irregolare?

**Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione**

(17 luglio 2012)

L'AR/VP è a conoscenza dell'incidente menzionato dall'onorevole parlamentare e, in generale, è preoccupata per le difficoltà con le quali la popolazione e le autorità pakistane si confrontano quotidianamente a causa di attacchi terroristici.

L'UE non può intervenire direttamente negli affari interni né garantire la prosperità di un paese partner e delle sue province. Tuttavia, può esprimere le proprie preoccupazioni per i danni che un clima di violenza e intimidazione può causare allo sviluppo del paese e può mettere a disposizione la sua esperienza nel risolvere problemi politici attraverso il dialogo e nel promuovere i valori democratici e i diritti umani.

L'UE mantiene un dialogo politico costante con il Pakistan per quanto riguarda i diritti umani, la sicurezza, la lotta al terrorismo e lo sviluppo e ha invitato le autorità pakistane ad adottare misure volte a tutelare i diritti di tutti i cittadini del paese, in linea con le norme e le convenzioni internazionali in materia di diritti umani. Alla sessione del dialogo UE-Pakistan sui diritti umani tenutasi nel febbraio 2012, l'UE ha sollevato in particolare la questione dei diritti civili, politici e umani delle popolazioni delle aree tribali di amministrazione federale (FATA).

Dal 2010 l'UE sostiene progetti in Pakistan, soprattutto nelle FATA e nel Khyber Pakhtunkwha, al fine di migliorare la qualità delle attività di controllo del territorio e l'accesso alla giustizia e di contribuire alle iniziative per il consolidamento della pace attraverso la mediazione.

L'accordo di riammissione UE-Pakistan è entrato in vigore il 1° dicembre 2010. Il 12 giugno 2012 il primo comitato misto per la riammissione ha avuto un costruttivo scambio di opinioni sull'applicazione dell'accordo. La sessione successiva è prevista per l'autunno 2012. La Commissione continuerà a monitorare attentamente l'applicazione dell'accordo.

La delegazione dell'UE ad Islamabad è quotidianamente in contatto con i rappresentanti degli Stati membri per quanto riguarda gli sviluppi della sicurezza nel paese.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004596/12**  
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**  
**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**  
(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Terrorist attack in Bajaur, region of Pakistan

Five people have been killed in Chamarkand, north-western Pakistan, by two bombs that had been placed to strike old tribal leaders active in the fight against the Taliban. A local official made the announcement and stated that the attacks took place today in the tribal region of Bajaur. The first explosion was caused by a bomb placed by the roadside that exploded as two tribal leaders passed by. Both of them died in the attack.

The second explosion, which resulted in two paramilitary soldiers and one police officer losing their lives, happened shortly after, while the security forces were heading to the site of the first attack.

No responsibility has so far been claimed for either of the two explosions, but in the past the Taliban have launched various similar attacks in the area.

In view of the above, could the Vice-President/High Representative state:

1. Whether she is aware of the situation involving the Pakistani region?
2. Whether any activities have been undertaken by the EU in the tribal region of Bajaur in order to guarantee prosperity and defend democratic values and human rights?
3. What are the outcomes of Council Decision 2010/649/EU of 7 October 2010 on the conclusion of the Agreement between the European Community and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan on the readmission of persons residing without authorisation?

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

The HR/VP is aware of the incident, and more generally is concerned by the difficult situation with which the Pakistani people and authorities are confronted on a daily basis as a result of terrorist attacks.

The EU cannot intervene directly in the internal affairs nor can it guarantee prosperity of a partner country and its provinces. But it can convey concern at the damage that a climate of violence and intimidation does to a country's development, and offer to share its experience in resolving political issues through dialogue, and in promoting democratic values and human rights.

The EU engages in regular dialogue with Pakistan on human rights, security and counter-terrorism, and development. The EU has called on the Pakistani authorities to adopt measures to protect the rights of all Pakistani citizens in line with international human rights standards and conventions. At the February 2012 EU-Pakistan human rights dialogue, the EU raised in particular the issue of the civil, political and human rights of the people of FATA.

Since 2010, the EU supports projects in Pakistan, focused on FATA and Kyhber Pakhtunkwha, intended to improve the quality of law enforcement, access to justice and contribute to peace-building initiatives through mediation.

The EU-Pakistan Readmission Agreement entered into force on 1 December 2010. The first Joint Readmission Committee held a constructive exchange on the application of the agreement on 12 June 2012. The next meeting is scheduled for the autumn of 2012. The Commission will continue close monitoring of the application of the agreement.

The EU Delegation in Islamabad is in daily contact with Member States' representatives on security developments in Pakistan.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004598/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(7 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: La politica interattiva dell'UE

Le consultazioni pubbliche della Commissione sono tra i principali strumenti attraverso i quali si concretizza la politica di trasparenza dell'Unione europea e si permette la partecipazione dei cittadini al processo decisionale e legislativo. Spesso accompagnate da un «libro verde», ossia un documento atto a stimolare il dibattito su un determinato argomento, le consultazioni pubbliche sono rivolte a tutti i cittadini e le organizzazioni che abbiano interesse nei temi che saranno oggetto delle future proposte legislative della Commissione e che vogliono far sentire la propria voce all'interno dei processi decisionali.

Tutte le consultazioni aperte sono disponibili nel sito «La vostra voce in Europa» al fine di migliorare la governance europea e promuovere l'azione «Legiferare meglio».

Alla luce di quanto precede, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. quali iniziative rilevanti sono state intraprese grazie a questo strumento di politica interattiva;
2. in che modo l'UE ha intenzione di migliorare il sito al fine di garantire che le consultazioni siano tradotte in tutte le lingue ufficiali dell'UE (ancora oggi molte di queste sono tradotte solo nelle lingue principali) e che tale sistema sia pubblicizzato e portato a conoscenza dei tanti cittadini disinformati ma allo stesso tempo interessati a interagire.

**Risposta di José Manuel Barroso a nome della Commissione**

(20 giugno 2012)

Consultare le parti direttamente interessate da una nuova iniziativa dell'UE e coloro che la dovranno mettere in atto è un obbligo imposto dal trattato e uno strumento essenziale per compiere scelte politiche intelligenti. Di conseguenza la Commissione avvia sistematicamente le attività di consultazione in merito alle principali iniziative e s'impegna a raggiungere tutte le categorie di destinatari interessati, compresi i cittadini in senso lato, avvalendosi anche delle consultazioni pubbliche aperte disponibili sul portale «La vostra voce in Europa», che dal 2010 ad oggi ha pubblicato ben 280 consultazioni.

Nel chiedere il parere delle parti interessate, la Commissione s'impegna a utilizzare un approccio inclusivo, ma poiché non dispone di risorse illimitate è costretta a dare la priorità alla traduzione nelle lingue ufficiali di tutti i testi legislativi e al rispetto degli altri obblighi di legge. La Commissione è tuttavia fermamente convinta che per compiere scelte politiche intelligenti sia importante consultare le parti interessate e cerca pertanto di rendere disponibile la traduzione del maggior numero possibile di documenti, tenendone in considerazione la rilevanza e il ruolo strategico. Ad esempio, data la loro fondamentale importanza politica, i libri verdi e i libri bianchi vengono tradotti, tendenzialmente, in tutte le lingue.

Sulla scia della comunicazione «Legiferare con intelligenza nell'Unione europea» <sup>(1)</sup> la Commissione sta rivedendo le sue politiche di consultazione per valutare, eventualmente, la necessità di ampliare la portata delle consultazioni e le modalità per farlo.

---

(1) COM(2010)543.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004598/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* The EU's interactive policy-making initiative

The Commission's public consultations are one of the main instruments with which the EU's transparency policy takes tangible form and citizens are allowed to participate in the decision-making and legislative process. Often accompanied by a 'green paper', that is, a document seeking to encourage debate on a given subject, public consultations are aimed at any citizen or organisation interested in the topics which will be the subject of the Commission's future legislative proposals, and who wish to have their say within the decision-making processes.

All ongoing consultations are available on the 'Your Voice in Europe' website, in order to improve European governance and promote the 'Better Regulation' initiative.

In view of the above, can the Commission state:

1. Which major initiatives have been undertaken thanks to this interactive policy-making instrument?
2. How the EU intends to improve the site to ensure that the consultations are translated into all of the EU's official languages (many have still only been translated into the main languages), and to ensure that this system is publicised and brought to the attention of the large number of citizens who are badly informed but also interested in interacting?

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

(20 June 2012)

Consulting those affected by a new EU initiative and those implementing it is a Treaty obligation and an essential tool to make smart policy choices. Accordingly, the Commission systematically consults stakeholders on all major initiatives and strives to reach all target audiences including citizens. One of the tools used to this end are the open public consultations made available via the single access website 'Your voice in Europe'. Since 2010, some 280 consultations have been posted on this website.

When seeking stakeholders' views, the Commission is committed to an inclusive approach. However, given the limited availability of resources, it must prioritise its translation activity to ensure that all legislative texts are translated into all the official languages and other legal obligations are respected. Since the Commission strongly believes in the importance of consultations for smarter policy making, it seeks to make available the translations of as many other documents as possible, taking into due account their importance and strategic nature. For instance, Green Papers and White Papers are, in principle, translated into all languages since they are considered a political priority for consultation purposes.

Following up on its communication on 'Smart Regulation in the European Union' <sup>(1)</sup>, the Commission is now carrying out a review of its consultation policy. Among other things, the review will look at the need for, and ways to, increase the reach of its consultations.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2010) 543.



(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004599/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(7 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Fenomeno sottostimato

Le piante sono molto più sensibili ai cambiamenti climatici di quanto si pensasse: basta che la temperatura aumenti di un grado perché foglie e fiori spuntino con una settimana di anticipo. È la conclusione di uno studio internazionale, che dimostra come gli esperimenti condotti in laboratorio abbiano sottostimato il fenomeno, anche fino a otto volte. Questa discrepanza sarebbe dovuta ai metodi usati negli esperimenti per ricreare artificialmente il riscaldamento globale.

I cambiamenti climatici stanno inoltre provocando un progressivo «rimpicciolimento» degli organismi viventi, dalle piante fino ai predatori al vertice della catena alimentare, e nel prossimo futuro questo processo potrebbe portare a pesanti conseguenze anche per l'alimentazione umana. Diversi studi hanno già dimostrato che, in risposta al riscaldamento globale, molte specie stanno cambiando la loro distribuzione geografica, spostandosi verso altitudini e latitudini sempre maggiori, oltre ad anticipare nel corso dell'anno eventi chiave per la sopravvivenza come la migrazione o l'impollinazione.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione comunicare:

1. se è a conoscenza dei nuovi studi che dimostrano come le ripercussioni negative del cambiamento climatico sulle piante siano state sottostimate;
2. se sono stati condotti ulteriori studi circa le difficoltà di adattamento, con conseguente mutamento di taglia, delle varie specie al cambiamento climatico?

**Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione**

(22 giugno 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza dei risultati degli studi scientifici che ci portano a una comprensione sempre migliore della risposta degli organismi e dei gruppi di organismi (popolazioni, gruppi funzionali, ecosistemi) ai cambiamenti climatici. A questo costante miglioramento della comprensione hanno contribuito in misura significativa le ricerche finanziate dall'UE nell'ambito dei successivi programmi quadro di ricerca e che dovrebbero proseguire nell'ambito del programma «Orizzonte 2020». Pertanto, alla Commissione non sorprende che gli studi rivelino come i cambiamenti climatici possano influire sui sistemi viventi in modi fino ad ora sconosciuti. La Commissione guarda con preoccupazione al rischio che i cambiamenti climatici possano sovrappassare la capacità di adattamento degli ecosistemi e alla conseguente minaccia per la produzione alimentare. La Commissione si rifà all'articolo 2 della Convenzione quadro delle Nazioni Unite sui cambiamenti climatici (UNFCCC) per cercare di intensificare la propria azione di contrasto ai cambiamenti climatici, sia nell'UE che a livello mondiale.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004599/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* An underestimated phenomenon

Plants are much more sensitive to climate change than was previously thought: it only takes a temperature rise of one degree to make leaves and flowers open a week earlier. This is the finding of an international study which demonstrates how experiments conducted in laboratories have underestimated the phenomenon at least eightfold. This discrepancy is thought to be due to the methods used in the experiments to artificially re-create global warming.

Climate change is also bringing about a progressive 'shrinking' of living organisms, from plants to predators at the top of the food chain, and in the near future this process could also lead to serious consequences for food. Various studies have already shown that many species are changing their geographical distribution in response to global warming, moving to increasingly higher altitudes and latitudes, as well as bringing forward, in the course of the year, events that are key to survival, such as migration or pollination.

In view of the above, can the Commission state:

1. Is it aware of the new studies showing that the negative repercussions of climate change on plants have been underestimated?
2. Have other studies been conducted on the adaptation difficulties shown — with a consequent change in size — by various species in response to climate change?

**Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission**

(22 June 2012)

Scientific research is constantly improving our understanding of the responses of organisms and groups of organisms (populations, functional groups, ecosystems) to climate change, and the Commission is aware of the results. Research funded under successive EU Research Framework Programmes have contributed significantly to the continual improvement of our understanding, and are expected to continue under Horizon 2020. The Commission is therefore not surprised when studies find that climate change may affect living systems in ways that were previously unknown. The Commission is deeply concerned about the risk of climate change overcoming the ability of ecosystems to adapt, and about the threat to food production. The Commission is guided by Article 2 of the UNFCCC in its efforts to step up action against climate change both globally and in the EU.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004600/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(7 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Sequestro farmaco cinese

Migliaia di confezioni di medicine sono state sequestrate in Cina mercoledì 18 aprile, dopo la scoperta che una grande impresa cinese aveva usato gelatina industriale, velenosa, per produrre le capsule che contengono farmaci in polvere. Il proprietario dell'impresa è stato arrestato per aver cercato di distruggere le prove del crimine.

Lo scandalo è esploso in Cina quando le autorità hanno denunciato di aver scoperto che le medicine con il rivestimento pericoloso erano state individuate nella provincia dello Zhejiang e nelle città di Pechino, Changzhou e Xiamen. Secondo gli esperti, a spingere alcune imprese a usare la gelatina industriale invece di quella commestibile è stata la crescente domanda, che ha lasciato sul mercato un «buco» valutato in dieci tonnellate di gelatina.

L'autorità nazionale cinese per la sicurezza dei farmaci ha ritirato dal mercato tredici prodotti diversi e ha segnalato che la gelatina prodotta dalle aziende (soprattutto nel nord della provincia di Hebei e in quella orientale di Jiangxi) usata nella fabbricazione delle capsule è derivata da scarti di materiale in pelle. In tutto il mondo aumenta la preoccupazione per la sicurezza dei prodotti fabbricati in Cina, soprattutto di quelli sanitari. Negli Stati Uniti, l'autorità delegata al controllo dei medicinali è stata più volte criticata per la mancata ispezione di prodotti importati dal paese asiatico e per la mancata messa al bando di farmaci provenienti da alcune società cinesi.

Alla luce di quanto precede, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. se è a conoscenza del sequestro del farmaco summenzionato;
2. se, in seguito alla firma della Convenzione MediCrime, volta a perseguire incisivamente la contraffazione dei farmaci, sono state intraprese nuove azioni per garantire la sicurezza dei medicinali anche dopo la loro autorizzazione e commercializzazione, e se la Cina è uno dei paesi che ha sottoscritto la Convenzione MediCrime.

**Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione**

(28 giugno 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza del problema menzionato dall'onorevole deputato.

La Convenzione Medicrime è stata adottata dal Comitato dei ministri del Consiglio d'Europa nel 2010 ed è aperta alla firma a partire dall'ottobre 2011. Essa però non è ancora in vigore. 14 Stati membri del Consiglio d'Europa hanno firmato la Convenzione.

La Convenzione è aperta alla firma degli Stati membri del Consiglio d'Europa, di Israele e del Giappone che hanno partecipato alla redazione della Convenzione, degli stati osservatori e dell'UE. Essa sarà anche aperta alla firma di altri stati non membri del Consiglio d'Europa su invito del Comitato di ministri. Informazioni in merito agli stati firmatari/ratificatari sono reperibili sulle pagine web dedicate del Consiglio d'Europa.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004600/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* Seizure of a Chinese drug

Thousands of boxes of medicine were seized in China on Wednesday, 18 April, following the discovery that a major Chinese company had used industrial gelatin, a toxic substance, to produce the capsules containing powdered medicines. The company owner has been arrested for attempting to destroy evidence of the crime.

The scandal erupted in China when the authorities reported they had discovered that medicines with the dangerous coating had been found in Zhejiang province and in the cities of Beijing, Changzhou and Xiamen. According to experts, it was growing demand, leaving an estimated shortfall in the market of 10 tonnes of gelatin that prompted some companies to use industrial gelatin instead of edible gelatin.

The Chinese national drug safety authority has withdrawn 13 different products from the market and has indicated that the gelatin produced by the companies (especially in the north of Hebei province and in the east of Jiangxi province), used to manufacture the capsules, comes from waste leather. Concerns are growing worldwide about the safety of goods made in China, particularly health products. In the United States, the authority responsible for controlling medicines has been criticised several times over its failure to inspect products imported from China and its failure to ban drugs made by certain Chinese companies.

In view of the above, can the Commission state:

1. Whether it is aware of the seizure of the abovementioned drug.
2. Whether, following the signing of the MediCrime Convention, which aims forcefully to combat the counterfeiting of medicines, new action has been taken to guarantee the safety of medicines, including after they have been authorised and marketed, and whether China is among the signatory countries to the MediCrime Convention?

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

(28 June 2012)

The Commission is aware of the issue mentioned by the Honourable Member.

The Medicrime Convention has been adopted by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe in 2010 and is open for signature since October 2011. It is not yet in force. 14 Member States of the Council of Europe have signed the Convention.

The Convention is open for signature for Council of Europe Member states, Israel and Japan who participated in the drafting of the convention, to observer states, and to the EU. It shall also be open for signature by any other non-Member State of the Council of Europe upon invitation by the Committee of Ministers. Information on signing/ratifying states can be found on the dedicated webpages of the Council of Europe.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004601/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(7 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Virus potenzialmente pandemico

È stato creato in laboratorio, da un virologo giapponese, un virus influenzale «chimera» potenzialmente pandemico, in grado di trasmettersi attraverso le classiche goccioline che si diffondono con un colpo di tosse o uno starnuto. Secondo quanto riportato da riviste scientifiche, è un ibrido di un virus influenzale umano e dell'aviaria H5N1 ed è stato creato a fini sperimentali per capire come l'influenza aviaria potrebbe passare all'uomo e divenire pandemica. La sua trasmissibilità è stata testata su furetti.

L'aviaria è l'influenza che spaventa di più perché quando l'H5N1 ha fatto il salto di specie passando dagli uccelli all'uomo, le conseguenze per gli individui sono state sempre molto gravi. Fortunatamente finora si è trattato di casi isolati perché l'H5N1 non è capace di trasmettersi da uomo a uomo col classico starnuto in quanto la sua HA fondamentale, con cui tutti i virus influenzali si attaccano al tessuto respiratorio dell'ospite, non è adatta.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. Se è a conoscenza della nuova ricerca sull'influenza aviaria?
2. Quali sono i punti chiave della strategia «Preparazione e intervento dell'UE in caso di influenza pandemica» e le raccomandazioni dell'Organizzazione mondiale della sanità (OMS)?

**Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione**

(22 giugno 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza dello studio recentemente pubblicato su «Nature» dal dott. Y Kawaoka et al. Tale studio indica come bastino pochissime mutazioni per rendere trasmissibile tra i furetti, attraverso le goccioline, un virus ricombinante dell'influenza contenenti geni sia del virus aviario H5N1 sia del virus H1N1 all'origine della pandemia del 2009. Questi risultati possono avere importanti implicazioni per la sanità pubblica al fine di migliorare la predisposizione operativa contro i virus H5N1 aventi un potenziale pandemico.

La Commissione ha adottato per l'Unione europea un Piano sulla pianificazione della preparazione e dell'intervento dell'UE quale cornice utile a identificare i ruoli e gli interventi degli attori chiave a livello UE e nazionale per ciascuna fase di una pandemia. Gli elementi chiave affrontati sono la pianificazione e il coordinamento, il monitoraggio e la valutazione, la prevenzione e il contenimento, la risposta del sistema sanitario e la comunicazione. Alla luce degli ultimi sviluppi scientifici e degli insegnamenti tratti da situazioni problematiche come la pandemia d'influenza del 2009 la Commissione porta attualmente avanti la predisposizione operativa contro le pandemie nel contesto di una più ampia iniziativa in tema di sicurezza sanitaria che copre tutti i tipi di gravi minacce transfrontaliere per la salute.

Il «Global Influenza Programme» dell'OMS fornisce agli Stati membri un orientamento strategico, un sostegno tecnico e il coordinamento di attività al fine di rendere i loro sistemi sanitari meglio reattivi alle minacce costituite dall'influenza per la popolazione e i singoli individui. Gli interventi raccomandati che le autorità nazionali e l'OMS dovrebbero attuare sono presentati per tutte le fasi di una pandemia e comprendono la pianificazione e il coordinamento, il monitoraggio e la valutazione della situazione, la riduzione della diffusione della malattia, la continuità dell'assistenza sanitaria e la comunicazione. L'orientamento dell'OMS viene attualmente aggiornato nel contesto del riesame del Regolamento sanitario internazionale.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004601/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* Virus with pandemic potential

A Japanese virologist has created, in a laboratory, a 'chimera' influenza virus with pandemic potential that can be transmitted through the typical droplets that are spread through coughs and sneezes. According to reports in scientific journals, it is a hybrid of a human influenza virus and the avian H5N1 influenza virus and was created for experimental purposes in order to discover how avian influenza could spread to humans and become pandemic. Its transmissibility was tested on ferrets.

Avian influenza is the most frightening influenza because when H5N1 jumped species, spreading from birds to humans, the consequences for the affected individuals were always extremely serious. Fortunately there have only been isolated cases so far, given that H5N1 is not capable of being transmitted between humans through a typical sneeze, as its haemagglutinin (HA), which all influenza viruses use to bind to the host's respiratory tissue, is not adapted for this.

In view of the above, can the Commission state:

1. Whether it is aware of the new research into avian influenza?
2. What the key points of the EU's 'Pandemic Influenza Preparedness and Response Planning' strategy and the recommendations of the World Health Organisation (WHO) are?

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

(22 June 2012)

The Commission is aware of the study recently published in 'Nature' by Dr Y Kawaoka et al. This study shows that very few mutations are required to make a laboratory-created reassortant influenza virus containing genes of both the avian H5N1 virus and the 2009 pandemic H1N1 virus transmissible among ferrets through droplets. These results might have important public health implications to improve the preparedness for H5N1 viruses with a pandemic potential.

The Commission adopted a Pandemic Influenza Preparedness and Response Plan for the European Union as a framework which identifies roles and actions for key players at EU and national level for each stage of a pandemic. Core pillars addressed are planning and coordination, monitoring and assessment, prevention and containment, health system response and communication. In light of latest scientific developments and lessons learnt from emerging issues such as the 2009 flu pandemic the Commission is currently taking forward pandemic preparedness planning as part of a wider initiative on health security that covers all types of serious cross-border threats to health.

The WHO's Global Influenza Programme provides Member States with strategic guidance, technical support and coordination of activities essential to make their health systems better prepared against influenza threats to populations and individuals. Recommended actions to be taken by WHO and national authorities are presented for all phases of a pandemic and comprise planning and coordination, situation monitoring and assessment, reducing the spread of disease, continuity of healthcare provision and communications. WHO guidance is currently updated in the context of the review of the International Health Regulations.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004602/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(7 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Tagli di posti di lavoro

Una compagnia aerea tedesca ha annunciato un draconiano piano di taglio dei costi, che prevede il taglio di 3 500 posti di lavoro entro la fine del 2014. Il piano intende ridurre di un quarto i costi amministrativi della compagnia. L'obiettivo è quello di risparmiare 1,5 miliardi di euro entro la fine del 2014 per controbilanciare l'aumento dei costi del carburante e far fronte alla concorrenza delle compagnie low cost. La compagnia tedesca ha fatto sapere anche che la riduzione della forza lavoro (battezzata piano «Score», cioè «punteggio») sarà messa in atto con la fusione di attività superflue e con l'abbandono di quelle che «non creano valore aggiunto per i clienti». Altre mansioni potrebbero essere affidate a partner esterni.

Il piano dei tagli, senza precedenti nella storia della compagnia tedesca, interesserà tutte le sedi sparse nel mondo e si attuerà nei prossimi due anni.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. Se sono stati accordati fondi dell'UE all'impresa tedesca e, in caso di risposta affermativa, a quanto ammontano?
2. Quando sono stati accordati i fondi e quali condizioni sono state imposte all'impresa?

**Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione**

(28 giugno 2012)

La autorità di gestione nazionali e regionali competenti sono responsabili della pubblicazione degli elenchi dei beneficiari <sup>(1)</sup>.

Sulla base degli elenchi disponibili per i programmi operativi FSE Germania non risulta che la compagnia aerea menzionata dall'onorevole deputato abbia ricevuto un finanziamento del FSE. Per ulteriori informazioni si invita l'onorevole deputato a mettersi direttamente in contatto con le autorità di gestione in Germania <sup>(2)</sup>.

Sulla base dell'elenco dei beneficiari e delle risposte fornite dall'autorità di gestione del programma FESR della Renania settentrionale Westfalia, nessun finanziamento FESR è stato concesso alla compagnia aerea in questione.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://www.esf.de/portal/generator/1294/verzeichnis\\_der\\_beguenstigten.html](http://www.esf.de/portal/generator/1294/verzeichnis_der_beguenstigten.html)

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://www.esf.de/portal/generator/1664/esf\\_kontaktstellen.html](http://www.esf.de/portal/generator/1664/esf_kontaktstellen.html)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004602/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* Job cuts

A German airline has announced a draconian cost-cutting programme that involves shedding 3 500 jobs by the end of 2014. The programme intends to reduce the company's administrative costs by a quarter. The aim is to save EUR 1.5 billion by the end of 2014 in order to offset the increase in fuel costs and cope with competition from low-cost companies. The German company has also announced that the reduction of the workforce (christened the 'SCORE' programme) will be achieved by merging superfluous functions and eliminating those which 'create no added value for the customer'. Other tasks could be outsourced.

The cost-cutting programme, which is unprecedented in the German airline's history, will affect all its offices worldwide and will be implemented over the next two years.

In view of the above, can the Commission state:

1. Whether EU funding has been granted to the German company, and if so, how much?
2. When the funding was granted and what conditions were imposed on the company?

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

(28 June 2012)

The competent national and regional Managing Authorities are responsible for the publication of the list of beneficiaries <sup>(1)</sup>.

It does not seem that the airline referred to by the Honourable Member has received ESF-funding according to the lists available for the German ESF operational programmes.

For further confirmation the Honourable Member is invited to contact directly the Managing authorities in Germany <sup>(2)</sup>.

According to the list of beneficiaries and answers provided by the managing authority of the ERDF programme in North-Rhine Westphalia, no ERDF funding was allocated to the airline referred to.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://www.esf.de/portal/generator/1294/verzeichnis\\_der\\_beguenstigten.html](http://www.esf.de/portal/generator/1294/verzeichnis_der_beguenstigten.html)

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://www.esf.de/portal/generator/1664/esf\\_kontaktstellen.html](http://www.esf.de/portal/generator/1664/esf_kontaktstellen.html)



(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004603/12  
do Komisji**

**Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D)**

(7 maja 2012 r.)

*Przedmiot:* Dane z oceny skutków dotyczące przedsiębiorczości kobiet w UE

W UE od wielu lat obowiązuje prawodawstwo dotyczące równouprawnienia płci. Zgodnie z tym prawodawstwem Komisja ma prawny obowiązek dokonywania oceny alokacji zasobów i gromadzenia danych segregowanych według kryterium płci.

Czy Komisja może określić, jaki wpływ te działania mają na przedsiębiorczość wśród kobiet?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Antonia Tajaniego w imieniu Komisji**

(21 czerwca 2012 r.)

Kobiety-przedsiębiorcy stanowią 34,4 % osób prowadzących działalność na własny rachunek w UE, 20 % – w przemyśle i około 30 % – wśród osób tworzących nowe firmy.

Komisja nie dysponuje danymi segregowanymi ze względu na płeć w odniesieniu do kobiet-przedsiębiorców w UE. Dostęp do takich informacji z pewnością ułatwiłby uzyskanie bardziej szczegółowego obrazu kobiet-przedsiębiorców w poszczególnych państwach członkowskich i zorganizowanie działań bardziej na nie ukierunkowanych.

Niemniej jednak Komisja gromadzi informacje na temat kobiet-przedsiębiorców z różnych państw członkowskich poprzez sieć WES<sup>(1)</sup>, składającą się z przedstawicieli rządów i instytucji krajowych, której zadaniem jest wspieranie przedsiębiorczości kobiet.

Faktem jest, że kobiety często napotykały na poważniejsze niż w przypadku mężczyzn trudności przy zakładaniu i prowadzeniu przedsiębiorstw, szczególnie w dziedzinach dostępu do finansowania i sieci, a także w związku z próbą pogodzenia obowiązków zawodowych i rodzinnych.

Komisja pracuje nad działaniami zmierzającymi do wspierania i zachęcania do przedsiębiorczości kobiet we wszystkich tych obszarach poprzez propagowanie sieci powiązań biznesowych dla kobiet, opracowywanie programów promujących postawy przedsiębiorcze i poprzez ułatwianie dostępu do finansowania i opieki nad dziećmi.

Komisja utworzyła także Europejską Sieć Ambasadek Przedsiębiorczości w 22 krajach europejskich, gdzie odnoszące sukcesy kobiety-przedsiębiorcy służą za wzór mający zachęcać kobiety w każdym wieku do założenia własnej działalności gospodarczej.

Ponadto Europejska Sieć Mentorów dla Kobiet-Przedsiębiorców w 17 krajach europejskich udziela porad i wsparcia kobietom-przedsiębiorcom przy zakładaniu przedsiębiorstw, ich prowadzeniu i rozwijaniu na wczesnym etapie.

Komisja opracowuje obecnie plan działań w dziedzinie przedsiębiorczości, który obejmie przedsiębiorczość kobiet.

<sup>(1)</sup> The European Network to Promote Women's Entrepreneurship (Europejska sieć wspierania przedsiębiorczości kobiet, WES).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004603/12  
to the Commission  
Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D)  
(7 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Impact assessment data on women entrepreneurs in the EU

The EU has had gender equality legislation in place for many years. In accordance with that legislation the Commission has a legal responsibility to assess the allocation of resources and the collection of gender disaggregated data.

Could the Commission detail what impact this has had on female entrepreneurship?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission  
(21 June 2012)**

Women entrepreneurs constitute 34.4% of the self-employed in the EU, 20% in industry and around 30% of start-ups.

The Commission does not have gender-disaggregated data regarding women entrepreneurs in the EU. Having such information would certainly make it easier to get more detailed profiles on women entrepreneurs in each Member State and create more targeted actions for them.

Nevertheless, the Commission collects information about women entrepreneurs in various Member States through the WES Network <sup>(1)</sup> of national governments' and institutions' representatives, whose responsibility is to promote female entrepreneurship.

It is a fact that women face a number of difficulties in establishing and running their businesses that are more significant than for men, mainly in the areas of access to finance and networking, but also as regards reconciling business and family obligations.

The Commission is working on actions to support and encourage female entrepreneurship in all these areas by encouraging business networks for women, providing schemes for entrepreneurship mindsets and by facilitating access to finance and to childcare.

It has also set up the European Network of Female Entrepreneurship Ambassadors in 22 European countries, where successful business women act as role models to encourage women of all ages to start their own business.

Moreover, the European Network of Mentors for Women Entrepreneurs in 17 European countries provides advice and support to women entrepreneurs on the start-up, functioning and growth of their enterprises in the early stage.

The Commission is currently working on an Entrepreneurship Action Plan that will include female entrepreneurship.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> The European Network to Promote Women's Entrepreneurship (WES).

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004604/12**  
**à la Commission**  
**Rachida Dati (PPE)**  
(7 mai 2012)

*Objet:* L'apprentissage: vers une reprise génératrice d'emplois pour les jeunes

Dans sa communication intitulée «Vers une reprise génératrice d'emplois», la Commission rappelle les difficultés des jeunes à entrer sur le marché du travail aujourd'hui, soulignant que «les contrats d'apprentis et les stages de qualité peuvent être un bon moyen d'entrer dans la vie active».

Un document accompagnant la communication, intitulé «Cadre de qualité pour les stages», propose la création d'un cadre légal commun pour les stages. Une ambition similaire pour l'apprentissage avait déjà été prévue en 2010 dans un rapport du «groupe de travail sur la mobilité des apprentis».

Je constate cependant que si la création d'un cadre commun pour les stages est envisagée, on ne parle plus aujourd'hui d'un cadre commun pour l'apprentissage.

Or l'apprentissage constitue un moyen efficace pour les jeunes d'entrer dans la vie active. Ce n'est pas une coïncidence si l'Allemagne et l'Autriche, deux États membres au système d'apprentissage très développé, connaissent un taux de chômage des jeunes moitié moins élevé que la moyenne européenne.

Il est, de plus, indiscutable qu'un cadre légal commun pour l'apprentissage serait un atout pour la mobilité des apprentis. Ne pas se donner les outils pour réfléchir à la création d'un tel cadre, surtout à un moment aussi crucial dans la lutte contre le chômage des jeunes, serait se priver d'une opportunité majeure.

Les jeunes doivent pouvoir avoir confiance en l'Europe, et l'Europe doit tout faire pour mériter cette confiance. Nous devons aider les jeunes à réussir dans le marché du travail.

— Compte tenu de l'importance d'un cadre légal commun pour l'apprentissage en Europe, quelles démarches la Commission a-t-elle entreprises pour son développement?

**Réponse donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission**  
(26 juin 2012)

La Commission partage pleinement l'opinion exprimée par l'Honorable Parlementaire selon laquelle l'apprentissage est un moyen efficace pour faciliter l'entrée des jeunes dans la vie active. Cependant, l'apprentissage est généralement bien mieux réglementé dans les États membres que les stages, principalement dans le cadre de la législation relative à l'enseignement et à la formation professionnels (EFP). À l'échelle de l'Union, un cadre européen de référence pour l'assurance de la qualité dans l'EFP (CERAQ) a été instauré afin que les autorités disposent d'outils de gestion de la qualité communs dans le domaine de l'EFP <sup>(1)</sup>.

Dans son initiative sur les perspectives d'emploi des jeunes du 20 décembre 2011, la Commission appelle les États membres et les partenaires sociaux à augmenter d'au moins 10 %, d'ici à fin 2013, le nombre d'apprentis dans l'UE (ce qui représente un total de 370 000 nouveaux contrats). La Commission participera à cet effort en destinant 1,3 million d'euros au titre de l'assistance technique du FSE à la mise en place de programmes d'apprentissage.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [www.eqavet.eu](http://www.eqavet.eu).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004604/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Rachida Dati (PPE)**  
(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* Apprenticeships: towards a job-rich recovery for young people

In its communication entitled 'Towards a job-rich recovery', the Commission reiterates the difficulties faced by young people in entering today's labour market, emphasising that 'apprenticeships and quality traineeships can be a good means of gaining entry into the world of work'.

A document accompanying the communication entitled 'Quality Framework for Traineeships' proposes the creation of a common legal framework for traineeships. A similar ambition for apprenticeships had already been foreseen in 2010 in a report from the 'Working Group on Mobility for Apprentices'.

I note, however, that while we envisage the creation of a common framework for traineeships, there is currently no more talk of a common framework for apprenticeships.

Yet apprenticeships are an effective way for young people to gain entry into the world of work. It is no coincidence that Germany and Austria, two Member States with well-developed apprenticeship systems, have a youth unemployment rate that is less than half that of the European average.

Furthermore, there is no question that a common legal framework for apprenticeships would be an asset to the mobility of apprentices. Failure to provide the tools to consider establishing such a framework, especially at such a crucial time in the fight against youth unemployment, would be to deprive young people of a major opportunity.

Young people must be able to trust in Europe, and Europe must do everything it can to deserve this trust. We must help young people to succeed in the labour market.

— In view of the importance of a common legal framework for apprenticeships in Europe, what steps has the Commission taken for its development?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission**  
(26 June 2012)

The Commission fully agrees with the assessment of the Honourable Member that apprenticeships are an efficient way of ensuring smooth education to work transitions for young people. However, apprenticeships are generally much better regulated in Member States than traineeships, mostly within vocational education and training (VET) legislation. At EU level the European Quality Assurance in Vocational Education and Training (EQAVET) developed a European Quality Assurance Reference Framework to provide authorities with common tools for the management of VET quality <sup>(1)</sup>.

In the Youth Opportunities Initiative of 20 December 2011 the Commission calls on Member States and social partners to increase the number of apprenticeships by at least 10% in the EU by the end of 2013 — that would add a total of 370 000 new apprenticeships. To support this, the Commission will use EUR 1.3 million of ESF Technical Assistance to support setting up apprenticeship schemes.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [www.eqavet.eu](http://www.eqavet.eu).

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-004605/12  
to the Commission  
Nicole Sinclaire (NI)  
(7 May 2012)**

*Subject:* European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF)

Could the Commission please advise me of any bar — legislative or otherwise — to the UK applying for funding from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) for the retraining of redundant workers, or for helping them to find new employment?

Would any claim on the EGF affect rebates already in place for the UK?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission  
(11 June 2012)**

The Commission confirms that there exists no bar, legislative or otherwise, preventing the United Kingdom from applying for EGF funds. It would invite the Honourable Member to get in touch with the EGF Contact Person for the United Kingdom <sup>(1)</sup> in order to find out why no application was ever submitted to support redundant workers in this Member State.

As regards the correction granted to the United Kingdom in respect of its budgetary imbalances, this is — in principle — the result of the application of the mathematical formula that returns to this Member State 66% of the difference between:

- (a) the percentage share of the United Kingdom in the sum of uncapped VAT assessment bases and
- (b) the percentage share of the United Kingdom in total allocated expenditure,

all this being (c) multiplied by total allocated expenditure.

Thus, any contribution from the EGF would reduce the amount of the United Kingdom rebate by 66% of the allocated amount. In practice this means it would receive the whole EGF contribution in year  $n$  and the above 66% impact would take place in year  $n+1$ .

\_\_\_\_\_

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=en>.

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004606/12  
à Comissão**

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**

(7 de maio de 2012)

*Assunto:* Inexistência de documentos importantes sobre o QFP 2014/2020 em português

Os documentos de trabalho da Comissão intitulados «The added value of the EU budget» (SEC(2011)0867) e «A Budget for Europe 2020: the current system of funding, the challenges ahead, the results of stakeholders consultation and different options on the main horizontal and sectoral issues» (SEC(2011)0868), não obstante apresentarem informação relevante, que complementa o conteúdo da comunicação da Comissão intitulada «Um orçamento para a Europa 2020» (COM(2011)0500), facilitando um estudo e análise mais completos desta importante temática, não se encontram disponíveis em português. O mesmo acontece com o documento de trabalho intitulado «Financing the EU Budget: report on the operation of the own resources system» (SEC(2011)0876) que acompanha a proposta de Decisão do Conselho relativa ao sistema de recursos próprios da União Europeia (COM(2011)0510).

Tendo em conta a importância fulcral do futuro Quadro Financeiro Plurianual 2014/2020, a necessidade de o mesmo ser alvo de uma discussão pública alargada, aberta e participada, e a evidente importância dos documentos mencionados, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Por que razão não estão estes documentos disponíveis em português?
2. Considera ainda a possibilidade de disponibilizar estes documentos em português, colmatando assim esta falha?

**Resposta dada por Janusz Lewandowski em nome da Comissão**

(22 de junho de 2012)

1. Por razões de custo-eficácia, as regras da Comissão relativas à tradução preveem que os documentos de trabalho dos serviços da Comissão (que não são adotadas pelo Colégio), só estejam disponíveis numa das três línguas processuais (inglês, francês e alemão), embora, em casos excecionais, alguns possam ser traduzidos para outras línguas processuais.
2. Esta regra aplica-se aos documentos de trabalho dos serviços da Comissão referidos na pergunta. Os documentos SEC(2011)0867 e SEC(2011)0868 estão disponíveis em inglês, enquanto o documento SEC(2011)0876 está disponível em inglês, francês e alemão.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004606/12  
to the Commission**

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**

(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* Failure to produce Portuguese versions of important documents on the 2014-2020 multiannual financial framework

The Commission working documents entitled 'The added value of the EU budget' (SEC(2011)0867) and 'A Budget for Europe 2020: the current system of funding, the challenges ahead, the results of stakeholders (sic) consultation and different options on the main horizontal and sectoral issues' (SEC(2011)0868) do not exist in Portuguese, even though they contain relevant information which fleshes out the substance of the Commission communication entitled 'A budget for Europe 2020' (COM(2011)0500), enabling this key area to be studied and analysed more fully. The same applies to the working document entitled 'Financing the EU Budget: report on the operation of the own resources system' (SEC(2011)0876), produced in conjunction with the proposal for a Council decision on the system of own resources of the European Union (COM(2011)0510).

Given the pivotal importance of the future 2014-2020 multiannual financial framework, which needs to be the subject of a broadly based open, participatory public debate, and the evident importance of the abovementioned documents:

1. Why are these documents not available in Portuguese?
2. Will the Commission consider producing Portuguese versions of the documents in order to fill this gap?

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

(22 June 2012)

1. For cost effectiveness reasons the Commission's rules for translation foresee that Commission staff working papers (which are not adopted by the College) are available only in one of the three procedural languages (English, French and German) although in exceptional cases some of them can be translated to the other procedural languages.
  2. This rule applied to the Commission staff working documents referred to in the question. Documents SEC(2011)0867 and SEC(2011)0868 are thus available in English whereas document SEC(2011)0876 is available in English, French and German.
-

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004608/12  
à la Commission**

**Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)**

(7 mai 2012)

*Objet:* Gazéificateur Sodastream et étiquetage «Made in Israel» en France

Le gazéificateur Sodastream (ou Soda Club) est vendu en Europe avec un étiquetage «*Made in Israel*» alors qu'il est fabriqué dans la colonie israélienne de Mishor Adumim/Maale Adumim en Cisjordanie, sous occupation militaire.

En France, ce produit est distribué par Darty, entreprise contre laquelle de nombreux consommateurs ont porté plainte pour tromperie.

Il est déterminant, sur un plan éthique, de différencier l'acte d'achat selon que le produit en question est effectivement en provenance soit de l'État d'Israël proprement dit, soit d'une colonie israélienne située en Cisjordanie, territoire palestinien occupé par Israël.

Les chefs des missions diplomatiques européennes en poste à Jérusalem, dans leur dernier rapport sur l'année 2011, recommandent un certain nombre de mesures en réaction à la colonisation israélienne et son expansion — notamment s'assurer que les produits manufacturés dans les colonies ne bénéficient pas de tarifs préférentiels dans le cadre de l'accord d'association UE-Israël — et ils invitent la Commission à proposer une législation européenne appropriée pour empêcher les transactions financières qui soutiennent l'activité des colonies.

1. La Commission est-elle au courant de l'affaire Sodastream en France et des plaintes déposées par des consommateurs français pour tromperie sur le lieu d'origine de ce produit?
2. La Commission a-t-elle pris connaissance des recommandations des chefs des missions diplomatiques européennes en poste à Jérusalem?
3. Comment la Commission s'assure-t-elle que les produits manufacturés dans les colonies ne bénéficient pas de tarifs préférentiels dans le cadre de l'accord d'association UE-Israël?

**Réponse donnée par M. De Gucht au nom de la Commission**

(20 juin 2012)

1. Le rapport concernant le gazéificateur SodaStream, établi au mois de janvier 2011 dans le cadre du projet de recherche Who Profits, apporte des précisions sur l'étiquetage «*Made in Israel*» des produits SodaStream. La Commission tient à rappeler que les questions relatives aux règles d'origine et à l'étiquetage sont de nature très différente et ne doivent pas être confondues.
2. Le rapport auquel l'Honorable Parlementaire fait référence dans sa question écrite est un exercice annuel auquel se livrent les missions diplomatiques européennes établies à Jérusalem et Ramallah et dans le cadre duquel elles relatent l'évolution de la situation sur le terrain. Il s'agit d'un rapport de routine interne et factuel, non d'un document public. Il sert de source d'information et alimente les débats sur la politique de l'UE à l'égard du Moyen-Orient et de Jérusalem-Est. Pour cette raison, la Commission ne considère pas comme opportun de commenter la teneur de ce rapport ou les recommandations qu'il formule.
3. Les biens fabriqués dans les colonies de peuplement israéliennes ne bénéficient pas de tarifs préférentiels lors de leur importation dans l'UE au titre de l'accord d'association, ce dernier ne s'appliquant qu'au territoire de l'État d'Israël tel qu'il a été internationalement reconnu avant le mois de juin 1967. Ceci a été confirmé en 2010 par la Cour de justice de l'Union européenne dans l'affaire Brita <sup>(1)</sup>.

Au mois de décembre 2004, le comité de coopération douanière UE-Israël a adopté un arrangement technique (AT) selon lequel le nom et le code postal du lieu de production doivent être mentionnés sur toutes les preuves de l'origine préférentielle délivrées ou établies en Israël. L'AT est mis en œuvre par les autorités douanières des États membres.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Arrêt du 25 octobre 2010 dans l'affaire C-386/08, Firma Brita GmbH contre Hauptzollamt Hamburg, Recueil 2010, p. I-1289.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004608/12  
to the Commission**

**Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)**

(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* Sodastream Drinks Maker and 'Made in Israel' labelling in France

The Sodastream (or Soda Club) Drinks Maker is sold in Europe labelled as 'Made in Israel', while it is manufactured in the Israeli colony of Mishor Adumim/Maale Adumim in the West Bank, which is under military occupation.

This product is distributed in France by Darty, a company against which many consumers have lodged complaints on the grounds of fraud.

Ethically, it is crucial at point of purchase to differentiate when the product in question is effectively from the state of Israel itself and when it is from an Israeli colony in the West Bank, which is Palestinian territory occupied by Israel.

The heads of the European Union diplomatic missions in Jerusalem recommend a certain number of measures in response to Israeli colonisation and its expansion in their latest 2011 report. In particular, they recommend ensuring that products manufactured in the colonies do not benefit from preferential rates within the framework of the EU-Israeli Association Agreement, and they invite the Commission to come up with appropriate European legislation to prevent the financial transactions which support the activity of the colonies.

1. Is the Commission aware of the Sodastream affair in France and the complaints lodged by French consumers for fraud concerning the place of origin of this product?
2. Have the recommendations of the heads of the European Union diplomatic missions in Jerusalem been brought to the attention of the Commission?
3. How does the Commission ensure that products manufactured in the colonies do not benefit from preferential rates under the EU-Israeli Association Agreement?

**Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission**

(20 June 2012)

1. The report on SodaStream produced by Who Profits in January 2011 elaborates on the 'made in Israel' labelling of the SodaStream products. The Commission would like to recall that questions related to rules of origin and to labelling are very different in nature and should not be confused.
2. The report referred to in your written question is an annual exercise by the EU missions in Jerusalem and Ramallah reporting on developments on the ground. It is an internal, routine, factual report, and is not a public document. The report serves as a source of information and input into discussions surrounding EU policy towards the Middle East and East Jerusalem. For this reason, the Commission does not consider it appropriate to comment on the contents of the report or its recommendations.
3. Goods produced in the Israeli settlements are not entitled to preferential tariffs upon their import into the EU under the Association Agreement, which applies solely to the territory of the State of Israel as internationally recognised before June 1967. This was confirmed in 2010 by the European Court of Justice in the *Brita* case<sup>(1)</sup>.

The EU-Israel Customs Cooperation Committee adopted in December 2004 a Technical Arrangement (TA) which provides for the name and postal code of the place where production has taken place to be indicated on all proofs of preferential origin issued or made out in Israel. The TA is implemented by the customs authorities of the Member States.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Judgment of 25 October 2010 in Case C-386/08 *Firma Brita GmbH v Hauptzollamt Hamburg-Hafen*, ECR [2010] I-01289.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004610/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**  
(7 Μαΐου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Χρόνος παραμονής παράνομου μετανάστη στο κέντρο κράτησης μεταναστών στην Αμυγδαλέζα

Την τρέχουσα εβδομάδα ξεκίνησε την λειτουργία του το κέντρο κράτησης παράνομων μεταναστών στην περιοχή Αμυγδαλέζα της Αττικής. Η Υπατη Αρμοστέα του ΟΗΕ για τους Πρόσφυγες, της οποίας κλιμάκιο επισκέφθηκε την Τρίτη 1.5.2012 το κέντρο στην Αμυγδαλέζα περιγράφει τις συνθήκες που επικρατούν εκεί ως «καλύτερες σε σχέση με άλλους χώρους κράτησης αλλοδαπών». Ωστόσο, η Υ.Α. υπενθυμίζει ότι «με βάση την ισχύουσα νομοθεσία, η διοικητική κράτηση αλλοδαπών χωρίς νομιμοποιητικά έγγραφα είναι επιτρεπτή για περιορισμένο χρονικό διάστημα και μόνο ενόψει της απομάκρυνσής τους στη χώρα καταγωγής ή προέλευσης. Σε περίπτωση που η απομάκρυνσή τους είναι ανέφικτη (για λόγους νομικούς ή πρακτικούς), η αποτελεσματικότητα του μέτρου της κράτησης εγείρει σοβαρά ερωτηματικά».

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Έχει ενημερωθεί από το αρμόδιο ελληνικό υπουργείο για το, κατά μέσο όρο, αναμενόμενο χρονικό διάστημα παραμονής στο συγκεκριμένο κέντρο ενός παράνομου μετανάστη, πριν την απομάκρυνσή του στην χώρα καταγωγής ή προέλευσης;
2. Ικανοποιεί ο χρόνος αυτός τους νόμιμους και πρακτικούς λόγους, όπως αυτοί διατυπώνονται σε ευρωπαϊκό και διεθνές επίπεδο;

**Απάντηση της κας Malmström εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(2 Ιουλίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή δεν έχει ενημερωθεί σχετικά με τον αναμενόμενο χρόνο παραμονής παράνομων μεταναστών στο κέντρο κράτησης μεταναστών της Αμυγδαλέζας πριν από την απομάκρυνσή τους προς την χώρα καταγωγής τους ή την χώρα προέλευσης.

Το 2011, η Ελλάδα κοινοποίησε στην Επιτροπή την πλήρη μεταφορά της οδηγίας περί των επιστροφών 2008/115/EK <sup>(1)</sup> στο ελληνικό δίκαιο. Η εν λόγω οδηγία, περιγράφει λεπτομερώς, στο άρθρο 15, τους όρους και την διάρκεια της κράτησης ενόψει απομάκρυνσης, και προβλέπει έξι μήνες ως ανώτατη διάρκεια της κράτησης, η οποία μπορεί να παραταθεί για άλλους δώδεκα μήνες σε εξαιρετικές περιπτώσεις. Η Επιτροπή θα ελέγξει κατά πόσον η κοινοποιηθείσα εθνική νομοθεσία εφαρμογής είναι συμβατή με τις υποχρεώσεις που απορρέουν από την οδηγία περί επιστροφών. Η εξέταση αυτή θα γίνει βάσει μελέτης που ολοκληρώθηκε τον Ιανουάριο 2011 σχετικά με τη μεταφορά της οδηγίας περί επιστροφών στο εθνικό δίκαιο των κρατών μελών. Η μελέτη δεν έχει μέχρι στιγμής καταδείξει καμία πρόδηλη έλλειψη στην ελληνική νομοθεσία όσον αφορά το χρονικό διάστημα της κράτησης. Εντούτοις, η νομική μεταφορά της οδηγίας περί των επιστροφών θα συζητηθεί λεπτομερώς με τα κράτη μέλη κατά τους προσεχείς μήνες. Επιπλέον, κατά τη διάρκεια του 2013 θα διεξαχθεί μελέτη σχετικά με την πρακτική εφαρμογή της οδηγίας περί των επιστροφών στα κράτη μέλη. Οι μελέτες θα χρησιμοποιηθούν ως πληροφοριακό υλικό ενόψει της προσεχούς έκθεσης της Επιτροπής για την εφαρμογή της οδηγίας περί των επιστροφών, που πρέπει να υποβληθεί τον Δεκέμβριο 2013, καθώς επίσης και για την κίνηση, αν χρειαστεί, διαδικασιών επί παραβάσει.

<sup>(1)</sup> Οδηγία 2008/115/EK του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου της 16ης Δεκεμβρίου 2008 σχετικά με τους κοινούς κανόνες και διαδικασίες στα κράτη μέλη για την επιστροφή των παράνομως διαμενόντων υπηκόων τρίτων χωρών.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004610/12  
to the Commission**

**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**

(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* Duration of illegal immigrants' custody at the Amygdaleza immigrant detention centre

This week the detention centre for illegal immigrants commenced operations in the Amygdaleza area of Attica. The United Nations High Commission for Refugees, whose officials visited the Amygdaleza centre on Tuesday 1 May 2012, describes the conditions prevailing there as 'better than in other centres for the detention of aliens'. Nevertheless, the High Commission reminded its Greek audience that 'on the basis of existing legislation, administrative detention of aliens without written legal authorisation is permissible only for a limited period of time and pending departure for their country of provenance or origin. In the event that such departure is not feasible (for legal or practical reasons), serious questions arise as to the effectiveness of detention'.

Can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Has it been informed by the responsible Greek ministry of the anticipated duration of the custody of an illegal immigrant at the centre in question prior to departure for his country of provenance or origin?
2. Is this period of custody in accordance with the legal and practical requirements as formulated at the European and international level?

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

(2 July 2012)

The Commission has not been informed about the expected time irregular immigrants will have to spend in the detention center in Amygdaleza before removal to their country of origin or country of provenance.

In 2011, Greece notified the full transposition of the Return Directive 2008/115/EC<sup>(1)</sup> to the Commission. The directive in Art 15 ff describes in detail the conditions and limits for detention for the purpose of removal and foresees a maximum length of detention of six months, which can be extended for further twelve months in exceptional circumstances. The Commission will check the compatibility of the notified national implementing legislation with the obligations imposed by the Return Directive. This examination is based on a study finalised in January 2011 on the legal transposition of the Return Directive by Member States. The study so far showed no obvious shortcomings in the Greek law in terms of the length of detention. However the legal transposition of the Return Directive will be thoroughly discussed with Member States authorities in the coming months. In addition, a study relating to the practical application of the Return Directive in Member States will be carried out in the course of 2013. The studies will serve as an input for the upcoming Commission report on the application of the Return Directive, due for December 2013, as well as for launching — if necessary — infringement procedures.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Directive 2008/115/EC of the European Parliament and Council of 16 December 2008 on common standards and procedures in Member States for returning illegally staying third-country nationals.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004611/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**  
(7 Μαΐου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Προστασία και αναδάσωση του εθνικού δρυμού της Πάρνηθας στην Αττική

Όπως πιθανόν γνωρίζει ήδη η Επιτροπή, το καλοκαίρι του 2007 εξαιτίας των καταστροφικών πυρκαγιών που έπληξαν την Ελλάδα, μεταξύ άλλων υπέστη σοβαρότατες ζημιές ο εθνικός δρυμός της Πάρνηθας, ο οποίος αποτελεί πολύτιμο τοπικό οικοσύστημα αλλά και σημαντικότατο πνεύμονα πρασίνου για την Αθήνα. Η Πάρνηθα έχει ενταχθεί στο δίκτυο NATURA 2000, που βασίζεται σε δύο κοινοτικές οδηγίες, την 92/43/ΕΟΚ για την προστασία των οικοτόπων και την 79/409/ΕΟΚ για τα πτηνά και έχει ανακηρυχθεί τοπιο ιδιαίτερου φυσικού κάλλους (25638/1269 απόφαση Υπ. Γεωργίας). Παράλληλα, διαθέτει σπάνια ήδη φυτών, μερικά εκ των οποίων είναι μοναδικά σε παγκόσμια κλίμακα. Καθώς έχουν παρέλθει πέντε χρόνια από την καταστροφική πυρκαγιά, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Ποιο το ύψος των κοινοτικών κονδυλίων που έχει αφιερωθεί αυτά τα χρόνια για την προστασία, αποκατάσταση και αναδάσωση του εθνικού δρυμού της Πάρνηθας στην Αττική;
2. Έχει επιτηρήσει η Επιτροπή τις διαδικασίες αξιοποίησης των πόρων για την αποκατάσταση του δρυμού.

**Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(19 Ιουνίου 2012)

Σύμφωνα με την αρχή της κοινής διαχείρισης που εφαρμόζεται στο πλαίσιο της διοίκησης της πολιτικής για τη συνοχή, η διαχείριση των πληροφοριών για συγκεκριμένα έργα, όπως η «Προστασία και αναδάσωση του εθνικού δρυμού της Πάρνηθας στην Αττική», συμπεριλαμβανομένων όλων των αξιολογήσεων που έχουν διενεργηθεί, εμπίπτει στην αρμοδιότητα των εθνικών αρχών. Κατά συνέπεια, η Επιτροπή προτείνει στον κ. βουλευτή να επικοινωνήσει απευθείας με τις ελληνικές αρχές που είναι υπεύθυνες για τη διαχείριση των εν λόγω προγραμμάτων:

Διαχειριστική Αρχή του προγράμματος «Αττική»  
Λεωφόρος Συγγρού 98-100  
117 41 Αθήνα  
Τηλ.: +30 210 928 7000  
Φαξ: +30 210 928 7001  
Ηλ. ταχ.: pepatt@otenet.gr  
<http://www.pepatt.gr>

Διαχειριστική αρχή του προγράμματος «Περιβάλλον και βιώσιμη ανάπτυξη»  
Αεροπόρου Παπαναστασίου 34  
115 27 Αθήνα  
Τηλ. +30 210 21 42 200  
Ηλ. Ταχ: grammateia-epperaa@mou.gr  
asterios@mou.gr

Επιπλέον, η Επιτροπή συγχρηματοδοτεί το έργο LIFE+ «Προσαρμογή της διαχείρισης των δασών στην κλιματική αλλαγή στην Ελλάδα», για την περίοδο από 1ης Ιανουαρίου 2010 έως τις 30 Ιουνίου 2013, με συνολικό προϋπολογισμό ύψους 1 719 112 ευρώ και μέγιστη συνεισφορά της ΕΕ 833 356 ευρώ. Πληροφορίες στον ιστότοπο: [en.life-adaptfor.gr](http://en.life-adaptfor.gr)

Το έργο στοχεύει να καταδείξει ότι η διαχείριση των δασών μπορεί να προσαρμοστεί στην αλλαγή του κλίματος και παράλληλα να βελτιώνεται η ικανότητα των δασικών υπηρεσιών. Στο έργο προβλέπεται να γίνει επίδειξη της προσέγγισης σε τέσσερις πρότυπες τοποθεσίες, μία από τις οποίες είναι ο εθνικός δρυμός της Πάρνηθας. Η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί την υλοποίηση του έργου, η οποία αν και γίνεται με ικανοποιητικό τρόπο έχει σημειώσει ορισμένες διοικητικές καθυστερήσεις. Για το λόγο αυτό ζητήθηκε παράταση 18 μηνών, την οποία αξιολογεί προς το παρόν η Επιτροπή.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004611/12  
to the Commission**

**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**

(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* Protection and reafforestation of the Mount Parnitha National Park in Attica

As the Commission probably knows, in the summer of 2007, because of the catastrophic fires that devastated Greece, very serious damage was inflicted, among other places, on Mount Parnitha National Park, which is not only a precious local ecosystem but also one of the most important 'green lungs' of Athens. Parnitha has been included in the Natura 2000 network, which is based on two EU directives, 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats 79/409/EEC on the conservation of wild birds, and has been proclaimed an area of outstanding natural beauty (Decision 25638/1269 of the Ministry of Agriculture). It also hosts some rare species of plants, some of which are unique in the world. Given that five years have passed since this catastrophic fire, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. How much Community funding has been made available in these years for the protection, rehabilitation and reafforestation of Mount Parnitha National Park in Attica?
2. Has the Commission supervised the process of absorption of funding for the restoration of the National Park?

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

(19 June 2012)

In line with the shared management principle used for the administration of cohesion policy, detailed information on specific projects, such as the 'Protection and reforestation of Parnitha National Park in Attica', including any evaluations carried out is managed by the national authorities. The Commission would therefore suggest that the Honourable Member contact directly the Greek authorities in charge of the management of the programmes concerned:

Managing authority of the programme 'Attiki'  
Leoforos Syngrou 98-100  
117 41 Athens  
Tel.: +30 210 928 7000  
Fax: +30 210 928 7001  
pepatt@otenet.gr  
<http://www.pepatt.gr>

Managing authority of the programme 'Environment & Sustainable Development'  
Aeroporu Papanastasiou 34  
115 27 Athens  
Tel: +30 210 21 42 200  
Email: [grammateia-epperaa@mou.gr](mailto:grammateia-epperaa@mou.gr)  
[asterios@mou.gr](mailto:asterios@mou.gr)

In addition, the Commission is co-financing the LIFE+ project 'Adaptation of forest management to climate change in Greece', for the period 01 January 2010 to 30 June 2013 with a total budget of EUR 1 719 112 and maximum EU contribution EUR of 833 356. More information is available on the website: [en.life-adaptfor.gr](http://en.life-adaptfor.gr)

The project aims to demonstrate that forest management can be adapted to climate change, while enhancing the capacity of forest services. The project will demonstrate this approach at four pilot sites, one of which is the National Park of Parnitha. The Commission is monitoring the implementation of the project. While it is being implemented in a satisfactory manner overall, it has experienced some administrative delays. Therefore, an 18 month extension has been requested, which is currently under evaluation by the Commission.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004612/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**  
(7 Μαΐου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Πορεία υλοποίησης Επιχειρησιακού Προγράμματος Αττικής για το 2011

Την επόμενη διετία ολοκληρώνεται το ελληνικό εθνικό στρατηγικό πλαίσιο αναφοράς (ΕΣΠΑ 2007-2013). Μέρος του προγράμματος αυτού αποτελούν τα περιφερειακά επιχειρησιακά προγράμματα για τα οποία διαθέτονται αρκετά δις ευρώ προς αξιοποίηση. Καθώς τα επιχειρησιακά προγράμματα αποτελούν σήμερα το πιο απτό και άμεσα διαθέσιμο εργαλείο για την στήριξη της ανάπτυξης, της απασχόλησης και της κοινωνικής συνοχής στην Ελλάδα, σε αυτή την δύσκολη περίοδο που διανύει, είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει η Επιτροπή:

1. Για το συνολικό ποσοστό απορρόφησης του ΠΕΠ Αττικής μέχρι σήμερα;
2. Σε ποιους άξονες διακρίνονται οι μεγαλύτερες καθυστερήσεις και για ποιους λόγους εκτιμά η Επιτροπή ότι συμβαίνει αυτό;

**Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(14 Ιουνίου 2012)

1. Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει τον κ. βουλευτή στην απάντηση που έδωσε στη γραπτή του ερώτηση E-004615/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.
2. Η προτεραιότητα του προγράμματος με τη μεγαλύτερη καθυστέρηση είναι η προτεραιότητα «βιώσιμη ανάπτυξη και βελτίωση της ποιότητας της ζωής». Ο κύριος λόγος για το χαμηλό ποσοστό απορρόφησης είναι η αργή πρόοδος που σημειώνεται σε πολλά έργα που αφορούν τα στερεά απόβλητα και την επεξεργασία λυμάτων καθώς και τις τουριστικές υπηρεσίες. Δεδομένου ότι οι ελληνικές αρχές επαναπρογραμματίζουν σήμερα τα περισσότερα προγράμματα, αναμένεται σαφής επίδραση στα ποσοστά απορρόφησης μετά την ολοκλήρωση αυτής της διαδικασίας.

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

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004612/12  
to the Commission  
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)  
(7 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Progress in implementation of the Operational Programme for Attica 2011

The biennium 2012-2013 will see the completion of the Greek national strategic reference framework (NSRF 2007-2013). The NSRF includes regional operational programmes with funding amounting to billions of euros and earmarked for utilisation. Given that, in this difficult period we are currently experiencing, the operational programmes are the most tangible and readily available tool for supporting development, employment and social cohesion in Greece, is the Commission in a position to inform me of the following:

1. What is the total sum absorbed to date by the Regional Operational Programme for Attica?
2. What are the axes on which the greatest delays are to be detected, and what are the reasons for this, in the Commission's view?

**Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission  
(14 June 2012)**

1. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to his Written Question E-004615/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.
2. The programme priority with the greatest delay is the 'sustainable development and improvement of quality of life' priority. The main reason for the low absorption rate is the slow progress of several projects concerning solid waste and waste water treatment, as well as tourist services. As the Greek authorities are currently re-programming most of the programmes, a clear impact on the absorption rates is expected once this is concluded.

---

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

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004613/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**  
(7 Μαΐου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Μερική αναθεώρηση των επιχειρησιακών προγραμμάτων στην Ελλάδα

Σύμφωνα με την Επιτροπή, αλλά και την ελληνική κυβέρνηση, στις αρχές του 2012 αναμενόταν να ξεκινήσουν οι διαδικασίες αναθεώρησης και επικαιροποίησης του ελληνικού ΕΣΠΑ 2007-2013. Η επικαιροποίηση αυτή θα λάμβανε υπόψη τα νέα οικονομικά δεδομένα της χώρας, καθώς και την ανάγκη να δοθεί έμφαση σε συγκεκριμένους αναπτυξιακούς τομείς και τομείς κοινωνικής προστασίας.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Έχουν μέχρι σήμερα προταθεί από την ελληνική πλευρά οι εν λόγω τροποποιήσεις; Σε ποια κατεύθυνση κινούνται οι σημαντικότερες παρεμβάσεις;

Είναι σε θέση να αναφέρει αν αποφασίστηκε να δοθούν περισσότερα κονδύλια για την προστασία των αδύναμων κοινωνικών ομάδων;

Θεωρεί αναγκαίες τις ριζικές τροποποιήσεις του ΕΣΠΑ ώστε να καταστεί ευκολότερη η απορρόφηση και αξιοποίηση των κοινοτικών πόρων;

**Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(26 Ιουνίου 2012)

1. Οι συζητήσεις για την αναθεώρηση των παρεμβάσεων και των προγραμμάτων των διαρθρωτικών ταμείων έχουν ξεκινήσει από τις ελληνικές αρχές. Σύμφωνα με τις ελληνικές αρχές, τα κύρια σημεία των τροποποιήσεων των περιφερειακών επιχειρησιακών προγραμμάτων αφορούν την ενίσχυση των ΜΜΕ και τις ενέργειες για τους νέους. Η αναθεώρηση δεν έχει ακόμη ολοκληρωθεί και η Επιτροπή δεν διαθέτει στην παρούσα φάση ακριβείς πληροφορίες για σχέδια που ενδεχομένως θα επηρεαστούν αρνητικά.

2. Οι τρέχουσες συζητήσεις για την αναθεώρηση των παρεμβάσεων και των προγραμμάτων δεν επικεντρώνονται συγκεκριμένα στην πρόσθετη υποστήριξη των πλέον ευάλωτων κοινωνικών ομάδων, αφού μόνο το 12,59% της προτεραιότητας «Πλήρης ενσωμάτωση όλων των ανθρώπινων πόρων σε μια κοινωνία ίσων ευκαιριών» (συνολικός προϋπολογισμός 273 855 563 ευρώ), στο πλαίσιο του προγράμματος «Ανάπτυξη ανθρώπινων πόρων» για την περίοδο 2007-2013, έχει υλοποιηθεί και απορροφηθεί.

3. Η Επιτροπή θεωρεί ότι, δεδομένων των ποσών που είναι ακόμη διαθέσιμα στο πλαίσιο όλων των προτεραιοτήτων των διαρθρωτικών ταμείων, θα ήταν καλύτερο να αποφευχθούν προς το παρόν δραστικές αλλαγές και να επικεντρωθούν όλες οι προσπάθειες στην επιτάχυνση της υλοποίησης των προγραμμάτων με τη σταδιακή αξιοποίηση της εμπειρίας που έχει αποκτηθεί. Επίσης, με την υποστήριξη της Επιτροπής, γίνονται ενέργειες από τις εθνικές αρχές για την απλούστευση και την επιτάχυνση της υλοποίησης του εθνικού στρατηγικού πλαισίου αναφοράς (ΕΣΠΑ). Σε κάθε περίπτωση, σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 33 παράγραφος 3 του κανονισμού αριθ. 1083/06, η αναθεώρηση των προγραμμάτων δεν απαιτεί αναθεώρηση της απόφασης της Επιτροπής με την οποία εγκρίθηκε το ΕΣΠΑ.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004613/12  
to the Commission**

**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**

(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* Partial revision of operational programmes in Greece

According to the Commission, as well as the Greek Government, it was expected that the procedures for revising and updating the Greek NSRF 2007-2013 would start at the beginning of 2012. The updating would take into account the new financial situation in Greece, as well as the need to place emphasis on specific development and social protection areas.

Will the Commission answer the following:

Have these modifications been proposed by Greece so far? What is the direction of the key interventions?

Is it in a position to say whether a decision has been made on making more funds available for the protection of weaker social groups?

Does it consider that radical modifications to the NSRF are needed in order to make it easier to take up and utilise Community resources?

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

(26 June 2012)

1. Discussions on the revision of the Structural Funds interventions and programmes have been initiated by the Greek authorities. According to the Greek authorities the main lines of the modifications of the regional operational programmes are to reinforce support to SMEs and youth actions. The revision is not yet complete and precise information on the projects that may be adversely affected is not available to the Commission at this stage.
  2. Current discussions on the revision of interventions and programmes do not particularly focus on additional support to the most vulnerable social groups since only 12.59% of the priority 'Complete Integration of all Human Resources into a Society of Equal Opportunities' (total budget 273 855 563 EUR) under the 2007-2013 'Human Resources Development' programme have been implemented and absorbed.
  3. The Commission considers that given the amounts still available under all Structural Fund's priorities it would be better to avoid radical changes for the time being and to concentrate all efforts to an accelerated implementation of the programmes when gradually taking on board the lessons learned. Moreover, with the assistance of the Commission, steps are being taken by the national authorities to simplify and accelerate the implementation of the National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF). In any case, according to Article 33.3 of Regulation 1083/06, a modification of the programmes shall not require a modification of the Commission's decision approving the NSRF.
-

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004614/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**  
(7 Μαΐου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Κατασκευή δύο κέντρων κράτησης και απομάκρυνσης παράνομων μεταναστών και έξι κέντρων υποδοχής αιτούντων άσυλο στην Τουρκία

Η Επιτροπή υποστηρίζει τις προσπάθειες της Τουρκίας με μια σειρά προγραμμάτων στους τομείς του ασύλου, της μετανάστευσης και της διαχείρισης των συνόρων, με χρηματοδοτήσεις από τον μηχανισμό προενταξιακής βοήθειας. Σε ό,τι αφορά τη μετανάστευση, η ΕΕ παρέσχε βοήθεια για την κατασκευή δύο κέντρων απομάκρυνσης παράνομων μεταναστών (17,4 εκατ. ευρώ) και έξι κέντρων υποδοχής αιτούντων άσυλο (56,2 εκατ. ευρώ).

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Ολοκληρώθηκαν επιτυχώς τα συγκεκριμένα έργα; Ελέγχει η Επιτροπή την ορθή αξιοποίηση των ευρωπαϊκών κεφαλαίων για τα κέντρα αυτά;

Δεδομένου ότι χορηγήθηκαν σημαντικά κεφάλαια (32 εκατ. ευρώ) για την υποστήριξη της ικανότητας διαχείρισης των συνόρων από την Τουρκία, έγινε ορθή και αποτελεσματική χρήση και αξιοποίηση αυτών των κεφαλαίων;

Κατά τα προσεχή έτη, προβλέπεται να διατεθούν επί πλέον πόροι με στόχο τη βελτίωση των ικανοτήτων της Τουρκίας σε όλους τους παραπάνω τομείς. Μπορεί η Επιτροπή να αναφέρει το ύψος των κονδυλίων αυτών;

**Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(27 Ιουνίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή επιβεβαιώνει ότι μέσω ενός έργου (Στήριξη της Τουρκίας για την αντιμετώπιση της παράνομης μετανάστευσης) στο πλαίσιο του μέσου προενταξιακής βοήθειας (ΜΠΒ) καταρτίστηκαν κατευθυντήριες γραμμές για τη διαχείριση κέντρων απομάκρυνσης, αναπτύχθηκαν προγράμματα κατάρτισης για την εθνική αστυνομία της Τουρκίας και εκπαιδεύτηκε προσωπικό. Εμπειρογνώμονες των κρατών μελών παρείχαν υποστήριξη στη διατύπωση της νομοθεσίας.

Ένα άλλο έργο του ΜΠΒ 2007 βρίσκεται σε εξέλιξη από τον Ιανουάριο του 2010. Η αδελφοποίηση έχει ολοκληρωθεί και έτσι θα διασφαλιστεί η κατασκευή και η επίβλεψη των εργασιών για επτά κέντρα υποδοχής και δύο κέντρα απομάκρυνσης. Εργοτάξια υπάρχουν στην Άγκυρα, στο Ερζερούμ, στο Gaziantep, στο Van, στο Kırklareli και στη Σμύρνη.

Ένα έργο του ΜΠΒ του 2010 θα εξασφαλίσει την επίπλωση και τον εξοπλισμό των κέντρων υποδοχής και απομάκρυνσης, μόλις ολοκληρωθεί η κατασκευή τους, η οποία προβλέπεται για το τέλος του 2013.

Το μέσο προενταξιακής βοήθειας (ΜΠΒ) εφαρμόζεται από τις εθνικές αρχές της Τουρκίας βάσει του συστήματος αποκεντρωμένης εφαρμογής. Οι επιχειρησιακές δομές πρέπει να πληρούν όλες τις προϋποθέσεις σχετικά με τη χρηστή δημοσιονομική διαχείριση πριν από την ανάθεση της διαχείρισης. Η χρησιμοποίηση των κεφαλαίων σύμφωνα με τις προδιαγραφές των δελτίων του έργου, των συμβάσεων αδελφοποίησης και του τεύχους δημοπράτησης παρακολουθείται μέσω προληπτικών ελέγχων της αντιπροσωπείας της ΕΕ και μέσω επιτόπιων επισκέψεων.

Η ολοκληρωμένη διαχείριση συνόρων (IBM) εξακολουθεί να αποτελεί μια από τις προτεραιότητες της Επιτροπής στις σχέσεις της με την Τουρκία, καθώς και για την οικονομική βοήθεια του ΜΠΒ. Για πληροφορίες σχετικά με προγραμματιζόμενα έργα, μπορείτε να συμβουλευτείτε την ακόλουθη διεύθυνση:

[http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/candidate-countries/turkey/financial-assistance/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/candidate-countries/turkey/financial-assistance/index_en.htm).

Σχετικά με τις επιχορηγήσεις του ΜΠΒ για το 2013, δεν υπάρχουν διαθέσιμα στοιχεία σ' αυτό το στάδιο του κύκλου προγραμματισμού.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004614/12  
to the Commission**

**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**

(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* Construction of two detention and removal centres for illegal immigrants and six reception centres for asylum-seekers in Turkey

The Commission has been supporting the efforts made by Turkey through a number of programmes in the asylum, immigration and border management areas, by providing funds from the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance. Concerning immigration, the EU has granted aid for the construction of two removal centres for illegal immigrants (EUR 17.4 million) and six reception centres for asylum-seekers (EUR 56.2 million).

Will the Commission answer the following:

Have these projects been completed successfully? Has the Commission verified that the European funds provided for these centres are used properly?

Given the significant sums of money granted (EUR 32 million) for supporting Turkey in managing its borders, have these funds been used and utilised properly and effectively?

Are there plans for any additional resources to be allocated in the years to come with a view to helping Turkey improve its performance in all the abovementioned areas? Could the Commission indicate the amount of these funds?

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

(27 June 2012)

The Commission can confirm that through a 2007 Instrument for Pre-Accession (IPA) project (Support Turkey's Capacity in Combating Illegal Migration) management guidelines for removal centres were prepared, training programmes for Turkish National Police developed and staff trained. Member State experts gave support on drafting legislation.

Another IPA 2007 project is ongoing since January 2010. The twinning has been completed; construction and works' supervision for seven reception and two removal centres will be ensured. Construction sites are in Ankara, Erzurum, Kayseri, Gaziantep, Van, Kırklareli and İzmir.

An IPA 2010 project will provide for the furnishing and equipment of the reception and removal centres as soon as construction is completed, which is foreseen for the end of 2013.

The Instrument for Pre-Accession (IPA) is implemented by Turkish national authorities under the Decentralised Implementation System. Operating Structures must meet all requirements related to sound financial management before conferral of management. The use of the funds in line with the specifications in the project fiches, twinning contracts and tender documents is supervised through the EU Delegation's *ex-ante* controls and on-the-spot visits.

Integrated Border Management (IBM) continues to be one of the Commission's priorities in its relations with Turkey, including for IPA financial assistance. For information on planned projects, please see:

[http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/candidate-countries/turkey/financial-assistance/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/candidate-countries/turkey/financial-assistance/index_en.htm).

Concerning IPA 2013 allocations, no figures are available at this point of the programming cycle.

---

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004615/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**  
(7 Μαΐου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Απορρόφηση των κοινοτικών κονδυλίων στην Ελλάδα για το 2011

Είναι σε θέση η Επιτροπή να δώσει τα στοιχεία από την τελευταία ενημέρωση που έχει για το ύψος των δεσμεύσεων και το ύψος των δαπανών που πραγματοποιήθηκαν στην Ελλάδα το 2011, ανά επιχειρησιακό πρόγραμμα και ως ποσοστό των πόρων που αναλογούν στη χώρα, για την περίοδο 2007-2013;

**Απάντηση του κυρίου Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(7 Ιουνίου 2012)

Ο πίνακας που επισυνάπτεται στην παρούσα απάντηση παρουσιάζει τα ποσά που δεσμεύτηκαν και καταβλήθηκαν από την Επιτροπή το 2011. Τα ποσά που καταβλήθηκαν το 2011 δεν λαμβάνουν υπόψη τα ποσά των αιτήσεων πληρωμής που υποβλήθηκαν από την Ελλάδα στα τέλη Δεκεμβρίου του 2011, τα οποία πληρώθηκαν τον Φεβρουάριο του 2012· περιλαμβάνουν τα ποσά των αιτήσεων πληρωμής που ελήφθησαν στα τέλη Δεκεμβρίου του 2010, τα οποία καταβλήθηκαν στις αρχές του 2011.

---

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-004615/12  
to the Commission  
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)  
(7 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Take-up of Community funds in Greece for 2011

Is it possible for the Commission to provide data from the latest briefing available concerning the level of commitments and the level of expenditure realised in Greece in 2011, per operational programme and as a percentage of the resources allocated to Greece for the period 2007-2013?

**Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission  
(7 June 2012)**

The table attached to this answer presents the amounts committed and paid by the Commission in 2011. The amounts paid in 2011 do not take into account payment claims submitted by Greece in late December 2011 which were paid in February 2012; they do include the amounts of payment claims received in late December 2010, which were paid in early 2011.

---

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004616/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**  
(7 Μαΐου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Αξιοποίηση εγγυοδοτικού μηχανισμού στην Ελλάδα για ενίσχυση του οπτικοακουστικού τομέα

Στόχος του ταμείου εγγυοδοσίας παραγωγών του οπτικοακουστικού τομέα στο πλαίσιο του προγράμματος MEDIA είναι η διευκόλυνση της πρόσβασης των μικρών και μεσαίων επιχειρήσεων (ΜΜΕ) της οπτικοακουστικής βιομηχανίας σε ιδιωτικές πηγές χρηματοδότησης. Σύμφωνα με αυτόν τον στόχο, προβλέπεται ότι το ταμείο θα αποδεσμεύσει 126 εκατομμύρια ευρώ για δάνεια υπέρ του οπτικοακουστικού τομέα κατά την τετραετή περίοδο εφαρμογής του (2010-2013).

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Έχουν μέχρι σήμερα αξιοποιηθεί χρήματα από τον συγκεκριμένο μηχανισμό για ελληνικές μικρές και μεσαίες επιχειρήσεις (ΜΜΕ) της οπτικοακουστικής βιομηχανίας; Ποιο είναι το ύψος των κεφαλαίων αυτών;

**Απάντηση της κας Βασιλείου εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(28 Ιουνίου 2012)

Στόχος του ταμείου εγγυοδοσίας παραγωγών του οπτικοακουστικού τομέα στο πλαίσιο του προγράμματος MEDIA (MPGF) είναι να στηρίζει και να διευκολύνει τη δανειοδότηση των ευρωπαϊκών εταιρειών του οπτικοακουστικού τομέα από τις τράπεζες. Το ταμείο χρησιμοποιείται για την εγγυοδοσία των δανείων (ή μέρους αυτών) που χορηγούνται από τις τοπικές τράπεζες στους παραγωγούς ταινιών. Μέχρι σήμερα καμία ελληνική ΜΜΕ δεν έχει ζητήσει εγγυοδοσία δανείου στο πλαίσιο του εν λόγω ταμείου.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004616/12  
to the Commission**

**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**

(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* Utilising the guarantee fund in Greece with a view to reinforcing the audiovisual sector

The objective of the MEDIA Production Guarantee Fund is to facilitate access for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in the audiovisual industry to private sources of funding. In accordance with this objective, it is anticipated that the fund will allocate EUR 126 million for loans in favour of the audiovisual sector during its four-year implementation period (2010-2013).

Can the Commission answer the following:

Has money from the fund in question been utilised to date for Greek SMEs in the audiovisual industry? What is the amount of these funds?

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

(28 June 2012)

The objective of the MEDIA Production Guarantee Fund (MPGF) is to support and facilitate the access of European audiovisual companies to bank credits. The fund is used to guarantee (part of) the loan granted by local banks to film producers. To date no loan guarantee has been requested by a Greek SME under the MPGF.

---

(Dansk udgave)

**Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-004617/12**  
**til Kommissionen**  
**Jens Rohde (ALDE)**  
(7. maj 2012)

Om: Vandrammedirektivet

I forlængelse af svaret fra Kommissionen af 26. april 2012 (E-002528/2012) bedes den oplyse, om det er muligt at ændre i vandplanerne, såfremt nye oplysninger viser, at vandets tilstand er bedre end forventet.

Endvidere bedes Kommissionen oplyse, om det er muligt at ændre i vandplanerne, hvis det viser sig, at indsatsen betyder uforholdsmæssige store samfundsøkonomiske omkostninger.

**Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Janez Potočnik**  
(27. juni 2012)

Artikel 4, stk. 1, i vandrammedirektivet (2000/60/EF<sup>(1)</sup>) pålægger medlemsstaterne at beskytte, forbedre og restaurere alle vandområder med henblik på at opnå en god tilstand for disse inden udgangen af 2015. Derudover bør medlemsstaterne træffe de nødvendige foranstaltninger for at hindre en forværring af vandområdernes tilstand. Hvis vandområderne allerede er i god tilstand, er det derfor kun nødvendigt at træffe foranstaltninger for at hindre en forringelse.

Hvad angår vandområder, som ikke er i god tilstand, bør vandområdeplanerne og handlingsprogrammerne omfatte foranstaltninger til opfyldelse af målsætningerne. I henhold til artikel 4, stk. 4 og 5, er det muligt at blive fritaget for det overordnede mål om at opnå god tilstand inden udgangen af 2015, såfremt visse strenge betingelser er opfyldt. En fritagelse er blandt andet mulig, hvis det kan påvises, at udgifterne ved at indføre de nødvendige foranstaltninger til opfyldelse af målsætningerne er uforholdsmæssigt store. I henhold til artikel 14 i vandrammedirektivet skal begrundelserne for at fritage bestemte vandområder angives og forklares i vandområdeplanerne og gøres til genstand for offentlig høring.

Artikel 13, stk. 7, i vandrammedirektivet pålægger medlemsstaterne at ajourføre vandområdeplanerne senest den 22. december 2015 og derefter hvert sjette år. Der er således ikke noget til hinder for, at medlemsstaterne kan tage planerne op til revision før 2015, hvis det skønnes nødvendigt og betingelserne i vandrammedirektivet er opfyldt, særlig bestemmelserne i artikel 14 om offentlig høring.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> EFT L 327 af 22.12.2000.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004617/12  
to the Commission  
Jens Rohde (ALDE)  
(7 May 2012)**

*Subject:* The Water Framework Directive

Further to the Commission's reply of 26 April 2012 (E-002528/2012), will the Commission please state whether it is possible to amend the aquatic plans if new information shows the water quality to be better than expected?

Will the Commission also state whether it is possible to amend the aquatic plans if it transpires that the action will result in disproportionately high costs to society?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission  
(27 June 2012)**

Water Framework Directive (WFD, 2000/60/EC<sup>(1)</sup>) Article 4.1 requires Member States to protect, enhance and restore water bodies with the aim of achieving good status by 2015. In addition, Member States should implement the necessary measures to prevent the deterioration of water bodies. Therefore, if water bodies are already in good status, measures are only needed to prevent deterioration.

For water bodies in less than good status, the river basin management plans and the programme of measures should include measures to achieve the objectives. Exemptions are possible to the general objective of achieving good status by 2015 if certain strict conditions are met, as laid down in Articles 4.4 and 4.5. This includes, among others, if it can be demonstrated that the measures needed to achieve the objectives are disproportionately costly. The reasons for applying exemptions for specific water bodies should be set out and explained in the river basin management plans and subject to public consultation as required by WFD Article 14.

WFD Article 13.7 requires Member States to update the river basin management plans at the latest by 22 December 2015 and every 6 years thereafter. Therefore, nothing prevents Member States to review the plans earlier than 2015 if deemed necessary, provided the obligations in the WFD are met, in particular those of Article 14 on public consultation.

---

(<sup>1</sup>) OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004619/12  
to the Commission**

**Jim Higgins (PPE)**

(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* Impact assessments and guardrails for new road projects

Can the Commission clarify its position and confirm that, when it comes to the provision of funding for new road projects in the EU, for example under the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), there are specific and stringent impact assessments that have to be carried out with regard to the environment?

Can the Commission explain why, when new roads are being built, especially with EU funds, there is no specific requirement to carry out a safety impact assessment before such a road is opened?

Is the Commission aware that some Member States use rope and steel wire barriers as a guardrail at roadsides to protect motorcyclists, and that such barriers are completely unsuitable? Does the Commission have plans to ensure that Member States use proper guardrails in new road construction projects in order to ensure that motorcyclists are protected insofar as possible? Does the Commission intend to introduce minimum standards for guardrails, so that all European travellers can be protected on the roads, regardless of the Member State they choose to work and travel in?

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

(19 June 2012)

All co-funded projects must comply with EU environmental law and policy including Directive 2011/92/UE <sup>(1)</sup> (the EIA Directive), which makes provisions for carrying out an Environmental Impact Assessment for certain public and private projects before development consent is granted by the competent authority. The EIA Directive distinguishes between projects which must always be subject to an EIA procedure (Annex I), and projects for which Member States have to determine through a case-by-case examination whether the project shall be subject to an EIA (Annex II). Important transport infrastructure, such as motorways or express roads of more than 10 km, are included in Annex I of the directive, while other road projects are included in Annex II.

In addition, road safety impact assessment is compulsory for any new infrastructure project which is part of the Trans European road network (TEN-T) at the initial planning stage, as required by Article 3 of Directive 2008/96/EC <sup>(2)</sup>. Uniform elements of road safety impact assessment to be met by Member States are set out in Annex I to this directive. Moreover, in Article 4, the directive foresees an obligation for Member States to carry out road safety audits at different stages of the project cycle, including pre-opening and early operation. However, the provisions of this directive are applicable only to roads which are part of the TEN-T. The Commission verifies that requests for funding from the EU funds related to road infrastructure within Member States incorporate safety requirements <sup>(3)</sup>.

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-2371/12 <sup>(4)</sup>. Under Directive 89/106/EEC <sup>(5)</sup>, the authorities of the Member States remain competent for setting safety levels for construction works, e.g. roads, in their respective territory.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 26, 28.1.2012 (codified version of Directive 85/337/EEC on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment, as amended).

<sup>(2)</sup> Directive 2008/96/EC of the European Parliament and the Council of 19 November 2008 on road infrastructure safety management OJ L 319, 29.11.2008, p. 59-67.

<sup>(3)</sup> as foreseen by the Policy Orientations on Road Safety 2011-2020-COM(2010)389 Final.

<sup>(4)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN>.

<sup>(5)</sup> Council Directive 89/106/EEC of 21 December 1988 on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States relating to construction products, OJ L 40, 11.2.1989.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004620/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(7 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Retinite pigmentosa

Dopo i primi esperimenti in Germania, anche in Gran Bretagna è stato impiantato in due pazienti resi ciechi da una patologia degenerativa un chip che ripristina parzialmente la vista.

L'intervento è stato attuato su due pazienti affetti da retinite pigmentosa. Entrambi sono stati in grado di distinguere la luce subito dopo l'impianto della retina artificiale e ora, a distanza di qualche settimana, stanno riguadagnando alcune funzioni dell'occhio. Il microchip, della grandezza di pochi millimetri, contiene 1500 piccoli diodi elettronici che «catturano» la luce e trasmettono il segnale al nervo ottico.

Il dispositivo, progettato da un'azienda tedesca, è stato impiantato con un intervento di otto ore ed è accompagnato da un'unità di controllo che a sua volta viene impiantata dietro l'orecchio. La visione è differente da quella normale e richiede processi cerebrali diversi ma allo stesso tempo si pensa che possa essere sufficiente a far riguadagnare l'indipendenza ai pazienti. In Europa si stima che migliaia di persone siano affette dalla retinite pigmentosa, che porta alla cecità nel giro di alcuni anni.

Alla luce di quanto sopraesposto, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. È a conoscenza della nuova invenzione summenzionata e del suo impiego?
2. Non ritiene che si possa finanziare, attraverso il Settimo Programma Quadro (7° PQ) oppure il Programma Quadro per la competitività e l'innovazione, al fine di garantire perfezionamenti dello strumento?
3. È in possesso di dati inerenti al numero di individui, negli Stati membri, affetti da retinite pigmentosa?

**Risposta di Neelie Kroes a nome della Commissione**

(19 giugno 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza di questa scoperta e del suo utilizzo e informa l'onorevole parlamentare che un dispositivo per l'impianto della retina era stato già sviluppato all'interno del progetto Healthy Aims, finanziato dal 6° PQ nel 2007. Il dispositivo progettato dalla società Intelligent Medical Implants (IMI, <http://www.imidevices.com/>) è attualmente oggetto di test clinici.

I sistemi di impianto attivo come quello in questione fanno parte del settore MicroNanoBioSystems (MNBS), già sostenuto nell'ambito delle TIC e che in futuro dovrebbe beneficiare del sostegno di Horizon 2020.

La Commissione non è in possesso di dati sul numero di cittadini europei affetti da retinite pigmentosa. Tuttavia ORPHANET, il portale delle malattie rare e dei medicinali orfani, stima che la prevalenza di questa patologia sia di circa 30,2/100 000 <sup>(1)</sup>. Il progetto ORPHANET, cofinanziato dalla Commissione, fornisce ulteriori informazioni sulle risorse sanitarie e le attività di ricerca, inclusi i test clinici, disponibili per questa malattia <sup>(2)</sup>.

Tuttavia, in linea con la decisione che lo istituisce, il programma quadro per la competitività e l'innovazione (CIP) non sostiene nessun tipo di ricerca.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://www.orpha.net/orphacom/cahiers/docs/IT/Prevalenza\\_delle\\_malattie\\_rare\\_in\\_ordine\\_alfabetico.pdf](http://www.orpha.net/orphacom/cahiers/docs/IT/Prevalenza_delle_malattie_rare_in_ordine_alfabetico.pdf)

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://www.orpha.net/consor/cgi-bin/Disease\\_Search.php?lng=EN&data\\_id=659&Disease\\_Disease\\_Search\\_diseaseGroup=retinitis-pigmentosa&Disease\\_Disease\\_Search\\_diseaseType=Pat&Disease\(s\)/group%20of%20diseases=Retinitis-pigmentosa&title=Retinitis-pigmentosa&searc](http://www.orpha.net/consor/cgi-bin/Disease_Search.php?lng=EN&data_id=659&Disease_Disease_Search_diseaseGroup=retinitis-pigmentosa&Disease_Disease_Search_diseaseType=Pat&Disease(s)/group%20of%20diseases=Retinitis-pigmentosa&title=Retinitis-pigmentosa&searc)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004620/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(7 May 2012)

*Subject: Retinitis pigmentosa*

After initial experiments conducted in Germany, a team in the UK has implanted a microchip that partially restored the sight of two patients blinded by a degenerative condition.

The operation was carried out on two patients suffering from *retinitis pigmentosa*. Both were able to distinguish light immediately after the artificial retina was implanted and now, several weeks later, they are recovering some vision. The microchip is just a few millimetres in size, and contains 1 500 tiny electronic diodes that 'capture' light and transmit a signal to the optic nerve.

The device was designed by a German company and implanted during an eight-hour operation, along with a control unit which is implanted behind the eye. Vision is different from normal vision, and requires different brain processes, but despite this it is thought that it will be sufficient to enable patients to regain their independence. In Europe it is estimated that thousands of people are affected by *retinitis pigmentosa*, which leads to blindness over several years.

In view of the above, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Is it aware of the aforementioned new invention and of its use?
2. Does it not think that funding could be provided under the Seventh Framework Programme (FP7) or the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme in order to allow the device to be perfected?
3. Is it in possession of figures concerning the number of people in Member States affected by *retinitis pigmentosa*?

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

(19 June 2012)

The Commission is aware of this invention and of its use. Retina implant device has been also developed within the FP6 funded project Healthy Aims (2007). The device currently exploited by IMI-Intelligent Medical Implants company (<http://www.imidevices.com/>) is currently under clinical trials.

Active implant systems such the one in question are part of the MNBS-MicroNanoBioSystems area already supported by the ICT and it is foreseen to be supported in Horizon 2020.

The Commission does not have data on the number of Europeans suffering from retinitis pigmentosa. However, Orphanet, the portal for rare diseases and orphan drugs, estimates the prevalence of retinitis pigmentosa at approximately 30.2 per 100 000 <sup>(1)</sup>. The Orphanet project, co-funded by the Commission, provides additional information on healthcare resources and research activities on this disease, including clinical trials <sup>(2)</sup>.

However, in line with the decision on the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme (CIP), this programme does not support any kind of research.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://www.orpha.net/orphacom/cahiers/docs/GB/Prevalence\\_of\\_rare\\_diseases\\_by\\_alphabetical\\_list.pdf](http://www.orpha.net/orphacom/cahiers/docs/GB/Prevalence_of_rare_diseases_by_alphabetical_list.pdf)

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://www.orpha.net/consor/cgi-bin/Disease\\_Search.php?lng=EN&data\\_id=659&Disease\\_Disease\\_Search\\_diseaseGroup=retinitis-pigmentosa&Disease\\_Disease\\_Search\\_diseaseType=Pat&Disease\(s\)/group%20of%20diseases=Retinitis-pigmentosa&title=Retinitis-pigmentosa&searc](http://www.orpha.net/consor/cgi-bin/Disease_Search.php?lng=EN&data_id=659&Disease_Disease_Search_diseaseGroup=retinitis-pigmentosa&Disease_Disease_Search_diseaseType=Pat&Disease(s)/group%20of%20diseases=Retinitis-pigmentosa&title=Retinitis-pigmentosa&searc)

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004621/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(7 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Trabucchi del Gargano

Il trabucco è un'antica macchina da pesca tipica delle coste abruzzesi, molisane e pugliesi. In Puglia è tutelata come patrimonio monumentale dal Parco nazionale del Gargano. Nell'ambito della ricognizione delle problematiche e potenzialità del territorio, il presidente del Parco nazionale del Gargano ha ritenuto necessario incontrare personalmente i rappresentanti del Comune di Vieste e delle associazioni dei trabucchi per fare con chiarezza il punto sul futuro dei caratteristici e affascinanti marchingegni per la pesca, divenuti nel tempo uno dei simboli più identitari del promontorio e della sua area protetta.

I trabucchi, sinonimo di cultura, storia e tradizione, non possono essere abbandonati all'incuria umana. Dovrebbero avere come naturale destinazione la valorizzazione della pesca tradizionale in chiave di attrattivo percorso turistico.

Alla luce delle considerazioni sopraesposte l'interrogante chiede alla Commissione:

1. se è a conoscenza dell'importanza culturale, storica e identitaria dei trabucchi per la zona del Gargano e dell'attuale stato di incuria nel quale versano;
2. se esistono finanziamenti per il recupero e la ripresa dell'attività dei trabucchi, anche a fini turistici;
3. se intende intraprendere ulteriori provvedimenti in proposito e, in caso affermativo, di quali si tratta.

**Risposta di Maria Damanaki a nome della Commissione**

(6 luglio 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza dell'importanza culturale, storica e identitaria dei «trabucchi» (reti da raccolta) per le zone costiere italiane.

L'uso e il recupero dei trabucchi possono essere utili ai fini dello sviluppo di talune zone costiere italiane purché gli attrezzi utilizzati dai trabucchi rispettino le disposizioni del regolamento (CE) n. 1967/2006 del Consiglio, segnatamente per quanto riguarda le dimensioni minime delle catture degli organismi marini elencati nell'allegato III del suddetto regolamento. Le disposizioni in parola vanno rispettate anche quando i trabucchi sono adoperati nella pesca sportiva.

Nell'ambito del Fondo europeo per la pesca gli Stati membri possono concedere aiuti ai gruppi locali di azione nel settore della pesca (FLAG) che mettono in atto strategie a livello locale per lo sviluppo e la diversificazione economica di zone dipendenti in ampia misura dalla pesca. La regione Abruzzo ha già fatto ricorso a tali disposizioni dando vita al FLAG «Costa dei trabucchi» nel preciso intento di servirsi dei trabucchi come attrazione turistica per l'intera zona costiera.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004621/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* Trabucchi of Gargano

The trabucco is an ancient fishing contraption typical of the Abruzzo, Molise and Apulia coasts. In Apulia, it is protected as part of the architectural heritage of the Gargano National Park. In the context of the work being done to identify the problems and potential of the area, the president of the Gargano National Park felt it was necessary to meet personally with representatives from the Municipality of Vieste and trabucchi associations to make a clear assessment of the future of these characteristic and fascinating fishing devices, which over time, have become one of the most distinctive symbols of the promontory and its protected area.

The trabucchi, which are synonymous with culture, history and tradition, cannot be abandoned to human neglect. Their natural purpose should be to promote traditional fishing as a tourist attraction.

In view of the above considerations, can the Commission answer the following:

1. Is it aware of the cultural, historical and identity-related importance of the trabucchi for the Gargano area, and of their current state of neglect?
2. Are there any funds available with which to recover and restore the operation of the trabucchi, including for purposes of tourism?
3. Does it propose to take any additional measures in this respect and, if so, what are these measures?

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

(6 July 2012)

The Commission is aware of the cultural, historical and identity-related importance of the 'trabucchi' (lift-nets) for the coastal areas of Italy.

The use and restoration of trabucchi can be useful for the development of certain Italian coastal areas provided that the gears used by trabucchi are in compliance with the provisions of Council Regulation 1967/2006 and especially with the minimum catching sizes for marine organisms established by Annex III therein. Such provisions need to be respected also in case trabucchi are used for the purposes of leisure fisheries.

Under the European Fisheries Fund Member States may grant aid to fisheries local action groups (FLAG) which implement local strategies for the development and the economic diversification of local areas highly dependent on fisheries. The Abruzzo region has already made use of those provisions by setting up the FLAG 'Coast of trabucchi' with the precise objective to use trabucchi as a tourist attractor for the entire coastal area.

---

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004622/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

*(7 maggio 2012)*

Oggetto: Programmi per fondi diretti, città di Matera

Gli enti territoriali, quali Comuni e Province, sono tra i primi possibili beneficiari dei fondi diretti programmati ed erogati da parte delle direzioni generali della Commissione europea. Tra i fondi disponibili ci sono ad esempio quelli previsti per: il programma «Cultura», il programma per l'occupazione e la solidarietà sociale PROGRESS, il programma per la cittadinanza «l'Europa per i cittadini», quello per l'ambiente LIFE +, quello per gestire i flussi migratori: «Programma Gestione dei flussi migratori», quello dedicato alle risorse umane: «Programma Investire nelle persone», e tanti altri.

In merito a questi e ad altri programmi disponibili, può la Commissione chiarire:

1. Ci sono programmi per i quali la città di Matera ha fatto richiesta?
2. In caso affermativo, quali sono i progetti che hanno avuto accesso a fondi europei e con quali risultati suddetti programmi sono stati portati a termine?

**Risposta di Janusz Lewandowski a nome della Commissione**

*(28 giugno 2012)*

Finora il comune di Matera non ha presentato alcuna richiesta per accedere ai fondi UE direttamente gestiti dalla Commissione.

Se la Commissione ha capito correttamente, l'onorevole parlamentare è interessato ai finanziamenti concessi direttamente alle città italiane nel quadro di specifici programmi UE gestiti dalla Commissione. In tal caso, la Commissione è disposta a fornirgli una tabella contenente queste informazioni per le principali città italiane che dovrebbero partecipare ai programmi in questione; ciò darebbe all'onorevole parlamentare una visione d'insieme dei dati disponibili, evitando alla Commissione di dover rispondere a ogni singola domanda.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004622/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* Direct funding programmes — city of Matera

Local government bodies, such as municipalities and provinces, are among the first possible beneficiaries of the direct funding planned and allocated by the European Commission's Directorates-General. The available funding includes funds for the Culture Programme, the Progress Programme for Employment and Social Solidarity, the Europe for Citizens Programme aimed at promoting citizenship, the Life+ Programme for the environment, the Migration Flow Management Programme, the Investing in People Programme dedicated to human resources, and many others.

With regard to these and other available programmes, could the Commission clarify:

1. Are there any programmes for which the city of Matera has applied?
2. If so, which projects were given access to European funds, and what results did these programmes have once they were complete?

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

(28 June 2012)

The City of Matera has not so far applied for any funding directly managed by the Commission.

The Commission notes that the Honourable Member is interested in the funding granted directly to Italian cities from specific EU programmes managed by the Commission. Should the Honourable Member so wish, the Commission could prepare a table providing this information for the major Italian cities likely to take part in these programmes. This would save the Commission time needed to reply to each individual question and provide the Honourable Member with one single set of comprehensive data.

---



(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004624/12**

**alla Commissione**

**Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)**

(7 maggio 2012)

**Oggetto:** Pericoloso potenziale inquinamento della falda acquifera a causa della Cava di ghiaia Morganella realizzata sottofalda e ubicata tra i Comuni di Ponzano e Paese (Treviso)

In data 11 agosto 2008, l'associazione temporanea di imprese «Biasuzzi Cave S.p.A. — Calcestruzzi S.p.A. — Superbeton S.p.A.» ha presentato alla Regione Veneto un progetto di riqualificazione ambientale e urbanistica (la valutazione di impatto ambientale è tutt'ora in corso) <sup>(1)</sup>, per scavare ulteriormente e in maggior profondità nell'ambito estrattivo situato nell'immediata periferia Nord del Comune di Treviso, tra i Comuni di Ponzano e Paese, meglio noto come «Cava di Castagnole-Morganella».

La suddetta cava è in funzione da prima del 1975 per l'estrazione della ghiaia, e da tempo la profondità delle escavazioni ha raggiunto la falda acquifera, permettendo all'acqua di affiorare e creare un lago dalle dimensioni di circa 500 000 metri quadrati. La suddetta falda, peraltro, presenta una direttrice di scorrimento sotterraneo verso parte dell'acquifero multifaldate della Provincia di Treviso nella Pianura Veneta, compresa nel Distretto Idrografico delle Alpi Orientali.

Da alcuni controlli realizzati dall'Agenzia Regionale per la Prevenzione e Protezione Ambientale del Veneto (ARPAV), effettuati su richiesta del Corpo Forestale dello Stato già nel 2004, su alcuni rifiuti non conformi e maleodoranti rinvenuti nella confinante «Discarica 2A» della Ditta Biasuzzi Cave S.p.A., è stata riscontrata la presenza di piombo, arsenico e cromo. Peraltro, nel 1999 la Provincia di Treviso aveva rilevato una nicchia di frana proprio nel sito della suddetta discarica prospiciente il lago della falda affiorante della cava, richiedendone ripetutamente la messa in sicurezza tuttora non eseguita.

Il nuovo progetto di cui sopra, effetto di una successiva modifica, prevede l'estrazione di ben altri 6 400 000 metri cubi di ghiaia, con un ulteriore approfondimento dell'estrazione, sempre sotto la falda acquifera, dagli attuali 40 metri di profondità sotto il piano di campagna, a ben 65 metri.

Con questo progetto, non ritiene la Commissione che siano seriamente minacciate dal pericolo di inquinamento e contaminazione le aree del Distretto Idrografico Alpi Orientali, comprese quelle dei Comuni di Ponzano e Paese (TV) e limitrofi, alle quali è stata attribuita una protezione speciale in base alla direttiva 2000/60/CE al fine di tutelare le acque superficiali e sotterranee ivi contenute, nonché di tutti i corpi idrici utilizzati per l'estrazione di acque destinate al consumo umano?

**Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione**

(28 giugno 2012)

La Commissione non è a conoscenza dei dettagli di questo progetto. Lo sfruttamento delle cave di ghiaia in quanto tale non comporta necessariamente un serio rischio di inquinamento per l'ambiente idrico. Il rischio dipende dalle condizioni locali e idrogeologiche, dalla progettazione e dal funzionamento dell'impianto tecnico.

La direttiva quadro sulle acque (WFD, 2000/60/CE <sup>(2)</sup>) impone agli Stati membri di adottare misure volte a prevenire il deterioramento dello stato dei corpi idrici sotterranei e di superficie. Alterazioni significative del livello dei corpi idrici sotterranei possono ripercuotersi sugli ecosistemi terrestri e di superficie connessi. Il deterioramento dello stato dovuto alla realizzazione di nuovi progetti è tollerato soltanto se ricorrono le condizioni stabilite nell'articolo 4, paragrafo 7.

La Commissione prende atto che la valutazione di impatto ambientale del progetto è tutt'ora in corso. Spetta al soggetto promotore e alle autorità italiane garantire il rispetto della normativa in materia di ambiente.

<sup>(1)</sup> Progetto VIA 53/2008.

<sup>(2)</sup> GU L 327 del 22.12.2000.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004624/12  
to the Commission**

**Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)**

(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* Potential threat of groundwater pollution due to the Morganelle gravel pit mined below the water table and located between the municipalities of Ponzano and Paese (Treviso)

On 11 August 2008, the 'Biasuzzi Cave S.p.A. — Calcestruzzi S.p.A. — Superbeton S.p.A.' temporary joint venture presented to the Veneto Region an environmental and urban planning redevelopment project (the environmental impact assessment is still ongoing) <sup>(1)</sup> to expand and deepen the mining operations at the site on the northern outskirts of the municipality of Treviso, between the municipalities of Ponzano and Paese, better known as the 'Castagnole-Morganelle pit'.

The aforementioned pit has been mined for gravel since before 1975 and the depth of the excavations reached the groundwater some time ago, allowing the water to surface and form a lake of around 500 000 square metres. The groundwater, however, flows underground towards part of the multi-layer aquifer of the Province of Treviso in the Venetian Plain, which forms part of the river basin district of the eastern Alps.

In 2004 the Veneto Regional Environmental Prevention and Protection Agency (ARPAV), at the request of the State Forestry Corps, conducted several tests on non-compliant and foul-smelling waste discovered in the neighbouring 'Landfill 2A', belonging to the company Biasuzzi Cave S.p.A. The tests revealed the presence of lead, arsenic and chromium. Moreover, in 1999 the Province of Treviso, which has repeatedly (but in vain) requested that the landfill be made safe, found a landslide scar on the very site of the aforementioned landfill overlooking the lake of groundwater surfacing from the pit.

The abovementioned new project has been subsequently amended and provides for the extraction of a further 6.4 million cubic metres of gravel, with a further deepening of the mining operations below the water table from the current 40 metres below ground level to some 65 metres.

Does the Commission not believe that this project poses a serious risk of pollution and contamination to areas lying within the river basin district of the eastern Alps, including those in the municipalities of Ponzano and Paese (Treviso) and surrounding areas, which have been designated as requiring special protection under Directive 2000/60/EC for the protection of their surface water and groundwater, as well as all bodies of water used for the abstraction of water intended for human consumption?

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

(28 June 2012)

The Commission is not aware of the details of this project. An exploitation of gravel, as such, does not necessarily pose a serious risk of pollution to the aquatic environment. The risk depends on the local conditions, hydrogeological conditions and on the design and operation of the technical installation.

The Water Framework Directive (WFD, 2000/60/EC <sup>(2)</sup>) requires Member States to take measures to prevent the deterioration of the status of surface and groundwater bodies. Significant alterations of the level of a groundwater body can impact associated surface and terrestrial ecosystems. Deterioration of status due to new projects is only allowed if the conditions in Article 4.7 are fulfilled.

The Commission notes that the environmental impact assessment of the project is ongoing. It is for the promoter and for the Italian authorities to ensure that the environmental legislation is respected.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Environmental Impact Project No 53/2008.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004625/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Godelieve Quisthoudt-Rowohl (PPE) und Daniel Caspary (PPE)**  
(7. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Schutzzölle der Türkei für bestimmte Bekleidungstextilien und Arzneimittel

Seit 1996 besteht zwischen der Türkei und der EU eine Zollunion. Der Handel zwischen den beiden Parteien ist unabhängig vom Ursprungsland der Waren zollfrei. Aus Drittstaaten importierte Waren können zwischen den beiden Parteien zollfrei ausgeliefert werden, wenn der Versand im Rahmen des Vertrags über die Zollunion erfolgt. Die Türkei hat nunmehr jedoch Handelshemmnisse in den Sektoren Bekleidung und Arzneimittel eingeführt, die mit Artikel 7 des Vertrags über die Zollunion in Konflikt stehen.

Die Türkei ist ein Land mit einer hohen Produktionskapazität für Bekleidung und Textilien. Sie ist der zweitgrößte Bekleidungsexporteur in die EU. Seit Juli 2011 erhebt die Türkei Schutzzölle für eine Reihe von Textilien — und alle Arten von Bekleidungsstücken —, die nicht aus der EU stammen, um ihre örtliche Industrie vor zunehmenden Importen zu schützen.

Darüber hinaus hat das Land GMP-Richtlinien (Good Manufacturing Practice) in Einklang mit europäischem Recht eingeführt, einen etablierten, international anerkannten Qualitätsstandard für die pharmazeutische Industrie. Seit Anfang 2010 verlangen die türkischen Behörden jedoch, dass Pharmaunternehmen, die ihre Produkte in den türkischen Markt importieren möchten, ein exklusiv vom türkischen Gesundheitsministerium ausgestelltes GMP-Zertifikat einreichen. Von den EU-Mitgliedstaaten ausgestellte GMP-Zertifikate werden nicht mehr anerkannt. Da die Kapazität der türkischen Behörden für die Durchführung solcher Prüfungen im Ausland sehr begrenzt ist, kann es bis zu 10 Jahre dauern, bis die Marktzulassung für die Türkei erteilt wird. Dadurch ergeben sich insgesamt unannehmbare Handelshemmnisse für europäische Pharmaunternehmen. Da die Türkei ein EU-Beitrittsland ist, sollte sie sicherlich den *gemeinschaftlichen Besitzstand* sowie die offiziellen Rechtsakte der Mitgliedstaaten anerkennen.

1. Ist die Kommission ebenfalls der Auffassung, dass die oben genannten Handelshemmnisse aus protektionistischen Gründen eingerichtet wurden und mit Artikel 7 des Vertrags über die Zollunion in Konflikt stehen?
2. Hat die Kommission die Türkei zur Einhaltung des Vertrags über die Zollunion aufgefordert?
3. Welche Auffassung vertritt die Kommission in Bezug auf die Schutzzölle, die von der türkischen Regierung für nicht aus der EU stammende Textilien und Bekleidungsstücke eingeführt wurde?
4. Was unternimmt die Kommission, um sicherzustellen, dass das türkische Gesundheitsministerium von den EU-Mitgliedstaaten ausgestellte GMP-Zertifikate anerkennt?
5. Wie wird die Kommission sicherstellen, dass die Türkei ihre Verpflichtungen im Rahmen der Zollunion erfüllt?

**Antwort von Herrn De Gucht im Namen der Kommission**  
(27. Juni 2012)

Die Kommission beobachtet aufmerksam die beiden von den Abgeordneten angesprochenen Themenbereiche und thematisiert sie im Rahmen der Sitzungen des Gemischten Ausschusses der Zollunion und in bilateralen Handelssitzungen.

Die Kommission ist der Auffassung, dass die türkischen Behörden die von der EU ausgestellten GMP-Zertifikate gemäß Artikel 10 des Beschlusses Nr. 1/95 über die Durchführung der Endphase der Zollunion anerkennen sollten.

In der Tat erhebt die Türkei seit Mitte 2011 zusätzliche Schutzzölle für die Einfuhr bestimmter Textilprodukte mit Ursprung in Staaten außerhalb der EU in die Türkei. Die Kommission hat bereits Bedenken hinsichtlich der Auswirkungen dieser Maßnahme auf die Industrie der EU geäußert. Darüber hinaus steht die Kommission in Kontakt mit Vertretern der EU-Textil- und Bekleidungsindustrie, um eine annehmbare Lösung herauszuarbeiten.

Die Kommission wird diese beiden Fragen weiterhin auf allen Ebenen ansprechen, gegebenenfalls auch unter Rückgriff auf die Rahmen des Zollunionsabkommens und des Assoziierungsabkommens. Gleichzeitig wird die Kommission einen regelmäßigen Austausch mit der Industrie pflegen.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004625/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Godelieve Quisthoudt-Rowohl (PPE) and Daniel Caspary (PPE)**  
(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* Turkey's safeguard duties for certain apparel fabrics and medicinal products

A customs union between Turkey and the EU has been in existence since 1996. Trade between the two parties is free of duties, irrespective of the origin of the goods. Goods imported from third countries can be delivered between the two parties without duties if they are shipped under the customs union agreement. However, Turkey has now introduced trade barriers in the apparel and medicinal products sectors which are in conflict with Article 7 of the Customs Union Agreement.

Turkey is a country with a huge production capacity for fabrics and apparel. It is the second largest exporter of apparel to the EU. Since July 2011 Turkey has implemented safeguard duties for a range of fabrics — and all types of garment — not originating in the EU in order to protect the local industry from rising imports.

Furthermore, the country has introduced GMP (Good Manufacturing Practice) guidelines consistent with European law, as the established, internationally recognised quality standard for the pharmaceutical industry. Since the beginning of 2010, however, the Turkish authorities have stipulated that pharmaceutical companies wishing to import their products into the Turkish market have to submit a GMP certificate issued exclusively by the Turkish Ministry of Health. They no longer accept GMP certificates issued by the EU Member States. As the Turkish authorities' capacity to carry out such inspections abroad is very limited, it can take up to 10 years before a market authorisation for Turkey is granted. This amounts to the imposition of unacceptable trade barriers for European drug companies. Given that Turkey is an EU accession country, it should certainly accept the *acquis communautaire* and the official acts of the Member States.

1. Does the Commission share the view that the abovementioned trade barriers have been established for protectionist reasons and are in conflict with Article 7 of the Customs Union Agreement?
2. Has the Commission challenged Turkey to stick to the Customs Union Agreement?
3. What is the Commission's view on the safeguard duties introduced by the Turkish Government for fabrics and garments not originating in the EU?
4. What is the Commission doing to ensure that the Turkish Ministry of Health accepts GMP certificates issued by the EU Member States?
5. How will the Commission ensure that Turkey fulfils its obligations under the customs union?

**Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission**  
(27 June 2012)

The Commission is following closely the two issues identified by the Honourable Members and has been raising them in meetings of the Customs Union Joint Committee and in bilateral trade meetings.

In the view of the Commission the Turkish authorities should accept the EU GMP (Good Manufacturing Practice) certificates pursuant to Article 10 of Decision 1/95 on implementing the final phase of the Customs Union.

Additional customs duties are indeed levied since mid-2011 on imports in Turkey of certain textile products originating in countries outside the EU. The Commission has already raised concerns with regard to the impact this measure could have on the EU industry. In addition, the Commission has been in contact with the EU textiles and clothing industry in order to find a solution suitable to them.

The Commission will continue to raise these two issues at all levels, using the frameworks of the Customs Union Agreement and the Association Agreement as appropriate. In doing so, the Commission will also keep regular contact with the industry.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004626/12  
to the Commission**

**Jim Higgins (PPE)**

(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* Voting rights of Europeans living abroad

In the EU Citizenship 2010 report, the Commission announced that it would launch a discussion to identify political options to prevent EU citizens from losing their political rights as a consequence of exercising their right to free movement. Has this discussion begun, and, if so, what have been the main results?

In light of this discussion, is the Commission aware of the fact that Irish people working in another Member State forfeit their right to vote in general elections at home, but equally are not eligible to vote in general elections in their host country? Is the Commission of the view that this situation needs to be changed? Does the Commission have any plans to oblige governments to implement new agreements so that Europeans who choose to travel and work freely in the European internal market, in a Member State other than that of their nationality, retain the right to elect people to the Council of Ministers, be it in their home or host country?

Could the Commission provide a detailed list of the criteria for each Member State, explaining how long nationals of their native Member States can work in another Member State without losing their right to vote in general elections? What are the requirements that foreign EU citizens must fulfil in each Member State before they are allowed to vote in general elections in that Member State, i.e. the host country?

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

(19 June 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-009269/2011 by Mr Andrew Duff.

In addition, the Commission would highlight that on 9 May 2012 it launched a broad consultation on the 2013 EU Citizenship Report 'EU citizens — Your rights, your future' asking EU citizens about the problems they face in using their rights as such, including the electoral rights. The public consultation also touches upon the issue of the loss by nationals of a number of Member States of their right to take part in national elections, as a consequence of exercising their right to free movement and residence within the EU <sup>(1)</sup>.

The Commission carried out in August 2010 a study on electoral matters <sup>(2)</sup> which includes a comparative analysis of the national arrangements in EU Member States concerning disenfranchisement as well as for allowing non-national EU citizens to participate in national elections.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> The public consultation is available via the following link:  
<http://ec.europa.eu/justice/opinion/your-rights-your-future/>

<sup>(2)</sup> Study on possible developments of EU legislation in the field of electoral matters including possible modification of Directive 93/109/EC. The study has been transmitted to the Parliament (AFCO Committee) in 2010.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004627/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)  
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)  
(7 May 2012)**

*Subject:* VP/HR — Recognition of Somaliland

Does the VP/HR recognise Somaliland as an independent state? If not, does she intend to?

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

The EU, like the UN, considers Somaliland part of Somalia, in respect of the country's territorial integrity. This is also the position taken by the AU. As part of a 'peace dividend' approach, rewarding regions for their stability and political progress, the EU invests a significant proportion of its development funds for Somalia (totalling EUR 412 million for 2008-2013 and additional funds under other EDF budget lines) in Somaliland. With these funds, we work with the Somaliland authorities to improve economic opportunities, agriculture and infrastructure, and governance.

The EU considers that the peace process in Somalia has to be as inclusive as possible, as it has implications for the whole region. The EU will therefore continue to engage with all parts of Somalia, including Somaliland, to support the return to peace and stability.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004629/12**  
**alla Commissione**  
**Debora Serracchiani (S&D)**  
(7 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Depositi di stoccaggio di CO<sub>2</sub> al largo di Senigallia (Ancona)

Preoccuparsi per l'ambiente è ormai pratica consueta persino per le più grandi società mondiali, che spesso cercano di bypassare le amministrazioni locali per evitare spiacevoli intoppi burocratici; durante il Consiglio comunale di Senigallia del 27 febbraio è stato tuttavia sollevato un argomento che non è passato inosservato perché può rappresentare una questione molto importante, in chiave futura, per le coste marchigiane e per tutto l'Adriatico.

Secondo l'ultimo numero del «Bollettino ufficiale degli idrocarburi e delle georisorse», pubblicato dal ministero dello Sviluppo economico, una società ha fatto istanza per ottenere una licenza di esplorazione ai fini dello stoccaggio di biossido di carbonio al largo delle coste di Senigallia (AN).

Nel dettaglio, la direttiva 2009/31/CE, traspota in Italia con il d.l. 162/2011, prevede il rilascio provvisorio di licenze di esplorazione del suolo ai fini dello stoccaggio geologico del biossido di carbonio. Nell'ambito dei provvedimenti in questione, assunti dal ministero dello Sviluppo economico, è tuttavia necessario che «le amministrazioni locali competenti, laddove previsto, siano sentite». Inoltre, il principio europeo prevede che i depositi di stoccaggio possano essere installati a condizione che la pratica si dimostri una «tecnologia ambientalmente sicura», e in un territorio a rischio sismico medio-alto appare difficile poter soddisfare tale condizione.

Qualora nei prossimi anni l'iter della pratica procedesse, la costa marchigiana, al largo della quale è anche prevista la costruzione di un rigassificatore (a Falconara Marittima, in provincia di Ancona), sarebbe oggetto dell'ennesima richiesta di utilizzo a fini industriali di un bene fondamentale.

Pertanto, alla luce delle informazioni sopraesposte, l'interrogante chiede alla Commissione:

- Era a conoscenza della situazione relativa all'istanza di esplorazione del sottosuolo al largo di Senigallia?
- Quali misure intende adottare per evitare che in futuro siano installati depositi di stoccaggio in zone dove sussiste un rischio di sismicità?

**Risposta di Connie Hedegaard a nome della Commissione**  
(5 luglio 2012)

La Commissione non era a conoscenza del fatto che una società avesse presentato alle autorità italiane un'istanza per ottenere una licenza di esplorazione ai fini dello stoccaggio di biossido di carbonio al largo delle coste di Senigallia (Ancona). L'articolo 5 della direttiva 2009/31/CE<sup>(1)</sup> (direttiva CCS) relativa allo stoccaggio geologico di biossido di carbonio stabilisce una serie di criteri per il rilascio di tali licenze di esplorazione. La direttiva CCS definisce, inoltre, i requisiti necessari per il rilascio delle autorizzazioni allo stoccaggio come, ad esempio, la precedente caratterizzazione del potenziale sito di stoccaggio e la sicurezza necessaria di stoccaggio che tenga conto, in particolare, del rischio di sismicità del sito. In conformità dell'articolo 4 della direttiva CCS, una formazione geologica è scelta come sito di stoccaggio solo se, alle condizioni di uso proposte, non vi è un rischio significativo di fuoriuscita e se non sussistono rischi rilevanti per l'ambiente o la salute. La direttiva CCS è stata recepita nella legislazione italiana.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> GUL 140 del 5.6.2009.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004629/12  
to the Commission**

**Debora Serracchiani (S&D)**

(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* CO<sub>2</sub> storage facilities off the coast of Senigallia (Ancona)

Nowadays, caring for the environment is routine practice even for the world's biggest companies, which often attempt to bypass local authorities to avoid disagreeable bureaucratic obstacles. However, during the meeting of Senigallia's Municipal Council on 27 February, an issue was raised which has not gone unnoticed, since it may in future come to represent a very important question for the Marche coastline and for the whole of the Adriatic.

According to the latest edition of the *Bollettino ufficiale degli idrocarburi e delle georisorse* [Official Bulletin of Hydrocarbons and Geothermal Resources], published by the Ministry of Economic Development, a company has submitted an application for an exploration licence for the storage of carbon dioxide off the coast of Senigallia (Ancona).

In detail, Directive 2009/31/EC, transposed in Italy by Legislative Decree 162/2011, provides for the temporary issuing of underground exploration permits with a view to the geological storage of carbon dioxide. However, within the scope of the measures in question, adopted by the Ministry of Economic Development, it is necessary for the competent local authorities to be consulted, where applicable. Moreover, the European principle provides that storage facilities may be installed on condition that the method used is demonstrated to be an 'environmentally safe technology', and in a region of medium-to-high seismic risk it appears difficult to satisfy this condition.

If this practice should go ahead in the coming years, the Marche coast, along which there are also plans to build a regasification plant (at Falconara Marittima, in the Province of Ancona), would be subject to endless requests to use a fundamental asset for industrial purposes.

Consequently, in view of the information provided above, can the Commission state:

- whether it was aware of the situation regarding the application for underground exploration off the coast of Senigallia?
- what steps it will take to ensure that in future no storage facilities are installed in areas at high risk of seismic activity?

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

(5 July 2012)

The Commission was not aware that an application for an exploration permit for the geological storage of carbon dioxide off the coast of Senigallia (Ancona) has been submitted to the Italian authorities. Article 5 of Directive 2009/31/EC<sup>(1)</sup> (CCS-Directive) on the geological storage of carbon dioxide sets out a number of requirements related to the granting of such exploration permits. The CCS-Directive also contains detailed requirements for the granting of an actual storage permit, e.g. the prior characterisation of a potential storage site and the expected security of storage, covering, in particular, a potential seismic activity. Pursuant to Article 4 of the CCS-Directive, a geological formation shall only be selected as a storage site, if under the proposed conditions of use there is no significant risk of leakage, and if no significant environmental or health risk exists. The CCS-Directive has been transposed in Italian legislation.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 140, 5.6.2009.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004630/12  
do Komisji**

**Konrad Szymański (ECR)**

(7 maja 2012 r.)

*Przedmiot:* Dyskryminacyjna polityka celna Ukrainy wobec unijnych producentów szkła

Ukraińskie władze planują zmianę taryf celnych w stosunku do importowanego szkła. Według projektu cła mają być zróżnicowane dla producentów szkła płaskiego w zależności od ich kraju pochodzenia. Zgodnie z założeniami preferencyjne stawki dla asortymentu szkła typu float (o grubości od 3,5 do 4,5 mm) mają obejmować m.in. Rosję (cło wysokości 5 %) i Turcję, z kolei dla Polski czy Bułgarii przewidziano stawkę rzędu 30 %. Zróżnicowane traktowanie partnerów handlowych i obciążanie Polski wysokimi taryfami celnymi ma charakter dyskryminujący.

W związku z tym, iż 85 % importu szkła tego typu pochodzi właśnie z Polski, takie działania w znaczący sposób wpłyną na zachwianie rynku.

— Jakimi środkami dysponuje Komisja, aby powstrzymać protekcyjną politykę handlową Ukrainy wobec producentów unijnych?

— Jaki jest wynik rozmów w tej sprawie ze stroną ukraińską w związku z wciąż toczącymi się negocjacjami dot. umowy handlowej UE-Ukraina?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Karela De Guchta w imieniu Komisji**

(8 czerwca 2012 r.)

Komisja pragnie zwrócić uwagę Szanownego Pana Posła, że środki, o których mowa, obejmują cła antydumpingowe, a nie zwykłą zmianę taryf celnych wobec importowanego szkła. Nakładanie cel antydumpingowych dopuszczają i regulują przepisy Światowej Organizacji Handlu (WTO). Środki takie określa się indywidualnie dla każdego eksportera na podstawie danych, które przedstawił on organom prowadzącym dochodzenie. Dlatego to normalne, że cła różnią się w zależności od państwa dostawcy.

Stosowanie takich środków jest więc zgodne z prawem, pod warunkiem przestrzegania odpowiednich przepisów, i nie powinno być uważane za protekcyjną politykę handlową.

Komisja śledziła wspomniane dochodzenie od czasu jego wszczęcia w kwietniu 2011 r. i interweniowała w ramach tego dochodzenia. Niestety, w tym przypadku nie udało się uniknąć wprowadzenia środków. W dniu 26 kwietnia 2012 r. Ukraina rzeczywiście podjęła decyzję o nałożeniu cel antydumpingowych, które weszły w życie po upływie 30 dni od daty przyjęcia tej decyzji.

Biorąc pod uwagę techniczny charakter antydumpingu i dobrze określone ramy prawne, trudno jest ustalić jakikolwiek związek między tą kwestią a negocjacjami w sprawie pogłębionej i kompleksowej strefy wolnego handlu pomiędzy UE a Ukrainą, które w każdym razie zostały zakończone pod koniec 2011 r.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004630/12  
to the Commission**

**Konrad Szymański (ECR)**

(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* Ukraine's discriminatory customs policy towards EU glass producers

The Ukrainian Government is planning to change customs tariffs for imported glass. According to the draft, customs duties are to be differentiated for producers of flat glass based on their country of origin. In accordance with the guidelines, preferential rates for float glass (from 3.5 to 4.5 mm thick) will apply to, amongst others, Russia (5% duty) and Turkey, whereas a duty rate of around 30% is stipulated for Poland and Bulgaria. Treating trade partners in a differential manner and burdening Poland with high customs tariffs is discriminatory.

In view of the above, since 85% of this type of glass comes from Poland, such a course of action will significantly destabilise the market.

— What resources will the Commission bring to bear to restrain Ukraine's protectionist trade policy towards EU producers?

— What has been the result of discussions on this matter with Ukraine in connection to the ongoing negotiations on the EU-Ukraine trade agreement?

**Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission**

(8 June 2012)

The Commission would like to draw the attention of the Honourable Member to the fact that the measures in question consist of anti-dumping duties and not a simple change of tariffs for imported glass. The imposition of anti-dumping duties is allowed and regulated under the rules of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) legislation. Such measures are established individually for each exporter on the basis of the data it submitted to the investigating authorities. It is thus normal that the duties vary between supplier countries.

To the extent the relevant rules are respected, applying such measures is thus legally allowed and should not be considered as a protectionist policy.

The Commission has been following this investigation since it was opened in April 2011 and has intervened within the framework of the investigation. Unfortunately the measures could not be avoided in this case. Indeed, Ukraine decided to impose the anti-dumping duties on 26 April 2012, and the measures entered into force 30 days after this decision.

Given the technical nature of anti-dumping and its well-defined legal framework, it is difficult to establish any link between this issue and the negotiations of the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area between the EU and Ukraine, which in any event have been completed at the end of the year 2011.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004631/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE)**  
(7 Μαΐου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Ανάγκη για κοινό πανευρωπαϊκό πρόγραμμα σπουδών για δεξιότητες τεχνολογιών πληροφορικής και επικοινωνιών

Ακαδημαϊκοί, εκπαιδευτικοί και καινοτόμοι επιχειρηματίες προειδοποιούν για την αυξανόμενη έλλειψη νέων Ευρωπαίων οι οποίοι να διαθέτουν επαρκείς δεξιότητες στις τεχνολογίες πληροφορικής και επικοινωνιών (ΤΠΕ), αλλά και δασκάλων με επαρκείς γνώσεις για τη διδασκαλία αυτών των μαθημάτων. Αυτή η έλλειψη θέτει σε κίνδυνο το καινοτομικό δυναμικό και την ανταγωνιστικότητα της Ευρώπης στην αναδυόμενη οικονομία της γνώσης. Η έλλειψη δεξιοτήτων ΤΠΕ σε μεγάλο βαθμό αποδίδεται στα συστήματα εκπαίδευσης, τα οποία αφενός υποτιμούν την διδασκαλία ΤΠΕ και αφετέρου είναι παρωχημένα και προσανατολισμένα σε γραμματειακές δεξιότητες και χειρισμό εμπορικών πακέτων λογισμικού και όχι στην επίλυση τεχνολογικών προβλημάτων, στην απόκτηση αναλυτικών δεξιοτήτων και τον προγραμματισμό υπολογιστών. Ταυτόχρονα, στοιχεία του δικτύου Ευρυδίκη δείχνουν ότι τα εκπαιδευτικά συστήματα πολλών κρατών μελών δεν προβλέπουν καν μαθήματα ΤΠΕ. Την ίδια στιγμή, η ΕΕ, αν και αναγνωρίζει το πρόβλημα, δεν έχει ενιαία προσέγγιση για την αντιμετώπισή του, με τις αρμοδιότητες να είναι μοιρασμένες μεταξύ των Επιτρόπων Εκπαίδευσης, Ψηφιακής Ατζέντας και Βιομηχανίας. Με βάση τα παραπάνω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Τι συγκεκριμένες πρωτοβουλίες θα λάβει για την αντιμετώπιση του προβλήματος έλλειψης επαρκών δεξιοτήτων ΤΠΕ στην ΕΕ;
2. Είναι διατεθειμένη να εκπονήσει μια συνεκτική στρατηγική για την απόκτηση δεξιοτήτων ΤΠΕ υψηλού επιπέδου από τους νέους της ΕΕ;
3. Αν και η αρμοδιότητα για την εκπαίδευση παραμένει στα ΚΜ, είναι η Επιτροπή διατεθειμένη να υποστηρίξει την ανάπτυξη ενός πρότυπου κοινού πανευρωπαϊκού σχολικού προγράμματος σπουδών πληροφορικής, σε συνεργασία με πανεπιστήμια και επιχειρήσεις, το οποίο θα μπορούσε να ενισχύσει την αξιοποίηση των ΤΠΕ και την καινοτομική επιχειρηματικότητα στην ΕΕ;

**Απάντηση της κας Βασιλείου εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(26 Ιουλίου 2012)

Στο πλαίσιο των εμβληματικών πρωτοβουλιών «Ευρώπη 2020», «Θεματολόγιο νέων δεξιοτήτων και θέσεων εργασίας», «Νεολαία σε κίνηση», «Ψηφιακό θεματολόγιο για την Ευρώπη», καθώς και «Ηλεκτρονικές δεξιότητες για τον 21ο αιώνα»<sup>(1)</sup>, η Επιτροπή δρομολόγησε διάφορες δράσεις που συνδέονται με τις τεχνολογίες των πληροφοριών και των επικοινωνιών (ΤΠΕ). Οι δράσεις αυτές βασίζονται στη συνεργασία μεταξύ όλων των υπηρεσιών της Επιτροπής, των κρατών μελών και των κοινωνικών εταίρων. Σκοπός τους είναι να στηρίζουν τα κράτη μέλη στην προσπάθειά τους να προσφέρουν τον κατάλληλο συνδυασμό δεξιοτήτων, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των ηλεκτρονικών δεξιοτήτων και των ψηφιακών δεξιοτήτων, στους ευρωπαίους πολίτες τον 21ο αιώνα<sup>(2)</sup>. Η ευρωπαϊκή εβδομάδα ηλεκτρονικών δεξιοτήτων<sup>(3)</sup>, που διοργανώθηκε πρόσφατα, σκοπό είχε να ενημερωθούν οι νέοι για τα οφέλη της εκπαίδευσης, των θέσεων εργασίας και της επαγγελματικής σταδιοδρομίας στον τομέα των ΤΠΕ. Στη δέσημη μέτρων για την απασχόληση 2012<sup>(4)</sup>, που εξέδωσε η Επιτροπή, προτείνονται διάφορες δράσεις, όπως η δημιουργία συμπράξεων μεταξύ πολλών ενδιαφερομένων μερών.

Η Επιτροπή θα στηρίξει τις πολιτικές που στοχεύουν στην αύξηση του εργατικού δυναμικού υψηλής ειδίκευσης στον τομέα των ΤΠΕ, μέσω της γεφύρωσης του χάσματος μεταξύ συστημάτων εκπαίδευσης και κατάρτισης και αναγκών του κλάδου παραγωγής και της μεγαλύτερης χρήσης των χρηματοπιστωτικών μέσων της ΕΕ. Στο πλαίσιο αυτό περιλαμβάνονται οι προτάσεις της Επιτροπής για νέες επενδύσεις στον τομέα δεξιοτήτων ΤΠΕ, στο πλαίσιο της νέας γενιάς επιχειρησιακών προγραμμάτων, από το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο κατά την περίοδο 2014-2020.

Το ισχύον πρόγραμμα διά βίου μάθησης και ειδικότερα η κύρια δραστηριότητα 3 για τις ΤΠΕ χρηματοδοτεί πρωτοβουλίες, όπως «Ένα κοινό ευρωπαϊκό σχολικό πρόγραμμα σπουδών πληροφορικής». Η επόμενη πρόσκληση υποβολής προτάσεων, που χρηματοδοτείται από το πρόγραμμα, θα δημοσιευτεί το φθινόπωρο του 2012<sup>(5)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2007)496 της 7.9.2007. Βλ. επίσης: [http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/ict/e-skills/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/ict/e-skills/index_en.htm).

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/ict/documents/e-skills/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/ict/documents/e-skills/index_en.htm).

<sup>(3)</sup> <http://eskills-week.ec.europa.eu>.

<sup>(4)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/commission\\_2010-014/andor/headlines/news/2012/04/20120418\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-014/andor/headlines/news/2012/04/20120418_en.htm).

<sup>(5)</sup> [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/llp/ka3/information\\_communication\\_technologies\\_en.php](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/llp/ka3/information_communication_technologies_en.php).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004631/12  
to the Commission**

**Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE)**

(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* Necessity for a common European programme of studies for skills in information and communication technology

Academics, educators and innovative entrepreneurs are warning of a growing shortage of young Europeans with adequate skills in information and communication technologies (ICT) and also of teachers with adequate knowledge for teaching these subjects. This shortage is placing in jeopardy the innovative dynamic and the competitiveness of Europe in the emerging knowledge economy. The lack of ICT skills is largely due to European education systems, which on the one hand undervalue ICT teaching and on the other suffer from obsolescence, oriented as they are towards secretarial skills and the management of commercial software packages rather than solving technological problems and acquiring analytical dexterity and expertise in computer programming. Moreover, data from the Eurydice Network indicates that the education systems of many Member States do not make provision at all for ICT teaching. Although the European Union recognises the problem, it has no unified approach for dealing with it, as the relevant competences are divided between the Education, Digital Agenda and Industry committees. In view of the above, can the Commission state:

1. What specific initiatives it intends to take to deal with the shortage of adequate ICT skills in the EU?
2. If it is prepared to elaborate a coherent strategy for acquisition of high-level ICT skills by young people in the EU?
3. Although responsibility for education remains with the Member States, if it is prepared to support development of a model common European school syllabus for informatics, in collaboration with universities and companies, which will be able to reinforce utilisation of ICT and encourage innovative entrepreneurship in the EU?

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

(26 July 2012)

In the framework of the 'Europe 2020' flagship initiatives 'Agenda for new skills and jobs', 'Youth on the Move' and the 'Digital Agenda for Europe' as well as of 'e-Skills for the 21st Century' <sup>(1)</sup>, the Commission launched several actions related to Information and Communication Technologies (ICT). These actions are built on cooperation between all Commission services, Member States, regions and social partners. The aim is to support Member States in their efforts to deliver the right mix of skills — including e-skills and digital competence skills — to European citizens in the 21st century <sup>(2)</sup>. The European e-Skills Week <sup>(3)</sup> recently aimed at informing young people about the benefits of ICT education, jobs and careers. The Employment Package 2012 <sup>(4)</sup> adopted by the Commission brings forward several actions such as the creation of multi-stakeholder partnerships.

The Commission will support policies that aim to expand a highly qualified ICT labour force by bridging the gap between education and training systems and industry needs, and through a greater use of EU financial instruments. This includes the Commission's proposals for new investment in ICT skills under the next generation of operational programmes under the European Social Fund- in 2014-20.

The current Lifelong Learning Programme, in particular Key Activity 3 on ICT, finances initiatives such as a 'common European school syllabus for informatics'. The next call for proposals financed by the Programme will be launched in autumn 2012 <sup>(5)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2007) 496 of 7.9.2007. See also: [http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/ict/e-skills/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/ict/e-skills/index_en.htm)

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/ict/documents/e-skills/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/ict/documents/e-skills/index_en.htm)

<sup>(3)</sup> <http://eskills-week.ec.europa.eu>.

<sup>(4)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/commission\\_2010-014/and/or/headlines/news/2012/04/20120418\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-014/and/or/headlines/news/2012/04/20120418_en.htm)

<sup>(5)</sup> [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/llp/ka3/information\\_communication\\_technologies\\_en.php](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/llp/ka3/information_communication_technologies_en.php).

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004633/12**  
**adresată Comisiei**  
**Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**  
(7 mai 2012)

*Subiect:* Impactul turbinelor eoliene asupra temperaturilor din zonele în care se situează

Universitatea de Stat din New York a realizat un studiu potrivit căruia turbinele eoliene pot mări temperaturile din zona în care se află într-un ritm de până la de zece ori mai rapid decât cel natural. Astfel, temperatura aerului din jurul a patru parcuri eoliene cuprinse în cercetări a crescut cu cca 0,72 grade Celsius în 10 ani, față de o creștere medie a temperaturii de 0,8 grade Celsius.

Având în vedere impactul creșterii temperaturii asupra faunei și condițiilor meteorologice din zonele respective, Comisia este rugată să precizeze dacă are cunoștință de acest studiu sau de altele similare și dacă are intenția de a adapta politicile sale în funcție de concluziile desprinse din rezultatele acestora.

**Răspuns dat de dl Potočník în numele Comisiei**  
(5 iulie 2012)

Documentul orientativ privind construcția de parcuri eoliene și Natura 2000 <sup>(1)</sup>, elaborat de către serviciile Comisiei, prezintă o analiză recentă a impactului potențial al dezvoltării energiei eoliene asupra naturii și vieții sălbatice.

În ceea ce privește studiul menționat de distinsul Membru al Parlamentului, încălzirea observată se datorează fenomenului de amestecare mai puternică a aerului atmosferic, prin care mase de aer mai cald sunt aduse la suprafața terestră, îndeosebi în timpul nopții, când temperaturile sunt mai mici decât în timpul zilei. După cum au precizat autorii studiului, acesta se aplică numai anumitei regiuni (West Texas) și perioade analizate și, prin urmare, nu ar trebui să fie extrapolat linear la alte regiuni sau la perioade mai lungi.

Prin urmare, se pare că studiul nu poate constitui o bază pentru schimbarea cunoștințelor actuale referitoare la riscurile pe care le prezintă pentru faună construcția de parcuri eoliene. Comisia va continua să evalueze orice dovezi noi cu privire la riscurile asociate impactului turbinelor eoliene, pentru a se asigura că se ține cont de ele la evaluarea dezvoltărilor propuse, care ar putea afecta semnificativ specii și habitate care prezintă interes la nivelul UE din punctul de vedere al conservării.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/Wind\\_farms.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/Wind_farms.pdf)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004633/12  
to the Commission**

**Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**

(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* Impact of wind turbines on the temperatures of the areas where they are situated

The State University of New York conducted a study concluding that wind turbines can increase the temperature of the surrounding area at a rate of up to 10 times faster than normal. The study has shown that the air temperature around the 4 wind farms included in the research increased by about 0.72 degrees Celsius in 10 years, compared with an average increase in temperature of 0.8 degrees Celsius.

Taking into account the impact of such temperature increases on fauna and meteorological conditions in the respective areas, can the Commission state whether it is aware of this study or other similar studies and whether it intends to adapt its policies based on the conclusions drawn from these results?

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

(5 July 2012)

The guidance document on wind farm development and Natura 2000 <sup>(1)</sup>, prepared by the Commission services, presents a recent overview of potential impacts of wind energy developments on nature and wildlife.

Regarding the study referred to by the Honourable Member is concerned, the observed warming is due to enhanced atmospheric mixing that brings warmer air to the surface mostly at night time, when temperatures are lower than during daytime. As acknowledged by the authors the study only applies to the specific region (West Texas) and period analysed, and thus should not be interpolated linearly into other regions or over longer periods.

The study therefore would not appear to provide a basis for changing the current understanding of risks to fauna from certain wind farm developments. The Commission will continue to evaluate any new evidence of risks of impacts from wind turbines with a view to ensuring that this is factored into assessments of proposed developments that may significantly affect species and habitats of EU conservation concern.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/Wind\\_farms.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/Wind_farms.pdf).

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004634/12**  
**adresată Comisiei**  
**Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**  
(7 mai 2012)

*Subiect:* Situația pășunilor

În România, există în patrimoniul primăriilor aproximativ patru milioane de hectare de pășune, din care maximum 40% sunt închiriate crescătorilor de animale pentru a beneficia de subvenția pentru întreținerea pășunilor. Pentru restul suprafeței de pășune, primăriile încasează ilegal această subvenție, deși nu dețin animale.

Comisia este rugată să exprime un punct de vedere cu privire la situația pășunilor în contextul descris.

**Răspuns dat de dl Ciolos în numele Comisiei**  
(28 iunie 2012)

România aplică plăți directe sub forma schemei de plată unică pe suprafață (SAPS). Este vorba despre o plată forfetară acordată și pentru suprafețele de pășune permanentă, fără nicio obligație de a respecta anumite criterii privind densitatea șeptelului. În plus, Comisia a autorizat, la cererea autorităților române, acordarea de plăți directe naționale suplimentare în România. Pe baza acestei cereri, pășunile permanente nu sunt eligibile pentru plățile directe naționale suplimentare acordate în România. Comisia nu cunoaște niciun sprijin din fonduri UE care ar fi disponibil în România sub denumirea de „subvenție pentru întreținerea pășunilor”.

---



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004634/12  
to the Commission**

**Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**

(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* Pasture situation

In Romania there are approximately four million hectares of pasture in municipal holdings, of which a maximum of 40% are leased to livestock farmers in order to benefit from the pasture protection subsidy. Municipalities receive this subsidy illegally for the remaining pasture areas, despite not owning animals.

Can the Commission state its opinion on the pasture situation in the described context?

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

(28 June 2012)

Romania is applying direct payments in the form of the single area payments scheme (SAPS). This is a flat rate payment paid also for the areas of permanent pastures without any obligation to respect certain livestock density criteria. In addition, the Commission authorised to grant complementary national direct payments (CNDPs) in Romania according to the request of Romanian authorities. On the basis of this request permanent pastures are not eligible for complementary national direct payments in Romania. The Commission is not aware of any support from EU funds which would be available in Romania as 'pasture protection subsidy'.

---

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004635/12**  
**à la Commission (Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante)**  
**Christine De Veyrac (PPE)**  
(7 mai 2012)

*Objet:* VP/HR — Relations UE-Ukraine

Prochain organisateur, avec la Pologne, de l'édition 2012 du Championnat d'Europe de football, l'Ukraine constitue aujourd'hui de fait un partenaire prioritaire de l'Union Européenne, dans le cadre de notre politique de voisinage.

Symbole du développement de cette coopération, les représentants de l'Union Européenne et de l'Ukraine ont paraphé, le 30 mars dernier, un nouvel accord d'association, prévoyant la mise en place d'une zone de libre-échange complète et approfondie.

Dans les recommandations qu'il avait adoptées à propos de la conclusion de cet accord en décembre 2011, le Parlement Européen, demandait que ce dernier «aille de pair avec des engagements de l'Ukraine quant à la conduite des réformes indispensables et au renforcement des valeurs démocratiques, des Droits de l'homme et de l'État de droit».

Or, la Commission Européenne vient d'exprimer une nouvelle fois ses préoccupations sur le sort réservé à Mme Ioulia Timochenko, ancien Premier ministre de ce pays, condamnée pour abus de pouvoir et emprisonnée.

— Quelles incidences les préoccupations exprimées par la Commission sur le sort de Mme Timochenko pourraient-elles alors avoir sur les relations politiques et économiques entre l'Union Européenne et l'Ukraine?

— Quelles conséquences peuvent-elles avoir, en particulier, sur la conclusion de l'accord d'association?

**Réponse donnée par Mme Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission**  
(28 juin 2012)

L'Union européenne a plusieurs fois fait savoir aux autorités ukrainiennes qu'il était essentiel de résoudre efficacement la question de la justice sélective, notamment pour les affaires concernant Mme Timochenko et d'autres membres de l'ancien gouvernement, afin de progresser vers une association politique et une intégration économique entre l'Ukraine et l'Union européenne. Dans ce contexte, l'EU insiste pour que les affaires particulières relatives à des poursuites pour des raisons politiques soient résolues et pour qu'une réforme judiciaire de fond, couvrant le Code pénal (outre le Code de procédure pénale, dont la récente mise à jour a été saluée), soit menée de manière prioritaire.

Dans le cadre de la déclaration conjointe à l'occasion du sommet UE-Ukraine de 2011, il a été souligné que les performances de l'Ukraine, notamment en ce qui concerne le respect des valeurs communes et l'État de droit, seraient d'une importance capitale pour accélérer son association politique et son intégration économique à l'UE, notamment dans le contexte de la conclusion de l'accord d'association et de sa mise en œuvre ultérieure.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004635/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Christine De Veyrac (PPE)**

(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — EU-Ukraine relations

Ukraine, the forthcoming joint-organiser with Poland of the European Football Championship, is now de facto a priority partner of the European Union, within our Neighbourhood Policy.

On 30 March 2012, representatives of the European Union and the Ukraine symbolised the deepening of this cooperation by initialling a new Association Agreement that provides for the introduction of a deep and comprehensive free trade area.

The European Parliament, in its recommendations in concluding this agreement in December 2011, asked for it to go 'hand in hand with commitments made by Ukraine to implement the necessary reforms and strengthen democratic values, human rights and the rule of law'.

However, the European Commission has just reiterated its concern over the fate of Yulia Tymoshenko, the country's former Prime Minister, sentenced and jailed for abuse of power.

— Can the Commission say what implications its concerns about the fate of Yulia Tymoshenko have on political and economic relations between the European Union and the Ukraine?

— What consequences might they have, in particular, on the conclusion of the Association Agreement?

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

(28 June 2012)

The EU has repeatedly informed the Ukrainian authorities that effectively tackling the issue of selective justice, including the cases of Mrs Tymoshenko and other members of the former government, will be critical to moving ahead on the path to Ukraine's political association and economic integration with the EU. In this context the EU insist that the individual cases of politically-motivated prosecution should be addressed, and also that a broad judicial reform, encompassing the Criminal Code (in addition to the Criminal Procedure Code, whose recent updating was welcomed), should be undertaken as a priority.

The joint statement at the 2011 EU-Ukraine Summit underlined that Ukraine's performance, notably in relation to respect for common values and the rule of law, will be of crucial importance for the speed of its political association and economic integration with the EU, including in the context of conclusion of the Association Agreement and its subsequent implementation.

---

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004636/12  
do Komisji**

**Wojciech Michał Olejniczak (S&D)**

(7 maja 2012 r.)

**Przedmiot:** Zniesienie unijnych wymogów dotyczących blankietowej retencji danych na rzecz systemu ukierunkowanego zbierania danych o ruchu telekomunikacyjnym

Unijna dyrektywa o retencji danych (dyrektywa 2006/24/WE) w obecnym brzmieniu zobowiązuje europejskie firmy telefoniczne oraz świadczące usługi dostępu do Internetu do zbierania danych o wszystkich połączeniach wykonywanych przez ich wszystkich klientów, niezależnie od jakiegokolwiek podejrzenia lub postępowania związanego z popełnieniem przestępstwa. W związku z tym pragnę zwrócić się do Komisji o odniesienie się do następujących kwestii:

- Czy Komisja jest świadoma tego, że dyrektywie o retencji danych sprzeciwiają się stowarzyszenia praw człowieka, swobód obywatelskich i ochrony danych, jak również operatorzy obsługujący telefony zaufania i numery alarmowe, stowarzyszenia zawodowe dziennikarzy, prawników i lekarzy, związki zawodowe, organizacje konsumentów i stowarzyszenia branżowe? Jakie działania w związku z powyższym podjęła Komisja?
- Czy Komisja rozważa wprowadzenie opcjonalnego charakteru dyrektywy 2006/24/WE tak, aby państwa członkowskie mogły uniemożliwić śledzenie kontaktów z prasą?
- Osoby, które szukają porady prawnika, lekarza lub centrum informacyjno-pomocowego (jak np. centrum poradnictwa małżeńskiego czy w sprawach uzależnień, telefonów zaufania) są świadome faktu, że kontakt taki może – przy stosowaniu retencji danych – wskazywać na ich osobiste problemy (np. toczące się dochodzenie w sprawie karnej, chorobę, kryzys małżeński bądź uzależnienie), co może powstrzymać takie osoby od szukania pomocy przez telefon (w tym telefon komórkowy), czy za pomocą poczty elektronicznej. Czy Komisja rozważa wprowadzenie opcjonalnego charakteru dyrektywy 2006/24/WE tak, aby państwa członkowskie mogły uniemożliwić śledzenie poufnych kontaktów?
- Czy, według najlepszej wiedzy Komisji, retencja danych ma znaczący wpływ na statystyki przestępczości bądź wykrywalności przestępczości danego państwa?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez Cecilję Malmström w imieniu Komisji**

(11 lipca 2012 r.)

Dyrektywa 2006/24/WE przewiduje zatrzymywanie pewnych danych przez dostawców usług, które mogą być udostępniane tylko z uzasadnionych powodów przez właściwe władze oraz mogą podlegać stosownym kontrolom demokratycznym i sądowym.

Komisja posiada informacje o wielu przypadkach, także tych o wymiarze transgranicznym, z całej UE, w których dane o ruchu i położeniu miały istotne znaczenie dla dochodzenia i ścigania najpoważniejszych przestępstw. Takie dane w całej UE odgrywają zasadniczą rolę w dochodzeniach. Na dane statystyczne dotyczące przestępstw wpływ ma szereg czynników i nie można takim danym przypisać konkretnego środka zabezpieczającego, np. zatrzymywania danych. Choć Komisja wspiera proces ratyfikacji Konwencji Rady Europy w sprawie cyberprzestępczości i zachęca wszystkie państwa członkowskie do jej ratyfikacji, zwraca uwagę, że zachowywanie danych nie gwarantuje dostępności danych historycznych, które mogą okazać się niezbędne do identyfikacji faktów i osób powiązanych z poważnym przestępstwem.

Operatorzy i właściwe organy ponoszą odpowiedzialność za zapewnienie odpowiednich środków zabezpieczających przed naruszeniem bezpieczeństwa danych zgodnie z zasadami ustanowionymi w art. 7 wspomnianej dyrektywy. Żaden krajowy trybunał konstytucyjny nie podważył legalności tej dyrektywy; decyzja o trybie jej wdrożenia leży w gestii państw członkowskich.

W związku z tym na podstawie dostępnych dowodów Komisja stwierdza, że zakazanie zatrzymywania danych w UE bądź fakultatywne stosowanie dyrektywy mogłoby zaszkodzić sądownictwu karnemu, a także pozbawia obywateli wspólnych minimalnych standardów w dziedzinie ochrony praw podstawowych. Nie można przewidzieć fakultatywnego stosowania wspomnianej dyrektywy, gdyż w myśl art. 288 TFUE dyrektywa „wiąże każde Państwo Członkowskie, do którego jest kierowana, w odniesieniu do rezultatu, który ma być osiągnięty”.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004636/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Wojciech Michał Olejniczak (S&D)**  
(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* Lifting of the European Union's requirements for blanket data retention of telecommunications data

In its present form, the Data Retention Directive (Directive 2006/24/EC) obliges European telecommunications companies and Internet service providers to collect data on all calls made by all their clients, irrespective of any suspicion of criminal activity or action pointing to a criminal offence. In view of this, I would like to ask the Commission the following:

- Is the Commission aware of the fact that human rights, civic freedom and data protection associations, helpline and emergency number operators, professional associations for journalists, lawyers and doctors, consumer organisations as well as trade associations are against the Data Retention Directive? In view of the above, what action has the Commission undertaken?
- Is the Commission considering the introduction of an optional character to Directive 2006/24/EC so that Member States may prevent the tracing of contacts with the media?
- People seeking legal and medical advice, as well as advice from information help centres (e.g. marital advice centres, addiction advice centres or helplines) are aware of the fact that, with data retention being put into practice, this form of contact may reveal their personal problems (e.g. an ongoing investigation into a criminal case, illness, marital crisis or addiction). This may deter such people from seeking advice over the telephone (including over the mobile phone) or by email. Is the Commission considering the introduction of an optional character to Directive 2006/24/EC so that Member States may prevent the tracing of confidential contacts?
- To the best knowledge of the Commission, does data retention have a considerable influence on crime statistics or on uncovering the criminal activities of a given State?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission**  
(11 July 2012)

Directive 2006/24/EC provides for the retention of certain data by service providers which can only be accessed for legitimate reasons by competent authorities and subject to appropriate democratic and judicial controls.

The Commission is aware of many cases, including those of a cross-border dimension, from across the EU, in which traffic and location data have been crucial to investigation and prosecution of the most serious crimes. This data is, throughout the EU, an essential part of criminal investigation. Crime statistics are determined by multiple factors, and cannot be attributed to a specific security measure, such as data retention. While the Commission supports, and invites all Member States to ratify, the Council of Europe Convention on Cybercrime, it notes that data preservation does not guarantee availability that historical data which may be necessary to identify facts and persons associated with serious crime.

Operators and competent authorities have a responsibility to ensure that proper safeguards are put in place against data security breaches, in accordance with the principles laid down in Article 7 of the directive. No national Constitutional Court has contested the legality of the directive, and the Member States continue to have discretion over how they implement it.

Therefore, on the basis of existing evidence, the Commission considers that prohibiting data retention across the EU, or having an optional application of the directive, could be damaging to criminal justice and also deprives the citizen of the common minimum standards for the protection of fundamental rights. An optional application of the directive cannot be envisaged, since directives are 'binding, as to the results to be achieved, upon each Member State', according to Article 288 TFEU.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004637/12  
an die Kommission**

**Gianni Vattimo (ALDE), Henri Weber (S&D), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Leonidas Donskis (ALDE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Alexander Alvaro (ALDE), Nadja Hirsch (ALDE) und Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE)**  
(7. Mai 2012)

**Betrifft:** Verhaftung HIV-infizierter Frauen, Zwangs-HIV-Tests und Schutz personenbezogener sensibler Daten in Griechenland und in der EU

Die griechischen Behörden haben 17 HIV-infizierte Frauen festgenommen und wegen strafrechtlicher Delikte angeklagt. Die Frauen haben angeblich illegal als Prostituierte gearbeitet. Zu den Festnahmen kam es, als die griechischen Behörden wenige Tage vor den Parlamentswahlen in einer Sonderaktion hart gegen Hunderte von nichtlizenzierten Bordellen in ganz Griechenland vorgingen. Dabei wurden 130 Sexarbeiter/-innen festgenommen, die sich einem HIV-Test unterziehen mussten. Die Regierung hat angekündigt, dass in den nächsten Wochen noch Hunderte mehr kontrolliert werden sollen.

Außerdem haben die griechischen Behörden am 28. April 2012 in einer Aktion, wie es sie bisher in keinem europäischen Land gegeben hat, in einer Pressemitteilung sämtliche Details über eine 22-jährige Sexarbeiterin aus Russland (einschließlich Fotos und Angaben aus der Gesundheitsakte) veröffentlicht. Die Frau erklärte, ihr Gesundheitszustand sei ihr nicht bekannt gewesen. Am 30. April 2012 stellten die Behörden die Fotos von weiteren 12 Prostituierten ins Internet.

— Ist ein solches Vorgehen der griechischen Behörden, insbesondere die Verhaftungskampagne, die Zwangstests sowie die Veröffentlichung personenbezogener und sensibler medizinischer Daten nach Auffassung der Kommission mit der EU-Charta der Grundrechte, den EU-Verträgen und den Verpflichtungen aus der Europäischen Menschenrechtskonvention hinsichtlich der Wahrung, des Schutzes und der Förderung der Grundrechte, der Würde des Menschen und der Gleichheit sowie des Verbots der Diskriminierung (insbesondere von HIV-Infizierten, Sexarbeitern/-innen und Migranten), des Rechts auf Privatsphäre sowie des Schutzes personenbezogener und sensibler Daten, z. B. medizinischer Informationen, vereinbar?

— Wird die Kommission die Datenschutzbehörden zurate ziehen, um sicherzustellen, dass sowohl die EU-Vorschriften als auch die nationalen Vorschriften zum Datenschutz eingehalten werden?

— Wird sie den griechischen Behörden gegenüber ihre Besorgnis zum Ausdruck bringen?

**Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission**  
(5. Juli 2012)

Die Kommission betrachtet die Veröffentlichung von Namen, Fotos und sonstigen Angaben von HIV-infizierten Prostituierten in Griechenland mit Sorge. Eine solche Veröffentlichung führt zu einer Stigmatisierung der Betroffenen und kann ihre Grundrechte, insbesondere das in Artikel 8 der EU-Grundrechtecharta verankerte Recht auf den Schutz personenbezogener Daten beeinträchtigen. Fotos und Angaben zum Gesundheitszustand stellen personenbezogene Daten dar, die durch die Datenschutz-Richtlinie 95/46/EG geschützt sind. Gemäß der Richtlinie untersagen die Mitgliedstaaten die Verarbeitung bestimmter sensibler Daten wie der genannten. Allerdings kann in Ausnahmefällen und vorbehaltlich angemessener Garantien die Verarbeitung solcher Daten u. a. aus Gründen eines wichtigen öffentlichen Interesses entweder im Wege einer nationalen Rechtsvorschrift oder aufgrund einer Entscheidung der Kontrollstelle zulässig sein. Unbeschadet der Befugnisse der Kommission als Hüterin der Verträge fällt die Überwachung und Durchsetzung des Datenschutzes in den Mitgliedstaaten in den Verantwortungsbereich ihrer nationalen Behörden und insbesondere der nationalen Kontrollstellen für Datenschutz. Dennoch wird die Kommission die Lage in Griechenland aufmerksam verfolgen und mit der griechischen Datenschutzbehörde Kontakt aufnehmen, um weitere Informationen einzuholen.

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004637/12  
à la Commission**

**Gianni Vattimo (ALDE), Henri Weber (S&D), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Leonidas Donskis (ALDE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Alexander Alvaro (ALDE), Nadja Hirsch (ALDE) et Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE)**  
(7 mai 2012)

*Objet:* Arrestations de femmes séropositives, test obligatoire de dépistage du VIH et protection des données personnelles et sensibles en Grèce et dans l'Union européenne

Les autorités grecques ont arrêté 17 femmes séropositives et les ont accusé d'avoir commis des infractions pénales. Elles auraient travaillé illégalement comme prostituées. Les arrestations ont été effectuées dans le cadre de mesures de répression contre des centaines de maisons closes illicites en Grèce à la veille des élections législatives. Lors de cette opération, 130 travailleuses de l'industrie du sexe ont été arrêtées et obligées de se soumettre à un test de dépistage du VIH. Le gouvernement a annoncé que des centaines d'autres personnes passeraient les mêmes tests dans le courant des semaines à venir.

De plus, les autorités grecques, prenant une mesure sans précédent dans tout autre pays européen, ont publié le 28 avril un communiqué de presse donnant des renseignements très détaillés concernant une travailleuse russe de l'industrie du sexe, âgée de 22 ans, y compris des photographies et des informations provenant de son dossier médical. Elle a nié être au courant de son état de santé. Le 30 avril, les autorités ont mis en ligne des photographies de 12 autres prostituées.

- La Commission estime-t-elle que de tels actes des autorités grecques (en particulier la vague d'arrestations, les tests de dépistage obligatoires et la publication de données personnelles et médicales sensibles) sont conformes à la Charte des droits fondamentaux de l'Union européenne, aux traités de l'Union et aux obligations découlant de la Convention européenne des Droits de l'homme en ce qui concerne le respect, la protection et la promotion des droits fondamentaux, de la dignité humaine et de l'égalité, l'interdiction de toute discrimination (notamment contre les séropositifs, les travailleurs de l'industrie du sexe et les immigrés), le droit au respect de la vie privée et à la protection des données personnelles et sensibles telles que les informations médicales?
- La Commission entend-elle consulter les autorités chargées de la protection des données pour garantir le respect des dispositions en vigueur aux niveaux européen et national en matière de protection des données?
- Fera-t-elle part de ses préoccupations aux autorités grecques?

**Réponse donnée par Mme Viviane Reding au nom de la Commission**  
(5 juillet 2012)

La publication, en Grèce, des noms, photographies et autres données personnelles de prostituées séropositives préoccupe la Commission. La publication de telles données peut porter atteinte aux droits fondamentaux des personnes concernées, dans la mesure où elles sont stigmatisées, et plus spécifiquement à leur droit fondamental à la protection des données à caractère personnel, tel qu'il a été consacré par l'article 8 de la Charte des droits fondamentaux de l'Union. Les photographies et l'état de santé d'un individu sont des données à caractère personnel protégées par la directive 95/46/CE du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 24 octobre 1995 relative à la protection des personnes physiques à l'égard du traitement des données à caractère personnel et à la libre circulation de ces données. La directive oblige les États membres à interdire le traitement de données sensibles particulières, comme celles qui sont susmentionnées. Toutefois, le traitement de données sensibles peut être autorisé dans certains cas particuliers, entre autres pour des motifs d'intérêt public importants, prévus par la loi ou par une décision de l'autorité de contrôle, sous réserve que des garanties appropriées soient fournies. Sans préjudice des compétences de la Commission en sa qualité de gardienne des traités, le contrôle et l'application des règles de protection des données dans les États membres relèvent toutefois de la compétence de leurs autorités nationales, en particulier des autorités de contrôle de la protection des données. Néanmoins, la Commission suivra l'évolution de la situation en Grèce et contactera l'autorité nationale chargée de la protection des données afin de recevoir des informations complémentaires.



(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004637/12  
alla Commissione**

**Gianni Vattimo (ALDE), Henri Weber (S&D), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Leonidas Donskis (ALDE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Alexander Alvaro (ALDE), Nadja Hirsch (ALDE) e Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE)**  
(7 maggio 2012)

**Oggetto:** Arresto di donne sieropositive, test dell'HIV obbligatorio e protezione dei dati personali e sensibili in Grecia e nell'UE

Le autorità greche hanno arrestato 17 donne sieropositive accusandole di reato, dal momento che avrebbero lavorato illegalmente come prostitute. Gli arresti sono stati effettuati nel corso di una serie di retate in centinaia di bordelli non autorizzati operanti nell'intero territorio greco alcuni giorni prima delle elezioni politiche. Nel corso delle perquisizioni sono state arrestate 130 lavoratrici del sesso, costrette in seguito a sottoporsi al test dell'HIV. Il governo ha annunciato che nelle prossime settimane verranno effettuati controlli su centinaia di altre donne.

Inoltre, il 28 aprile 2012, con modalità senza precedenti negli altri paesi europei, le autorità greche, tramite un comunicato stampa, hanno illustrato nei dettagli il caso di una lavoratrice del sesso russa di 22 anni, incluse fotografie e informazioni sulle sue cartelle cliniche. La giovane ha negato di essere a conoscenza del proprio stato di salute. Il 30 aprile 2012 le autorità hanno pubblicato in rete le foto di altre 12 prostitute.

— Secondo la Commissione, tali azioni da parte delle autorità greche (in particolare le retate, l'obbligo di sottoporsi a test e la pubblicazione di dati personali e sensibili riguardanti lo stato di salute) sono conformi alla Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea, ai trattati dell'UE e agli obblighi derivanti dalla Convenzione europea dei diritti dell'uomo per quanto riguarda la difesa, la protezione e la promozione dei diritti fondamentali, della dignità umana e dell'eguaglianza, il divieto di discriminazione (in particolar modo nei confronti di soggetti sieropositivi, lavoratori del sesso e migranti), il diritto alla riservatezza e la protezione dei dati personali e sensibili, quali le informazioni di tipo sanitario?

— Intende la Commissione rivolgersi ai garanti per la protezione dei dati affinché vengano rispettate le norme europee e nazionali in materia di tutela dei dati?

— Intende essa indirizzare le proprie preoccupazioni alle autorità greche?

**Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione**

(5 luglio 2012)

La Commissione è preoccupata per la pubblicazione in Grecia di nomi, fotografie e altri dati di prostitute che hanno contratto l'HIV. Tali pubblicazioni possono ripercuotersi sui diritti fondamentali delle persone interessate in quanto vengono stigmatizzate, in particolar modo per quanto riguarda il diritto fondamentale alla tutela dei dati personali sancito dall'articolo 8 della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea. Fotografie e stato di salute sono dati personali tutelati dalla direttiva sulla protezione dei dati 95/46/CE, che obbliga gli Stati membri a vietare il trattamento di determinati dati riservati quali quelli sopra citati. Tuttavia, il trattamento di dati riservati può essere consentito in casi particolari, tra l'altro per importanti motivi di interesse pubblico stabiliti dalla legge o da una decisione dell'autorità di controllo, a condizione che siano previste le opportune garanzie. Fatti salvi i poteri della Commissione in qualità di custode dei trattati, il controllo e l'applicazione della normativa in materia di protezione dei dati negli Stati membri sono comunque di competenza delle autorità nazionali, in particolare delle autorità di controllo per la protezione dei dati. Tuttavia, la Commissione seguirà la situazione in Grecia e contatterà l'autorità nazionale di protezione dei dati al fine di ottenere ulteriori informazioni.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

**Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-004637/12**

**Komisijai**

**Gianni Vattimo (ALDE), Henri Weber (S&D), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Leonidas Donskis (ALDE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Alexander Alvaro (ALDE), Nadja Hirsch (ALDE) ir Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE)**  
(2012 m. gegužės 7 d.)

*Tema:* ŽIV užsikrėtusių moterų suėmimai, priverstiniai ŽIV tyrimai ir asmeninių bei ypatingų duomenų apsauga Graikijoje ir ES

Graikijos valdžios institucijos suėmė 17 ŽIV užsikrėtusių moterų ir apkaltino jas nusikalstama veika. Įtariama, kad šios moterys nelegaliai vertėsi prostitucija. Likus kelioms dienoms iki visuotinių rinkimų daugybėje licencijų neturinčių Graikijos viešnamių atliekant reidus buvo vykdomi suėmimai. Per operaciją suimta 130 sekso paslaugų teikėjų ir priverstiniai atlikti jų ŽIV tyrimai. Vyriausybė paskelbė, kad per kelias ateinančias savaites bus patikrinta šimtai kitų moterų.

Be to, 2012 m. balandžio 28 d. Graikijos valdžios institucijos, imdamosi nė vienoje Europos šalyje precedento neturinčių veiksmų, paskelbė spaudos pranešimą, kuriame pateikiama išsami informacija apie 22 metų amžiaus sekso paslaugas teikusią moterį iš Rusijos, taip pat pateikdami jos nuotrauką ir tam tikrą informaciją apie jos sveikatos duomenis. Ji paneigė žinanti apie savo sveikatos būklę. 2012 m. balandžio 30 d. valdžios institucijos internete paskelbė 12 kitų prostitučių nuotraukas.

— Ar Komisija mano, kad tokie Graikijos valdžios institucijų veiksmai, ypač suėmimai, priverstiniai tyrimai ir asmeninių bei ypatingų sveikatos duomenų skelbimas, atitinka ES pagrindinių teisių chartiją, ES Sutartis ir Europos žmogaus teisių konvencijoje įtvirtintą pareigą puoselėti, saugoti ir skatinti pagrindines žmogaus teises, žmogaus orumą ir lygybę, drausti diskriminaciją (pvz., ŽIV užsikrėtusių žmonių, sekso paslaugas teikiančių asmenų ir migrantų diskriminaciją), gerbti teisę į privatumą ir saugoti ypatingus ir asmeninius duomenis, t. y. medicininę informaciją?

— Ar Komisija konsultuosis su duomenų apsaugos institucijomis siekdama užtikrinti, kad būtų laikomasi ES ir nacionalinių duomenų apsaugos taisyklių?

— Ar ji ketina pareikšti susirūpinimą dėl Graikijos valdžios institucijų veiksmų?

**V. Reding atsakymas Komisijos vardu**

(2012 m. liepos 5 d.)

Komisija yra susirūpinusi dėl ŽIV užsikrėtusių prostitučių vardų, pavardžių, nuotraukų ir kitų duomenų paskelbimo Graikijoje. Tokiais veiksmais stigmatizuojami susiję asmenys, todėl gali būti paveiktos jų pagrindinės teisės, visų pirma Europos Sąjungos pagrindinių teisių chartijos 8 straipsnyje nustatyta teisė į asmens duomenų apsaugą. Nuotraukos ir sveikatos būklė yra asmens duomenys, saugomi pagal Duomenų apsaugos direktyvą 95/46/EB. Direktyva valstybes nares įpareigoja uždrausti konkrečių neskelbtinų duomenų, tokių kaip minėtieji, tvarkymą. Tačiau tvarkyti neskelbtinus duomenis gali būti leidžiama konkrečiais atvejais, be kita ko, dėl svarbių visuomenės interesų, nustatytų įstatymu arba priežiūros institucijos sprendimu, su sąlyga, kad bus taikomos tinkamos apsaugos priemonės. Nepažeidžiant Komisijos, kaip Sutarčių sergėtojos, įgaliojimų, duomenų apsaugos priežiūra ir vykdymo užtikrinimas valstybėse narėse priklauso nacionalinių valdžios institucijų kompetencijai, visų pirma duomenų apsaugos priežiūros institucijoms. Vis dėlto Komisija stebės padėtį Graikijoje, susisieks su nacionaline duomenų apsaugos institucija ir paprašys papildomos informacijos.

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004637/12  
aan de Commissie**

**Gianni Vattimo (ALDE), Henri Weber (S&D), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Leonidas Donskis (ALDE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Alexander Alvaro (ALDE), Nadja Hirsch (ALDE) en Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE)**  
(7 mei 2012)

*Betref:* Arrestatie HIV-positieve vrouwen, verplichte HIV-tests, en bescherming van persoons- en gevoelige gegevens in Griekenland en in de EU

De Griekse autoriteiten hebben 17 HIV-positieve vrouwen gearresteerd en beschuldigd van strafbare feiten. De vrouwen hadden naar verluidt illegaal als prostitueés gewerkt. De arrestaties maakten onderdeel uit van invallen in honderden illegale bordelen in heel Griekenland enkele dagen voor de parlementsverkiezingen. Bij de invallen werden 130 sekswerkers gearresteerd en aan verplichte HIV-tests onderworpen. De regering heeft aangekondigd dat de komende weken nog honderden andere sekswerkers zullen worden gecontroleerd.

Verder hebben de Griekse autoriteiten op 28 april 2012 een persbericht doen uitgaan met daarin de volledige persoonsgegevens van een 22-jarige sekswerker uit Rusland, inclusief foto's en informatie uit haar medisch dossier — een ongekende zaak in enig Europees land. De sekswerker ontkent op de hoogte te zijn van haar medische situatie. Op 30 april 2012 hebben de autoriteiten in Griekenland foto's van nog eens 12 prostitueés op het internet gezet.

— Zijn dit soort acties van de Griekse autoriteiten (in het bijzonder de arrestatiecampagne, het verplicht testen op HIV-besmetting en de publicatie van persoons- en gevoelige medische gegevens) in overeenstemming met het Handvest van de grondrechten van de Europese Unie, de EU-Verdragen en de verplichtingen die voortvloeien uit het Europees mensenrechtenverdrag met betrekking tot het handhaven, beschermen en bevorderen van grondrechten, de menselijke waardigheid en gelijkheid, het verbod op discriminatie (met name van HIV-positieven, sekswerkers en migranten), het recht op privacy en het recht op bescherming van persoons- en gevoelige gegevens, zoals medische informatie?

— Gaat de Commissie contact opnemen met de gegevensbeschermingsautoriteiten, teneinde ervoor te zorgen dat de Europese en de nationale gegevensbeschermingsregels in acht worden genomen?

— Gaat de Commissie haar bezorgdheid kenbaar maken aan de Griekse autoriteiten?

**Antwoord van mevrouw Reding namens de Commissie**  
(5 juli 2012)

De Commissie is bezorgd over de publicatie van namen, foto's en andere gegevens van HIV-positieve prostitueés in Griekenland. Aangezien de betrokken personen op deze manier worden gestigmatiseerd, kunnen dergelijke publicaties de grondrechten aantasten, met name het recht op de bescherming van persoonsgegevens, zoals bepaald in artikel 8 van het Handvest van de grondrechten van de Unie. Foto's en gezondheidstoestand zijn persoonsgegevens die door Gegevensbeschermingsrichtlijn 95/46/EG worden beschermd. Deze richtlijn verplicht lidstaten de verwerking van specifieke gevoelige gegevens — ook de hierboven vermelde — te verbieden. De verwerking van gevoelige gegevens kan echter in specifieke gevallen worden toegestaan, bijvoorbeeld op grond van een zwaarwegend algemeen belang dat bij wet of bij een besluit van de toezichthoudende autoriteit is vastgelegd, mits passende waarborgen worden geboden. Onverminderd de bevoegdheden van de Commissie als hoedster van de Verdragen, vallen het toezicht op en de handhaving van gegevensbescherming in de lidstaten onder de bevoegdheid van de nationale autoriteiten, met name de toezichthoudende autoriteiten voor gegevensbescherming. Desalniettemin zal de Commissie de situatie in Griekenland op de voet volgen en contact opnemen met de nationale autoriteit voor gegevensbescherming om aanvullende informatie te verkrijgen.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004637/12  
to the Commission**

**Gianni Vattimo (ALDE), Henri Weber (S&D), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Leonidas Donskis (ALDE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Alexander Alvaro (ALDE), Nadja Hirsch (ALDE) and Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE)**  
(7 May 2012)

*Subject:* Arrests of HIV-positive women, compulsory HIV testing and protection of personal and sensitive data in Greece and in the EU

The Greek authorities have arrested 17 HIV-positive women and charged them with criminal offences. The women had allegedly been working illegally as prostitutes. The arrests came amid a crackdown on hundreds of unlicensed brothels around Greece a few days before the general election. In the course of the operation, 130 sex workers were arrested and subjected to compulsory HIV testing. The government has announced that hundreds more will be checked in the next few weeks.

Furthermore, on 28 April 2012 the Greek authorities — in an action without precedent in any European country — issued a press release giving full details about a 22-year-old sex worker from Russia, including photographs and information from her medical records. She denied knowing about her medical condition. On 30 April 2012 the authorities uploaded photographs of another 12 prostitutes to the Internet.

— Does the Commission think that such acts by the Greek authorities — in particular the campaign of arrests, compulsory testing and publication of personal and sensitive medical data — comply with the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, the EU Treaties and the obligations deriving from the European Convention on Human Rights in relation to upholding, protecting and promoting fundamental rights, human dignity and equality, to the prohibition of discrimination (notably against HIV-positive individuals, sex workers and migrants), to the right to privacy and to the protection of personal and sensitive data, such as medical information?

— Will the Commission consult data protection authorities to ensure that EU and national rules on data protection are complied with?

— Will it raise its concern with the Greek authorities?

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

(5 July 2012)

The Commission is concerned by the publication of names, photographs and other data of prostitutes, who were infected by HIV, in Greece. Such publications can affect the fundamental rights of the persons concerned as they are stigmatised, more specifically the fundamental right to the protection of personal data as enshrined in Article 8 of the Fundamental Rights Charter of the Union. Photographs and health status are personal data which are protected by the Data Protection Directive 95/46/EC. The directive obliges Member States to prohibit the processing of specific sensitive data such as the mentioned. However, the processing of sensitive data can be permitted in specific cases, *inter alia*, for reasons of substantial public interest laid down by law or by a decision of the supervisory authority subject to suitable safeguards being provided. Without prejudice to the powers of the Commission as the guardian of the Treaties, the supervision and enforcement of data protection in the Member States however falls under the competence of their national authorities, in particular data protection supervisory authorities. Nonetheless the Commission will monitor the situation in Greece and contact the national Data Protection Authority in order to receive additional information.

---

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita P-004638/12**

**à Comissão**

**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**

(8 de maio de 2012)

*Assunto:* Atraso no pagamento das verbas do POSEI / Madeira

— O artigo 349.º do Tratado sobre o Funcionamento da União Europeia estabelece a condição de ultraperiferia das regiões europeias de Guadalupe, Guiana Francesa, Martinica, Ilha da Reunião, Saint-Barthélemy, Saint-Martin, Canárias, Açores e Madeira;

— A 30 de janeiro de 2006, a Comissão apresentou o Regulamento (CE) n.º 247/2006 com vista a «estabelecer medidas específicas no domínio agrícola a favor das regiões ultraperiféricas da União Europeia para compensar o afastamento, a insularidade, a ultraperifericidade, a superfície reduzida, o relevo e o clima difícil, assim como a dependência de um pequeno número de produtos das regiões da UE»;

— A 12 de abril de 2006, a Comissão apresentou o Regulamento (CE) n.º 793/2006 que estabelece as normas de execução do Regulamento (CE) n.º 247/2006, nomeadamente os produtos que podem beneficiar dos regimes específicos de abastecimento;

— Em Portugal, foi criado o programa POSEI Madeira com vista a apoiar a Região Autónoma na área da produção animal, produção vegetal e abastecimento;

— O Instituto de Financiamento da Agricultura e Pescas, I. P. do Ministério da Agricultura, Mar, Ambiente e Ordenamento do Território do Governo de Portugal é responsável pela gestão do programa POSEI Madeira, não se encontrando a cumprir o prazo obrigatório de pagamento de 90 dias definidos pela legislação comunitária;

— Atualmente, as verbas em atraso totalizam 807 765,69 euros, sendo 422 174,58 euros relativos a 2011 e 383 591,11 euros de 2012, o que acaba por originar graves situações de rotura financeira e perda de competitividade do setor empresarial regional;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Tem conhecimento dos atrasos de pagamentos efetuados pelo Instituto de Financiamento da Agricultura e Pescas, I. P. do Ministério da Agricultura, Mar, Ambiente e Ordenamento do Território do Governo de Portugal no âmbito do programa POSEI Madeira?
2. Que ações pode a Região Autónoma da Madeira realizar a nível europeu para instar o Governo português a proceder aos respetivos pagamentos do programa POSEI Madeira dentro dos prazos estipulados pelos regulamentos europeus?
3. Pode assumir uma posição ativa na defesa dos interesses do setor empresarial regional?

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

(1 de junho de 2012)

A Comissão foi contactada pelas autoridades regionais da Madeira sobre a questão dos atrasos nos pagamentos pelo organismo pagador português aos operadores no âmbito do regime de medidas específicas de apoio à Madeira. Esta reclamação será registada segundo o procedimento oficial e objeto de investigação por parte dos serviços da DG Agricultura e Desenvolvimento Rural. No âmbito do processo, o Governo português será contactado a fim de determinar as razões de tais atrasos.

A DG Agricultura e Desenvolvimento Rural confirma que o prazo para pagamento, de 90 dias, é obrigatório desde que os controlos administrativos e no local previstos pelo Regulamento (CE) n.º 793/2006 <sup>(1)</sup> da Comissão confirmem a elegibilidade da ajuda e que não esteja em curso uma investigação de fraude relativa ao operador e/ou ao pedido de ajuda em causa.

<sup>(1)</sup> Regulamento (CE) n.º 247/2006 do Conselho, de 30 de janeiro de 2006, que estabelece medidas específicas no domínio agrícola a favor das regiões ultraperiféricas da União Europeia, e Regulamento (CE) n.º 793/2006 da Comissão, que estabelece as respetivas normas de execução.

Se o apuramento de contas ou os procedimentos oficiais de reclamação confirmarem que houve efetivamente atrasos de pagamento, podem ser incorridas correções financeiras.

\_\_\_\_\_

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-004638/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**  
(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* Delay in the payment of POSEI/Madeira funds

Article 349 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union defines the European regions of Guadeloupe, French Guiana, Martinique, Réunion, Saint-Barthélemy, Saint-Martin, the Canary Islands, the Azores and Madeira as outermost regions.

On 30 January 2006, the Commission presented Regulation (EC) No 247/2006 to lay down 'specific measures on agriculture in order to remedy the difficulties caused by the remoteness, insularity, distant location, small surface area, terrain, difficult climate and dependence of the outermost regions of the European Union'.

On 12 April 2006, the Commission presented Regulation (EC) No 793/2006 laying down certain detailed rules for applying Council Regulation (EC) 247/2006, including products eligible under the specific supply arrangements.

In Portugal, the POSEI Madeira programme was established to support the Autonomous Region in livestock farming, crop production and supply.

The Agriculture and Fisheries Financing Institute, a public body of the Portuguese Government's Ministry of Agriculture, the Sea, the Environment and Spatial Planning, is responsible for managing the POSEI Madeira programme but it is not respecting the mandatory payment deadline of 90 days, as laid down by EU legislation.

At present, the late payments amount to EUR 807 765.69, EUR 422 174.58 of which are from 2011 and EUR 383 591.11 from 2012, resulting in serious situations such as bankruptcy and a loss of competitiveness in the region's business sector.

1. Is the Commission aware of the late payments under the POSEI Madeira programme on the part of the Agriculture and Fisheries Financing Institute, a public body of the Portuguese Government's Ministry of Agriculture, the Sea, the Environment and Spatial Planning?
2. What action can the Autonomous Region of Madeira take at EU level to urge the Portuguese Government to make the respective POSEI Madeira programme payments within the time limits laid down by European regulations?
3. Can the Commission take an active role in protecting the interests of the region's business sector?

**Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission**  
(1 June 2012)

The Commission has been contacted by the Madeira regional authorities in relation to the delays in payments made by the Portuguese Paying Agency to operators under the Specific Support Arrangements for Madeira. This complaint will be registered according to the official procedure and it will be investigated by the services of DG Agriculture and Rural Development. This process will involve contacting the Portuguese Government to determine the reasons for these delays.

DG Agriculture and Rural Development confirms that the payment deadline of 90 days is compulsory, provided the administrative and on-the-spot checks defined by Commission Regulation (EC) No 793/2006<sup>(1)</sup> confirm the eligibility of the aid and that no fraud investigation on the operator and/or the concerned aid application is ongoing.

If the Clearance of Accounts or official complaints procedures confirm that unjustified payment delays have occurred, financial corrections may be incurred.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Council Regulation (EC) No 247/2006 of 30 January 2006 laying down specific measures for agriculture in the outermost regions of the Union and the implementing Commission Regulation (EC) No 793/2006.

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004639/12**  
**à la Commission**  
**Franck Proust (PPE)**  
(8 mai 2012)

*Objet:* Remboursement des soins médicaux au sein de l'Union européenne

Depuis la création de l'espace Schengen, la libre circulation des personnes au sein de l'Union européenne a accru considérablement les flux touristiques et économiques.

La santé et la protection sociale sont des droits inaliénables. Or, l'accès aux soins médicaux et les modalités de remboursement dans un autre État membre pour les touristes et les expatriés (rattachés à leur système d'origine) posent très souvent des difficultés. Cela crée, de fait, une entrave à leur mobilité.

1. La Commission peut-elle préciser si des débats sont actuellement en cours à ce sujet?

Récemment, une directive a été adoptée qui précise les modalités d'accès aux soins de santé des ressortissants communautaires. Les expatriés et touristes s'avouent souvent perdus.

2. La Commission a-t-elle fait le même constat? Quelles solutions proposerait-elle pour améliorer cette situation? De quelles sources d'information disposent les citoyens?

Actuellement, le processus de remboursement des soins médicaux varie en fonction des États membres, ce qui rend d'autant plus complexe l'information pour le patient.

3. Une harmonisation est-elle prévue?

**Réponse donnée par M. Dalli au nom de la Commission**  
(4 juillet 2012)

L'accès aux soins de santé dans un autre État membre est régi par deux instruments juridiques: les règlements (CE) n° 883/2004 <sup>(1)</sup> et (CE) n° 987/2009 <sup>(2)</sup> sur la coordination des systèmes de sécurité sociale, d'une part, et la directive 2011/24/UE <sup>(3)</sup>, de l'autre.

Selon les règlements, un touriste peut bénéficier des soins médicaux nécessaires dans les mêmes conditions que les personnes assurées dans le pays où il séjourne (un droit que confirme la carte européenne d'assurance maladie). Il peut aussi, en vertu de la directive, régler les soins et en demander le remboursement directement dans son État membre d'origine, à hauteur du coût de ces prestations dans son système d'affiliation.

Les soins de santé pour les expatriés sont régis uniquement par les règlements. La directive ne s'applique pas aux soins reçus dans l'État membre de résidence. Le droit aux soins de santé dépend de la situation personnelle des expatriés (selon qu'ils sont salariés, retraités, etc.) et de la législation en vigueur dans l'État membre où ils résident.

La directive 2011/24/UE impose à chaque État membre de désigner un point de contact national pour informer de leurs droits les personnes qui viennent se faire soigner dans le pays ou qui partent se faire soigner dans un autre.

Le but des règlements est de coordonner entre eux les systèmes de sécurité sociale et non de les harmoniser. Les États membres disposent donc d'une grande latitude pour fixer les modalités de leurs systèmes respectifs. Les règlements établissent des modalités communes pour garantir que l'application des législations nationales est conforme aux principes d'égalité de traitement et de non-discrimination.

Aucune harmonisation des procédures au titre de la directive n'est prévue: il revient aux États membres d'établir la procédure la mieux adaptée à leur système (celle-ci doit cependant être facilement accessible, permettre un traitement objectif et impartial des demandes, et être conforme aux principes généraux énoncés à l'article 9 de la directive).

<sup>(1)</sup> JO L 166 du 30.4.2004.

<sup>(2)</sup> JO L 284 du 30.10.2009.

<sup>(3)</sup> Directive 2011/24/UE du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 9 mars 2011 relative à l'application des droits des patients en matière de soins de santé transfrontaliers, JO L 88/45 du 4.4.2011, p. 45. La directive doit être transposée d'ici au 25 octobre 2013.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004639/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Franck Proust (PPE)**  
(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* Reimbursement of medical treatment within the European Union

Since the Schengen area was created, the free movement of people within the European Union has caused tourism and economic flows to increase considerably.

Health and social protection are inalienable rights. However, access to medical treatment and reimbursement procedures in different Member States for tourists and expatriates (still attached to their system of origin) very often gives rise to difficulties. That creates a *de facto* barrier to their mobility.

1. Can the Commission clarify whether this matter is currently under discussion?

Recently, a directive was adopted which stipulates procedures for access to health treatment for EU nationals. Expatriates and tourists admit frequently to being lost.

2. Has the Commission arrived at the same conclusion? What solutions might it suggest to improve this situation? What sources of information are available to citizens?

At present, the reimbursement process for medical treatments varies depending on the Member State, and this makes patient information even more complicated.

3. Are there plans to harmonise procedures?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission**  
(4 July 2012)

Access to healthcare in another Member State is governed by two legal instruments: Regulations (EC) Nos 883/2004 <sup>(1)</sup> and 987/2009 <sup>(2)</sup> on the coordination of social security systems and Directive 2011/24/EU <sup>(3)</sup>.

Under the regulations, a tourist is entitled to necessary healthcare on the same conditions as persons insured in that country, (entitlement confirmed via a European Health Insurance Card). Alternatively, a tourist may pay for treatment and claim reimbursement under the directive directly from his/her home Member State, up to the cost of such treatment in his/her system.

Healthcare for expatriates is governed only by the regulations. The directive does not apply to healthcare received in the Member State of residence. The right to healthcare depends on the personal situation of the expatriate, i.e. whether he/she is employed, a pensioner etc., and on the national legislation in the Member State of residence.

Directive 2011/24/EU requires each Member State to have a National Contact Point to provide information to both incoming and outgoing patients about their rights.

The aim of the regulations is coordination and not harmonisation of social security systems. This means that the Member States are largely free to determine the details of their systems. The regulations establish common rules to ensure that the application of the national legislations respects the principles of equality of treatment and non-discrimination.

There are no plans to harmonise procedures under the directive: it is for Member States to decide on the most appropriate procedure for their system (although such procedures must be easily accessible and capable of dealing with requests objectively and impartially and comply with the general principles set in Article 9 of the directive).

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 166, 30.4.2004.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 284, 30.10.2009.

<sup>(3)</sup> Directive 2011/24/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 9 March 2011 on the application of patients' rights in cross-border healthcare, OJ L 88/45, 4.4.2011, p. 45. The directive is due to be transposed by 25 October 2013.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004640/12**  
**alla Commissione**  
**Mara Bizzotto (EFD)**  
(8 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Spreco di cibo

Si stima che in Italia ogni giorno vada sprecato cibo col quale si potrebbero sfamare più di 630 mila persone, solo calcolando i prodotti invenduti dai supermercati e gettati perché prossimi alla scadenza (ma ancora commestibili) o non più esteticamente presentabili sugli scaffali come accade per frutta e verdura. Solo una piccola parte di esso viene recuperata grazie ad accordi locali fra Onlus e grande distribuzione e destinata ai meno abbienti.

Da una relazione presentata dall'Eurostat nel febbraio di quest'anno il 24,5 % degli italiani è a rischio povertà e, a conferma, le notizie di atti di disperazione dei così detti «nuovi poveri» sono sempre più presenti sulle cronache dei media.

— È la Commissione a conoscenza della situazione?

— Come intende intervenire per sensibilizzare gli Stati membri a prendere provvedimenti che agevolino il recupero e non lo spreco dei generi alimentari invenduti?

— Il PEAD (Programma Europeo di aiuti agli indigenti) è senza dubbio indice della volontà dell'UE di sostenere queste fasce di popolazione, ma, considerando i dati forniti e i singoli progetti portati avanti per condividere il cibo che verrebbe gettato dalla grande distribuzione, intende la Commissione sostenere progetti di questo tipo, magari in maniera più strutturata coinvolgendo le istituzioni nazionali?

— Com'è la situazione negli altri Stati?

**Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione**  
(22 giugno 2012)

La Commissione, nella sua «Tabella di marcia verso un'Europa efficiente nell'impiego delle risorse» <sup>(1)</sup> si è impegnata ad esaminare come meglio limitare gli sprechi di cibo lungo la filiera delle forniture alimentari e a esaminare i possibili incentivi per dimezzare lo smaltimento di rifiuti di cibo commestibili nell'UE entro il 2020. Questi lavori sui rifiuti commestibili sfoceranno nella comunicazione su un'alimentazione sostenibile che verrà adottata nel 2013.

In tale contesto la Commissione ha iniziato l'analisi, assieme alle parti interessate, del modo per ridurre al minimo i rifiuti alimentari senza compromettere la sicurezza alimentare. La Commissione consulterà anche gli Stati membri ed esperti per definire gli interventi più appropriati a livello di UE al fine di integrare le azioni condotte a livello nazionale e locale. Inoltre, la Commissione intende agevolare lo scambio di buone pratiche in tema di riduzione dei rifiuti alimentari e costituirà una base dati contenente buone pratiche in tema di riduzione dei rifiuti alimentari.

Il Programma europeo di distribuzione di derrate alimentari agli indigenti, nel suo formato attuale, dovrebbe terminare con il completamento del piano annuale 2013 <sup>(2)</sup>. La Commissione sta attualmente elaborando una proposta relativa a un nuovo sistema di aiuti agli indigenti per il periodo successivo. In tale contesto si stanno esaminando diverse questioni tra cui l'uso possibile dei residui alimentari per aiutare le persone indigenti e la creazione di sinergie con le iniziative europee e nazionali in tale ambito.

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2011)571.

<sup>(2)</sup> Articolo 3 del regolamento (UE) n. 121/2012.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004640/12  
to the Commission  
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)  
(8 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Wasted food

In Italy, it is estimated food that goes to waste on a daily basis could be used to feed more than 630 000 people. This comprises of unsold supermarket produce that is thrown away because they are close to their sell-by date (but can still be consumed) or no longer aesthetically presentable on the shelves, as happens with fruit and vegetables. Just a small part of this waste is rescued thanks to local agreements between Onlus (Organizzazione Non Lucrativa di Utilità Sociale, the Italian Social Organisation) and major stores and is intended for the less well-off.

According to a report presented by Eurostat in February 2012, 24.5% of the Italian population is close to the poverty threshold. To confirm this, the media frequently reports acts of desperation by the 'new poor'.

— Is the Commission aware of the situation?

— How does it intend to intervene to raise awareness in Member States of the need to make provisions for assisting the recovery, not waste, of unsold food?

— There is no question that the European Food Aid Programme for the Most Deprived indicates the EU's willingness to support this population stratum, but considering the data supplied and the individual projects implemented to share food that would otherwise be thrown away by major stores, does the Commission intend to support projects of this type in a more structured way by involving national institutions?

— What is the situation in other Member States?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission  
(22 June 2012)**

The Commission committed in its 'Roadmap to a Resource Efficient Europe' <sup>(1)</sup> to further assess how best to limit food waste throughout the food supply chain and to investigate incentives to halve the disposal of edible food waste in the EU by 2020. This work on food waste will feed into the communication on Sustainable Food that will be adopted in 2013.

In this context the Commission has started to analyse with relevant stakeholders how to minimise food waste without compromising food safety. The Commission will also consult Member States and experts in order to define the most appropriate actions at EU level to complement the actions carried out at national and local level. Furthermore, the Commission aims to facilitate the exchange of good practices on food waste reduction and will set up a data base consisting of good practices on food waste reduction.

The European Food Distribution Programme for the Most Deprived Persons, in its current format, is due to end with the completion of the 2013 annual plan <sup>(2)</sup>. The Commission is currently working at a proposal for a new aid scheme for deprived people for the following period. In this context different issues are being investigated including the possible use of food waste for the most deprived people and the creation of synergies with European and national initiatives in this area.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2011)571.

<sup>(2)</sup> Article 3 of Regulation (EU) No 121/2012.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004641/12  
alla Commissione  
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)  
(8 maggio 2012)**

Oggetto: Violazione dei diritti dell'uomo in Bahrain

Il 6 maggio 2012, è stato arrestato, in Bahrain, Nabeel Rajab, presidente del «Centro per i Diritti Umani del Bahrain», dopo che aveva rilasciato un'intervista nella quale parlava delle violenze che da più di un anno il governo del suo paese porta avanti per reprimere i movimenti civili che chiedono una riforma democratica.

L'accusa mossagli è stata quella di «insulti alle istituzioni».

Questo è solo l'ultimo atto legato alla repressione dei manifestanti e che il governo sta portando avanti ormai dal 2011 in palese violazione dei diritti dell'uomo, come testimoniato anche da una recente inchiesta di Amnesty International.

— È la Commissione a conoscenza della situazione politica in Bahrain?

— Come si pone la Commissione nei confronti delle violazioni dei diritti dell'uomo in Bahrain?

— Reputa la Commissione che vi sia pericolo per i cittadini dell'Unione che vi si recano per lavoro o turismo?

**Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione  
(27 giugno 2012)**

L'UE è perfettamente a conoscenza della situazione generale in Bahrain. Dall'inizio dei disordini nel febbraio 2011, l'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton ha rilasciato numerose dichiarazioni che condannano l'uso della violenza da parte di chiunque e le ampiamente documentate violazioni dei diritti dell'uomo, e che invocano l'urgente avvio di un dialogo costruttivo fra il governo e l'opposizione. La posizione dell'UE riguardo al Bahrain è espressa anche nelle conclusioni del Consiglio «Affari esteri» di marzo, aprile e maggio 2011 e nella Dichiarazione sul vicinato meridionale adottata dal Consiglio europeo del giugno 2011.

La diramazione di avvisi per i viaggi ai cittadini dell'UE spetta ai singoli Stati membri.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004641/12  
to the Commission  
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)  
(8 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Human rights violations in Bahrain

On 6 May 2012, Nabeel Rajab, President of the Bahrain Human Rights Centre, was arrested in Bahrain after releasing an interview in which he talked about the violence that has been perpetrated for more than a year by his country's government to repress civil movements demanding democratic reform.

The accusation against him was 'insulting the institutions'.

This is only the latest act linked with the repression of demonstrators, which the government has been carrying out since 2011 in a blatant violation of human rights, as reported in a recent investigation by Amnesty International.

— Is the Commission aware of the political situation in Bahrain?

— What is the Commission's position with regard to the human rights violations happening in Bahrain?

— Does the Commission consider it dangerous for EU citizens who go to Bahrain to work or on holiday?

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

The EU is fully aware of the overall situation in Bahrain. Since the beginning of the current unrest in February 2011, High Representative/Vice-President Ashton has issued numerous statements condemning the use of violence from all sides, the thoroughly documented human rights violations and calling for the urgent start of a meaningful dialogue between the government and the opposition. The EU position with regard to Bahrain is also contained in the Foreign Affairs Council conclusions of March, April and May 2011 and in the Declaration on the Southern Neighbourhood adopted by the June 2011 European Council.

Issuance of travel advice to EU citizens is a responsibility of the respective Member State.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-004642/12  
to the Commission**

**Emma McClarkin (ECR)**

(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* European Central Bank soft low-interest loans

Small and medium-sized enterprises are a vital part of our economic recovery in Europe, and it is important that they are given as much help to prosper as we can afford.

I am therefore concerned that the trillions of euros given by the European Central Bank by way of soft, low-interest loans to banks have been unconditional; there is no evidence that this vast amount of money has been used by the banks to reduce their toxic balance sheets and redress their losses and sizeable loans.

Can the Commission therefore tell me what can be done to increase the growth and job creation generated by small businesses starved of bank lending?

And what action is the Commission taking to ensure banks in receipt of funding are actually providing funds for SMEs?

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

(15 June 2012)

The Commission shares the Honourable Member view that SMEs are a vital part of our economic recovery in Europe. SMEs need a stable and efficient financial system.

The 3-year liquidity operations carried out by the ECB had the objective of addressing a situation where banks were experiencing difficulties in access to funding while a large amount of bank bonds were maturing and had to be refinanced.

The liquidity operations did not include any elements on conditionality regarding the use of the credit granted. Given the nature and urgency of the situation, elements of conditionality could potentially have made the operations less effective in addressing the urgent funding difficulties. It shall also be observed that the net-liquidity actually added to the banking system only corresponded to about half of the amount of the announced EUR 1.1 trillion as banks at the same time scaled down their regular demand for short-term ECB-funding.

The Commission also observes that the ECB is fully independent in its decisions. Thus, the Commission cannot influence or demand conditionality in its decisions.

Finally, the Commission would like to draw the attention of the Honourable Member to the action plan to improve SMEs access to finance adopted in December 2011 <sup>(1)</sup>. It includes budgetary and regulatory measures and policy initiatives which aim at improving access to lending, to venture capital and to capital markets. By the end of 2011, 170,545 SMEs had received EUR 10.2 billion of loans supported by the SME Guarantee Facility (SMGF) under the Competitiveness and Innovation multiannual Programme (CIP 2007-2013).

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0870:FIN:EN:PDF>.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004643/12  
an die Kommission**

**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**

(8. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Türkei als Nettozahler oder Nettoempfänger?

In der Europäischen Union wird immer wieder die Frage der sogenannten Nettozahler und Nettoempfänger diskutiert. Deshalb kommt dieser Frage auch bei der Beurteilung von Beitrittskandidaten Bedeutung zu.

1. Wäre die Türkei ein sogenannter Nettozahler oder ein Nettoempfänger, würde sie — hypothetisch und auf Grundlage heute bekannter wirtschaftlicher Fakten betrachtet — im Jahr 2013 der EU beitreten?
2. Fall sie Nettoempfängerland wäre, wie viele Jahre würde es nach Einschätzung der Kommission und unter Einbeziehung der heute bekannten wirtschaftlichen Fakten dauern, bis die Türkei zu einem Nettozahlerland würde?

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

(26. Juni 2012)

Zu diesem Zeitpunkt ist es nicht möglich, künftige Ausgaben und Einnahmen in Verbindung mit einer möglichen EU-Mitgliedschaft der Türkei ernsthaft abzuschätzen. Eine Reihe von Faktoren sind in diesem Zusammenhang wichtig, z. B. das Datum des möglichen Beitritts, das Volumen des EU-Finanzrahmens zu diesem Zeitpunkt, die zwischenzeitlichen Entwicklungen in verschiedenen politischen Bereichen und die gesamtwirtschaftlichen Entwicklungen sowohl in der EU als auch in der Türkei sowie die spezifischen finanziellen Rahmenbedingungen eines Beitrittsvertrags.

---

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-004643/12  
to the Commission**

**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**

*(8 May 2012)*

*Subject:* Turkey as a net contributor or a net recipient?

In the European Union, the issue regarding so-called net contributors and net recipients is continually discussed. This issue, therefore, is also accorded importance in the evaluation of candidate countries.

1. Would Turkey be a so-called net contributor or a net recipient, if the country — hypothetically speaking and taking into account today's known economic facts — were to join the EU in the year 2013?
2. If Turkey were a net recipient country, how many years does the Commission believe it would take for Turkey to become a net contributor country, in consideration of today's known economic facts?

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

*(26 June 2012)*

It is not possible at this stage to give a serious estimate of future expenditure and revenues associated with possible Turkish EU membership. A number of key factors, for instance the date of possible accession, the volume of the Financial Perspectives at that moment in time, developments until then in relation to various sector policies, macroeconomic developments until then in both the EU and in Turkey, as well as any specific financial terms of an accession treaty.

---



(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004645/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**  
(8. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Spanisches Küstengesetz

Die Umsetzung des spanischen Küstengesetzes führt zu ernsthaften Problemen, da sie ca. eine Millionen spanische Haus- und Grundbesitzer sowie 80 000 Bürger anderer Mitgliedstaaten betrifft. Diese Probleme entstehen durch die Versuche einer rückwirkenden Anwendung dieses Gesetzes, mit dem die Küsten vor Umweltzerstörung und Spekulation sowie vor ähnlichen Missbräuchen geschützt werden sollen.

Das Küstengesetz wurde in einigen Aspekten willkürlich und chaotisch angewandt, so dass es sich auf Hunderte von Besitzern legal erworbener Immobilien auswirkt.

1. Ist das spanische Küstengesetz mit europäischem Recht vereinbar?
2. Sind der Kommission ähnliche Fälle in anderen Mitgliedstaaten bekannt?
3. Welche Auffassung vertritt die Kommission im Hinblick auf diese Maßnahme? Plant sie die Einführung einer ähnlichen Regelung auf europäischer Ebene?
4. Wie wirken sich die Umweltveränderungen auf Küstengebiete aus?
5. Ist die Kommission aufgrund der zunehmenden Umweltbelastung an der Mittelmeerküste, von denen die Küstenökosysteme bedroht sind, besorgt?
6. Welche Rechtsinstrumente hat die EU zum Schutz der Küstenressourcen eingeführt?
7. Wie beurteilt die Kommission den Reformvorschlag des Küstengesetzes, durch den die spanische Küste ihren Schutz verlieren könnte?

**Antwort von Herrn Potočnik im Namen der Kommission**  
(27. Juni 2012)

1.-3., 7. Der Kommission liegen die Rechtstexte zur Umsetzung der angekündigten Reform des Küstengesetzes bislang noch nicht vor. Die Kommission kann die angekündigten Änderungen nur auf Grundlage der Rechtstexte bewerten, die mit dem EU-Besitzstand und den im Rahmen des Übereinkommens von Barcelona <sup>(1)</sup> zum Schutz der Meeresumwelt und der Küstengebiete des Mittelmeers eingegangenen einschlägigen Verpflichtungen im Einklang stehen müssen.

4.-5. Die Kommission ist angesichts der zunehmenden Umweltbelastungen an der Mittelmeerküste äußerst besorgt. Die Auswirkungen des Klimawandels und menschliche Einwirkungen wie die Küstenentwicklung, Fischerei und Aquakultur haben weitreichende und schwerwiegende Auswirkungen auf die örtlichen Ökosysteme der Küsten und der Meere. Lediglich 8 % der Küstenlebensräume weisen einen guten Erhaltungszustand auf und nur bei 11 % der an den Küsten lebenden Arten ist die Situation günstig. Darüber hinaus wurde das EU-Ziel, den Verlust an biologischer Vielfalt bis 2010 zu stoppen, weder bei der Küsten- noch bei der Meeresumwelt erreicht.

6. Zur Erhaltung der Küstenressourcen hat die EU mehrere Rechtsinstrumente eingeführt, darunter auch die Meeresstrategie-Rahmenrichtlinie <sup>(2)</sup>, die Vogelschutz- und die FHH-Richtlinie <sup>(3)</sup> sowie die Wasserrahmenrichtlinie <sup>(4)</sup>. Von Bedeutung ist in diesem Zusammenhang auch die 2011 verabschiedete Strategie zum Schutz der Biodiversität bis 2020.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Beschlüsse 77/585/EWG und 1999/802/EG, ABl. L 240 vom 19.9.1977.

<sup>(2)</sup> Richtlinie 2008/56/EG, ABl. L 164 vom 25.6.2008.

<sup>(3)</sup> Richtlinie 2009/147/EG, ABl. L 20 vom 26.1.2010 und Richtlinie 92/43/EWG, ABl. L 206 vom 22.7.1992.

<sup>(4)</sup> Richtlinie 2000/60/EG, ABl. L 327 vom 22.12.2000.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004645/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**  
(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* Spanish coastal law

The implementation of the Spanish coastal law is leading to severe problems, affecting approximately one million Spanish property owners and 80 000 citizens of other Member States. The problems are arising from the attempts at retroactive application of this law, which is aimed at preventing abuses and protecting the coasts from environmental aggression and speculation.

Some aspects of the coastal law have been applied arbitrarily and chaotically, affecting hundreds of owners of legally acquired homes.

1. Is the Spanish coastal law compatible with European law?
2. Is the Commission aware of similar cases in other Member States?
3. What view does the Commission take of this measure? Is it planning to introduce a similar rule at European level?
4. What are the impacts of environmental change in coastal areas?
5. Is the Commission concerned about the increase in environmental pressures on the Mediterranean coast, which is threatening coastal ecosystems?
6. What are the legislative instruments that the EU has established in order to preserve coastal resources?
7. How does the Commission judge the proposed reform of the coastal law, which could leave the Spanish coast unprotected?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission**  
(27 June 2012)

1-3, 7. The Commission has so far not yet received the legal texts relating to the announced reform of the Coastal law. The Commission will only be in a position to assess the announced changes based on the legal texts that need to be in compliance with the *acquis* and relevant commitments undertaken under the Barcelona Convention <sup>(1)</sup> for the Protection of the Marine Environment and the Coastal Region of the Mediterranean.

4-5. The Commission is highly concerned about the increase in environmental pressures on the Mediterranean Sea Coast. Climate change effects, human activities, such as coastal development, fishing and aquaculture cause large and severe impacts on local coastal and marine ecosystems. Only 8% of coastal habitats have favourable conservation status, and only 11% of coastal species are in favourable condition and the EU objective of halting biodiversity loss by 2010 was met neither in the coastal nor the marine environment.

6. In order to preserve coastal resources, the EU has established several legislative instruments, including the Marine Strategy Framework Directive <sup>(2)</sup>, the Birds and Habitat Directives <sup>(3)</sup> and the Water Framework Directive <sup>(4)</sup>. Also relevant is the Biodiversity Strategy 2020, adopted in 2011.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Decisions 77/585/CEE and 1999/802/EC, OJ L 240, 19.9.1977.

<sup>(2)</sup> Directive 2008/56/EC, OJ L 164, 25.6.2008.

<sup>(3)</sup> Directive 2009/147/EC, OJ L 20, 26.1.2010 and Directive 92/43/EEC, OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.

<sup>(4)</sup> Directive 2000/60/EC, OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004647/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**  
(8. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Von der Polizei identifizierte HIV-Infektionen und Prostituierte

Bei medizinischen Untersuchungen, die während der beiden letzten Tage vom griechischen Zentrum für die Kontrolle und Vorbeugung von Krankheiten (KEEL) bei Dutzenden von Prostituierten durchgeführt wurden, hat sich gezeigt, dass zwölf der Prostituierten HIV-positiv sind.

Im Zuge der Veröffentlichung einer Fotografie einer 22-jährigen russischen Prostituierten am Sonntag lud die Polizei am Dienstag die Fotos von elf weiteren Prostituierten in Athen auf ihre Website ([www.hellenicpolice.gr](http://www.hellenicpolice.gr)) und forderte alle diejenigen, die einen sexuellen Kontakt mit ihnen hatten, auf, sich im Hinblick auf eine medizinische Untersuchung und Behandlung an die Behörden zu wenden.

1. Was unternimmt die Kommission, um einer Verbreitung von HIV über einen florierenden illegalen Sexhandel, der nicht nur im Zentrum Athens, sondern auch in anderen Mitgliedstaaten ein schwerwiegendes Problem darstellt, vorzubeugen?
2. Wie kann die Kommission dieses Problem, das sich über das Athener „Getto der illegalen Einwanderer“ hinaus ausgebreitet hat, kontrollieren?

**Antwort von Herrn Dalli im Namen der Kommission**  
(27. Juni 2012)

1. Die Kommission verfolgt aufmerksam die Lage in Griechenland in Bezug auf HIV. Sie hat keine Hinweise darauf, dass der „illegale Sexhandel“ ein wichtiger HIV-Übertragungsweg in Griechenland oder in anderen Mitgliedstaaten ist.

Aufgrund der starken Zunahme der HIV-Ansteckungen insbesondere bei injizierenden Drogenkonsumenten in Griechenland hat die Kommission das Europäische Zentrum für die Prävention und die Kontrolle von Krankheiten beauftragt, Ende Mai eine technische Mission nach Griechenland durchzuführen, um die Informationen und Hinweise zu prüfen und über die HIV-Situation in Griechenland Bericht zu erstatten. An die Mission schließt sich eine vollständige Risikobewertung an, die Ende September vorgelegt werden soll und die der Kommission umfassende Informationen für die weitere Unterstützung Griechenlands liefern wird.

2. Die Kommission fördert nationale evidenzbasierte Reaktionen auf die HIV-Epidemie, unterstützt die uneingeschränkte Einhaltung der Grundrechte und engagiert sich gegen Diskriminierung, Stigmatisierung und geschlechterspezifische Ungleichheiten gemäß der Mitteilung der Kommission über die Bekämpfung von HIV/AIDS in der Europäischen Union und in den Nachbarländern (2009-2013) <sup>(1)</sup>. Die in diesem Zusammenhang entwickelten Maßnahmen betreffen die Situation aller Menschen, die mit HIV leben oder davon bedroht sind. Allerdings sind die Mitgliedstaaten dafür verantwortlich, die Fähigkeit von Regierungseinrichtungen und Organisationen der Zivilgesellschaft im Hinblick auf die Entwicklung, Durchführung und Evaluierung wirksamer nationaler HIV-/AIDS-Programme zu stärken.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> KOM(2009)569 endg. vom 26.10.2009.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004647/12  
to the Commission**

**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**

(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* Police identify HIV+ sex workers

Medical tests conducted on dozens of prostitutes by the Hellenic Centre for Disease Control and Prevention (KEEL) in Athens over the past two days have revealed that twelve of the sex workers concerned are HIV positive.

Following the publication of a photograph of a 22-year-old Russian sex worker on Sunday, on Tuesday the police uploaded photos of another 11 prostitutes working in Athens onto their website ([www.hellenicpolice.gr](http://www.hellenicpolice.gr)) and appealed to those who had had sexual contact with them to contact the authorities to arrange health checks and treatment.

1. What is the Commission doing to prevent the spread of HIV via the flourishing illegal sex trade, which is a severe problem not only in central Athens but also in other Member States?
2. How can the Commission control this problem, which has spread beyond the 'ghetto of illegal immigrants' in Athens?

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

(27 June 2012)

1. The Commission is closely following the situation of HIV in Greece. The Commission does not have evidence that 'illegal sex trade' is a major route of HIV transmission in Greece, nor in other Member States.

However, in response to the strong increase of HIV cases in particular among injecting drug users in Greece, the Commission has mandated the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control to carry out a technical mission to Greece at the end of May 2012 to assess information and evidence and to report on the situation with regard to HIV in Greece. This mission will be followed by a full risk assessment to be finalised by end of September, which will provide the Commission with comprehensive information to guide its next steps in supporting Greece.

2. The Commission supports national evidence-based responses to the HIV epidemic, promotes full adherence to fundamental rights, and include efforts against discrimination, stigmatisation and gender inequalities as stated in the Commission Communication on combating HIV/AIDS in the EU and neighbouring countries, 2009-2013 <sup>(1)</sup> Actions developed in this context address the situation of all people living with or at risk of HIV. However, it is responsibility of the Member States to strengthen the capacity of governmental institutions and civil society organisations to develop, implement and evaluate effective national HIV/AIDS programmes.

---

(1) COM(569) 2009 Final of 26.10.2009.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004648/12  
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(8 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Abusi della polizia keniota

La polizia keniota sta compiendo abusi, sul confine somalo e in attigui campi profughi, a danno di rifugiati e richiedenti asilo in fuga dalla Somalia, devastata dalla guerra. Il Kenya dovrebbe fermare immediatamente le sue violente forze di polizia e l'agenzia delle Nazioni Unite per i rifugiati dovrebbe incrementare i controlli e fare pressioni per porre fine agli abusi. Un'associazione per la tutela dei diritti umani ha pubblicato un rapporto sulle violenze commesse «sistematicamente» dalla polizia keniana nei confronti dei rifugiati somali fuggiti che vivono nei campi profughi del Kenya settentrionale. In sessantacinque pagine il rapporto elenca una serie di arresti arbitrari e maltrattamenti commessi in particolare nel campo profughi di Dadaab ai danni di uomini e donne, apparentemente come rappresaglia agli attentati compiuti dai miliziani islamici somali del gruppo integralista al Shabaab.

Alla luce di quanto sovraesposto, può l'Alto Rappresentante far sapere:

1. Se è a conoscenza dell'ultimo rapporto sugli abusi della polizia keniana?
2. Se non ritiene che si debbano prendere ulteriori provvedimenti affinché siano salvaguardati i diritti umani e sia rispettata la Convenzione di Cotonou considerato che il mancato rispetto dei diritti umani da parte di uno dei paesi ACP può comportare la sospensione delle concessioni commerciali dell'UE e il ridimensionamento dei programmi di aiuto?

**Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione**

(26 giugno 2012)

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente è a conoscenza del recente rapporto di Human Rights Watch intitolato «Criminal Reprisals: Kenyan Police and Military Abuses against Ethnic Somalis» e riceve regolarmente, da parte della delegazione UE in Kenya, aggiornamenti che tengono conto delle informazioni provenienti da diverse fonti sulla situazione in materia di diritti umani.

L'UE mantiene con le autorità keniate, la società civile e altri soggetti interessati un dialogo costante e intenso su questioni relative ai diritti umani e ricopre un ruolo influente in Kenya, sostenendo da molto tempo la democrazia, i diritti umani e le riforme politiche. In vari incontri di alto livello avvenuti di recente con il governo keniota, l'UE ha espressamente sottolineato la necessità di trattare correttamente i rifugiati e i richiedenti asilo provenienti dalla Somalia.

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente continuerà a seguire attentamente la questione.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004648/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)  
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Abuse by Kenyan police

The Kenyan police are committing abuses against refugees and asylum-seekers fleeing from war-torn Somalia. The abuses occur on the Somali border and in adjacent refugee camps. Kenya should immediately stop its violent police forces, and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees should increase checks and exert pressure so as to put an end to the abuse. A human rights association has published a report on the violence 'systematically' committed by the Kenyan police against Somali refugees who live in the refugee camps of northern Kenya. The 65-page report lists a series of arbitrary arrests and mistreatment of men and women, committed in particular in the Dadaab refugee camp, apparently in retaliation for attacks by Somali Muslim militia from the fundamentalist group Al-Shabaab.

In view of the above, can the High Representative state:

1. Whether she is aware of the latest report on abuse by Kenyan police;
2. Whether she considers that further steps should be taken in order to protect human rights and to uphold the Cotonou Agreement, considering that failure to respect human rights by one of the ACP countries can lead to the suspension of EU trade agreements and cuts in aid programmes?

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

(26 June 2012)

The High Representative/Vice-President is aware of the latest report by Human Rights Watch with the title 'Criminal Reprisals: Kenyan Police and Military Abuses against Ethnic Somalis'. The HR/VP also receives regular updates on the human rights situation by the European Union Delegation to Kenya taking into account information from a variety of sources.

The EU maintains a constant and intensive political dialogue with Kenyan authorities, civil society and other relevant stakeholders on human rights issues and has an influential position in Kenya as a longstanding advocate for democracy, human rights and political reforms. At various recent high-level meetings with the Government of Kenya the EU specifically underlined the need for correct treatment of refugees and asylum-seekers from Somalia.

The HR/VP will continue to follow this matter closely.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004649/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(8 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Albania, percorso di avvicinamento all'Europa

C'è la salda convinzione che l'adesione dell'Albania, la cui linea di politica estera nell'area balcanica è stata tradizionalmente improntata a grande moderazione, farebbe gli interessi di sicurezza e stabilità di più Stati membri. Il sostegno dell'Italia non si basa su un approccio fideistico o una concezione visionaria, ma deriva dalla constatazione che l'esclusione dell'Albania dall'Unione europea non è giustificata da una diversa connotazione culturale, storica o geografica. È in Europa, nel progetto di piena integrazione di tutti i Balcani Occidentali, che le differenze etniche potranno trovare piena composizione.

La Commissione europea nel 2008 aveva dichiarato che l'Albania, al fine di ottenere lo status di Paese candidato, avrebbe dovuto fare di più per combattere la corruzione e la criminalità organizzata e sviluppare le sue infrastrutture e la sua rete di energia elettrica. La dirigenza albanese è cosciente del fatto che il percorso sarà lungo e complesso e allo stesso tempo intende continuare a potenziare il cammino di modernizzazione economica e sociale del paese.

Alla luce di quanto sopraesposto, si interroga la Commissione per sapere:

1. quali sono i progressi fatti registrare dall'Albania, negli ultimi anni, dopo aver firmato l'Accordo di stabilizzazione e associazione;
2. se, a distanza di due anni dalla presentazione della domanda di adesione, Tirana ha soddisfatto le priorità stabilite dalla Commissione europea nel 2010 nell'ambito del percorso di avvicinamento all'Unione europea.

**Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione**

(26 giugno 2012)

L'Albania è fortemente impegnata nel processo di integrazione nell'UE e la sua prospettiva di adesione è stata confermata più volte dall'UE stessa. L'Albania sta applicando regolarmente l'accordo di stabilizzazione ed associazione e si sta gradualmente allineando con l'acquis dell'UE in tutti i settori principali. Alla fine del 2010, è entrato in vigore un regime di spostamenti senza obbligo di visto nella zona Schengen per i cittadini albanesi e i requisiti previsti da questo accordo vengono ampiamente rispettati. Sostenere l'Albania nel suo impegno a integrarsi nell'UE è uno dei punti centrali della strategia di allargamento dell'Unione.

Il Consiglio europeo del dicembre 2010 ha accolto favorevolmente le raccomandazioni della Commissione contenute nel parere della Commissione in merito alla richiesta di adesione dell'Albania all'UE. Questo ha stabilito 12 priorità fondamentali che l'Albania deve rispettare prima che si possa proporre l'avvio dei negoziati di adesione. Nella relazione dell'ottobre 2011 in merito ai progressi conseguiti, la Commissione ha dichiarato che i progressi verso il rispetto delle priorità stabilite nel parere erano stati compiuti solo in parte. In seguito all'accordo politico del novembre 2011 tra la maggioranza al governo e l'opposizione, l'Albania ha compiuto sforzi più mirati e progressi concreti verso il rispetto di tali priorità fondamentali. Il parlamento albanese ha adottato una legislazione di base che richiedeva i 3/5 del voto di maggioranza ha nominato il mediatore attraverso una procedura consensuale e ha compiuto notevoli progressi verso una riforma elettorale e una riforma del regolamento interno del Parlamento. Un lavoro notevole viene svolto attualmente nell'ambito di numerosi altri settori contemplati dalle 12 priorità fondamentali.

La Commissione valuterà il rispetto delle 12 priorità fondamentali nell'ambito della sua relazione in merito ai progressi conseguiti.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004649/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* Albania's path towards Europe

There is a firm belief that the accession of Albania, whose foreign policy in the Balkans has traditionally been very moderate, would be in the interests of the security and stability of various Member States. Italy's support is not based on a fideistic approach or a visionary concept, but derives from the observation that excluding Albania from the European Union is not justified by any cultural, historical or geographical connotations. As part of the full integration of all the western Balkans, the ethnic differences could actually find their full composition in Europe.

In 2008, the European Commission declared that in order to obtain candidate country status, Albania should do more to fight corruption and organised crime and develop its infrastructure and its electricity network. The Albanian leadership is aware that the path will be long and complex, and at the same time continues to support the country's progress towards economic and social modernisation.

In view of the above, we ask the Commission:

1. what progress has been made by Albania in recent years after signing the Stabilisation and Association Agreement?
2. if, two years after submitting its application, Tirana has satisfied the priorities set by the Commission in 2010 relating to Albania's path towards the European Union?

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

(26 June 2012)

Albania is fully committed to the process of EU integration and its EU perspective has been confirmed several times by the EU. Albania smoothly implements its Stabilisation and Association Agreement and is gradually aligning with the EU *acquis* in all key areas. At the end of 2010, a visa free travel regime for Albanian citizens to the Schengen area entered into force, and requirements under this agreement are being broadly respected. Supporting Albania in its endeavour of moving towards EU integration is a core part of the EU's enlargement strategy.

The December 2010 European Council endorsed the Commission's recommendations included in the opinion on Albania's EU membership application. This established 12 key priorities, which Albania needs to fulfil before the start of accession negotiations can be recommended. In its Progress Report of October 2011, the Commission stated that only limited progress had been made in meeting the opinion's key priorities. Since the political agreement of November 2011 between ruling majority and opposition, Albania has made more focused efforts and concrete progress towards fulfilling the key priorities. The Albanian parliament has adopted key legislation requiring a 3/5 majority vote, appointed the Ombudsman through a consensual procedure and made significant progress towards electoral reform and reform of the Parliament's rules of procedures. A considerable amount of work is under way in several other areas covered by the 12 key priorities.

The Commission will assess the fulfilment of the 12 key priorities in its 2012 Progress Report.

---



(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004651/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(8 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Farmaco per malattie neurodegenerative

Un solo farmaco per curare tante diverse malattie neurodegenerative, come Alzheimer e Parkinson: è un sogno che si potrebbe ora concretizzare, dopo che un team di scienziati britannici è riuscito a fermare una malattia neurologica legata ai prioni «riprogrammando» le cellule degli animali destinate a morire.

Il Parkinson è una malattia degenerativa del sistema nervoso centrale. La degenerazione, intesa come perdita lenta ma progressiva di neuroni, avviene in varie parti del cervello, ma in modo particolare a livello della sostanza nera, i cui neuroni producono un neurotrasmettitore, la dopamina, che regola il funzionamento dei movimenti involontari attraverso l'attività dei nuclei della base. Insorge abitualmente tra i 50 e i 60 anni e ha andamento progressivo con durata che può superare i 20 anni. Esistono forme più giovanili che insorgono anche intorno ai 40 anni e forme senili presenti in età molto avanzata.

Alla luce di quanto sovraesposto, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. È a conoscenza del nuovo studio condotto dall'università britannica?
2. Ci sono studi su farmaci per curare le malattie neurodegenerative che siano stati finanziati nell'ambito del Settimo programma quadro per la ricerca e lo sviluppo tecnologico (7° PQ)?

**Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione**

(22 giugno 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza dello studio condotto sui nuovi approcci terapeutici per la cura delle malattie neurodegenerative. Il Settimo programma quadro di ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico dell'UE (7° PQ, 2007-2013) sostiene, con uno stanziamento di circa 320 milioni di euro, la ricerca sulle malattie neurodegenerative, incentrata in particolare su varianti genetiche, patofisiologia, sviluppo di dispositivi per imaging e biomarcatori per diagnosi, monitoraggio e prognosi, plasticità e recupero celebrale, sviluppo di trattamenti rigenerativi e di nuovi farmaci mirati<sup>(1)</sup>.

Tra i progetti relativi alla cura delle malattie neurodegenerative sostenuti nell'ambito del 7° PQ figurano:

LUPAS<sup>(2)</sup>, progetto sostenuto con 5 milioni di euro, che mira a sviluppare agenti e metodi innovativi per la diagnosi e la prevenzione dell'aggregazione proteica e per la cura del morbo di Alzheimer e delle malattie da prioni.

MITOTARGET<sup>(3)</sup>, per il quale sono stati stanziati 6 milioni di euro, finalizzato a migliorare la comprensione delle disfunzioni mitocondriali connesse a meccanismi patofisiologici e a creare un nuovo modello per la scoperta di farmaci, in particolare per la sclerosi laterale amiotrofica.

PHRMA-COG, progetto che ha ricevuto un finanziamento di 9,6 milioni di euro nell'ambito dell'iniziativa in materia di medicinali innovativi (IMI)<sup>(4)</sup> e di 10 milioni di euro da parte di 11 società farmaceutiche e il cui obiettivo è sviluppare uno schema per la validazione dei farmaci che fornisca informazioni sulla progressione della malattia e sugli effetti dei farmaci «candidati».

NRT<sup>(5)</sup>, progetto sostenuto con uno stanziamento di 6 milioni di euro e nel cui ambito si realizza attualmente un test clinico di fase II finalizzato a dimostrare che l'omodimero BB del fattore di crescita derivato dalle piastrine agisce ottimamente come terapia rigenerativa per il morbo di Parkinson.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/research/health/medical-research/brain-research/index\\_en.html](http://ec.europa.eu/research/health/medical-research/brain-research/index_en.html) e  
[http://ec.europa.eu/research/health/biotechnology/index\\_en.html](http://ec.europa.eu/research/health/biotechnology/index_en.html)

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.lupas-amyloid.eu/>

<sup>(3)</sup> <http://www.mitotarget.eu>

<sup>(4)</sup> L'IMI è un partenariato pubblico-privato fra l'UE e la Federazione europea delle industrie e delle associazioni farmaceutiche (EFPIA):  
<http://www.imi.europa.eu/content/prediction-cognitive-properties-new-drug-candidates-neurodegenerative-diseases-early-clinical>

<sup>(5)</sup> [http://cordis.europa.eu/search/index.cfm?fuseaction=proj.document&PJ\\_LANG=DE&PJ\\_RCN=12538826&pid=66&q=C953682604849D783C4E5F0D1BA7B8EB&type=rap](http://cordis.europa.eu/search/index.cfm?fuseaction=proj.document&PJ_LANG=DE&PJ_RCN=12538826&pid=66&q=C953682604849D783C4E5F0D1BA7B8EB&type=rap)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004651/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* Drug for neurodegenerative diseases

A single drug for treating many different neurodegenerative diseases, including Alzheimer's and Parkinson's, is a dream that might come true now that a team of British scientists have succeeded in arresting a neurological disease associated with prions by 'reprogramming' the cells of terminally ill animals.

Parkinson's disease is a degenerative disease of the central nervous system. The degeneration, which takes the form of a slow but progressive loss of neurons, occurs in various parts of the brain, but particularly in the black matter. Its neurons produce a neurotransmitter, dopamine, which regulates involuntary movements through the activity of the basal nuclei. It generally arises between the ages of 50 and 60, and gradually worsens over a period that can last more than 20 years. There are juvenile forms of the disease, which arise around the age of 40, and senile forms, which are found in those of more advanced age.

In view of the above, can the Commission answer the following:

1. Is it aware of the new study conducted by the British university?
2. Are there any studies into drugs for the treatment of neurodegenerative diseases that have been financed as part of the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7)?

**Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission**

(22 June 2012)

The Commission is aware of work performed on new therapeutic approaches for neurodegenerative diseases. The EU 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013) supports research on neurodegenerative diseases for about EUR 320 million, focusing on genetic variations, pathophysiology, development of imaging probes and biomarkers for diagnostic, monitoring and prognosis, brain plasticity and repair, development of restorative approaches and identification of new drug targets <sup>(1)</sup>.

Examples of FP7 supported projects for the treatment of neurodegenerative diseases are:

LUPAS <sup>(2)</sup>, supported for EUR 5 million, aims at developing novel agents and methods for diagnostic, prevention of protein aggregation and treatment of Alzheimer's and prion diseases.

MITOTARGET <sup>(3)</sup>, supported for EUR 6 million, aims at better understanding mitochondrial dysfunction in relation to pathophysiological mechanisms and creating a new paradigm for drug discovery in particular for amyotrophic lateral sclerosis.

PHARMA-COG is supported for EUR 9.6 million by the Innovative Medicines Initiative (IMI) <sup>(4)</sup> and for 10 million EUROS by 11 pharmaceutical companies. It aims at developing a signature giving information on the progression of the disease and the effect of candidate drugs.

NRT <sup>(5)</sup>, supported for EUR 6 million, is performing a phase II clinical trial to demonstrate that Platelet Derived Growth Factor BB homodimer acts as a unique regenerative therapy for Parkinson's.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/research/health/medical-research/brain-research/index\\_en.html](http://ec.europa.eu/research/health/medical-research/brain-research/index_en.html) and  
[http://ec.europa.eu/research/health/biotechnology/index\\_en.html](http://ec.europa.eu/research/health/biotechnology/index_en.html)

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.lupas-amyloid.eu/>

<sup>(3)</sup> <http://www.mitotarget.eu>

<sup>(4)</sup> IMI is a public-private partnership between the EU and the European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industries and Associations:  
<http://www.imi.europa.eu/content/prediction-cognitive-properties-new-drug-candidates-neurodegenerative-diseases-early-clinica>

<sup>(5)</sup> [http://cordis.europa.eu/search/index.cfm?fuseaction=proj.document&PJ\\_LANG=DE&PJ\\_RCN=12538826&pid=66&q=C953682604849D783C4E5F0D1BA7B8EB&type=rap](http://cordis.europa.eu/search/index.cfm?fuseaction=proj.document&PJ_LANG=DE&PJ_RCN=12538826&pid=66&q=C953682604849D783C4E5F0D1BA7B8EB&type=rap)

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004653/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(8 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Incidente in un Luna Park

Uno scricchiolio, poi lo schianto improvviso della giostra e il divertimento che si trasforma in urla di terrore. Il crollo di una giostra nel Luna Park di Carpi, nel modenese, ha provocato dieci feriti, uno dei quali grave.

L'incidente è accaduto nella tarda serata di ieri, mentre la giostra stava compiendo gli ultimi giri. Sopra, un gruppo di ragazze tra i tredici e i diciassette anni, che sono rimaste ferite finendo a terra e rischiando di travolgere le persone che assistevano alla scena. La più grave è una straniera di tredici anni, ricoverata in ospedale. Dai primi accertamenti effettuati da vigili del fuoco e polizia risulta che, a provocare la caduta degli avventori in quel momento sulla giostra, è stata la rottura di un braccio meccanico che la sorregge. Al momento del crollo, il «tappeto volante» si trovava nel suo punto più basso e questo ha sicuramente evitato che il bilancio dell'incidente risultasse più grave. La giostra del Luna Park, che aveva aperto i battenti proprio ieri sera, è stata messa sotto sequestro.

Alla luce di quanto sovraesposto, si interroga la Commissione per sapere:

1. L'UE, a seguito del rapporto del 2005 sulla valutazione delle migliori pratiche in materia di sicurezza dei consumatori messe in atto durante le feste locali ed i parchi di divertimento, non ritiene di dover discutere sull'opportunità di emanare una direttiva comunitaria sulla sicurezza delle attrazioni all'interno dei parchi di divertimento e per attrazioni viaggianti, vista la gravità degli incidenti che continuano a verificarsi in tali impianti?
2. È in possesso di dati, inerenti a incidenti in parchi di divertimenti, verificatisi negli Stati membri nell'ultimo anno?

**Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione**

(22 giugno 2012)

La sicurezza dei luna-park e dei parchi dei divertimenti è un ambito in cui la Commissione ha identificato una dimensione transfrontaliera potenziale.

Finora non si sono riscontrate indicazioni di barriere specifiche alla fornitura transfrontaliera intraunionale di servizi a causa di requisiti diversi in tema di sicurezza. Ciò rende difficile giustificare un eventuale intervento sostanziale dell'UE.

Approssimativamente, lo 0,25 % di tutte le lesioni dovute a incidenti domestici e del tempo libero nell'UE27 (circa 80 000 casi) è riconducibile a parchi dei divertimenti (rapporto di sintesi statistico dell'UE nel 2009 <sup>(1)</sup>); tuttavia le lesioni dovute in modo specifico alle attrezzature e ai giochi dei luna-park rappresentano soltanto un quinto di tali casi. La raccolta di dati UE in relazione agli incidenti e alle lesioni è un ambito ancora in corso di sviluppo.

---

(<sup>1</sup>) [https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/sanco/heid/index.php/EU\\_Injury\\_Database\\_\(IDB\)/Reports\\_and\\_fact\\_sheets/National\\_and\\_EU\\_reports](https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/sanco/heid/index.php/EU_Injury_Database_(IDB)/Reports_and_fact_sheets/National_and_EU_reports).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004653/12  
to the Commission  
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)  
(8 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Incident at a fairground

A creaking noise, followed by the sudden collapse of a fairground ride, and laughter turned into screams of terror. The collapse of a ride at the fairground in Carpi, in the province of Modena, left ten people injured, one of them seriously.

The accident occurred late yesterday evening, while the ride was making its final turns. A group of girls aged between 13 and 17 was injured when they fell from the top to the ground, nearly landing on the people below. The most seriously injured victim is a 13-year-old foreign girl, who was admitted to hospital. Initial investigations carried out by firefighters and police officers indicate that the fracture of a mechanical arm supporting the ride caused the incident. When it broke, the 'flying carpet' was at its lowest point, which certainly prevented the accident from being even more serious. The ride has been seized from the fairground, which opened just yesterday evening.

In view of the above, can the Commission state:

1. Following the 2005 report on the Assessment of Best Practices in Fairgrounds and Amusement Parks in Relation to Safety of Consumers, whether the EU considers it necessary to discuss the advisability of issuing an EU directive on the safety of attractions in amusement parks and of travelling attractions in view of the seriousness of the accidents that continue to occur at such sites;
2. Whether it is in possession of data relating to accidents in amusement parks that have occurred in Member States in the last year?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission  
(22 June 2012)**

The safety of fairgrounds and amusement parks is an area which the Commission has identified as having a potential cross-border dimension.

So far, no evidence has been found of specific barriers to intra-EU cross-border supply of services due to different safety requirements. This makes it difficult to justify any substantive EU action.

Approximately 0.25% of all Home and Leisure Injuries in EU-27 (some 80 000 cases) occurred in amusement parks (EU statistics summary report in 2009 <sup>(1)</sup>); however, injuries related specifically to fairground equipment and amusements only constitute about a fifth of these cases. EU data collection about accidents and injuries is still an area in development.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/sanco/heid/index.php/EU\\_Injury\\_Database\\_\(IDB\)/Reports\\_and\\_fact\\_sheets/National\\_and\\_EU\\_reports](https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/sanco/heid/index.php/EU_Injury_Database_(IDB)/Reports_and_fact_sheets/National_and_EU_reports).

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004654/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(8 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Peschereccio italiano trattenuto in Croazia

È della Marineria di Monopoli il peschereccio che da ieri è trattenuto dalle autorità marittime della Croazia, pare per un presunto sconfinamento durante le operazioni di pesca in Adriatico. Lo ha confermato la Capitaneria di porto di Monopoli. A bordo ci sono cinque marittimi pugliesi.

Il peschereccio, secondo le prime notizie, sarebbe stato intercettato in mare nel pomeriggio di ieri da motovedette croate e fatto attraccare al porto di Dubrovnik. Sulla vicenda sono state informate le competenti autorità italiane e attivati tutti i canali istituzionali.

Da qualche anno la Croazia, come già aveva fatto precedentemente l'Albania, si è dotata di una normativa propria per sanzionare i casi di sconfinamento nelle proprie acque territoriali. Mille euro di sanzione per ciascun membro dell'equipaggio e il sequestro dell'imbarcazione che, come in casi precedenti, potrebbe anche finire all'asta salvo permettere allo stesso armatore di parteciparvi.

Alla luce di quanto sovraesposto, si interroga la Commissione per sapere:

1. È a conoscenza della vicenda che ha interessato il peschereccio pugliese, è in possesso di maggiori informazioni e l'UE non intende avviare un dialogo con le autorità croate?
2. La vicenda rientra nella Strategia contro la pesca illegale, non dichiarata e non regolamentata e, in caso di risposta affermativa, la questione è di competenza dell'Agenzia comunitaria di controllo della pesca?

**Risposta di Maria Damanaki a nome della Commissione**

(6 luglio 2012)

La Commissione non era a conoscenza dell'incidente citato dall'onorevole parlamentare.

Nell'ambito della politica comune della pesca (PCP) la responsabilità principale per il controllo e l'esecuzione spetta alle autorità degli Stati membri. Dalle informazioni comunicate dall'onorevole parlamentare la Commissione comprende che le autorità italiane competenti sono già state informate dell'incidente e, pertanto, ritiene che siano già stati attivati i corretti canali di dialogo.

A norma del regolamento (CE) n. 1005/2008 (regolamento INN) se è stato dimostrato, a seguito delle indagini condotte dallo Stato di bandiera, che la nave in realtà stava svolgendo operazioni di pesca illegali come la pesca nelle acque croate senza autorizzazione, lo Stato di bandiera dovrebbe adottare misure appropriate in conformità al suddetto regolamento. In tal caso, spetta alla Commissione e non all'Agenzia comunitaria di controllo della pesca garantire un adeguato seguito del caso di concerto con lo Stato membro interessato.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004654/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* Italian fishing boat held in Croatia

The fishing boat seized yesterday by the Croatian maritime authorities for allegedly crossing the frontier during fishing operations in the Adriatic is from the harbour of Monopoli. The news was confirmed by the Monopoli harbour master's office. There are five Apulian fishermen on board.

According to initial reports, the fishing boat was intercepted at sea yesterday afternoon by Croatian motorboats and escorted to the port of Dubrovnik. The competent Italian authorities have been informed of the incident and all institutional channels have been mobilised.

For some years, Croatia, like Albania before it, has had its own legislation to sanction cases of trespass in its territorial waters: a EUR 1 000 fine for each crew member and seizure of the boat which, as in previous cases, could even end up at auction, unless the owner is allowed to intervene.

In view of the above, can the Commission state:

1. Whether it is aware of the incident involving the Apulian fishing boat, whether it has more information and whether the EU intends to initiate a dialogue with the Croatian authorities;
2. Whether the incident falls within the strategy against illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing, and if so, whether the issue is the responsibility of the Community Fisheries Control Agency?

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

(6 July 2012)

The Commission was not aware of the incident referred to by the Honourable Member.

Under the common fisheries policy (CFP) the primary responsibility for control and enforcement lies with the Member State authorities. The Commission understood from the information reported by the Honourable Member that the competent Italian authorities have already been informed of the incident and therefore considers that the correct channels for dialogue have already been activated.

In accordance with Council Regulation 1005/2008 (IUU Regulation) if it was proven, following the investigations conducted by the flag State that the vessel was actually conducting illegal fishing operations, such as fishing without authorisation in the Croatian waters, the flag State would have to take appropriate measures in conformity with this regulation. In such a case, it is for the Commission and not for the European Fisheries Control Agency to ensure the proper follow up with the relevant Member State.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004655/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(8 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Programmi per fondi diretti, città di Potenza

Gli enti territoriali, quali Comuni e Province, sono tra i primi possibili beneficiari dei fondi diretti programmati ed erogati dalle direzioni generali della Commissione europea. Tra i fondi disponibili ci sono, ad esempio: il programma «Cultura», il programma per l'occupazione e la solidarietà sociale «Progress», il programma cittadinanza «L'Europa per i cittadini», quello per l'ambiente «Life +», quello per gestire i flussi migratori «Programma di gestione flussi migratori» e quello dedicato alle risorse umane «Programma Investire nelle persone», e tanti altri.

In merito a questo e ad altri programmi disponibili, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Ci sono programmi per i quali la città di Potenza ha fatto richiesta?
2. In caso affermativo, quali sono i progetti che hanno avuto accesso a fondi europei e con quali risultati detti programmi sono stati portati a termine?

**Risposta di Janusz Lewandowski a nome della Commissione**

(22 giugno 2012)

La città di Potenza ha già richiesto finanziamenti nell'ambito del «Fondo europeo per i rifugiati — programma per le azioni comunitarie 2009» con una proposta denominata «Cultura e Territorio» che non è stata selezionata ai fini del finanziamento.

La Commissione nota che l'onorevole parlamentare è interessato ai finanziamenti concessi direttamente a città italiane nell'ambito di programmi specifici dell'UE gestiti dalla Commissione. Qualora l'onorevole parlamentare lo desiderasse, la Commissione potrebbe preparare una tabella contenente tali informazioni per le principali città italiane che potrebbero partecipare a questi programmi. La Commissione potrebbe in tal modo risparmiare il tempo impiegato per rispondere ad ogni singola interrogazione e fornire all'onorevole parlamentare un unico insieme di dati esaustivi.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-00465/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* Programmes for direct funds, city of Potenza

Regional authorities, such as municipalities and provinces, are among the first potential beneficiaries of the direct funds programmed and disbursed by the Directorates-General of the European Commission. The available funds include those of the Culture programme, the PROGRESS programme for employment and social solidarity, the Europe for Citizens citizenship programme, the Life + environment programme, the 'Management of migratory flows' framework programme, the Investing in People human resources programme, and many others.

With regard to these and other available programmes, can the Commission answer the following:

1. Are there any programmes for which the city of Potenza has made an application?
2. If so, which projects have had access to European funds and what results have these programmes achieved?

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

(22 June 2012)

The City of Potenza has so far applied for funding under the European Refugee Fund Community Actions 2009 programme with an application entitled 'Culture and Territory'. This application was not selected for funding.

The Commission notes that the Honourable Member is interested in the funding granted directly to Italian cities from specific EU programmes managed by the Commission. Should the Honourable Member so wish, the Commission could prepare a table providing this information for the major Italian cities likely to take part in these programmes. This would save the Commission time needed to reply to each individual question and provide the Honourable Member with one single set of comprehensive data.

---



(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004657/12**  
**aan de Commissie**  
**Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE)**  
(8 mei 2012)

*Betreeft:* Fiscale vrijstelling voor gecombineerd vervoer

Richtlijn nr. 92/106/EEG van de Raad van 7 december 1992 houdende de vaststelling van gemeenschappelijke voorschriften voor bepaalde vormen van gecombineerd vervoer van goederen tussen lidstaten, heeft als doel het gebruik van gecombineerd vervoer te stimuleren.

Artikel 1 van deze richtlijn definieert gecombineerd vervoer als de combinaties weg-spoor, weg-zee of weg-binnenwateren. Desondanks staat artikel 6 de lidstaten enkel toe een fiscaal voordeel te geven voor het gecombineerd weg-spoorvervoer en niet voor de andere combinaties (weg-zee of weg-binnenwateren).

Dit lijkt te resulteren in oneerlijke concurrentie ten nadele van de ferries: vrachtwagens die de Eurotunnel tussen Calais en Folkestone gebruiken kunnen potentieel een fiscaal voordeel genieten, daar waar vrachtwagens die de ferry Calais-Dover gebruiken dit niet kunnen.

In die zin graag volgende vragen aan de Commissie:

1. Erkent de Commissie dat dit een vorm van discriminatie is? Is de Commissie bereid deze discriminatie te elimineren? Zo ja, hoe en op welke termijn? Zo nee, waarom niet?
2. Is de Commissie bereid het fiscaal voordeel uit te breiden naar de andere vormen van gecombineerd transport? Zo ja, hoe en op welke termijn? Zo nee, waarom niet?

**Antwoord van de heer Kallas namens de Commissie**  
(26 juni 2012)

De Commissie herhaalt haar opvatting, dat binnenwateren en zeetrajecten bijdragen aan een duurzaam vervoerssysteem.

De Commissie wil eraan herinneren dat zij in 1998 heeft voorgesteld om Richtlijn 92/106/EEG <sup>(1)</sup> van de Raad te wijzigen. Het voorstel <sup>(2)</sup> werd echter in 2001 <sup>(3)</sup> ingetrokken in het licht van de politieke discussie over het gezamenlijk voorstel betreffende gewichten en afmetingen.

Daar het Witboek Stappenplan voor een interne Europese vervoersruimte — werken aan een concurrerend en zuinig vervoerssysteem <sup>(4)</sup> stelt dat 30 % van het goederenvervoer via de weg over afstanden van meer dan 300 km naar andere vervoerswijzen moet worden overgeheveld, is de Commissie voornemens de huidige staat van het gecombineerd vervoer in de EU-lidstaten onder de loep te nemen als een mogelijke manier om deze verandering te bewerkstelligen. Daarbij wordt ook de in de vragen van het geachte Parlementslid beschreven situatie geanalyseerd. Eventuele toekomstige voorstellen betreffende Richtlijn 92/106/EEG van de Raad hangen af van het resultaat van die beoordeling.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Richtlijn 92/106/EEG van de Raad van 7 december 1992 houdende vaststelling van gemeenschappelijke voorschriften voor bepaalde vormen van gecombineerd vervoer van goederen tussen lidstaten.

<sup>(2)</sup> COM(1998) 414 definitief — 98/0226(SYN). Voorstel voor een richtlijn van de Raad tot wijziging van Richtlijn 92/106/EEG houdende vaststelling van gemeenschappelijke voorschriften voor bepaalde vormen van gecombineerd vervoer van goederen tussen lidstaten en voorstel voor een richtlijn van de Raad tot wijziging van Richtlijn 96/53/EG van de Raad van 25 juli 1996 houdende vaststelling, voor bepaalde aan het verkeer binnen de Gemeenschap deelnemende wegvoertuigen, van de in het nationale en het internationale verkeer maximaal toegestane afmetingen, en van de in het internationale verkeer maximaal toegestane gewichten.

<sup>(3)</sup> COM(2001)763 definitief/2 van 21 december 2001.

<sup>(4)</sup> COM(2011) 0144 definitief.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004657/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE)**  
(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* Tax exemption for combined transport

Council Directive 92/106/EEC of 7 December 1992 on the establishment of common rules for certain types of combined transport of goods between Member States is aimed at stimulating the use of combined transport.

Article 1 of this directive defines combined transport as the combination of road and rail, road and maritime services and road and inland waterways. Nevertheless, Article 6 allows the Member States to grant tax benefits only for combined road-rail transport and not for other combinations (road-maritime services and road-inland waterways).

This seems to result in unfair competition to the detriment of the ferries: lorries using the Eurotunnel between Calais and Folkestone can potentially enjoy a tax benefit but not lorries using the Calais-Dover ferry.

In this context, I would like to ask the Commission the following questions:

1. Does the Commission recognise that this is a form of discrimination? Is the Commission prepared to eliminate this discrimination? If so, how and within what period? If not, why not?
2. Is the Commission prepared to extend the tax benefit to other forms of combined transport? If so, how and within what period? If not, why not?

**Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission**  
(26 June 2012)

The Commission reiterates its view that inland waterway and maritime services contribute to sustainable transport system.

The Commission would like to recall that it had proposed in 1998 to modify the Council Directive 92/106/EEC <sup>(1)</sup>. However the proposal <sup>(2)</sup> was withdrawn in 2001 <sup>(3)</sup> in the light of the political discussions on the joint proposal regarding weights and dimensions.

As the White Paper Roadmap to a Single European transport Area — Toward a competitive and resource efficient transport system <sup>(4)</sup> aims to shift 30% of road freight over 300 km to other modes, the Commission plans to assess again the current state of combined transport in the EU Member States as one possible means to achieving this change. This will include analysing the situation described by the Honourable Member in her questions. Any future proposal regarding Council Directive 92/106/EEC depends on the outcome of that assessment.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Council Directive 92/106/EEC of 7 December 1992 on the establishment of common rules for certain types of combined transport of goods between Member States.

<sup>(2)</sup> COM(1998)414 final — 98/0226(SYN), Proposal for a Council Directive amending Council Directive 92/106/EEC on the establishment of common rules for certain types of combined transport of goods between Member States and proposal for a Council Directive amending Council Directive 96/53/EC of 25 July 1996 laying down for certain road vehicles circulating within the Community the maximum authorised dimension is in national and international traffic and the maximum authorised weights in international traffic.

<sup>(3)</sup> COM(2001)763 final/2 of 21 December 2001.

<sup>(4)</sup> COM/2011/0144 final.

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004658/12**

**aan de Commissie**

**Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE)**

(8 mei 2012)

*Betreeft:* Oneerlijke concurrentie tussen luchthavens Brussel en Charleroi

1. Wat is de stand van zaken van de opgestarte inbreukprocedure? Heeft België de Europese Commissie intussen een formeel en definitief antwoord gegeven met betrekking tot de luchtvaartnavigatieheffingen, in aanvulling op de initiële informatie die verstrekt werd op 5 juli 2011?
2. Bevat deze informatie ook een mededeling aan de Commissie over Belgische eenheidstarieven voor plaatselijke luchtvaartnavigatiediensten zoals gevraagd in Verordening (EG) nr. 1794/2006 inzake een gemeenschappelijk heffingstelsel voor luchtvaartnavigatiediensten? Welke luchthavens vallen boven de toepassingsdrempel van 50 000 luchtvervoersbewegingen?
3. Heeft België een lijst van vrijgestelde luchthavens aangeleverd?

Voor vragen 1, 2, 3 graag volgende subvragen:

- Zo ja, wanneer en wat was de inhoud van het antwoord?
  - Hoe wordt het antwoord door de Commissie beoordeeld?
  - Zo nee, waarom niet en welke actie heeft de Commissie ondernomen? Welke actie plant de Commissie eventueel nog en op welke termijn?
4. Recent werd het onderzoek naar ongeoorloofde staatssteun aan de luchthaven van Charleroi heropend. Wat is de stand van zaken? Binnen welk tijdsbestek verwacht de Commissie het onderzoek af te ronden?
  5. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van het recente rapport van de Vlaamse Luchthavencommissie <sup>(1)</sup>? Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie de bevindingen van dit rapport?
  6. Volgens het dubbelbelastingverdrag tussen België en Ierland, heeft Ierland het recht belastingen te heffen op de lonen van piloten die werken voor Ierse luchtvaartmaatschappijen. Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie het feit dat Ierland geen gebruik maakt van zijn heffingsbevoegdheid? Schendt Ierland het verbod op staatssteun en/of het vrij verkeer van werknemers, indien blijkt dat dit een sectorale maatregel is?

**Antwoord van de heer Kallas namens de Commissie**

(4 juli 2012)

1. Na verscheidene gedachtewisselingen tussen de Commissie en de Belgische autoriteiten heeft de Commissie België een met redenen omkleed advies gestuurd op grond van de niet-naleving van de procedure inzake de raadpleging van de luchtruimgebruikers met het oog op de vaststelling van het eenheidstarief. In november 2011 heeft België de Commissie in kennis gesteld van een op 12 september 2011 ondertekend koninklijk besluit waarmee de procedurele kwestie werd opgelost.
2. De Belgische autoriteiten hebben informatie verstrekt over eenheidstarieven voor terminallucht-navigatiediensten voor de luchthaven van Brussel, die volgens de Belgische autoriteiten de enige Belgische luchthaven is welke de drempel van 50 000 luchtvervoersbewegingen per jaar overschrijdt.
3. De Belgische autoriteiten hebben informatie verstrekt volgens welke alle regionale luchthavens in België onder de drempel van 50 000 luchtvervoersbewegingen blijven en enkel de luchthaven van Brussel onder Verordening (EG) nr. 1794/2006 valt.
4. De Commissie heeft op 21 maart 2012 de formele onderzoeksprocedure uitgebreid om voor 200 miljoen euro publieke overdrachten aan luchthavenbeheerder BSCA alsook verdere mogelijke staatssteun aan Ryanair in de procedure te betrekken. Na de ophanden zijnde bekendmaking van dit besluit hebben derde partijen vervolgens de gelegenheid om opmerkingen over de onderzochte maatregelen te maken. Afhankelijk van het aantal en de complexiteit van de aangevoerde argumenten zal de Commissie trachten de zaak in de komende maanden te sluiten.

(<sup>1</sup>) <http://www.serv.be/vlc/publicatie/rapport-concurrentiepositie-zaventem>.

5. Het rapport is niet aan de Commissie toegezonden. De bovenbedoelde uitbreiding van de procedure betreft de voornaamste staatssteunzaken die in dit rapport worden beschreven.

6. De Commissie is niet op de hoogte van een mogelijk geval van staatssteun zoals beschreven in de vraag. Er is meer gedetailleerde informatie nodig om een werkelijk onderzoek in te stellen en te besluiten of een dergelijke maatregel al dan niet staatssteun vormt.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004658/12  
to the Commission**

**Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE)**

(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* Unfair competition between Brussels and Charleroi airports

1. What is the state of play as regards the infringement proceeding which has been launched? Has Belgium already given the Commission a formal and definitive answer as regards air navigation charges in addition to the initial information provided on 5 July 2011?
2. Does that information also include a notice to the Commission on Belgian unit rates for terminal air navigation services as requested in Regulation (EC) No 1794/2006 laying down a common charging scheme for air navigation services? Which airports exceed the threshold of 50 000 air transport movements?
3. Has Belgium provided a list of exempted airports?

The following sub-questions relate to questions 1, 2 and 3:

- If so, when, and what was the substance of the answer?
  - How does the Commission view the answer?
  - If not, why not and what action has the Commission taken? What action is the Commission possibly planning to take and when?
4. The investigation into illegal state aid for Charleroi Airport restarted recently. What is the current situation? When does the Commission expect to wind up the investigation?
  5. Is the Commission familiar with the recent report by the Flemish Airport Commission <sup>(1)</sup>? What is the Commission's view of the findings in that report?
  6. Under the double taxation convention between Ireland and Belgium, Ireland has the right to tax the pay of pilots who work for Irish airlines. How does the Commission view the fact that Ireland does not make use of its taxation rights? Is Ireland violating the ban on state aid and/or the free movement of workers if this proves to be a sectoral measure?

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

(4 July 2012)

1. After several exchanges between the Commission and the Belgian Authorities, in October 2011, a reasoned opinion was sent by the Commission to Belgium on the ground that the procedure concerning the consultation of airspace users to set up the unit rate was not respected. In November 2011, Belgium notified to the Commission a Royal Arrêté signed on 12 September 2011 which solved the procedural issue.
2. The Belgian Authorities provided information on unit rates for terminal air navigation services for Brussels, which is according to the Belgian authorities the only airport of Belgium that exceeds the threshold of 50 000 air transport movements.
3. The Belgian Authorities provided information according to which all regional airports of Belgium are below the threshold of 50 000 air transport movements and that only Brussels falls under Regulation (EC) No 1794/2006.
4. The Commission extended the formal investigation procedure on 21 March 2012 to encompass more than EUR 200 million in public transfers to the airport manager BSCA, as well as further potential aid measures to Ryanair. Following the upcoming publication of this decision, third parties will now have the opportunity to comment on the measures under scrutiny. Subject to the number and complexity of the arguments made, the Commission will endeavour to close the case in the coming months.
5. The report was not forwarded to the Commission. The extension of procedure mentioned above addresses the main state aid issues presented in this report.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.serv.be/vlc/publicatie/rapport-concurrentiepositie-zaventem>.

6. The Commission is not aware of any possible state aid measure as described in the question. More specific information would be necessary to launch a proper investigation and conclude whether such measure would be state aid or not.

---

(българска версия)

**Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор P-004660/12**

до Комисията

**Кристиан Вигенин (S&D)**

(8 май 2012 г.)

Относно: Неравностойно заплащане за работа по Програмата на Комисията за обучение през целия живот за 2012 г., основано на национален принцип

Принципът на „равностойно заплащане за еднакъв или равностойен труд“ е основен принцип в областта на труда, поддържан от множество международни организации и документи на ЕС, включително: членове 8 и 10 от Договора за функционирането на Европейския съюз, бели книги на Комисията относно социалната политика и заетостта, резолюциите на Европейския парламент от 20 септември 2001 г. относно равностойното заплащане за еднакъв или равностойен труд<sup>(1)</sup> и от 13 февруари 1996 г. относно Меморандума за равностойно заплащане за еднакъв или равностойен труд<sup>(2)</sup>, член 21 от Хартата на основните права на Европейския съюз, членове 2 и 23 от Всеобщата декларация за правата на човека от 10 декември 1948 г., Декларацията на МОТ относно основните принципи и права в областта на труда и др.

Програмата на Комисията за обучение през целия живот за 2012 г., обаче, дава пример за противоположното и подтиква към неравенство, основано на гражданството. В общите разпоредби на ръководството за максималните допустими дневни ставки за персонала (в евро) размерът на разходите е определен на 40 EUR на ден за мениджър на проект в България. Сравнението с други държави членки е поразително: в Белгия един мениджър със същата квалификация би получавал 460 EUR, в Румъния — 84 EUR, а в Испания — 321 EUR. Дори в Хърватия мениджър на проект с равностойна квалификация би получавал повече от трикратния размер на сумата, която би получавал български гражданин за същата работа: 141 EUR на ден.

1. Подкрепя ли Комисията дискриминацията спрямо българските граждани по Програмата за обучение през целия живот?
2. Предвижда ли Комисията въвеждането на мерки за премахване на неравенствата в заплащането, основани на национален принцип, в областта на науката и научноизследователската и развойна дейност, за да насърчи реалния обмен на знания и най-добри практики между държавите членки?

**Отговор, даден от г-жа Василиу от името на Комисията**

(14 юни 2012 г.)

В съответствие с Финансовия регламент „Максималният размер на дневната ставка на разходите за персонал“ за 2012 г. и 2013 г. е приет с решение на Комисията.

Процедурата за изчисляване на дневните разходи за персонал се прилага за всички участващи държави; тя бе установена след извършването на външно проучване през 2011 г., което бе утвърдено от Комисията. Размерът на ставките се основава на последните данни на Евростат за пазара на труда (за някои държави — на националните статистически служби).

В сравнение с 2011 г. размерът на някои от ставките се понижи и някои държави членки, в това число и България, изразиха притесненията си по този въпрос. След тези оплаквания Комисията направи проверка на метода и резултатите; тя е в състояние да потвърди, че методологията е надеждна и последователна и че изчислените по нея ставки са правилни.

Като отчита факта, че понижението на ставките може да създаде усещане за несправедливост и някои практически затруднения при планирането на дейностите, Комисията понастоящем проучва възможността за актуализиране на размера на дневните разходи за персонал по работната програма за обучение през целия живот за 2013 г., за да се ограничат различията и така да се даде възможност за по-добро планиране на дейностите.

<sup>(1)</sup> ОВ С 77 Е, 28.3.2002 г., стр. 134.

<sup>(2)</sup> ОВ С 65, 4.3.1996 г., стр. 43.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-004660/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Kristian Vigenin (S&D)**  
(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* Inequality in remuneration in the Commission's Lifelong Learning Programme for 2012 based on national principles

The principle of 'equal pay for equal work' is a core labour principle, upheld in numerous international organisations and EU documents, including: Articles 8 and 10 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union; Commission white papers on social policy and employment; the European Parliament's resolutions of 20 September 2001 on equal pay for work of equal value <sup>(1)</sup> and of 13 February 1996 on the Memorandum on equal pay for work of equal value <sup>(2)</sup>; Article 21 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union; Articles 2 and 23 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 10 December 1948; the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, etc.

The Commission's Lifelong Learning Programme for 2012, however, sets quite the opposite example and foments inequality on the basis of citizenship. In the general provisions in the guide for maximum eligible daily rates (in EUR) for staff, costs are set at EUR 40 per day for a project manager in Bulgaria. The comparison with other Member States is striking: in Belgium a manager with the same qualification would receive EUR 460, in Romania EUR 84 and in Spain EUR 321. Even in Croatia a project manager with an equivalent qualification would receive more than three times the amount that a Bulgarian citizen would receive for the same work: EUR 141 per day.

1. Does the Commission support discrimination against Bulgarian citizens under the Lifelong Learning Programme?
2. Does the Commission envisage the introduction of measures to tackle inequalities in terms of pay based on national principles in the field of science, research and development in order to promote real exchange of knowledge and best practices between Member States?

**Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission**  
(14 June 2012)

In conformity with the Financial Regulation, the 'Maximum eligible daily rates for staff costs' for 2012 and 2013 were adopted by Commission decision.

The procedure for the calculation of daily staff costs is applied to all participating countries; it was created following an external study of 2011 which was validated by the Commission. Rates are based on the most recent Eurostat data on the labour market (for some countries, national statistical offices).

Compared with 2011, some rates decreased and some Member States, including Bulgaria, expressed their concern on this. Following these complaints the Commission rechecked the method and the results; it can confirm that the methodology is robust and consistent, and that the resulting calculation of rates is accurate.

Recognising that the decrease in rates may create a sense of injustice and some practical difficulties in the planning of activities, the Commission is currently exploring the possibility of updating the daily staff costs for the Lifelong Learning Programme (LLP) Work Programme for 2013 to limit variations and therefore allow for a better planning of activities.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 77 E, 28.3.2002, p. 134.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ C 65, 4.3.1996, p. 43.



*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-004661/12  
to the Commission  
Emma McClarkin (ECR)  
(8 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Tax registration

Is it legal for a company operating in one country, such as Poland, to be registered for taxation purposes in another Member State, namely the UK, and only pay tax (at a beneficial rate) in the UK, thus avoiding higher tax rates in operating countries?

**Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission  
(18 June 2012)**

When a company is tax resident in one Member State and is operating in another Member State, the allocation of the taxing rights is usually dealt with in a bilateral double tax convention between the two Member States. These conventions usually follow the OECD model tax convention. The model convention allows the country where the company operates to tax the company if the company carries on business through a permanent establishment in that country, in which case the country may tax the profits attributable to the permanent establishment.

The convention between the United Kingdom and Poland for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income and capital gains leads to the same result on this point as the model convention. Poland may therefore tax companies resident in the United Kingdom if the company carries on business through a permanent establishment in Poland, in which case Poland may tax the profits attributable to the permanent establishment.

---

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004663/12  
do Komisji**

**Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)**

(8 maja 2012 r.)

*Przedmiot:* Współpraca UE-Rosja

6 i 7 maja w Rosji odbyły się masowe demonstracje przeciwko zaprzysiężeniu Władimira Putina na stanowisko prezydenta Rosji. W sobotę kilka tysięcy protestujących w Moskwie zostało okrążonych przez siły OMON. Zatrzymano co najmniej 120 osób, w tym jednego z liderów opozycji Borysa Niemcowa. W niedzielę w opozycyjnym Marszu Milionów wzięło udział od 15 do 20 tysięcy osób. Policja rosyjska rozpędziła demonstrację, aresztowano około 450 osób, w tym Aleksieja Nawalnego i Siergieja Udalcowa.

Przypomnę, że w swojej rezolucji Parlament Europejski uznał wybory parlamentarne w Rosji za niewolne i nieuczciwe. Opinię taką potwierdziły również inne organizacje zajmujące się monitoringiem wyborów.

Łamanie swobód obywatelskich oraz praw człowieka w Rosji jest nagminne. Dla zobrazowania skali naruszeń odsyłam Komisję do raportu o stanie przestrzegania praw człowieka w tym kraju w 2012 r. <sup>(1)</sup>.

— Jakie działania zamierza podjąć Komisja w związku z zatrzymaniami opozycjonistów rosyjskich?

— Czy w kontekście zapowiedzi bojkotu Euro 2012 na Ukrainie, Komisja ma zamiar w podobny sposób odnieść się do uczestnictwa w uroczystościach związanych z zimowymi igrzyskami olimpijskimi w Soczi w 2014 r.?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu  
Komisji**

(19 czerwca 2012 r.)

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca uważnie śledzi przebieg wydarzeń w Rosji i należycie zapoznała się z rezolucją Parlamentu w sprawie wyborów parlamentarnych w Rosji. UE zareagowała na wydarzenia, które miały miejsce podczas wyborów w Rosji, jak i na te, które rozegrały się po wyborach, wydając oświadczenia i bezpośrednio przekazując swoje zastrzeżenia w rozmowach z przywódcami rosyjskimi podczas szczytu UE-Rosja, który odbył się w dniu 15 grudnia 2011 r.

Jeśli chodzi o demonstracje, które rozpoczęły się w dniach 6 i 7 maja 2012 r., Wysoka Przedstawiciel / Wiceprzewodnicząca wydała oświadczenie, w którym wyraża zaniepokojenie faktem aresztowania przywódców opozycji w Moskwie i skazania ich na karę pozbawienia wolności. W swoim oświadczeniu podkreśliła, że wolność słowa, wolność zgromadzeń i prawo do uczestniczenia w pokojowych demonstracjach są podstawowymi prawami w państwach demokratycznych. Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca Ashton wezwała Rosję do przestrzegania tych praw, również w świetle międzynarodowych zobowiązań Rosji wynikających z jej członkostwa w Radzie Europy i OBWE.

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca niezmiennie bardzo uważnie śledzi kwestie przestrzegania praw człowieka w Rosji i otwarcie omawia przypadki ich naruszeń z Federacją Rosyjską na licznych forach, od konsultacji w sprawie praw człowieka po szczyt UE-Rosja. Stale podejmowane są nowe działania w tym zakresie. Nie możemy z góry przesądzać o niepowodzeniu tych działań, decydując na kilka lat przed zimowymi igrzyskami olimpijskimi w Soczi o tym, czy UE będzie w nich uczestniczyć.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.korespondent-wschodni.org/en-gb/node/2122>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004663/12  
to the Commission**

**Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)**

(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* EU-Russia cooperation

Mass demonstrations took place in Russia, on 6 and 7 May against Vladimir Putin being sworn in to the presidency. On Saturday, several thousand protesters in Moscow were surrounded by OMON. At least 120 people were detained, including Boris Nemtsov — one of the opposition leaders. On Sunday 15 000 to 20 000 people took part in the opposition's 'March of Millions'. The Russian police broke up the demonstration and arrested around 450 people, including Alexei Navalny and Sergei Udaltsov.

Let me remind you that in its resolution, the European Parliament recognised the parliamentary elections in Russia as not being free and fair. Other organisations monitoring the elections also supported this opinion.

Infringement of civil freedoms and human rights is widespread in Russia. To demonstrate the scale of infringement, I refer the Commission to the report on the state of compliance with human rights in that country in 2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

— What action does the Commission aim to take regarding the detention of Russian oppositionists?

— Given the announcement of the boycott of Euro 2012 in Ukraine, does the Commission intend to deal similarly with participating in the celebrations for the Winter Olympics in Sochi in 2014?

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

(19 June 2012)

The High Representative/Vice-President follows closely events in Russia and has taken careful note of the Parliament's resolution on the parliamentary elections in Russia. The EU reacted to both the elections and the post-election events in Russia, via statements and by addressing directly these concerns to the Russian leaders during the EU-Russia Summit, which took place on 15 December 2011.

As regards the demonstrations which started on 6 and 7 May 2012, the HR/VP issued a statement that expressed concern with the arrests of opposition leaders in Moscow and their prison sentences. The statement stressed that the freedoms of expression and of assembly, and participation in peaceful demonstrations, were fundamental rights in democratic states. The HR/VP called on Russia to respect these rights, also in light of Russia's international commitments taken as a member of the Council of Europe and the OSCE.

The HR/VP continues to follow the situation of human rights in Russia very closely, and discusses human rights issues and infringements openly with the Russian Federation in a number of fora, from our human rights consultations to the Summit. There are constant ongoing developments in this area. These developments should not be prejudged by deciding on the EU participation in the Winter Olympics in Sochi a few years before the planned event.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.korespondent-wschodni.org/en-gb/node/2122>.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004664/12  
do Komisji**

**Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)**

(8 maja 2012 r.)

*Przedmiot:* Nowelizacja prawa prasowego w Polsce

8 maja 2012 r. odbędzie się pierwsze czytanie projektu nowelizacji prawa prasowego w komisjach Senatu RP. W reakcji na wcześniejszy wyrok Trybunału Konstytucyjnego, wskazujący na niejasność przepisów dotyczących sprostowań i odpowiedzi, senatorowie RP proponują skasowanie instytucji sprostowania, wprowadzając w jej miejsce jedynie odpowiedź prasową.

Sprostowanie nawiązuje do faktów i umieszczane jest w momencie, gdy w opublikowanym artykule znajdują się zakłamania i fałszywe tezy, które można wykazać. Zaproponowana przez senatorów odpowiedź prasowa nie musi się odnosić jedynie do faktów, a może do ocen zawartych w artykule. Odpowiedź mogłaby zostać sformułowana przez jakąkolwiek osobę, która poczuje się dotknięta przez treść artykułu, co może stać się doskonałym narzędziem nacisku na prasę drukowaną. Łatwość zamieszczania odpowiedzi spowoduje nadużywanie tej możliwości i zmusi redakcje do kosztownego drukowania opinii na temat ocen osób i instytucji im nieprzychylnych lub odpowiednio sformułowanych ogłoszeń instytucji chcących wykorzystać darmową przestrzeń reklamową. W ekstremalnym przypadku można sobie wyobrazić sytuację, w której gazeta drukuje odpowiedzi na każdy zamieszczony dzień wcześniej artykuł.

Przyjęcie senackiego projektu nowelizacji prawa prasowego będzie więc ograniczeniem możliwości formułowania niezależnych opinii przez wolne media oraz będzie obligowało gazety do publikacji poglądów, z którymi się nie zgadzają i które są dla ich czytelników nieinteresujące.

Należy się spodziewać, że dla wielu, szczególnie niewielkich, lokalnych redakcji wprowadzenie założeń proponowanych przez Senat RP będzie jednoznaczne z zakończeniem działalności. Z powyższych powodów projekt nowelizacji został skrytykowany przez Stowarzyszenie Dziennikarzy Polskich, Izbę Wydawców Prasy i Helsińską Fundację Praw Człowieka.

Wolność słowa i funkcjonowanie niezależnych mediów to wartości, które powinny leżeć u fundamentów każdego ze społeczeństw Unii Europejskiej. Co prawda zmiany opisane powyżej znajdują się dopiero w procesie legislacyjnym, ale już teraz, opierając się na precedensach, proszę Komisję o opinię, czy uważa, iż proponowane przez Senat RP zmiany naruszają wolność mediów oraz ograniczają swobodę debaty publicznej?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Neelie Kroes w imieniu Komisji**

(26 czerwca 2012 r.)

Swoboda wypowiedzi i informacji, a także pluralizm mediów, są w istocie wartościami chronionymi przez artykuł 11 Karty praw podstawowych Unii Europejskiej.

Zgodnie z artykułem 51 ust. 1 wspomnianej wyżej Karty jej zapisy odnoszą się do instytucji i organów Unii oraz do państw członkowskich tylko wówczas, gdy stosują one prawo unijne.

Kwestie sprostowań prasowych i odpowiedzi nie podlegają regulacji na szczeblu Unii Europejskiej. Dlatego zapisy Karty praw podstawowych nie znajdują w tym przypadku bezpośredniego zastosowania.

Dyrektywa Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady 2010/13/UE (dyrektywa o audiowizualnych usługach medialnych) zawiera postanowienia dotyczące prawa do odpowiedzi w programach telewizyjnych. Ponadto zalecenie 2006/952/WE Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady z dnia 20 grudnia 2006 r. w sprawie ochrony małoletnich, godności ludzkiej oraz prawa do odpowiedzi rekomenduje państwom członkowskim rozważenie wprowadzenia do prawa krajowego rozwiązań lub zastosowania praktyk odnoszących się do prawa do odpowiedzi lub równoważnych środków w odniesieniu do mediów internetowych z uwzględnieniem zapisów prawa krajowego i konstytucji<sup>(1)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> Zalecenie 2006/952/WE Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady z dnia 20 grudnia 2006 r. w sprawie ochrony małoletnich, godności ludzkiej oraz prawa do odpowiedzi w odniesieniu do konkurencyjności europejskiego przemysłu audiowizualnego oraz internetowych usług informacyjnych – Dz.U. L 378 z 27.12.2006, s. 72.

Komisja będzie uważnie monitorować rozwój wydarzeń w Polsce, w tym także zgodność propozycji legislacyjnych z zapisami dyrektywy audiowizualnej. Kontynuując aktywną politykę wdrażania prawa, Komisja przypomina, że dysponuje możliwościami działania jedynie w granicach kompetencji przyznanych jej w tym zakresie przez traktaty.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004664/12  
to the Commission**

**Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)**

(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* Press Law Amendment in Poland

The first reading of the draft Press Law Amendment will take place 8 May 2012 in the Senate committees of Poland. In response to the previous Constitutional Tribunal decree, which indicated that the provisions for corrections and replies were unclear, Polish senators are proposing to remove the institution of corrections and replace it with only press replies.

A factual correction is made when distortions and false claims, which can be proven, are found in a published article. The press reply proposed by the senators does not have to refer solely to facts but can also refer to the opinions expressed in the article. The reply could be constructed by anyone who feels affected by the content of the article, which could in turn become a powerful instrument for putting pressure on published articles. The ease with which replies can be published will cause this feature to be overused and will force editorial offices to spend a great deal of money publishing opinions from people and institutions that are unfavourable towards them, or publishing appropriately worded announcements from institutions wanting to make use of free advertising space. In the worst case scenario, a paper may have to publish replies to every article featured the day before.

If the Senate's draft Press Law Amendment is adopted, the possibility for a free press to put forward independent opinions will be limited and papers will also be forced to publish points of view with which they disagree and which are uninteresting for their readers.

We can expect that for many editorial offices, especially for small local ones, introducing the guidelines proposed by the Polish Senate will cause the offices to close. The draft amendment was criticised by the Polish Journalists Association, the Chamber of Press Publishers and the Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights for the aforementioned reasons.

Freedom of speech and the existence of independent media are values which should be the bedrock for each community in the European Union. Although the amendments described above are only at the legislative stage, I would ask the Commission to use precedents to give its opinion of the following: does the Commission consider that the amendments proposed by the Polish Senate will infringe on the media's freedom and limit the freedom of public debate?

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

(26 June 2012)

Freedom of expression and information as well as media pluralism are indeed values protected by Article 11 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.

According to Article 51(1) of the said Charter, its provisions are addressed to the institutions and bodies of the Union and to the Member States only when they are implementing Union law.

The issues of press corrigenda and answers as such are not regulated at EU level. Therefore, the provisions of the Charter cannot be directly applied in this case.

Directive 2010/13/EU (Audiovisual Media Services Directive or AVMSD) contains provisions on the right of reply in television broadcasting. Furthermore, the 2006 Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the protection of minors and human dignity and on the right of reply recommends that the Member States consider the introduction of measures into their domestic law or practice regarding the right of reply or equivalent remedies in relation to online media, with due regard for their domestic and constitutional legislative provisions <sup>(1)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 December 2006 on the protection of minors and human dignity and on the right of reply in relation to the competitiveness of the European audiovisual and online information services industry — OJ L 378, 27.12.2006, p. 72-77.

The Commission will monitor developments in Poland carefully, including if legislative proposals are compatible with the provisions of the AVMSD. Whilst the Commission will continue to pursue an active enforcement policy, it would recall that it can only act within the limits of the competences granted to it under the Treaties in this.

---

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-004666/12**

**a la Comisión**

**Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)**

(8 de mayo de 2012)

*Asunto:* Ayuda pública

El Gobierno español ha impuesto el pasado 10 de abril, y para este año 2012, un recorte adicional de 10 000 millones de euros a las Comunidades Autónomas. Dicho recorte recaerá íntegramente en Sanidad y Educación, sesrvicios públicos básicos que son competencia exclusiva de las Comunidades Autónomas <sup>(1)</sup>.

El Gobierno español justifica dicha imposición en que no hay dinero público que sostenga tal gasto y, por lo tanto, no hay ninguna flexibilidad en el déficit para las Comunidades Autónomas <sup>(2)</sup>.

No obstante, el día 7 de mayo de 2012, el Gobierno español cambió de opinión y dijo que sí hay dinero público para rescatar una entidad financiera privada, Bankia. El montante de dinero público que el Gobierno Central prevé inyectar en una primera fase se encuentra entre 7 000 y 10 000 millones de euros <sup>(3)</sup>.

Asimismo, parece que BFA, matriz de Bankia, acumula con Bankia un desfase conjunto de 20 000 millones de euros <sup>(4)</sup>.

El mismo día que se hacía pública la intervención de dicha entidad también salió en la prensa otro hecho relevante: Bankia, entidad que recibirá dinero público, tiene previsto retribuir a sus accionistas privados mediante dividiendo por un importe no menor de 150 M€ <sup>(5)</sup>.

A la luz del semestre europeo y del Reglamento (UE) n° 1173/2011. Teniendo en cuenta los artículos 87 y 89 del Tratado de la Unión Europea de ayudas públicas.

1. Qué opinión merece a la Comisión el hecho de que el Gobierno español recorte en servicios básicos, según la inflexibilidad del déficit, y luego rescate con dinero público el banco madrileño Bankia, que paga dividendos?
2. Si Bankia realiza el pago de dividendos citado, ¿qué piensa la Comisión a este respecto?
3. Bankia posee una amplia cartera de participaciones en sociedades (Iberdrola, Mapfre, IAG —antigua Iberia—, NH Hoteles, Indra, SOS... ¿Piensa la Comisión que, antes de usar dinero público en su rescate, Bankia debería liquidar todas las participaciones citadas?

**Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión**

(19 de junio de 2012)

La Comisión está al corriente de las medidas adoptadas en los ámbitos de la sanidad y la educación en el marco del necesario saneamiento presupuestario de las comunidades autónomas. Alrededor de dos tercios del desvío presupuestario en 2011 se debió a rebasamientos del presupuesto a escala regional, lo que subraya la importancia de una disciplina presupuestaria rigurosa en todos los niveles de la administración. Teniendo en cuenta el alto porcentaje que representan la sanidad y la educación en el gasto de las comunidades autónomas, las medidas anunciadas constituyen un elemento importante para que esas comunidades autónomas puedan controlar sus déficits presupuestarios.

La Comisión se congratula del reciente anuncio por el Gobierno español de nuevas medidas de apoyo a la reestructuración del sector bancario. La Decisión del Fondo de Reestructuración Ordenada Bancaria (FROB) de asumir el control de Bankia, considerado por muchos analistas un banco especialmente vulnerable y de carácter sistémico, representa un paso importante para despejar la incertidumbre de mercado.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.abc.es/20120410/espana/abcp-gobierno-impone-recorte-millones-20120410.html>

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.lavanguardia.com/politica/20120306/54264568811/hacienda-avisa-a-las-autonomias-no-hay-ninguna-flexibilidad-deficit.html>

<sup>(3)</sup> <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/dfd702ee-9840-11e1-8617-00144feabdc0.html#axzz1uCRF7Tim>

<sup>(4)</sup> <http://www.lavanguardia.com/economia/20120507/54290740183/gobierno-banco-de-espana-bankia.html>

<sup>(5)</sup> <http://www.elconfidencial.com/economia/2012/05/08/el-gobierno-nacionalizara-bfabankia-el-viernes-por-un-agujero-de-casi-20000-millones-de-euros-97576>

<sup>(6)</sup> <http://www.lavanguardia.com/local/valencia/20120506/54290060288/bankia-propondra-a-la-junta-el-reparto-de-un-dividendo-de-152-millones-la-mitad-del-beneficio.html>



Faltan por anunciar los planes concretos sobre la reestructuración efectiva del banco, la solución de los problemas ligados a su gran exposición al sector inmobiliario y el papel de las ayudas del sector público. Tras recibir más información, la Comisión evaluará estos planes, incluida su posible incidencia en las cuentas públicas y su respeto de las normas sobre ayudas estatales.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-004666/12  
to the Commission**

**Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)**

(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* State aid

On 10 April 2012, the Spanish Government imposed further cuts of EUR 10 billion on the Autonomous Communities for the current year. These cuts will be made entirely in health and education, basic public services that are the exclusive competence of the Autonomous Communities <sup>(1)</sup>.

The Spanish Government's justification for these cuts is that there is no public money to sustain such expenditure and so there is no flexibility in the deficit for the Autonomous Communities <sup>(2)</sup>.

However, on 7 May 2012, the Spanish Government changed its mind and said that there was public money to bail out a private financial institution, Bankia. The amount of public money the Central Government plans to inject initially is between EUR 7 billion and EUR 10 billion <sup>(3)</sup>.

In addition, the joint deficit of BFA, Bankia's parent company, and Bankia appears to total EUR 20 billion <sup>(4)</sup>.

On the same day that the bailout of this company was made public, the press reported another significant fact: Bankia, the institution that will receive public money, plans to pay a dividend of no less than EUR 150 million to its private shareholders <sup>(5)</sup>.

In view of the European Semester and Regulation (EU) No 1173/2011, and considering Articles 87 and 89 of the Treaty on European Union, concerning state aid:

1. What is the Commission's view on the Spanish Government's cuts to basic services, due to an inflexible deficit, and its subsequent use of public money to bail out the Madrid-based bank Bankia, which is paying out dividends?
2. What would be the Commission's view should Bankia pay these dividends?
3. Bankia has a broad portfolio of company shareholdings (Iberdrola, Mapfre, IAG (formerly Iberia), NH Hotels, Indra, SOS etc.) Does the Commission believe that, before using public money for a bailout, Bankia should liquidate all these shares?

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

(19 June 2012)

The Commission is aware of the measures adopted in the areas of health and education to underpin the necessary fiscal consolidation by Autonomous Communities. Around two thirds of the budgetary deviation in 2011 had been due to budget overruns at regional levels. This underscores the importance of strict budgetary discipline at all levels of government. Given the large share of health and education in the expenditure of Autonomous Communities, the announced measures are an important element in supporting Autonomous Communities to rein in their budget deficits.

The Commission welcomes the recent announcement by the Spanish Government of additional measures to support the restructuring of the banking sector. The decision by The Fund for Orderly Bank Restructuring — El Fondo de Reestructuración Ordenada Bancaria (FROB) to take over the control of Bankia, considered by many analysts to be a particularly vulnerable and systemically relevant bank, is an important further step to dispel market uncertainty.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.abc.es/20120410/espana/abcp-gobierno-impone-recorte-millones-20120410.html>

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.lavanguardia.com/politica/20120306/54264568811/hacienda-avisa-a-las-autonomias-no-hay-ninguna-flexibilidad-deficit.html>

<sup>(3)</sup> <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/dfd702ee-9840-11e1-8617-00144feabdc0.html#axzz1uCRF7Tim>;

<http://www.lavanguardia.com/economia/20120507/54290740183/gobierno-banco-de-espana-bankia.html>

<sup>(4)</sup> <http://www.elconfidencial.com/economia/2012/05/08/el-gobierno-nacionalizara-bfabankia-el-viernes-por-un-agujero-de-casi-20000-millones-de-euros-97576>.

<sup>(5)</sup> <http://www.lavanguardia.com/local/valencia/20120506/54290060288/bankia-propondra-a-la-junta-el-reparto-de-un-dividendo-de-152-millones-la-mitad-del-beneficio.html>

Concrete plans regarding the actual restructuring of the bank, the resolution of the problems linked to its large real estate exposure and the role of public sector support still need to be announced. After receiving more details, the Commission will assess these plans, including their potential impact on public finances and their compliance with state aid rules.

---

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004667/12  
an die Kommission  
Angelika Werthmann (NI)  
(8. Mai 2012)**

*Betrifft:* Zahlungen an die Türkei aus Mitteln des EU-Haushalts

Gemäß Darstellung der Kommission erhält die Türkei jährlich Zahlungen und Zuschüsse zum Beispiel aus „IPA“ und „Erasmus“. Allerdings scheint der Gesamtumfang an Programmen und EU-Mitteln, aus denen der Türkei EU-Mittel zufließen, umfangreicher zu sein.

1. Aus welchen EU-Programmen, Fördermaßnahmen, Fonds etc. hat die Türkei in den Jahren 2009-2012 Mittel in jeweils welcher Höhe pro Jahr erhalten?
2. Welche Planung besteht seitens der Kommission für 2013?
3. Welche Mittel (s. Pkt. 1) plant die Kommission im kommenden MFR 2014-2020 für die Türkei ein? Bitte Detailaufstellung.
4. Seit welchem Jahr hat die Türkei Mittel aus dem EU-Haushalt bezogen? Auf welche Gesamtsumme belaufen sich alle Zahlungen aus dem EU-Haushalt, welche die Türkei jemals erhalten hat, zusammengerechnet?

**Antwort von Herrn Füle im Namen der Kommission  
(20. Juni 2012)**

Die Türkei erhält seit 2007 EU-Mittel aus dem Instrument für Heranführungshilfe (IPA). Außerdem wird ihre Teilnahme an EU-Programmen (wie „Lebenslanges Lernen“, das Unterprogramme wie Erasmus umfasst) mit IPA-Mitteln unterstützt. Ausführlichere Informationen zur Vergabe von IPA-Mitteln an die Türkei im Zeitraum 2007-2012 sind dem Dokument unter folgendem Link zu entnehmen:

[http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/how\\_does\\_it\\_work/miff\\_12\\_10\\_2011.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/how_does_it_work/miff_12_10_2011.pdf)

Insgesamt hat die Türkei im Zeitraum 2007-2012 IPA-Mittel in Höhe von 3,9 Mrd. EUR erhalten. Im neuesten indikativen Mehrjahresfinanzrahmen für IPA (siehe obigen Link) sind zugunsten der Türkei 935 Mio. EUR für 2013 vorgesehen.

Wie im Kommissionsvorschlag vom 7. Dezember 2011 für eine IPA-II-Verordnung <sup>(1)</sup> dargelegt, hat die Kommission für den Zeitraum 2014-2020 die Zuweisung eines Betrags von 14,1 Mrd. EUR vorgeschlagen. Da diese Zuweisung noch nicht nach Ländern aufgeschlüsselt und auch noch nicht von der Haushaltsbehörde genehmigt ist, steht zum derzeitigen Zeitpunkt die Höhe der für die Türkei vorgesehenen Mittel nicht fest. Die Kommission wird eine solche Aufschlüsselung erstellen, wenn die Mittelausstattung für IPA II im Zeitraum 2014-2020 vereinbart wurde.

In der Vergangenheit hat die Türkei auch Mittel aus anderen Programmen wie MEDA (779 Mio. EUR für den Zeitraum 1996-2001) oder der speziellen Heranführungshilfe für die Türkei TPA (1,2 Mrd. EUR für den Zeitraum 2002-2006) erhalten.

Außerdem wurden der Türkei seit 1999 insgesamt 22 Mio. EUR aus dem Europäischen Instrument für Demokratie und Menschenrechte (EIDHR) gewährt.

Es ist darauf hinzuweisen, dass sich die genannten Zahlen auf die im EU-Haushaltsplan veranschlagten Mittel beziehen, die gemäß dem zeitlichen Ablauf der mitunter mehrjährigen Projekte ausgezahlt werden. So sind im Falle von IPA weit mehr Mittel im Haushaltsplan vorgesehen, als bisher ausgezahlt wurden.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> KOM(2011)838 endg.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004667/12  
to the Commission**

**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**

(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* Payments to Turkey from EU budgetary funds

According to information from the Commission, Turkey receives annual payments and subsidies, for example from the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance and from the Erasmus programme. It would seem, however, that the full range of programmes and EU funds from which Turkey benefits is, in fact, more extensive.

1. From which EU programmes, support measures, funds, etc. has Turkey received payments in the years 2009-2012, and how much has been received per year in each case?
2. What are the Commission's plans for 2013?
3. What funds (see point 1) is the Commission budgeting for Turkey in the coming Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) 2014-2020? Please provide a detailed list.
4. When did Turkey first start receiving funds from the EU budget? What is the total figure for all payments received by Turkey from the EU budget?

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

(20 June 2012)

Turkey has been receiving EU funding through the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA) since 2007. Funding for participation in EU programmes (such as Lifelong Learning Programme which comprises sectoral programmes like Erasmus) is also financed under IPA. For detailed information on IPA funding to Turkey from 2007-2012, the Honourable Member is kindly referred to the following link:

[http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/how\\_does\\_it\\_work/miff\\_12\\_10\\_2011.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/how_does_it_work/miff_12_10_2011.pdf)

Overall Turkey has received EUR 3.9 billion under IPA over the period 2007-2012. In line with the latest IPA Multi-annual Indicative Financial Framework (see above link), Turkey should receive EUR 935 million in 2013.

As set out in the Commission proposal of 7 December 2011 for a regulation on IPA II <sup>(1)</sup>, the Commission has proposed to allocate an amount of EUR 14.1 billion for the period 2014-2020. As the allocation has not yet been broken down by country and is subject to approval by the budgetary authority, it is not possible at this stage to determine the allocation for Turkey. The Commission envisages establishing this breakdown once there is agreement on the 2014-2020 IPA II envelope.

In the past, Turkey has also received funding from other programmes, such as MEDA (amount of EUR 779 million for the period 1996-2001) and under the Pre-accession Assistance Programme (TPA), for an amount of EUR 1.2 billion for the period 2002-06).

Since 1999 Turkey has also received a total of EUR 22 million in funding from the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR).

It should be noted that the above figures relate to budget appropriations that translate into payments from the EU budget in accordance with the schedule of the funded projects that can span over several years. In the case of IPA, it means that budget appropriations considerably exceed the amount of payments made so far.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2011)838 final.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004668/12  
alla Commissione**

**Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Mario Mauro (PPE), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Raffaele Baldassarre (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Vito Bonsignore (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Elisabetta Gardini (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Crescenzo Rivellini (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE) e Iva Zanicchi (PPE)**  
(8 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Difesa dei cristiani di Cipro e tutela della popolazione greco-cipriota

Il regime di occupazione turco ha respinto le richieste di due ecclesiastici ciprioti, del vescovo di Neapolis, Porfirio, e del sacerdote Diomidis Konstantinou, ambedue della Chiesa ortodossa di Cipro, di celebrare la messa nei territori occupati. Porfirio doveva celebrare la messa domenicale nella chiesa di San Eufemiano a Lysi, mentre il sacerdote era atteso dai fedeli alla chiesa di San Caralambo a Neo Choriò Kythreas.

L'ennesima proibizione giunge subito dopo l'inserimento del vescovo della penisola di Karpasia, Cristoforo in una lista di persone a cui è vietato definitivamente l'ingresso nei territori della cosiddetta Repubblica turca di Cipro Nord.

Dall'inizio dell'occupazione turca, 1974, si è cercato di cancellare ogni traccia di presenza cristiana e greca: infatti, sono centinaia i luoghi di culto cristiani e i monumenti archeologici saccheggiati, sconsacrati e sottoposti a vandalismi.

Considerando:

- che ogni giorno una moltitudine di turco-ciprioti — considerati dal governo della Repubblica di Cipro come cittadini a tutti gli effetti — attraversa i sette check-point al fine di raggiungere i territori liberi di Cipro per motivi di lavoro, per fare uso dell'assistenza medica gratuita o per ottenere documenti di identificazione e di viaggio della Repubblica di Cipro, in modo da poter espatriare;
- le recenti risoluzioni del Parlamento europeo a difesa dei cristiani;
- che la Repubblica di Cipro a partire dal 1° luglio eserciterà il semestre di Presidenza del Consiglio dell'UE;
- che solo la Turchia riconosce la Repubblica turca di Cipro Nord, la cui dichiarazione di indipendenza è stata dichiarata «non valida dal punto di vista giuridico» dalle risoluzioni 541 (1983) e 550 (1984) del Consiglio di Sicurezza dell'ONU;

potrebbe la Commissione far sapere quali azioni intende intraprendere a difesa dei cristiani di Cipro e a tutela della popolazione greco-cipriota?

**Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione**

(27 giugno 2012)

La Commissione rinvia gli onorevoli parlamentari alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-003084/2012.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004668/12  
to the Commission**

**Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Mario Mauro (PPE), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Raffaele Baldassarre (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Vito Bonsignore (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Elisabetta Gardini (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Crescenzo Rivellini (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE) and Iva Zanicchi (PPE)**  
(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* Defending Christians in Cyprus and protecting the Greek Cypriot population

The Turkish occupying regime has rejected requests from two Cypriot clerics, Bishop Porphyrios of Neapolis and Fr. Diomodis Konstantinou, both of the Cypriot Orthodox Church, to celebrate mass in the occupied territories. Porphyrios was scheduled to celebrate Sunday mass in the church of Saint Euphemianos in the village of Lysi, while the priest was expected by faithful at the church of Saint Charalambos in Neo Choriò Kythreas.

This latest prohibition comes shortly after the Bishop of the Karpass peninsula, Christoforos, was added to a list of people who are definitively banned from entering the so-called Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

Since the beginning of the Turkish occupation in 1974, there has been an attempt to remove every trace of Christian and Greek presence: hundreds of Christian places of worship and archaeological monuments have been ransacked, deconsecrated and vandalised.

Considering:

- that every day, a large number of Turkish Cypriots — regarded by the government of the Republic of Cyprus as citizens in every respect — cross the seven check-points to reach the free territories of Cyprus for work, to make use of the free medical care or to obtain identity and travel documents from the Republic of Cyprus, in order to be able to travel abroad;
- the recent resolutions of the European Parliament in defence of Christians;
- that on 1 July, the Republic of Cyprus will begin its six-month Presidency of the Council of the EU;
- that only Turkey recognises the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, whose declaration of independence has been declared 'legally invalid' by Resolutions 541 (1983) and 550 (1984) of the Security Council of the United Nations;

Can the Commission say what actions it proposes to take to defend the Christians of Cyprus and to protect the Greek Cypriot population?

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

(27 June 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Members to its answer to Written Question E-003084/2012.

---

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004669/12  
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin / Hohe Vertreterin)**

**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**

(8. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* VP/HR — Der Fall Julija Timoschenko

Die ehemalige ukrainische Ministerpräsidentin Julija Timoschenko wird in ihrem Heimatland in Haft gehalten. Internationalen Medienberichten zufolge soll sie in der Haft misshandelt worden sein, und ihr wird keine adäquate medizinische Behandlung zuteil.

1. Welche Maßnahmen hat die Hohe Vertreterin unternommen, um das ukrainische Regime aufzufordern, Frau Timoschenko menschenwürdig zu behandeln, ihr die notwendige medizinische Versorgung zukommen zu lassen sowie ein rechtsstaatliches Verfahren zu garantieren?
2. Welche Maßnahmen und Aktivitäten haben die Hohe Vertreterin und ihre Dienste in der Vergangenheit unternommen, um die Regierung unter Ministerpräsident Viktor Janukowitsch zu mehr demokratischer und rechtsstaatlicher Staatsführung aufzurufen?

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

(22. Juni 2012)

Die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin hat die ukrainische Führung mehrfach daran erinnert, dass die Wiederherstellung der Rechtsstaatlichkeit eine grundlegende Voraussetzung für eine politische Assoziierung mit der Europäischen Union ist. Die Durchführung freier und fairer Wahlen sowie die Beschleunigung der vereinbarten Reformen, einschließlich der Verfassungsreform, sind in dieser Hinsicht ebenfalls von zentraler Bedeutung. In der gemeinsamen Erklärung des Gipfeltreffens zwischen der EU und der Ukraine vom Dezember 2011 heißt es, „dass das Tempo der politischen Assoziierung und wirtschaftlichen Integration der Ukraine mit der EU — u. a. im Zusammenhang mit dem Abschluss und der anschließenden Umsetzung des Assoziationsabkommens — maßgeblich von der Leistung des Landes im Hinblick auf die Achtung gemeinsamer Werte und der Rechtsstaatlichkeit abhängen wird“.

Der Europäische Auswärtige Dienst (EAD) hat gefordert, dass Frau Timoschenko von medizinischem Personal ihres Vertrauens behandelt und von dem Leiter der EU-Delegation in Kiew besucht wird. Des Weiteren drängt der EAD darauf, dass die Geschehnisse, zu denen es am 20. April 2012 auf dem Weg Timoschenkos vom Gefängnis ins Krankenhaus kam, vollständig und auf transparente Weise untersucht werden sollen. Die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin hat betont, dass eine grundlegende Reform der ukrainischen Justiz Voraussetzung dafür ist, ordnungsgemäße Gerichtsverfahren für sämtliche Opfer selektiver Rechtsprechung zu gewährleisten. Die Verabschiedung einer neuen Strafprozessordnung zur Einräumung gleicher Rechte für Anklage und Verteidigung ist ein willkommener Schritt in diese Richtung, dem jedoch eine umfassende Reform des gesamten Sektors folgen muss.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004669/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**

(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — The case of Yulia Tymoshenko

The former Ukrainian Prime Minister Yulia Tymoshenko is imprisoned in her home country. According to international media reports, she has been abused during her imprisonment and has not been offered adequate medical treatment.

1. What measures has the High Representative undertaken to request that the Ukrainian Government treat Yulia Tymoshenko in a humane manner, to allow her to receive the necessary medical care and to guarantee due process of law?
2. What measures and activities have the High Representative and her services undertaken in the past to call on the government under Prime Minister Viktor Yanukovich to pursue a more democratic and constitutional form of governance?

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

(22 June 2012)

The High Representative/Vice-President has repeatedly informed the leadership in Ukraine that re-establishment of the Rule of Law is an essential prerequisite to achieving political association with the European Union. The conduct of free and fair elections, and the acceleration of agreed reforms including the constitution, will also be critical in this respect. The joint statement of the EU-Ukraine Summit in December 2011 concluded that 'Ukraine's performance, notably in relation to respect for common values and the rule of law, will be of crucial importance for the speed of its political association and economic integration with the EU, including in the context of conclusion of the Association Agreement and its subsequent implementation'.

The European External Action Service (EEAS) has requested access to Mrs Tymoshenko for medical staff trusted by her, and for the EU Head of Delegation in Kyiv, and has insisted that the events which occurred during her transfer from prison to hospital on 20 April 2012 should be fully and transparently investigated. The HR/VP has stressed that due process of law for all victims of selective justice can only be guaranteed in the event of a substantial judicial reform in Ukraine. The adoption of a new Criminal Procedure Code, which would help to ensure equality of arms between prosecution and defence, is a welcome step, but needs to be complemented by a comprehensive reform across the whole sector.

---

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004670/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**  
(8. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Hochschul-Rankings in Europa

Die Europäische Union unternimmt mit Programmen, wie zum Beispiel „Erasmus“, große Anstrengungen, die Mobilität, den europaweiten Gedankenaustausch und das interkulturelle Lernen von Studenten zu fördern. Bei der Wahl ihrer ausländischen Studienorte sind die Studenten allerdings häufig auf nationale Untersuchungen sowie die Hochschul-Rankings angewiesen, die zum Beispiel von der „Financial Times“ oder dem „Economist“ erstellt werden.

1. Inwieweit sieht die Kommission die Erforderlichkeit eines EU-weit einheitlichen Hochschul-Rankings, um den Studenten eine objektive, EU-übergreifende Entscheidungsgrundlage an die Hand zu geben?
2. Gedenkt die Kommission, hierzu tätig zu werden?
3. Wenn nein, warum nicht (ausführliche Begründung)?

**Antwort von Frau Vassiliou im Namen der Kommission**  
(22. Juni 2012)

Im März 2012 hat die Kommission eine Ausschreibung zur Umsetzung eines nutzerorientierten, multidimensionalen und internationalen Rankings für Hochschulen veröffentlicht. Die ersten Ergebnisse dieses Auftrags sollen Ende 2013 vorliegen. Das neue Ranking wird die Transparenz in der Hochschulbildung verbessern. Der Zugriff wird über eine benutzerfreundliche Web-Oberfläche erfolgen, die verständliche Informationen enthält und erläutert, was mit den jeweiligen Leistungsindikatoren für die einzelnen Bereiche gemessen wird. Mit Hilfe des Rankings werden Studierende, Hochschulen, politische Entscheidungsträger und andere Stakeholder eine auf ihre persönlichen Bedürfnisse abgestimmte Rangliste aufstellen und vergleichbare Einrichtungen einander gegenüberstellen können, so dass das Profil und die Stärken jeder Einrichtung deutlich werden. Damit das Ranking hohen Qualitätsanforderungen entspricht und als objektive Entscheidungsgrundlage dienen kann, unterliegt seine Entwicklung Qualitätssicherungsverfahren und der Aufsicht einer Beratergruppe, die die Kommission bei der Überwachung und Bewertung der Projektqualität unterstützt, um optimale Zuverlässigkeit und Transparenz zu gewährleisten.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004670/12  
to the Commission**

**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**

(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* University rankings in Europe

Through programmes such as Erasmus, the European Union is making huge efforts to promote mobility, the exchange of views throughout Europe and intercultural learning among students. However, when choosing a location for study abroad, students often have to rely on national reports and university rankings produced by, for example, the *Financial Times* or the *Economist*.

1. To what extent does the Commission recognise the need for a uniform university ranking system that covers the entire EU in order to provide students with an objective basis for making decisions?
2. Does the Commission intend to take action in this direction?
3. If not, why not (please provide detailed reasons)?

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

(22 June 2012)

In March 2012 the Commission launched a call for tender for the implementation of a user-driven, multi-dimensional and international ranking for higher education institutions with first results due end 2013. This new ranking will improve the transparency of the higher education sector. The ranking will be accessible via a user-friendly web tool that will provide clear information and explanations of what is being measured by each of the performance indicators in every dimension. It will be possible for students, higher education institutions, policymakers and other stakeholders to make their own personalized ranking, based on the five dimensions of the ranking, and to benchmark institutions against similar institutions, using the results to develop a clear picture of an institution's profile and its strengths. To ensure quality and an objective basis for decisions, the development of the ranking will be accompanied by quality assurance procedures and will be overseen by an Advisory group to advise and support the Commission in monitoring and evaluating the quality of the project, to ensure maximum reliability and transparency.

---

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004671/12  
an die Kommission**

**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**

(8. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Rückfluss der Mittel des EU-Haushaltes in die Mitgliedstaaten

Vonseiten der Kommission wird stets ausgeführt, dass rund 94 % der Mittel des EU-Haushaltes wieder in die Mitgliedstaaten zurückfließen. Hierbei nicht in Betracht gezogen wird, dass EU-Mittel auch an Drittländer gezahlt werden.

1. Wie viel Prozent der Mittel des EU-Haushaltes fließen pro Jahr an Drittländer außerhalb der EU?
2. Welche Drittländer profitieren hiervon in welcher Höhe (bitte exakte Beträge angeben)?

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

(22. Juni 2012)

1. Die Excel-Datei „Ausführliche Daten 2000-2010“, die dem jährlich von der Kommission veröffentlichten Finanzbericht <sup>(1)</sup> beigefügt ist, enthält eine Aufschlüsselung der Ausgaben aus dem EU-Haushalt nach Rubriken. Die außerhalb der EU getätigten Zahlungen sind in der Spalte „nicht-EU“ aufgeführt. Anteilsmäßig betragen diese Ausgaben 4,7 % der insgesamt getätigten Ausgaben im Jahr 2000, 5,8 % im Jahr 2001, 6,2 % im Jahr 2002, 6,6 % im Jahr 2003, 4,9 % im Jahr 2004, 5,4 % im Jahr 2005, 5,7 % im Jahr 2006, 4,5 % im Jahr 2007, 4,8 % im Jahr 2008, 5,4 % im Jahr 2009 und 5,3 % im Jahr 2010.

2. Dem Haushaltsentwurf für 2013 (COM(2012) 300 – Mai 2012) liegt ein Dokument namens „Working Document Part VII – Expenditure related to the external action of the EU“ in englischer Sprache bei. Dieses Dokument enthält eine Aufschlüsselung der Mittel nach Ländern und Instrumenten für das Jahr 2011 und ist unter folgender Adresse in Vollversion abrufbar:

<http://intracomm.ec.testa.eu/budg/bud/proc/adopt/procedure-2013-en.html>

Ein Auszug der relevanten Informationen ist beigefügt und wird der Frau Abgeordneten sowie dem Sekretariat des Parlaments direkt zugesandt.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/budget/biblio/documents/2010/2010\\_de.cfm#rap\\_fin](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/biblio/documents/2010/2010_de.cfm#rap_fin)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004671/12  
to the Commission**

**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**

(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* Return of EU budget funds to Member States

The Commission often reminds us that around 94% of the EU budget funds are returned to Member States. This fails to account for the fact that EU funds are also paid out to third countries.

1. What is the percentage of EU budget funds paid out to third countries outside the EU?
2. Which third countries benefit from this and to what extent (please provide precise figures)?

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

(22 June 2012)

1. The 'Detailed data 2000-2010' Excel file attached to the Financial Report published annually by the Commission<sup>(1)</sup> provides for the breakdown of the EU budget's expenditure by heading. The payments executed outside the EU are grouped under column 'Non-EU'. In relative terms these expenditure amounted to: 4.7% of total executed expenditure in year 2000, 5.8% in 2001, 6.2% in 2002, 6.6% in 2003, 4.9% in 2004, 5.4% in 2005, 5.7% in 2006, 4.5% in 2007, 4.8% in 2008, 5.4% in 2009 and 5.3% in 2010.

2. The 2013 draft budget (COM(2012) 300 — May 2012) is accompanied by a 'Working Document Part VII — Expenditure related to the external action of the EU'. This presents a breakdown of the appropriations by country and instruments for 2011. The full document is available at the following address:

<http://intracomm.ec.testa.eu/budg/bud/proc/adopt/procedure-2013-en.html>

An extract of the relevant information is attached in annex, sent directly to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's Secretariat.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/budget/biblio/documents/2010/2010\\_en.cfm#rap\\_fin](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/biblio/documents/2010/2010_en.cfm#rap_fin).

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004672/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**  
(8. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Aktionsprogramm für Zoll und Steuern 2014-2020 (Fiscus)

In dem Vorschlag für eine Verordnung des Europäischen Parlamentes und des Rates zur Einrichtung eines Aktionsprogramms für Zoll und Steuern in der Europäischen Union für den Zeitraum 2014-2020 (Fiscus) und zur Aufhebung der Entscheidungen Nr. 1482/2007/EG und Nr. 624/2007/EG wird unter „Artikel 4 — Allgemeines Ziel“ ausgeführt:

„Das allgemeine Ziel des Programms besteht darin, die Funktionsweise der Zollunion zu unterstützen und den Binnenmarkt durch eine Verbesserung der Funktionsweise der Steuersysteme aufgrund der Zusammenarbeit zwischen den teilnehmenden Ländern, ihren Zoll- und Steuerbehörden, ihren Beamten und externen Sachverständigen zu stärken.

Die Erreichung dieses Ziels wird unter anderem anhand des folgenden Indikators bewertet: Entwicklung der Wahrnehmung der Programmbeteiligten in Bezug auf den Beitrag des Programms zur Funktionsweise der Zollunion und zur Stärkung des Binnenmarktes.“

Auf den ersten Blick scheint es, als ob dieser „Indikator“ eher auf ein rein subjektiv interpretierbares Gefühl abzielt, mit dem Ergebnis, dass er jedweder beliebigen Interpretation Tür und Tor öffnen könnte.

1. Wie, wie oft und mit welchen Maßnahmen gedenkt die Kommission die „Entwicklung der Wahrnehmung der Programmbeteiligten“ zu evaluieren?
2. Hat die Kommission die Entwicklung von messbaren, objektiv nachprüfbaren Indikatoren und zu erreichende Zielen für dieses Programm geprüft?
3. Warum verzichtet die Kommission bei diesem Programm darauf, klare Ziele und objektiv messbare Ergebnisse zu formulieren?

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004673/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**  
(8. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Artikel 5 des Aktionsprogramms für Zoll und Steuern 2014-2020

In dem Vorschlag für eine Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zur Einrichtung eines Aktionsprogramms für Zoll und Steuern in der Europäischen Union für den Zeitraum 2014-2020 (Fiscus) werden in Artikel 5 „Spezifische Ziele“ in Absatz 1 nur 6 Aussagesätze formuliert. In Absatz 2 heißt es: „Jedes der oben genannten spezifischen Ziele wird anhand eines Indikators gemessen, der sich auf die Wahrnehmung der Programmbeteiligten in Bezug auf den Beitrag des Programms zur Verwirklichung der spezifischen Ziele stützt“.

1. Wie, wie oft und mit welchen Maßnahmen gedenkt die Kommission die „Entwicklung der Wahrnehmung der Programmbeteiligten“ zu evaluieren?
2. Hat die Kommission die Entwicklung von messbaren, objektiv nachprüfbaren Indikatoren und der zu erreichenden Ziele für dieses Programm geprüft?
3. Warum verzichtet die Kommission insbesondere bei den „spezifischen Zielen“ darauf, für Fiscus klare Ziele und objektiv messbare Ergebnisse zu formulieren?

**Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Šemeta im Namen der Kommission***(26. Juni 2012)*

Das Programm ist nur eines von mehreren Instrumenten für ein besseres Funktionieren des Binnenmarkts und der Zollunion. Dies muss bei der Bewertung der Ergebnisse des Programms berücksichtigt werden. In der Folgenabschätzung wurden für jedes (allgemeine, spezifische und operative) Ziel des Programms Indikatoren aufgestellt (siehe Teil 1 Anhang 10 und Teil 2 Anhang 7 der Folgenabschätzung). Mit diesen Indikatoren werden die Auswirkungen und Folgen des Programms und sein Beitrag zu einem besseren Funktionieren des Binnenmarkts — wenn möglich quantitativ — bewertet. Insbesondere bei den allgemeinen und spezifischen Zielen ist es wichtig, zu bewerten, wie sich die Wahrnehmung der Programmbeteiligten entwickelt hat. Die Bewertungsmethode stützt sich auf Erfahrungswerte, u. a. aus der Halbzeitbewertung 2011 der laufenden Programme.

Die Indikatoren für die Folgenabschätzung werden zu drei verschiedenen Zeitpunkten bewertet: vor Beginn, bei Halbzeit und am Ende des Programms. In einem ersten Schritt muss folglich der Ausgangszustand festgelegt werden, dem die künftigen Ergebnisse dann gegenübergestellt werden. Die Vorgaben für die Programmziele werden nach vollständiger Festlegung des Ausgangszustands ausgearbeitet.

Bei der Datenerhebung für die Indikatoren werden, soweit möglich, elektronische Mittel eingesetzt. Die Bewertung erfolgt unter Führung der Kommission. Die erforderlichen Daten werden hauptsächlich durch die Mitgliedstaaten, die Hauptbegünstigten des Programms, erhoben.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004672/12  
to the Commission  
Angelika Werthmann (NI)  
(8 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Action programme for customs and taxation 2014-2020 (Fiscus)

The proposal for a European Parliament and Council Regulation establishing an action programme for customs and taxation in the European Union for the period 2014-2010 (Fiscus) and repealing Decisions No 1482/2007/EC and No 624/2007/EC states the following under Article 4 — General Objective:

‘The general objective of the Programme shall be to support the functioning of the Customs Union and to strengthen the internal market by improving the operation of the taxation systems through cooperation between participating countries, their customs and tax authorities, their officials and external experts.

This objective will be measured, *inter alia* by the following indicator: the evolution of the perception of Programme stakeholders regarding the contribution of the Programme towards the functioning of the Customs Union and the strengthening of the internal market.’

At first glance, it would seem that this is a purely subjective ‘indicator’ that opens the door to an infinite variety of interpretations.

1. How does the Commission intend to evaluate the ‘evolution of the perception of Programme stakeholders’, how often does it intend performing such an evaluation and what measures does it have in mind?
2. Has the Commission looked into the development of measurable, objectively verifiable indicators and attainable objectives for this programme?
3. Why has the Commission not formulated clear targets and objectively measurable results for this programme?

**Question for written answer E-004673/12  
to the Commission  
Angelika Werthmann (NI)  
(8 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Article 5 of the action programme for customs and taxation 2014-2020

The proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing an action programme for customs and taxation in the European Union for the period 2014-2010 (FISCUS) simply formulates six statements in Article 5 ‘Specific objectives’. Paragraph 2 states: ‘Each of the specific objectives above shall be measured by an indicator based on the perception of Programme stakeholders regarding the contribution of the Programme to the realisation of the specific objectives.’

1. How does the Commission intend to evaluate the ‘evolution of the perception of Programme stakeholders’, how often does it intend to perform such an evaluation and what measures does it have in mind?
2. Has the Commission looked into the development of measurable, objectively verifiable indicators and attainable objectives for this programme?
3. Why has the Commission not formulated clear targets and objectively measurable results for FISCUS, in particular in relation to the ‘specific objectives’?



**Joint answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission**  
(26 June 2012)

The programme is one amongst other instruments supporting the better functioning of the internal market and the Customs Union. This has to be taken into account when measuring the performance of the programme. In the impact assessment, indicators were outlined for each objective (general, specific and operational) of the programme (see Annex A0 of Part 1 of the impact assessment and Annex A of Part 2 of the impact assessment). These indicators will measure — where possible in a quantitative way — the effects and the impact of the programme and its contribution to the better functioning of the internal market. Measuring the evolution of the view of stakeholders will be an important instrument in particular for the general and specific objectives. The evaluation method will be based on previous experiences including the 2011 mid-term evaluation of the current programmes.

Impact indicators will be measured at three different time intervals: before the start, in the middle and at the end of the programme. The first exercise will be the baseline against which the future results will be compared. Targets for the programme objectives will be established after the baseline has been completed.

Data collection for the indicators will use where possible electronic tools. The evaluation exercise will be steered by the Commission. Member States, as main beneficiaries of the programme will do an important part of the data collection.

---

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004675/12  
do Komisji**

**Konrad Szymański (ECR)**

(8 maja 2012 r.)

**Przedmiot:** Dyrektywa o retencji danych (2006/24/WE) a ochrona danych osobowych

Unijna dyrektywa o retencji danych (dyrektywa 2006/24/WE) w obecnym brzmieniu zobowiązuje europejskie firmy telefoniczne oraz świadczące usługi dostępu do Internetu do zbierania danych o wszystkich połączeniach wykonywanych przez ich klientów, niezależnie od jakiegokolwiek podejrzenia lub postępowania związanego z popełnieniem przestępstwa.

Tak uogólniona retencja danych stwarza ryzyko ujawnienia bądź nadużycia danych lub kontaktów, np. z dziennikarzami, telefonami zaufania, adwokatami, lekarzami, czy partnerami biznesowymi.

Blankietowa retencja danych uznana już została przez kilka sądów krajowych państw członkowskich za niekonstytucyjną.

Wiele państw (m.in. Austria, Belgia, Grecja, Niemcy, Rumunia, Szwecja, Australia, Japonia, Kanada, Stany Zjednoczone) ścigają przestępstwa równie skutecznie z wykorzystaniem bardziej ukierunkowanych narzędzi określonych w Konwencji Rady Europy o cyberprzestępczości, jak np. system zabezpieczania danych w związku z określonym podejrzeniem popełnienia czynu zabronionego.

— Czy Komisja skłonna jest rozważyć opcję zakazu szerokiego stosowania w UE blankietowej retencji danych na rzecz systemu ukierunkowanego zbierania danych o ruchu telekomunikacyjnym? Jeśli nie, to dlaczego?

— Czy Komisja rozważa wprowadzenie opcjonalnego charakteru dyrektywy 2006/24/WE tak, aby państwa członkowskie mogły uniemożliwić naruszanie poufnych danych osobowych?

— Czy, według wiedzy Komisji, retencja danych ma znaczący wpływ na statystyki przestępczości bądź wykrywalności przestępstwa?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Cecilję Malmström w imieniu Komisji**

(17 lipca 2012 r.)

Dyrektywa w sprawie zatrzymywania danych przewiduje zatrzymywanie przez dostawców usług niektórych danych, nie obejmujących jednak danych o treści przekazywanych informacji. Dane te mogą zostać udostępnione z uzasadnionych powodów właściwym organom na warunkach i przy zachowaniu procedur prawnych określonych w prawie krajowym zgodnie z kartą praw podstawowych. Dostawcy usług są zobowiązani wprowadzić odpowiednie środki zabezpieczające przed naruszeniem bezpieczeństwa danych zgodnie z zasadami ustanowionymi w art. 7 dyrektywy.

Żaden krajowy trybunał konstytucyjny nie stwierdził, że dyrektywa narusza prawa podstawowe.

Komisja jest świadoma obaw wyrażonych przez liczne zainteresowane strony w odniesieniu do tej dyrektywy. Komisja przygotowuje rewizję unijnych ram prawnych w sprawie zatrzymywania danych, uwzględniającą te kwestie. W tym kontekście Komisja nie rozważa jednak wprowadzenia całkowitego zakazu zatrzymywania danych dotyczących abonenta oraz danych o ruchu i o lokalizacji. Komisja zna wiele przypadków z całej UE, w których dane o ruchu i lokalizacji miały fundamentalne znaczenie dla dochodzeń prowadzonych w sprawie poważnych przestępstw i ścigania ich sprawców. Te dowody wskazują, że UE powinna w dalszym ciągu zapewniać możliwość uzyskania dostępu do takich danych przez właściwe organy przez ograniczony czas i z zastrzeżeniem odpowiednich środków zabezpieczających.

W odniesieniu do pytania o opcjonalne stosowanie dyrektywy Komisja odsyła do swojej odpowiedzi na pytanie P-2286/12 <sup>(1)</sup>.

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

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004675/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Konrad Szymański (ECR)**  
(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* Data Retention Directive and personal data protection

In its present form, the Data Retention Directive (Directive 2006/24/EC) obliges European telecommunications companies, as well as Internet service providers, to collect data on all communications made by all their clients, irrespective of any suspicion of criminal activity or action pointing to a criminal offence.

Such generalised data retention creates a risk of data leakage or the abuse of data or contacts, such as with journalists, helplines, lawyers, doctors and business partners.

Blanket data retention has already been deemed unconstitutional by some Member States' national courts.

Many states including Austria, Belgium, Greece, Germany, Romania, Sweden, Australia, Japan, Canada and the United States track criminal activity just as effectively by using more specific instruments described in the Council of Europe's Convention on Cybercrime. These include a data protection system for dealing with suspected prohibited acts.

— Is the Commission willing to consider the option of prohibiting the widespread use of blanket data retention within the EU on the telecommunications traffic data collection system? If not, why not?

— Is the Commission considering making Directive 2006/24/EC optional so that Member States can prevent the infringement of confidential personal data?

— According to the best knowledge of the Commission, does data retention have a considerable influence on crime statistics or on uncovering the criminal activity of a given state?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission**  
(17 July 2012)

The Data Retention Directive provides for the retention of certain data, not including data on the content of communications, by service providers. That data may be accessed for legitimate reasons by competent authorities, on conditions and in compliance with legal procedures set out in national law in compliance with the Charter of Fundamental Rights. Providers are required to put in place proper safeguards against data security breaches, in accordance with the principles laid down in Article 7 of the directive.

No national constitutional court has ruled that the directive is contrary to fundamental rights.

The Commission is aware of the concerns expressed by a number of stakeholders regarding the directive. The Commission is preparing a revision of the EU data retention legal framework addressing those issues. In that context, the Commission is however not considering prohibiting completely the retention of subscriber, traffic, and location data. The Commission is aware of many cases from across the EU in which traffic and location data have been of crucial importance for the investigation and prosecution of the serious forms of crime. That evidence suggests that the EU should continue to ensure that such data will be available, for a limited period of time and subject to appropriate safeguards, for access by competent authorities.

With regard to the question on an optional application of the directive, the Commission refers to its answer to Question P-2286/12 <sup>(1)</sup>.

---

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

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004676/12  
to the Commission  
Emma McClarkin (ECR)  
(8 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Graduate traineeships within the European institutions (budget line 15 01 61)

Can the Commission provide costing information for graduate traineeships within the European institutions (budget line 15 01 61), so that we know how much we are paying for these opportunities?

How many traineeships have been awarded for the money that has been spent? Can the Commission provide a detailed breakdown of the cost per traineeship?

**Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission  
(9 July 2012)**

The appropriations for the Commission traineeship programme for 2012 (budget line 15.01. 61) amount to 7 000 000 euros, i.e. 1,2% below the level of 2011 (7 087 126 euros). The Commission engages trainees in 2 sessions of 5 months each, of 575 trainees, i.e. 1 150 trainees per year.

The breakdown of costs is:

1. Contribution towards living expenditure of trainees and related costs (including accident, sickness and third party liability insurance): 6 480 000 euros.
2. Contribution towards travel expenses incurred by the trainees at the beginning and at the end of the traineeship: 320 000 euros.
3. Costs of events and activities stemming from the traineeship programme (e.g. welcome conference, visits, conferences, training, Liaison Committee): 190 000 euros.
4. Communication and dissemination of information to the public at large: 10 000 euros.

The total average cost per trainee per session is 6 087 euros. The contribution towards living expenditure is 1 071, 19 euros per month <sup>(1)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> This amount represents 25% of the remuneration of an AD5/1 grade civil servant according to the Commission Decision C(2007) 1221 of 21 March 2007.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004677/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D)**

(8 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Malattia infiammatoria intestinale

La malattia infiammatoria intestinale (IBD: Inflammatory Bowel Disease) colpisce più di 2 500 000 persone in Europa e più di 5 000 000 nel mondo, una percentuale di 1 caso di IBD ogni 200 persone. Attualmente, la causa dell'IBD è sconosciuta e non vi sono cure note.

Secondo un'indagine sull'impatto dell'IBD condotta su 5 000 pazienti affetti da questa malattia, il 21 % di essi ha subito discriminazioni sul mercato del lavoro. L'IBD è stata classificata dalla Commissione come una «malattia rara» e non vi è armonizzazione tra gli Stati membri sul riconoscimento dei pazienti affetti da IBD quali persone disabili.

L'articolo 26 della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea recita: «L'Unione riconosce e rispetta il diritto delle persone con disabilità di beneficiare di misure intese a garantirne l'autonomia, l'inserimento sociale e professionale e la partecipazione alla vita della comunità». L'Unione europea ha anche ratificato la convenzione delle Nazioni Unite sui diritti delle persone con disabilità, che stabilisce norme minime universali volte a tutelare tutta una serie di diritti civili, politici, sociali ed economici e a garantirne il rispetto.

Alla luce di tali considerazioni:

- Quali azioni intende la Commissione intraprendere per garantire «l'autonomia, l'inserimento sociale e professionale e la partecipazione alla vita della comunità» dei pazienti affetti da IBD e per evitare discriminazioni nei loro confronti?
- Ha preso in considerazione la possibilità di elaborare una strategia a livello europeo per tutelare i diritti delle persone affette da IBD nell'UE e per garantire che i loro diritti in quanto disabili siano riconosciuti ufficialmente in tutta l'Unione europea?
- Prevede di promuovere ricerche paneuropee al fine di trovare la causa di tale malattia e la sua cura? Intende organizzare campagne di sensibilizzazione a livello nazionale ed europeo per contribuire a promuovere l'inclusione sociale dei pazienti affetti da IBD?

**Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione**

(22 giugno 2012)

La Commissione è consapevole della problematica delle persone affette da malattia infiammatoria intestinale (IBD). Per quanto concerne però la gestione di tale malattia compete agli Stati membri assicurare che siano posti in atto adeguati regimi medici e sanitari.

La strategia Disabilità 2010-2020 <sup>(1)</sup> della Commissione intende agevolare l'integrazione sociale e occupazionale di tutti i disabili e assicurare che essi possano esercitare appieno i loro diritti sanciti dalla Convenzione delle Nazioni Unite sui diritti delle persone con disabilità. La definizione di persone con disabilità abbraccia tutte le persone che hanno una forma di handicap di lungo periodo che, in interazione con diverse barriere, può ostacolare la loro piena ed efficace partecipazione alla società; tale definizione può pertanto includere diversi pazienti affetti da IBD ed essi possono pertanto beneficiare delle diverse iniziative promosse nel quadro della Strategia.

La ricerca sulla malattia infiammatoria intestinale è stata finanziata nell'ambito del Settimo programma quadro di ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico (FP7) <sup>(2)</sup>. Con i suoi diversi programmi l'FP7 sostiene attualmente 19 progetti di ricerca (per un ammontare di quasi 52 milioni di EUR) nell'ambito dei quali la maggior parte dei finanziamenti è consacrata a iniziative di ricerca condotte in collaborazione tra i paesi dell'UE. L'ambito di ricerca dei progetti sovvenzionati va dalla genomica e dalla microbiomica alla diagnosi precoce dei processi patogeni, allo sviluppo di processi terapeutici e di nuovi medicinali.

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

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/home\\_en.html](http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/home_en.html)

La Commissione non intende avviare campagne di sensibilizzazione in materia. Ciò potrebbe essere fatto più appropriatamente a livello di Stato membro per tener conto della situazione specifica di ciascun paese.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004677/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D)**

(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* Inflammatory bowel disease

Inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) affects more than 2 500 000 people in Europe and more than 5 000 000 worldwide: a rate of 1 case of IBD per 200 people. At present, the cause of IBD is unknown, and there is no known cure.

The IBD Impact Survey, conducted on 5 000 IBD patients, shows that 21% of them have suffered discrimination in the labour market. IBD is categorised as a 'rare disease' by the Commission, and there is no harmonisation across the Member States as regards recognising IBD patients as people who are affected by disability.

Article 26 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union states: 'The Union recognises and respects the right of persons with disabilities to benefit from measures designed to ensure their independence, social and occupational integration and participation in the life of the community', and the EU has ratified the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, which lays down universal minimum standards protecting and guaranteeing a whole range of civil, political, social and economic rights.

Bearing all these points in mind:

- What action is the Commission going to take in order to ensure the 'independence, social and occupational integration and participation in the life of the community' of IBD patients and to prevent discrimination against them?
- Has the Commission considered the possibility of developing a Europe-wide strategy to protect the rights of IBD people in the EU and to ensure that their rights as disabled people are officially recognised throughout the EU?
- Is the Commission considering promoting pan-European research to find the cause of, and a cure for, this disease? Is the Commission intending to develop awareness-raising campaigns at national and European level to help promote the social inclusion of IBD patients?

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

(22 June 2012)

The Commission is aware of the burden of people suffering from inflammatory bowel diseases (IBD). In terms of managing these diseases, however, it is for Member States to ensure that there are adequate medical and health systems in place.

The Commission's Disability Strategy 2010-2020 <sup>(1)</sup> aims at facilitating the social and occupational integration of all persons with a disability, and ensuring that they can fully exercise their rights as enshrined in the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Persons with a disability are defined as anybody with a form of long-term impairment which, in interaction with various barriers, may hinder their full and effective participation in society; this definition may therefore include a number of patients affected by IBD and they will then benefit from the various initiatives promoted in the framework of the strategy.

Research on Inflammatory bowel diseases has consistently been financed within the 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7) <sup>(2)</sup>. Through its various programmes, FP7 is currently supporting 19 research projects (representing almost EUR 52 million), where a large part of these funds is devoted to collaborative research across EU countries. The areas of research covered by the supported projects range from genomics and microbiomics, early diagnosis of the pathogenetic processes, to development of therapeutic processes and novel drugs.

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

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/home\\_en.html](http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/home_en.html)

The Commission does not intend to launch awareness-raising campaigns in this respect. This could more appropriately be done at Member State level to take account of the specific situation in each country.

---



(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004681/12**

**à Comissão**

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**

(8 de maio de 2012)

*Assunto:* Aumento do roubo de metais nos países da União Europeia

Considerando que:

- O furto de metais, em especial do cobre, está a aumentar em vários Estados-Membros da UE,
- A situação descrita começa a afetar seriamente o funcionamento de infraestruturas essenciais para os transportes, telecomunicações e o setor da energia,
- Em Portugal, as ocorrências duplicaram em relação ao ano passado e os prejuízos ascendem a dezenas de milhões de euros,
- A abundância destas peças, a sua diversidade e a sua dispersão geográfica dificultam a proteção das referidas infraestruturas, tornando o seu furto relativamente fácil para organizações criminosas ou indivíduos, que obtêm avultados benefícios com a fundição das peças roubadas e a venda da matéria obtida a negociantes em ferro-velho ou transformadores,
- Obras em curso são vandalizadas, redes elétricas são inutilizadas, e empresas inviabilizadas;

Tendo em conta a resposta da Comissão ao meu requerimento E-008787/2011;

Pergunto à Comissão:

- Está a Comissão em condições de informar dos resultados da criação da rede informal de pontos de contacto especializados em abordagens administrativas, bem como da instituição de um sistema de certificação?

**Resposta dada por Cecilia Malmström em nome da Comissão**

(22 de junho de 2012)

A Comissão remete para a resposta dada às perguntas E-008787/2011 e E-0000868/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

No que diz respeito a possíveis sistemas a serem utilizados na luta contra o furto de metais, a Comissão está consciente da dimensão do problema e regista as ações tomadas ou propostas nos Estados-Membros — como é o caso do Reino Unido — que são especialmente afetados por este problema. Contudo, na atual fase, a Comissão não tenciona propor a introdução de medidas obrigatórias à escala da UE específicas para furto de metais. No entanto, continuaremos a acompanhar de perto a situação.

---

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

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004681/12  
to the Commission**

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**

(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* Rise in metal theft in EU countries

Given that:

- Metal theft, particularly copper theft, is on the rise in several EU Member States,
- This situation is starting to seriously affect the operation of essential infrastructure for transport, telecommunications and the energy sector,
- Incidents in Portugal have doubled since last year and the losses amount to tens of millions of euros,
- The abundance of these parts, their diversity and their geographical distribution hinder the protection of such infrastructures, making theft relatively easy for criminal organisations or individuals, who reap huge rewards from melting the stolen items and selling the resulting material to scrap metal dealers or metalworkers,
- Works in progress are vandalised, power grids are rendered unusable, and companies are destroyed.

In view of the Commission's response to my Written Question E-008787/2011, I would ask:

- Is it able to report on the results of creating an informal network of specialised contact points as part of the management strategy, and of establishing a certification system?

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

(22 June 2012)

The Commission would like to refer to the reply it provided to Questions E-008787/2011 and E-0000868/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

As regards possible systems which could be used to counter metal theft, the Commission is aware of the extent of the problem and takes note of the range of actions which are being taken or proposed in those Member States — such as the United Kingdom — which are particularly affected by this problem. However, at this stage, the Commission has no plans to propose the introduction of mandatory EU-wide measures specific to metal theft. Nevertheless we will continue to closely monitor the situation.

---

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

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004682/12**

**à Comissão**

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**

(8 de maio de 2012)

Assunto: Relatório «Situação Mundial da Infância 2012»

Segundo o relatório da Unicef sobre a «Situação Mundial da Infância 2012», a vida nas cidades está a atirar para a rua milhares de crianças. O relatório indica que, apesar de os estudos demonstrarem que as crianças urbanas têm melhores índices de saúde, educação e proteção do que as crianças que nascem e crescem em ambientes rurais, a Unicef distingue as que se desenvolvem saudavelmente e as que sobrevivem em péssimas condições. Muitas vivem em estado de marginalização, vulnerabilidade e privação. Estas crianças ficam muitas vezes excluídas de cuidados de saúde e acesso à educação.

Pergunto à Comissão:

- Tem conhecimento deste estudo?
- Se tem conhecimento do número de crianças que se encontram nesta situação nos Estados-Membros da União?
- Que tipo de programas existem na UE para promover a educação e integração das crianças que se encontram nesta situação?

**Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão**

(4 de julho de 2012)

A Comissão conhece o relatório da Unicef a que o Sr. Deputado faz referência.

Segundo os dados mais recentes de um inquérito da UE sobre rendimento e condições de vida <sup>(1)</sup>, elaborado em 2010, 26,9 % das crianças com menos de 18 anos que vivem na UE <sup>(2)</sup> corriam o risco de pobreza ou exclusão social.

Apesar de caber aos Estados-Membros a competência pelas políticas de combate à pobreza infantil, a UE pode apoiar e complementar a ação nacional. No quadro do método aberto de coordenação aplicado à proteção social e à inclusão social <sup>(3)</sup>, foram desenvolvidos novos indicadores e ferramentas analíticas. A coordenação à escala da UE levou a uma melhor compreensão das determinantes da pobreza infantil, conferindo prioridade a esta questão na agenda política. A Comissão está atualmente a preparar uma recomendação sobre pobreza infantil e a trabalhar em conjunto com os Estados-Membros para definir princípios e indicadores comuns com o objetivo de dar respostas mais eficazes ao problema.

No quadro da estratégia Europa 2020, foi definida uma meta global para a pobreza, tendo vários Estados-Membros fixado os seus próprios objetivos em matéria de pobreza infantil. A Análise Anual do Crescimento 2012 reconhece a necessidade de proteger as crianças do impacto da crise e emite várias recomendações a países específicos no sentido de combater a pobreza infantil. O principal objetivo da agenda da UE em prol dos direitos das crianças é protegê-las em todas as ações relevantes da UE. Entre estas incluem-se o ensino e o acolhimento da primeira infância e medidas para reduzir o abandono escolar precoce <sup>(4)</sup>. O FSE <sup>(5)</sup> e o FEDER <sup>(6)</sup> prestam apoio a áreas como a educação, o acolhimento de crianças e a habitação e facilitam a desinstitucionalização das crianças. Nas zonas rurais, o Feader <sup>(7)</sup> proporciona apoios sob a forma de instalações de acolhimento de crianças, ensino e atividades recreativas. Existem igualmente programas da UE que prestam ajuda alimentar em escolas <sup>(8)</sup> e a pessoas em situação de privação <sup>(9)</sup>. O programa Progress financia a realização de análises e estudos, o estabelecimento de redes e projetos transnacionais de experimentação social sobre pobreza infantil.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/ewco/surveys/national/countries/eu\\_silc2005\\_6.htm](http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/ewco/surveys/national/countries/eu_silc2005_6.htm)

<sup>(2)</sup> Cerca de 24 milhões do total de 90 milhões.

<sup>(3)</sup> Para uma visão de conjunto, ver relatório «Tackling child poverty and social exclusion, promoting child well-being», aprovado pelo CPS em 6 de junho de 2012.

<sup>(4)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/education/school-education/childhood\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/education/school-education/childhood_en.htm)

<sup>(5)</sup> Fundo Social Europeu.

<sup>(6)</sup> Fundo Europeu de Desenvolvimento Regional.

<sup>(7)</sup> Fundo Europeu Agrícola de Desenvolvimento Rural.

<sup>(8)</sup> Programas da UE «Fruta nas Escolas» e «Leite Escolar».

<sup>(9)</sup> Programa Europeu de Ajuda Alimentar às Pessoas mais Desfavorecidas.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004682/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Nuno Melo (PPE)**  
(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* The 'State of the World's Children 2012' report

According to the Unicef report on the 'State of the World's Children 2012', city living is driving thousands of children onto the street. The report notes that, while studies show health, education and protection indicators are better for urban children than children who are born and grow up in the countryside, Unicef distinguishes between those who develop healthily and those who survive in appalling conditions. Many live in marginalised, vulnerable and deprived circumstances. These children are often excluded from healthcare and access to education.

I ask the Commission:

- Is it aware of this study?
- Does it know how many children are in this situation in the Member States of the European Union?
- What kind of programmes are there in the EU to promote the education and integration of children in this situation?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission**  
(4 July 2012)

The Commission is familiar with the Unicef report referred to.

According to the latest 2010 figures from the EU survey on income and living conditions <sup>(1)</sup>, 26.9% of children under 18 living in the EU <sup>(2)</sup> were at risk of poverty or social exclusion.

While the Member States have competence for policy to address child poverty, the EU can support and supplement national action. New analytical tools and indicators were developed under the Open Method of Coordination on Social Protection and Social Inclusion <sup>(3)</sup>. EU coordination led to a better understanding of the determinants of child poverty and has put it higher on the political agenda. The Commission is currently preparing a recommendation on child poverty and is working together with the Member States on common principles and indicators to tackle this issue more effectively.

A headline target for poverty was set under the Europe 2020 strategy, several Member States have set their own child poverty targets. The 2012 Annual Growth Survey recognises the need to protect children from the impact of the crisis and several Country Specific Recommendations address child poverty. The main goal of the EU agenda for the rights of the child is to protect children in all relevant EU actions. These actions include early childhood education and care and measures to reduce early school-leaving <sup>(4)</sup>. The ESF <sup>(5)</sup> and ERDF <sup>(6)</sup> provide support for education, childcare and housing and have facilitated de-institutionalisation. In rural areas, the EARDF <sup>(7)</sup> provides support for childcare, educational and recreational facilities. EU schemes exist that provide food aid in schools <sup>(8)</sup> and to deprived people <sup>(9)</sup>. The Progress programme has financed peer reviews, studies, networks and transnational social experimentation projects on child poverty.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/ewco/surveys/national/countries/eu\\_silc2005\\_6.htm](http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/ewco/surveys/national/countries/eu_silc2005_6.htm)

<sup>(2)</sup> About 24 million of the 90 million total.

<sup>(3)</sup> For an overview see the report 'Tackling child poverty and social exclusion, promoting child well-being' adopted by the SPC on 6 June 2012.

<sup>(4)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/education/school-education/childhood\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/education/school-education/childhood_en.htm)

<sup>(5)</sup> European Social Fund.

<sup>(6)</sup> European regional Development Fund.

<sup>(7)</sup> European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development.

<sup>(8)</sup> EU School Fruit Scheme and School Milk Scheme.

<sup>(9)</sup> European Food Aid programme for the Most Deprived People.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004683/12  
to the Commission  
Daniel Hannan (ECR)  
(8 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Turkish as an official language of the European Parliament

If the Commission acknowledges the jurisdiction of the Republic of Cyprus over the entire island, why is Turkish not an official language of the European Parliament?

**Answer given by M. Barroso on behalf of the Commission  
(25 June 2012)**

As the Commission has pointed out in its response to the Written Question E-6131/07 by Mr Marios Matsakis <sup>(1)</sup>, the official languages of the European Union are determined in Regulation N° 1/1958 of the Council (Article 1) <sup>(2)</sup>.

The terms of the Accession Treaty of the Republic of Cyprus to the European Union in 2004 did not add Turkish to this list.

---

---

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

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 17, 6.10.1958, as last amended by Regulation (EC) No 1791/2006, OJ L 363, 20.12.2006.

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004684/12**  
**aan de Commissie**  
**Barry Madlener (NI)**  
(8 mei 2012)

*Betref:* Persvrijheid in Turkije: nog slechter dan in Oeganda

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht <sup>(1)</sup> van „Reporters without Borders” dat Turkije 10 plaatsen is gedaald op de „Press Freedom Index 2011/2012” en ondertussen terug te vinden is op de 148ste plaats van de 179 gemeten landen?
2. Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie het gegeven dat Turkije betreft persvrijheid nog slechter scoort dan bijvoorbeeld Oeganda, Colombia en Tunesië?
3. Welke gevolg heeft de belabberde persvrijheid in Turkije voor het toetredingsproces?
4. Als „vrijheid van expressie en informatie” <sup>(2)</sup> één van de belangrijkste basisrechten van de EU zijn, hoe kan het dan zijn dat de Commissie bijvoorbeeld Oekraïne boycot, maar wel doorgaat met de toetredingsonderhandelingen met Turkije, een land waar tientallen journalisten zijn opgesloten?
5. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat, gezien het feit dat kandidaat-lidstaat Turkije elk jaar slechter scoort op zowel het gebied van persvrijheid als op bestrijding van corruptie, direct zou moeten worden gestopt met de toetredingsonderhandelingen? Zo neen, waarom niet?

**Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie**  
(3 juli 2012)

Een van de belangrijkste taken van de Commissie in het kader van de lopende onderhandelingen met Turkije is erop toezien dat het land voldoet aan de politieke criteria van Kopenhagen, waarvan de grondrechten en de vrijheid van meningsuiting een belangrijk deel uitmaken.

De Commissie is bekend met het door het geachte Parlementslid genoemde verslag, en volgt in het algemeen de situatie van de vrijheid van meningsuiting in Turkije met bezorgdheid. Zij schenkt hierbij bijzondere aandacht aan het grote aantal opgesloten journalisten en het grote aantal gerechtelijke procedures tegen journalisten. Uit het voortgangsverslag 2011 van de Commissie kwamen een aantal belangrijke kwesties naar voren die moeten worden behandeld om deze aantallen terug te dringen. Zo moeten met name bepaalde artikelen van het Turkse strafwetboek en de antiterreurwet worden gewijzigd en moet de rechtspraak worden veranderd.

De Commissie heeft kennis genomen van het derde pakket gerechtelijke hervormingen dat de Turkse regering heeft voorgesteld aan het Turkse parlement, dat het voorstel momenteel behandelt. De Commissie staat positief tegenover de hierin opgenomen voorstellen om het onmogelijk te maken publicaties die onderzocht worden, preventief op te schorten en om rechters te verplichten voorlopige hechtenis van verdachten duidelijker te motiveren. De Commissie heeft echter ook duidelijk gemaakt dat er meer nodig is om het recht op vrijheid van meningsuiting, het recht op vrijheid en veiligheid en het recht op een eerlijk proces te waarborgen. In de eerste plaats moeten wijzigingen worden aangebracht in de bepalingen van het Turkse strafwetboek, de antiterreurwet en het wetboek van strafvordering waarin misdrijven die verband houden met terrorisme worden gedefinieerd, teneinde een duidelijk onderscheid te maken tussen het uiten van een mening en het aanzetten tot het gebruik van geweld.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://en.rsf.org/press-freedom-index-2011-2012,1043.html>

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://www.europa-nu.nl/id/viz6c7z6jkza/nieuws/world\\_press\\_freedom\\_day\\_en?ctx=vim%b2bzlxcxy](http://www.europa-nu.nl/id/viz6c7z6jkza/nieuws/world_press_freedom_day_en?ctx=vim%b2bzlxcxy).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004684/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Barry Madlener (NI)**  
(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* Press freedom in Turkey: even worse than in Uganda

1. Is the Commission familiar with the report <sup>(1)</sup> by the organisation Reporters without Borders according to which Turkey fell 10 places on the 'Press Freedom Index 2011/2012' and now ranks 148th on a list of the 179 countries evaluated?
2. How does the Commission respond to the fact that Turkey scores worse in terms of press freedom than, for instance, Uganda, Colombia and Tunisia?
3. What consequence does the appalling level of press freedom in Turkey have for the accession process?
4. As 'freedom of expression and information' <sup>(2)</sup> is one of the most important of the EU's fundamental rights, how can it be that the Commission is boycotting Ukraine, for instance, but is moving forward with accession negotiations with Turkey, a country where dozens of journalists are imprisoned?
5. Does the Commission agree with the Dutch Party for Freedom that, given the fact that Turkey, a candidate country, scores worse and worse each year in the area of press freedom and in the fight against corruption, accession talks should be stopped immediately? If not, why not?

**Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission**  
(3 July 2012)

Monitoring Turkey's compliance with the Copenhagen political criteria, of which fundamental rights and freedom of expression in particular are an important aspect, is one of the core tasks of the Commission in the framework of the ongoing negotiations with Turkey.

The Commission is familiar with the report mentioned by the Honourable Member, and more in general the Commission is following with concern the situation in Turkey as regards freedom of expression. The high number of journalists in prison and the high number of judicial proceedings against journalists have the Commission's close attention. The Commission in its 2011 Progress report on Turkey has identified a number of key issues to be addressed in order to curb these numbers, notably the amendment of articles in the Turkish Criminal Code and anti-terrorism law, and changes in judicial practice.

The Commission has taken note of a third judicial reform package presented by the Turkish government to the Turkish Grand National Assembly, where it is currently pending, and welcomed the proposals it contains to abolish the possibility to preventively suspend publications pending investigations, and the obligation for judges to more clearly justify the decision to detain suspects on remand. However, the Commission also made it very clear that more is needed to ensure the right to freedom of expression, the right to liberty and security and the right to a fair trial. Most importantly, there needs to be a change in the provisions in the Turkish Criminal Code, the Anti-Terror Law and the Code of Criminal Procedures which define crimes related to terrorism, in order to make a clear distinction between the expression of opinions and incitement to the use of violence.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://en.rsf.org/press-freedom-index-2011-2012,1043.html>

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://www.europa-nu.nl/id/viz6c7z6jka/nieuws/world\\_press\\_freedom\\_day\\_en?ctx=vim2bzqlxcsy](http://www.europa-nu.nl/id/viz6c7z6jka/nieuws/world_press_freedom_day_en?ctx=vim2bzqlxcsy).

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004685/12**

**an die Kommission**

**Ismail Ertug (S&D)**

(8. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Bildungsreform in der Türkei

Im Mai 2012 wurde die Zahl der Pflichtschuljahre in der Türkei auf 12 angehoben (ein Vorgang, der allgemein als die „4+4+4-Reform“ bezeichnet wurde), gleichzeitig wurde das Einschulungsalter auf fünf Jahre herabgesetzt. Nach den ersten vier Schuljahren müssen sich die Kinder zwischen einer allgemeinen, einer technischen und einer religiösen Ausbildung entscheiden.

Vor allem in ländlichen Gebieten könnte dieses Gesetz Eltern dazu veranlassen, ihre Kinder vorzeitig aus der Schule zu nehmen.

1. Inwieweit geht die Kommission ernsthaft davon aus, dass ein neunjähriges Kind über eine hinreichende Reife verfügt, um schon nach dem vierten Schuljahr eine derart grundlegende Entscheidung zu treffen?
2. Welche Maßnahmen regt die Kommission an, um Mädchen vor allem in ländlichen Gebieten vor einem vorzeitigen Schulabbruch zu schützen?
3. Wie bewertet die Kommission ein solches Gesetz hinsichtlich seiner Kompatibilität mit den europäischen Standards?

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

(26. Juni 2012)

Die Kommission hat die Debatte über die Rechtsvorschriften zur Änderung des Gesetzes über die Grundschulbildung im türkischen Parlament und in der Gesellschaft aufmerksam verfolgt. Sie ist der Auffassung, dass wesentliche Änderungen des nationalen Bildungssystems das Ergebnis breit angelegter Konsultationen sein sollten und ermutigt alle Seiten, sich an einer konstruktiven Debatte zu beteiligen.

Die Kommission wird das Gesetz im Rahmen des Fortschrittsbericht 2012 über die Türkei eingehend überprüfen. Es enthält einige positive Elemente wie die Anhebung der Schulpflicht von acht auf zwölf Jahren, was sich möglicherweise positiv auf die nach wie vor hohe Anzahl der Schulabbrecher und der häufigen Schulverweigerung insbesondere in ländlichen Gebieten und in den Vorstädten im Osten und Südosten des Landes auswirken könnte. Ferner könnte der neue Ansatz für den Hausunterricht Kindern von Saisonarbeitern zugutekommen.

Spezifische Aspekte wie die Bildung für Mädchen oder Kinderarbeit müssen analysiert und mit der Umsetzung des Gesetzes angegangen werden.

Bezüglich des Alters, in dem Kinder in verschiedene Schularten wechseln, stellt die Kommission in ihrer Mitteilung „Bessere Kompetenzen für das 21. Jahrhundert: eine Agenda für die europäische Zusammenarbeit im Schulwesen“<sup>(1)</sup> aus dem Jahr 2008 fest, dass der Großteil der verfügbaren Erkenntnisse darauf hindeutet, dass sich durch eine frühe Differenzierung, also die frühzeitige Aufteilung der Schüler auf verschiedene Schultypen, die auf den sozialen Hintergrund zurückzuführenden Unterschiede beim Bildungsniveau noch stärker ausprägen können.

Als Beitrittsland muss die Türkei im Einklang mit dem EU-Besitzstand, den Bestimmungen der Europäischen Menschenrechtskonvention und der Rechtsprechung des Europäischen Gerichtshofes für Menschenrechte das Recht auf Bildung für alle, Jungen und Mädchen, in Städten und in ländlichen Gebieten, tatsächlich gewährleisten.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> KOM(2008)425 endg.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004685/12  
to the Commission  
Ismail Ertug (S&D)  
(8 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Education reform in Turkey

In May 2012 the number of compulsory years of schooling in Turkey was raised to 12 (in what is widely known as the 4+4+4 reform), and the age of enrolment reduced to five. After the first four years children have to decide between a general, technical or religious education.

Especially in rural areas, this law could lead parents to withdraw their children from school prematurely.

1. Does the Commission seriously hold the opinion that a nine-year-old child has sufficient maturity to make such a crucial decision after the fourth grade?
2. What measures does the Commission suggest in order to protect girls, especially in rural areas, from dropping out of school prematurely?
3. How does the Commission view such a law as regards compatibility with European standards?

**Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission  
(26 June 2012)**

The Commission has closely followed the debate in the Turkish parliament and society on legislation amending the law on primary education. The Commission believes any important changes to the national educational system should result from a broad consultation and encourages all sides to engage in a constructive debate.

The Commission will examine the law in detail in the context of the Turkey 2012 Progress Report. The law contains some positive elements such as the extension of compulsory education from eight to 12 years, which could potentially bring some improvements to the persisting drop-out and absenteeism rates notably in rural and suburban areas in the East and South-east of the country, and children of seasonal workers could benefit from the new approach to home schooling.

Specific aspects such as education of girls, or child labour, need to be analysed and addressed through the implementation of the law.

As for the age at which children are placed in different school types in its 2008 Communication 'Improving competences for the 21st Century: an Agenda for European Cooperation on Schools' <sup>(1)</sup>, the Commission notes that the bulk of available evidence indicates that early tracking into different school types can exacerbate differences in pupils' educational attainment due to social background.

Turkey, as a country negotiating accession to the EU, needs to guarantee in practice the right to education for all, boys or girls, in urban or rural areas, in accordance with the EU acquis, the provisions of the European Convention on Human Rights and the case law of the European Court of Human Rights.

---

(1) COM(2008) 425 final.

(Verzjoni Maltija)

**Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004687/12**

**lill-Kummissjoni**  
**Simon Busuttill (PPE)**  
 (8 ta' Mejju 2012)

Suġġett: Elezzjonijiet fil-Libja

Il-Viċi Kap tad-Divizjoni tal-Magreb tas-Servizz Ewropew għall-Azzjoni Esterna (SEAE) kien rappurtat li ddikjara li s-SEAE qed jgħin l-awtoritajiet fil-Libja jippreparaw għall-elezzjonijiet.

Tista' l-Kummissjoni tispeċifika:

- Liema tip ta' assistenza qed tinghata l-Libja għall-ghanijiet ta' elezzjonijiet?
- Liema huma l-oqsma li fihom il-Libja għandha bżonn l-aktar għajnuna għall-ghanijiet ta' elezzjonijiet?
- Liema rwol tipprevedi għall-NGOs f'dawn l-elezzjonijiet u fit-trawwim tal-ambjent demokratiku neċessarju fil-Libja?
- Liema rizorsi jew fondi qed tagħmel disponibbli l-UE għall-NGOs għall-ghanijiet imsemmija hawn fuq?
- Jekk hijiex kunfidenti li l-preparazzjonijiet għall-elezzjonijiet fil-Libja mexjin fit-triq it-tajba?

**Tweġiba mogħtija mir-Rappreżentant Għoli/il-Viċi President Ashton f'isem il-Kummissjoni**

(19 ta' Ġunju 2012)

Fit-thejġija tagħha għall-elezzjonijiet, il-Libja talbet għall-għajnuna f'diversi oqsma. L-għajnuna tal-UE hija kkoordinata taħt it-tmexxija tan-NU biex jiġi żgurat li ma tirdoppjax l-isforzi tal-oħrajn. Għaldaqstant, hija ma tkoprix l-oqsma kollha tal-għajnuna elettoral.

L-UE qed tiffoka l-appoġġ tagħha għall-elezzjonijiet fuq l-oqsma li ġejjin:

- il-finanzjament ta' esperti li jahdmu mal-Kumitat tal-Elezzjonijiet Nazzjonali permezz tat-tim tan-NU ddedikat għall-elezzjoniet;
- il-kopertura mill-midja — it-tahriġ tal-ġurnalisti fi shubija mal-Internews u mad-Deutsche Welle; l-ghoti ta' appoġġ għal netwerk ta' ġurnalisti Libjani indipendenti li jiffoka fuq l-elezzjonijiet u fuq id-dibattiti bejn iċ-ċittadini, permezz ta' proġett mal-RSF, il-monitoraġġ tal-midja permezz ta' proġett ma' IDEA;
- l-edukazzjoni ċivika — qed jiġu implimentati żewġ programmi tal-UE minn ACTED u minn EUNIDA/Crown Agents li qed jahdmu fuqhom flimkien;
- l-elezzjonijiet lokali: proġett implimentat minn konsorzju magħmul minn IDEA, ECES, NMID, EPD u l-Club De Madrid, qed jappoġġja l-organizzazzjoni tal-elezzjonijiet lokali u l-proċess tar-rikonċiljazzjoni nazzjonali;
- il-valutazzjoni tal-elezzjonijiet — l-UE se tifforma Tim għall-Valutazzjoni tal-Elezzjonijiet għall-elezzjonijiet ta' Ġunju.

L-NGOs għandhom rwol ewlieni fl-elezzjonijiet u fil-proċess ta' tranżizzjoni demokratika. Il-programmi attwali tal-UE fil-Libja jammontaw għal aktar minn EUR 30 miljun. Dawn jinkludu komponent speċifiku għall-promozzjoni tal-NGOs (ta' kważi EUR 10 miljun). Il-biċċa l-kbira ta' dawn il-programmi għandhom komponent għall-elezzjonijiet li huwa marbut ma' objettivi oħrajn bħalma huma l-bini tas-soċjetà ċivili u r-rikonċiljazzjoni.

Fir-rigward tal-elezzjonijiet innifishom, l-awtoritajiet Libjani qed jiffaċċjaw kompitu diffiċli. Diġà sar xi progress. Il-liġi dwar l-elezzjonijiet għaddiet u bhalissa qed issir ir-registrazzjoni tal-votanti. Filwaqt li m'għandhiex tiġi eskluża kompletament il-possibbiltà li jkun hemm xi dewmien, huwa mistenni li l-elezzjonijiet se jsiru xorta waħda fid-19 ta' Ġunju 2012.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004687/12  
to the Commission  
Simon Busuttil (PPE)  
(8 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Elections in Libya

The Deputy Head of the Maghreb Division of the European External Action Service (EEAS) has reportedly stated that the EEAS is helping the authorities in Libya prepare for elections.

Could the Commission specify:

- What kind of assistance is being given to Libya for the purposes of elections?
- Which are the areas in which Libya needs most help for the purposes of the elections?
- What role does it foresee for NGOs in these elections and in fostering the necessary democratic environment in Libya?
- What resources or funds is the EU making available to NGOs for the abovementioned purposes?
- Whether it is confident that preparations for elections in Libya are on track?

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

Libya has requested assistance in many areas in preparation for the elections. EU assistance is coordinated under UN leadership to ensure it does not duplicate the efforts of others. It therefore does not cover every area of electoral assistance.

The EU is focusing its support for elections in the following areas:

- financing experts working with the National Election Committee through the UN election team;
- media coverage — journalist training in partnership with Internews and Deutsche Welle; support for a network of independent Libyan Journalist focusing on the elections and citizen debates through a project with RSF, media monitoring implemented through a project with IDEA;
- civic education — two EU programmes are being implemented by ACTED and EUNIDA/Crown Agents working together;
- local elections: a project implemented by a consortium of IDEA, ECES, NMID, EPD and the Club De Madrid is supporting the organisation of local elections and the process of national reconciliation;
- election assessment — the EU will deploy an Election Assessment Team for the June elections.

NGOs have a key role to play in the elections and in the democratic transition process. Current EU programmes in Libya amount to more than EUR 30 million. These include a specific component for the promotion of NGOs (of nearly EUR 10 million). Many of these programmes have an election component combined with other objectives such as building civil society or reconciliation.

As regards the elections themselves, the Libyan authorities face a daunting task. Some progress has been made so far. The election law has been passed and voter registration is in progress. Whilst the possibility of delay cannot be discounted, it is still to be expected that the elections will take place on or about 19 June 2012.

(Verzjoni Maltija)

**Mistoqsija ghal twegiba bil-miktub E-004688/12**

**lill-Kummissjoni**

**Simon Busuttil (PPE)**

(8 ta' Mejju 2012)

Suġġett: Il-liv tal-maternità fis-settur tal-edukazzjoni f'Malta

B'zieda mar-risposta tal-Kummissjoni għall-mistoqsijiet E-002138/2011 u E-005193/2011 u fid-dawl tal-fatt li għaddew erba' snin minn meta tqajmet l-ewwel darba din il-kwistjoni, il-Kummissjoni qieghda f'pożizzjoni li tispjega l-istadju milhuq fir-rigward tal-konformità ta' Malta mal-liġi tal-UE u mad-deċiżjoni tal-ECJ dwar il-liv tal-maternità fis-settur tal-edukazzjoni?

**Twegiba moghtija mis-Sinjura Reding f'isem il-Kummissjoni**

(27 ta' Ġunju 2012)

Il-Kummissjoni tifhem mill-awtoritajiet Maltin li saru diskussjonijiet mal-Malta Union of Teachers sabiex tinstab soluzzjoni għal din il-kwistjoni. Il-Gvern Malti ressaq proposti biex jiġi emendat il-Kodiċi tal-Immaniġġjar tas-Servizz Pubbliku bil-ghan li jiġi żgurat li l-ghalliema li l-liv tal-maternità tagħhom jikkoinċidi ma' perjodi statutorji ta' liv jiġu kumpensati. Għadejjin diskussjonijiet bejn l-awtoritajiet Maltin u l-Malta Union of Teachers dwar in-natura eżatta tat-test. Il-Kummissjoni tkompli ssegwi s-sitwazzjoni mill-aktar qrib possibbli.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-004688/12  
to the Commission  
Simon Busuttil (PPE)  
(8 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Maternity leave in the education sector in Malta

Further to the Commission's reply to questions E-002138/2011 and E-005193/2011 and in the light of the fact that four years have passed since this issue was first raised, is the Commission in a position to outline the state of play with regard to Malta's compliance with EC law and with the ECJ ruling on maternity leave in the education sector?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission  
(27 June 2012)**

The Commission understands from the Maltese authorities that there have been discussions with the Malta Union of Teachers in order to resolve this issue. The Maltese Government has put forward proposals to amend the Public Service Management Code with a view to ensuring that teachers whose maternity leave coincides with statutory holiday periods are compensated. Discussions between the Maltese authorities and the Malta Union of Teachers regarding the exact nature of the text are ongoing. The Commission keeps monitoring the situation as closely as possible.

---

(Dansk udgave)

**Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-004689/12**  
**til Kommissionen**  
**Ole Christensen (S&D)**  
(8. maj 2012)

Om: Manglede svar fra Kommissionen i timelærersag

Foreningen af timelønnede universitetslærere i Danmark mener ikke, at den danske stat lever op til hensigten bag direktiverne om deltidsansættelse, tidsbegrænset ansættelse og vikaransættelse, eftersom en stor gruppe af deltids- og tidsbegrænset ansatte undervisere ved de højere læreanstalter i Danmark til stadighed diskrimineres i form af manglende rettigheder til pension, fuld løn under sygdom og barsel, manglende ret til at arbejde på fuld tid samt ret til efteruddannelse mv.

Dansk Magisterforening lagde på vegne af timelønnede universitetslærere sag an mod Personalestyrelsen, som blev tabt i 2007. Ved samme lejlighed bad foreningen af timelønnede universitetslærere Kommissionen om at indhente udtalelser i sagen fra den danske stat, som er part i sagen.

Foreningen venter imidlertid fortsat på et svar fra Kommissionen. Kommissionen bedes derfor gøre rede for, hvorfor foreningen af timelønnede universitetslærere endnu ikke har modtaget svar, samt klargøre, hvornår Kommissionen påtænker at svare foreningen?

**Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af László Andor**  
(4. juli 2012)

Kommissionen skrev efter sit svar på skriftlig forespørgsel E-7027/08 <sup>(1)</sup> fra det ærede medlem til de danske myndigheder for at få afklaret, hvordan direktiv 1999/70/EF og direktiv 97/81/EF finder anvendelse på de højere læreanstalter i Danmark. Siden dengang har Kommissionen flere gange været i direkte kontakt med de danske myndigheder, og det har ledt Kommissionen til den konklusion, at den danske overenskomstaftale, som gælder for akademikere i staten (der omfatter ansatte ved universiteterne) ikke skelner mellem »normalansatte« og ansatte, der arbejder i mindre end otte timer om ugen eller i mindre end en måned. Hvis de danske arbejdsgivere anvender reglerne forkert, findes der i Danmark effektive midler til at rette op på situationen i det enkelte tilfælde.

Kommissionen færdiggør sin undersøgelse af de andre aspekter af denne sag med henblik på at træffe foranstaltninger, hvis det skulle vise sig, at disse direktiver ikke er korrekt gennemført. Kommissionen vil underrette klagerne om resultaterne hurtigst muligt.

---

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

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004689/12  
to the Commission**

**Ole Christensen (S&D)**

(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* Lack of response from the Commission to an action brought by hourly-paid teachers

The association of hourly-paid university teachers in Denmark does not believe that the Danish Government is fulfilling the objectives of the directives on part-time work, fixed-term work and temporary work, as a large group of part-time and fixed-term teachers at higher education establishments in Denmark continue to face discrimination in the form of a lack of rights to a pension, to full sick pay and to maternity benefits and lack of rights to full-time work and continuing education.

The Danish Association of Masters and PhDs brought an action against the Danish State Employers' Authority (now the Agency for the Modernisation of Public Administration) on behalf of hourly-paid university teachers which was lost in 2007. At the same time, the association of hourly-paid university teachers asked the Commission to obtain an opinion from the Danish Government, which is a party to the proceedings.

The association is still waiting for a response from the Commission. Will the Commission therefore explain why the association of hourly-paid university teachers has still not received a response, and will the Commission give an indication as to when it intends to respond to the association?

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

(4 July 2012)

Following its answer to Written Question E-7027/08 <sup>(1)</sup> by the Honourable Member, the Commission wrote to the Danish authorities to seek clarification of the way Directives 1999/70/EC and 97/81/EC were applied in the higher education sector in Denmark. Several direct exchanges have taken place with the Danish authorities since then, and this has enabled the Commission to conclude that the Danish collective agreement covering academic staff employed by the State (which covers staff employed by universities) makes no distinction between 'normal staff' and staff employed for less than eight hours a week or for less than one month. Should the Danish employers apply the rules incorrectly, effective remedies exist in Denmark to redress the situation in individual cases.

The Commission is finalising its examination of the other aspects of the case with a view to taking measures where it is found that those Directives were incorrectly transposed. It will inform the complainants of its findings at the earliest opportunity.

---

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

(Dansk udgave)

**Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-004691/12**  
**til Kommissionen**  
**Søren Bo Søndergaard (GUE/NGL)**  
(8. maj 2012)

Om: Rådets direktiv 93/104/EF

Den britiske regering har ikke anvendt bestemmelserne i Rådets direktiv 93/104/EF af 23. november 1993 om visse aspekter i forbindelse med tilrettelæggelse af arbejdstiden <sup>(1)</sup> med hensyn til »kompenserende hvileperioder«, når det drejer sig om ansatte i retssystemet for unge, som følge af den bevogtningsmæssige karakter af deres arbejde.

Trods den britiske undtagelse fra dette afsnit af lovgivningen, der begrænser arbejdsugen til 48 timer, er den britiske regering forpligtet til at følge punkt 2 i afsnittet om undtagelser, der giver ansatte ret til »kompenserende hvileperioder«, eller, i tilfælde hvor sådanne ikke kan gives med rimelighed eller objektivt, til alternativ beskyttelse af deres sundhed og sikkerhed.

Youth Justice Agency i Nordirland tillader ikke, at dets personale tager sådanne kompenserende hvileperioder eller passende pauser, selv om det arbejder i skift på mere end otte timer, ofte under farlige betingelser.

Til sammenligning gives personale i sydirske fængsler, der bevogter mere farlige indsatte, hvilepauser.

Mener Kommissionen, at den britiske regering som følge af de manglende passende pauser eller kompenserende hvileperioder for ansatte inden for retssystemet for unge og anden »forældremyndighedsbaseret« beskæftigelse overtræder de obligatoriske foranstaltninger i henhold til arbejdstidsdirektivet?

Kommissionen bedes svare på engelsk.

**Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af László Andor**  
(28. juni 2012)

Artikel 4 i arbejdstidsdirektivet <sup>(2)</sup> fastsætter, at alle arbejdstagere kan holde pause, hvis den daglige arbejdstid overstiger seks timer: Pausens varighed fastsættes i kollektive overenskomster eller i den nationale lovgivning.

Direktivet indeholder ikke en øvre grænse som sådan for den daglige arbejdstid. Det fremgår imidlertid af artikel 3 og 4, at den daglige arbejdstid ikke kan være ubegrænset, da den daglige minimumshvileperiode skal være på 11 timer ud over hvileperioder.

Som en undtagelse fastsætter artikel 8 udtrykkeligt en øvre grænse for det daglige arbejde for de personer, der er defineret som »natarbejdere« i henhold til artikel 2, stk. 4. I sådanne tilfælde er den øvre grænse på gennemsnitligt 8 timer: eller 8 timer inden for en 24-timersperiode for arbejde, der i henhold til national lovgivning eller kollektive overenskomster er defineret som særlig risikofyldt beskæftigelse eller beskæftigelse, der indebærer en betydelig fysisk eller psykisk belastning.

Artikel 17, stk. 3, litra c), indeholder undtagelsesbestemmelser for aktiviteter, der udføres af døgninstitutioner, plejehjem og fængsler, hvor der kræves kontinuerlige ydelser. Sådanne undtagelser er underlagt den betingelse, at de pågældende arbejdstagere skal have tilsvarende kompenserende hvileperioder med undtagelse af særlige og begrænsede tilfælde.

Til gengæld gælder artikel 17, stk. 3, ikke for den 48-timers grænse for så vidt angår den ugentlige arbejdstid, hvor det kun er muligt med undtagelser i henhold til artikel 22 (undtagelser) eller artikel 17, stk. 1, (særlige kategorier af arbejdstagere).

Da længden af hvileperioden på 6 timer hører ind under den nationale lovgivning, og da de arbejdstagere, der er defineret som »natarbejdere«, ikke må arbejde mere end 8 timer, er det ikke klart ud fra spørgsmålet, om arbejdsbetingelserne i det nordiske retssystem for unge er i modstrid med direktivet.

<sup>(1)</sup> EFT L 307 af 13.12.1993, s. 18.

<sup>(2)</sup> Europa-Parlamentets og Rådets direktiv 2003/88/EF, EUT L 299 af 18.11.2003, s. 9 (der ophæver og konsoliderer direktiv 93/104/EF som nævnt af det ærede medlem).



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004691/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Søren Bo Søndergaard (GUE/NGL)**  
(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* Council Directive 93/104/EC

The British Government has not applied the provisions of Council Directive 93/104/EC of 23 November 1993 concerning certain aspects of the organisation of working time <sup>(1)</sup> relating to 'compensatory rest' when it comes to people working in the juvenile justice system, owing to the custodial nature of their work.

Despite the British opt-out from the section of the legislation which limits the working week to 48 hours, the British Government is obliged to follow point 2 of the section on derogations, which entitles staff to 'compensatory rest', or, where this cannot be reasonably and objectively granted, to alternative protection of their health and safety.

The Youth Justice Agency in the north of Ireland does not allow its staff to take such compensatory rest or adequate breaks despite the fact that its staff work shifts that are more than eight hours long, often in dangerous conditions.

As a means of comparison, in prisons in the south of Ireland, staff who guard more dangerous inmates are given rest breaks.

Does the Commission believe that, owing to its failure to provide adequate breaks or compensatory rest for those working in youth justice and other 'custody-based' employment, the British Government is contravening the obligatory measures stipulated in the Working Time Directive?

Can the Commission please reply in English?

**Answer given by M. Andor on behalf of the Commission**  
(28 June 2012)

Article 4 of the Working Time Directive <sup>(2)</sup> stipulates that, where the working day is longer than six hours, the worker is entitled to a rest break: the length of this break is to be set by collective agreement or national law.

The directive does not set a limit, as such, to daily working time. However, it follows from Articles 3 and 4 that the daily working time cannot be unlimited, as the minimum daily rest period must be 11 hours, in addition to any rest breaks.

Article 8, by way of exception, sets an explicit fixed limit for the daily work of those defined as 'night workers' under Article 2(4). In such cases, the limit is eight hours on average: or eight hours in any 24-hour period, for work defined under national law or collective agreements as particularly stressful or hazardous.

Article 17(3)(c) allows derogations as regards activities of residential institutions and prisons which require continuity of service. Such derogations are subject to the condition that the workers concerned must be afforded equivalent periods of compensatory rest, save in exceptional and limited circumstances.

Conversely, Article 17(3) does not apply to the 48-hour limit to weekly working time, where derogations are possible only under Article 22 ('opt-out') or Article 17(1) (specified categories of workers).

Since the length of the six-hourly rest break is a matter for national law, and since those workers defined as 'night workers' cannot work longer than eight hours, it is not clear from the question that working conditions in the Youth Justice Agency of Northern Ireland are contrary to the directive.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 307, 13.12.1993, p. 18.

<sup>(2)</sup> Directive 2003/88/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council, OJ L 299, 18.11.2003, p. 9 (repealing and consolidating Directive 93/104/EC as mentioned by the Honourable Member).

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004693/12**

**aan de Commissie**

**Lucas Hartong (NI)**

(8 mei 2012)

*Betreeft:* Beschikking staande privé-jet van Barosso, Ashton en Van Rompuy

1. Is de Commissie bekend met haar besluit om een contract af te sluiten bij zakenluchtvaartgroep Abelag voor het bedrag van EUR 12 miljoen voor de komende vier jaar <sup>(1)</sup>?
2. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat in tijden van ongekende bezuinigingen waarin de burgers hard in hun portemonnee worden getroffen, het volkomen ongepast is om een contract van EUR 12 miljoen af te sluiten voor het gebruik van decadente privé-jets voor Barosso, Ashton en Van Rompuy? Zo nee, waarom niet?
3. Hoe denkt zij het aan de burgers te kunnen verkopen dat overal door overheden bezuinigd wordt en dat hier in de Europese bubbel met geld wordt gesmeten zodat bovengenoemde EU-bobo's in alle luxe de wereld rond kunnen vliegen à EUR 20 000 per uur?
4. Kan de Commissie opheldering geven over het feit waarom Abelag de enige gegadigde partij was voor dit lucratieve contract en er niet meer kandidaten in de aanbestedingsprocedure zijn meegenomen?
5. Kunt zij de PVV voorzien van bewijsstukken waaruit blijkt dat er naar meerdere kandidaten is gezocht in de aanbestedingsprocedure en de schijn van „vriendjespolitiek” bij ons wegnemen?

**Antwoord van de heer Šefčovič namens de Commissie**

(27 juni 2012)

1. Het interinstitutionele luchttaxi-contract heeft betrekking op het Europees Parlement, de Europese Raad, de Europese Dienst voor extern optreden, en de Europese Commissie en heeft een waarde van maximaal 12,7 miljoen EUR voor alle instellingen over een periode van vier jaar. Dit is een absolute bovengrens en is geen raming van de uitgaven: er is geen specifiek activiteitsvolume vastgelegd en bedragen worden alleen betaald wanneer luchttaxi's worden gebruikt en binnen het voor zakenreizen beschikbare budget.
2. en 3. De Commissie herinnert eraan dat zij voorstellen heeft ingediend die tot 2020 1 miljard EUR besparingen zullen opleveren en op lange termijn jaarlijks 1 miljard EUR besparingen op de administratieve EU-begroting, naast de belangrijke besparingen die voortvloeien uit de hervorming van de EU-administratie van 2004. Anders dan veel regeringen kunnen de EU-instellingen geen vliegtuigen van nationale strijdkrachten gebruiken. In specifieke gevallen, wanneer commerciële vluchten niet beschikbaar of te duur zijn of wanneer het gebruik van commerciële vluchten om veiligheidsredenen onmogelijk is, gebruikt de Commissie luchttaxi's, niet de luxe privé-jets waarnaar het geachte Parlementslid verwijst en waarvan de Commissie de kostprijs niet kent.
- 4 en 5. De interinstitutionele aanbesteding is opgesteld met inachtneming van het Financieel Reglement en de desbetreffende uitvoeringsvoorschriften en met eerbiediging van de beginselen van transparantie, evenredigheid, gelijke behandeling en non-discriminatie. Het doel was te zorgen voor optimale concurrentie en de best mogelijke prijs-kwaliteitverhouding. Bij de aanbestedingsprocedure waren meerdere kandidaten betrokken.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.demorgen.be/dm/nl/996/Economie/article/detail/1431064/2012/04/29/Europa-sluit-contract-van-12-miljoen-voor-Belgische-privéjets-van-Abelag.dhtml>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004693/12  
to the Commission**

**Lucas Hartong (NI)**

(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* Private jet made available to Mr Barroso, Baroness Ashton and Mr Van Rompuy

1. Is the Commission familiar with its decision to sign a contract with the business airline Abelag for a value of EUR 12 million for the next four years <sup>(1)</sup>?
2. Does the Commission share the view of the Dutch Party for Freedom (PVV) that, in times of unprecedented cost cutting when citizens have been hit hard in their pockets, it is completely inappropriate to sign a contract for EUR 12 million for the use of decadent private jets for Mr Barroso, Baroness Ashton and Mr Van Rompuy? If not, why not?
3. How does it think it will be able to sell citizens on the idea that, while governments everywhere have to cut costs, here in the European bubble, money is being thrown around so that the abovementioned EU notables can jet around the world in luxury at a cost of EUR 20 000 per hour?
4. Can the Commission provide an explanation of why Abelag was the only bidder for this lucrative contract, and why more candidates did not take part in the tendering procedure?
5. Can it provide the PVV with documents demonstrating that an effort was made to find several candidates during the tendering process and thereby remove any semblance of nepotism?

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

(27 June 2012)

1. The interinstitutional air taxi contract covers the European Parliament, the European Council, the European External Action Service and the European Commission and has a maximum value of EUR 12.7 million over four years between all the institutions. This is an absolute financial ceiling, not a forecast of expenditure: there is no commitment to a particular volume of activity and amounts are paid only when air taxis are used and within the available budget for business trips.

2 and 3. The Commission would like to recall that it has tabled proposals which will bring savings of EUR 1 billion until 2020 and EUR 1 billion/year in the long run for the administrative budget of the EU in addition to major savings stemming from the 2004 reform of the EU administration. Unlike many governments, that can use planes of their respective armed forces, the EU institutions do not have such means. In particular circumstances, where commercial flights are not available or too expensive or where security constraints do not permit the use of commercial flights, the Commission uses air taxis, not the luxury private jets the Honourable Member refers to and whose cost the Commission is not aware of.

4 and 5. The interinstitutional call for tender was drawn up in respect of the Financial Regulation and its Implementing Rules and complied with the principles of transparency, proportionality, equal treatment and non-discrimination. It was designed to maximise competition and to obtain the best possible value for money. There were several candidates in the procurement process.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.demorgen.be/dm/nl/996/Economie/article/detail/1431064/2012/04/29/Europa-sluit-contract-van-12-miljoen-voor-Belgische-priv jets-van-Abelag.dhtml>.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-004694/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)**  
(8 Μαΐου 2012)

Θέμα: Έγγραφες δεσμεύσεις για την απόφαση της Συνόδου Κορυφής της 26ης Οκτωβρίου 2011.

Σύμφωνα με την ερμηνεία που δόθηκε στο σημείο 16 της απόφασης της Συνόδου Κορυφής για το ευρώ της 26ης Οκτωβρίου 2011, ζητήθηκαν έγγραφες δεσμεύσεις από τα «μεγάλα» πολιτικά κόμματα της Ελλάδας ότι συμφωνούν με «τις αποφάσεις της 26ης Οκτωβρίου και τα συγκεκριμένα μέτρα που απαιτούνται για την εφαρμογή τους». Αυτή την ερμηνεία υιοθέτησαν ρητά τόσο ο Επίτροπος κ. Ρεν αλλά και άλλοι θεσμικοί παράγοντες της ΕΕ. Μάλιστα σε γραπτή ερώτησή μου E-011047/2011 (6.12.2011) η Επιτροπή είχε απαντήσει ότι «ένα τέτοιο αίτημα είναι ενδεδειγμένο» αφού «επιθυμούν οι δανειστές να έχουν καθισχυαστεί ως προς τη δέσμευση της Ελλάδας να σεβαστεί τους συμφωνημένους στόχους, παρά τις όποιες αλλαγές κυβέρνησης». Οι έγγραφες δεσμεύσεις των πολιτικών κομμάτων (ΠΑΣΟΚ, ΝΔ, ΛΑΟΣ) τις οποίες είχαν ζητήσει, υπογράφηκαν από τα κόμματα που συμμετείχαν τότε στη κυβέρνηση της Ελλάδας.

Στις εκλογές που έγιναν στις 6.5.2012 στην Ελλάδα αναδείχτηκε δεύτερο κόμμα (ΣΥΡΙΖΑ), με πολύ μικρή διαφορά από το πρώτο, κόμμα που δεν είχε υπογράψει την δήλωση εφαρμογής της συμφωνίας. Κατόπιν του ανωτέρω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Θεωρεί ότι χρειάζεται το κόμμα αυτό, εάν αναλάβει κυβερνητικές ευθύνες, να δεσμευθεί εγγράφως ότι θα τηρήσει τη Συμφωνία της Συνόδου Κορυφής για το ευρώ της 26ης Οκτωβρίου 2011 και ότι θα συνεχίσει να υλοποιεί το πρόγραμμα οικονομικής προσαρμογής;

Εξάκολουθεί να θεωρεί η Επιτροπή ότι ένα τέτοιο αίτημα είναι «ενδεδειγμένο»;

**Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(11 Ιουνίου 2012)

Η εκταμίευση της χρηματοδοτικής συνδρομής προς την Ελλάδα από το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Χρηματοπιστωτικής Σταθερότητας (EFSF) υπόκειται σε όρους οικονομικής πολιτικής κατά τη διάρκεια της ρύθμισης. Οι όροι αυτοί αναλύονται στο Μνημόνιο Συνεννόησης (ΜΣ) που συζητήθηκε μεταξύ της Επιτροπής (η οποία ενεργεί εξ ονόματος των κρατών μελών της ευρωζώνης) και της Ελληνικής Κυβέρνησης και της Τράπεζας της Ελλάδος.

Το ΜΣ αναπροσαρμόζεται ελαφρώς ανά τρίμηνο, πριν εκδοθεί απόφαση για εκταμίευση, και συμφωνείται σε τεχνικό επίπεδο μεταξύ των ελληνικών αρχών και των εκπροσώπων της τρόικας, πριν υπογραφεί από την ελληνική κυβέρνηση και τον διοικητή της Τράπεζας της Ελλάδος, και τον Αντιπρόεδρο της Επιτροπής για τις οικονομικές και νομισματικές υποθέσεις και το ευρώ.

Η Επιτροπή δεν επιθυμεί να εκφράσει εικασίες για το αν, στο μέλλον, παράλληλα με υπογραφή που δεσμεύει την κυβέρνηση, οι επίσημοι δανειστές θα επιθυμούσαν επίσης να λάβουν πολιτικές διαβεβαιώσεις από συγκεκριμένα κόμματα στην Ελλάδα ή σε άλλα κράτη μέλη που λαμβάνουν οικονομική βοήθεια με τη μορφή δανείων.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-004694/12  
to the Commission**

**Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)**

(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* Written commitments relating to the agreement reached at the EU summit of 26 October 2011

According to the interpretation of point 16 of the agreement reached at the European Council and euro area summit on 26 October 2011, Greece's 'main' political parties were requested to confirm in writing that they endorse 'the agreement of 26 October and the specific measures required to implement it'. This interpretation was explicitly adopted by Commissioner Olli Rehn and also by representatives of the other EU institutions. To my Written Question E-011047/2011 (6 December 2011), the Commission replied that 'such a request was appropriate' as the lenders 'wished to be reassured about the commitment of Greece to respect the agreed objectives, no matter changes in government'. The written commitments requested from the political parties (PASOK, ND, LAOS) were signed by the parties which were part of the Greek Government at the time.

In the elections held on 6 May 2012 in Greece, the SYRIZA party came in second with a marginal difference between it and the winning party, a party which had not signed the statement on the implementation of the agreement.

In view of this:

Does the Commission consider that, if this party takes on government responsibilities, it needs to confirm in writing that it will comply with the agreement reached at the euro area summit of 26 October 2011 and that it will continue to implement economic adjustment programmes?

Does the Commission still consider that such a request is 'appropriate'?

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

(11 June 2012)

The disbursement of financial assistance to Greece by the European Financial Stability Facility (EFSF) is subject to economic policy conditionality for the duration of the arrangement. The conditionality is detailed in a memorandum of understanding (MoU) discussed between the Commission (acting on behalf of the euro area Member States) and the Greek Government and the Bank of Greece.

The MoU is slightly adjusted every quarter, prior to a decision on a disbursement, and agreed at technical level between the Greek authorities and Troika's representatives, before being signed by the Greek Government and the governor of the Bank of Greece, and the Vice-President of the Commission for Economic and Monetary Affairs and the Euro.

The Commission does not want to speculate if, in future, alongside a signature that binds the Government, the official lenders would also wish to receive political assurances from specific parties in Greece or in other Member States receiving financial assistance loans.

---

(българска версия)

**Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-004695/12**

**до Комисията**

**Метин Казак (ALDE)**

(8 май 2012 г.)

Относно: Договори за обществени поръчки на ЕС, възложени на дружества от трети страни

Моля Комисията да обяви обема на обществените поръчки на ЕС, възложени от 2007 г. насам на дружества от трети страни, определени в предложението на Комисията за регламент (COM(2012)0124) като предоставящи „необхванати от международни задължения стоки и услуги“, в следните разбивки:

- общо и процентно в целия ЕС според броя на възложените поръчки;
- общо и процентно в целия ЕС според стойността;
- общо и процентно във всяка държава членка според броя на възложените поръчки;
- общо и процентно във всяка държава членка според стойността.

**Отговор, даден от г-н Барние от името на Комисията**

(2 юли 2012 г.)

Определението за „необхванати от международни задължения стоки и услуги“ в предложението на Комисията се отнася до правилата за произход за стоки и услуги, които се основават на правилата, предвидени в Митническият кодекс на Съюза за стоки и в Договорите на ЕС, както и в Общото споразумение по търговията с услуги (ГАТС) на Световната търговска организация (СТО) за услуги. Възлагащите органи или възложителите понастоящем не са задължени да предоставят тази информация за произхода на стоките и услугите в обявленията за възложени поръчки, публикувани в Електронната база данни на търговете (TED). Това означава, че Комисията не разполага с подробните данни, поискани от уважаемия член на Парламента.

Оценката на въздействието на предложението, обаче, включва оценка на общото чуждестранно участие на пазара на обществените поръчки в ЕС, което е на стойност между 10 и 17 млрд. EUR годишно. TED съдържа данни за поръчките, възложени на дружествата от трети държави в областите, които не са обхванати от международните ангажименти на ЕС: над хиляда поръчки на обща стойност от почти 3 млрд. EUR са възложени на дружества от трети държави между 2007 и 2011 г. в областите, които не са обхванати от международните ангажименти на ЕС. Тъй като в 40 % от тези случаи, обаче, стойността на възложените поръчки не е оповестена, горната цифра безспорно представлява значително подценяване на реалната стойност на тези поръчки. Освен това може да има случаи, при които държавата на произход на спечелилия търга изпълнител от трета държава не е била посочена от възлагащия орган.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004695/12  
to the Commission**

**Metin Kazak (ALDE)**

(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* EU public procurement contracts awarded to third-country companies

Could the Commission please state the volume of EU public procurement tenders awarded since 2007 to third-country companies defined in the Commission's proposal for a regulation (COM(2012)0124) as providing 'non-covered goods and services', broken down as follows:

- the total and percentage across the EU by number of contracts awarded;
- the total and percentage across the EU by value;
- the total and percentage in each Member State by number of contracts awarded;
- the total and percentage in each Member State by value.

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

(2 July 2012)

The definition of 'non-covered goods and services' in the Commission proposal refers to rules of origin for goods and services which are based upon the rules provided under the Union Customs Code for goods, and the EU Treaties, as well as the World Trade Organisation (WTO) General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) for services. Contracting authorities or entities are not currently obliged to provide this information on the origin of the goods and services in the contract award notices published in Tenders Electronic Database (TED). This means that the Commission is not in possession of the detailed data requested by the Honourable Member.

However, the impact assessment of the proposal includes an estimate of the total foreign participation on the EU's public procurement market which amounts to between 10 and 17 billion Euro per year. TED does contain data on the contracts awarded to third-country companies in areas not covered by the international commitments of the EU: over one thousand contracts were awarded to third country companies between 2007 and 2011 in areas not covered by the EU's international commitments, for a total value of almost EUR 3 billion. However, since in 40% of these cases the value of the contracts awarded has not been disclosed, this figure is certainly a gross underestimate of the real value of those contracts. In addition, there may be instances where the country of origin of the successful contractor from a third-country has not been mentioned by the contracting authority.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004696/12**  
**alla Commissione**  
**Crescenzo Rivellini (PPE) e Potito Salatto (PPE)**  
(8 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Vincoli territoriali Expo 2015

Nel 2015 Milano sarà protagonista dell'Expo 2015. Nell'ambito di tale kermesse è stato promosso un concorso internazionale di idee per la progettazione e la realizzazione di strutture di servizio a supporto dell'area espositiva, il cui bando prevede la valutazione delle proposte in base ad un disciplinare di concorso che assegna, a parità di condizioni, un punteggio superiore al concorrente il cui progetto presenti l'utilizzo di materiali con provenienza geografica entro i 350 chilometri dal capoluogo lombardo, motivando tale limite con la necessità di salvaguardare l'ambiente.

— Non ritiene la Commissione che si sia verificata una violazione delle norme europee poste a salvaguardia del libero gioco della concorrenza?

— Non crede che la previsione citata sia in contrasto con l'articolo 101, lettera d), del TFUE che vieta di «applicare, nei rapporti commerciali con gli altri contraenti, condizioni dissimili per prestazioni equivalenti, così da determinare per questi ultimi uno svantaggio nella concorrenza»?

— Non crede che questo atteggiamento potrebbe facilitare ovvero indurre ad un abuso di posizione dominante delle imprese che si dovessero trovare nell'area richiesta e quindi in condizioni di monopolio per specifici materiali?

— In quale modo intende procedere rispetto alla questione descritta, soprattutto relativamente ai fondi comunitari stanziati a favore dell'Expo 2015?

— Non ritiene che i bandi di gara potrebbero violare la normativa dell'UE in quanto le clausole che delimitano l'area geografica creano una barriera protezionistica ingiustificata a favore delle aziende del nord a scapito di quelle del sud dell'Italia, così come nei confronti delle società europee?

**Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione**  
(2 luglio 2012)

La Commissione conferma di aver ricevuto una denuncia da una cittadina italiana concernente, tra l'altro, una presunta violazione delle norme UE sugli appalti pubblici nella gara d'appalto per la progettazione delle strutture di servizio di EXPO 2015. Dato che l'esecuzione dei lavori o dei servizi collegati alle infrastrutture non costituiscono oggetto dell'appalto, che si limita alla progettazione, l'invito in questione è verosimilmente di valore inferiore ai limiti per l'applicazione delle direttive in materia di appalti pubblici. I servizi della Commissione stanno tuttavia esaminando in quale misura nel caso in questione si potrebbe configurare una violazione dei principi UE del trattato. I servizi della Commissione si metteranno in contatto con le autorità italiane competenti al fine di raccogliere tutte le informazioni disponibili. La Commissione osserva inoltre che, siccome in questo caso sono pendenti procedimenti giudiziari, il giudice nazionale competente ad applicare il diritto dell'Unione, può dichiarare la nullità della clausola geografica in questione.

Sulla base delle informazioni fornite, il concorso di idee del 2011 bandito da EXPO 2015 non sembra violare le regole di concorrenza dell'UE. La probabilità che tale invito possa creare una posizione dominante nel mercato dei materiali di costruzione e che tale impresa in posizione dominante possa abusare della propria posizione dominante sembra remota in questa fase.

Il programma operativo regionale della Regione Lombardia, che stabilisce la strategia di intervento del FESR nella regione per il periodo 2007-2013, non prevede finanziamenti per l'organizzazione o la realizzazione della fiera internazionale EXPO 2015.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004696/12  
to the Commission  
Crescenzo Rivellini (PPE) and Potito Salatto (PPE)  
(8 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Geographical constraints, Expo 2015

In 2015, Milan will host Expo 2015. In connection with this fair, an international call for tenders has been issued for ideas for the design and creation of service facilities to support the exhibition area. This call for tenders provides for bids to be evaluated on the basis of a set of rules which, all things being equal, awards a higher score to bidders whose design involves the use of materials derived from geographical sources within 350 kilometres of Milan, citing the need to protect the environment as the reason for this limitation.

— Does the Commission not consider that there has been a violation of European rules established for the protection of free competition?

— Does it not consider that the cited provision is contrary to Article 101(d) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), which prohibits the application of 'dissimilar conditions to equivalent transactions with other trading parties, thereby placing them at a competitive disadvantage'?

— Does it not consider that this attitude could facilitate or bring about an abuse of a dominant position by companies situated within the specified area and therefore holding a monopoly on specific materials?

— How does it propose to proceed with respect to the issue described, particularly in relation to the Community funds earmarked for Expo 2015?

— Does it not consider the calls for tender to violate EU rules, in that the clauses delimiting the geographical area create an unjustified protectionist barrier benefitting companies in the north of Italy and detrimental to those in the south of Italy, and to companies from elsewhere in Europe?

**Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission  
(2 July 2012)**

The Commission confirms it has received a complaint from an Italian citizen alleging *inter alia* violation of EU public procurement rules in the call for tender for the design of service facilities of EXPO 2015. Given that it is not the execution of the works or the services linked to the facilities that are being procured but only the design, the call in question is likely to be of a value inferior to the thresholds for the applicability of the public procurement Directives. The Commission services are nevertheless investigating to what extent there might be a violation of EU principles of the Treaty in the present case. The Commission services will contact the competent Italian authorities in order to obtain all available information. The Commission also notes that as judicial proceedings are pending in this case, the national judge, who is competent to apply Union law, might declare the the geographical clause in question null and void.

On the basis of the information provided, the 2011 call for ideas issued by EXPO 2015 does not appear to violate EU competition rules. The likelihood that this call would ultimately lead to the creation of a dominant position in the market for construction materials and that any such dominant company would then abuse its dominance appears at this stage remote.

The regional operational programme for Region Lombardia which sets out the strategy for ERDF assistance in the Region for 2007-2013 does not foresee funding for the organisation or realisation of the international fair EXPO 2015.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004697/12  
do Komisji**

**Bogusław Sonik (PPE)**

(8 maja 2012 r.)

*Przedmiot:* Dyrektywa o retencji danych

Unijna dyrektywa o retencji danych (dyrektywa 2006/24/WE) w obecnym brzmieniu zobowiązuje europejskie firmy telefoniczne oraz świadczące usługi dostępu do Internetu do zbierania danych o wszystkich połączeniach wykonywanych przez ich wszystkich klientów, niezależnie od jakiegokolwiek podejrzenia lub postępowania związanego z popełnieniem przestępstwa.

Tak uogólniona retencja, stwarza ryzyko wycieku danych lub nadużycia poufnej działalności lub kontaktów, np. z dziennikarzami, telefonami zaufania, adwokatami, lekarzami.

Co więcej, blankietowa retencja danych uznana już została przez kilka sądów krajowych państw członkowskich za niekonstytucyjną?

— Czy Komisja jest świadoma tego, że dyrektywie o retencji danych sprzeciwiają się stowarzyszenia praw człowieka, ochrony danych, jak również operatorzy obsługujący telefony zaufania i numery alarmowe, stowarzyszenia zawodowe dziennikarzy, prawników i lekarzy, związki zawodowe, organizacje konsumentów? Jakie działania w związku z powyższym podjęła Komisja?

— Zgodnie z raportem ewaluacyjnym COM(2011)0225, Komisja zamierza oszacować wpływ zmian dyrektywy o retencji danych na przedsiębiorców i konsumentów włączając w to „wykorzystanie specjalnej ankiety, aby zbadać opinie publiczną”. Czy Komisja zamierza zamówić takie badanie opinii publicznej odnośnie popierania blankietowej retencji danych? Jeśli tak, to, kiedy takie badanie się odbędzie? Jeśli nie, dlaczego nie?

— Czy Komisja rozważy możliwość wprowadzenia opcji zakazu szerokiego stosowania w UE blankietowej retencji danych na rzecz systemu ukierunkowanego zbierania danych o ruchu telekomunikacyjnym zgodnie z Konwencją Rady Europy o Cyberprzestępczości?

— Czy, według najlepszej wiedzy Komisji, retencja danych ma znaczący wpływ na statystyki przestępczości bądź wykrywalność przestępczości danego państwa? Jak dane te różnią się w stosunku do państw, w których nie stosuje się retencji danych?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Cecilję Malmström w imieniu Komisji**

(25 lipca 2012 r.)

Dyrektywa w sprawie zatrzymywania danych (dyrektywa 2006/24/WE) przewiduje zatrzymywanie przez dostawców usług niektórych danych, nie obejmujących jednak danych o treści przekazywanych informacji. Dane te mogą zostać udostępnione z uzasadnionych powodów właściwym organom na warunkach i przy zachowaniu procedur prawnych określonych w prawie krajowym zgodnie z Kartą praw podstawowych.

Komisja jest świadoma zastrzeżeń wyrażonych przez szereg zainteresowanych stron w odniesieniu do tej dyrektywy. W kontekście przygotowań do przeglądu ram prawnych UE w sprawie zatrzymywania danych Komisja uwzględniła bardzo dokładnie przedstawione zastrzeżenia i postanowiła zebrać opinie wszystkich zainteresowanych stron.

Na dane statystyczne dotyczące przestępstw ma wpływ szereg czynników i nie można jednoznacznie powiedzieć, że determinuje je jeden konkretny środek zabezpieczający, np. zatrzymywanie danych. Komisja zna jednak wiele przypadków z całej UE, w których dane o ruchu i lokalizacji miały fundamentalne znaczenie dla dochodzeń prowadzonych w sprawie poważnych przestępstw i ścigania ich sprawców.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004697/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Bogusław Sonik (PPE)**  
(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* Data Retention Directive

In its present form, the Data Retention Directive (Directive 2006/24/EC) obliges European telecommunications companies, as well as Internet service providers, to collect data on all calls made by all their clients, irrespective of whether there is any suspicion or evidence of criminal behaviour.

Such generalised data retention creates a risk of data leakage or of information on confidential activities or contacts with, for example, journalists, helplines, lawyers and doctors, being misused.

Moreover, blanket data retention has already been deemed unconstitutional by some Member States' national courts.

— Is the Commission aware that human rights and data protection associations, helpline and emergency-number operators, journalists', lawyers' and doctors' associations, trade unions and consumer organisations are against the Data Retention Directive? What action has the Commission taken in response to this?

— According to the evaluation report (COM(2011)0225), the Commission intends to assess the impact of changes to the Data Retention Directive on entrepreneurs and consumers, including through a specific survey to gauge public perceptions. Does the Commission intend to use this as a means of gauging the level of support for blanket data retention? If so, when will the survey take place? If not, why not?

— Will the Commission consider the possibility of introducing the option of prohibiting the widespread use of blanket data retention in the EU in connection with telecommunications traffic data collection systems, in accordance with the Council of Europe Convention on Cybercrime?

— To the Commission's best knowledge, are there any countries in which data retention has a significant impact on crime figures or crime detection rates? How do the statistics for any such countries differ from those for countries that do not practise data retention?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission**  
(25 July 2012)

The Data Retention Directive (Directive 2006/24/EC) provides for the retention of certain data, not including data on the content of communications, by service providers. That data may be accessed for legitimate reasons by competent authorities, on conditions and in compliance with legal procedures set out in national law in compliance with the Charter of Fundamental Rights.

The Commission is aware of the concerns expressed by a number of stakeholders regarding the directive. In the context of its work to prepare a revision of the EU data retention legal framework, the Commission is giving careful consideration to those concerns, and it has sought the views of all stakeholders.

Crime statistics are determined by multiple factors, and cannot be clearly attributed to a specific security measure, such as data retention. The Commission is however aware of many cases from across the EU in which traffic and location data have been of crucial importance for the investigation and prosecution of the serious forms of crime.

---

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004700/12**

**a la Comisión**

**Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)**

(8 de mayo de 2012)

*Asunto:* Competencia, tasa de emisiones de CO<sub>2</sub> y fiabilidad de los índices de compensación

El próximo 1 de enero de 2013 entrarán en vigor las directrices que van a regular la articulación de ayudas de Estado diseñadas para paliar los problemas de competitividad y competencia que tienen que ver con la aplicación, en las tarifas eléctricas, de la tasa por emisiones indirectas de CO<sub>2</sub>. Algunas de las previsiones establecidas en las citadas directrices han creado honda preocupación en muchas industrias europeas cuyos costes principales están vinculados al consumo de electricidad.

Para calcular la cuantía de las ayudas a que cada consumidor de energía eléctrica tiene derecho se ha establecido un procedimiento que tiene en cuenta los niveles de producción y de consumo de electricidad de referencia de la instalación y el factor de emisión de CO<sub>2</sub> para la electricidad suministrada por plantas de combustión en distintas zonas geográficas. Algunos afectados han expresado su preocupación porque los índices de compensación no reflejan adecuadamente las características de abastecimiento reales, ni las que se derivan de las previsiones de generación derivadas de los planes cuatrienales de planificación eléctrica.

A la vista de los hechos expuestos,

¿Considera la Comisión que los indicadores de compensación propuestos por los Estados miembros recogen adecuadamente la realidad de la generación eléctrica y la posible evolución de los medios de generación en los próximos años?

¿Qué criterios se han utilizado para aceptar los indicadores propuestos?

¿Hay alguna posibilidad de renegociar estos indicadores si se constatan desviaciones evidentes entre la realidad y las previsiones que han servido de base para el cálculo?

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004702/12**

**a la Comisión**

**Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)**

(8 de mayo de 2012)

*Asunto:* Competencia, tasa de emisiones de CO<sub>2</sub> y recortes presupuestarios en los Estados miembros

El próximo 1 de enero de 2013 entrarán en vigor las directrices que van a regular la articulación de ayudas de estado diseñadas para paliar los problemas de competitividad y competencia que tienen que ver con la aplicación, en las tarifas eléctricas, de la tasa por emisiones indirectas de CO<sub>2</sub>. Algunas de las previsiones establecidas en las citadas directrices han creado honda preocupación en muchas industrias europeas cuyos costes principales están vinculados al consumo de electricidad.

Sin embargo la existencia de las directrices y la normativa europea que las sustenta no obliga a los Estados miembros a presupuestar y pagar las correspondientes ayudas. La necesidad de cumplir el pacto de estabilidad está llevando a los estados en situación más crítica a introducir recortes presupuestarios que afectan también a los gastos destinados a apoyar la economía productiva. En algunos estados las prospecciones realizadas por las empresas confirman que en el ejercicio de 2013 no habrá consignaciones presupuestarias destinadas a financiar ayudas de estado por este concepto de emisión indirecta de CO<sub>2</sub>. De confirmarse este dato:

¿Cree la Comisión que la circunstancia descrita propicia una distorsión de la competencia interna?

¿Tiene la Comisión previsto intervenir si algunos Estados no articulan ayudas de Estado para paliar los sobrecostes sobrevenidos por la aplicación de la tasa de emisiones indirectas de CO<sub>2</sub>?

¿En caso de no existir este tipo de ayudas debería eliminarse la tasa que se aplica al emisor indirecto?

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004703/12**  
**a la Comisión**  
**Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)**  
(8 de mayo de 2012)

*Asunto:* Competencia, tasa de emisiones de CO<sub>2</sub> y mercado europeo de energía eléctrica

El próximo 1 de enero de 2013 entrarán en vigor las directrices que van a regular la articulación de ayudas de estado diseñadas para paliar los problemas de competitividad y competencia que tienen que ver con la aplicación, en las tarifas eléctricas, de la tasa por emisiones indirectas de CO<sub>2</sub>. Algunas de las previsiones establecidas en las citadas directrices han creado honda preocupación en muchas industrias europeas cuyos costes principales están vinculados al consumo de electricidad.

Uno de los problemas detectados es que las citadas directrices se basan en el consumo de energía eléctrica en vez de en la generación real de emisiones y en que no tiene en cuenta las diferencias que existen en los mercados de energía eléctrica en los Estados miembros. Así puede ocurrir que algunos países subvencionen por su consumo eléctrico a empresas que se abastecen de energía eléctrica de origen nuclear, por la que no van a tener que pagar tasas de CO<sub>2</sub>. En otros Estados miembros, sin embargo habrá empresas que se vean abocadas a pagar las correspondientes tasas y que no recibirán subvenciones por el consumo eléctrico. Igualmente las diferencias de modelos contractuales de suministro completa un cuadro que propicia una clara distorsión de la competencia en el mercado interno de la UE que va a propiciar que los efectos positivos de las ayudas sean menores que las distorsiones sobre la competencia.

¿Es consciente la Comisión de que la aplicación de estas directrices va a generar distorsiones internas de la competencia a la vista de que no existe un mercado único europeo de energía eléctrica ni por tecnologías de generación, ni por medidas regulatorias?

¿Tiene previsto la Comisión revisar estas directrices para evitar que la tasa por emisiones indirectas de CO<sub>2</sub> distorsione la competencia?

**Respuesta conjunta del Sr. Almunia en nombre de la Comisión**  
(5 de julio de 2012)

El 22 de mayo, la Comisión adoptó nuevas Directrices relativas a determinadas medidas de ayuda estatal en conexión con el régimen de comercio de derechos de emisión de gases de efecto invernadero de la UE para después de 2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

Sobre la base de datos de Eurostat procedentes de los Estados miembros y de la información recabada a través de consultas públicas, la Comisión estableció determinados sectores que presentan un riesgo significativo de fuga de carbono. Entre los sectores que pueden acceder a la compensación figuran los de producción de aluminio, cobre, abonos, acero, papel, algodón, productos químicos y algunos plásticos. Las Directrices establecen las condiciones para conceder la ayuda y los importes máximos que los Estados miembros puedan conceder tomando como referencia las empresas más eficientes de cada sector. El cálculo de la compensación se basa en una fórmula que garantiza la proporcionalidad de la ayuda al tiempo que mantiene los incentivos para generar una electricidad eficiente y para realizar la transición hacia una economía con bajas emisiones de carbono. También tiene en cuenta la cantidad de CO<sub>2</sub> utilizada en la generación de electricidad a partir de combustibles fósiles en el Estado miembro o región geográfica más extensa de que se trate. La Comisión efectuará un seguimiento periódico de este tipo de ayudas concedidas y podrá revisar las Directrices, incluyendo los correspondientes factores de emisión de CO<sub>2</sub>. Las nuevas normas aspiran a mitigar el impacto de los costes indirectos del CO<sub>2</sub> de las industrias más vulnerables con el fin de evitar fugas de carbono que socavarían la eficacia del RCDE UE. Las normas también se han diseñado para mantener las señales de precios que crea el RCDE con el fin de promover de descarbonización rentable y reducir al mínimo los falseamientos de la competencia en el mercado interior, evitando las carreras de subsidios dentro de la UE en un momento de incertidumbre económica y disciplina presupuestaria.

Los Estados miembros son libres de decidir si es o no oportuno conceder ayuda estatal a las empresas por los costes indirectos del CO<sub>2</sub>. La ayuda estatal es discrecional de los Estados miembros, que pueden decidir conceder importes de ayuda por debajo de los máximos establecidos en las Directrices.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/competition/sectors/energy/legislation\\_en.html](http://ec.europa.eu/competition/sectors/energy/legislation_en.html)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004700/12  
to the Commission  
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)  
(8 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Competition, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions tax and reliability of compensation indexes

On 1 January 2013, guidelines regulating the organisation of state aid aimed at mitigating the competitiveness and competition problems caused by the indirect CO<sub>2</sub> emissions tax on electricity tariffs will enter into force. Some of the provisions set out in these guidelines have led to serious concerns in many European industries whose main costs are linked to electricity consumption.

In order to calculate the value of aid for which each electricity user is eligible, a procedure has been established that assesses the plants' reference electricity production and consumption levels and the CO<sub>2</sub> emission factor for the electricity supplied by combustion plants in different geographical areas. Some of the affected parties have expressed their concern because the compensation indexes neither adequately reflect the real characteristics of supply, nor those based on the generation forecasts from the four-year electricity plans.

In view of the above, can the Commission say:

Does it believe that the compensation indicators proposed by the Member States adequately reflect the reality of electricity generation and possible changes in generation methods in the future?

What criteria were used to accept the indicators proposed?

Will it be possible to renegotiate these indicators if we become aware of clear deviations between reality and the forecasts used as a basis for the calculation?

**Question for written answer E-004702/12  
to the Commission  
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)  
(8 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Competition, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions tax and budget cuts in Member States

On 1 January 2013, guidelines regulating the organisation of state aid aimed at mitigating the competitiveness and competition problems caused by the indirect CO<sub>2</sub> emissions tax on electricity tariffs will enter into force. Some of the provisions set out in these guidelines have led to serious concerns in many European industries whose main costs are linked to electricity consumption.

Nonetheless, despite the existence of the guidelines and supporting European regulations, Member States are not obliged to budget for and pay out the corresponding aid. The need to comply with the stability pact is resulting in a more critical situation with countries introducing budget cuts that affect spending designed to support economic productivity. In some countries, company forecasts confirm that in 2013 there will be no budget resources available to finance state aid for these indirect CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. If this is confirmed:

Does the Commission believe that the situation described could lead to internal EU competition distortion?

Does the Commission intend to intervene if some countries do not provide state aid to mitigate the excessive costs generated by the indirect CO<sub>2</sub> emissions tax?

If this type of aid does not exist, will the Commission eliminate the tax applied to the party responsible for the indirect emissions?

**Question for written answer E-004703/12  
to the Commission**

**Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)**

(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* Competition, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions tax and the European electricity market

On 1 January 2013, guidelines regulating the organisation of state aid aimed at mitigating the competitiveness and competition problems caused by the indirect CO<sub>2</sub> emissions tax on electricity tariffs will enter into force. Some of the provisions set out in these guidelines have led to serious concerns in many European industries whose main costs are linked to electricity consumption.

One problem is that the guidelines in question are based on electricity use instead of actual emissions, and that they do not assess differences between Member States' electricity markets. Consequently, some countries might provide electricity subsidies for companies that get their electricity from nuclear power, for which they do not have to pay CO<sub>2</sub> taxes. Conversely, in other Member States, some companies will be forced to pay the corresponding taxes but will not receive subsidies for electricity use. Similarly, differences in supply contract models add to a framework that fosters a clear distortion of competition within the EU market, which will mean that the positive effects of the aid could be less tangible than the competition distortions.

Is the Commission aware that the application of these guidelines is going to cause internal competition since there is no single European electricity market for generation technologies or for regulatory measures?

Does the Commission plan to revise these guidelines in order to ensure that the indirect CO<sub>2</sub> emissions tax does not distort competition?

**Joint answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission**

(5 July 2012)

On 22 May the Commission adopted new Guidelines for state aid in connection with the EU ETS after 2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

Based on Eurostat data collected from Member States and input from public consultations, the Commission identified certain sectors that are deemed to be at a significant risk of carbon leakage. Sectors eligible for compensation include producers of aluminium, copper, fertilisers, steel, paper, cotton, chemicals and some plastics. The Guidelines set the conditions for providing the aid and the maximum amounts that Member States can provide based on the most efficient companies in each sector. The calculation of the compensation is based on a formula ensuring that the aid is proportionate and it maintains the incentives for electricity efficiency and the transition towards a low-carbon economy. It also takes into account the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> used to generate electricity from fossil fuels in the Member State or wider region in question. The Commission will regularly monitor such aid granted and may review the Guidelines, including the relevant CO<sub>2</sub> emission factors. The new rules aim to mitigate the impact of indirect CO<sub>2</sub> costs for the most vulnerable industries, thereby preventing carbon leakage which would undermine the effectiveness of the EU ETS. The rules have also been designed to preserve the price signals created by the EU ETS in order to promote cost-effective decarbonisation and minimise competition distortions in the internal market by avoiding subsidy races within the EU at a time of economic uncertainty and budgetary discipline.

Member States are free to decide whether or not to grant any such state aid to companies for indirect CO<sub>2</sub> costs. State aid is discretionary on Member states, which may decide to grant lower aid amounts than those foreseen as maximum in the Guidelines.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/competition/sectors/energy/legislation\\_en.html](http://ec.europa.eu/competition/sectors/energy/legislation_en.html)

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004701/12**  
**a la Comisión**  
**Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)**  
(8 de mayo de 2012)

*Asunto:* Competencia, tasa de emisiones de CO<sub>2</sub> y acuerdo de Kioto

El próximo 1 de enero de 2013 entrarán en vigor las directrices que van a regular la articulación de ayudas de estado diseñadas para paliar los problemas de competitividad y competencia que tienen que ver con la aplicación, en las tarifas eléctricas, de la tasa por emisiones indirectas de CO<sub>2</sub>. Algunas de las previsiones establecidas en las citadas directrices han creado honda preocupación en muchas industrias europeas cuyos costes principales están vinculados al consumo de electricidad.

Para empezar, la mayor parte de ellas están sometidas a una fuerte competencia sectorial internacional protagonizada por empresas que se ubican en países que no han suscrito el acuerdo de Kioto. El diferencial de coste que les permite no abonar tasa alguna que grave las emisiones directas o indirectas de dióxido de carbono amenaza la posición y supervivencia de algunas industrias europeas.

A la vista de los problemas que pueden afectar a estas empresas:

¿Tiene la Comisión el proyecto de proponer la aplicación de una tasa de CO<sub>2</sub> a las importaciones de países que no han suscrito el acuerdo de Kioto?

En su defecto ¿Tiene la Comisión previsto en el marco de la directiva sobre el comercio de emisiones la compensación financiera mediante tasas específicas a las empresas expuestas por esta causa a una competencia con países terceros desequilibrada y ajena a los objetivos y sentido de la Unión Europea?

**Respuesta de la Sra. Hedegaard en nombre de la Comisión**  
(2 de julio de 2012)

Las directrices adoptadas recientemente <sup>(1)</sup> sobre determinadas medidas de ayuda estatal en el contexto del régimen de comercio de derechos de emisión de gases de efecto invernadero con posterioridad a 2012 aclaran en qué condiciones pueden concederse ayudas estatales a los sectores a los que se considera expuestos a un riesgo significativo de «fuga de carbono», debido a los costes de la reducción de emisiones de gases de invernadero repercutidos en los precios de la electricidad. Las nuevas normas establecen un delicado equilibrio entre varios objetivos clave. Por un lado, permiten a los Estados miembros atenuar el impacto de los costes de las emisiones indirectas de CO<sub>2</sub> para las industrias más expuestas a unos precios de la electricidad más elevados, evitando de esta manera una posible «fuga de carbono» que socavaría la eficacia del régimen para el comercio de derechos de emisión (RCDE) de la UE. Por otro, están asimismo pensadas para preservar las señales de precios creadas por el RCDE a fin de promover una descarbonización rentable de la economía. Por último, se proponen minimizar los falseamientos de la competencia en el mercado interior evitando escaladas de subvenciones dentro de la UE en un momento de incertidumbre económica y disciplina presupuestaria.

La Comisión no tiene intención de proponer una tasa del carbono a las importaciones de países que no se han obligado a través del Protocolo de Kioto, entre ellos, muy en particular, los Estados Unidos y Canadá. Para dar respuesta a las inquietudes de las instalaciones industriales que podrían enfrentarse a una competencia desleal por parte de terceros países, la Directiva RCDE de la UE prevé, sin embargo, la asignación gratuita de derechos de emisión sobre la base de unos criterios de eficiencia concertados.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2012:158:0004:0022:EN:PDF>.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004701/12  
to the Commission**

**Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)**

(8 May 2012)

*Subject:* Competition, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions tax and Kyoto Protocol

On 1 January 2013, guidelines regulating the organisation of state aid aimed at mitigating the competitiveness and competition problems caused by the indirect CO<sub>2</sub> emissions tax on electricity tariffs will enter into force. Some of the provisions set out in these guidelines have led to serious concerns in many European industries whose main costs are linked to electricity consumption.

First and foremost, most of them face strong global competition in their sector from companies located in countries that have not signed the Kyoto Protocol. The cost differential resulting from them not having to pay any tax on direct or indirect carbon dioxide emissions threatens the position and survival of some European industries.

In the view of the problems that may affect these companies:

Does the Commission plan to propose a CO<sub>2</sub> tax on imports from countries that have not signed the Kyoto Protocol?

Failing that, does the Commission intend, within the framework of the emissions trading Directive, to provide financial compensation for companies that face unfair competition from third countries through specific rates, as the directive runs counter to the objectives and spirit of the European Union?

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

(2 July 2012)

The recently adopted guidelines <sup>(1)</sup> on certain state aid measures in the context of the greenhouse emission allowance trading scheme post 2012 clarify under which conditions state aid may be granted to sectors deemed to be exposed to a significant risk of carbon leakage due to the costs of reducing greenhouse gas emissions passed on in electricity prices. The new rules carefully balance several key objectives. They allow the Member States to mitigate the impact of indirect CO<sub>2</sub> costs for the industries most exposed to higher electricity prices, thereby preventing possible carbon leakage which would undermine the effectiveness of the EU Emissions Trading Scheme (EU ETS). The rules were also designed to preserve the price signals created by the EU ETS so as to promote a cost-effective decarbonisation of the economy. Finally, they are to minimise competition distortions in the internal market by avoiding subsidy races within the EU in times of economic uncertainty and budgetary discipline.

The Commission does not intend to propose a carbon tax on imports from countries that are not bound by the Kyoto Protocol, including most notably, the US and Canada. Instead of this, in order to address the concerns of industrial installations that could face unfair competition from 3rd countries, the EU ETS Directive foresees the free allocation of emission allowances on the basis of agreed efficiency benchmarks.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2012:158:0004:0022:EN:PDF>.

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-004706/12**  
**à la Commission**  
**Alain Cadec (PPE)**  
(9 mai 2012)

*Objet:* Expiration du protocole à l'accord de partenariat de pêche UE-Mauritanie

L'accord de partenariat de pêche UE-Mauritanie (APP) revêt une importance majeure pour les chalutiers européens qui ciblent les espèces pélagiques, les céphalopodes et les crustacés.

Le protocole relatif à cet accord avec la Mauritanie viendra à expiration le 31 juillet prochain. Il semble pourtant que les négociations avec les autorités mauritaniennes, en cours depuis plus d'un an, ne pourront pas aboutir à temps pour qu'un nouveau protocole puisse être paraphé par la Commission et mis en application provisoire par le Conseil avant cette date — et a fortiori pour qu'il puisse être valablement conclu après approbation du Parlement européen. Les délais semblent également intenables dans l'hypothèse d'un simple renouvellement du protocole à l'APP existant.

L'expiration du protocole risque de se traduire par un arrêt brutal de l'activité des navires européens dans les eaux mauritaniennes. En effet, en l'absence de protocole, l'APP resterait en vigueur, empêchant les navires battant pavillon européen de pêcher en dehors du cadre de cet accord, en raison de la clause d'exclusivité qu'il contient et qui continuerait de s'appliquer.

Cette situation involontaire aurait pour effet de confronter les opérateurs européens à la difficile alternative suivante: soit renoncer à pêcher dans les eaux mauritaniennes, malgré leurs droits historiques, leurs investissements importants et leurs engagements de longue date en faveur de l'emploi local, soit recourir à un changement de pavillon pour échapper aux règles de l'UE et négocier des droits de pêche dans le cadre de licences privées avec la Mauritanie.

Cette situation est contradictoire car les armateurs souhaiteraient continuer à pêcher dans le cadre des règles imposées par l'Union européenne et non pas changer de pavillon pour échapper à ces règles. Néanmoins, s'ils choisissaient de respecter ces règles, ils seraient contraints d'arrêter leurs activités de pêche avec toutes les conséquences économiques et sociales que cela comporte, tant pour les entreprises concernées que pour leurs partenaires mauritaniens.

— Dans ces conditions, la Commission serait-elle prête à dispenser les opérateurs européens du respect de la clause d'exclusivité, de manière exceptionnelle, tant qu'un nouveau protocole n'a pas été négocié et mis en application avec la Mauritanie?

— Plus généralement, la Commission envisage-t-elle d'inclure à l'avenir ce type de clauses d'exclusivité dans les protocoles aux APP qu'elle négocie, plutôt que dans les APP eux-mêmes, de manière à éviter ce genre d'impasse juridique?

**Réponse donnée par Mme Maria Damanaki au nom de la Commission**  
(4 juillet 2012)

La Commission continuera à tout mettre en œuvre pour trouver une solution mutuellement acceptable et conclure les négociations à temps avant l'expiration du protocole en vigueur, de manière à éviter une discontinuité des opérations de pêche après le 1<sup>er</sup> août 2012.

La principale question encore en suspens dans la négociation est celle du niveau de la participation financière de l'UE. La Commission souligne que, conformément au mandat de négociation, un nouvel accord ne peut être accepté que s'il prend en considération tant un bon rapport coûts-avantages qu'une gestion durable des stocks. Il est également nécessaire de parvenir à un équilibre équitable entre le budget de l'UE et la participation du secteur industriel.

La Commission considère qu'une suspension temporaire de la clause d'exclusivité n'est pas une bonne solution. Cette clause constitue un élément important de notre politique extérieure, qui interdit aux navires de l'UE d'opérer hors du cadre d'un accord et garantit donc que tous les navires de l'UE soient soumis aux mêmes règles. Ce principe est exposé dans la communication de la Commission relative à la dimension extérieure de la politique commune de la pêche et confirmé par les conclusions du Conseil du mois de mars concernant cette communication.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-004706/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Alain Cadec (PPE)**  
(9 May 2012)

*Subject:* Expiry of the fisheries partnership agreement protocol between the EU and Mauritania

The Fisheries Partnership Agreement (FPA) between the EU and Mauritania is of major significance for European trawlers fishing pelagic stocks, cephalopods and crustaceans.

The relative protocol to this agreement with Mauritania will expire on 31 July 2012. However, it seems that negotiations with the Mauritanian authorities, which have been ongoing for over a year, will not conclude in time to ensure that the new protocol can be signed by the Commission and provisionally implemented by the Council before this date — and, more importantly, to ensure that it can be legitimately concluded after approval by the European Parliament. Even in a scenario where the existing FPA protocol could simply be renewed, the deadlines seem equally unfeasible.

If the protocol expires, the activities of European vessels in Mauritanian waters may cease. Indeed, in the absence of a protocol, the FPA would remain in force, preventing vessels flying the European flag from fishing outside the framework of this agreement because the exclusivity clause it contains would continue to apply.

This unintentional situation would leave European vessel operators with the following difficult choice: either they would have to stop fishing Mauritanian waters, despite their historical rights, significant investments and long-term commitment to promote local employment; or they would have to resort to using different flags in order to evade the EU rules, and negotiate private licences for fishing rights with Mauritania.

This situation is contradictory because ship owners wish to continue fishing within the framework of rules imposed by the EU and do not want to change their flags in order to evade these rules. Nevertheless, if they choose to respect these rules, they will be forced to cease their fishing activities along with all the economic and social consequences this entails, both for the businesses concerned and for their Mauritanian partners.

— Under these conditions, would the Commission be prepared to exempt European vessel operators from the exclusivity clause as an exception, since no new protocol has been negotiated or implemented with Mauritania?

— On a more general note, does the Commission plan to include such exclusivity clauses in protocols to the FPAs it negotiates rather than within the FPAs themselves in future, in order to prevent this kind of legal impasse?

**Answer given by Ms Maria Damanaki on behalf of the Commission**  
(4 July 2012)

The Commission will continue to do its utmost to find a mutually acceptable solution and to conclude negotiations in time before the expiry of the current Protocol so as to avoid discontinuity of fishing operations after 1 August 2012.

The main remaining issue in the negotiation is the level of financial contribution paid by the EU budget. The Commission underlines that, in line with the negotiating mandate, any new agreement can only be accepted when it takes into consideration both a good value for money and sustainable management of the stocks. There is also a need to achieve a fair balance between EU budget and industry's participation.

The Commission considers that a temporary cessation of the exclusivity clause does not constitute a way forward. This clause it is an important element of our external policy which prevents EU vessels to operate outside the framework of an agreement and therefore ensures that all EU vessels are subject to the same rules. This principle was set out in the Commission Communication on the External dimension of the common fisheries policy and has been confirmed by the Council conclusions of March on this communication.

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004707/12  
à la Commission (Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante)**

**Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)**

(9 mai 2012)

*Objet:* VP/HR — Vaste mouvement de grève de la faim des prisonniers palestiniens

Plus de 2000 prisonniers palestiniens sont actuellement en grève de la faim depuis le 17 avril afin de dénoncer leurs conditions humiliantes de détention (notamment les fouilles à nu), l'isolement carcéral, les limitations des visites familiales et autres mesures répressives.

Le rejet par la Cour suprême d'Israël ce lundi 7 mai du recours de deux prisonniers palestiniens placés sous détention administrative et qui souhaitaient avoir accès à leur dossier afin de connaître les raisons légales de leur détention confirme l'impasse dans laquelle sont ces hommes, obligés, pour alerter sur leur situation, de mettre leur propre vie en danger par ces grèves de la faim.

4 610 prisonniers palestiniens sont encore détenus par l'État d'Israël à l'intérieur de ses frontières et en violation de l'article 49 de la quatrième Convention de Genève qui interdit les transferts forcés en dehors du territoire occupé. Parmi ces prisonniers, se trouvent 185 enfants ou jeunes de moins de dix-huit ans, 11 femmes, 27 députés, 2 anciens ministres, et plus d'une centaine de personnes atteintes de maladies et de handicaps. De plus, 320 prisonniers sont soumis à la détention administrative, un régime arbitraire et illégal qui viole le droit international, notamment la quatrième convention de Genève.

— Quelles mesures la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante a-t-elle prises pour s'assurer de la santé de ces prisonniers en grève de la faim et faciliter une réponse positive à leur demande?

— Alors que la journée des prisonniers s'est déroulée le 17 avril, la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante a-t-elle en cette occasion et à la suite des multiples interpellations d'élus et d'ONG révisé son approche pour obtenir des autorités israéliennes le respect des droits fondamentaux de ces prisonniers?

— La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante ne considère-t-elle pas que son approche visant à aborder le sort de ces prisonniers dans le dialogue structurel de l'accord d'association a clairement montré ses limites?

— La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante est-elle d'avis que la défense des libertés fondamentales de ces personnes doit faire l'objet d'une plus forte utilisation des moyens de pression communautaires?

— Dans la perspective de la mise en place du Service européen pour l'action extérieure, que pense la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante d'assigner à ses personnels sur place en Israël des missions de soutien et d'assistance à ces détenus, comme le font déjà plusieurs délégations des États membres de l'Union européenne?

**Réponse donnée par Mme Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission**

(9 juillet 2012)

Mme Ashton salue l'accord trouvé le 14 mai 2012 visant à mettre un terme aux grèves de la faim des détenus et prisonniers palestiniens en Israël. Elle incite toutes les parties concernées à mettre en œuvre, promptement et de bonne foi, l'accord en question. Elle salue le rôle clé joué par l'Égypte dans la négociation de cet accord.

Le 14 mai 2012, le Conseil Affaires étrangères a débattu de la question des grèves de la faim menées par les prisonniers palestiniens.

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante a suivi de très près les grèves de la faim menées par les prisonniers palestiniens et reste impliquée, notamment au travers de la délégation de l'UE, dans les efforts en cours pour trouver une solution. Plus particulièrement, la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante s'est inquiétée de l'état de santé préoccupant des Palestiniens placés en détention administrative en Israël qui avaient entamé une grève de la faim depuis plus de deux mois, et de l'éventualité d'une issue fatale.

Le 8 mai, les chefs de mission de l'UE à Jérusalem ont également fait une déclaration à cet égard, exposant la position de l'UE.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004707/12**  
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**  
**Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)**  
(9 May 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Huge hunger strike movement among Palestinian prisoners

More than 2 000 Palestinian prisoners have been on hunger strike since 17 April 2012, protesting against their demeaning prison conditions (particularly strip searches), solitary confinement, limitations on family visits and other repressive measures.

The Israeli Supreme Court's rejection of the appeal of two Palestinian prisoners placed in administrative detention who requested access to their files in order to find out the legal reasons for their imprisonment confirms the deadlock faced by these men, who have been forced to endanger their own lives by using hunger strikes to highlight their situation.

Currently, 4 610 Palestinian prisoners are being detained by the state of Israel within its borders, in violation of Article 49 of the Fourth Geneva Convention, which prohibits forcible transfers outside of occupied territory. These prisoners include 185 children or teenagers younger than 18, 11 women, 27 elected representatives, 2 former ministers, and more than 100 prisoners suffering from illness or disability. Furthermore, 320 prisoners have been placed in administrative detention, an arbitrary and illegal system which violates international law, particularly the Fourth Geneva Convention.

— What measures has the Vice-President/High Representative taken to ensure the health of these hunger-striking prisoners and to facilitate a positive response to their requests?

— Considering that Palestinian Political Prisoners' Day took place on 17 April 2012, and following multiple requests from elected representatives and NGOs, has the Vice-President/High Representative revised her approach for ensuring that the Israeli authorities respect the fundamental rights of these prisoners?

— Does the Vice-President/High Representative not believe that her approach to bringing about the release of these prisoners through structured dialogue for an association agreement has clearly shown its limitations?

— Is the Vice-President/High Representative of the opinion that defending the fundamental rights of these people warrants the EU's stronger use of pressure on the state of Israel?

— From the point of view of implementing the European External Action Service, what is the Vice-President/High Representative's opinion on instructing personnel located in Israel to support and assist these prisoners, as multiple delegations from EU Member States are already doing?

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

The HR/VP welcomes the agreement reached on 14 May to end the hunger strike by Palestinian detainees and prisoners in Israeli custody. She urges all concerned to implement the agreement swiftly and in good faith. She commends Egypt for its key role in brokering the agreement.

The 14 May Foreign Affairs Council discussed the hunger strike by Palestinian prisoners.

The HR/VP has been following the hunger strike by Palestinian prisoners very closely and has remained engaged, including through the EU Delegation, in the ongoing efforts to find a solution. In particular the HR/VP was very concerned about the critical health condition of the Palestinians held in Israeli administrative detention who had been on hunger strike for more than two months and the possibility that this might lead to a loss of life.

EU Heads of Missions in Jerusalem also issued a statement on this issue on the 8 May setting out the EU position.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004711/12**  
**alla Commissione**  
**Mara Bizzotto (EFD)**  
(9 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Attacchi contro la Comunità Cristiana in Nigeria e Kenia

Domenica 29 aprile, la comunità cristiana in Africa è stata colpita in Kenia e in Nigeria da due attentati di matrice estremista islamica: in tutto 21 vittime e decine di feriti fra i fedeli riuniti per la celebrazione delle funzioni religiose.

Il primo attacco si è verificato nel campus universitario di Bayero in Nigeria dove 3 ordigni sono esplosi nei pressi dell'auditorium scelto dai fedeli per officiare i riti. Il secondo attacco si è verificato a Nairobi in Kenya dove una granata è deflagrata all'interno di una chiesa.

Indiziati degli attentati sono due gruppi estremisti attivi nei rispettivi paesi: i militanti del Boko Haram in Nigeria e quelli di Al-Shabab, legati ad Al-Qaeda in Kenia.

— La Commissione è a conoscenza di questi eventi?

— Come valuta la situazione nei due paesi?

— Che misure ha intenzione di mettere in campo per salvaguardare la comunità cristiana?

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004713/12**  
**alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**  
**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**  
(9 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Attacco a comunità cristiane in Africa

È stata una domenica di sangue nelle chiese cristiane in Africa.

Nel Nord della Nigeria, a Kano, un campus universitario è stato colpito da diverse esplosioni e, secondo testimoni, anche da numerosi colpi di arma da fuoco. Una ventina di corpi sono stati rinvenuti ma il bilancio rischia di salire, visto che numerosi feriti sono stati evacuati verso gli ospedali della zona e che alcuni di loro versano in gravi condizioni. Un'altra fonte ha confermato di aver visto portar via almeno quindici corpi. Gli episodi si sono verificati nei pressi di un auditorium dove si stava svolgendo una funzione religiosa cristiana. Fortemente indiziato è il gruppo islamico Boko Haram, che nel corso di un attacco in gennaio ha ucciso almeno 150 persone e che è ritenuto anche responsabile del rapimento e della morte dell'ostaggio italiano Franco Lamolinara e dell'inglese Christopher McManus. Boko Haram dal 2009 a oggi ha causato oltre un migliaio di morti in Nigeria e nelle regioni limitrofe.

A Nairobi, in Kenya, almeno una persona — un sacerdote — è morta e decine sono rimaste ferite, di cui quattro in modo grave, in una chiesa nella quale è stata lanciata una granata. Un portavoce locale ha riferito che l'edificio, in lamiera, è devastato e il pavimento è ricoperto di sangue. Fonti di polizia non confermano ancora che dietro l'attentato possano esserci terroristi legati ad al-Qaeda.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può l'Alto Rappresentante far sapere:

1. se è a conoscenza della vicenda che ha interessato la comunità cristiana in Africa;
2. se ritiene che si debbano prendere nuovi provvedimenti affinché siano salvaguardati i diritti umani e la libertà degli individui di professare il loro credo;
3. quali sono i progressi fatti registrati nell'ultimo anno dall'UE nella veste di garante della pace e nell'azione volta a rafforzare il suo ruolo di mediatore in Africa?

**Risposta congiunta di Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione***(19 giugno 2012)*

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente è bene a conoscenza degli attacchi contro le comunità cristiane in Africa.

Tuttavia, i cristiani non sono il bersaglio specifico degli attacchi in Kenya; questi attacchi rientrano in una più vasta campagna del terrore o sono volti a creare instabilità, colpendo gli affollati luoghi pubblici kenyoti come, ad esempio, stazioni degli autobus, bar, locali notturni e chiese. L'identità e le motivazioni degli attentatori non sono sempre chiare. Non tutti gli attacchi vengono perpetrati dai militanti di Al-Shabab. A volte altri gruppi approfittano della situazione, compresi i gruppi politici che hanno un interesse a creare instabilità in vista delle prossime elezioni generali, previste per l'inizio del 2013.

La sicurezza dei cittadini del Kenya e degli stranieri che si trovano nel paese dovrebbe essere migliorata e, nell'ambito del dialogo politico con il governo kenyota, l'UE solleva regolarmente le questioni relative alla sicurezza.

Per quanto riguarda la Nigeria, gli attacchi perpetrati da Boko Haram hanno come bersaglio tanto lo stato laico, quanto i cristiani e i musulmani moderati. Lo scopo primario degli attacchi è minare lo Stato di diritto e diffondere il terrore. L'UE e la Nigeria intrattengono un continuo dialogo in materia di diritti umani, nel quale rientrano questioni relative alla libertà di religione e di credo.

L'UE sta inoltre esaminando il miglior modo per aiutare la Nigeria ad affrontare queste difficoltà in cooperazione con il paese stesso. L'UE ha già ridestinato parti importanti del suo programma di cooperazione con la Nigeria alla parte settentrionale del paese, dove opera Boko Haram. Inoltre, l'UE fornirà a breve lo sviluppo di capacità nell'ambito della mediazione, attraverso un progetto pilota varato dal Parlamento europeo.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004711/12  
to the Commission  
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)  
(9 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Attacks against the Christian community in Nigeria and Kenya

On Sunday, 29 April, the Christian community in Kenya and Nigeria was hit by two attacks with radical Islamic origins. In total, there were 21 victims and dozens of wounded among the worshippers who had gathered together at the religious service.

The first attack took place at the university campus of Bayero in Nigeria where three devices exploded near the lecture hall chosen by worshippers for their services. The second attack took place in Nairobi in Kenya where a grenade went off inside a church.

The suspected perpetrators of the attacks are two extremist groups active in the respective countries: the Boko Haram militants in Nigeria and Al-Shabab militants, who have links to Al-Qaeda, in Kenya.

- Is the Commission aware of these events?
- What is its assessment of the situation in the two countries?
- What measures does it intend to put in place to safeguard the Christian community?

**Question for written answer E-004713/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)  
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)  
(9 May 2012)**

*Subject:* VP/HR — Attack on Christian communities in Africa

It was a 'bloody' Sunday in Christian churches in Africa.

In the north of Nigeria, in Kano, a university campus has been hit by various explosions and, according to witnesses, numerous gunshots. Around twenty bodies have been found but the death toll could rise further, given that many wounded were sent to local hospitals and some of them are in a serious condition. Another source has confirmed seeing at least 15 bodies being taken away. The episode took place near a hall in which a Christian religious service was being held. The Islamic group Boko Haram has been named as a strong suspect. It killed at least 150 people during an attack in January 2012, and is also considered to be responsible for the kidnapping and death of the Italian hostage Franco Lamolinara and the British hostage Christopher McManus. Since 2009, Boko Haram has caused over a thousand deaths in Nigeria and the surrounding regions.

In Nairobi, in Kenya, at least one person — a clergyman — has died and dozens have been injured, four of whom very seriously, when a grenade was thrown into a church. A local spokesperson reported that the sheet metal building was destroyed and the floor was covered in blood. Police sources have not yet confirmed that terrorists connected with Al-Qaeda could be behind the attack.

In view of the above, can the High Representative/Vice-President state:

1. whether she is aware of the event that has affected the African Christian community?
2. whether she believes that new measures should be taken to protect the human rights and freedom of individuals to practice their faith?
3. what progress has been recorded over the past year by the EU in order to guarantee peace, and in its activities aimed at reinforcing its role as mediator in Africa?



**Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**  
(19 June 2012)

The High Representative/Vice-President is fully aware of the attacks on Christian communities in Africa.

The attacks in Kenya are not targeting specifically Christians. They are part of a larger terror campaign or simply intended to cause instability by attacking Kenyans in crowded public places such as bus stations, bars, night clubs and churches. The identity and the motivation of the perpetrators are not always clear. Not all of these actions are carried out by Al-Shabab militants. Sometimes other groups take advantage of the situation, including political groups with an interest to cause instability ahead of the next general elections which are scheduled for early 2013.

The safety of all Kenyans and foreigners staying in the country should be improved and the EU regularly raises security issues in its political dialogue with the Government of Kenya.

As far as Nigeria is concerned, the attacks by Boko Haram target the secular state, as well as Christians and moderate Muslims. The primary purpose of the attacks is to undermine the rule of law and spread terror. There is a continuing human rights dialogue between the EU and Nigeria, which includes the issues related to freedom of religion and belief.

The EU is also studying, in cooperation with Nigeria, how best to support it in facing these difficulties. The EU has already reoriented important parts of its cooperation programme with Nigeria to the North of the country, where Boko Haram operates. In addition, the EU shall shortly provide capacity building for mediation making use of a pilot project established by the European Parliament.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004714/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(9 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Direttiva 2011/24/UE

La direttiva 2011/24/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio del 9 marzo 2011 fa chiarezza sul diritto dei pazienti di accedere a un trattamento sanitario sicuro e di buona qualità, nonché di essere rimborsati. La legge dispone che i pazienti che si recano in un altro Stato membro dell'UE per ricevere cure mediche avranno diritto al medesimo trattamento dei cittadini del paese che li ospita. Gli esperti della sanità di tutta Europa potranno, dunque, condividere buone pratiche in tema di assistenza sanitaria e fornire standard di eccellenza.

A volte risulta più semplice o necessario recarsi in un altro Stato membro dell'UE, ad esempio se la struttura sanitaria più vicina è al di là del confine o se le cure specialistiche sono disponibili soltanto all'estero. La direttiva ha quindi come obiettivo quello di definire un sistema di rimborso grazie al quale i pazienti potrebbero essere indennizzati dal loro paese di origine per delle cure mediche ricevute in un altro paese all'interno dell'Unione europea.

Un'altra iniziativa prevista nella normativa europea (che gli Stati membri dovranno attuare entro il 2013) sui diritti dei pazienti all'assistenza sanitaria transfrontaliera è la tessera europea di assicurazione malattia che permette a chi è in vacanza o in viaggio di affari di ottenere cure sanitarie in un altro paese europeo in caso di malattia.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se, a distanza di un anno dalla data di approvazione della direttiva, gli Stati membri hanno avviato le procedure per garantire il rispetto dei termini per il recepimento;
2. quali Stati membri hanno già previsto la tessera europea di assicurazione malattia?

**Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione**

(3 luglio 2012)

La Commissione collabora da vicino con gli Stati membri per aiutarli a rispettare il termine (ottobre 2013) previsto per l'attuazione della direttiva 2011/24/UE <sup>(1)</sup>. In particolare, si è dichiarata disponibile a contattare ogni singolo Stato membro per discutere approfonditamente con i ministeri competenti le disposizioni della direttiva al fine di assistere le autorità nazionali nel recepimento della stessa nel diritto nazionale. I primi contatti hanno avuto luogo nel giugno 2011 e proseguiranno fino all'ottobre 2012.

Inoltre, conformemente a tale direttiva è stato istituito il comitato per l'assistenza sanitaria transfrontaliera composto da rappresentanti degli Stati membri. Il comitato si riunisce regolarmente per assistere la Commissione nella preparazione dei provvedimenti attuativi e per discutere l'attuazione della direttiva.

La Commissione è pertanto al corrente degli sforzi degli Stati membri per recepire la direttiva e continuerà a seguire da vicino la situazione.

Il Consiglio europeo del marzo 2002 ha deciso che una tessera europea di assicurazione malattia sostituisce i moduli cartacei utilizzati per usufruire dell'assistenza sanitaria durante un soggiorno temporaneo in un altro Stato membro. Tra il 1° giugno 2004 e il 31 dicembre 2005, a seguito di tale decisione, è stata introdotta progressivamente la tessera europea di assicurazione malattia. La tessera è in circolazione dal 1° gennaio 2006 ed è riconosciuta in tutti i paesi dell'UE, come pure in Islanda, Liechtenstein, Norvegia e Svizzera. La tessera europea di assicurazione malattia conferma che i cittadini hanno diritto alle necessarie cure mediche previste dal sistema sanitario nazionale in condizioni di parità rispetto alle persone assicurate nel paese in cui essi soggiornano (articolo 19 del regolamento (CE) n. 883/2004 <sup>(2)</sup>).

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:088:0045:0065:IT:PDF>.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32004R0883:it:NOT>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004714/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(9 May 2012)

*Subject:* Directive 2011/24/EU

Directive 2011/24/EU of the European Parliament and the Council of 9 March 2011 clarifies the right of patients to access, and be reimbursed for, safe and good-quality healthcare treatment. The law stipulates that patients who go to another EU Member State to receive medical care will have the right to the same treatment as the citizens of that country. Healthcare experts from across Europe will, therefore, be able to share good practices in terms of healthcare assistance and provide standards of excellence.

It can sometimes be more straightforward or necessary to go to another EU Member State, for example if the nearest healthcare facility is over the border or if specialist treatment is only available abroad. The directive therefore aims to establish a reimbursement system whereby patients could be compensated by their country of origin for medical care received in another country within the European Union.

Another initiative provided for in the European regulations (which Member States must implement by 2013) on the rights of patients to cross-border healthcare is the European health insurance card which permits those on holiday or travelling on business to receive treatment in another European country if they are ill.

In view of the above, can the Commission state:

1. whether, a year after the directive was approved, Member States have launched procedures to ensure that deadlines are met for its transposition?
2. which Member States have already implemented plans for introducing the European health insurance card?

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

(3 July 2012)

The Commission is working very closely with Member States to help them meet the October 2013 deadline for the transposition of Directive 2011/24/EU <sup>(1)</sup>. In particular, the Commission has offered to visit each and every Member State for in-depth discussions with the relevant Ministries on the provisions of the directive with a view to supporting national authorities with its transposition into national law. These visits began in June 2011 and the last visit is planned for October 2012.

In addition, the Committee on Cross-border Healthcare consisting of representatives of Member States has been established in accordance with the directive. This Committee meets regularly to assist the Commission in preparing implementing acts and to discuss the implementation of the directive.

The Commission is therefore aware of Member States' endeavours to transpose the directive and will continue to monitor the situation closely.

The European Council of March 2002 decided that a European Health Insurance Card should replace the paper forms needed to receive healthcare during a temporary stay in another Member State. The decision was followed by a progressive introduction of the European Health Insurance Card from 1 June 2004 until 31 December 2005. Since 1 January 2006, it has been issued and is recognised in all EU-countries as well as in Iceland, Lichtenstein, Norway and Switzerland. The European Health Insurance Card confirms that citizens are entitled to necessary healthcare within the public healthcare system on the same conditions as persons insured in the country they are visiting (Article 19 of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 <sup>(2)</sup>).

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:088:0045:0065:EN:PDF>.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32004R0883:en:NOT>.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004715/12  
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(9 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Esplosione presso l'università di Istanbul

Tre persone sono rimaste ferite per un'esplosione presso l'università di Istanbul. Secondo quanto riferito da un'agenzia turca, lo scoppio è avvenuto nei bagni della facoltà di legge e le tre vittime sono state ricoverate con ferite leggere. La polizia sta indagando sulle cause dell'esplosione, ancora non chiare.

Istanbul è spesso teatro di piccoli attentati con ordigni di fabbricazione rudimentale. Nei mesi precedenti, nella metropoli turca ne sono stati contati almeno una decina, senza gravi danni alle persone o alle strutture. Diversi gruppi fuorilegge (curdi, islamici e estremisti di sinistra) hanno rivendicato attacchi a Istanbul e Ankara. Gli attentati avvenuti in passato a Istanbul sono stati attribuiti al PKK, che dal 1984 si è battuto per l'indipendenza del territorio del sud-est dell'Anatolia, abitato in prevalenza da curdi. Il conflitto curdo in Turchia ha causato più di 37 mila morti, ma anche altri gruppi, di estrema sinistra o di ispirazione islamica, hanno compiuto attentati.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può l'Alto Rappresentante far sapere:

1. se è a conoscenza dell'esplosione che ha interessato l'università di Istanbul;
2. quali sono i progressi compiuti dalla Turchia nel percorso di avvicinamento all'Unione europea e se questi continui attacchi, che coinvolgono la società turca, vanno a comprometterne l'adesione?

**Risposta dell'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione**

(27 giugno 2012)

Il rispetto dei diritti umani è un requisito fondamentale nel processo di allargamento, cui la Commissione attribuisce la massima importanza. La Commissione monitora costantemente la situazione dei diritti umani in Turchia, che è posta in primo piano anche nelle relazioni annuali sui progressi compiuti dal paese. In varie occasioni, la Commissione ha sottolineato la sua preoccupazione per quanto attiene ai procedimenti giudiziari in relazione al caso dell'Unione delle comunità curde (KCK), in cui circa 2 000 persone, tra politici, rappresentanti eletti a livello locale e attivisti per i diritti umani, sono state arrestate nel sud-est del paese dall'aprile del 2008. La Commissione ha altresì sottolineato che le disposizioni della normativa turca in materia di terrorismo e l'ampia definizione data a questo termine dalla legge antiterrorismo rimane un motivo di grave preoccupazione.

La Commissione affronta sistematicamente presso le autorità turche casi specifici di violazione dei diritti umani. Inoltre, la delegazione UE in Turchia segue da vicino casi importanti come quello citato, anche partecipando alle udienze dei processi.

La Commissione ha più volte ribadito che occorre trovare una soluzione equa ed equilibrata alla questione curda e ha incoraggiato tutte le parti a impegnarsi per portare pace e prosperità a tutti i cittadini della Turchia. La Turchia sud-orientale ha bisogno di pace, democrazia e stabilità, oltre a sviluppo sociale, economico e culturale. Questo obiettivo può essere raggiunto solo attraverso un accordo su misure concrete che amplino i diritti sociali, economici e culturali degli abitanti della regione. Un tale approccio richiede la partecipazione e l'inclusione di tutte le forze democratiche, e non la loro esclusione. La Commissione auspica che una nuova Costituzione civile ponga le basi per ulteriori progressi.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004715/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)  
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(9 May 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Explosion at Istanbul University

Three people have been injured in an explosion at Istanbul University. According to reports from a Turkish agency, the blast took place in the law faculty toilets and the three victims were hospitalised with light injuries. Police are investigating the causes of the explosion, which are still unclear.

Istanbul is often the scene of small attacks using rudimentary devices. In previous months, in the Turkish metropolis there have been at least ten incidents without any serious damage to people or buildings. Kurds, Muslims and the extreme left have claimed responsibility for attacks in Istanbul and Ankara. In the past, attacks that occurred in Istanbul were attributed to the PKK; a group that has been fighting for independence in the south-eastern Anatolia territory since 1984, an area previously inhabited by the Kurds. The Kurdish conflict in Turkey has caused more than 37 000 deaths, but other extreme left or Islam-inspired groups have also carried out attacks.

In view of the above, can the High Representative/Vice-President state:

1. whether she is aware of the explosion at the University of Istanbul?
2. what progress has been made by Turkey in its path towards the European Union and whether these continuous attacks involving Turkish civilians will compromise its membership?

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

(27 June 2012)

Respect for human rights is a core requirement of the enlargement process, to which the Commission attaches the highest importance. The Commission continuously monitors the human rights situation in Turkey. It features prominently in the annual Progress Reports. The Commission has, on various occasions, stressed its concern as regards the judicial procedures in connection with the Kurdish Communities' Union (KCK) case in which around 2 000 politicians, locally elected representatives and human rights activists in the south-east have been detained since April 2008. The Commission also underlined that terrorism-related articles of Turkish legislation and the wide definition of terrorism under the Anti-Terror Law remain a cause for serious concern.

The Commission systematically raises specific cases of violations of human rights brought with the Turkish authorities. Furthermore, the EU Delegation in Turkey closely monitors important cases such as this, including by attending trial hearings.

The Commission has repeatedly stressed that a balanced and fair solution to the Kurdish issue needs to be found and encouraged all parties to make all efforts to bring peace and prosperity for all the citizens of Turkey. The south-east of Turkey needs peace, democracy and stability as well as social, economic and cultural development. This can only be achieved via consensus on concrete measures expanding the social, economic and cultural rights of the people living in the region. This approach requires the participation and inclusion of all democratic forces, and not their exclusion. The Commission expects a new civilian Constitution to provide a basis for further progress.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004716/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(9 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Logo Euro-leaf

Il logo BIO dell'Unione europea è quello che dà ai consumatori sicurezza per quanto riguarda l'origine e la qualità degli alimenti e delle bevande, assicurando la conformità con il regolamento europeo sull'agricoltura biologica.

Dopo che è stato approvato il nuovo logo — «euro-leaf» (marchio rettangolare verde con foglia fatta di stelle) — per un certo periodo è stato possibile utilizzare per i prodotti bio etichette che riportavano ancora il vecchio logo, quello rotondo con la spiga e le stelle, lanciato alla fine degli anni Novanta e applicato su base volontaria.

Dal luglio del 2010, tutti i prodotti alimentari biologici preconfezionati nell'Unione europea devono recare obbligatoriamente il logo biologico UE. È possibile usare il logo su base volontaria per le produzioni biologiche non preconfezionate nell'Unione europea o su altri prodotti biologici importati da paesi terzi.

Il prossimo 1° luglio, in ottemperanza a quanto riportato all'art. 95 comma 10 del regolamento (CE) n. 889/2008, scade la misura transitoria che aveva concesso la possibilità di smaltire etichette e confezioni in possesso dell'azienda, predisposte e approvate durante il primo periodo di applicazione dei nuovi regolamenti.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione far sapere come intende garantire che negli Stati membri non siano smaltiti prodotti giacenti in azienda privi del nuovo logo euro-leaf, anche dopo la fine del periodo transitorio?

**Risposta di Dacian Cioloș a nome della Commissione**

(10 luglio 2012)

Il periodo transitorio per l'introduzione delle nuove norme relative all'etichettatura dei prodotti ottenuti in conformità alla normativa unionale in materia di agricoltura biologica <sup>(1)</sup> si è concluso il 1° luglio 2012. Di conseguenza, il logo biologico dell'UE diventa obbligatorio nell'etichettatura e nella pubblicità dei prodotti alimentari biologici preconfezionati immessi sul mercato unionale e rispondenti ai criteri previsti dal regolamento (CE) n. 834/2007 o stabiliti in forza del medesimo. Il periodo transitorio di due anni era stato previsto per aiutare gli operatori ad adeguarsi al nuovo regolamento e per evitare di sprecare gli imballaggi esistenti.

La normativa in materia di agricoltura biologica riguarda tutte le fasi di produzione, preparazione e distribuzione, compresa l'importazione o l'esportazione di prodotti biologici, e mira a garantire condizioni di concorrenza leale e l'efficace funzionamento del mercato interno. A fini di tutela del consumatore e a garanzia della concorrenza leale, i termini utilizzati per indicare i prodotti biologici sono protetti in tutta l'Unione europea e indipendentemente dalla lingua impiegata.

L'uso del logo e l'uso di tutti i termini che designano i prodotti biologici sono soggetti ai sistemi di controllo istituiti dagli Stati membri a norma del titolo V del suddetto regolamento. In particolare, almeno una volta all'anno tutti gli operatori devono sottostare ai controlli svolti da ispettori specializzati appartenenti agli organismi e alle autorità di controllo designati a livello nazionale. Di conseguenza, ogni operatore della catena del biologico (l'agricoltore, il trasformatore, il distributore) deve essere certificato conforme alla normativa unionale in materia di agricoltura biologica.

È inoltre importante osservare che l'Ufficio alimentare e veterinario della Commissione svolge audit di sistema sui controlli svolti dagli Stati membri nel settore biologico.

Infine, benché obbligatorio, il logo biologico non è l'unico a figurare sulla confezione del prodotto: nel rispetto della legislazione unionale, accanto all'eurofoglia possono essere utilizzati e figurare sui prodotti biologici marchi nazionali e privati.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Regolamento (CE) n. 834/2007 del Consiglio del 28 giugno 2007 (GU L 189 del 20.7.2007, pag. 1) e regolamento (CE) n. 889/2008 della Commissione del 5 settembre 2008 (GU L 250 del 18.9.2008, pag. 1).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004716/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(9 May 2012)

*Subject:* Euro Leaf logo

The European Union's Ecolabel offers consumers confidence in the origin and quality of food and drink, ensuring conformity with the EU organic agriculture regulation.

For a certain period following the approval of the new Euro Leaf logo (a green rectangle containing a leaf shape made up of stars) it was possible to label organic products with the old logo (a circle containing a corn ear and stars), launched at the end of the 1990s and applied on a voluntary basis.

From July 2010, all organic food products pre-packaged in the European Union must carry the EU organic logo as a requirement. It is only for organic products not pre-packaged in the European Union, or on other organic products imported from third countries, that the use of the logo is optional.

From next July, in accordance with the requirements set out in Article 95(10) of Regulation (EC) No 889/2008, the transitional measure that granted the possibility of disposing of labels and packaging in the company's possession, which were prepared and approved during the first application period of the new regulations, will end.

In view of the above, can the Commission state how it intends to ensure that, in Member States, products stored at companies without the new Euro Leaf logo are not disposed of, including after the end of the transition period?

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

(10 July 2012)

The transitional period for introducing the new labelling rules for the products produced in accordance with the requirements of the EU organic legislation <sup>(1)</sup> ended on 1st July 2012. Consequently, the EU organic logo becomes compulsory for the labelling and advertising of organic pre-packaged food products which satisfy the requirements set out under or pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 834/2007, placed on the EU market. The 2-years transitional period was foreseen to help operators adapt to the new regulation and to avoid waste of existing packaging.

The organic farming legislation covers all stages of production, preparation and distribution including import or export of organic products aiming to ensure fair competition and a proper functioning of the internal market. For the sake of consumer protection and fair competition, the terms used to indicate organic products are protected throughout the European Union and independently of the language used.

The use of the logo and the use of all the terms indicating organic products are subject to control systems set up by Member States in accordance with Title V of that regulation. All operators are in particular subject to controls at least once a year by specialised inspectors from the nationally appointed control bodies and control authorities. Consequently, each operator in the organic chain — the farmer, the processor, the distributor — has to be certified as complying with the EU organic rules established by the organic legislation.

It is also important to note that the Commission's Food and Veterinary Office conducts system audits on Member States' controls in the organic sector.

Finally, although compulsory, the organic logo is not exclusive on the packaging: subject to the respect of the EU legislation, national and private labels may be used and can be displayed on organic products next to the Euro-leaf.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 OJ L 189, 20.7.2007, p. 1-23, Commission Regulation (EC) No 889/2008 of 5 September 2008, OJ L 250, 18.9.2008, p. 1.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004717/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(9 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Nuovo vaccino per la meningite B

La prevenzione delle meningiti batteriche rappresenta una priorità sanitaria complessa perché i batteri che causano meningite sono diversi. Per arrivare all'eliminazione di queste malattie è quindi necessario disporre di più vaccini mirati verso i diversi agenti eziologici.

Ricercatori australiani hanno creato in via sperimentale un vaccino contro la meningite B, il tipo più diffuso in Europa e Nord America che uccide centinaia di persone all'anno. Una sperimentazione compiuta su adolescenti in Australia, Polonia e Spagna ha rivelato che tali vaccini sviluppavano una reazione immunitaria senza seri effetti collaterali, generando anticorpi attivi contro il 90 % delle forme di meningite B. I dati provenienti dagli studi ne confermano le potenzialità di primo vaccino ad ampio spettro in grado di proteggere i neonati contro la meningite B. La prevenzione per le infezioni da meningococco B rimane una grande esigenza medica per proteggere i neonati e i bambini. Essa è una delle cause principali della meningite batterica in tutto il mondo, soprattutto tra i neonati, e nel 2006 in Italia ha rappresentato il 63 % della malattia meningococcica.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione far sapere se:

1. è a conoscenza del nuovo studio sulla meningite B;
2. esiste una strategia europea sulla malattia summenzionata e esistono recenti ricerche finanziate nell'ambito del Settimo programma quadro per la ricerca e lo sviluppo tecnologico (7° PQ);
3. è in possesso di dati inerenti al numero di individui colpiti dalla malattia in questione negli Stati membri?

**Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione**

(11 luglio 2012)

I vaccini meningococcici (A, C, W135 e Y) e pneumococcici resisi disponibili negli ultimi anni hanno già prestato un importante contributo alla riduzione dei casi di meningite batterica nell'UE.

La Commissione è a conoscenza dello studio recentemente pubblicato sul «The Lancet Infectious Diseases» dal Dr. Peter Richmond (University of Western Australia) e alla cui stesura hanno collaborato diversi gruppi di esperti europei in Spagna, nel Regno Unito e in Polonia. Lo studio riporta i risultati di un test clinico di fase 2 compiuto su un vaccino contro la *Neisseria meningitidis* basato su due varianti di una proteina legante il fattore H, esposta in superficie e immunogenica. Questo vaccino è un candidato promettente per la protezione ad ampio spettro dall'infezione meningococcica invasiva del sierogruppo.

Al momento, il Settimo programma quadro di ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico (7° PQ, 2007-2013) finanzia in totale cinque progetti di ricerca sulla meningite batterica, per un totale di circa 11,7 milioni di euro. Altri progetti potrebbero essere finanziati a seguito degli ultimi inviti del 7° PQ.

La maggior parte delle infezioni meningococciche invasive è provocata dai sierogruppi B e C. Il Centro europeo per la prevenzione e il controllo delle malattie (ECDC), che sorveglia da vicino la patologia da meningococco, ha segnalato per il 2010 un totale di 3 553 casi confermati di meningite invasiva, tra cui rispettivamente 2 443 e 489 casi appartenenti ai sierogruppi B e C.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004717/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(9 May 2012)

*Subject:* New meningitis B vaccine

The prevention of bacterial meningitis is a complex healthcare priority because there are so many different bacteria that cause meningitis. In order to eliminate it, it is therefore necessary to have more vaccines targeting the various etiological agents.

Australian researchers have created an experimental vaccine against meningitis B, the most common form in Europe and North America, which kills hundreds of people every year. A trial carried out on adolescents in Australia, Poland and Spain has revealed that these vaccines develop an immune reaction without serious side-effects by generating active anti-bodies against 90% of all forms of meningitis B. The study data confirm the potential of the first broad-spectrum vaccine capable of protecting babies against meningitis B. Prevention of meningococcal B infections remains a major medical necessity in order to protect babies and children. It is one of the main worldwide causes of bacterial meningitis, especially in babies, and in 2006 it represented 63% of meningococcal diseases in Italy.

In view of the above, can the Commission state:

1. Whether it is aware of the new study on meningitis B?
2. Is there a European strategy for the aforementioned disorder and has there been recent research funded within the context of the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technical Development?
3. Is it in possession of figures concerning the number of people in Member States affected by the disease in question?

**Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission**

(11 July 2012)

The meningococcal (A, C, W135 and Y) and pneumococcal vaccines that have become available in the recent years have already had an important impact on reducing the cases of bacterial meningitis in the EU.

The Commission is aware of the study recently published in 'The Lancet Infectious Diseases' by Dr Peter Richmond from University of Western Australia and also co-authored by several European groups in Spain, the United Kingdom and Poland. This study reports the result of a phase 2 clinical trial of a vaccine against *Neisseria meningitidis* based on two variants of a surface-exposed and immunogenic factor H binding protein. This vaccine is a promising candidate for broad protection against invasive meningococcal serogroup B disease.

The 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013) funds a total of five research projects on bacterial meningitis to date, totalling some EUR 11.7 million. Other projects might be funded as a result of the last calls of FP7.

Most invasive meningococcal infections are caused by the serogroups B and C. The European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) performs enhanced surveillance of meningococcal disease and reported for 2010 a total of 3 553 confirmed invasive meningococcal disease cases, of which 2 443 and 489 cases belonged to serogroups B and C, respectively.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004718/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(9 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: «Organic data network for better european organic market information»

Il settore biologico sta crescendo ma le indicazioni sull'andamento del mercato sono incomplete e talora non del tutto affidabili. Ne avvertono gli effetti soprattutto le piccole imprese che spesso sono chiamate a prendere importanti decisioni senza poter disporre di sufficienti informazioni di mercato. I dati sono fondamentali per tutti gli attori della filiera e per i decisori, a livello politico e economico che devono essere in grado di operare scelte importanti senza rischiare di danneggiare il comparto biologico.

L'UE ha recentemente messo a disposizione i fondi per avviare il progetto «Organic data network for better european organic market information» che coinvolge 30 ricercatori e 15 organizzazioni di diversi paesi europei. Tale progetto mira a soddisfare le esigenze dei responsabili politici e degli attori coinvolti nel mercato biologico, aumentando la trasparenza del mercato del settore biologico europeo attraverso una migliore disponibilità d'informazioni.

Il progetto avrà come punti di riferimento la Commissione europea, Eurostat e tutti gli istituti di statistica nazionali utilizzando le strutture esistenti per la raccolta e l'elaborazione dei dati sul mercato del settore biologico e stimolando lo sviluppo di nuove strutture di ricerca.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se ha preso in via la rete informativa europea per il biologico e quali sono i primi risultati fatti registrare;
2. a quanto ammontano i fondi messi a disposizione per il progetto?

**Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione**

(25 giugno 2012)

La riunione d'avvio dei lavori della «Rete di dati per una migliore informazione sul mercato europeo dei prodotti biologici» (*Data Network for better European Organic Market Information*) <sup>(1)</sup> si è svolta l'8 e il 9 marzo ad Ancona. Una relazione su quanto discusso nel corso di questo primo incontro è disponibile sul sito web del progetto, da poco accessibile in rete <sup>(2)</sup>, e sul sito di Organic Market Info <sup>(3)</sup>. La disponibilità di dati di mercato più precisi è indispensabile per tutti gli attori coinvolti in questo settore e per i responsabili delle politiche in materia. Ogni futura relazione europea riguardante il mercato biologico in Europa potrà beneficiare della disponibilità di dati più precisi.

La Commissione finanzia il progetto con un contributo massimo pari a 1 498 844 euro; il bilancio complessivo ammonta a 1 939 262 euro, che comprendono contributi provenienti dai partner del progetto. Essendo stato avviato solo recentemente, questo progetto di durata triennale non ha ancora evidenziato risultati significativi.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/research/bioeconomy/agriculture/projects/organicdatanetwork\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/research/bioeconomy/agriculture/projects/organicdatanetwork_en.htm)

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://www.organicdatanetwork.net/dw-news-detail.html?&tx\\_ttnews%5Btt\\_news%5D=658&cHash=2478f416c540770938a5aa35af7ef587](http://www.organicdatanetwork.net/dw-news-detail.html?&tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=658&cHash=2478f416c540770938a5aa35af7ef587).

<sup>(3)</sup> <http://www.organic-market.info/web/Europe/Italy/Data/220/233/0/12085.html>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004718/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(9 May 2012)

*Subject:* Organic data network for better European organic market information

The organic sector is growing, but information on market trends is incomplete and not always reliable. The resulting effects are particularly felt by small businesses which are often called upon to make important decisions without possessing adequate market information. The data are fundamental for all stakeholders in the industry and for decision-makers who must be able to make important decisions at a policy and economic level without risking damage to the organic sector.

The EU has recently made funds available to launch the Organic data network for better European organic market information project which involves 30 researchers and 15 organisations from various European countries. This project aims to satisfy the requirements of policy-makers and stakeholders involved in the organic market, thus increasing market transparency in the European organic sector through greater availability of information.

As reference points, the project will have the Commission, Eurostat and all the national statistics institutions, and will use existing structures for collecting and processing data on the organic sector market and stimulating the development of new research structures.

In view of the above, can the Commission state:

1. Whether it has launched the European organic data network and what are the first recorded results?
2. How much funding has been made available for the project?

**Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission**

(25 June 2012)

The kick-off meeting of the 'Data Network for better European Organic Market Information' <sup>(1)</sup> took place on 8 and 9 March 2012 in Ancona, Italy. A report on the first project meeting is available on the project website, which has recently gone online <sup>(2)</sup>, and on the site of Organic Market Info <sup>(3)</sup>. Better market data are vital for all industry players and decision-makers. European reports which will be published on the European organic market, will be able to benefit from this improved data quality.

The Commission is funding the project with a maximum Commission contribution of EUR 1 498 844s. The total budget of the project is EUR 1 939 262, including own contributions of the project partners. Since the three-year project started only recently, no substantial results are available yet.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/research/bioeconomy/agriculture/projects/organicdatanetwork\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/research/bioeconomy/agriculture/projects/organicdatanetwork_en.htm)

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://www.organicdatanetwork.net/dw-news-detail.html?tx\\_ttnews%5Btt\\_news%5D=658&cHash=2478f416c540770938a5aa35af7ef587](http://www.organicdatanetwork.net/dw-news-detail.html?tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=658&cHash=2478f416c540770938a5aa35af7ef587).

<sup>(3)</sup> <http://www.organic-market.info/web/Europe/Italy/Data/220/233/0/12085.html>

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004720/12  
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(9 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Sventato attacco con detonatore sofisticato

Un'operazione della Cia effettuata in collaborazione con agenti alleati, ha sventato il nuovo piano contro un aereo civile americano. Per un mese gli agenti hanno seguito nella Penisola arabica le mosse dei possibili cospiratori basati nello Yemen e legati ad Al Qaeda e, pochi giorni fa, sono riusciti a intercettare in un paese del Medio Oriente un ordigno, che è una nuova versione delle mutande-bombe con un detonatore sofisticato.

In base al piano dei terroristi, un kamikaze avrebbe dovuto indossare l'indumento in grado di sfuggire ai moderni sistemi di controllo, salire su un aereo Usa e farsi esplodere. La scelta del bersaglio — compagnia, tempi, rotta — era lasciata al mujahed incaricato della missione. Fonti americane sostengono che il progetto ricorda molto da vicino il fallito attentato ad un jet nel 2009 e all'attacco con cartucce del computer riempite d'esplosivo solo che in questo caso, gli artificieri sono riusciti a superare i problemi tecnici emersi in passato, in particolare quello del detonatore. A ideare l'attentato sarebbe stata la fazione qaedista che agisce nello Yemen e che ha tra i suoi seguaci uomini capaci di maneggiare gli esplosivi.

La Cia, forse allertata dai sauditi o dagli yemeniti, è riuscita a intervenire in tempo.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può l'Alto Rappresentante far sapere se:

1. è a conoscenza dell'operazione della Cia e ritiene di avviare controlli e studi su questo nuovo modello di ordigno che sembra essere in grado di sfuggire ai sistemi di controllo;
2. a causa dei numerosi attacchi terroristici, ritiene di dover rivedere la decisione quadro 2002/475/GAI del Consiglio?

**Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione**

(5 luglio 2012)

In seguito al recente attacco sventato, i servizi della Commissione hanno stabilito contatti con il Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) e con il Dipartimento per la sicurezza interna degli Stati Uniti per scambiare informazioni in merito alla progettazione dell'ultimo ordigno esplosivo improvvisato, creato dal gruppo terrorista di Al-Qaeda nella Penisola araba.

Tuttavia, poiché l'indagine delle autorità statunitensi è tuttora in corso, non è ancora possibile trarre conclusioni immediate riguardo all'impatto sulle vigenti misure di sicurezza aerea.

Ciononostante, la Commissione rileva che tali misure applicate negli aeroporti dell'UE affrontano efficacemente il problema dell'individuazione di ordigni esplosivi improvvisati e prevedono l'utilizzo di scanner di sicurezza, che sono stati introdotti in risposta diretta al tentativo di attentato al volo 253 della Northwest Airlines il 25 dicembre 2009.

Nel frattempo, i servizi della Commissione manterranno lo scambio di informazioni tecniche con le autorità statunitensi riguardo alle nuove minacce e valuteranno costantemente il potenziale impatto sulle prestazioni dei sistemi di controllo negli aeroporti dell'UE.

Quest'ultima minaccia non giustifica la revisione della decisione quadro 2002/475/GAI del Consiglio; tuttavia, la Commissione si riserva il diritto di proporre eventuali modifiche qualora lo ritenga necessario.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004720/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)  
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(9 May 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Attack involving sophisticated detonator thwarted

A CIA operation carried out in collaboration with allied agents foiled a recent plot against an American passenger plane. For a month, agents had been following the movements of possible Al-Qaeda conspirators based in Yemen and the Arabian Peninsula, and a few days ago they managed to intercept a device in a Middle Eastern country: it is a new version of the underpants bomb and features a sophisticated detonator.

According to the terrorist plot, a suicide bomber would have been able to board a U.S. flight wearing the garment, which cannot be detected by modern control systems, and blow themselves up. The choice of target — airline, time, route — was left to the Mujahedeen in charge of the mission. American sources say the plot is highly reminiscent of the failed bombing of a jet in 2009: an attack using computer ink cartridges filled with explosives, except in this case, the bomb squad was able to overcome the technical problems that occurred previously, particularly with the detonator. An Al-Qaeda faction masterminded the attack. It is based in Yemen and has men among its followers who are capable of handling explosives.

The CIA, which may have been alerted by either Saudis or Yemenis, was able to intervene in time.

1. Is the High Representative/Vice-President aware of the CIA operation and does she not consider that this new device, which appears capable of evading detection, should be studied and evaluated?

2. In view of the numerous terrorist attacks, does she not consider that EU Council Framework Decision 2002/475/JHA needs revising?

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

(5 July 2012)

In response to the recently published foiled attack, the Commission services liaised with the U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and U.S. Department of Homeland Security with a view to exchange information on the design of the latest improvised explosive device created by the terrorist group, Al-Qaeda, in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP).

However, due to the still ongoing investigation by the US authorities, no immediate conclusions regarding the impact on the existing aviation security measures can yet be drawn.

Nevertheless, the Commission notes that the existing aviation security measures applied at EU airports effectively address the detection of both assembled improvised explosive devices and they also include the use of security scanners which were introduced as direct response to the previous attempt to bomb the Northwest Airlines 253 on 25 December 2009.

Meanwhile, the Commission services will continue to maintain the technical exchange on the arising threats with US authorities and continuously evaluate the potential impact on the performance of detection at EU airports.

The latest threat does not warrant the revision of the framework Decision 2002/475/JHA of the Council, but the Commission reserves the right to propose potential changes when deemed necessary.

---

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004721/12**

**à Comissão**

**Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)**

(9 de maio de 2012)

*Assunto:* Atraso no reembolso de fundos para Capital Europeia da Cultura Guimarães 2012

Veio recentemente a público, através de João Serra, Presidente da Fundação Cidade de Guimarães, a notícia de que a iniciativa Capital Europeia da Cultura Guimarães 2012 estaria a passar por dificuldades de tesouraria. Segundo o mesmo, estas dificuldades de tesouraria estão relacionadas com o atraso nos reembolsos devidos à Fundação Cidade de Guimarães, e que são essenciais para a gestão e manutenção das atividades deste importante evento cultural. Face a esta situação, a Fundação equaciona o recurso ao crédito na banca privada, situação esta que é de todo inadmissível, uma vez que contraria os objetivos e métodos de gestão e financiamento associados à construção deste evento cultural e traz encargos adicionais a uma estrutura que é de natureza pública.

Face ao exposto, solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Qual a informação que tem sobre esta situação?
2. Como a avalia?
3. Existem atrasos na transferência dos fundos europeus previstos para financiamento da iniciativa Capital Europeia da Cultura Guimarães 2012, nomeadamente de subsídios, fundos estruturais ou outros?

**Resposta dada por Androulla Vassiliou em nome da Comissão**

(5 de julho de 2012)

A Comissão é responsável pela iniciativa Capital Europeia da Cultura ao abrigo da Decisão n.º 1622/2006/CE <sup>(1)</sup> e tem seguido de perto os preparativos da Capital Europeia da Cultura Guimarães 2012 através de um processo de acompanhamento dos compromissos assumidos pela cidade e das recomendações formuladas pelos painéis de seleção e de acompanhamento. Contudo, a própria cidade, em conjunto com as autoridades locais e nacionais, é a única responsável pela criação e execução do programa.

O cofinanciamento concedido pela Comissão a cada Capital da Cultura é constituído por um prémio de 1,5 milhões de euros concedidos e pagos três meses antes do início do evento, na condição de terem sido cumpridos os respetivos compromissos e seguidas as recomendações dos painéis de seleção e de acompanhamento.

Com base nos resultados do processo de acompanhamento, o prémio foi atribuído a Guimarães 2012 e pago em setembro de 2011. A Comissão não recebeu quaisquer informações sobre eventuais dificuldades de gestão no que diz respeito a esse prémio.

O Programa de Ação Guimarães 2012 — Capital Europeia da Cultura, promovido pela Fundação Cidade de Guimarães é também cofinanciado pelo FEDER, com um montante de 18 milhões de euros do Programa Operacional Regional Norte 2007/2013. A Comissão também não recebeu quaisquer informações sobre eventuais dificuldades de gestão desses fundos.

Contudo, no âmbito da gestão partilhada, as autoridades nacionais são responsáveis pela execução dos programas, incluindo os critérios de seleção de projetos e os procedimentos. Por conseguinte, a Comissão sugere à Senhora Deputada que contacte diretamente as autoridades portuguesas responsáveis pelo programa mencionado:

Gabinete de Gestão do Programa Operacional Regional do Norte <sup>(2)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> JO L 306 de 3.11.2006.

<sup>(2)</sup> Correio eletrónico: novonorte@ccdr-n.pt - Web: <http://www.novonorte.qren.pt/>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004721/12  
to the Commission**

**Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)**

(9 May 2012)

*Subject:* Overdue funds reimbursement for Guimarães, a 2012 European Capital of Culture

The President of the City of Guimarães Foundation, João Serra, recently announced that the Guimarães 2012 European Capital of Culture initiative was experiencing cash-flow problems. According to Mr Serra, these problems are related to the late reimbursement of monies owed to the City of Guimarães Foundation, which are vital for managing and sustaining the activities of this important cultural event. Faced with this situation, the Foundation is considering borrowing from private banks, which is completely unacceptable since this goes against the management and financing objectives and methods associated with the planning of this cultural event and is an additional financial burden for a public organisation.

In view of this, I would like the Commission to answer the following:

1. What information does it have on this situation?
2. What is its assessment of it?
3. Are there delays in the transfer of EU funds, in particular subsidies, structural funds or others, destined for the Guimarães 2012 European Capital of Culture initiative?

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

(5 July 2012)

The Commission is in charge of the Capital of Culture initiative under Decision 1622/2006/EC <sup>(1)</sup>. It has closely followed the preparations for Guimarães 2012 through a process of monitoring the commitments made by the city and the recommendations made by the selection and monitoring panels. However, the city itself together with the local and national authorities is solely responsible for the setting up and implementation of the programme.

The co-financing granted by the Commission to each Capital of Culture consists of a EUR 1.5 million prize awarded and paid 3 months before the beginning of the event, on condition that they have fulfilled their commitments and implemented the recommendations made by the selection and the monitoring panels.

On the basis of the results of the monitoring process, the prize was awarded to Guimarães 2012 and paid in September 2011. The Commission has not received any information about possible management difficulties regarding this prize.

The Action Programme Guimarães 2012 — European Capital of Culture promoted by the Guimarães City Foundation is also co-financed by ERDF with EUR 18 million from the regional operational programme Norte 2007-2013. The Commission has not received any information about possible management difficulties about these funds either.

However, within the framework of the shared management principle, the national authorities are responsible for the implementation of the programmes, including project selection criteria and procedures. Therefore, the Commission suggests that the Honourable Member directly contacts the Portuguese authorities in charge of the programme concerned:

Gabinete de Gestão do Programa Operacional Regional do Norte <sup>(2)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 306 of 3 November 2006

<sup>(2)</sup> E-mail: novonorte@ccdr-n.pt

Web: <http://www.novonorte.qren.pt/>

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004723/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Jutta Steinruck (S&D), Udo Bullmann (S&D) und Peter Simon (S&D)**  
(9. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Antworten auf die Anfragen zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002800/2012 und E-002552/2012

Zu den Antworten auf die Anfragen zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002800/2012 und E-002552/2012, beide eingegangen am 2. Mai 2012 bitten die Verfasser um Klarstellung der widersprüchlichen Antworten:

Antwort 1 (E-002552/2012): Die Kommission hat nicht vorgeschlagen, dass die betriebliche Altersversorgung unter die Solvabilität-II-Regelung fallen sollte. Das Weißbuch zur Altersversorgung enthält keinerlei Aussage dazu, dass die Kommission einen entsprechenden Vorschlag vorzulegen plant.

Antwort 2 (E-002800/2012): Soweit Pensionsfonds und Versicherungsunternehmen die gleichen Risiken abdecken, sollten auch die Aufsichtsregeln identisch sein, um gleiche Wettbewerbsbedingungen zu gewährleisten. (...) Obwohl es zum gegenwärtigen Zeitpunkt noch zu früh ist, um zu entscheiden, welche Prinzipien von Solvabilität II übernommen werden können, beabsichtigt die Kommission, die Besonderheiten der betrieblichen Altersversorgung bei der Überarbeitung der Richtlinie in angemessener Form zu berücksichtigen.

— Welche der beiden Antworten ist nun richtig: Entweder es ist zum gegenwärtigen Zeitpunkt zu früh, um zu entscheiden, welche Prinzipien der Solvabilität-II-Regelung auf betriebliche Altersvorsorgen angewendet werden sollen, oder die Kommission hat eine entsprechende Anwendung nicht vorgeschlagen?

— In Punkt 2 Absatz 11 des Weißbuches heißt es: „Im Jahr 2012 wird die Kommission einen Legislativvorschlag zur Überprüfung der IORP-Richtlinie vorlegen. Mit dieser Überprüfung sollen einheitliche Rahmenbedingungen mit Solvabilität II hergestellt und die grenzüberschreitende Tätigkeit in diesem Bereich gefördert sowie das gesamte Angebot an Renten und Pensionen in der EU verbessert werden“. Geht daraus nicht eindeutig hervor, dass einheitliche Rahmenbedingungen für Solvabilität-II-Regelungen hergestellt werden sollen?

**Antwort von Herrn Barnier im Namen der Kommission**  
(22. Juni 2012)

Beide Antworten, auf welche die Damen und Herren Abgeordneten sich beziehen, sind korrekt.

Die Kommission schlägt nicht vor, dass die betriebliche Altersversorgung durch Solvabilität II geregelt werden sollte. Vielmehr bereitet die Kommission zurzeit die Überprüfung der Richtlinie 2003/41/EG im Hinblick auf die Einführung einer risikobasierten Beaufsichtigung von Pensionsfonds vor. Solvabilität II ist eine zeitgemäße Aufsichtsregelung, die sinnvolle Grundsätze für entsprechende Verträge oder Systeme enthält, die Schutz gegen Risiken bieten, auch bei Produkten für die Altersversorgung, unabhängig von der jeweiligen Finanzierungsform. Von einigen dieser Elemente könnte sich die Überprüfung der Richtlinie 2003/41/EG leiten lassen.

Gleichzeitig ist es aber immer noch zu früh, um genau beurteilen zu können, welche Elemente von Solvabilität II verwendet werden können, um die Beaufsichtigung der betrieblichen Altersversorgungssysteme zu verbessern. Die Vorbereitungen in Form einer umfassenden Konsultation der Beteiligten sind im Gange. Derzeit prüft die Kommission sorgfältig die Ergebnisse der fachlichen Stellungnahme, welche die Europäische Aufsichtsbehörde für das Versicherungswesen und die betriebliche Altersversorgung (EIOPA) im Februar 2012 vorgelegt hat, und plant, EIOPA um die Durchführung einer quantitativen Wirkungsanalyse zu bitten. Ziel ist es, Informationen für die Entwicklung eines risikobasierten Aufsichtssystems für Pensionsfonds zu sammeln, und, soweit Pensionsfonds selbst Risiken eingehen, eine Regulierung zu gewährleisten, die konsistent ist mit der Behandlung anderer Finanzdienstleistungserbringer, insbesondere Versicherungsunternehmen.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004723/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Jutta Steinruck (S&D), Udo Bullmann (S&D) and Peter Simon (S&D)**  
(9 May 2012)

*Subject:* Answers to the questions for written answer E-002800/2012 and E-002552/2012

In relation to the answers to the questions for written answer E-002800/2012 and E-002552/2012, both submitted on 2 May 2012, the authors ask for clarification on the following contradictory answers:

Answer 1 (E-002552/2012): 'The Commission has not proposed that occupational pensions would be subject to the Solvency II regime. The White Paper on pensions does not mention that the Commission intends to present such a proposal.'

Answer 2 (E-002800/2012): 'To the extent that the risks underwritten by pension funds and insurance companies are the same, the prudential requirements should be similar in order to maintain a level playing field. On 15 February 2012 EIOPA <sup>(1)</sup> provided the Commission with technical advice on this subject. Although at the present time it is too early to identify which principles can be taken from Solvency II, the Commission intends to take due account of the particular features of occupational retirement provision in the revision of the directive.'

— Can the Commission say which of these answers is correct: is it either too early to identify which principles of the Solvency II provision are to be applied to occupational retirement plans, or did the Commission not propose such a move?

— Point 2(11) of the White Paper states: 'The Commission will, in 2012, present a legislative proposal to review the IORP Directive. The aim of the review is to maintain a level playing field with Solvency II and promote more cross-border activity in this field and to help improve overall pension provision in the EU.'

Does the Commission believe that this clearly indicates that a uniform framework should be established for Solvency II provisions?

**Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission**  
(22 June 2012)

Both Commission answers referred to by the Honourable Member are correct.

The Commission is not proposing that occupational retirement schemes should be regulated by Solvency II. The Commission is instead preparing a review of Directive 2003/41/EC in order to introduce risk-based prudential supervision for pension funds. Solvency II is a modern supervisory regime that contains useful principles for contracts or schemes offering protection against risk, including retirement products, irrespective of the financial vehicle through which they are delivered. Some of those elements may usefully inspire the review of Directive 2003/41/EC.

It is at the same time still too early to know precisely which elements of Solvency II can be used to improve the supervision of occupational retirement schemes. Preparatory work in full consultation with stakeholders is ongoing. The Commission is carefully assessing the technical advice that EIOPA delivered in February 2012 and is preparing to ask EIOPA to carry out a quantitative impact study. The objective is to gather information for the development of a risk-based supervisory system for pension funds and, to the extent that pension funds themselves underwrite risk, ensure regulatory consistency with the treatment of other financial service providers, notably insurance undertakings.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> European Insurance and Occupational Pensions Authority.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004724/12  
an die Kommission**

**Hermann Winkler (PPE)**

(9. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Streichung der Richtlinie 2000/84/EG zur Regelung der Sommerzeit

Gemäß der Richtlinie 2000/84/EG wird in Europa derzeit zweimal im Jahr die Zeit um eine Stunde verstellt. Dies wurde ursprünglich eingeführt, um — neben einer Erleichterung der Abläufe des Binnenmarktes durch gemeinsame Start- und Endtermine — vor allem eine Strom- und Energieeinsparung herbeizuführen.

Bereits in der Mitteilung KOM(2007)739 der Kommission, in der Daten der Mitgliedstaaten ausgewertet und zusammengefasst wurden, gesteht die Kommission ein, dass die Energieeinsparungen gering sind und sich die Vor- und Nachteile der Sommerzeit in etwa die Waage halten. Warum schlägt also die Kommission keine Abschaffung der Sommerzeit vor, wenn sie keine nennenswerten Auswirkungen feststellen konnte?

Des Weiteren hat die Forschung in der Zeit seit der Mitteilung gänzlich neue Bereiche beleuchtet und wichtige Erkenntnisse zu den Auswirkungen der Sommerzeit zutage gefördert. So hat zum Beispiel das renommierte Karolinska-Institut einen Anstieg der Herzinfarkte nach der Zeitumstellung festgestellt. Diese Beobachtung wurde von der deutschen Krankenversicherung DAK bestätigt.

— Hat die Kommission daher die Absicht, eine neue Studie zu den tatsächlichen Vor- und Nachteilen der Sommerzeit anzufertigen, und kann sie dafür einen Zeitplan nennen? Sollte dies nicht der Fall sein: Weshalb besteht diese Absicht nicht?

— Wird die Kommission insbesondere im Hinblick auf die Auswirkungen der Sommerzeit auf die Gesundheit einen Vorschlag zur Abschaffung der Sommerzeit vorlegen?

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

(12. Juni 2012)

Die Kommission verweist den Herrn Abgeordneten auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftlichen Anfragen H-103/2010 und E-9209/2011 <sup>(1)</sup>.

---

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

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004724/12  
to the Commission**

**Hermann Winkler (PPE)**

(9 May 2012)

*Subject:* Removal of Directive 2000/84/EC on summer-time arrangements

According to Directive 2000/84/EC, the time is adjusted by one hour twice each year in Europe. This arrangement was originally introduced to make work easier in the internal market through common starting and finishing times, and, above all, to save electricity and energy.

In its communication COM(2007) 739, which evaluates and collates data from Member States, the Commission admitted that the energy savings are negligible and that the advantages and disadvantages of summer time are fairly evenly balanced. Why has the Commission not proposed to abolish summer time if it has been unable to identify any appreciable advantage?

Furthermore, research carried out since the communication was issued has revealed completely new areas and important insights into the impact of summer time. For example, the renowned Karolinska Institute has identified a rise in the incidence of heart attacks after the changeover. These observations were confirmed by DAK, a German health insurance company.

— Does the Commission therefore intend to produce a new study on the actual advantages and disadvantages of summer time, and can it provide a schedule for this? If not, why not?

— Specifically, in view of the health implications of summer time, does the Commission intend to present a proposal for the abolition of summer time?

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

(12 June 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question H-103/2010 and E-9209/2011 <sup>(1)</sup>.

---

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

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004726/12**

**an die Kommission**

**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**

(9. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Kraftstoffpreisregulierung

Die Bundesrepublik Deutschland erwägt derzeit an den Tankstellen eine Preisobergrenze für Kraftstoffe. Den Plänen zufolge würden Petroleumlieferanten unter einer Meldepflicht für Preis und Menge stehen. Außerdem müssen die Betreiber der rund 14 700 Tankstellen in Deutschland künftig detailliert darüber Auskunft geben, wann und in welchem Umfang sie die Preise an den Zapfsäulen erhöhen oder senken. Zusätzlich müssten sie der neu eingerichteten „Markttransparenzstelle“ melden, welche Mengen an Treibstoffen sie wo und wie teuer eingekauft haben.

— Hat die Kommission bereits die für alle Mitgliedstaaten möglichen positiven wie auch negativen Aspekte einer solchen Preisobergrenze und Preismeldepflicht untersucht?

— Zieht die Kommission angesichts der enormen Preissprünge der Kraftstoffe in allen EU Mitgliedstaaten in Erwägung, eine EU-weite Harmonisierung bzw. Standardisierung der Treibstoffpreise festzulegen?

— Gibt es bereits Pläne der Kommission, im Zusammenhang mit den stets steigenden Kraftstoffpreisen, das EU Kartellrecht (gemäß Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2003) anzuwenden und die Petroleumlieferanten nochmals auf eine Absprache der Preise zu kontrollieren?

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

(2. Juli 2012)

1. Nein, die Kommission hat keine Bewertung der möglichen positiven oder negativen Auswirkungen einer derartigen Maßnahme für alle Mitgliedstaaten vorgenommen und, soweit wir wissen, Deutschland ebenso wenig.

2. Eine weitere Harmonisierung der Treibstoffpreise auf Verbraucherebene könnte vor allem durch größere Einheitlichkeit bei der Mehrwertsteuer und den indirekten Steuern, insbesondere den Verbrauchssteuern, zwischen den EU-Ländern erreicht werden. Die Kommission hat eine überarbeitete Energiesteuerrichtlinie<sup>(1)</sup> vorgeschlagen, die in diese Richtung geht. Die Treibstoffpreise können allerdings nicht vollständig harmonisiert werden, da von einem Mitgliedstaat zum anderen Unterschiede in Hinblick auf die verschiedenen Produktions-, Verteilungs- und Dienstleistungskosten sowie die Produktqualität, die Marketingpraktiken und die Marktstrukturen bestehen.

3. Der Kommission liegen derzeit keine Informationen vor, die spezifische Maßnahmen im Rahmen der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2003<sup>(2)</sup> rechtfertigen würden, sie verfolgt und überwacht die Lage im Erdölsektor und auf dem Erdölmarkt der EU aber weiterhin aufmerksam. Die Kommission verfolgt Vertragsverletzungsverfahren mit Nachdruck, wenn mit den EU-Wettbewerbsvorschriften und -regelungen unvereinbare Praktiken festgestellt werden. Es ist darauf hinzuweisen, dass steigende Preise per se nicht notwendigerweise Wettbewerb bedeuten und der Ausgleich von Angebot und Nachfrage nicht funktioniert. In den letzten Wochen sind die Preise für Rohöl und Mineralölherzeugnisse angesichts neu aufkommender Sorgen bezüglich der Weltwirtschaftslage wieder gesunken. Die jüngste Abwertung des Euro gegenüber dem US-Dollar, der Währung, in der Rohöl auf den internationalen Märkten gehandelt wird, hat diesen Preisrückgang in Europa teilweise wieder ausgeglichen.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/taxation\\_customs/resources/documents/taxation/com\\_2011\\_169\\_de.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/taxation/com_2011_169_de.pdf)

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2003:001:0001:0025:DE:PDF>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004726/12  
to the Commission**

**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**

(9 May 2012)

*Subject:* Fuel price regulation

The Federal Republic of Germany is currently considering imposing an upper price limit for fuel at service stations. The plans involve introducing the mandatory reporting of price and volume for petroleum suppliers. In addition, the operators of Germany's approximately 14 700 service stations will have to provide detailed information about the time and extent of price increases or reductions at the pumps. In addition, they would be required to report to the newly established Market Transparency Agency, indicating how much fuel they have purchased, where they purchased it and how much they paid for it.

— Has the Commission already examined the possible positive and negative effects of such an upper price limit and the mandatory price reporting provision for all Member States?

— In view of the huge fuel price increases in all EU Member States, would the Commission consider setting harmonised, or standardised, fuel prices throughout the European Union?

— In the context of continuously rising fuel prices, does the Commission plan to apply EU competition law (according to Regulation (EC) No 1/2003) and to monitor petroleum suppliers again to ensure that prices are not fixed?

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

(2 July 2012)

1. No, the Commission has not carried out an assessment for all Member States regarding the potential impacts (positive or negative) of such a measure and, as far as we understand, neither has Germany.

2. A further harmonisation of fuel prices at consumer level could be reached, notably through more homogeneous VAT and indirect taxes rates, in particular excise duties, between the EU countries. The Commission has proposed a revised 'Energy Taxation Directive' <sup>(1)</sup> which goes in that direction. Prices could not, however, be fully harmonised since differences exist from one Member State to another as regards different production/distribution/service costs as well as product quality, the marketing practices and the market structures.

3. The Commission currently has no information warranting specific action under regulation 1/2003 <sup>(2)</sup> but it remains vigilant and closely monitors the situation in the European Union's oil sector and markets. The Commission pursues infringement procedures with full vigour if practices undesirable from the point of view of EU competition laws and rules are discovered. It has to be pointed out that rising prices per se do not necessarily mean competition and demand/supply balancing does not work. In the last couple of weeks crude oil and product prices have weakened again as doubts over the global economy have resurfaced. The recent depreciation of the Euro versus the US Dollar, the currency in which the crude oil prices are expressed on the international markets, has partially counterbalanced this drop in prices in Europe.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/taxation\\_customs/resources/documents/taxation/com\\_2011\\_169\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/taxation/com_2011_169_en.pdf)

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2003:001:0001:0025:EN:PDF>.

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004728/12  
alla Commissione**

**Mario Borghezio (EFD)**

*(9 maggio 2012)*

Oggetto: Richiesta di chiarimenti sui pagamenti

Il 20 aprile la Commissione ha proposto alla commissione per i bilanci del Parlamento europeo di approvare trasferimenti da fondi da voci legate a energie convenzionali e rinnovabili a voci quali sanità, prodotti alimentari, agricoltura e pesca, biotecnologie e nanoscienze, nanotecnologie, materiali e nuove tecnologie di produzione per un ammontare di 485 milioni di euro. La Commissione ritiene questi fondi indispensabili per coprire l'ammontare delle spese che verranno effettuate nei prossimi mesi poiché i fondi messi a disposizione per i pagamenti non si sono dimostrati sufficienti.

La Commissione non aveva valutato correttamente le spese che si sarebbero dovute effettuare nei primi mesi dell'anno?

Come mai aveva sottostimato di così gran misura gli esborsi?

La Commissione ha verificato se i fondi esborsati finora sono stati correttamente utilizzati?

**Risposta di Janusz Lewandowski a nome della Commissione**

*(28 giugno 2012)*

Il trasferimento di fondi in questione è il risultato dell'effetto combinato, da una parte, dei tagli effettuati dall'autorità di bilancio nel quadro della procedura di bilancio 2012, e dall'altra degli sforzi della Commissione per accelerare, dato l'attuale scenario economico europeo, la firma degli accordi di sovvenzione per permettere ai beneficiari di avviare rapidamente i progetti di ricerca, nonché della decisione di incrementare il sostegno per il 2012 del partenariato pubblico-privato per le nanoscienze.

Prima del pagamento, tutte le transazioni con i beneficiari sono soggette a controlli a livello scientifico e finanziario. Inoltre, per specifiche transazioni, alcuni beneficiari sono sottoposti a controlli in loco. Una sintesi dei risultati dei controlli e il quadro di controllo interno sono esposti nelle pertinenti relazioni annuali di attività comunicate al Parlamento e disponibili all'indirizzo: [http://ec.europa.eu/atwork/synthesis/aar/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/atwork/synthesis/aar/index_en.htm).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004728/12  
to the Commission**

**Mario Borghezio (EFD)**

(9 May 2012)

*Subject:* Request for clarification on payments

On 20 April 2012, the Commission proposed that the European Parliament's Committee on Budgets approve transfers from funds made up of items linked with conventional and renewable energies to items such as health, food, agriculture and fishing, biotechnologies and nanosciences, nanotechnologies, materials and new production technologies totalling EUR 485 million. The Commission considers that these funds will be essential to cover the total expenditure that will be required in the coming months, because the funds made available for payments have proved insufficient.

Did the Commission not estimate correctly the expenditure that would be required in the first few months of the year?

How could it have ever underestimated disbursements by such a large amount?

Has the Commission checked whether the funds disbursed up to now have been used correctly?

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

(28 June 2012)

The transfer in question resulted from the combined effect of, on the one hand, the cuts made by the budget authority during the 2012 budget procedure and, on the other hand, the Commission's efforts to accelerate, in the current economic context in Europe, the signature of grants in order to allow the beneficiaries to start quickly the research projects as well as the decision to increase in 2012 support for public-private partnership for Nanosciences.

All transactions with beneficiaries are subject to scientific and financial controls before a payment is made. In addition, some beneficiaries are audited on the spot for selected transactions. An overview of the results of these controls, together with the Internal Control Framework, is set out in the relevant Annual Activity Reports which are communicated to the Parliament and are also available at the following address:

[http://ec.europa.eu/atwork/synthesis/aar/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/atwork/synthesis/aar/index_en.htm)

---

(Verżjoni Maltija)

### **Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004730/12**

**lill-Kummissjoni**

**Louis Grech (S&D)**

(9 ta' Mejju 2012)

**Suġġett:** Drittijiet għal smiġh ġust: l-ghoti tad-dritt liċ-ċittadini għall-informazzjoni fi procedimenti kriminali u ċivili

Il-proposta tal-Kummissjoni għal direttiva dwar id-dritt għall-informazzjoni fi procedimenti kriminali (COM(2010)0392), adottata fl-aħħar ta' April 2012, hija mistennija tidhol fis-sehh f'madwar sentejn. Din il-liġi ġdida se tiżgura li l-persuni kollha arrestati jew suġġetti għal Mandat ta' Arrest Ewropew jingħataw "Ittra tad-Drittijiet" li tispijega d-drittijiet bażiċi tagħhom fi procedimenti kriminali.

Din il-miżura ġdida tal-UE, mmirata sabiex trażżan każijiet ta' nuqqas ta' ġustizzja, inkluż f'każijiet ta' appell, tista' faċilment isservi bhala l-galvu għall-immaniġġjar ta' każijiet ġudizzjarji ta' natura ċivili. It-tishih tad-drittijiet taċ-ċittadini f'dan ir-rigward, f'konformità mal-Karta tad-Drittijiet Fundamentali tal-UE, se jikkontribwixxi wkoll għat-tishih tal-qasam tal-ġustizzja tal-UE u l-aċċess għalih.

Il-Kummissjoni tikkunsidra li għandha tingħata attenzjoni simili fir-rigward tad-dritt għall-informazzjoni għall-persuni involuti fi procedimenti ċivili?

Bhalissa l-Kummissjoni qed taħdem fuq xi haġa f'dan il-qasam?

### **Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Reding fisem il-Kummissjoni**

(29 ta' Ġunju 2012)

Il-Kummissjoni taqbel li l-informazzjoni taċ-ċittadini involuti fi procedimenti ċivili u kriminali hija kwistjoni importanti. L-Onorevoli Membru jista' jkun konxju li fi kwistjonijiet ċivili, tali informazzjoni tkun diġà disponibbli, pereżempju, fir-Regolament (KE) Nru 805/2004<sup>(1)</sup> dwar il-holqien ta' Ordni Ewropew ta' Infurzar għal talbiet mhux kontestati. L-Artikoli 16 u 17 ta' dan ir-Regolament jitolbu li konvenut jkun debitament informat dwar it-talba kontrih u dwar il-passi procedurali li jehtieg li jiehu biex jikkontesta t-talba. Eżempju iehor li jinsab fil-proposta għal riformulazzjoni tar-Regolament (KE) Nru 44/2001<sup>(2)</sup>, fejn il-Kummissjoni tipproponi biex tiġi żgurata informazzjoni speċjali lill-konvenuti li huma konsumaturi, impjegati jew assicurati meta jidhru fil-qorti dwar id-dritt tagħhom li jikkontestaw il-ġurisdiżżjoni tal-qorti u dwar il-konsegwenzi li tidher quddiem qorti (ara l-Artikolu 24). Fuq livell aktar ġenerali, il-websajt tan-Netwerk Ġudizzjarju Ewropew f'materji ċivili u kummerċjali jipprovdi liċ-ċittadini b'informazzjoni komprensiva dwar it-tipi differenti ta' proceduri ċivili fuq il-litigazzjoni transfruntiera u l-infurzar<sup>(3)</sup> u l-Kummissjoni ppubblikat bosta gwidi għaċ-ċittadini dwar kwistjonijiet suġġetti għal-leġiżlazzjoni tal-Unjoni<sup>(4)</sup>.

Il-Kummissjoni għandha intenzjoni li tevalwa l-htieġa għal iktar standards minimi komuni jew regoli standard ta' procedura ċivili għall-infurzar transkonfinali tas-sentenzi u d-deċiżjonijiet. Tali standards minimi jistgħu jinkludu kwistjonijiet bħalma huma n-notifika ta' dokumenti, it-tehid tax-xhieda, il-proceduri ta' revizzjoni u l-infurzar. Se jitnieda studju f'dan ir-rigward lejn tmien l-2012. Fejn xieraq, il-Kummissjoni se tissottometti proposti dwar dawn il-kwistjonijiet, kif dan kien mitlub mill-Kunsill Ewropew fil-programm ta' Stokkolma<sup>(5)</sup>.

(1) ĠU L 143 tat-30.04.2004, p. 15-39.

(2) COM(2010) 748 final.

(3) <http://www.ejn-crimjust.europa.eu/ejn/>.

(4) [http://ec.europa.eu/civiljustice/publications/publications\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/civiljustice/publications/publications_en.htm)

(5) ĠU C 115, tal-04.05.2010, p. 1-38.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004730/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Louis Grech (S&D)**  
(9 May 2012)

*Subject:* Fair trial rights: giving citizens the right to information in criminal and civil proceedings

The Commission proposal for a directive on the right to information in criminal proceedings (COM(2010) 0392), adopted at the end of April 2012, is expected to come into force in approximately two years' time. This new law will ensure that all persons arrested or subject to a European Arrest Warrant are given a 'Letter of Rights' outlining their basic rights in criminal proceedings.

This new EU measure, geared towards curbing instances of miscarriage of justice, including in appeal cases, could very well serve as a blueprint for the handling of judicial cases of a civil nature. The strengthening of the rights of citizens in this respect, in line with the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, will also contribute to strengthening the EU area of justice and access thereto.

Does the Commission consider that similar attention in regard to the right to information should be paid to persons involved in civil proceedings?

Is the Commission currently working on anything in this field?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission**  
(29 June 2012)

The Commission agrees that the information of citizens involved in civil and criminal proceedings is an important matter. The Honourable Member might be aware that in civil matters such information is already contained, for instance in Regulation (EC) No 805/2004 <sup>(1)</sup> on the creation of a European Enforcement Order for uncontested claims. Articles 16 and 17 of this regulation require that a defendant be duly informed about the claim against him and about the procedural steps he needs to undertake to contest the claim. Another example is contained in the proposal for a recast of Regulation (EC) No 44/2001 <sup>(2)</sup>, where the Commission proposes to ensure special information to defendants who are consumers, employees or insured when they appear in court on their right to contest the jurisdiction of the court and on the consequences of entering an appearance (see Article 24). On a more general level, the website of the European Judicial Network in civil and commercial matters provides citizens with comprehensive information on different types of civil procedures on cross-border litigation and enforcement <sup>(3)</sup> and the Commission has published several guides for citizens on matters subject to Union legislation <sup>(4)</sup>.

The Commission intends to assess the need for further common minimum standards or standard rules of civil procedure for the cross-border enforcement of judgments and decisions. Such minimum standards could include matters such as the serving of documents, the taking of evidence, review procedures and enforcement. A study in this regard will be launched towards the end of 2012. Where appropriate, the Commission will submit proposals on these issues, as this was requested by the European Council in the Stockholm programme <sup>(5)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 143, 30.4.2004, p. 15-39.

<sup>(2)</sup> COM(2010)748 final.

<sup>(3)</sup> <http://www.ejn-crimjust.europa.eu/ejn/>.

<sup>(4)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/civiljustice/publications/publications\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/civiljustice/publications/publications_en.htm)

<sup>(5)</sup> OJ C 115, 4.5.2010, p. 1-38.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004731/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)**

(9 May 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Deir Istiya olive tree destruction

I understand that the Israeli army has ordered nine farmers from the village of Deir Istiya in the Salfit Governorate of the West Bank to destroy thousands of their own olive trees. The Israelis justify this approach by pointing out that the farmers' land is within the boundary of a nature reserve. However, the nature reserve appears to risk encroachment from Israeli settlements and has recently had a road laid through it to allow access to those very settlements.

Is the High Representative aware of this order? Does the High Representative agree with the affected farmers, who consider this to be an inequitable state of affairs as no action has been taken against the road builders or settlement developers who have encroached on the reserve?

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

(9 July 2012)

The EU office in East Jerusalem follows closely developments on the ground and has reported about the threat to the livelihoods of Palestinians in the village of Deir Istiya. The EU is concerned about the impact of the continuing occupation and settlement construction on the Palestinian population in the West Bank, in particular in the Area C and East Jerusalem.

In the Foreign Affairs Council conclusions on Middle East Peace Process of 14 May, the Council expressed its concern regarding such developments in the occupied Palestinian territory, particularly the worsening living conditions of the Palestinian population and serious limitations for the PA to promote the economic development of Palestinian communities in Area C. It also recalled the applicability of international humanitarian law in the occupied Palestinian territory, including the applicability of the fourth Geneva Convention relative to the protection of civilians.

The long-standing position on settlements of the EU remains valid: settlements are illegal under international law, constitute an obstacle to peace and threaten to make a two-state solution impossible. The Council has urged the government of Israel to end all settlement activities, in East Jerusalem and the rest of the West Bank and including natural growth, and to dismantle all outposts erected since March 2001. These messages are being conveyed to the representatives of the Government of Israel in bilateral contacts in different levels by the EU and individual Member States.

---

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004734/12  
aan de Commissie**

**Peter van Dalen (ECR) en Corien Wortmann-Kool (PPE)**

(9 mei 2012)

*Betref:* Hoge boetes voor chauffeurs van vrachtauto's en touringcarbedrijven in Frankrijk

Onlangs kregen 2 chauffeurs van een touringcarbedrijf uit Vlaanderen een boete van 39 000 euro in Frankrijk opgelegd, omdat zij geen patronaal attest konden overleggen. Chauffeur 1 was 4 dagen in dienst en chauffeur 2 was nieuw en werkte voor de eerste dag. Ze konden wel hun arbeidscontract overleggen waarin de datum van indiensttreding stond en voldeden verder aan alle eisen wat betreft verkeersveiligheid en de rij- en rusttijden.

Sinds 1 januari 2012 zijn er 15 soortgelijke hoge boetes met een gemiddeld bedrag van ruim 10 000 euro uitgeschreven in Frankrijk aan chauffeurs van vrachtauto's en touringcars. Dit zijn absurd hoge bedragen en deze bedragen hebben vèrstrekkende gevolgen voor de bedrijven die deze boetes moeten betalen.

1. Is de Commissie het ermee eens dat 39 000 euro voor het ontbreken van een patronaal attest een onwenselijk hoog bedrag is?
2. De chauffeurs hebben zich aan de rij- en rusttijden gehouden en konden een arbeidscontract overleggen waaruit blijkt dat ze net in dienst waren. Is de Commissie het ermee eens dat in dit bijzondere geval een arbeidscontract ipv. een patronaal attest voldoende bewijs is en dat chauffeurs niet meer schijven konden overleggen, dan de dagen waarvoor ze voor deze werkgever werkzaam zijn?
3. De menselijke maat, de redelijkheid en billijkheid van controles in landen zoals Frankrijk is ver te zoeken. Kan de Commissie aangeven dat zij actie zal ondernemen om de interpretatie van de sociale wetgeving in het wegvervoer te harmoniseren en er voor te zorgen dat opgelegde boetes, naast doeltreffend en afschrikwekkend, ook evenredig zijn?
4. Kan de Commissie actie ondernemen om de uitzonderlijk hoge boete van 39 000 euro te onderzoeken en indien wenselijk ongedaan te maken en daarin ook andere, soortgelijke hoge boetes die onlangs in Frankrijk zijn uitgeschreven mee te nemen?
5. De rij- en rusttijdenregistratie over de laatste 28 dagen is ooit in de verordening gekomen om de genoten weekendrust te kunnen controleren. Kan de Commissie bevestigen dat deze regeling daarvoor bedoeld is en is de Commissie bereid om maatregelen te treffen, zodat alle lidstaten daartoe overeenkomstig handelen?

**Antwoord van dhr. Kallas namens de Commissie**

(2 juli 2012)

1. Overeenkomstig art. 15, lid 6, van Verordening 3821/85 <sup>(1)</sup> moet de bestuurder de tachograafgegevens van de dag zelf en de voorafgaande 28 dagen kunnen tonen om te bewijzen dat hij de bepalingen van Verordening 561/2006 <sup>(2)</sup> heeft nageleefd. De verklaring <sup>(3)</sup> mag alleen worden gebruikt als de tachograafgegevens om objectieve redenen niet beschikbaar zijn. Wanneer de registratiebladen niet kunnen worden voorgelegd, wordt dit als een heel belangrijke inbreuk beschouwd <sup>(4)</sup>. Het is aan de lidstaten om een sanctie vast te stellen die doeltreffend, evenredig en afschrikkend is en die aangepast is aan dit niveau van inbreuk <sup>(5)</sup>.
2. In dit specifieke geval volstaat een arbeidscontract alleen niet om aan te tonen dat de bestuurder de regels inzake rij- en rusttijden heeft nageleefd. Nieuwe bestuurders moeten een registratieblad van hun vorige werkgever kunnen voorleggen, inclusief handmatig opgetekende gegevens wanneer er geen tachograafgegevens beschikbaar zijn (bijvoorbeeld als ze bij hun vorige werkgever niet als bestuurder werkten).

<sup>(1)</sup> Verordening (EEG) nr. 3821/85 van de Raad van 20 december 1985 betreffende het controleapparaat in het wegvervoer, PB L 370 van 31.12.1985, blz. 8.

<sup>(2)</sup> Verordening (EG) nr. 561/2006 van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 15 maart 2006 tot harmonisatie van bepaalde voorschriften van sociale aard voor het wegvervoer, tot wijziging van Verordeningen (EEG) nr. 3821/85 en (EG) nr. 2135/98 van de Raad en tot intrekking van Verordening (EEG) nr. 3820/85 van de Raad, PB L 102 van 11.4.2006, blz. 1.

<sup>(3)</sup> Besluit van de Commissie van 14 december 2009 tot wijziging van Beschikking 2007/230/EG tot vaststelling van een formulier in het kader van de sociale wetgeving met betrekking tot het wegvervoer (2009/959/EU), PB L 330 van 16.12.2009, blz. 80.

<sup>(4)</sup> Richtlijn 2009/5/EG van de Commissie van 30 januari 2009 tot wijziging van bijlage III bij Richtlijn 2006/22/EG, PB L 29 van 31.1.2009, blz. 45.

<sup>(5)</sup> Artikel 19 van Verordening (EG) nr. 561/2006.

3. De Commissie heeft tal van stappen ondernomen op weg naar een geharmoniseerde interpretatie en toepassing van de sociale regels. Sinds 2007 heeft de wetgevingswerkgroep <sup>(6)</sup> regelmatig tenuitvoerleggingskwesties besproken. Op de Europa-website zijn zes nota's met richtsnoeren gepubliceerd. De Commissie heeft TRACE <sup>(7)</sup> gelanceerd om een gemeenschappelijk curriculum op te stellen voor de opleiding van controleambtenaren en een meer geharmoniseerde benadering van controles en heeft een studie opgestart om de nationale sancties op overtredingen van de EU-wetgeving inzake wegvervoer te analyseren <sup>(8)</sup>.
4. De Commissie beschikt over onvoldoende gegevens over deze zaak om het aangehaalde probleem te kunnen onderzoeken.
5. De verplichting om registratiebladen met de activiteiten van bestuurders bij te houden, is noodzakelijk om te kunnen nagaan of de bestuurders de verplichte beperkingen van de rij-en rusttijden naleven. Alle lidstaten moeten erop toezien dat deze regels worden nageleefd.
- 

<sup>(6)</sup> De wetgevingswerkgroep inzake de geharmoniseerde toepassing van sociale regels in het wegvervoer bestaat uit de vertegenwoordigers van de lidstaten, wegvervoersorganisaties uit de EU en de Commissie.

<sup>(7)</sup> <http://www.traceproject.eu/>.

<sup>(8)</sup> Of de boete in dit geval evenredig is, kan alleen worden bepaald door te vergelijken met het algemene niveau van boetes in Frankrijk.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004734/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Peter van Dalen (ECR) and Corien Wortmann-Kool (PPE)**  
(9 May 2012)

*Subject:* High fines for lorry and coach company drivers in France

Two drivers of a Flemish coach company have recently received a fine of EUR 39 000 in France because they had failed to produce an attestation of activities. The first driver had been on duty for four days, while the second driver was new and it was his first day. They were able to produce their employment contract, which contained the date of entry into service and satisfied all the requirements concerning traffic safety and the driving times and rest periods.

Since 1 January 2012, 15 such high fines, averaging over EUR 10 000, have been issued in France to lorry and coach drivers. These are absurdly high amounts with far-reaching consequences for the companies that have to pay them.

1. Does the Commission agree that EUR 39 000 is an undesirably high amount for the failure to produce an attestation of activities?
2. The drivers had observed the driving times and rest periods and were able to produce an employment contract, which showed that they had just entered into service. Does the Commission agree that in this particular case an employment contract constitutes sufficient proof of attestation of activities and that drivers could not provide any more written proof than for the days for which they had worked for this employer?
3. The human dimension, the moderation and fairness of checks, is lacking in countries such as France. Can the Commission indicate that it will take action to harmonise the interpretation of social legislation on road transport and to ensure that fines being issued should not only be effective and serve as a deterrent but should also be proportionate?
4. Can the Commission take action to investigate the exceptionally high fine of EUR 39 000 and, if desirable, to reverse it and to extend this reversal to other similarly high fines recently issued in France?
5. The recording of driving times and rest periods over the preceding 28 days was at some point included in the regulation in order to ascertain the observation of weekend resting periods. Can the Commission confirm that this is indeed the purpose of this regulation and is the Commission prepared to take measures to ensure that all Member States act accordingly?

**Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission**  
(2 July 2012)

1. In accordance with Article 15(6) of Regulation 3821/85 <sup>(1)</sup> a driver must be able to produce the tachograph records for the current day and the previous 28 days to demonstrate that the provisions of Regulation 561/2006 <sup>(2)</sup> have been respected. The attestation form <sup>(3)</sup> shall be used only if the tachograph records, for objective reasons, are unavailable. The inability to produce the work records is regarded as a very serious infringement <sup>(4)</sup>. It is up to the Member State to establish a penalty which is effective, proportionate and dissuasive for this level of infringement <sup>(5)</sup>.
2. In this particular case a sole employment contract does not constitute a sufficient proof that the driver complied with the driving times and rest period rules. Newly employed drivers should be able to present records from their previous employer(s) either via a copy of work records, including manual records if tachograph records are not available (e.g. if their previous job was not as a driver).

<sup>(1)</sup> Council Regulation (EEC) No 3821/85 of 20 December 1985 on recording equipment in road transport, OJ L 370, 31.12.1985, p. 8.

<sup>(2)</sup> Regulation (EC) No 561/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 March 2006 on the harmonisation of certain social legislation relating to road transport and amending Council Regulations (EEC) No 3821/85 and (EC) No 2135/98 and repealing Council Regulation (EEC) No 3820/85, OJ L 102, 11.4.2006, p. 1.

<sup>(3)</sup> Commission decision of 14 December 2009 amending Decision 2007/230 on a form concerning social legislation relating to road transport activities (2009/959/EU), OJ L 330, 16.12.2009, p. 80.

<sup>(4)</sup> Commission Directive 2009/5/EC of 30 January 2009 amending Annex III to Directive 2006/22/EC, OJ L 29, 31.1.2009, p. 45.

<sup>(5)</sup> Article 19 of Regulation (EC) No 561/2006.

3. The Commission has taken numerous steps towards a harmonised understanding and application of the social rules. The Legal Working Group <sup>(6)</sup> discusses regularly implementation issues since 2007. Six guidance notes have been published on the Europa website. The Commission launched the TRACE <sup>(7)</sup> to establish a common curriculum for the training of control officers aiming at more harmonised approach on controls and launched a study to analyse the national penalty systems in relation to infringements of the EU road transport legislation <sup>(8)</sup>.
4. The Commission does not have sufficient details on the matter to be able to investigate the problem raised.
5. The obligation to keep driver's activities records is necessary to verify whether a driver observes obligatory rest periods and driving times limits. All Member States are obliged to ensure compliance with these rules.

---

---

<sup>(6)</sup> Legal Working Group on harmonised application of social rules in road transport is composed of the representatives of the Member States, EU road transport organisations and the Commission.

<sup>(7)</sup> <http://www.traceproject.eu/>.

<sup>(8)</sup> Whether the particular fine in this case is proportionate could only be determined by reference to the general level of fines in France.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004735/12**

**alla Commissione**  
**Mario Borghezio (EFD)**  
(9 maggio 2012)

**Oggetto:** Erbicidi che causano malformazioni ai neonati

In Argentina alcuni agricoltori, affiliati alle grandi industrie del tabacco, hanno citato in giudizio la Monsanto per aver fatto pressione affinché venisse utilizzato il Roundup, un erbicida prodotto dall'azienda, che causa non solo la distruzione di cellule renali, ma che ha avuto come nefasta conseguenza l'incremento di malformazioni nei nascituri quali paralisi cerebrale, ritardo psicomotorio, dita mancanti e cecità. Inoltre le industrie del tabacco hanno imposto agli agricoltori di sbarazzarsi delle eccedenze di Roundup con il rischio di contaminazione alle falde acquifere sotterranee.

— La Commissione è a conoscenza se questo erbicida venga usato anche in Europa?

— In tal caso, quali misure di precauzione sono state prese per la tutela della salute degli agricoltori?

**Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione**

(22 giugno 2012)

Il «Roundup» è la denominazione commerciale di un erbicida contenente la sostanza attiva glifosato. Questa sostanza attiva è stata approvata a livello di UE nel 2001 <sup>(1)</sup> e inclusa nell'allegato I della direttiva 91/414/CEE del Consiglio <sup>(2)</sup> relativa all'immissione in commercio dei prodotti fitosanitari.

Sulla base delle informazioni di cui dispone la Commissione e contenute nella base dati della Commissione <sup>(3)</sup>, i prodotti contenenti glifosato sono attualmente autorizzati in tutti gli Stati membri dell'Unione europea.

La direttiva 91/414/CEE del Consiglio stabilisce un sistema in due fasi: le sostanze attive sono valutate e approvate a livello di UE e i prodotti fitosanitari in quanto formulazioni contenenti sostanze attive approvate sono valutati e autorizzati dagli Stati membri. Questi ultimi devono quindi assicurare anche che l'uso di tali prodotti avvenga in modo sicuro, vale a dire nel rispetto dei cosiddetti principi uniformi definiti nell'allegato VI della direttiva summenzionata.

Poiché le condizioni di utilizzazione possono variare, a causa delle specificità agricole, fitosanitarie, ambientali e climatiche, gli Stati membri hanno la responsabilità di porre in atto le più adeguate misure di mitigazione del rischio. Per quanto concerne l'esposizione degli operatori, si deve assicurare che l'esposizione non superi i limiti massimi definiti nel corso del riesame inter pares della sostanza. Se si prevede un tale superamento, deve essere imposta l'utilizzazione di dispositivi di protezione personale o di tecniche per ridurre la deriva delle sostanze nebulizzate.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Direttiva della Commissione 2001/99/CE, G.U.L. 304 del 21.11.2001.

<sup>(2)</sup> G.U.L. 230 del 19.8.1991.

<sup>(3)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/protection/evaluation/database\\_act\\_subs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/protection/evaluation/database_act_subs_en.htm)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004735/12  
to the Commission  
Mario Borghezio (EFD)  
(9 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Herbicides that cause birth defects in newborns

In Argentina, farmers affiliated with the large tobacco companies have filed a lawsuit against Monsanto for pressuring them into using Roundup, a herbicide produced by the company, which not only causes the destruction of renal cells but also increases birth defects in newborn babies such as cerebral palsy, psychomotor retardation, missing fingers and blindness. In addition, the tobacco companies have forced farmers to dispose of surplus Roundup with the risk of contaminating groundwater aquifers.

— Does the Commission know if this herbicide is also used in Europe?

— If so, what precautionary measures have been taken to protect the health of farmers?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission  
(22 June 2012)**

Roundup is the commercial name of a herbicide containing the active substance glyphosate. This active substance was approved at EU level in 2001 <sup>(1)</sup>, and included in Annex I of Council Directive 91/414/EEC <sup>(2)</sup> on the placing on the market of plant protection products.

Following the information available to the Commission and recorded in the Commission database <sup>(3)</sup>, glyphosate-containing products are currently authorised in all Member States of the European Union.

Council Directive 91/414/EEC lays down a two step system: active substances are evaluated and approved at EU level, and plant protection products as formulations, containing approved active substances, are evaluated and authorised by Member States. The latter must then as well ensure that the use of these products can be done safely, i.e. in respect of the so-called Uniform Principles laid down in Annex VI of the above directive.

As conditions of use may vary, due to agricultural, plant health, environmental and climatic specificities, Member States are responsible for implementing the most adequate risk mitigation measures. As regards operator exposure, it will be ensured that the exposure is not exceeding the maximum limits that have been defined during the peer review of the substance. Where such exceedance is forecasted, the use of personal protective equipment or spray-drift reducing techniques must be imposed.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Commission Directive 2001/99/EC OJ L 304, 21.11.2001.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 230, 19.8.1991.

<sup>(3)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/protection/evaluation/database\\_act\\_subs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/protection/evaluation/database_act_subs_en.htm)



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004738/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR)**

(9 May 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Protection of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people in third countries

Can the EEAS state what political, economic and social pressure has been applied to Saudi Arabia, Iran, Mauritania, Sudan, Yemen and parts of Nigeria, Pakistan and Somalia to help protect lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people who are at risk of execution by hanging, stoning and beheading?

Furthermore, can the EEAS provide specific data in the form of a numerical budget breakdown of the EU technical and financial support that these countries may receive, despite continuing with the introduction and practice of draconian legislation that criminalises and punishes homosexual behaviour through execution?

In its reply, can the EEAS take account of a parliamentary question I submitted on 17 November 2011 (E-010237/2011), which suggested that the EU should take as a best practice example the United Kingdom, which has shown strong leadership in suspending all general budget support to countries which do not respect human rights?

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

(25 July 2012)

The human rights of LGBT persons and the fight against the death penalty are EU priorities and two areas for which human rights guidelines and toolkits exist. The EU condemns unconditionally the death penalty, and — in line with international minimum standards — maintains that it should never be imposed for non-violent acts like sexual relations between consenting adults.

The EU closely monitors the human rights situation of LGBT persons in the countries referred to and has raised it in political dialogues and contacts with LGBT human rights defenders wherever it can do so, e.g. Mauritania and Sudan. The EU regularly uses statements and demarches to react to human rights violations against LGBT persons <sup>(1)</sup>.

Concerning financial support to the countries referred to, the 2010 figures are: Saudi Arabia 0, Iran EUR6 million, Mauritania EUR15.6 million, Sudan EUR146.03 million, Yemen EUR43 million, Nigeria EUR94.5 million, Pakistan EUR203.76 million, Somalia EUR35.71 million.

Commitment to human rights, including non-discrimination, democracy and the rule of law is essential for the establishment of any partnership with a third country. May 2012 Council conclusions make it clear that general budget support should only be provided when there is trust that aid will be spent in accordance with these shared values. The EU will aim at a coordinated progressive and proportionate response to any significant deterioration of human rights in the world.

An event on non-discrimination and development, held by the Commission, the ACP Group of States and the European Parliament, took place in Brussels on 1 June 2012. On this occasion the Member of the Commission responsible for Development, unveiled the launch of a new EUR20 million package to help fight against any kind of discrimination, whether based on gender, sexual orientation, religion or belief, race or ethnic origin, or disability.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> In her speech at the EP in April the HR/VP unequivocally condemned the fact that 80 States criminalize homosexuality as incompatible with international human rights law.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004740/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR)**

(9 May 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — The disappearance of M Ilias Ali of the main opposition party in Bangladesh

I have been contacted by one of my London constituents who has enquired whether the European External Action Service (EEAS) is aware of the unexplained disappearance of M Ilias Ali, who is a high-profile political leader of the main opposition party in Bangladesh?

If so, would the EEAS please ask the Bangladeshi authorities to immediately locate and disclose the whereabouts of Mr Ali so as to ensure his physical and psychological wellbeing?

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

(22 June 2012)

The HR/VP is aware of the disappearance of Mr Ilias Ali and his driver, Mr Ansar Ali, and of the political unrest that this has caused. The EU's concern has been widely reported by the Bangladeshi media, and the EU Delegation has also called for a full investigation of this case and urged all political actors to exercise restraint.

In this regard, the HR/VP reiterates the recent statement by the Chairman of Bangladesh's National Human Rights Commission, who, while calling on the Government to carry out a full investigation of the disappearance of Mr Ilias Ali, recalled that it is the state which has the ultimate responsibility to find persons who have disappeared, irrespective of their political or other identity.

In the context of a meeting held on 3 May 2012 with Ms Tahsina Rushdir Luna, Mr Ilias Ali's wife, Prime Minister Sheikh Hasina assured Mr Ali's family members that law enforcement agencies have been trying their best to trace him, and requested them to assist the authorities in the search.

The circumstances surrounding this case are still to be clarified and the HR/VP will continue to monitor developments closely.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004741/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)  
Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR)**

(9 May 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — EEAS spending and Europe Day

In the week in which Europe Day is marked, the people of France, Greece and Schleswig-Holstein have expressed their dissatisfaction with EU austerity plans at the ballot box.

Can the EEAS please provide a detailed breakdown as to how much it spent on events marking Europe Day in third countries in May 2012?

Please include details of diplomatic receptions, seminars, concerts and any other events related to 9 May. As Brussels is so keen on austerity, can it provide last year's figures by way of comparison, to show that the EEAS too is tightening its belt?

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

(18 June 2012)

The representation budget of the EEAS for 2012 amounts to EUR 2 234 million. This is supplemented by a contribution of the European Commission to the administrative costs of their staff in European Union Delegations of EUR 0 838 million, making a total budget of EUR 3 072 million.

This amount is used, in addition to activities linked to Europe Day, to finance the usual representation activities of a network of 140 delegations worldwide and represents an average budget of EUR 21 942 per delegation. The activities financed include the hosting of meetings previously assumed by the rotating Presidency in third countries and now transferred to the EEAS following the Lisbon Treaty. The comparative figures for 2011 and 2013 can be found in the table below.

	EEAS (EUR)	COMM (EUR)	TOTAL (EUR)
2011	2 351 623	965 000	3 316 623
2012	2 234 000	838 000	3 072 000
2013	2 176 000	813 000	2 989 000

As can be seen from this table the EEAS, conscious of the severe economic climate, has been making efforts to reduce expenditure in this area despite increasing responsibilities under the Lisbon Treaty and has cut its budget by almost 10% between 2011 and 2013.

It is not possible to provide details of expenditure specifically for Europe Day celebrations but general guidelines recommend that no more than 30% of the annual budget per delegation be used for this purpose. It is underlined that events hosted by European Union delegations in third countries provide high visibility to the work of the Union in the host country and are seen as important events not just by the host country but also by the diplomatic community in general, including the Member States.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004742/12  
to the Commission  
Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR)  
(9 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Commission spending to mark Europe Day

In the week in which Europe Day is marked, the people of France, Greece and Schleswig-Holstein have expressed their dissatisfaction with EU austerity plans at the ballot box.

Can the Commission please provide a detailed breakdown as to how much it spent on events marking Europe Day in the Member States in May 2012?

Please include details of receptions, seminars, concerts and any other events related to 9 May. As Brussels is so keen on austerity, can it also provide last year's figures by way of comparison, to show that the Commission too is tightening its belt?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission  
(22 June 2012)**

The European Council, in Milan in 1985, established the 9 May as 'Europe Day', thus commemorating the declaration made by Robert Schuman on 9 May 1950. Every year the institutions and Committees, as well as the Commission Representations and the European Parliament Information Offices (EPIOs) in the Member States organise events to inform citizens about the European Union and how Europe contributes to improving their lives.

This year's motto was 'Growing stronger together' aiming at passing a message of hope and solidarity. The activities focused on 'economic recovery' and 'citizens' rights'.

In 2012 the Representations spent on 9th May around EUR 1 250 000 (25% less than in 2011). This amount is the total spent by 27 Representations and 9 regional offices in order to ensure the best geographical coverage.

The Representations finance events through the specific budget line for local actions. The wide range of activities makes it difficult to regroup all costs under a single budget line, as often the cooperation with national or local authorities (Partnerships) leads to the use of different sources of funding. Events co-organised by the European Commission and the European Parliament may be funded from Commission funds, from European Parliament funds or on a shared basis, and in some cases with the co-financing of the Member States' authorities.

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Questions E-002390/2012 <sup>(1)</sup> by Mr Frank Proust and E-004872/2011 <sup>(2)</sup> by Mr John Bufton.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+WQ+E-2012-002390+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN&language=EN>.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+WQ+E-2011-004872+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN&language=EN>.

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-004744/12**

**à la Commission**

**Anne Delvaux (PPE)**

(9 mai 2012)

*Objet:* Accord commercial anti-contrefaçon (ACTA)

En prévision d'un éventuel vote sur l'accord commercial anti-contrefaçon (ACTA) au Parlement européen en juin prochain, la Commission pourrait-elle m'éclairer sur les points suivants:

1. Quels sont les avantages réels qu'apporterait ACTA par rapport aux traités communautaires existants? Pourquoi lesdits traités ne seraient-ils pas suffisants en la matière? Quels seraient les avantages qu'apporterait l'entrée en vigueur d'ACTA?
2. Par ailleurs, quels seraient les effets d'ACTA sur les médicaments génériques?

**Réponse donnée par M. De Gucht au nom de la Commission**

(22 juin 2012)

L'accord commercial anti-contrefaçon (ACTA) définit, pour 38 pays, des normes internationales visant à faire respecter les droits de propriété intellectuelle selon des modalités déjà consacrées par le droit européen.

Au fil des ans, l'Union européenne a mis en place un système global pour la protection de la propriété intellectuelle, qui garantit notamment les droits des citoyens à la liberté d'expression, au libre accès à l'information et à la protection des données, ainsi que les droits des prestataires de services et des intermédiaires faisant le commerce de biens protégés.

ACTA constitue un moyen d'étendre les bénéfices de ce système au-delà des frontières de l'Europe. Il s'agit d'une avancée modeste, mais significative vers l'éradication de l'industrie mondiale de la contrefaçon et du piratage, dont le poids est estimé à plus de 200 milliards d'euros par an.

L'un des principaux objectifs de l'UE était de garantir qu'ACTA soit étroitement inspiré du modèle du système européen. En effet, comme mentionné dans les réponses à des questions parlementaires précédentes, ACTA est tout à fait compatible avec l'acquis européen concernant la propriété intellectuelle et, de ce fait, il ne nécessitera aucune modification de celui-ci. Cet accord apportera surtout des avantages par rapport aux pays tiers, en incitant ceux-ci à améliorer la façon dont ils font respecter les droits de propriété intellectuelle sur leur territoire, et notamment ceux des détenteurs de droits européens.

Comme précisé dans les réponses aux questions parlementaires P-9459/2010, E-011835/2011 et E-004340/2012, ACTA n'aura aucun impact sur les médicaments génériques au sein de l'UE. Cet accord n'aura pas non plus d'impact sur les pays en développement qui n'ont pas l'intention d'adhérer à ACTA. De plus, il convient de remarquer qu'ACTA vise des biens susceptibles de porter atteinte aux droits de propriété intellectuelle, et non pas des produits génériques non couverts par de tels droits, la Commission n'ayant pas l'intention d'entraver le commerce de ces derniers.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-004744/12  
to the Commission  
Anne Delvaux (PPE)  
(9 May 2012)**

*Subject:* The Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement

In anticipation of a possible vote on the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA) in the European Parliament next June, could the Commission please explain the following points:

1. What real advantages will the ACTA bring to the existing Community treaties? Why are these treaties not sufficient on this topic? What benefits will ACTA's entry into force bring about?
2. In addition, what effects will ACTA have on generic medicines?

**Answer given by Mr Karel De Gucht on behalf of the Commission  
(22 June 2012)**

The Anti-counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA) creates international standards for 38 countries to enforce intellectual property rights in ways that are already enshrined in European law.

Over the years the EU has built up a comprehensive system to protect intellectual property, including safeguards for the rights of citizens to free speech and free access to information and data protection and of service providers and intermediaries who deal with protected goods.

ACTA is a means to extend the benefits of this system beyond Europe's borders. It represents a small but significant step towards stamping out the global counterfeiting and piracy industry — estimated to be worth over EUR 200 billion a year.

And one of the main achievements of the EU was to ensure that ACTA is closely modelled on the European system. Indeed, as mentioned in the replies to previous parliamentary questions, ACTA is fully compatible with the EU *acquis* regarding intellectual property, and will therefore not require any changes thereto. It is in relation to third countries that this agreement will bring benefits, driving them to improve the way in which they enforce intellectual property rights on their territory — including, in particular, those of European right holders.

ACTA will have no impact on generic medicines within the EU, as clarified in the replies to parliamentary questions P-9459/2010, E-011835/2011 and E-004340/2012. It will not have any impact either on developing countries which do not intend to join ACTA. In addition, it should be noted that ACTA targets goods which may infringe intellectual property rights, not generic products which are not covered by any such rights, the trade of which the Commission does not intend to hinder.

---

(Dansk udgave)

**Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-004747/12**  
**til Kommissionen**  
**Bendt Bendtsen (PPE)**  
(9. maj 2012)

Om: Projektobligationer

I Kommissionens forslag til en forordning om ændring af afgørelse nr. 1639/2006/EF om et rammeprogram for konkurrenceevne og innovation (2007-2013) og forordning (EF) nr. 680/2007 om generelle regler for Fællesskabets finansielle støtte inden for de transeuropæiske transport- og energinet (KOM(2011)0659) anføres følgende: »Facilitetens finansielle instrumenter kan udvides til at omfatte andre sektorer som f.eks. social infrastruktur, vedvarende energi og bestemte rumprojekter, forudsat at de opfylder de relevante økonomiske og finansielle kriterier (...)»

1. Kan Kommissionen sige, under hvilke omstændigheder disse finansielle instrumenter kan udvides til at omfatte andre sektorer, og anføre den nødvendige lovgivningsproces?
2. Hvis det ikke er nødvendigt at revidere forordningen, kan Kommissionen da sige, hvem der beslutter, om de finansielle instrumenter kan udvides til at omfatte andre typer af projekter?
3. Vil der blive holdt en formel høring om dette, og hvornår vil den i bekræftende fald blive arrangeret?

**Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Olli Rehn**  
(27. juni 2012)

I pilotfasen for projektobligationsinitiativet 2012-2013 ydes der støtte til investeringer på transport-, energi- og ikt-området, som alle er nødvendige for at nå Europa 2020-målene. Dette er de vigtigste sektorer, som Connecting Europe-faciliteten (CEF) sigter mod i perioden 2014-2020. CEF åbner imidlertid også op for muligheden for, at andre politikområder kan bidrage med finansielle instrumenter. Dette gælder også for projektobligationer.

Enhver udvidelse til andre politikområder kan først finde sted efter 2014 i form af et nyt forslag fra Kommissionen eller som en del af Connecting Europe-faciliteten. Udvidelsen vil også afhænge af, hvor stor succes der opnås i pilotfasen, da den skulle vise de institutionelle investorers efterspørgsel efter sådanne investeringer, også i sektorer, der ikke hører under CEF. En eventuel udvidelse af projektobligationsinitiativet til andre sektorer afhænger i høj grad også af en grundig konsekvensanalyse af det pågældende politikområdes finansieringsbehov og af ønsket om, at EU — frem for medlemsstaterne selv — skrider til handling. Gennemførelsesprocessen vil afhænge af, hvilke lovgivningsprocedurer der skal overholdes, og om der er budgetmidler til rådighed inden for det pågældende politikområde.

Iværksættelsen af pilotfasen har været genstand for en offentlig høring. Emnet blev desuden for nyligt debatteret under høringen den 24. april 2012.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004747/12  
to the Commission  
Bendt Bendtsen (PPE)  
(9 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Project bonds

The Commission's proposal for a regulation amending Decision No 1639/2006/EC establishing a Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme (2007-2013) and Regulation (EC) No 680/2007 laying down general rules for the granting of Community financial aid in the field of the trans-European transport and energy networks (COM(2011)0659) states: 'The financial instruments under the Facility may be extended to other sectors such as social infrastructure, renewable energy or certain space projects, provided they fulfil the appropriate economic and financial criteria (...).'

1. Could the Commission please state under what circumstances these financial instruments may be extended to other sectors, and indicate the necessary legislative processes?
2. If no revision of the regulation is necessary, could the Commission please indicate who will decide whether the financial instruments may be extended to other types of project?
3. Will there be a formal hearing on this matter, and, if so, when will it be organised?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission  
(27 June 2012)**

The pilot phase of the project bond initiative 2012-2013 is able to support investments in transport, energy and ICT networks, which are crucial to meet the policy goals of the Europe 2020 strategy. These are all the primary sectors targeted by the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) 2014-2020. However, the CEF opens the possibility for other policy areas to contribute to financial instruments within the CEF and this also applies to project bonds.

Any extension to other policy areas will only take place post 2014 in the framework of a new proposal by the Commission or as part of the CEF. It will also depend on the success of the pilot phase which should demonstrate the demand from institutional investors for such investments including in other sectors than those under CEF. The eventual extension of the Project Bond Initiative to other sectors will also to a considerable degree depend on an in-depth impact assessment of the financing needs of the policy area in question and the demand for the EU to take action instead of Member States themselves. Implementation process would depend on the legislative procedures to be respected and budgetary availability to provide funds in the relevant policy area.

Finally, the launch of the pilot phase was subject to a public consultation. More recently, the the subject was discussed in the hearing of 24 April 2012.

---



(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004748/12**  
**adresată Comisiei**  
**Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)**  
(9 mai 2012)

*Subiect:* Mierea în școli

Mierea este un aliment cu un conținut bogat de vitamine. Având în vedere faptul că elevii consumă o serie de dulciuri cu un aport caloric ridicat și că obezitatea în rândul copiilor este în creștere, consideră Comisia oportună crearea unui proiect-pilot privind un program european pentru distribuirea mierii de albine în școli?

**Răspuns dat de dl Ciolos în numele Comisiei**  
(27 iunie 2012)

În prezent, Comisia desfășoară o evaluare a proiectului care încurajează consumul de fructe în școli, inclusiv a posibilității de a extinde domeniul de aplicare al acestuia. Deși experiența cu acest sistem este pozitivă, orice decizie de a include miere într-un astfel de program ar trebui să fie examinată în funcție de caracteristicile sale proprii. Cu toate acestea, trebuie avut în vedere faptul că mierea este un produs relativ costisitor, iar aproximativ 40% din consumul de miere al UE este importat.

---

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-004748/12  
to the Commission**

**Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)**

*(9 May 2012)*

*Subject:* Honey in schools

Honey is a food that is rich in vitamins. Given the fact that schoolchildren consume a range of sweets with a high calorie content and that obesity among children is increasing, does the Commission consider it appropriate to create a pilot project on a European programme for the distribution of honey in schools?

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

*(27 June 2012)*

The Commission is currently undertaking an evaluation of the School Fruit Scheme including the possibility to extend its scope. Notwithstanding the positive experience of this scheme any decision to include honey in such a programme would have to be examined on its own merits. However, it should be borne in mind that honey is a relatively expensive product of which around 40% of the EU consumption is imported.

---

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004751/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή (Αντιπρόεδρος/Υπατη Εκπρόσωπος)**  
**Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)**  
(10 Μαΐου 2012)

**Θέμα:** VP/HR — Νέα επιθετική στάση της Τουρκίας

Αμετανόητη συνεχίζει η Τουρκία την επιθετικότητά της, απέναντι σε όσους αρνούνται να «υπακούσουν» στις επιταγές της.

Έτσι, μετά την επιθετικότητα στο Αιγαίο, σε Ελλάδα και Κύπρο, τώρα προχωρά σε «αποκλεισμό» του Ισραήλ από την Σύνοδο του ΝΑΤΟ που θα συνέλθει στο Σικάγο στις 20 και 21 Μαΐου 2012.

Την είδηση δημοσίευσε χθες η Hürriyet Daily News, και σύμφωνα με τον συντάκτη, «Η Τουρκία άσκησε βέτο δια του Υπουργού Εξωτερικών κ. Νταβούντογλου κατά την διάρκεια της συνεδρίασης των Υπουργών Εξωτερικών της Συμμαχίας, την περασμένη εβδομάδα».

«Δεν θα υπάρξει παρουσία του Ισραήλ στην Σύνοδο του ΝΑΤΟ, εκτός αν προχωρήσει σε επίσημη απολογία και ζητήσει συγγνώμη για τη δολοφονία Τούρκων υπηκόων σε διεθνή ύδατα», δήλωσε Τούρκος αξιωματούχος.

Προέτρεψε μάλιστα τις χώρες εκείνες που διατηρούν σχέσεις με την Τουρκία και το Ισραήλ, «να συμβουλευθούν το Ισραήλ να ζητήσει συγγνώμη».

Ερωτάται η Υπατη Εκπρόσωπος:

Τι μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει ώστε να καταλαγιάσει την επιθετικότητα της Τουρκίας, ως χώρας υποψήφιας για ένταξη στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, και να εναρμονιστεί με την ευρωπαϊκή άποψη της φιλίας και καλής γειτονίας των λαών;

**Απάντηση της Υπατης Εκπροσώπου/Αντιπρόεδρου κας Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(4 Ιουλίου 2012)

Η Υπατη Εκπρόσωπος/Αντιπρόεδρος δεν σχολιάζει άρθρα που δημοσιεύονται στον Τύπο.

Όσον αφορά τη διαδικασία προσχώρησης της Τουρκίας, είναι γεγονός ότι η Τουρκία, ως υποψήφια χώρα, πρέπει να έχει κοινές αξίες και στόχους με την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, όπως αυτές ορίζονται στις Συνθήκες. Υπό αυτό το πρίσμα, είναι καθοριστική η κατηγορηματική δέσμευσή της για την καλλιέργεια καλών σχέσεων με τις γειτονικές χώρες. Δηλώσεις που δεν οδηγούν προς αυτό τον στόχο πρέπει να αποφεύγονται και αντίθετα πρέπει να επικρατεί η χρήση του διαλόγου.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004751/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)  
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)  
(10 May 2012)**

*Subject:* VP/HR — Turkey's recent aggressive behaviour

Turkey is unapologetically continuing to adopt an aggressive stance towards all those who refuse to 'obey' its orders.

Thus, following acts of aggression in the Aegean directed against Greece and Cyprus, it is now 'blocking' Israel from attending the NATO summit to be held in Chicago on 20 and 21 May 2012.

This was reported yesterday by the *Hurriyet Daily News* and, according to the author of the article, 'Turkey's Foreign Minister, Mr Davutoglu, vetoed Israel's participation during a NATO Foreign Ministers meeting last week'.

'There will be no Israeli presence at the NATO summit unless it issues a formal apology and pays compensation for the Turkish citizens killed in international waters' a Turkish official stated.

It also urged those countries with ties to Turkey and Israel 'to advise Israel to apologise'.

In view of this:

What measures does the High Representative intend to take to contain acts of aggression by Turkey, a candidate for European Union membership, so as to bring it into line with the European view regarding friendship and good neighbourly relations?

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

The High Representative/Vice-President does not comment on press articles.

Regarding Turkey's accession process, it is a fact that Turkey as a candidate country must share the values and objectives of the European Union as set out in the Treaties. In this light, unequivocal commitment to good neighbourly relations is essential. Statements that are not conducive to this objective should be avoided whereas dialogue should prevail.

---

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004752/12**  
**à la Commission**  
**Gaston Franco (PPE)**  
(10 mai 2012)

*Objet:* Amélioration de la gestion des domaines skiables et soutien à l'innovation en matière de développement durable

Des expériences innovantes, basées sur de nouvelles technologies, sont en cours de réalisation afin d'améliorer la gestion des domaines skiables dans un souci de développement durable.

Elles poursuivent notamment les objectifs suivants:

- développer l'engazonnement des pistes;
- favoriser le couplage de la petite hydroélectricité, du solaire et de chaufferies au bois pour faire fonctionner le matériel des remontées mécaniques et pour chauffer les résidences des stations;
- utiliser du matériel EnR (énergies renouvelables) innovant à bon rendement pour les remontées mécaniques et pour les paravalanches, comme l'installation de petits panneaux solaires sur les câbles des téléskis pour fabriquer l'électricité nécessaire à leur fonctionnement, le surplus de production électrique étant réinjecté dans le réseau;
- permettre une gestion raisonnée de la neige de culture (par exemple: éviter le pompage de l'eau et privilégier le captage grâce à la pression gravitaire, prélever une eau plus abondante au moment de la fonte des neiges, favoriser le cycle vertueux de récupération pour éviter le gaspillage, développer le pilotage innovant des dameuses par radar et GPS pour calculer l'épaisseur minimale de neige nécessaire).

Quel soutien la Commission pourrait-elle accorder à ces démarches innovantes et contribuant à l'utilisation efficace des ressources en zone de montagne?

**Réponse donnée par M. Oettinger au nom de la Commission**  
(2 juillet 2012)

La Commission est très intéressée par toutes les initiatives de développement durable, y compris les approches innovantes. Elle soutient également de multiples projets. Au cours de la période de programmation actuelle 2007-2013, un financement important est consacré à l'énergie durable dans le budget de la politique de cohésion, quelque 9 milliards d'euros étant prévus pour l'efficacité énergétique et les énergies renouvelables dans l'ensemble de l'Union européenne. L'accent a en outre été mis sur la recherche et l'innovation. Les parts relatives allouées à ces domaines diffèrent selon les États membres, en fonction du volume total des fonds disponibles ainsi que des priorités et besoins nationaux fixés par chaque État membre. Se fondant sur le principe de la gestion partagée, la gestion des programmes financés par ces fonds relève des États membres. Les promoteurs de projets potentiels pourraient vérifier s'il est possible de demander un cofinancement dans leur zone géographique spécifique pour le type de projets décrits par l'Honorable Parlementaire en prenant contact avec les autorités de gestion concernées (liste disponible à l'adresse suivante:

[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/gérer/autorité/Authority\\_fr.cfm](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/gérer/autorité/Authority_fr.cfm)).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004752/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Gaston Franco (PPE)**  
(10 May 2012)

*Subject:* Improving the management of ski resorts and support for innovation in the interests of sustainable development

Innovative experiments, involving the use of new technologies, are being conducted with a view to improving the management of ski resorts in the interests of sustainable development.

The experiments are seeking to:

- improve the covering of grass on slopes;
- promote the combined use of small-scale hydroelectric installations, solar panels and wood-burning stoves to power the mechanical lifts and heat accommodation at resorts;
- encourage the use of high-performance innovative renewable-energy installations for mechanical lifts and avalanche barriers, for example by powering ski lifts by means of small solar panels mounted on the cables and feeding any surplus electricity generated back into the grid;
- advocate the intelligent use of artificial snow (for example by not pumping water and giving priority to water catchment through gravitational pressure, collecting greater quantities of water when snow melts, promoting a virtuous cycle involving the reuse of water and the avoidance of waste and using innovative radar- and GPS-controlled snow grooming machines to calculate the minimum snow depth required).

What can the Commission do to promote such innovative technologies that contribute to the efficient use of resources in mountain regions?

**Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission**  
(2 July 2012)

The Commission is very interested in all initiatives for sustainable development, including innovative approaches. It also supports multiple projects. In the current 2007-2013 programming period, significant funding is dedicated to sustainable energy within the Cohesion Policy budget, with about EUR 9 billion planned for energy efficiency and renewables across the EU as a whole. In addition, a strong focus has been put on research and innovation. Relative shares allocated to these areas differ between Member States, to be seen in the light of total volume of funds available, national needs and priorities set by each Member State. Based on the principle of shared management, the management of programmes supported by these funds is the responsibility of the Member States. Potential project promoters could check whether it might be possible to apply for co-financing in their specific location for the type of projects described by the Honourable Member by contacting the relevant managing authorities (list available at [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/manage/authority/authority\\_en.cfm](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/manage/authority/authority_en.cfm)).

---

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004753/12**  
**à la Commission**  
**Gaston Franco (PPE)**  
(10 mai 2012)

*Objet:* Aide au maintien du patrimoine paysager en milieu rural

À l'heure où l'Union européenne discute de la révision de sa politique de développement rural, une attention particulière mérite d'être portée à d'anciennes techniques d'aménagement du territoire qui contribuent à préserver la beauté et la durabilité de nos paysages, à maintenir une agriculture dans des endroits reculés et à faire vivre le patrimoine de nos ancêtres.

Tel est le cas des anciens murs de retenue en pierre sèche sans mortier appelés «restanques», qui se sont généralisés en Provence à partir de la fin du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle avec la conquête des terres non cultivées et l'introduction du mûrier, et dont la construction s'est poursuivie durant la première moitié du XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle avec le partage des biens communaux.

Créés pour favoriser la culture en terrasses, ces murs permettent aujourd'hui de maintenir les terrains en montagne, d'éviter l'érosion des sols et de protéger des milieux ouverts et des prairies fleuries qui sont en voie de disparition.

Parlons également des anciens systèmes d'irrigation qui participent eux aussi au maintien des paysages ruraux et à la remise en exploitation de terrains agricoles dans des zones reculées ou en montagne, un phénomène qui se développe en raison du coût du foncier en zone périurbaine.

— Quelle aide financière la Commission peut-elle apporter à la réfection des murs de retenue et à la remise en fonction des anciens canaux d'irrigation?

**Réponse donnée par M. Ciolos au nom de la Commission**  
(21 juin 2012)

Au cours de la période actuelle, le Fonds européen agricole pour le développement rural (Feader) soutient la conservation et la mise en valeur du patrimoine rural [article 52, point b), sous iii), et article 57 du règlement (UE) n° 1698/2005 du Conseil <sup>(1)</sup>]. Ce soutien s'étend aux études et investissements liés à l'entretien, à la restauration et à la mise en valeur du patrimoine culturel, et notamment des caractéristiques culturelles des villages et du paysage rural. Une aide pourrait également être fournie pour les investissements liés à l'entretien, à la restauration et à la mise en valeur du patrimoine naturel, ainsi que pour les investissements relatifs au développement d'espaces de haute valeur naturelle. Pour ce qui est de la réparation des murs de retenue, il serait envisageable d'apporter un soutien dans le cadre d'investissements non productifs, au titre de l'article 49 du règlement précité. Afin de vérifier si une telle aide peut être attribuée à une région précise couverte par le programme, il convient de s'adresser à l'autorité de gestion chargée du programme de développement rural (PDR) dans cette région <sup>(2)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> JO L 277 du 21.10.2005, p. 1.

<sup>(2)</sup> Dans le cas de la France, le PDR est coordonné conjointement par le Ministère de l'agriculture et de l'agroalimentaire (Ministère de l'agriculture et de l'agroalimentaire, 19 avenue du Maine, 75015 Paris, France) et la Direction régionale de l'alimentation, de l'agriculture et de la forêt de la région Provence Alpes Côte d'Azur (DRAAF-PACA, 132, boulevard de Paris, 13003 Marseille, France).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004753/12  
to the Commission  
Gaston Franco (PPE)  
(10 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Aid in maintaining the landscape heritage in rural settings

At a time when the European Union is discussing revising its rural development policy, special attention should be paid to historical land-development techniques that help to preserve the beauty and sustainability of our landscapes, maintain agriculture in remote areas and bring the heritage of our ancestors to life.

This is the case with the drystone retaining walls ('restanques') that became common in Provence from the end of 18th century with the cultivating of wild land and the introduction of the mulberry tree. Construction of the walls continued throughout the first half of the 19th century with the division of municipal property.

While these walls were created to promote terraced cultivation, today they allow mountain lands to be maintained, prevent soil erosion and protect open spaces and flowering grasslands that are disappearing.

Of equal importance are the historical irrigation systems, which also play a part in maintaining rural landscapes and making agricultural land in remote or mountainous areas available again, a phenomenon that is developing as a result of land prices in suburban areas.

— What financial aid can the Commission offer for repairing retaining walls and reopening historical irrigation channels?

**Answer given by Mr Ciołoş on behalf of the Commission  
(21 June 2012)**

The European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) supports in the current period the conservation and upgrading of the rural heritage [Article 52(b)iii and Article 57 of Council Regulation (EU) No 1698/2005 <sup>(1)</sup>]. This covers studies and investments associated with maintenance, restoration and upgrading of the cultural heritage such as the cultural features of villages and the rural landscape. Support could also be provided for investments associated with the maintenance, restoration and upgrading of the natural heritage and with the development of high natural value sites. As regards repairing retaining walls, such support could potentially be provided in the context of non-productive investments under Article 49 of the aforementioned regulation. To verify if such support may be provided in a given programme area, the Managing Authority responsible for the Rural Development Programme (RDP) for that programme area should be contacted <sup>(2)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 277, 21.10.2005, p. 1.

<sup>(2)</sup> In the case of France it is jointly coordinated by the Ministry of Agriculture and Agri-Food (Ministère de l'Agriculture et de l'Agroalimentaire, 19 avenue du Maine, 75015 Paris, France) and PACA (DRAAF-PACA, 132 boulevard de Paris, 13003 Marseille, France).



(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004754/12**

**alla Commissione**

**Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)**

(10 maggio 2012)

**Oggetto:** Pericolo di chiusura del laboratorio INCA, unica struttura in grado di effettuare i controlli e le analisi dei POP nel Nord-Est dell'Italia

I Persistent Organic Pollutants (POP) sono pericolose sostanze genotossiche, interferenti endocrini, cancerogeni o potenziali tali che immessi nell'ambiente contaminano l'uomo e il latte materno attraverso la catena alimentare, ma l'Italia è l'unico paese europeo a non aver ratificato la Convenzione di Stoccolma che prevede la protezione della salute umana e dell'ambiente dai POP.

Dal 6 al 17 settembre 2010 gli ispettori del UAV (Ufficio alimentare e veterinario), hanno effettuato un audit specifico nella Regione Veneto e in Sicilia, conformemente al regolamento (CE) n. 882/2004 relativo ai controlli ufficiali in materia di mangimi e di alimenti <sup>(1)</sup>.

Riguardo alla Regione Veneto, tra le non conformità rilevate dagli ispettori comunitari risultavano: 1) la non completezza del piano regionale di controllo per l'assenza di campioni su cui ricercare diossine (PCDD/F), policlorobifenili (PCB) e idrocarburi policiclici aromatici (IPA); 2) la carenza in alcune ASL dei controlli sulle attività di autocontrollo fatte dai produttori per diossine (PCDD/F), policlorobifenili (PCB) e idrocarburi policiclici aromatici (IPA) e altri parametri quali i metalli, tra cui i composti organostannici; 3) evidenti carenze nel controllo dei POP nelle risorse ittiche pescate/allevate del Veneto.

Il Veneto, come il Friuli Venezia Giulia e il Trentino Alto Adige, sono regioni dense di allevamenti animali (bovini, ovicaprini, suini, pesce). Tali alimenti sono controllati dall'Istituto zooprofilattico sperimentale delle Venezie che però non è dotato di strutture adatte all'analisi dei POP. Per effettuare questi controlli, la Regione Veneto si appoggia, infatti, sporadicamente presso il laboratorio del Consorzio interuniversitario nazionale della chimica per l'ambiente (I.N.C.A.) accreditato e riconosciuto internazionalmente per l'analisi dei POP. Negli ultimi anni, però, a seguito di ripetuti e ingiustificati tagli di bilancio, questo prestigioso laboratorio ha ricevuto sempre meno finanziamenti e ormai rischia clamorosamente di chiudere.

Ritiene la Commissione che le autorità competenti, nel caso specifico la Regione Veneto, dovrebbero, al contrario, potenziare il sostegno al laboratorio I.N.C.A. dal momento che è l'unico presidio scientifico nel Nord-Est dell'Italia capace di effettuare i controlli e le analisi dei POP, così come richiesto dagli ispettori comunitari in ottemperanza del regolamento (CE) n. 854/2004 e raccomandato a livello internazionale?

**Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione**

(29 giugno 2012)

La relazione finale relativa all'audit cui si riferisce l'onorevole parlamentare, effettuato per valutare i sistemi di controllo vigenti in Italia sulla produzione e l'immissione sul mercato dei prodotti della pesca è disponibile sul sito: [http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/rep\\_details\\_en.cfm?rep\\_id=2634](http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/rep_details_en.cfm?rep_id=2634).

Le norme applicabili alla designazione dei laboratori ufficiali da parte delle autorità competenti che effettuano controlli ufficiali sulla catena alimentare sono stabilite negli articoli 5 e 12 del regolamento (CE) n. 882/2004 relativo ai controlli ufficiali intesi a verificare la conformità alla normativa in materia di mangimi e di alimenti e alle norme sulla salute e sul benessere degli animali <sup>(2)</sup>.

Le autorità competenti devono essere dotate delle risorse necessarie per effettuare i controlli ufficiali e per acquisire i servizi dei laboratori ufficiali incaricati di effettuare le analisi, indipendentemente dal fatto che tali laboratori siano pubblici o privati, situati nella stessa regione e nello stesso Stato membro o altrove.

Spetta alle autorità italiane competenti cui l'INCA presta attualmente i suoi servizi come laboratorio ufficiale ai sensi dell'articolo 12 del regolamento (CE) n. 882/2004 garantire che tali servizi siano disponibili. La Commissione non ha il potere di intervenire in merito al livello di remunerazione di tali servizi, ma si assicurerà che l'Italia dia un seguito appropriato alla relazione.

<sup>(1)</sup> DG (SANCO)2010-8525; Ares(2011)321689.

<sup>(2)</sup> GUL 165 del 30.4.2004.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004754/12  
to the Commission**

**Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)**

(10 May 2012)

*Subject:* INCA laboratory — the only facility able to carry out sampling and analysis of POPs in north-east Italy — at risk of closure

Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) are dangerous genotoxic substances, endocrine disruptors and carcinogens with the potential to contaminate humans through the food chain when released into the environment, affecting breast milk in particular. Italy is the only European country that has not ratified the Stockholm Convention regarding the protection of human health and the environment from POPs.

From 6 to 17 September 2010, Food and Veterinary Office inspectors carried out a specific audit in the Veneto Region and Sicily, in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules <sup>(1)</sup>.

Examples of non-compliance found by the EU inspectors in the Veneto Region included: (1) Incomplete regional monitoring plan due to the absence of samples to detect dioxins (PCDD/Fs), polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs); (2) Insufficient monitoring in some ASLs (local health authorities) of internal checks by the producers for dioxins (PCDD/Fs), polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) and other parameters such as metals, including organostannic compounds; (3) Clear deficiencies in the sampling of POPs in fish caught or farmed in the Veneto Region.

Veneto, along with Friuli, Venice, Giulia and Trentino-Alto Adige, is a region of intensive animal husbandry (cattle, sheep, pigs and fish). These foods are monitored by the Istituto zooprofilattico sperimentale delle Venezie (Experimental Zooprophyllactic Institute), which, however, has no facilities for the analysis of POPs. To carry out these checks, the Veneto Region occasionally relies, in fact, on the laboratory of the National Interuniversity Chemistry for the Environment Consortium (INCA), which is accredited and recognised internationally for the analysis of POPs. In recent years, however, after repeated and unjustified budget cuts, this prestigious laboratory has received increasingly less funding and is now facing the threat of closure.

Does the Commission consider that the competent authorities should, contrary to the current situation, increase the support offered to the INCA in the specific case of the Veneto Region, since it is the only scientific centre in north-east Italy capable of carrying out sampling and analysis of POPs, as requested by the EU inspectors pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 and as recommended at an international level?

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

(29 June 2012)

The final report in relation to the audit referred to by the Honourable Member carried out to evaluate the control systems in place in Italy governing the production and placing of the market of fishery products can be found at [http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/rep\\_details\\_en.cfm?rep\\_id=2634](http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/rep_details_en.cfm?rep_id=2634)

The rules applicable to the designation of official laboratories by competent authorities performing official controls along the food chain are laid down in Articles 5 and 12 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules <sup>(2)</sup>.

Competent authorities must be provided with the resources needed to perform official controls, and to acquire the services of official laboratories tasked with analytical work, irrespective of whether the laboratories in question are public or private, in the same region or Member State or in another one.

It is for the Italian competent authorities, to which INCA is currently providing its services as official laboratory in the meaning of Article 12 of Regulation (EC) 882/2004, to ensure that such services are available. The Commission has no power to interfere on the level at which such services are remunerated. The Commission will however, ensure that Italy gives an appropriate follow-up to the report.

<sup>(1)</sup> DG (SANCO) 2010-8525; Ares(2011)321689.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 165, 30.4.2004.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004755/12**

**alla Commissione**  
**Mario Borghezio (EFD)**  
(10 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Intervento dell'UE sulle archeomafie in Serbia

Recentemente la polizia serba ha ritrovato il dipinto di Cézanne sottratto con la violenza nel 2008 alla fondazione E.G. Buhrlé Collection in Svizzera.

Gli agenti dello SBPOK (servizio per la lotta alla criminalità organizzata) hanno arrestato tre serbi a Belgrado e Cacak. Il successo è stato possibile grazie alla collaborazione con le polizie di mezza Europa.

Posto che la Commissione, nella sua relazione presentata il 12.10.2011 COM(2011)0666 «Strategia di allargamento e sfide principali per il periodo 2011-2012», riferendosi alla Serbia, non cita questo tipo di organizzazione criminale e afferma, anzi, che «il quadro legislativo e istituzionale per lo Stato di diritto è completo, anche per quanto riguarda la lotta alla corruzione e alla criminalità organizzata che ha dato i primi risultati», intende aprire un capitolo di verifica e di approfondimento circa l'inquietante realtà delle grandi organizzazioni criminali serbe, ivi comprese le archeomafie la cui pericolosa attività si svolge anche negli Stati membri?

**Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione**

(3 luglio 2012)

La Commissione segue attentamente gli sforzi compiuti dai paesi candidati e potenziali candidati verso un allineamento progressivo alla legislazione dell'UE, anche nel settore della giustizia, della libertà e della sicurezza.

Nel parere sulla domanda di adesione della Serbia <sup>(1)</sup> dell'ottobre 2011, nell'ambito del capitolo 24 «Giustizia, libertà e sicurezza», la Commissione ha osservato che il paese dispone sostanzialmente di un quadro legislativo e istituzionale che le consente in generale di combattere efficacemente la criminalità organizzata. Negli ultimi anni la Serbia ha anche firmato con molti paesi europei accordi di cooperazione tra forze di polizia e di cooperazione nella lotta contro la criminalità organizzata. Nel 2009 ha concluso un accordo di cooperazione strategica con l'Europol. La Commissione ha accolto con favore la firma nell'ottobre 2010 di un accordo che istituisce a Belgrado un ufficio regionale per migliorare la cooperazione nella lotta alla criminalità organizzata. Dal 2008 la Serbia ha condotto con successo una serie di operazioni di polizia in stretta collaborazione con l'Interpol, l'Europol, gli Stati membri e paesi non appartenenti all'UE, che hanno portato all'arresto e all'azione penale nei confronti di membri appartenenti a varie organizzazioni criminali.

Tuttavia, nel parere della Commissione si precisa chiaramente che la Serbia deve proseguire il suo impegno in questo ambito. Le relazioni annuali della Commissione forniscono una valutazione globale della situazione senza riferire su singoli casi o su indagini penali specifiche. La Commissione continuerà a monitorare gli sforzi compiuti dalla Serbia per soddisfare i criteri di adesione all'UE e a riferirne i progressi nel quadro della prossima relazione di ottobre 2012.

---

(1) Cfr. il parere e l'allegata relazione analitica: [http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/press\\_corner/key-documents/reports\\_oct\\_2011\\_it.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/press_corner/key-documents/reports_oct_2011_it.htm)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004755/12  
to the Commission  
Mario Borghezio (EFD)  
(10 May 2012)**

*Subject:* EU action on 'archeomafia' organisations in Serbia

The Serbian police have recently recovered a painting by Cézanne stolen from the Foundation E.G. Bührle Collection in Switzerland during an armed robbery in 2008.

Officials from the Service for the Fight Against Organised Crime have arrested three Serbs in Belgrade and Čačak. The success of the operation was made possible through the collaborative efforts of the police forces of half of Europe.

Given that, in its report 'Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2011-2012' (COM(2011) 0666) submitted on 12 October 2011, the Commission did not cite this type of criminal organisation when referring to Serbia, stating, in fact, that 'the legal and institutional framework for the rule of law is comprehensive, including in the areas of the fight against corruption and organised crime where initial results were achieved', does it intend to open a chapter for verifying and studying the disturbing reality of large criminal organisations in Serbia, including 'archeomafias' whose dangerous activities also take place in Member States?

**Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission  
(3 July 2012)**

The Commission closely monitors the efforts of candidate and potential candidate countries to progressively align with EU legislation including in the area of justice, freedom and security.

The Commission has reported in its October 2011 Opinion on Serbia's EU membership application<sup>(1)</sup>, under Chapter 24 — justice, freedom and security — that the legal framework for the fight against organised crime is generally in place in Serbia and its institutional framework generally allows it to fight organised crime effectively. Serbia has also signed agreements on police cooperation and on cooperation in the fight against organised crime with many European countries over the past years and an agreement on strategic cooperation with Europol in 2009. The Commission positively noted that an agreement establishing a regional office in Belgrade for improving cooperation in the fight against organised crime had been signed in October 2010. Since 2008, Serbia has successfully conducted a number of police operations in close cooperation with Interpol, Europol, Member States and non-EU countries, leading to the arrest and prosecution of members of several organised crime organisations.

However, it is clearly spelt out in the Commission's Opinion that Serbia should continue its efforts in this area. The Commission's annual reports provide a global assessment of the situation without reporting on individual cases or specific criminal investigations. The Commission will continue to further monitor Serbia's efforts to comply with the EU accession criteria and report on the country's progress in the framework of the next Progress report in October 2012.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> See the opinion and its accompanying Analytical report:  
[http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/press\\_corner/key-documents/reports\\_oct\\_2011\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/press_corner/key-documents/reports_oct_2011_en.htm)

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-004756/12  
to the Commission**

**David Campbell Bannerman (ECR)**

*(10 May 2012)*

*Subject:* EU tender process

Regarding the EU tender process, what action does the Commission take when companies are found to be in contempt of a regulatory authority, as in the case of the complaint against Atos, which was upheld by the UK Advertising Standards Authority adjudication of 4 April 2012 (case number A11-180372/NM)?

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

*(2 July 2012)*

The Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that in its role of the guardian of the Treaties and in the context of monitoring the correct application of EC law in Member States, including rules on public procurement, in case of alleged violation of law during a specific tendering procedure, it will investigate the matter and it may launch an infringement procedure on the basis of Article 258 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union in order to bring the violation to the end.

The Commission is not aware of the situation referred to by the Honourable Member. However, should the Honourable Member be in a possession of any information regarding the case at stake and pass it to the Commission, its services will duly examine it.

---

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004759/12**

**a la Comisión**

**Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)**

(10 de mayo de 2012)

*Asunto:* Investigación sobre el Alzheimer

La actual situación de crisis económica está llevando a realizar recortes presupuestarios en cuestiones tan importantes como la sanidad. Además, el Gobierno del Estado español y el Gobierno de Galicia están reduciendo la inversión pública dedicada a investigación científica con aplicaciones médicas. Según datos del Instituto Nacional de Estadística (INE) de España, la inversión en investigación y desarrollo tiende a la baja desde 2008 hasta la fecha actual, aún sin concretarse los datos para el 2012.

El 19 de enero de 2011, el Parlamento Europeo aprobó la Resolución 2010/2084 (INI) sobre una iniciativa europea acerca de la enfermedad de Alzheimer y otras demencias, que reconocía la necesidad de que el Consejo de la Unión Europea «inste firmemente a los Estados miembros a que elaboren planes y estrategias nacionales específicos para abordar las consecuencias sociales y sanitarias de la demencia y prestar servicios y apoyo a las personas con demencia y a sus familias, como ya ocurre en algunos Estados miembros, donde el plan “Alzheimer y enfermedades afines” iniciado en 2008 ha permitido coordinar la atención médico-social y la investigación clínica y básica sobre estas enfermedades a escala nacional».

Cabe recordar, además, que la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea establece en su artículo 35 el derecho de todos los europeos a acceder a la prevención sanitaria. Así, el mecanismo de prevención más efectivo es la inversión en programas de investigación.

— ¿Puede informar la Comisión sobre el volumen de inversión en investigación sobre el Alzheimer?

— ¿Se verá afectada la estrategia de investigación de la UE relativa a dolencias neurodegenerativas por el actual contexto de crisis económica y el retroceso en la inversión en investigación?

— ¿Qué medidas tomará la Comisión para incentivar que los Estados miembros mantengan la inversión en prevención de estas enfermedades degenerativas?

**Respuesta de la Sra. Geoghegan-Quinn en nombre de la Comisión**

(29 de junio de 2012)

Las enfermedades neurodegenerativas han sido consideradas prioritarias en todo el Séptimo Programa Marco de investigación y desarrollo (7° PM, 2007-2013) <sup>(1)</sup>. Han disfrutado por ello de un presupuesto superior al asignado en Programas Marco precedentes, con 320 millones EUR desde 2007, de los cuales unos 115 millones han correspondido al Alzheimer.

La propuesta de la Comisión relativa a Horizonte 2020 <sup>(2)</sup> demuestra su compromiso con la investigación y la innovación en Europa. Horizonte 2020 debe ofrecer nuevas oportunidades de prestar apoyo a la investigación sobre las enfermedades neurodegenerativas, incluida la de Alzheimer, en particular a través del reto social específico denominado «Salud, cambio demográfico y bienestar».

Con el proyecto Jumpahead, la Comisión respalda la ejecución de la iniciativa de programación conjunta sobre las enfermedades neurodegenerativas, en particular la de Alzheimer (JPND), iniciativa liderada por los Estados miembros <sup>(3)</sup> que se propone incrementar la repercusión de la investigación europea en este ámbito coordinando y consolidando los esfuerzos de los distintos países. La JPND adoptó una estrategia de investigación el 7 de febrero de 2012, que ha inducido ya a tres países (IR, IT, NL) a elaborar estrategias nacionales sobre enfermedades neurodegenerativas.

Para exhortar a los Estados miembros a seguir invirtiendo en la prevención de la enfermedad, la Comisión financia la acción conjunta «ALzheimer Cooperative Valuation in Europe» <sup>(4)</sup> (Alcove), que, entre otros objetivos, inventaría las buenas prácticas existentes y emergentes en relación con el tratamiento, incluida la detección precoz, y la atención a personas que padezcan Alzheimer y otras formas de demencia.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://cordis.europa.eu/home\\_en.html](http://cordis.europa.eu/home_en.html)

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/research/horizon2020/index\\_en.cfm](http://ec.europa.eu/research/horizon2020/index_en.cfm).

<sup>(3)</sup> <http://www.neurodegenerationresearch.eu/>.

<sup>(4)</sup> <http://www.alcove-project.eu/>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004759/12  
to the Commission**

**Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)**

(10 May 2012)

*Subject:* Research into Alzheimer's disease

The current economic crisis is leading to budget cuts in important areas such as health. Furthermore, the Spanish Government and the Galician Government are reducing public investment in medical scientific research. According to the Spanish National Statistics Institute, investment in research and development has been falling since 2008, with no data for 2012 yet available.

On 19 January 2011, the European Parliament adopted Resolution 2010/2084(INI) on a European initiative on Alzheimer's disease and other dementias, recognising the need for the Council of the European Union to strongly urge the Member States 'to develop specific national plans and strategies for Alzheimer's disease in order to deal with the social and health consequences of dementia and to provide services and support for people with dementia and their families, as has been done in several Member States where the "Alzheimer's and similar diseases" plan launched in 2008 has made it possible to coordinate medical and social care and clinical and basic research into these diseases at national level'.

It should also be noted that Article 35 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union establishes the right of access of all Europeans to preventive healthcare. The most effective prevention mechanism is therefore investment in research programmes.

— Can the Commission provide information on the level of investment in research into Alzheimer's disease?

— Will the EU's research strategy on neurodegenerative diseases be affected by the current economic crisis and the decline in research investment?

— What measures will the Commission take to encourage the Member States to continue investing in degenerative disease prevention?

**Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission**

(29 June 2012)

Neurodegenerative diseases were a priority throughout the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Development (FP7, 2007-2013) <sup>(1)</sup> with about EUR 320 million dedicated to this area since 2007, including some EUR 115 million on Alzheimer's, the budget was higher than in the previous Framework Programmes.

The Commission's proposal for Horizon 2020 <sup>(2)</sup> demonstrates its commitment to support European research and innovation. Horizon 2020 should provide further opportunities to support research on neurodegenerative diseases including Alzheimer's, in particular through the specific societal challenge on 'health, demographic change and well-being'.

With the Jumpahead project the Commission supports the implementation of the Joint Programming Initiative on Neurodegenerative Diseases, in particular Alzheimer's (JPND), a Member States-led initiative <sup>(3)</sup>, which aims at increasing the impact of European research in this area by coordinating and strengthening efforts across countries. The JPND adopted a Research Strategy on 7 February 2012, which already triggered three countries (IR, IT, NL) to develop national strategies on neurodegenerative diseases.

To encourage Member States to continue investing in disease prevention, the Commission is financing the joint action 'Alzheimer COoperative Valuation in Europe' <sup>(4)</sup> (Alcove), which, among other objectives, maps existing and emerging good practices related to treatment, including early detection, and care for persons suffering from Alzheimer's and other forms of dementia.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://cordis.europa.eu/home\\_en.html](http://cordis.europa.eu/home_en.html)

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/research/horizon2020/index\\_en.cfm](http://ec.europa.eu/research/horizon2020/index_en.cfm).

<sup>(3)</sup> <http://www.neurodegenerationresearch.eu/>.

<sup>(4)</sup> <http://www.alcove-project.eu/>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004760/12  
to the Commission  
Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR)  
(10 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Freedom of religion for Pakistan's religious minorities

I have been contacted by a concerned London constituent who has asked what means of pressure the European External Action Service (EEAS) has, or can exert on the Pakistani authorities to investigate and bring an immediate stop to the situation which gives rise to allegations by Hindu and Christian representatives that forced conversions to Islam, particularly amongst young girls for marriage, has become the latest weapon of Islamic extremists against Pakistan's religious minorities?

I am particularly interested to know if the EEAS has systematically raised the issue of freedom of religion in all bilateral contact with the Pakistani authorities and, if so, how frequently.

In replying could the EEAS please also assess whether the situation of religious minorities, particularly concerning Christians, is getting worse when one takes into account previous anti-freedom of religion violence through assassination and mob intimidation of non-Muslim places of worship?

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

The EU follows closely the situation of religious minorities in Pakistan and is aware of the allegations of forced conversions.

The EU is in regular contact with groups representing minorities. It is fact that members of minority groups do face serious difficulties. Many live peacefully alongside fellow Muslims, especially in urban areas, but they are often subject to discrimination. This concerns not only Christians and Hindus, but also Shias, Ahmadis and others. Moreover with fundamentalism and sectarianism on the rise, religious intolerance appears to be increasing.

On freedom of religion, and specifically the rights of religious minorities the EU consistently raises this issue in the EU-Pakistan regular human rights dialogue, and it is also raised systematically in all high-level and senior officials' meetings between the EU and Pakistan. So far in 2012, the issue has been raised in four political dialogues with Pakistan. In addition the EU Delegation and EU ambassadors in Islamabad raise specific cases with the Pakistani authorities in bilateral contacts. The Foreign Affairs Council has referred to this question on a number of occasions, most recently in its conclusions of 25 June 2012.

It should be noted that Pakistan's constitution provides for freedom of religion and requires the state to safeguard the rights of minorities.

Dialogue will be intensified following a recently agreed Engagement Plan with Pakistan. The EU has insisted that individual and minority rights be respected. We will continue to focus on the need to fully protect every individual's right to religious freedom in Pakistan or elsewhere.

---



(Verzjoni Maltija)

**Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004761/12**  
**lill-Kummissjoni**  
**David Casa (PPE)**  
(10 ta' Mejju 2012)

**Suġġett:** Razzizzmu pprovokat minn miżuri ta' awsterità

Il-Kunsill tal-Ewropa ħareġ rapport li juri li l-miżuri ta' awsterità fl-UE qed jgħinu fl-alimentazzjoni tar-razziżmu fl-Istati Membri tal-UE. Dan it-thassib huwa ripetut f'rapport mill-Kummissjoni Ewropea kontra r-Razziżmu u l-Intolleranza (ECRI) li jgħid li ż-zieda fil-vjolenza fl-Istati Membri hija dovuta l-aktar minhabba nuqqas ta' sigurtà fuq is-sikurezza tax-xogħol ikkawżata minn miżuri ta' awsterità.

Qieghda l-Kummissjoni tippjana li tiehu azzjoni biex tiproteġi membri vulnerabbli tas-soċjetà minn vjolenza li tinbet minn nuqqas ta' sigurtà fuq is-sikurezza tax-xogħol bhala riżultat ta' miżuri ta' awsterità?

**Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Reding f'isem il-Kummissjoni**  
(27 ta' Ġunju 2012)

L-Unjoni Ewropea hija bbażata fuq il-valuri tar-rispett għad-dinjità tal-bniedem, l-ugwaljanza, l-istat tad-dritt u r-rispett tad-drittijiet tal-bniedem. Il-Kummissjoni tikkundanna bil-qawwa kull manifestazzjoni ta' razziżmu u l-ksenofobija, inkluża l-vjolenza, minhabba li huma inkompatibbli ma' dawn il-valuri. Hija tinsab impenjata li tiġġieled dawn il-fenomeni bil-mezzi kollha disponibbli skont it-Trattati.

Il-Kummissjoni tfakkar li l-UE adottat leġislazzjoni speċifika biex tiġġieled kontra mġiba razzista u ksenofobika, inkluża l-vjolenza. Id-Deciżjoni Qafas tal-Kunsill 2008/913/ĠAI dwar il-ġlieda kontra ċerti forum u espressjonijiet ta' razziżmu u ksenofobija permezz tal-liġi kriminali <sup>(1)</sup> tobbliga lill-Istati Membri kollha biex jagħmlu punibbli l-inċitar pubbliku intenzjonali għall-vjolenza jew il-mibegħda diretta kontra grupp ta' persuni jew membru ta' tali grupp definit b'referenza għal r-razza, il-kulur, ir-religjon, id-dixxendenza jew l-oriġini nazzjonali jew etnika. L-Istati Membri għandhom jiżguraw ukoll li motivazzjoni razzista jew ksenofobika ta' kwalunkwe reat iehor titqies bhala ċirkustanza aggravanti jew li tali motivazzjoni tista' tiġi kkunsidrata mill-qrati fid-determinazzjoni tal-penali.

Qabel l-1 ta' Diċembru 2014 il-Kummissjoni mhix awtorizzata mit-Trattati li tibda proċedimenti ta' ksur abbażi tad-Deciżjonijiet Qafas. Madankollu, hija qed tagħmel monitoraġġ kemm jista' jkun mill-qrib tat-traspożizzjoni ta' din id-Deciżjoni Qafas u se tippreżenta rapport dwar dan fl-2013.

(<sup>1</sup>) Deciżjoni Qafas tal-Kunsill 2008/913/ĠAI tat-28 ta' Novembru 2008 dwar il-ġlieda kontra ċerti forum u espressjonijiet ta' razziżmu u ksenofobija permezz tal-liġi kriminali ĠU L 328, p. 55.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004761/12  
to the Commission  
David Casa (PPE)  
(10 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Racism provoked by austerity measures

The Council of Europe has issued a report indicating that EU austerity measures are helping to feed racism in EU Member States. The concern is repeated in a report from the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) stating that the increase in violence in Member States is largely due to insecurity over job safety brought about by austerity measures.

Does the Commission plan to take action to protect vulnerable members of society from violence stemming from insecurity over job safety in the wake of austerity measures?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission  
(27 June 2012)**

The European Union is based on the values of respect for human dignity, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights. The Commission strongly condemns all manifestations of racism and xenophobia, including violence, as they are incompatible with these values. It is committed to fight these phenomena by all means available under the Treaties.

The Commission recalls that EU has adopted specific legislation to fight against racist and xenophobic behaviour, including violence. Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law <sup>(1)</sup> obliges all Member States to make punishable the intentional public incitement to violence or hatred directed against a group of persons or a member of such group defined by reference to their race, colour, religion, descent or national or ethnic origin. The Member States must also ensure that a racist or xenophobic motivation of any other offence is considered an aggravating circumstance or that such motivation may be taken into consideration by the courts in the determination of the penalties.

The Commission is not authorised by the Treaties to launch infringement proceedings on the basis of Framework Decisions until 1 December 2014. However, it is monitoring as closely as possible the transposition of this framework Decision and will deliver a report to this end in 2013.

---

<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, p. 55.

(Verzjoni Maltija)

**Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004762/12**  
**lill-Kummissjoni**  
**David Casa (PPE)**  
(10 ta' Mejju 2012)

Suġġett: Inizjattiva taċ-Ċittadini Ewropej

L-Inizjattiva taċ-Ċittadini Ewropej (ECI) dahlet fis-sehħ fl-1 ta' April 2012, biex tissodisfa wiehed mill-miri stipulati fit-Trattat ta' Lisbona. L-ewwel ECIs ġew immedija riċentament. Il-kritiċi tal-ECI jgħidu li hafna mill-inizjattivi proposti (eż. pro-Ewropej u pro-edukazzjoni) huma dwar suġġetti li huma wisq vasti u mhux kontroversjali. Huma jiddikjaraw, għalhekk, li dan l-istrument mhux se tintuża u n-nies mhux se jibbenefikaw mill-ECI bil-mod kif kien previst fit-Trattat ta' Lisbona.

Il-Kummissjoni għandha pjanijiet biex tirrevedi l-istruttura tal-ECI biex tagħmilha għodda aktar xierqa għan-nies sabiex ilehnu talbiet kontroversjali u mhux?

**Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Šeřčovič fisem il-Kummissjoni**  
(7 ta' Ġunju 2012)

L-inizjattiva taċ-ċittadini hija strument tad-demokrazija partecipattiva li tippermetti miljun ċittadin tal-UE li jistiednu lill-Kummissjoni tagħmel proposta għal att legali għall-iskop tal-implimentazzjoni tat-Trattati.

Billi l-Kummissjoni hija d-destinatarju ta' dawn it-talbiet, mhuwiex ir-rwol tagħha li tippromwovi kwalunkwe inizjattiva partikolari.

Ir-registrazzjoni ta' inizjattiva taċ-ċittadini proposta hija suġġetta għall-kundizzjonijiet stabbiliti fl-Artikolu 4 tar-Regolament dwar l-inizjattiva taċ-ċittadini. <sup>(1)</sup>B'mod partikolari, l-inizjattiva taċ-ċittadini proposta ma għandhiex taqa' b'mod manifest barra mill-qafas tas-setgħat tal-Kummissjoni biex tippreżenta proposta għal att legali tal-Unjoni għall-fini tal-implimentazzjoni tat-Trattati, ma tridx tkun manifestament abbużiva, frivoli jew vessatorja u ma għandhiex tkun manifestament kontrarja għall-valuri tal-Unjoni kif stabbiliti fl-Artikolu 2 tat-Trattat dwar l-Unjoni Ewropea.

Ir-Regolament daħal fis-sehħ fl-1 ta' April. Fanqas minn xahrejn, sitt inizjattivi taċ-ċittadini proposti li jkopru firxa wiesgħa ta' oqsma politiċi diġà ġew reġistrati. Fil-fehma tal-Kummissjoni, huwa kmieni wisq biex wiehed jiġbed xi konklużjonijiet finali. Skont ir-Regolament dwar l-inizjattiva taċ-ċittadini, il-Kummissjoni se thejji rapport dwar l-implimentazzjoni ta' dan ir-Regolament fl-2015. Din il-valutazzjoni se tiġi bbażata fuq l-ewwel tliet snin ta' applikazzjoni.

<sup>(1)</sup> Ir-Regolament (UE) Nru 211/2011 tal-Parlament Ewropew u tal-Kunsill tas-16 ta' Frar 2011 dwar l-inizjattiva taċ-ċittadini, ĠU L 65, 11.3.2011. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:065:0001:0022:MT:PDF>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004762/12  
to the Commission**

**David Casa (PPE)**

(10 May 2012)

*Subject:* European Citizens' Initiative

The European Citizens' Initiative (ECI) came into effect on 1 April 2012, fulfilling one of the goals set out in the Lisbon Treaty. The first ECIs have recently been launched. Critics of the ECI say that many of the initiatives being proposed (e.g. pro-European and pro-education) are on topics that are too broad and uncontroversial. They claim, therefore, that the instrument will go unused and people will not benefit from the ECI in the way the Lisbon Treaty envisaged.

Does the Commission have plans to revise the structure of the ECI to make it a more appropriate instrument for people to voice both uncontroversial and controversial demands?

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

(7 June 2012)

The citizens' initiative is an instrument of participatory democracy allowing one million EU citizens to invite the Commission to make a proposal for a legal act for the purpose of implementing the Treaties.

The Commission being the addressee of these requests, it is not its role to promote any particular initiative.

The registration of a proposed citizens' initiative is subject to the conditions set out in Article 4 of Regulation on the citizens' initiative<sup>(1)</sup>. In particular, the proposed citizens' initiative must not manifestly fall outside the framework of the Commission's powers to submit a proposal for a legal act of the Union for the purpose of implementing the Treaties, it must not be manifestly abusive, frivolous or vexatious and it must not be manifestly contrary to the values of the Union as set out in Article 2 of the Treaty on European Union.

The regulation entered into application on 1st April. In less than two months, six proposed citizens' initiatives covering a wide range of policy areas have already been registered. In the Commission's view, it is much too early to draw any final conclusions. According to the regulation on the citizens' initiative, the Commission will prepare a report on the implementation of this regulation in 2015. This assessment will be based on the first three years of application.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Regulation (EU) No 211/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 February 2011 on the citizens' initiative, OJ L 65, 11.3.2011 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:065:0001:0022:EN:PDF>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004763/12  
to the Commission  
David Martin (S&D)  
(10 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Proven effectiveness of Commission Regulation (EC) No 245/2009 implementing ecodesign requirements for non-directional household lamps

The following statement was made on 8 December 2008 (IP/08/1909) on behalf of the Commissioner for Energy, Andreas Piebalgs.

'At today's meeting of the Ecodesign Regulatory Committee, EU Member States experts endorsed the European Commission's proposals for a regulation progressively phasing out incandescent bulbs starting in 2009 and finishing at the end of 2012. By enforcing the regulation of switching to energy saving bulbs, EU citizens will save close to 40 TWh (roughly the electricity consumption of Romania, or of 11 million European households, or the equivalent of the yearly output of 10 power stations of 500 megawatts) and will lead to a reduction of about 15 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub> emission per year.'

This regulation has raised criticism from EU citizens and organisations regarding the hazards of mercury waste, adverse medical impacts on a significant minority of the population and much higher costs to households in replacing lamps. These criticisms need to be addressed by providing positive proof that the goals in energy saving and reduction of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions have been achieved by this regulation.

The speed of implementation of this regulation was declared to be a key factor in achieving the claimed benefits. The first two stages of this legislation have been in force for over a year. Proof of the effectiveness of the regulation is essential ahead of the review required in 2013 with a view to amending the regulation in 2014.

1. What monitoring has taken place to measure the effectiveness of this regulation in achieving its objectives?
2. What proof is there that the expected reduction in energy use attributable to this regulation is now being achieved?

**Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission  
(22 June 2012)**

It is still premature to draw conclusions as regards the effectiveness of the regulation on household lamps 244/2009<sup>(1)</sup> as major categories of incandescent bulbs are only phased out in September 2011 (60W) and in September 2012 (40W and below), with retailers allowed to sell their remaining stocks even beyond those dates. The regulation will — like other regulations in the frame of the ecodesign process — be subject to a review in the light of technical progress, at the latest five years after its entry into force (2014). During this review, the Commission will collect data in a systematic way that will allow to judge the effectiveness of the regulation.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Commission Regulation (EC) No 244/2009 of 18 March 2009 implementing Directive 2005/32/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council with regard to ecodesign requirements for non-directional household lamps, OJ L 76, 24.3.2009.

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004764/12**

**à Comissão**

**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**

(10 de maio de 2012)

*Assunto:* Situações especiais na afetação de fundos estruturais

Tendo em conta que:

- Os acordos europeus sobre as perspetivas financeiras sempre concederam múltiplas exceções aos métodos de afetação e respetivos critérios de repartição regional de Fundos Estruturais, verificando-se mesmo que as dotações e regimes especiais têm evoluído significativamente em número e em conteúdo (montantes e regras de elegibilidade regional), desde, pelo menos, o acordado sobre o segundo Quadro Comunitário de Apoio, até às atuais perspetivas financeiras, cujo acordo foi marcado por um vasto pacote de especificidades, designado por disposições suplementares aos métodos de afetação.
- Analisando os dois últimos períodos de programação (2000 a 2006 e 2007 a 2013) e respetivos acordos políticos, verifica-se, inclusivamente, uma certa tipologia de situações específicas.
- Da análise dos mesmos pode verificar-se que tem havido claramente exceções às regras gerais de afetação dos Fundos.
- No período de programação de 2000/2006, verifica-se que há um conjunto de regiões que, de acordo com os métodos de afetação, reuniam as condições para serem abrangidas por um regime de afetação menos favorável, em termos de financiamento, e que permaneceram abrangidas pelo regime de afetação mais favorável em que se encontravam no anterior período de programação.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

Quais os motivos justificativos para o facto de as regiões gregas de Attiki, Notio Aigaio, bem como das regiões espanholas de Castilla y León e das Canárias que, à época das negociações, tinham já atingido o limiar dos 75 % da média comunitária (EUR 15), isto é, registavam todas um PIB/hab igual a 75 % da média da EUR 15, devendo sair do grupo de regiões do objetivo 1, terem aí permanecido (em vez de transitarem para o grupo de regiões de apoio transitório, alvo de menor apoio estrutural)?

**Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão**

(20 de junho de 2012)

A elegibilidade das regiões para apoios do objetivo n.º 1 no período de 2000/2006 foi determinada com base nos valores regionais do PIB por habitante relativos aos anos de 1994, 1995 e 1996, que foram os anos mais recentes disponíveis na altura das negociações. As quatro regiões mencionadas tinham todas um PIB por habitante em PPC inferior a 75 % da média da UE-15, mais especificamente: Attiki: 74,96 %; Notio Aigaio: 74,61 %; Castilla y León: 74,65 %; Canárias: 74,76 %.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004764/12  
to the Commission**

**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**

(10 May 2012)

*Subject:* Structural funding: special cases

EU financial perspective agreements have always made many exceptions to the structural funding allocation methods and the regional distribution criteria. Indeed, special allocations and schemes have been growing considerably in number and in terms of substance (amounts and regional eligibility rules). This has been the case at least since the second Community support framework agreement and still holds good under the current financial perspective and the corresponding agreement, which has allowed for a comprehensive package of specific points, termed additional provisions (applying alongside the allocation methods).

Analysis of the two most recent programming periods (2000-2006 and 2007-2013) and the related policy agreements shows that particular types of special cases have emerged and that there have clearly been exceptions to the general funding allocation rules.

In the 2000-2006 programming period, there was a group of regions which, under the allocation methods, were eligible for a less favourable funding arrangement but continued to be covered by the more favourable allocation scheme that had applied to them during the previous programming period.

Why was it that the Greek regions of Attiki and Notio Aigaiio and the Spanish regions of Castile-León and the Canaries, which had already attained the 75% threshold (measured against the average for the EU-15) at the time of the negotiations, remained in the group of Objective 1 regions when they all had a GDP per capita equal to 75% of the EU-15 average and should have been transferred to the transitional support group, whose regions receive less structural support?

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

(20 June 2012)

The eligibility of regions for Objective 1 support in the 2000-2006 period has been determined on the basis of the regional GDP/head figures of the years 1994, 1995 and 1996, which were the most recent years available at the time of the negotiations. All four mentioned regions had a GDP/head in PPS below 75% of the EU-15 average, more specifically: Attiki: 74.96%; Notio Aigaiio: 74.61%; Castilla y Leon: 74.65%; Canarias: 74.76%.

---

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004765/12**

**à Comissão**

**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**

(10 de maio de 2012)

Assunto: Situações especiais na afetação de fundos estruturais

Tendo em conta que:

- Os acordos europeus sobre as perspetivas financeiras sempre concederam múltiplas exceções aos métodos de afetação e respetivos critérios de repartição regional de Fundos Estruturais, verificando-se mesmo que as dotações e regimes especiais têm evoluído significativamente em número e em conteúdo (montantes e regras de elegibilidade regional), desde, pelo menos, o acordado sobre o segundo Quadro Comunitário de Apoio, até às atuais perspetivas financeiras, cujo acordo foi marcado por um vasto pacote de especificidades, designado por disposições suplementares aos métodos de afetação.
- Analisando os dois últimos períodos de programação (2000 a 2006 e 2007 a 2013) e respetivos acordos políticos, verifica-se, inclusivamente, uma certa tipologia de situações específicas.
- Da análise dos mesmos pode verificar-se que tem havido claramente exceções às regras gerais de afetação dos Fundos.
- No período de programação de 2000/2006, verifica-se que há um conjunto de regiões que, de acordo com os métodos de afetação, reuniam as condições para serem abrangidas por um regime de afetação menos favorável, em termos de financiamento, e que permaneceram abrangidas pelo regime de afetação mais favorável em que se encontravam no anterior período de programação.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

Que motivos justificam que, em alguns casos de regiões ou países que aderiram à UE em 2004, cujo PIB/hab, segundo os dados do Eurostat, igualava ou ultrapassava muito ligeiramente a média da EUR 25, a saber, a região húngara DeKözép-Magyarország, a Eslovénia (considerada no seu todo uma região de nível 2) e Malta (idem), devendo sair do grupo de regiões do objetivo 1, aí tenham permanecido, em vez de transitarem para o grupo de regiões de apoio transitório?

**Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão**

(20 de junho de 2012)

O objetivo n.º 1, elegibilidade de regiões de países que aderiram à UE em 2004, foi determinado em conformidade com o artigo 3.º, n.º 1, do Regulamento (CE) n.º 1260/1999 <sup>(1)</sup> do Conselho, alterado pelos anexos do Ato relativo às condições de adesão e às adaptações dos Tratados em que se funda a União Europeia <sup>(2)</sup>.

Esta alteração refere que: «Para a República Checa, a Estónia, Chipre, a Letónia, a Lituânia, a Hungria, Malta, a Polónia, a Eslovénia e a Eslováquia, as regiões abrangidas pelo objetivo n.º 1 são regiões correspondentes ao nível II da nomenclatura das unidades territoriais estatísticas (NUTS II), cujo produto interno bruto (PIB) por habitante, medido em paridades de poder de compra e calculado a partir dos dados comunitários de 1997, 1998 e 1999, seja inferior a 75 % da média comunitária no momento da conclusão das negociações de adesão.»

Com base nos valores acima mencionados, Közép-Magyarország, Malta e Slovenija têm valores PIB/por habitante inferiores a 75 % da média da UE-15, estando plenamente em conformidade com os critérios de elegibilidade para o objetivo n.º 1.

<sup>(1)</sup> Regulamento (CE) n.º 1260/1999 do Conselho, de 21 de junho de 1999, que estabelece disposições gerais sobre os Fundos estruturais, JO L 161 de 26.6.1999.

<sup>(2)</sup> JO L 236 de 23.9.2003.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004765/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**  
(10 May 2012)

*Subject:* Structural funding: special cases

EU financial perspective agreements have always made many exceptions to the structural funding allocation methods and the regional distribution criteria. Indeed, special allocations and schemes have been growing considerably in number and in terms of substance (amounts and regional eligibility rules). This has been the case at least since the second Community support framework agreement and still holds good under the current financial perspective and the corresponding agreement, which has allowed for a comprehensive package of specific points, termed additional provisions (applying alongside the allocation methods).

Analysis of the two most recent programming periods (2000-2006 and 2007-2013) and the related policy agreements shows that particular types of special cases have emerged and that there have clearly been exceptions to the general funding allocation rules.

In the 2000-2006 programming period, there was a group of regions which, under the allocation methods, were eligible for a less favourable funding arrangement but continued to be covered by the more favourable allocation scheme that had applied to them during the previous programming period.

Why is it that regions or countries which joined the EU in 2004 and which, according to Eurostat data, have a GDP per capita equal to or slightly above the EU-25 average, specifically, the Hungarian region of DeKözép-Magyarország, Slovenia (considered as a whole to be a level 2 region) and Malta (also a level 2 region), have remained in the group of Objective 1 regions, when they should have been transferred to the transitional support group of regions?

**Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission**  
(20 June 2012)

The Objective 1 eligibility of regions of countries which joined the EU in 2004 has been determined according to Article 3(1) of Council Regulation 1260/1999 <sup>(1)</sup>, amended by the annexes of the Act concerning the conditions of accession and the adjustments to the Treaties on which the European Union is founded <sup>(2)</sup>.

This amendment states that: 'For the Czech Republic, Estonia, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Slovenia and Slovakia, the regions covered by Objective 1 shall be regions corresponding to NUTS level II whose per capita GDP, measured in purchasing power parities and calculated on the basis of Community figures for the years 1997-1998-1999, is less than 75% of the Community average at the time of conclusion of the accession negotiations.'

Based on the aforementioned figures, Közép-Magyarország, Malta and Slovenia all had GDP/head figures below 75% of the EU-15 average, and were fully compliant with the eligibility criterion for Objective 1.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Council Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999 of 21 June 1999 laying down general provisions on the Structural Funds, OJ L 161, 26.6.1999.  
<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 236, 23.9.2003..

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004766/12**

**à Comissão**

**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**

(10 de maio de 2012)

*Assunto:* Situações especiais na afetação de fundos estruturais

Tendo em conta que:

- Os acordos europeus sobre as perspetivas financeiras sempre concederam múltiplas exceções aos métodos de afetação e respetivos critérios de repartição regional de Fundos Estruturais, verificando-se mesmo que as dotações e regimes especiais têm evoluído significativamente em número e em conteúdo (montantes e regras de elegibilidade regional), desde, pelo menos, o acordado sobre o segundo Quadro Comunitário de Apoio, até às atuais perspetivas financeiras, cujo acordo foi marcado por um vasto pacote de especificidades, designado por disposições suplementares aos métodos de afetação.
- Analisando os dois últimos períodos de programação (2000 a 2006 e 2007 a 2013) e respetivos acordos políticos, verifica-se, inclusivamente, uma certa tipologia de situações específicas.
- Da análise dos mesmos pode verificar-se que tem havido claramente exceções às regras gerais de afetação dos Fundos.
- No período de programação de 2000/2006, verifica-se que há um conjunto de regiões que, de acordo com os métodos de afetação, reuniam as condições para serem abrangidas por um regime de afetação menos favorável, em termos de financiamento, e que permaneceram abrangidas pelo regime de afetação mais favorável em que se encontravam no anterior período de programação.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

Que motivos justificam que, as regiões finlandesas de Vali-Suomi e Pohjois-Suomi, assim como as regiões suecas de Norra Mellansverige, Mellersta Norrland e Övre Norrland, cujos valores dos respetivos PIB/hab superavam significativamente os 75 % da média da EUR 15 e que, por essa razão já não deveriam estar incluídas das regiões do objetivo 1, aí tenham permanecido?

**Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão**

(20 de junho de 2012)

Durante o período de 1995/1999, as zonas setentrionais escassamente povoadas da Finlândia e Suécia beneficiaram de apoio ao abrigo do objetivo específico n.º 6, nos termos do Protocolo n.º 6 do Tratado de Adesão da Áustria, Finlândia e Suécia.

Para o período de 2000/2006, o objetivo específico n.º 6 foi integrado no objetivo n.º 1. A correspondente regra de elegibilidade está definida no artigo 3.º, n.º 1, do Regulamento (CE) n.º 1260/1999 do Conselho <sup>(1)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Regulamento (CE) n.º 1260/1999 do Conselho, de 21 de junho de 1999, que estabelece disposições gerais sobre os Fundos estruturais, JO L 161 de 26.6.1999.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004766/12  
to the Commission  
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)  
(10 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Structural funding: special cases

EU financial perspective agreements have always made many exceptions to the structural funding allocation methods and the regional distribution criteria. Indeed, special allocations and schemes have been growing substantially in number and in terms of substance (amounts and regional eligibility rules). This has been the case at least since the second Community support framework agreement and still holds good under the current financial perspective and the corresponding agreement, which has allowed for a comprehensive package of specific points, termed additional provisions (applying alongside the allocation methods).

Analysis of the two most recent programming periods (2000-2006 and 2007-2013) and the related policy agreements shows that particular types of special cases have emerged and that there have clearly been exceptions to the general funding allocation rules.

In the 2000-2006 programming period, there was a group of regions which, under the allocation methods, were eligible for a less favourable funding arrangement but continued to be covered by the more favourable allocation scheme that had applied to them during the previous programming period.

Why is it that the Finnish regions of Vali-Suomi and Pohjois-Suomi, and the Swedish regions of Norra Mellansverige, Mellersta Norrland and Övre Norrland have been classed as Objective 1 regions when their GDP per capita is well above 75% of the EU-15 average and they therefore should not be included in that category?

**Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission  
(20 June 2012)**

During the 1995-1999 period, Northern sparsely populated areas in Finland and Sweden received support under a specific Objective 6, pursuant to Protocol 6 to the Act of Accession of Austria, Finland and Sweden.

For the 2000-2006 period, the specific Objective 6 was integrated into Objective 1. The corresponding eligibility rule is laid down in Article 3(1) of Council Regulation 1260/1999 <sup>(1)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Council Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999 of 21 June 1999 laying down general provisions on the Structural Funds, OJ L 161, 26.6.1999.

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004767/12**

**à Comissão**

**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**

(10 de maio de 2012)

*Assunto:* Situações especiais na afetação de fundos estruturais

Tendo em conta que:

- Os acordos europeus sobre as perspetivas financeiras sempre concederam múltiplas exceções aos métodos de afetação e respetivos critérios de repartição regional de Fundos Estruturais, verificando-se mesmo que as dotações e regimes especiais vêm evoluindo significativamente em número e em conteúdo (montantes e regras de elegibilidade regional) desde, pelo menos, o acordado sobre o segundo Quadro Comunitário de Apoio, até às atuais perspetivas financeiras, cujo acordo foi marcado por um vasto pacote de especificidades, designadamente por disposições suplementares aos métodos de afetação.
- Analisando os dois últimos períodos de programação (2000 a 2006 e 2007 a 2013) e respetivos acordos políticos, verifica-se inclusivamente uma certa tipologia de situações específicas.
- Da análise dos mesmos pode verificar-se que tem havido claramente exceções às regras gerais de afetação dos Fundos.
- No período de programação de 2000/2006 verifica-se que há um conjunto de regiões que, de acordo com os métodos de afetação, apresentavam condições para serem abrangidas por determinado regime de apoio e foram-no efetivamente, mas beneficiaram de apoios suplementares — isto é, foram classificadas e incluídas no grupo de regiões de acordo com a aplicação automática dos critérios gerais de afetação estabelecida na regulamentação, mas beneficiaram de ajudas especiais devido a vários motivos e especificidades.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

Que motivos justificam, respetivamente: que a região de Lisboa tenha sido compensada com um suplemento de 500 milhões de euros; algumas regiões suecas tenham sido alvo de um programa de assistência orçado em 150 milhões de euros; a região de Flevoland tenha sido beneficiada com um apoio suplementar de 500 milhões de euros?

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004768/12**

**à Comissão**

**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**

(10 de maio de 2012)

*Assunto:* Situações especiais na afetação de fundos estruturais

Os acordos europeus sobre as perspetivas financeiras sempre concederam múltiplas exceções aos métodos de afetação e respetivos critérios de repartição regional de fundos estruturais, verificando-se mesmo que as dotações e regimes especiais vêm evoluindo significativamente em número e em conteúdo (montantes e regras de elegibilidade regional), desde, pelo menos, o acordado sobre o segundo Quadro Comunitário de Apoio, até às atuais perspetivas financeiras, cujo acordo foi marcado por um vasto pacote de especificidades, designado por disposições suplementares aos métodos de afetação.

Analisando os dois últimos períodos de programação (2000/2006 e 2007/2013) e respetivos acordos políticos, verifica-se, inclusivamente, uma certa tipologia de situações específicas.

Da análise dos mesmos pode verificar-se que tem havido claramente exceções às regras gerais de afetação dos fundos.

No período de programação de 2000/2006, verifica-se que há um conjunto de regiões que, de acordo com os métodos de afetação, apresentavam condições para serem abrangidas por determinado regime de apoio, e foram-no efetivamente, mas beneficiaram de apoios suplementares, ou seja, foram classificadas e incluídas no grupo de regiões de acordo com a aplicação automática dos critérios gerais de afetação estabelecida na regulamentação, mas beneficiaram de ajudas especiais ao abrigo de vários motivos e especificidades.

Tendo em conta o acima exposto, pode a Comissão indicar que motivos justificam, respetivamente, que inúmeras regiões tenham recebido apoios suplementares de montantes variados: Berlim Leste, 100 milhões; Hainut, 15 milhões; regiões NUTS III italianas do Objetivo 2, 96 milhões; regiões belgas do mesmo objetivo, 64 milhões; e, em certa medida, a região de Abruzzo?

**Resposta conjunta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão**

*(25 de junho de 2012)*

Os montantes de apoio adicional para as regiões mencionadas não faziam parte da proposta da Comissão relativa ao quadro financeiro plurianual. Essas dotações adicionais foram incluídas na sequência da negociação final no Conselho (Conselho Europeu de Berlim de 24 e 25 de março de 1999).

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004767/12  
to the Commission  
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)  
(10 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Structural funding: special cases

EU financial perspective agreements have always made many exceptions to the structural funding allocation methods and the regional distribution criteria. Indeed, special allocations and schemes have been growing considerably in number and in terms of substance (amounts and regional eligibility rules). This has been the case at least since the second Community support framework agreement and still holds good under the current financial perspective and the corresponding agreement, which has allowed for a comprehensive package of specific points, including additional provisions applying alongside the allocation methods.

Analysis of the two most recent programming periods (2000-2006 and 2007-2013) and the related policy agreements shows that particular types of special cases have emerged and that there have clearly been exceptions to the general funding allocation rules.

In the 2000-2006 programming period, there was a group of regions which were eligible under the allocation methods to be covered by a given support scheme — and were in fact covered — and, moreover, received additional support. In other words, they were classified and included within the group of regions concerned by virtue of automatic application of the general allocation criteria set out in the regulations and also benefited from special help for a number of reasons, taking into account various specific characteristics.

Can the Commission therefore say why the Lisbon region received an extra EUR 500 million, why several Swedish regions benefited from an assistance programme worth EUR 150 million, and why the Flevoland region received additional support amounting to EUR 500 million?

**Question for written answer E-004768/12  
to the Commission  
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)  
(10 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Structural funding: special cases

EU financial perspective agreements have always made many exceptions to the structural funding allocation methods and the regional distribution criteria. Indeed, special allocations and schemes have been growing considerably in number and in terms of substance (amounts and regional eligibility rules). This has been the case at least since the second Community support framework agreement and still holds good under the current financial perspective and the corresponding agreement, which has allowed for a comprehensive package of specific points, termed additional provisions (applying alongside the allocation methods).

Analysis of the two most recent programming periods (2000-2006 and 2007-2013) and the related policy agreements shows that particular types of special cases have emerged and that there have clearly been exceptions to the general funding allocation rules.

In the 2000-2006 programming period, there was a group of regions which were eligible under the allocation methods to be covered by a given support scheme — and were in fact covered — and, moreover, received additional support. In other words, they were classified and included within the group of regions concerned by virtue of automatic application of the general allocation criteria set out in the regulations and also benefited from special help for a number of reasons, taking into account various specific characteristics.

Given the above, can the Commission explain why many regions have received varying amounts of additional support, namely: East Berlin, EUR 100 million; Hainaut, EUR 15 million; Italian NUTS III Objective 2 regions, EUR 96 million; Belgian regions covered by that objective, EUR 64 million; and, to some extent, the Abruzzo region?

**Joint answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission**

*(25 June 2012)*

The amounts of additional support to the mentioned regions were not part of the Commission's proposal for the multiannual financial framework. These additional allocations were added as a result of the final negotiation in the Council (Berlin European Council 24-25 March 1999).

---

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004769/12**

**à Comissão**

**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**

(10 de maio de 2012)

*Assunto:* Situações especiais na afetação de fundos estruturais

Tendo em conta que:

- Os acordos europeus sobre as perspetivas financeiras sempre concederam múltiplas exceções aos métodos de afetação e respetivos critérios de repartição regional de Fundos Estruturais, verificando-se mesmo que as dotações e regimes especiais têm evoluído significativamente em número e em conteúdo (montantes e regras de elegibilidade regional), desde, pelo menos, o acordado sobre o segundo Quadro Comunitário de Apoio, até às atuais perspetivas financeiras, cujo acordo foi marcado por um vasto pacote de especificidades, designado por disposições suplementares aos métodos de afetação.
- Analisando os dois últimos períodos de programação (2000 a 2006 e 2007 a 2013) e respetivos acordos políticos, verifica-se, inclusivamente, uma certa tipologia de situações específicas.
- Da análise dos mesmos pode verificar-se que tem havido claramente exceções às regras gerais de afetação dos Fundos.
- No período de programação de 2000/2006, verifica-se que há um conjunto de regiões que, de acordo com os métodos de afetação, apresentavam condições para serem abrangidas por determinado regime de apoio e foram-no efetivamente, mas beneficiaram de apoios suplementares, ou seja foram classificadas e incluídas no grupo de regiões de acordo com a aplicação automática dos critérios gerais de afetação estabelecida na regulamentação, mas beneficiaram de ajudas especiais ao abrigo de vários motivos e especificidades.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

Que motivos justificam, respetivamente, que o processo de paz na Irlanda do Norte tenha resultado num apoio conjunto a esta região e à Irlanda ou que a nova divisão territorial do Estado-Membro (Irlanda) tenha proporcionado apoios especiais às novas regiões daí resultantes?

**Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão**

(20 de junho de 2012)

As razões para a aplicação de um programa especial de apoio à paz e à reconciliação tanto na Irlanda do Norte como nalgumas partes da Irlanda foram estabelecidas na Comunicação da Comissão ao Conselho e ao Parlamento Europeu <sup>(1)</sup>.

O apoio especial à Irlanda resultante da nova divisão do seu território não fazia parte da proposta da Comissão relativa ao quadro financeiro plurianual, mas resultou da negociação final no Conselho.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(94)607 final, 7.12.1994.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004769/12  
to the Commission  
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)  
(10 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Structural funding: special cases

EU financial perspective agreements have always made many exceptions to the structural funding allocation methods and the regional distribution criteria. Indeed, special allocations and schemes have been growing considerably in number and in terms of substance (amounts and regional eligibility rules). This has been the case at least since the second Community support framework agreement and still holds good under the current financial perspective and the corresponding agreement, which has allowed for a comprehensive package of specific points, termed additional provisions (applying alongside the allocation methods).

Analysis of the two most recent programming periods (2000-2006 and 2007-2013) and the related policy agreements show that particular types of special case have emerged and that there have clearly been exceptions to the general funding allocation rules.

In the 2000-2006 programming period, there was a group of regions which were eligible under the allocation methods to be covered by a given support scheme — and were in fact covered — and, moreover, received additional support. In other words, they were classified and included within the group of regions concerned by virtue of automatic application of the general allocation criteria set out in the regulations and also benefited from special help for different reasons and on specific grounds.

Why did the peace process in Northern Ireland lead to support both for that region and for Ireland? Why did the Member State concerned (Ireland) receive special support for the new regions resulting from the new division of its territory?

**Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission  
(20 June 2012)**

The reasons for the implementation of a special programme for peace and reconciliation in both Northern Ireland and parts of Ireland have been set out in the communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament <sup>(1)</sup>.

The special support for Ireland resulting from the new division of its territory was not part of the Commission's proposal for the multiannual financial framework, but was the result of the final negotiation in the Council.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(94) 607 final, 7.12.1994.

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004770/12**

**à Comissão**

**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**

(10 de maio de 2012)

Assunto: Situações especiais na afetação de fundos estruturais

Considerando que:

- Os acordos europeus sobre as perspetivas financeiras sempre concederam múltiplas exceções aos métodos de afetação e respetivos critérios de repartição regional de Fundos Estruturais, verificando-se mesmo que as dotações e regimes especiais vêm evoluindo significativamente em número e em conteúdo (montantes e regras de elegibilidade regional), desde, pelo menos, o acordado sobre o segundo Quadro Comunitário de Apoio, até às atuais perspetivas financeiras, cujo acordo foi marcado por um vasto pacote de especificidades, designado por disposições suplementares aos métodos de afetação;
- Analisando os dois últimos períodos de programação (de 2000 a 2006 e de 2007 a 2013) e respetivos acordos políticos, verifica-se, inclusivamente, uma certa tipologia de situações específicas;
- Da análise dos mesmos, pode verificar-se que tem havido claramente exceções às regras gerais de afetação dos Fundos;
- No período de programação de 2000/2006, verifica-se que há um conjunto de regiões que, de acordo com os métodos de afetação, apresentavam condições para serem abrangidas por determinado regime de apoio e foram-no efetivamente, mas beneficiaram de apoios suplementares, i.e., foram classificadas e incluídas no grupo de regiões de acordo com a aplicação automática dos critérios gerais de afetação estabelecida na regulamentação, mas beneficiaram de ajudas especiais ao abrigo de vários motivos e especificidades;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Que motivos justificam que várias regiões tenham acumulado dotações suplementares?
2. Por que motivo beneficiaram determinadas regiões suecas do estatuto de região "Objetivo 1" e de parte do apoio de assistência especial à Suécia?

**Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão**

(20 de junho de 2012)

1. Os montantes de apoio adicional para certas regiões não faziam parte da proposta da Comissão relativa ao quadro financeiro plurianual. As dotações adicionais foram incluídas na sequência da negociação final no Conselho (Conselho Europeu de Berlim de 24 e 25 de março de 1999).
2. Durante o período de 2000/2006, algumas partes de certas regiões da Suécia tiveram estatuto de objetivo n.º 1, mais especificamente as partes que tinham sido antigas regiões do objetivo n.º 6. Este critério está previsto no artigo 3.º, n.º 1, do Regulamento (CE) n.º 1260/1999 do Conselho <sup>(1)</sup>. Como parte da negociação final sobre o quadro financeiro plurianual, foi previsto um programa especial para as outras partes das regiões do Norte da Suécia (ou seja, principalmente algumas zonas costeiras), de Övre Norrland e Mellersta Norrland (artigo 7.º, n.º 4, do mesmo regulamento).

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Regulamento (CE) n.º 1260/1999 do Conselho, de 21 de junho de 1999, que estabelece disposições gerais sobre os Fundos estruturais, JO L 161 de 26.6.1999.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-004770/12  
to the Commission  
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)  
(10 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Structural funding: special cases

EU financial perspective agreements have always made many exceptions to the structural funding allocation methods and the regional distribution criteria. Indeed, special allocations and schemes have been growing considerably in number and in terms of substance (amounts and regional eligibility rules). This has been the case at least since the second Community support framework agreement and still holds good under the current financial perspective and the corresponding agreement, which has allowed for a comprehensive package of specific points, termed additional provisions (applying alongside the allocation methods).

Analysis of the last two programming periods (2000-2006 and 2007-2013) and the related political agreements shows that there are particular types of special cases and that there have clearly been exceptions to the general funding allocation rules.

In the 2000-2006 programming period, a group of regions were eligible for a given support scheme, in accordance with the allocation methods, and they did in fact benefit under it. However, they also received additional support, in other words they were automatically classified and included within the group of regions concerned in accordance with the general allocation criteria set out in the regulations and, moreover, received special support for different reasons and on specific grounds.

1. Why is it that certain regions have received additional funding from several sources?
2. Why have some Swedish regions benefited from 'Objective 1' region status and from a share of Sweden's special funding?

**Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission  
(20 June 2012)**

1. The amounts of additional support for certain regions were not part of the Commission's proposal for the multiannual financial framework. The additional allocations were added as a result of the final negotiation in the Council (Berlin European Council 24-25 March 1999).
2. During the 2000-2006 period, parts of some Swedish regions had Objective 1 status, more specifically those parts which were former Objective 6 areas. This criterion is laid down in Article 3(1) of Council Regulation 1260/1999 <sup>(1)</sup>. As part of the final negotiation on the multiannual financial framework, a special programme has been foreseen for the other parts of the northern Swedish regions (i.e. mainly some coastal areas) of Övre Norrland and Mellersta Norrland (Article 7(4) of the same regulation).

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Council Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999 of 21 June 1999 laying down general provisions on the Structural Funds, OJ L 161, 26.6.1999.