

## 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 173 E/01)

Treść	Strona
<b>P-005189/12</b> by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Earthquake in Veneto, Emilia-Romagna and the Po Valley	
Versione italiana .....	13
English version .....	16
<b>E-005229/12</b> by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Earthquake in Italy: damage to artistic, historical and cultural heritage	
Versione italiana .....	13
English version .....	16
<b>E-005257/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Earthquake in Emilia-Romagna	
Versione italiana .....	14
English version .....	17
<b>E-005312/12</b> by Debora Serracchiani and Francesca Balzani to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Earthquake in Emilia-Romagna	
Versione italiana .....	14
English version .....	17
<b>E-005196/12</b> by Franz Obermayr to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Stricter safeguards for toys	
Deutsche Fassung .....	19
English version .....	20
<b>E-005197/12</b> by Salvador Sedó i Alabart to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The e-book market in Spain	
Versión española .....	21
English version .....	23

<b>P-005200/12</b> by Ioannis Kasoulides to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The European Convention on Transfrontier Television	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	24
English version .....	25
<b>E-005201/12</b> by Elisabeth Köstinger and Hubert Pirker to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Recognition of tractor driving licences	
Deutsche Fassung .....	26
English version .....	27
<b>E-005203/12</b> by Sergio Berlato to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Serious violations of human rights of innocent civilians in Libya	
Versione italiana .....	28
English version .....	29
<b>E-005205/12</b> by Andrea Zanoni to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Transport of animals unfit for slaughter in the European Union	
Versione italiana .....	30
English version .....	31
<b>E-005206/12</b> by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Financial market and bonus reforms	
Versione italiana .....	32
English version .....	33
<b>E-005208/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Helicopter defects	
Versione italiana .....	34
English version .....	35
<b>E-005209/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Atrial fibrillation	
Versione italiana .....	36
English version .....	37
<b>E-005210/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Protectionist policy in Argentina	
Versione italiana .....	38
English version .....	39
<b>E-005211/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Fish kill	
Versione italiana .....	40
English version .....	41
<b>E-005213/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Support for the crisis	
Versione italiana .....	42
English version .....	43
<b>E-005214/12</b> by Małgorzata Handzlik to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> EU requirements for the blanket retention of telecommunications traffic data (Directive 2006/24/EC)	
Wersja polska .....	44
English version .....	45
<b>E-005215/12</b> by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Suspension of POSDRU payments in Romania	
Versiunea în limba română .....	46
English version .....	47
<b>E-005216/12</b> by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Change of procedure for the appointment of the Attorney General and Chief Prosecutors	
Versiunea în limba română .....	48
English version .....	49

<b>E-005217/12</b> by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Study carried out by the Slovak Association of Consumers	
Versiunea în limba română .....	50
English version .....	51
<b>P-005219/12</b> by Mario Borghesio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The EU must intervene to save Pompeii	
Versione italiana .....	52
English version .....	53
<b>E-005220/12</b> by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Revision of the NSRF	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	54
English version .....	55
<b>E-005221/12</b> by Niki Tzavela to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Studies on the cost of means of payment	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	56
English version .....	57
<b>E-005222/12</b> by Robert Goebbels to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Exploitation of methane hydrates in Europe	
Version française .....	58
English version .....	59
<b>E-005224/12</b> by Mario Mauro to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Massacre of Christians in Nigeria and Kenya	
Versione italiana .....	60
English version .....	61
<b>E-005226/12</b> by Karl-Heinz Florenz to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Animal Transport Regulation (EC) No 1/2005	
Deutsche Fassung .....	62
English version .....	63
<b>E-005230/12</b> by Claude Moraes to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Noise pollution caused by aviation	
English version .....	64
<b>E-005232/12</b> by Franz Obermayr to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Illegal border crossings, particularly in Greece	
Deutsche Fassung .....	65
English version .....	66
<b>E-005235/12</b> by Konrad Szymański and Martin Kastler to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Funds from the EU budget and sterilisation targets in India	
Deutsche Fassung .....	67
Wersja polska .....	68
English version .....	69
<b>E-005236/12</b> by Konrad Szymański and Martin Kastler to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Funds under the Seventh Framework Programme for forced sterilisation in Namibia	
Deutsche Fassung .....	70
Wersja polska .....	71
English version .....	72
<b>E-005237/12</b> by Konrad Szymański and Martin Kastler to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Funds from the EU budget for forced sterilisation in Rwanda	
Deutsche Fassung .....	73
Wersja polska .....	74
English version .....	75

<b>E-005238/12</b> by Konrad Szymański and Martin Kastler to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Funds from the EU budget and forced sterilisation in South Africa	
Deutsche Fassung .....	76
Wersja polska .....	77
English version .....	78
<b>E-005239/12</b> by Konrad Szymański and Martin Kastler to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Funds from the EU budget for forced sterilisation in Vietnam	
Deutsche Fassung .....	79
Wersja polska .....	80
English version .....	81
<b>E-005240/12</b> by Franz Obermayr to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Consequences for the EU of Turkey's obstruction of NATO's work	
Deutsche Fassung .....	82
English version .....	83
<b>E-005241/12</b> by Amelia Andersdotter to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Following up the resolution on the Treaty for the Blind in EU trade relations	
Svensk version .....	84
English version .....	85
<b>E-005242/12</b> by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Superyacht harbour at Marina Port Vell	
Versión española .....	86
English version .....	87
<b>E-005244/12</b> by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Gasifier in Cassola and protection of the public from environmental pollution hazards	
Versione italiana .....	88
English version .....	89
<b>E-005245/12</b> by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Relocation of Filivivi in the Veneto region	
Versione italiana .....	90
English version .....	91
<b>E-005246/12</b> by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Reopening of exclusion zones in the area around Chernobyl	
Versione italiana .....	92
English version .....	93
<b>P-005247/12</b> by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The dangers of liquid nicotine products	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	94
English version .....	95
<b>E-005248/12</b> by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Consequences of the energy rate deficit in Spain	
Versión española .....	96
English version .....	97
<b>E-005250/12</b> by Nicole Sinclair to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Shortcomings in agri-environment support	
English version .....	98
<b>E-005251/12</b> by Nicole Sinclair to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> CAP reform — consultation procedures	
English version .....	99
<b>E-005252/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The Ancient Villas [Le Antiche Ville] Association	
Versione italiana .....	100
English version .....	101

<b>E-005253/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Sun creams and the development of endometriosis	
Versione italiana .....	102
English version .....	104
<b>E-005254/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Immigrants in southern Italy	
Versione italiana .....	105
English version .....	107
<b>E-005256/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Abduction in Afghanistan	
Versione italiana .....	108
English version .....	109
<b>E-005258/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Direct funding programmes for Campobasso	
Versione italiana .....	110
English version .....	111
<b>E-005259/12</b> by Fiona Hall to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Treatment of Ahmadiyya Muslims in Pakistan	
English version .....	112
<b>E-005260/12</b> by Oreste Rossi to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Coping with adolescence with the help of social networks	
Versione italiana .....	113
English version .....	114
<b>E-005261/12</b> by Oreste Rossi to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Sport and disability: what is the future for disabled athletes?	
Versione italiana .....	115
English version .....	116
<b>E-005262/12</b> by Oreste Rossi to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Yemen: health and medical care emergency for Eritrean refugees	
Versione italiana .....	117
English version .....	118
<b>P-005263/12</b> by Gerard Batten to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Article 4 of the MiFID Implementing Directive 2006 and the MiFID Review 2012	
English version .....	119
<b>E-005265/12</b> by Claude Moraes to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Recognition of EU marriage certificates	
English version .....	120
<b>E-005266/12</b> by Mario Mauro to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> 2000-2006 Regional Operational Programme for Liguria under Objective 3 — integrated Programme 'Ricomincio da 40' [Starting again at 40]	
Versione italiana .....	121
English version .....	122
<b>E-005267/12</b> by Spyros Danellis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Ensuring the successful 'greening' of the new Common Agricultural Policy (CAP)	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	123
English version .....	124
<b>E-005268/12</b> by Spyros Danellis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The need for the definition of 'permanent grassland' to be changed	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	125
English version .....	126

<b>E-005269/12</b> by Konrad Szymański and Nirj Deva to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> EU funds for abortion providers in developing countries in which abortion is illegal	
Wersja polska .....	127
English version .....	128
<b>E-005270/12</b> by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Food fraud in restaurants/protection of citizens	
Deutsche Fassung .....	129
English version .....	130
<b>E-005271/12</b> by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Cannes Film Festival	
Deutsche Fassung .....	131
English version .....	132
<b>E-005272/12</b> by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The Salzburg Festival	
Deutsche Fassung .....	133
English version .....	134
<b>E-005273/12</b> by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Ecological footprint	
Deutsche Fassung .....	135
English version .....	136
<b>E-005274/12</b> by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Privatisation process transparency	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	137
English version .....	138
<b>E-005275/12</b> by Konrad Szymański and Nirj Deva to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Provision of abortion as a part of 'sexual and reproductive health'	
Wersja polska .....	139
English version .....	140
<b>E-005276/12</b> by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Reprogramming the Cohesion Fund allocations to Madeira	
Versão portuguesa .....	141
English version .....	142
<b>E-005277/12</b> by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Reallocating Cohesion Fund monies to Madeira	
Versão portuguesa .....	143
English version .....	144
<b>E-005278/12</b> by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Classification of the Madeira International Business Centre (IBC)	
Versão portuguesa .....	145
English version .....	146
<b>E-005279/12</b> by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Making the Madeira International Business Centre (IBC) competitive at EU level	
Versão portuguesa .....	147
English version .....	148
<b>E-005280/12</b> by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Dividend payment exemption from withholding tax in the Madeira International Business Centre (IBC)	
Versão portuguesa .....	149
English version .....	150
<b>E-005281/12</b> by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Revising the maximum tax ceilings of the Madeira International Business Centre (MIBC)	
Versão portuguesa .....	151
English version .....	153

<b>E-005282/12</b> by Paul Murphy to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Amending Regulation (EC) No 1/2005: provisions regarding the protection of poultry and rabbits during transport	
English version .....	154
<b>E-005283/12</b> by Nicole Sinclair to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Eurobonds	
English version .....	156
<b>P-005284/12</b> by Matteo Salvini to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Earthquake in Emilia-Romagna	
Versione italiana .....	157
English version .....	158
<b>E-005285/12</b> by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Cost of stress tests on EU nuclear power stations	
Deutsche Fassung .....	159
English version .....	160
<b>E-005286/12</b> by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Funding for Berlin-Brandenburg International Airport	
Deutsche Fassung .....	161
English version .....	162
<b>E-005287/12</b> by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Upgrading the St. Pölten-Loosdorf section as part of the Trans-European Network (TEN) project: required capacity and associated costs	
Deutsche Fassung .....	163
English version .....	165
<b>E-005288/12</b> by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Delays in the Stuttgart 21 project and impact on the Karlsruhe-Munich rail line	
Deutsche Fassung .....	167
English version .....	169
<b>E-005289/12</b> by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Negative impact and costs for the Karlsruhe-Munich rail line caused by delays in the Stuttgart 21 project	
Deutsche Fassung .....	167
English version .....	169
<b>E-005290/12</b> by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Classification of the 'Semmering Tunnel', part of the TEN-T project	
Deutsche Fassung .....	170
English version .....	172
<b>E-005292/12</b> by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Classification of the Koralm Tunnel, part of the TEN-T project	
Deutsche Fassung .....	170
English version .....	172
<b>E-005291/12</b> by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Problems with the construction of the 'Semmering Tunnel', part of the TEN-T project	
Deutsche Fassung .....	173
English version .....	174
<b>E-005293/12</b> by Claudio Morganti to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> European debt held by China	
Versione italiana .....	175
English version .....	176
<b>E-005294/12</b> by Zuzana Roithová to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Šumava — Natura 2000	
České znění .....	177
English version .....	178

<b>E-005295/12</b> by Zuzana Roithová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Customs Code — TIR	
České znění .....	179
English version .....	180
<b>E-005297/12</b> by Zuzana Roithová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Sale of cat and dog fur	
České znění .....	181
English version .....	182
<b>E-005298/12</b> by Zuzana Roithová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Website accessibility for the visually impaired	
České znění .....	183
English version .....	184
<b>E-005301/12</b> by Zuzana Roithová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Sale of crocodile meat	
České znění .....	185
English version .....	186
<b>E-005302/12</b> by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Capturing and storing personal data from mobile phones by the London police	
Versione italiana .....	187
English version .....	188
<b>E-005303/12</b> by Fiorello Provera to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Counterfeit malaria drugs	
Versione italiana .....	189
English version .....	191
<b>E-005304/12</b> by Fiorello Provera to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Egyptian Islamists move to the right on eve of presidential election	
Versione italiana .....	193
English version .....	194
<b>E-005305/12</b> by Fiorello Provera to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Tunisian court fines Tunisian TV director in free-speech case	
Versione italiana .....	195
English version .....	196
<b>E-005306/12</b> by Fiorello Provera to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Malian Islamists in Timbuktu	
Versione italiana .....	197
English version .....	198
<b>E-005307/12</b> by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Council Directive 96/53/EC of 25 July 1996	
Versión española .....	199
English version .....	200
<b>E-005308/12</b> by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Project bonds	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	201
English version .....	202
<b>E-005309/12</b> by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Greece requests a boost to the food distribution programme for the poor	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	203
English version .....	204
<b>E-005310/12</b> by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Digi-Mobile programme	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	205
English version .....	206



<b>E-005311/12</b> by Ulrike Rodust to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Fishing off the Somali coast	
Deutsche Fassung .....	207
English version .....	209
<b>E-005313/12</b> by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Consequences of the nationalisation of Bankia for the energy market	
Versión española .....	210
English version .....	211
<b>E-005314/12</b> by João Ferreira and Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Granting emergency autonomous trade preferences for Pakistan	
Versão portuguesa .....	212
English version .....	214
<b>P-005316/12</b> by Debora Serracchiani to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Ecobonus	
Versione italiana .....	215
English version .....	216
<b>E-005317/12</b> by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Project to unify regulatory bodies	
Versión española .....	217
English version .....	218
<b>E-005318/12</b> by Jens Rohde to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Support for car manufacturers	
Dansk udgave .....	219
English version .....	220
<b>E-005319/12</b> by Werner Langen to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Matching clauses in EC law on state aid	
Deutsche Fassung .....	221
English version .....	222
<b>E-005320/12</b> by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Repeal of provisions on reducing minimum wages and on collective employment agreements in Greece	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	223
English version .....	224
<b>E-005322/12</b> by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> EFSF decision to cut loan instalments	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	225
English version .....	226
<b>E-005323/12</b> by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Progress in the construction of the fence in Evros	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	227
English version .....	228
<b>E-005324/12</b> by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Greek national plan for Roma integration	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	229
English version .....	230
<b>E-005325/12</b> by Kay Swinburne to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Brazilian Awá tribe	
English version .....	231
<b>E-005326/12</b> by Kay Swinburne to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> EU rules on bestiality	
English version .....	232

<b>E-005327/12</b> by Kay Swinburne to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> SME growth English version .....	233
<b>E-005330/12</b> by Sophia in 't Veld to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Amendment of the US Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (CALEA) Nederlandse versie .....	234
English version .....	236
<b>E-005332/12</b> by Charles Tannock to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Azerbaijan's conduct with regard to fundamental human rights during the Eurovision Song Contest English version .....	237
<b>E-005595/12</b> by Graham Watson to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Political prisoners in Azerbaijan English version .....	237
<b>E-005334/12</b> by Elena Băsescu to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Measures to support young entrepreneurs Versiunea în limba română .....	239
English version .....	240
<b>E-005336/12</b> by Emer Costello to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Assessing the impact of public services cuts on the most vulnerable in society English version .....	241
<b>E-005337/12</b> by Emer Costello to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Au pairs English version .....	242
<b>E-005339/12</b> by Emer Costello to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Closure of Palestinian NGOs in Jerusalem English version .....	243
<b>E-005341/12</b> by Emer Costello to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Country-by-country reporting concerning conflict minerals English version .....	244
<b>E-005342/12</b> by Emer Costello to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Cross-border credit management by SMEs English version .....	245
<b>E-005343/12</b> by Emer Costello to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Cross-contamination of food by allergens English version .....	246
<b>E-005344/12</b> by Emer Costello to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> 'Dial to Stop Drug Dealing' service English version .....	247
<b>E-005345/12</b> by Emer Costello to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Dog management in the EU English version .....	248
<b>E-005347/12</b> by Emer Costello to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> EU legislative initiative on carers' leave English version .....	249
<b>E-005348/12</b> by Emer Costello to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> EU support for start-ups and small innovative companies English version .....	250

<b>E-005349/12</b> by Emer Costello to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> European Charter on the workplace rights of cancer patients and chronically sick people and European social dialogue English version .....	251
<b>E-005363/12</b> by Emer Costello to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Rehabilitating and reintegrating cancer patients in the workplace English version .....	251
<b>E-005350/12</b> by Graham Watson to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Car hire agreements English version .....	252
<b>E-005352/12</b> by Graham Watson to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Area C evictions and demolitions English version .....	253
<b>E-005353/12</b> by Graham Watson to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Renewable Energy Directive (2009/28/EC) English version .....	254
<b>E-005354/12</b> by Emer Costello to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> European universities together — administrative, technical and support staff in third-level institutions who assist research workers engaged in cross-border research English version .....	255
<b>E-005355/12</b> by Emer Costello to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Fairer practices in business-to-business relationships English version .....	256
<b>E-005356/12</b> by Emer Costello to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Future of the Enterprise Europe Network under the COSME Programme (2014-2020) English version .....	257
<b>E-005357/12</b> by Emer Costello to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Implementation of the revised Late Payments Directive English version .....	258
<b>E-005358/12</b> by Emer Costello to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Incentive measures to favour the mobility of disabled drivers English version .....	259
<b>E-005359/12</b> by Emer Costello to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Insurance against damage caused by floods English version .....	260
<b>E-005360/12</b> by Emer Costello to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> EU-Mercosur Association Agreement English version .....	261
<b>E-005361/12</b> by Emer Costello to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Parental Leave Directive English version .....	262
<b>E-005362/12</b> by Emer Costello to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Planned 2012 regulation on EU hotline for missing children English version .....	263
<b>E-005364/12</b> by Emer Costello to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> VAT gap English version .....	264
<b>E-005365/12</b> by Emer Costello to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> VAT on 'topical and IV medications' English version .....	265

<b>E-005366/12</b> by Emer Costello to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Working time of self-employed drivers English version .....	266
<b>P-005367/12</b> by Paweł Robert Kowal to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> The impact of the Single European Patent on innovation and SMEs Wersja polska .....	267
English version .....	268
<b>P-005368/12</b> by Catherine Stihler to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Internet cookies English version .....	269
<b>E-005370/12</b> by Niccolò Rinaldi to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Ownership of the Corcolle site Versione italiana .....	270
English version .....	271
<b>E-005371/12</b> by Filip Kaczmarek to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> The future of Indect Wersja polska .....	272
English version .....	273
<b>E-005372/12</b> by Paweł Robert Kowal to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Actions by certain Member States and the EU's energy security Wersja polska .....	274
English version .....	275
<b>E-005373/12</b> by Mario Borghezio to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Ritual crimes in Gabon Versione italiana .....	276
English version .....	277
<b>E-005374/12</b> by João Ferreira to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> The Commission's involvement in initiatives in Ireland during the referendum campaign Versão portuguesa .....	278
English version .....	279

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-005189/12**

**alla Commissione**  
**Mara Bizzotto (EFD)**  
(22 maggio 2012)

*Oggetto:* Terremoto in Veneto, Emilia Romagna e Pianura Padana

Il 20 maggio 2012, il Veneto, l'Emilia Romagna e gran parte della Pianura Padana sono stati colpiti da violente scosse sismiche. Pesantissimo il bilancio in termini di vite umane e disagio sociale: sette morti, decine di feriti, seimila sfollati. Gravissimi anche i danni a due settori che, da sempre, sono il traino dell'economia di queste aree: il turismo e il comparto agroalimentare. Secondo la Coldiretti, ad esempio, quasi il 10 % della produzione italiana di parmigiano reggiano è stata danneggiata dal terremoto.

Preso atto del grande sforzo organizzativo e finanziario messo immediatamente in campo dalle amministrazioni locali interessate, dalla protezione civile e dai vigili del fuoco; considerata la necessità di garantire che gli interventi proseguano secondo una strategia continuativa orientata a garantire la rapida ricostruzione del tessuto sociale ed economico, nonché a restituire al più presto alle vittime del sisma alloggi, infrastrutture e lavoro, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Ritiene opportuno mobilitare subito il Fondo di solidarietà europeo?
2. Può indicare quali altri fondi dell'UE, quali altre tipologie di risorse finanziarie e non, sono già operative e potrebbero subito essere invocate dall'Italia per sostenere le operazioni di ricostruzione?
3. Intende predisporre stanziamenti straordinari a sostegno del settore agroalimentare il cui danneggiamento si ripercuoterà sull'economia della zona e, con il conseguente aumento dei prezzi, su tutti i consumatori europei?
4. Intende predisporre stanziamenti straordinari a sostegno del recupero del patrimonio storico e artistico, importante richiamo per il turismo nell'area pesantemente danneggiata dal sisma?

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005229/12**

**alla Commissione**  
**Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)**  
(23 maggio 2012)

*Oggetto:* Terremoto in Italia: danni al patrimonio artistico, storico e culturale

Il recente terremoto avvenuto in Italia nelle regioni dell'Emilia Romagna e in parte della Lombardia, oltre ad avere procurato diversi morti e feriti nonché la distruzione o il danneggiamento di attività produttive e di abitazioni private, ha causato gravi danni anche al patrimonio storico e culturale tra i quali si ricordano i danneggiamenti al Castello degli Estensi e alla Biblioteca di Ferrara, a diverse torri e chiese nel ferrarese e nel modenese, a Bondeno, Sant'Agostino, Mirabello, Mirandola, e a Revere, Quistello, Sernide, San Giacomo e Poggio Rusco nel mantovano, solo per citare alcuni dei monumenti e delle località danneggiati.

1. Ciò premesso, può la Commissione far sapere se è a conoscenza di questo grave danno al patrimonio storico, artistico e culturale italiano?
2. Non ritiene opportuno inviare un proprio rappresentante per verificare la portata dei danni e valutare quali interventi la Commissione possa attuare per aiutare le comunità locali a restaurare monumenti di pregio storico, che sono significativi non solo per la storia italiana ma anche per la storia europea?

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005257/12**  
**alla Commissione**  
**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**  
(24 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Terremoto in Emilia Romagna

Un sisma di magnitudo sei con epicentro nella zona di Finale Emilia, tra Ferrara e Modena, ha devastato l'Emilia Romagna. La scossa di terremoto è stata registrata dall'Istituto nazionale di geofisica e vulcanologia alle ore 4.04, seguita da due repliche di intensità minore: una di 3.3 alle ore 5.35 e un'altra di 2.9 alle ore 5.44.

Pesantissimo è il bilancio del sisma: alla fine si contano sette morti, sei in provincia di Ferrara e uno in provincia di Bologna, i feriti sono complessivamente un centinaio e migliaia sono gli sfollati, molti dei quali non hanno trovato posto nelle tendopoli. Poi ci sono i danni materiali, dovuti alle centinaia di crolli, e le drammatiche ferite al patrimonio architettonico. Danni incalcolabili come quello alla Torre di Finale Emilia squarciata a metà, la foto simbolo di questo terremoto che ha fatto il giro del mondo. I beni culturali nei paesi del Modenese e del Ferrarese colpiti sono stati devastati. Per il patrimonio architettonico di proprietà della Chiesa è stato un colpo durissimo mentre altri edifici come torri e castelli sono molto danneggiati.

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

1. se è possibile per l'Italia usufruire del Fondo di solidarietà dell'Unione europea;
2. quali misure intende adottare per favorire lo scambio tra l'Emilia Romagna ed altre regioni europee già vittime di calamità naturali analoghe di buone pratiche sulle modalità di ripristino del tessuto sociale?

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005312/12**  
**alla Commissione**  
**Debora Serracchiani (S&D) e Francesca Balzani (S&D)**  
(25 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Terremoto Emilia Romagna

Lo scorso 20 maggio la regione dell'Emilia Romagna è stata colpita da un forte terremoto che ha causato sette vittime e migliaia di sfollati, nonché gravissimi danni al patrimonio culturale.

Gli strumenti esistenti della coesione economica e sociale permettono di finanziare le azioni di prevenzione dei rischi. Il Fondo di solidarietà dell'Unione europea ha l'obiettivo di affrontare situazioni d'emergenza in maniera rapida, efficace e flessibile, secondo le disposizioni definite nell'articolo 3 comma 2 del regolamento (CE) n. 2012/2002 che però non prevede alcuna voce per la ricostruzione del patrimonio culturale andato distrutto.

Alla luce di quanto sopra precede, non ritiene la Commissione necessario dotarsi di uno strumento comunitario supplementare, distinto dagli altri esistenti, che consenta di finanziare la ricostruzione del patrimonio culturale distrutto in zone colpite da eventi naturali devastanti?

**Risposta congiunta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione**  
(2 luglio 2012)

La Commissione rinvia gli onorevoli deputati alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-5139/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

La Commissione è disponibile per discutere le eventuali proposte dell'Italia volte a modificare i pertinenti programmi dei Fondi strutturali al fine di includere interventi per alleviare i danni e le difficoltà causati dal terremoto al tessuto produttivo della regione.

Il regolamento (CE) n. 1698/2005 <sup>(2)</sup> prevede la possibilità di intervenire tramite la misura «Ripristino del potenziale produttivo agricolo danneggiato da calamità naturali e introduzione di adeguate misure di prevenzione». Le regioni italiane possono presentare proposte di modifica del programma chiedendo l'attivazione di tale misura o possono aggiornarne il contenuto e gli importi stanziati conformemente ai bisogni correnti, anche per quanto concerne il sostegno al ripristino del potenziale produttivo delle imprese che partecipano alla trasformazione dei prodotti agricoli, laddove i prodotti finali rientrino nel campo di applicazione dell'allegato I del trattato.

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

<sup>(2)</sup> Sul sostegno allo sviluppo rurale da parte del Fondo europeo agricolo per lo sviluppo rurale.

Per agevolare lo scambio di informazioni tra i paesi partecipanti al Meccanismo di protezione civile dell'Unione europea, il Centro d'informazione e monitoraggio (MIC) gestisce il Sistema comune di comunicazione e informazione in caso di emergenza. Di tale strumento si è avvalsa la protezione civile italiana per fornire aggiornamenti sulla situazione nelle aree dell'Emilia Romagna colpite dal sisma. Inoltre, è prassi invalsa della Commissione organizzare riunioni sugli insegnamenti tratti da tali eventi con tutte le parti interessate dopo ciascuna emergenza in cui sia stato attivato il Meccanismo di protezione civile dell'Unione europea. Queste riunioni costituiscono una tribuna per lo scambio di pratiche ottimali.

Non è tuttavia prevista la creazione di uno strumento unionale supplementare volto a fornire finanziamenti per il ripristino del patrimonio culturale andato distrutto.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-005189/12  
to the Commission  
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)  
(22 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Earthquake in Veneto, Emilia-Romagna and the Po Valley

On 20 May 2012, the regions of Veneto and Emilia-Romagna, and most of the Po Valley, were hit by a violent earthquake. The earthquake took a very heavy toll in terms of human lives and social disruption, leaving seven dead, dozens injured and 6 000 people evacuated. Two sectors that have always been the driving force of the economy in these areas, tourism and the agro-food industry, have also been very seriously damaged. For example, according to Coldiretti, the national farmers' confederation, almost 10% of Italian Parmigiano Reggiano cheese produced has been damaged by the earthquake.

The significant organisational and financial resources immediately deployed by the local authorities concerned, together with the civil defence and fire services, has been acknowledged. However, given the need to ensure that work continues, in keeping with a strategy to ensure that the social and economic fabric is rapidly rebuilt, and to restore housing, infrastructure and work for the earthquake victims as quickly as possible, could the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Does it agree that the European Solidarity Fund should be mobilised immediately?
2. Can it say what other EU funds and what other financial and non-financial resources are already in place and could be called upon immediately by Italy to support reconstruction efforts?
3. Does it intend to arrange special funding to support the agro-food industry, the damage to which will affect the local economy and, with the resulting price rises, all European consumers?
4. Will it arrange special funding to support the restoration of historical and artistic heritage, which is a major draw for tourists to the area severely damaged by the earthquake?

**Question for written answer E-005229/12  
to the Commission  
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)  
(23 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Earthquake in Italy: damage to artistic, historical and cultural heritage

The recent Italian earthquake in the regions of Emilia-Romagna and part of Lombardy — beyond having caused deaths and injuries and having destroyed or damaged manufacturing industries and private homes — caused major damage to historical and cultural heritage sites. These sites included, to mention just a few, Ferrara's Estense castle and library, several towers and churches in the Ferrara and Modena areas, in Bondeno, Sant'Agostino, Mirabello, Mirandola, and Revere, Quistello, Sernide, San Giacomo and Poggio Rusco in the Mantua area.

1. Can the Commission say whether it is aware of this serious damage to Italy's historical, artistic and cultural heritage?
2. Does it not consider that it would be appropriate to send its own representative to verify the extent of the damage and assess what measures the Commission could take to help local communities to restore historical monuments that are important not only for Italian history but for European history too?



**Question for written answer E-005257/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(24 May 2012)

*Subject:* Earthquake in Emilia-Romagna

A magnitude-six earthquake with its epicentre in the Finale Emilia area between Ferrara and Modena, has devastated Emilia-Romagna. The earthquake was recorded by the National Institute of Geophysics and Volcanology at 04:04, followed by two similar tremors of lower intensity: one measuring 3.3 at 05:35 and another measuring 2.9 at 05:44.

The consequences of the earthquake were significant: in the end seven people died, six in the province of Ferrara and one in the province of Bologna; a total of around 100 people were injured and thousands have been displaced, many of whom have not found space in the tent cities. Then there is the material damage, owing to the hundreds of collapsed buildings and the dramatic damage to the area's architectural heritage. Incalculable damages include the damage to the Tower of Finale Emilia that was torn in half and is now the photographic symbol of this earthquake seen around the world. The cultural heritage in the affected areas around Modena and Ferrara has been devastated. The architectural heritage of Church property has been hit extremely hard while other buildings such as towers and castles are also very badly damaged.

In view of this, could the Commission state:

1. whether it is possible for Italy to make use of the European Union Solidarity Fund;
2. what measures it intends to adopt to facilitate the exchange of good practices between Emilia-Romagna and European regions that have already been victims of similar natural disasters on ways of restoring the social fabric?

**Question for written answer E-005312/12  
to the Commission**

**Debora Serracchiani (S&D) and Francesca Balzani (S&D)**

(25 May 2012)

*Subject:* Earthquake in Emilia-Romagna

On 20 May 2012, the Emilia-Romagna region was hit by a strong earthquake which killed seven and displaced thousands of people. It also caused serious damage to the region's cultural heritage.

Existing economic and social cohesion instruments will fund risk-prevention measures. The European Union Solidarity Fund aims to deal with emergency situations swiftly, effectively and flexibly, as stated in Article 3(2) of Regulation (EC) No 2012/2002. However, the regulation does not contain any entry for restoring damage to cultural heritage.

In view of the above, does the Commission agree that an additional and distinct Community instrument is needed which would provide funding to restore cultural heritage destroyed in areas hit by devastating natural disasters?

**Joint answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission**

(2 July 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Members to its answer to Written Question E-5139/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

The Commission is open to discuss proposals from Italy to modify the relevant Structural Funds programmes, with a view to including interventions addressing the damage and difficulties caused by the earthquake to the productive fabric of the region.

Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005 <sup>(2)</sup> provides for the possibility to intervene through the measure 'Restoring agricultural production potential damaged by natural disasters and introducing appropriate prevention measures'. Italian regions may introduce programme modification proposals requesting the activation of this measure or may update the content of it and the amounts allocated in accordance with current needs, including with regard to support for restoring the production potential of enterprises involved in processing agricultural products, where the final products are covered by Annex I to the Treaty.

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

<sup>(2)</sup> on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development.

To facilitate the exchange of information between participating States in the European Civil Protection Mechanism in case of disasters, the MIC operates the Common Emergency Communication and Information System. This tool was used by Italy's civil protection authorities to share updates on the situation in the earthquake-affected areas in Emilia Romagna. In addition, it is standard practice for the Commission to organise lessons-learnt meetings with all relevant stakeholders after each emergency in which the European Civil Protection Mechanism was activated. These meetings provide a forum for the exchange of best practice.

The creation of an additional Community instrument to provide funding to restore destroyed cultural heritage is however not envisaged.

---

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005196/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Franz Obermayr (NI)**  
(22. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Strengere Schutzmaßnahmen für Spielzeug

Mit der neuen europäischen Spielzeugrichtlinie 2009/48/EG dürften Spielzeuge ab Juli 2013 mehr Schadstoffe enthalten, als dies jetzt zulässig ist, warnen Experten in ganz Europa. Diesbezügliche Erhebungen der letzten Jahre haben nicht nur zu hohe Gehalte von Giftstoffen in Spielzeugen belegt, sondern auch nachgewiesen, dass diese Stoffe das Nervensystem der Kinder schädigen und zur Tumorentwicklung führen können. Viele Kinder sind so einer Unzahl chemischer, teils toxischer, teils hormonaktiver Stoffe wie z. B. Blei, Arsen und Quecksilber ausgesetzt. Daraus resultieren folgende Fragen:

1. Warum wird die erlaubte Schadstoffgrenze erhöht und nicht verringert?
2. Warum wird die Verwendung besonders gefährlicher Substanzen in Spielzeugen nicht vollkommen verboten?
3. Warum gibt es keine rigorosen Kontrollen der teilweise bekannten „schwarzen Schafe“ unter den Spielzeugerzeugern und den Erzeugerländern?
4. Welche Möglichkeiten hat die Kommission, um eine Risikoreduzierung statt einer weiteren Risikoerhöhung anzustreben?
5. Wie beurteilt die Kommission die diesbezügliche Klage der deutschen Bundesregierung?
6. Welche Möglichkeiten sieht die Kommission, um Europas Kinder in Zukunft dieser Gefahrenquelle nicht mehr auszusetzen?

**Antwort von Herrn Tajani im Namen der Kommission**  
(11. Juli 2012)

Auf der Grundlage eines kohärenten und transparenten wissenschaftlich-toxikologischen Ansatzes verbessert die Spielzeugrichtlinie <sup>(1)</sup> die Sicherheit von Kindern durch Vorschriften über die Konzentration von chemischen Stoffen, die zu den strengsten weltweit gehören. Allerdings ist es technisch nicht immer möglich, chemische Stoffe in Spielzeugen komplett zu verbieten. Wäre dies machbar, so wäre dieses Vorgehen nicht verhältnismäßig, da die Gesundheit von Kindern durch weniger restriktive Maßnahmen gewährleistet werden kann, beispielsweise durch die Einführung sicherer Grenzwerte für diese Chemikalien.

Für bestimmte chemische Stoffe <sup>(2)</sup> beantragte Deutschland die Beibehaltung nationaler Bestimmungen mit den Argumenten, dass sie für Kinder einen höheren Schutz böten als die Richtlinie. Die Kommission lehnte den deutschen Antrag in Teilen ab. Die Begründung für die teilweise Ablehnung finden sich in einem Beschluss <sup>(3)</sup> der Kommission, der von Deutschland angefochten wurde (Rechtssache T-198/12).

In der Richtlinie ist die Änderung gewisser Bestimmungen über chemische Stoffe vorgesehen, damit eine konstante Anpassung an jüngste wissenschaftliche Erkenntnisse sichergestellt ist. Derartige Änderungen wurden bereits eingeführt <sup>(4)</sup>, weitere sind in Vorbereitung <sup>(5)</sup>. Die Kommission wird immer dann Änderungen vorschlagen, wenn neue wissenschaftliche Erkenntnisse vorliegen.

Die Sicherheitsvorschriften der Richtlinie gelten für alle Spielzeuge unabhängig von ihrem Ursprung. Für die Überprüfung der Sicherheit von Spielzeug sind vornehmlich die Mitgliedstaaten zuständig. Die Kommission hat ihre Zusammenarbeit mit China intensiviert und für chinesische Behörden und Wirtschaftsakteure Schulungen zur Spielzeugsicherheit angeboten.

<sup>(1)</sup> Richtlinie 2009/48/EG (ABl. L 170 vom 30.6.2009, S. 1).

<sup>(2)</sup> Blei, Arsen, Barium, Antimon, Quecksilber und Nitrosamine.

<sup>(3)</sup> Beschluss 2012/160/EU der Kommission vom 1. März 2012 (ABl. L 80 vom 20.3.2012, S. 19).

<sup>(4)</sup> Richtlinie 2012/7/EU (ABl. L 64 vom 3.3.2012, S. 7).

<sup>(5)</sup> Blei, Barium.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005196/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Franz Obermayr (NI)**  
(22 May 2012)

*Subject:* Stricter safeguards for toys

Experts throughout Europe warn that the new European Toy Safety Directive 2009/48/EC will mean that from July 2013 toys may contain more harmful substances than currently allowed. Surveys conducted on this issue in recent years have not only uncovered excessive amounts of toxic substances in toys, but also established that these substances can damage children's nervous systems and lead to the development of tumours. Many children are thus exposed to countless chemical substances, some of them toxic and some of them endocrine disruptors such as lead, arsenic and mercury. I would like to ask the Commission the following:

1. Why is the permitted limit for harmful substances to be increased rather than reduced?
2. Why is the use of particularly dangerous substances in toys not completely banned?
3. Why are there no rigorous controls on the 'black sheep' among toy manufacturers and producer countries, some of which are well known?
4. What options are available to the Commission to reduce risks rather than further increase them?
5. How does the Commission assess the corresponding complaint by the German Government?
6. What options does the Commission foresee to ensure that Europe's children are not exposed to this source of danger in the future?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission**  
(11 July 2012)

The Toy Safety Directive <sup>(1)</sup> enhances children's safety by establishing amongst the strictest rules in the world on the presence of chemical substances, based on a consistent and transparent scientific-toxicological approach. However, fully banning chemicals in toys is not always technically possible; if it was workable, it would not be proportionate since children's health can be assured by less restrictive measures, such as establishing safe limit values for these chemicals.

For certain chemical substances <sup>(2)</sup>, Germany requested permission to maintain national rules, arguing that they would offer a higher level of protection to children than the directive. The Commission partially rejected the German request, the reasons for the partial rejection are set out in the Commission's decision <sup>(3)</sup>. The latter has been challenged by Germany (case T-198/12).

The directive also allows for the amendment of certain chemical provisions, to assure a constant alignment with the latest scientific evidence. Such amendments have already been introduced <sup>(4)</sup> and others are under preparation <sup>(5)</sup>. The Commission will propose such amendments every time new scientific evidence is made available.

The directive safety rules apply to all toys, regardless of their origin. Verifying toys' safety is primarily the responsibility of Member States. The Commission intensified cooperation with China, by providing training to Chinese authorities and economic operators on toy safety.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Directive 2009/48/EC, OJEU, 30.6.2009, L 170/1.

<sup>(2)</sup> Lead, arsenic, barium, antimony, mercury and nitrosamines.

<sup>(3)</sup> Commission Decision 2012/160/EU of 1 March 2012, OJEU, 20.3.2012, L 80/19.

<sup>(4)</sup> Directive 2012/7/EU, OJEU, 3.3.2012, L 64/7.

<sup>(5)</sup> Lead, barium.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005197/12  
a la Comisión**

**Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)**

(22 de mayo de 2012)

*Asunto:* El mercado del libro digital en España

El mercado del libro digital en España se encuentra significativamente menos desarrollado que en el resto de países de la Unión Europea.

El tipo impositivo aplicado en España al libro digital, así como las diferencias regulatorias dentro de la UE son algunos de los principales obstáculos para el crecimiento de este mercado. La Administración fiscal española entiende que el libro digital debe tributar al tipo de IVA del 18 %, correspondiente a la prestación de servicios, y no al tipo de IVA del 4 %, relativo a las ventas de libros en soporte físico, en tanto que bienes.

El Art. 56 de la Directiva 2006/112/CE del Consejo de 28 de noviembre de 2006, relativa al sistema común del impuesto sobre el valor añadido, expone que los tipos reducidos no serán aplicados a servicios suministrados por vía electrónica, entre los cuales se incluye el suministro de imágenes, texto e información.

Sin embargo, algunos países como Francia y Luxemburgo aplican tipos reducidos (7 % y 3 %, respectivamente), lo que conlleva una desventaja competitiva para las empresas españolas de servicios digitales; y al mismo tiempo desincentiva a empresas multinacionales a tributar en España, incitándolas a instalar sus sedes en otros países de la UE.

1. ¿Ha estudiado la Comisión la posibilidad de poner fin a la situación de discriminación a la que se enfrenta España debido a aquellos países de la UE que han modificado su normativa del IVA contradiciendo lo previsto en la Directiva comunitaria?
2. ¿Avala la Comisión la introducción del sistema de precio fijo del libro digital a nivel europeo para contribuir a una mayor difusión del libro?
3. ¿Cómo prevé la Comisión hacer frente a la situación de desventaja competitiva de las empresas europeas frente a empresas de Internet internacionales, como Google, que aprovechan las ventajas legales del sistema fiscal de la UE para no tributar en Europa?

**Respuesta del Sr. Šemeta en nombre de la Comisión**

(19 de julio de 2012)

1. La Comisión confirma que, en virtud de las normas actuales sobre el IVA, servicios electrónicos tales como el suministro de contenidos digitalizados de libros por Internet o a través de una red electrónica están sujetos al tipo normal del IVA.

En lo que respecta a la situación en Francia y Luxemburgo, la Comisión acaba de incoar (3 de julio de 2012) un procedimiento de infracción contra esos dos Estados miembros.

2. La Comisión no tiene previsto introducir un sistema de fijación de precios a escala de la UE para los libros digitales. Sin embargo, tal como anunció en su Comunicación de enero sobre el comercio electrónico, la Comisión está controlando estrechamente el proceso legislativo y la evolución del mercado, además de participar en conversaciones de índole más general con los Estados miembros y las partes interesadas sobre la tendencia hacia la adopción de libros digitales en el mercado único y los obstáculos a esta evolución.

En este sentido, la Comisión recuerda una investigación en curso en materia de competencia sobre la posible existencia de acuerdos o prácticas ilegales que tendrían como objeto o efecto restringir la competencia en la UE o en el EEE. La Comisión también está estudiando el carácter y las condiciones de los acuerdos de agencia celebrados entre las editoriales Hachette Livre, Harper Collins, Simon & Schuster, Penguin y Verlagsgruppe Georg von Holzbrinck y los minoristas para la venta de libros digitales.

3. La situación a que se refiere Su Señoría no se produce en lo que se refiere al IVA, porque las prestaciones de servicios electrónicos efectuadas por proveedores de terceros países a destinatarios establecidos en la UE son imposables en la UE, de acuerdo con la normativa vigente sobre el IVA. Respecto a la fiscalidad directa, la Comisión remite a Su Señoría a su respuesta a la pregunta E-009260/2011 <sup>(1)</sup>.

---

---

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

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005197/12  
to the Commission**

**Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)**

(22 May 2012)

*Subject:* The e-book market in Spain

The e-book market in Spain is significantly less developed than it is in the other EU Member States.

The tax rate applied to e-books in Spain and regulatory differences within the EU are among the main obstacles to the growth of the Spanish e-book market. The Spanish tax authorities believe that e-books should carry a VAT rate of 18%, which applies to the provision of services, and not a VAT rate of 4%, which applies to the sale of physical books as goods.

Article 56 of Council Directive 2006/112/EC of 28 November 2006 on the common system of value added tax provides that reduced rates shall not be applied to electronically supplied services, which includes the supply of images, text and information.

However, some countries, such as France and Luxembourg, apply reduced rates (7% and 3% respectively), which puts Spanish digital service companies at a competitive disadvantage. At the same time this discourages multinational companies from paying taxes in Spain, prompting them to set up their headquarters in other EU countries.

1. Has the Commission considered the possibility of ending the discrimination faced by Spain, caused by EU countries that have changed their VAT rules contrary to the provisions of the directive?
2. Does the Commission support the introduction of an EU-wide fixed price system for e-books to help increase book sales?
3. How does the Commission plan to tackle European companies' competitive disadvantage against international Internet companies, such as Google, which exploit the legal benefits of the EU tax system so as not to pay taxes in Europe?

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

(19 July 2012)

1. The Commission confirms that, under the current VAT rules, electronic services, such as the supply of the digitised content of books over the Internet or on an electronic network, must be subject to the standard rate of VAT.

As regards the situation in France and Luxembourg, the Commission has just launched (3 July 2012) an infringement procedure against the two Member States concerned.

2. The Commission is not planning to introduce an EU-wide price fixing system for e-books. However, as also announced in the January adopted E-Commerce Communication, the Commission is closely monitoring the legislative and market developments, and it is engaged in more general discussions with Member States and stakeholders on the trend towards digital books in the single market and on obstacles to such developments.

In this vein the Commission would also like to refer to a currently ongoing competition investigation on the possible existence of illegal agreements or practices that would have the object or the effect of restricting competition in the EU or in the EEA. The Commission is also examining the character and terms of the agency agreements entered into by the five publishers Hachette Livre, Harper Collins, Simon & Schuster, Penguin and Verlagsgruppe Georg von Holtzbrinck and retailers for the sale of e-books.

3. The situation referred to by the Honourable Member does not occur as far as VAT is concerned, since according to the current VAT rules supplies of electronic services made by third country suppliers to recipients established in the EU are taxable in the EU. As for direct taxation, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its reply for Question E-009260/2011 <sup>(1)</sup>.

---

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

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-005200/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Ioannis Kasoulides (PPE)**  
(23 Μαΐου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Ευρωπαϊκή Σύμβαση για τη Διασυνοριακή Τηλεόραση

Η ερώτηση αφορά την Ευρωπαϊκή Σύμβαση για τη Διασυνοριακή Τηλεόραση (ΕΣΔΤ), στη Μόνιμη Επιτροπή της οποίας η Επιτροπή συμμετέχει ως παρατηρητής. Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Τι νοείται ως «συντακτική ευθύνη»; Διευκολύνει το γράμμα και το πνεύμα της ως άνω Σύμβασης τυχόν απαίτηση των ημεδαπών αρχών κρατών-μελών της ΕΕ να ασκούν επιπρόσθετο και αχρείαστο έλεγχο τηλεοπτικών προγραμμάτων που είναι ήδη νόμιμα αδειοδοτημένα και ελεγμένα και εκπέμπουν σε άλλο κράτος μέλος, και το περιεχόμενό τους αναμεταδίδεται αυτούσιο στο ημεδαπό κράτος μέλος;

**Απάντηση της κας Kroes εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(14 Ιουνίου 2012)

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Σύμβαση για τη Διασυνοριακή Τηλεόραση είναι μια διεθνής συνθήκη. Η ΕΕ δεν είναι συμβαλλόμενο μέρος στη συνθήκη αυτή και η Επιτροπή έχει καθιστώσ παρατηρητή στη μόνιμη επιτροπή που συστάθηκε με τη Σύμβαση. Ως εκ τούτου, η Επιτροπή δεν είναι αρμόδια να ερμηνεύει τις διατάξεις της Σύμβασης.

---



*(English version)*

**Question for written answer P-005200/12  
to the Commission**

**Ioannis Kasoulides (PPE)**

*(23 May 2012)*

*Subject:* The European Convention on Transfrontier Television

This question concerns the European Convention on Transfrontier Television, on the Standing Committee of which the Commission participates as an observer. Can the Commission answer the following:

What is meant by 'editorial responsibility'? Does it serve either the letter or the spirit of the abovementioned Convention if domestic authorities of EU Member States can exercise additional and unnecessary control of television programmes that are being legally transmitted, are licensed and are being broadcast in another Member State, with their content broadcast unedited into the original Member State?

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

*(14 June 2012)*

The European Convention on Transfrontier Television is an international treaty. The EU is not party to this treaty and the Commission only observer in the Standing Committee established by the Convention. The Commission therefore is not competent to interpret the provisions of the Convention.

---

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005201/12  
an die Kommission**

**Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE) und Hubert Pirker (PPE)**

(23. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Anerkennung des Traktorführerscheines

Der Führerschein, der zum Lenken von Traktoren berechtigt, ist kein international gültiger Führerschein. Die Berechtigung gilt nur in jenen EWR-Staaten, die dies aufgrund einer (gegenseitigen) Anerkennung akzeptieren. Während in Österreich eine großzügige Anerkennung sämtlicher Führerscheine aus EWR-Staaten erfolgt, ist dies in anderen Mitgliedstaaten nicht so, wodurch sich erhebliche Schwierigkeiten ergeben, wenn Österreicher, die nur einen Traktorführerschein, nicht jedoch einen LKW-Führerschein haben, im Ausland einen Traktor lenken wollen (was z. B. bei Praktikanten häufig der Fall ist).

Welche konkreten Maßnahmen gedenkt die Kommission zu ergreifen, um die Regeln der gegenseitigen Anerkennung innerhalb der EU auf diesem Gebiet voranzutreiben, so dass im Sinne der von der EU befürworteten „Freizügigkeiten“ diese Einschränkungen wegfallen?

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

(3. Juli 2012)

Der Traktorführerschein ist eine rein nationale Führerscheinkategorie. Die Kommission sieht in der derzeitigen Situation keine Einschränkung der „vier Freiheiten“ und plant in vorhersehbarer Zukunft keine Harmonisierung der Traktorführerscheine auf EU-Ebene. Es obliegt den Mitgliedstaaten, festzustellen, ob Interesse am Abschluss bilateraler Abkommen über die Anerkennung von Traktorführerscheinen besteht.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005201/12  
to the Commission  
Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE) and Hubert Pirker (PPE)  
(23 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Recognition of tractor driving licences

Tractor driving licences are not internationally recognised. This class of licence is valid only in those member countries of the European Economic Area (EEA) which have concluded a (mutual) recognition agreement. While Austria recognises all driving licences issued by EEA member countries, the same is not true in other Member States. This gives rise to considerable difficulties when Austrians who hold a tractor licence but not an HGV licence want to drive a tractor in a foreign country (this is a problem that frequently affects trainees, for example).

What specific steps are being considered by the Commission in order to develop the relevant rules in the EU so that these restrictions no longer apply, in line with the 'freedoms' promoted by the EU?

**Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission  
(3 July 2012)**

Tractor driving licences are only a national category. The Commission does not consider that the current situation is restricting the four 'freedoms' and is not foreseeing the harmonisation of tractor driving licences at EU level in the foreseeable future. It is up to the Member States to establish whether there is an interest to conclude bilateral recognition agreement for tractor driving licences.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005203/12**  
**alla Commissione**  
**Sergio Berlato (PPE)**  
(23 maggio 2012)

**Oggetto:** Gravi violazioni dei diritti umani di civili indifesi in Libia

Secondo quanto diffuso in un comunicato stampa, Amnesty International ha sollecitato il Consiglio nazionale di transizione libico ad indagare sulla morte sotto tortura di appartenenti all'etnia tawargha, la popolazione libica nera che sta subendo gravi violazioni dei diritti umani.

Le ricerche di Amnesty International hanno messo in luce come, da settembre 2011, più di una decina di persone siano morte mentre si trovavano in centri di detenzione sotto la direzione delle milizie armate.

La tortura nei confronti di presunti sostenitori e soldati di Gheddafi e, soprattutto, dei neri libici dell'etnia tawargha è assai diffusa in Libia: trentamila persone, in pratica l'intera popolazione della municipalità di Tawargha, sono state colpite dalle azioni di rappresaglia delle milizie armate, che li accusano di aver sostenuto il deposedo regime.

Preso atto di questa situazione che assume i caratteri di una grave violazione dei diritti umani di civili indifesi, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se ritiene che le gravi azioni in corso rendano urgente l'azione della comunità internazionale al fine di difendere le popolazioni civili e i diritti umani fondamentali;
2. quali azioni di pressione politica e/o diplomatica ritiene possano essere intraprese per sollecitare il Consiglio nazionale di transizione libico a fermare definitivamente queste gravi azioni di rappresaglia nei confronti della popolazione tawargha?

**Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione**  
(16 luglio 2012)

La questione del maltrattamento dei detenuti è stata sollevata dall'Unione europea nel corso del suo dialogo con le autorità libiche. Quando sono state pubblicate le prime relazioni sugli abusi commessi nei centri di detenzione, l'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha rilasciato una dichiarazione in cui chiedeva che tutti i detenuti in Libia fossero rispettati conformemente alle norme internazionali. L'AR/VP ha inoltre chiesto alle autorità di accelerare il processo con cui stanno ponendo sotto il loro controllo tutti i luoghi di detenzione e di indagare sulle denunce relative a violazioni dei diritti dei detenuti. Il governo libico ha successivamente dichiarato che sta attuando misure volte a trasferire alle autorità il controllo delle strutture di detenzione. La questione continuerà comunque a essere attentamente seguita dall'Unione europea.

L'Unione ha fornito aiuti di emergenza alle persone che necessitavano di protezione in seguito al conflitto e rimane disposta a prestare alle autorità ogni forma di assistenza di cui avranno bisogno per garantire il rispetto dei diritti umani, dei valori democratici e dello Stato di diritto.

Inoltre l'UE sta attualmente finanziando, mediante la linea tematica dello strumento europeo per la democrazia e i diritti umani, un progetto volto a offrire servizi di riabilitazione e assistenza alle vittime di torture, sparizioni forzate e traumi violenti in Libia, nonché a promuovere lo sviluppo di un quadro giuridico e politico nazionale per combattere la tortura e altre forme di maltrattamento.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005203/12  
to the Commission  
Sergio Berlato (PPE)  
(23 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Serious violations of human rights of innocent civilians in Libya

An Amnesty International press release urged the Libyan National Transitional Council to investigate the death under torture of members of the Tawargha ethnic community, Libya's black population which is suffering serious violations of its human rights.

Amnesty International research revealed that, since September 2011, more than a dozen people have died while in detention centres under the authority of armed militia.

Torture of suspected Gaddafi supporters and soldiers and, above all, of the black Tawargha ethnic group, is prevalent in Libya: 30 000 people, practically the entire population of the municipality of Tawargha, were the victims of acts of retaliation by the armed militia, which accuses them of having supported the deposed regime.

Considering that this situation can be viewed as a serious violation of human rights of innocent civilians, can the Commission state:

1. whether it agrees that these serious and continuing actions make it a matter of urgency for the international community to take measures to defend civilian populations and fundamental human rights;
2. what political and/or diplomatic pressure it thinks can be brought to bear to prevail on the Libyan National Transitional Council to put a complete stop to these serious acts of reprisal against the Tawargha population?

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

The EU has raised the issue of ill-treatment of detainee's in its dialogue with the Libyan authorities. When the first reports of abuses in detention centres were made public the High Representative/Vice-President issued a statement in which she called for the respect of all detainees in Libya in accordance with international standards. The HR/VP also called on the authorities to accelerate the process of bringing all places of detention under their control and to investigate allegations of violations of detainee's rights. The Libyan government has subsequently declared that it is in the process of implementing measures aiming at transferring the control of detention facilities to the authorities. Nonetheless, the EU will continue to follow this issue very closely.

The EU has provided emergency assistance to people in need of protection as a result of the conflict and stands ready to provide every assistance to the authorities in their efforts to ensure respect for human rights, democratic values and the rule of law.

Moreover, the EU is currently funding a project under the thematic line of the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights whose objective is to provide victims of torture, enforced disappearances and victims of violent trauma in Libya with rehabilitation and support services and to advocate for a national legal and policy framework that addresses torture and other forms of ill-treatment.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005205/12  
alla Commissione**

**Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)**

(23 maggio 2012)

**Oggetto:** Trasporto al macello di animali non idonei nell'Unione europea

Il regolamento (CE) n. 1/2005 sulla protezione degli animali durante il trasporto stabilisce che gli animali gravemente malati o feriti non debbano essere trasportati al macello. Tali animali devono ricevere adeguate cure veterinarie o essere uccisi sul posto, per esempio presso l'azienda agricola.

Nonostante le varie iniziative per far valere il regolamento, le infrazioni sono ancora diffuse. Gli animali non idonei sono spesso trasportati al macello e sono quindi esposti a gravi sofferenze (si veda ad esempio l'interrogazione E-011393/2011 dell'autore). Ciò è messo in evidenza in numerosi rapporti dell'Ufficio alimentare e veterinario (FVO) (per esempio: DG (SANCO) 2010-8390 Francia, DG (SANCO) 2010-8388 Italia; DG (SANCO) 2011-6052 Portogallo; DG (SANCO) 2009-8284 Spagna; DG (SANCO) 2009-8263 Bulgaria; DG (SANCO) 2009-8252 Lituania), nonché dalle ricerche di ONG come «Animals' Angels».

Nel febbraio 2010 la Commissione ha inviato una lettera agli Stati membri (SANCO D5 DS / eu D (2010) 450003) richiamando la loro attenzione sull'importanza di stabilire politiche volte, tra l'altro, ad aumentare i controlli a livello dei macelli, al fine di scoraggiare il trasporto di animali non idonei.

1. Hanno gli Stati membri risposto alla lettera della Commissione e hanno comunicato se sono intervenuti? Se sì, quanti Stati membri hanno risposto e quali misure hanno messo in atto?
2. Se gli Stati membri hanno risposto alla Commissione, hanno fornito dati misurabili sui risultati delle misure adottate, come il numero di controlli specifici e il numero delle sanzioni applicate?
3. Ritiene la Commissione che le misure adottate dagli Stati membri siano sufficienti per abolire il trasporto di animali non idonei al macello, e quindi siano sufficienti per garantire l'applicazione del regolamento (CE) n. 1/2005?
4. Considerando la quantità di violazioni reiterate del regolamento (CE) n. 1/2005 nel corso degli anni, quando proporrà la Commissione una revisione del regolamento che chiaramente non è stata in grado di applicare nella sua forma attuale nonostante i numerosi tentativi?

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

(3 luglio 2012)

1. e 2. Il 24 febbraio 2010 la Commissione ha inviato agli Stati membri una lettera <sup>(1)</sup> sul trasporto di animali non idonei. La questione è stata inoltre discussa con le autorità competenti degli Stati membri nel corso di una riunione del Comitato permanente per la catena alimentare e la salute degli animali tenutasi il 12-13 aprile 2010 <sup>(2)</sup>.

La Commissione ha ricevuto informazioni da tre Stati membri. Uno di questi Stati membri ha informato la Commissione delle misure in vigore consistenti in un regime di assicurazione che può essere usato per sovvenzionare la rimozione degli animali morti nell'azienda.

3. Nell'ottica della Commissione le misure adottate dagli Stati membri in proposito non sono sufficienti, come menzionato nella relazione della Commissione sulla protezione degli animali durante il trasporto <sup>(3)</sup> adottata nel novembre 2011. Essendo necessari ulteriori interventi in tale ambito la Commissione ha discusso l'argomento nella riunione con i punti di contatto di cui al regolamento 1/2005 <sup>(4)</sup>. La riunione è prevista per il 19-21 giugno 2012.

4. La Commissione non prevede attualmente di proporre modifiche del regolamento 1/2005.

<sup>(1)</sup> SANCO D5 DS/eu D(2010)450003.

<sup>(2)</sup> L'ordine del giorno e la sintesi della riunione sono reperibili all'indirizzo:  
[http://ec.europa.eu/food/committees/regulatory/scfcah/animal\\_health/ag\\_sum2010\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/food/committees/regulatory/scfcah/animal_health/ag_sum2010_en.htm)

<sup>(3)</sup> Relazione della Commissione al Parlamento europeo e al Consiglio sull'impatto del regolamento (CE) n. 1/2005 del Consiglio sulla protezione degli animali durante il trasporto. COM(2011)700 definitivo.

<sup>(4)</sup> Di cui all'articolo 24, paragrafo 2, del regolamento (CE) n. 1/2005 sulla protezione degli animali durante il trasporto: GU L 3 del 5.1.2005, pag. 1.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005205/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)**  
(23 May 2012)

*Subject:* Transport of animals unfit for slaughter in the European Union

Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations establishes that seriously ill or injured animals must not be taken to slaughter. Such animals must be given appropriate veterinary care or be put down on site, for example at the farm itself.

Despite various initiatives taken to enforce the regulation, infringements are still commonplace. Unfit animals are often taken to slaughter, thus enduring serious suffering (see, for example, my Question E-011393/2001). This has been highlighted in numerous reports from the Food and Veterinary Office (FVO) (for example: DG(SANCO) 2010-8390 France; DG(SANCO) 2010-8388 Italy; DG(SANCO) 2011-6052 Portugal; DG(SANCO) 2009-8284 Spain; DG(SANCO) 2009-8263 Bulgaria; DG(SANCO) 2009-8252 Lithuania), and in research carried out by NGOs such as Animals' Angels.

In February 2010, the Commission sent a letter to Member States (SANCO D5 DS/eu D (2010) 450003) drawing their attention to the importance of introducing policies aimed at, among other things, increasing the number of abattoir inspections in order to discourage the transport of unfit animals.

1. Have any Member States responded to the Commission's letter, stating that they have taken action in the matter? If so, how many Member States have responded and what measures have they taken?
2. If any Member States have responded to the Commission, have they provided measurable data on the outcome of the action taken, such as the number of inspections carried out and the number of penalties imposed?
3. Does the Commission consider that the measures taken by Member States are sufficient to put an end to the transport of unfit animals to slaughter, and therefore to ensure that regulation (EC) No 1/2005 is duly implemented?
4. Given the number of violations of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 that have occurred over the years, when will the Commission propose a review of the regulation, which, despite numerous attempts, is clearly inapplicable in its current form?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission**  
(3 July 2012)

1 and 2. The Commission sent a letter on transport of unfit animals to the Member States on 24 February 2010 <sup>(1)</sup>. In addition the issue was discussed with the competent authorities of the Member States during a meeting of the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health on 12-13 April 2010 <sup>(2)</sup>.

The Commission has received information from three Member States. One of these Member States informed the Commission of existing measures in the form of an insurance scheme which can be used to subsidise the removal of animals which died on the holding.

3. In the view of the Commission, the measures taken by the Member States in this regard are not sufficient as mentioned in the Commission report on animal welfare during transport <sup>(3)</sup>, adopted in November 2011. As there is a need for further action in this area the Commission discussed the topic at the meeting with the contact points of Regulation 1/2005 <sup>(4)</sup> of 19-21 June 2012.

4. The Commission is at present not considering proposing any changes to Regulation 1/2005.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> SANCO D5 DS/eu D(2010)450003.

<sup>(2)</sup> Agenda and summary from the meeting can be found on:  
[http://ec.europa.eu/food/committees/regulatory/scfcah/animal\\_health/ag\\_sum2010\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/food/committees/regulatory/scfcah/animal_health/ag_sum2010_en.htm)

<sup>(3)</sup> Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the impact of Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport. COM(2011) 700 final.

<sup>(4)</sup> As referred to in Article 24(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport: OJ L 3, 5.1.2005, p. 1.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005206/12  
alla Commissione**

**Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)**

(23 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Riforma dei mercati finanziari e bonus

Neanche il G8 di Camp David è riuscito a proporre la riforma dei mercati finanziari. Nonostante l'emozione provocata dallo scandalo della «JP Morgan Chase», il cui presidente è responsabile della clamorosa perdita di oltre 2 miliardi di dollari in speculazioni sbagliate, nessun passo avanti è stato fatto per sbloccare i regolamenti attuativi del «Dodd-Franck Act» che ha impostato la riforma nel 2010. Da allora nulla s'è mosso e la credibilità di questa banca è fortemente minacciata. Forse è un bene perché il suo presidente guidava la forte resistenza dei banchieri anglosassoni contro ogni regola capace di correggere il regime dei bonus miliardari dei banchieri, e non solo. Se il G8 non è stato in grado di depotenziare la finanza, nessuno riuscirà a ridurre l'appropriazione privata della ricchezza da parte dei suoi manager, come è successo, purtroppo, e come succederà scandalosamente ancora.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Come spiega l'assenza di questo argomento dall'agenda del G8?
2. Condivide questa omissione del dibattito sulla riforma del sistema?
3. Ha intenzione di proporre iniziative per la modifica del regime dei bonus?
4. Ha finalmente una visione globale della riforma del sistema e della differente funzione tra attività finanziaria e attività generalista commerciale, da separare nelle banche?

**Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione**

(12 luglio 2012)

Dall'inizio della crisi finanziaria nel 2008 la riforma finanziaria globale è stata coordinata dal G20, che annovera un numero vasto e piuttosto rappresentativo di Stati di tutto il mondo. È questa la ragione per cui questo argomento non è stato al centro dei recenti incontri del G8.

Fin dall'inizio della crisi la Commissione ha dimostrato pieno sostegno all'agenda di riforma finanziaria in sede di G20. In termini di attuazione pratica dell'agenda del G20, l'UE ha assunto un ruolo guida in merito a numerose questioni, quali ad esempio i bonus per i dirigenti bancari, la regolamentazione applicata alle agenzie di rating del credito, i fondi speculativi (hedge fund) e la negoziazione dei derivati OTC.

Nel settembre 2009 il G20 ha approvato i principi FSB per pratiche sane in materia di retribuzione e le relative norme attuative, incorporati nell'ordinamento giuridico dell'Unione dalla direttiva 2010/76/CE <sup>(1)</sup>, in vigore negli Stati membri dal gennaio 2011. I negoziati attualmente in corso con il Parlamento europeo e il Consiglio sulla proposta CRD IV della Commissione <sup>(2)</sup> possono condurre a un rafforzamento ulteriore delle norme che disciplinano la remunerazione nelle banche e nelle imprese di investimento nell'UE.

La Commissione ha esposto il suo programma di riforma del sistema finanziario europeo nella comunicazione <sup>(3)</sup> del 2 giugno 2010. In termini di proposte legislative presentate dalla Commissione, l'agenda è adesso pressoché completa. Il programma di riforma finanziaria mira a rendere il sistema finanziario dell'UE più stabile, solido e trasparente, nonché ad accertarsi che il settore finanziario sia al servizio dell'economia reale. La Commissione sta inoltre valutando se i problemi legati al sistema bancario ombra richiedano un'apposita normativa e ha istituito un gruppo ad alto livello presieduto da Erkki Liikanen, governatore della Banca centrale finlandese, preposto a vagliare la necessità di ulteriori misure relative alla struttura delle banche. Tale gruppo dovrebbe presentare le proprie raccomandazioni in autunno.

<sup>(1)</sup> «CRD III».

<sup>(2)</sup> COM(2011)453 definitivo.

<sup>(3)</sup> COM(2010)301 definitivo — Regolare i servizi finanziari per garantire una crescita sostenibile — 2 giugno 2010. Per maggiori informazioni consultare la pagina web: [http://ec.europa.eu/internal\\_market/finances/policy/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/finances/policy/index_en.htm)



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005206/12  
to the Commission**

**Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)**

(23 May 2012)

*Subject:* Financial market and bonus reforms

The G8 summit at Camp David was unable to propose any financial market reforms. Despite the furore caused by the JP Morgan Chase scandal — bad speculation by its CEO caused the sensational loss of over USD 2 billion — no progress has been made in unlocking the implementing regulations of the 2010 Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. Nothing has changed since then and the credibility of this bank is under serious threat, which may be a good thing because its CEO was spearheading resistance among British and American bankers to any regulation that might change the system of billion-dollar bonuses for bankers. If the G8 summit was unable to disempower finance, no-one will be able to cut down the private appropriation of wealth by managers in the sector, as has occurred, unfortunately, and shockingly will continue to occur.

1. How does the Commission explain the fact that this topic was not on the G8 agenda?
2. Is it supportive of the decision not to discuss reforming the system?
3. Does it intend to propose initiatives to change the bonus system?
4. Lastly, does it have a global view on how to reform the system and how to split the different functions of financial asset management and general business activities in banks?

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

(12 July 2012)

Since the start of the financial crisis in 2008, global financial reform has been coordinated by the G20, which includes a large and rather representative number of countries around the world. For this reason, financial reform has not been the focus of recent G8 meetings.

From the outset of the crisis, the Commission has been fully supportive of the financial reform agenda within the G20 context. In terms of practical implementation of the G20 agenda, the EU has taken the lead on a number of issues as bankers' bonuses, regulation of credit rating agencies, hedge funds and OTC derivatives trading.

In September 2009, the G20 endorsed the FSB Principles for Sound Compensation Practices and their Implementation Standards, incorporated into the EU legal order by Directive 2010/76/EC<sup>(1)</sup> in force in Member States since 1 January 2011. The negotiations currently under way with the European Parliament and the Council on the Commission's 'CRD IV' proposal<sup>(2)</sup> may lead to a further strengthening of the rules governing remuneration in banks and investment firms in the EU.

The Commission set out its programme for the reform of the European financial system in its communication<sup>(3)</sup> of 2 June 2010. This agenda is now very close to completed in terms of legislative proposals presented by the Commission. The aim of the financial reform program is to make the EU financial system more stable, solid and transparent and make sure that the financial sector serves the real economy. The Commission is also examining whether legislation may be necessary to address problems around shadow banking and has set up a High-level group chaired by Mr Liikanen, Governor of the Central Bank of Finland, to analyse whether additional measures relating to the structure of banks will be needed. This Group is expected to deliver its recommendations in autumn.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> 'CRD III'.

<sup>(2)</sup> COM(2011) 453 final.

<sup>(3)</sup> COM(2010) 301 final — Regulating financial services for sustainable growth — 2 June 2010. More information at: [http://ec.europa.eu/internal\\_market/finances/policy/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/finances/policy/index_en.htm)

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005208/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(23 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Difetto su elicotteri

Durante l'esecuzione dei controlli pre-volo sono state rilevate crepe sul disco inferiore di due elicotteri. Le microfessure trovate su questi velivoli difettosi potrebbero portare ad un'ulteriore propagazione del danno, con la possibilità di giungere alla rottura del disco, con conseguente perdita dell'elicottero.

Le agenzie addette a garantire la sicurezza dei voli chiedono tuttavia agli operatori che fanno uso dell'elicottero civile e della sua versione militare di ispezionare visualmente il sistema di rotore prima di ogni volo per assicurarsi che non ci siano crepe ed, eventualmente, sostituire il rotore principale. Il modello in questione è anche stato fonte di numerose critiche da parte di utenti sia civili che militari. In Svizzera è stato sottoposto a una serie di critiche da parte della stampa.

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

1. se è a conoscenza del difetto riscontrato sugli elicotteri;
2. quali norme sono state adottate dall'UE nel settore della sicurezza del volo;
3. se intende intervenire per approfondire la questione e garantire la sicurezza dei passeggeri che usufruiscono del mezzo in questione?

**Risposta di Siim Kallas a nome della Commissione**

(16 luglio 2012)

Nel settore dell'aviazione civile la sicurezza di volo è disciplinata dal regolamento (CE) n. 216/2008<sup>(1)</sup>. Oltre a stabilire i requisiti essenziali comuni per un livello elevato e uniforme di sicurezza nel settore dell'aviazione civile e di protezione dell'ambiente e a istituire un'Agenzia europea della sicurezza aerea (AESA), tale regolamento impone l'adozione, da parte della Commissione, di norme attuative specifiche per garantirne l'applicazione uniforme. I requisiti comuni nel settore dell'aviazione in materia di aeronavigabilità, oggetto dell'interrogazione scritta, sono definiti nei regolamenti della Commissione (CE) n. 1702/2003<sup>(2)</sup> e (CE) n. 2042/2003<sup>(3)</sup>.

I controlli da effettuare prima del volo, cui si fa riferimento nell'interrogazione, sono parte integrante delle procedure relative all'aeronavigabilità continua e delle cosiddette operazioni di manutenzione preventiva. Lo scopo di tale manutenzione è garantire l'idoneità dell'elicottero al volo in ogni ambiente e circostanza per cui è stato progettato e cui può pertanto essere esposto.

Qualora il livello di sicurezza di un elicottero rischi palesemente di essere compromesso, l'AESA può emanare, a norma del regolamento (CE) n. 1702/2003 della Commissione, una direttiva di aeronavigabilità che precisi le azioni da eseguire al fine di ripristinare un adeguato livello di sicurezza. Per quanto riguarda gli elicotteri del tipo EC-135 cui si fa riferimento nell'interrogazione, sulla base delle informazioni supplementari fornite dall'onorevole parlamentare, il 17 maggio 2012 l'AESA ha emesso la direttiva di aeronavigabilità d'emergenza n. 2012-0085-E per garantire la sicurezza dei passeggeri che utilizzano tali elicotteri. L'indagine relativa a questo modello di elicottero è ancora in corso e la causa delle incrinature non è ancora stata determinata. La suddetta direttiva di aeronavigabilità di emergenza è da considerarsi un provvedimento provvisorio e potrà essere seguita dall'adozione di ulteriori iniziative in questo senso.

<sup>(1)</sup> GUL 79 del 19.3.2008, pag. 1.

<sup>(2)</sup> GUL 243 del 27.9.2003, pag. 6.

<sup>(3)</sup> GUL 315 del 28.1.2003, pag. 1.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005208/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(23 May 2012)

*Subject:* Helicopter defects

During pre-flight checks, cracks have been detected on the lower disc of two helicopters. The micro-fissures on these faulty aircraft could lead to further damage. They could even cause the disc to crack open with the ensuing loss of the helicopter.

The agencies responsible for flight safety, however, ask operators who use civilian helicopters and their military versions to perform visual inspections of the rotor system before each flight to make sure there are no cracks and, if necessary, to replace the main rotor. The model in question has also been criticised by both civilian and military users and has been subject to criticism from the Swiss press.

In view of the above, can the Commission state:

1. whether it is aware of the defect found on the helicopters;
2. what rules have been adopted by the EU with regard to flight safety;
3. whether it intends to take action to investigate the issue and ensure the safety of passengers who use the helicopters in question?

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

(16 July 2012)

Flight safety in the field of the aviation is governed by Regulation (EC) No 216/2008 <sup>(1)</sup>. While the aforementioned Regulation establishes common essential requirements to provide for a high uniform level of civil aviation safety and environmental protection and establishes a European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA), it also requires the adoption by the Commission of specific implementing rules to ensure their uniform application. Common aviation requirements in the field of airworthiness, which is the subject of the question, are contained in Commission Regulation (EC) No 1702/2003 <sup>(2)</sup> and in Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 <sup>(3)</sup>.

Pre-flight checks referenced in the question are part of the continuing airworthiness procedures and the so-called preventive maintenance procedures. The purpose of this maintenance is to ensure the fitness of the helicopter for flight in all the environments and circumstances for which it has been designed and to which it may therefore be exposed.

When evidence shows that the safety level of a helicopter may be compromised, an Airworthiness Directive (AD), which mandates specific actions to restore an acceptable level of safety, may be issued by EASA in accordance with Commission Regulation (EC) No 1702/2003. With regard to the helicopters of the type EC-135 referred to in the question on the basis of the supplemental information provided by the Honourable Member, EASA issued on 17 May 2012 the emergency AD No 2012-0085-E to ensure the safety of passengers who use these helicopters. The investigation on this helicopter type is still ongoing and the cause of the cracking has not been determined yet. This emergency AD is considered to be an interim action and further AD actions may follow.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 79, 19.3.2008, p. 1.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 243, 27.9.2003, p. 6.

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ L 315, 28.1.2003, p. 1.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005209/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(23 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Fibrillazione atriale

La fibrillazione atriale è una frequente anomalia del ritmo cardiaco a causa della quale il sangue, non pompato più correttamente, ristagna all'interno delle camere superiori del cuore (gli atri), favorendo la formazione di trombi che, se entrano nel circolo sanguigno, possono arrivare al cervello e provocare un ictus cerebrale. Attualmente si stima che in Europa oltre 6 milioni di persone siano affette da questa patologia, anche se ci si aspetta un'ulteriore crescita, in quanto legata all'invecchiamento della popolazione. Questa aritmia cardiaca è causa del 15-20 % di tutti gli ictus tromboembolici, il disturbo cardiovascolare più comune dopo le cardiopatie, che colpisce 9,6 milioni di persone in Europa, con un'incidenza di 2 milioni di soggetti l'anno. Inoltre, gli ictus collegati a fibrillazione atriale sono più gravi, provocano invalidità maggiori e sono associati a un aumento del 70 % del tasso di mortalità rispetto agli eventi che colpiscono chi non ne è affetto.

Alla luce di quanto suesposto, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Esiste una strategia europea sulla malattia summenzionata e vi sono nuove ricerche in campo sanitario finanziate nell'ambito del Settimo programma quadro per la ricerca e lo sviluppo tecnologico?
2. Vi sono medicinali, che hanno avuto l'autorizzazione alla vendita all'interno dell'UE dall'Agenzia europea per i medicinali (EMA), per contrastare la malattia in questione?

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

(3 luglio 2012)

Non esiste una strategia europea in tema di fibrillazione atriale. Tuttavia il processo di riflessione della Commissione in tema di malattie croniche basato sulle conclusioni del Consiglio relative a «Approcci innovativi alle malattie croniche nella sanità pubblica e nei sistemi di assistenza sanitaria <sup>(1)</sup>» affronterà la problematica della fibrillazione atriale nel contesto più ampio delle altre malattie croniche.

La Commissione ha rilasciato autorizzazioni alla commercializzazione su scala UE con le seguenti indicazioni:

- prevenzione degli eventi aterotrombotici e tromboembolici nei pazienti affetti da fibrillazione atriale per quanto concerne i medicinali Iscover (clopidogrel), Plavix (clopidogrel come idrogeno solfato), Clopidogrel Zentiva;
- prevenzione dell'ictus e dell'embolia sistemica in pazienti con fibrillazione atriale per i medicinali Pradaxa 110 mg e 150 mg (dabigatran) e Xarelto 15 mg e 20 mg (rivaroxaban);
- fibrillazione atriale: Multaq (dronedarone) e Brinavess (vernakalant).

Inoltre esistono medicinali generici autorizzati su scala UE contenenti clopidogrel quale sostanza attiva da usarsi nella prevenzione degli eventi aterotrombotici in pazienti colpiti da ictus ischemico.

La Commissione supporta la ricerca sulla fibrillazione atriale nell'ambito del Settimo programma quadro di ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico (2007-2013 <sup>(2)</sup>) dell'UE attraverso il progetto EUTRAF <sup>(3)</sup> (con una dotazione di 12 milioni di EUR). Tale consorzio, costituito di ricercatori europei di punta, intende esplorare i meccanismi della malattia e sviluppare migliori strumenti diagnostici e nuove terapie per i pazienti colpiti da fibrillazione atriale.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms\\_Data/docs/pressdata/en/lsa/118282.pdf](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/lsa/118282.pdf)

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/health/home\\_en.html](http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/health/home_en.html)

<sup>(3)</sup> <http://www.eutraef.eu/>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005209/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(23 May 2012)

*Subject:* Atrial fibrillation

Atrial fibrillation is a common cardiac rhythm anomaly which causes blood to build up in the upper chambers of the heart (the atria). The fact that blood is no longer being pumped around the body normally encourages the formation of clots, which, if they enter the bloodstream, can reach the brain and cause a stroke. It is estimated that more than 6 million people in Europe are currently affected by this condition, and a further increase is expected, given the connection between the prevalence of the disease and an ageing population. This form of cardiac arrhythmia causes 15-20% of all thromboembolic strokes; it affects 2 million people in Europe every year, making it the most common cardiovascular disorder after cardiopathy (9.6 million). In addition, strokes linked to atrial fibrillation are more serious, cause more severe disabilities and are 70% more likely to result in death than other types of stroke.

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

1. Is there a European strategy on atrial fibrillation and is new research into the disease being funded under the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development?
2. Has the European Medicines Agency authorised for sale in the EU drugs designed to combat this disease?

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

(3 July 2012)

There is no European strategy on atrial fibrillation. However, the chronic disease reflection process of the Commission based on the Council conclusions on 'Innovative approaches for chronic diseases in public health and healthcare systems' <sup>(1)</sup> will address atrial fibrillation in the wider context of other chronic diseases.

The Commission has granted EU-wide marketing authorisations with the following indications:

- prevention of atherothrombotic and thromboembolic events in patients with atrial fibrillation to the medicinal products Iscover (clopidogrel), Plavix (clopidogrel hydrogen sulphate), Clopidogrel Zentiva;
- prevention of stroke and systemic embolism in patients with atrial fibrillation to Pradaxa 110 mg and 150 mg (dabigatran) and Xarelto 15 mg and 20 mg (rivaroxaban);
- atrial fibrillation: Multaq (dronedarone) and Brinavess (vernakalant).

Moreover, there are EU-authorized generic medicinal products containing clopidogrel as an active substance for use in prevention of atherothrombotic events in patients suffering from ischemic stroke.

The Commission is supporting research on atrial fibrillation under the EU 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (2007-2013 <sup>(2)</sup>) through the EUTRAF project <sup>(3)</sup> (EUR 12 million). This consortium, composed of top European researchers, aims to explore disease mechanisms and to develop better diagnostic means and new therapies in patients with atrial fibrillation.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms\\_Data/docs/pressdata/en/lsa/118282.pdf](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/lsa/118282.pdf)

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/health/home\\_en.html](http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/health/home_en.html)

<sup>(3)</sup> <http://www.eutraf.eu/>

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005210/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(23 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: La politica protezionistica dell'Argentina

Il giro di vite della politica protezionistica del governo di Buenos Aires ha investito anche l'import di prodotti suini con lo stop all'ingresso di prosciutti e salumi provenienti da Italia, Spagna e Brasile.

Gli allevatori e gli industriali argentini hanno firmato un accordo per autolimitarsi negli acquisti di materie prime suine dall'estero e per migliorare la propria produzione nei prossimi anni in cambio dello stop di tutte le importazioni di prosciutto. Intesa che è stata accolta dal governo argentino, il quale ha provveduto immediatamente al blocco dell'import. Nel 2011 l'Argentina ha acquistato 274 tonnellate di prosciutti dalla Spagna; 199 tonnellate dall'Italia e 241 dal Brasile. Si tratta di un atto che danneggia l'export europeo agro-alimentare che fattura solo in Italia circa 30 miliardi l'anno. È una misura in netto contrasto con le regole del commercio internazionale.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione far sapere se l'UE sta valutando se si configura una violazione degli accordi internazionali sul libero scambio e, in caso affermativo, come intende intervenire?

**Risposta di Karel De Gucht a nome della Commissione**

(20 giugno 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza del problema sollevato dall'onorevole parlamentare e segue la questione da vicino.

Il 25 maggio 2012 l'UE ha avviato la procedura formale di consultazioni in vista della composizione di una controversia in seno all'Organizzazione mondiale del commercio (OMC) contro la politica di sostituzione delle importazioni e le restrizioni alle importazioni adottate dall'Argentina, compresi i recenti provvedimenti emanati per il settore delle carni.

In numerose occasioni, a livello sia bilaterale sia multilaterale, l'UE aveva già espresso agli organi dell'OMC la sua preoccupazione per un'ampia serie di restrizioni all'importazione adottate dall'Argentina (ad esempio, da ultimo, il 30 marzo 2012 con una dura presa di posizione in seno al Consiglio per gli scambi di merci, sostenuta da 19 membri dell'OMC), ma senza risultato.

L'OMC costituisce il forum appropriato per comporre le dispute commerciali tra i suoi membri come l'UE e l'Argentina. La decisione dell'UE rappresenta un chiaro segnale che essa non tollera misure che violano le norme internazionali e che è intenzionata ad agire con fermezza contro i provvedimenti protezionistici adottati dall'Argentina o da qualsiasi altro partner commerciale.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005210/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(23 May 2012)

*Subject:* Protectionist policy in Argentina

The protectionist policy clampdown of the Buenos Aires Government has also affected the import of pork products, with a halt on the entry of hams and cured meats from Italy, Spain and Brazil.

Argentinean farmers and manufacturers have signed an agreement whereby purchases of pork raw materials from abroad will be limited and domestic production will be increased in the coming years in exchange for a total halt on ham imports. This agreement has been accepted by the Argentine Government, which has immediately imposed a block on imports. In 2011, Argentina purchased 274 tonnes of ham from Spain, 199 tonnes from Italy and 241 tonnes from Brazil. This act damages European agri-food exports, which amount to some EUR 30 billion per year in Italy alone. This measure is clearly contrary to the rules of international trade.

In view of the above, can the Commission state whether the EU is determining whether this constitutes a violation of international agreements on free trade, and if so, how does it intend to intervene?

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

(20 June 2012)

The Commission is aware and following closely the matter referred to by the Honourable Member.

On 25 May 2012, the EU launched a formal process of dispute settlement consultations in the World Trade Organisation (WTO) against the import substitution policy and import restricting measures introduced by Argentina, including the recent measures applied to meat products.

The EU had already raised concerns on a broad range of import restricting measures in Argentina on numerous occasions both bilaterally and multilaterally at WTO bodies (e.g. with the last strong statement in Trade in Good Council on 30 March 2012 supported by 19 WTO Members), but to no avail.

The WTO is the adequate forum to address trade disputes between WTO Members like the EU and Argentina. This decision is a clear signal that the EU does not tolerate measures in violation of international rules and is determined to act firmly against protectionist measures by Argentina or by any other partner.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005211/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(23 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Moria di pesci

Come nel maggio di due anni fa, si sta assistendo ad una moria di pesci (carpe) in Basilicata. Gli agricoltori della zona hanno subito lanciato l'allarme, sperando che si intervenga al più presto per svelare questo mistero e individuare le cause. Di qui l'appello anche a prelevare con urgenza le carcasse dei pesci per poter effettuare esami tossicologici. Due anni fa, invece, gli animali furono esaminati quand'erano già in avanzato stato di decomposizione.

Le carpe, stando alle analisi del settembre 2011, non sono morte né per colpa di qualche alga tossica né per la presenza di metalli pesanti. Un'alga tossica aveva fatto la sua comparsa seminando il panico in uno specchio d'acqua nella vicina Puglia. Questo fatto aveva generato il sospetto che le micro tossine di quell'alga fossero state trasportate dagli uccelli migratori. Ma le analisi lo hanno escluso, così come avrebbero escluso la presenza di metalli pesanti nelle acque del lago.

Questa nuova moria di pesci fa scattare nuovamente l'allarme inquinamento e probabilmente accelerare i tempi per una valutazione dello stato ecologico del luogo interessato. Occhi puntati anche sui depuratori e sulle case isolate della zona per verificare che scarichino in modo corretto i loro reflui.

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

1. è a conoscenza della vicenda che sta interessando la Basilicata?
2. può fornire dati su eventuali casi simili nelle acque dell'Unione europea?
3. intende prendere misure intese ad evitare che si ripetano questi casi?

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

(10 luglio 2012)

La Commissione non è a conoscenza di questo incidente. La moria di pesci può avvenire per vari motivi, ad esempio l'inquinamento accidentale e/o l'inquinamento cronico legato alle specifiche condizioni meteorologiche (ad esempio periodi di bassa marea e temperature elevate). Gli Stati membri non sono tenuti a riferire alla Commissione su tali incidenti.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005211/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(23 May 2012)

*Subject:* Fish kill

Following a similar incident which occurred two years ago, there has now been a new fish kill (carp) in Basilicata. Local farmers immediately reported the incident in the hope that immediate action would be taken to shed light on the matter and identify the causes. To this end, a call has been made for specimens of the dead fish to be collected without delay so that toxicological tests may be carried out; the fish that died two years ago were not examined until they were already in an advanced state of decomposition.

According to the tests carried out in September 2011, the carp did not die because of toxic algae or the presence of heavy metals. The discovery of toxic algae in a lake in neighbouring Puglia had given rise to serious concerns, and it was suspected that the micro-toxins from those algae might have been spread by migratory birds. However, this was ruled out by the tests, as was the presence of heavy metals in the lake's waters.

This new fish kill has again sparked serious concern about pollution and made it all the more necessary for the ecological status of the affected area to be assessed without delay. Attention is being focused on the sewage plants and isolated houses in the area, in order to establish whether they are discharging their effluent correctly.

In view of the above, can the Commission say whether:

1. it is aware of the above incident in Basilicata;
2. it can provide information on any similar cases that have occurred in the European Union;
3. it intends to take steps to prevent any recurrence of such incidents?

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

(10 July 2012)

The Commission is not aware of this incident. Fish kills may happen due to a variety of reasons, e.g. accidental pollution and/or chronic pollution linked to specific meteorological conditions (e.g. periods of low flow and high temperatures). The Member States are not obliged to report such incidents to the Commission.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005213/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(23 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Sostegno alla crisi

Per l'Unione europea, importante potenza commerciale dotata di un mercato unico, coordinare le politiche economiche nazionali è un'esigenza naturale. Solo così l'Unione può reagire rapidamente a sfide come quella rappresentata dall'attuale crisi economica e finanziaria. Questa cooperazione permette inoltre all'UE di dare una risposta coordinata ai problemi economici e finanziari globali e di affrontare meglio gli shock esterni.

Il consolidamento di bilancio e la crescita devono camminare di pari passo: questa la linea concordata dai partner europei. La necessità è quella di portare avanti un piano per gli investimenti e per lo sviluppo. Gli Eurobond sono un asset importante ed economicamente valido nel quadro delle misure destinate a fronteggiare la crisi.

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

1. quali ulteriori iniziative sono state attivate dall'UE allo scopo di contrastare la crisi economica e finanziaria?
2. a quanto ammontano i contributi del Fondo monetario internazionale per il sostegno complessivo alla stabilità finanziaria degli Stati membri?

**Risposta di Olli Rehn a nome della Commissione**

(20 agosto 2012)

Per contrastare la crisi l'UE ha adottato numerose iniziative, contenute nella tabella di marcia per la stabilità e la crescita <sup>(1)</sup> presentata dalla Commissione. Sono stati realizzati progressi su tutti i fronti: la Grecia, gli strumenti di protezione finanziaria, le misure immediate per migliorare la stabilità e la crescita, i bilanci delle banche, la riforma della *governance* economica. In questo sforzo rientra anche l'attuazione di politiche intese a rafforzare la crescita nel quadro del semestre europeo <sup>(2)</sup>. La Commissione ha inoltre presentato una serie di proposte <sup>(3)</sup> intese a dare impulso alla crescita, tra cui l'aumento del capitale della BEI, prestiti obbligazionari per il finanziamento di progetti, la riassegnazione di fondi strutturali e misure per consolidare il mercato interno. Tali misure sono contenute nel patto per la crescita e l'occupazione, adottato nel corso del Consiglio europeo dello scorso giugno. La Commissione ha inoltre dichiarato la necessità di compiere passi concreti verso la realizzazione di una vera e propria Unione economica e monetaria dotata di un'unione bancaria, di un quadro di bilancio e un quadro economico più integrati e di una più forte legittimità democratica. Nel corso del Consiglio europeo di giugno, il Presidente del Consiglio europeo — insieme al presidente della Commissione europea, al presidente dell'Eurogruppo e al presidente della Banca centrale europea — ha presentato la relazione «Verso un'autentica Unione economica e monetaria». Si sta attualmente lavorando su un calendario specifico e con scadenze esatte, e una relazione intermedia sarà presentata in autunno. La Commissione intende presentare proposte legislative su un meccanismo di vigilanza unico per le banche in settembre.

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2011)669 definitivo, 12 ottobre 2011.

<sup>(2)</sup> Cfr. le raccomandazioni specifiche per paese della Commissione:

[http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/index_en.htm)

<sup>(3)</sup> <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/12/313&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005213/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(23 May 2012)

*Subject:* Support for the crisis

For the European Union, a major trading power with a single market, coordinating national economic policy is a natural requirement. Only in this way can the Union react rapidly to challenges such as that posed by the current financial crisis. Furthermore, this cooperation allows the EU to give a coordinated response to global economic problems and to cope better with external shocks.

The EU partners have agreed that budgetary consolidation and growth must go hand in hand. A plan for investment and development needs to be put into action. Eurobonds are an important and economically valid asset within the framework of the measures aimed at tackling the crisis.

In view of the above:

1. What further measures have been taken by the EU with a view to countering the economic and financial crisis?
2. What amount has the International Monetary Fund contributed for overall support of the financial stability of Member States?

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

(20 August 2012)

The EU has taken many measures to tackle the crisis. The Roadmap towards Stability and Growth <sup>(1)</sup> presented by the Commission is a comprehensive blueprint for tackling the crisis. Progress has been made on all elements: Greece, financial firewalls; banks' balance sheets; frontloading stability and growth enhancing measures; economic governance reform. The implementation of growth-enhancing policies under the European Semester is also part of this effort <sup>(2)</sup>. The Commission has also presented <sup>(3)</sup> a range of proposals to boost growth, including an increase of EIB capital, project bonds, reallocation of structural funds and measures to deepen the Single Market. These proposals are reflected in the Compact for Growth and Jobs, decided at the June European Council. The Commission has also made clear the need for concrete steps to deliver a genuine Economic and Monetary Union with a banking union, more integrated budgetary and economic frameworks and stronger democratic legitimacy. At the June European Council the President of the European Council, with the President of the Commission and the Presidents of the Euro Group and the European Central Bank, presented the report 'Towards a Genuine Economic and Monetary Union'. Further work on a specific and time-bound roadmap is underway and an interim report will be presented in the autumn. The Commission intends to present legislative proposals on a single supervisory mechanism for banks in September.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2011) 669 final, 12 October 2011.

<sup>(2)</sup> See the Commission's country-specific recommendations:

[http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/index_en.htm)

<sup>(3)</sup> <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/12/313&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005214/12  
do Komisji**

**Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE)**

(23 maja 2012 r.)

*Przedmiot:* Unijne wymogi dotyczące blankietowej retencji danych o ruchu telekomunikacyjnym (dyrektywa 2006/24/WE)

Dyrektywa dotycząca retencji danych zobowiązuje do zbierania danych o wszystkich połączeniach wykonywanych przez wszystkich użytkowników telekomunikacji, niezależnie od podejrzenia lub postępowania związanego z popełnieniem przestępstwa. W związku z tym pojawia się duże ryzyko ujawnienia – poprzez „wycieki danych” lub nadużycia – prywatnej informacji o obywatelach UE. Obawiam się, że tak daleko idąca ingerencja w życie prywatne obywateli jest nieproporcjonalna do celu, jakim jest zwalczanie przestępczości w cyberprzestrzeni. Wydaje się, że ukierunkowany system zbierania danych o ruchu telekomunikacyjnym, jak na przykład system zabezpieczania danych w związku z określonym podejrzeniem popełnienia czynu zabronionego, byłby wystarczającym i tym samym właściwym środkiem do osiągnięcia wspomnianego celu.

Komisja Europejska, odpowiadając na interpelacje poselskie w tej sprawie, 1 lutego 2012 r. oraz 19 kwietnia 2012 r., wskazała, że przeprowadziła konsultacje z zainteresowanymi stronami, a także zasięgała opinii publicznej w tej kwestii i że wnioski zostaną przeanalizowane w ocenie wpływów. W związku z tym chciałabym zapytać Komisję, czy znane są już możliwe opcje rewizji dyrektywy? Kiedy Komisja przedstawi wspomnianą analizę wpływu?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Cecilję Malmström w imieniu Komisji**

(24 lipca 2012 r.)

Jak wskazano w odpowiedziach na odnośne pytania poselskie, udzielonych w dniach 1 lutego 2012 r. i 19 kwietnia 2012 r., Komisja przeprowadziła konsultacje z zainteresowanymi stronami i opinią publiczną na temat sposobu, w jaki należy dokonać rewizji ram prawnych UE w dziedzinie przechowywania danych. Wszystkie odpowiedzi zostały starannie przeanalizowane. Na tej podstawie Komisja uważa, że ewentualna rewizja dyrektywy dotyczącej zatrzymywania danych powinna zagwarantować, że zatrzymane dane będą wykorzystywane wyłącznie do celów przewidzianych w tej dyrektywie, a nie do innych celów, jak obecnie zezwalają na to przepisy dyrektywy dotyczącej ochrony prywatności w sektorze łączności elektronicznej (dyrektywa 2002/58/WE). Jeśli chodzi o przyszłe działania, Komisja informuje, że zostały one opisane w odpowiedzi na pytanie poselskie E-5140/12 <sup>(1)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/pl/parliamentary-questions.html>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005214/12  
to the Commission**

**Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE)**

(23 May 2012)

*Subject:* EU requirements for the blanket retention of telecommunications traffic data (Directive 2006/24/EC)

The Data Retention Directive requires the collection of data on all calls made by all telecommunications users, regardless of whether there are suspicions of a crime or evidence of criminal behaviour. This creates a high risk of disclosure — through ‘data leaks’ or abuse — of the private information of EU citizens. I fear that such far-reaching interference in citizens’ private lives is disproportionate to the objective of combating crime in cyberspace. It seems that a targeted telecommunications traffic data collection system, such as, for example, a system for securing data when a crime is suspected, would constitute a sufficient and, ipso facto, appropriate means of achieving the aforesaid objective.

In its replies, given on 1 February 2012 and 19 April 2012, to parliamentary questions in this matter, the Commission indicated that it had carried out consultations with stakeholders and the public in this matter, and that the conclusions would be analysed in an impact assessment. Does the Commission know what the possible options for the revision of the directive are? Will the Commission provide the aforementioned impact analysis?

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

(24 July 2012)

As stated in its replies, given on 1 February 2012 and 19 April 2012, to parliamentary questions on this matter, the Commission has carried out consultations with stakeholders and the public on how to revise the EU legal framework for data retention. All responses have been carefully considered. On that basis, the Commission considers that any revision of the Data Retention Directive should ensure that retained data will be used exclusively for the purposes foreseen in the Data Retention Directive, and not for other purposes as currently allowed by the E-Privacy Directive (Directive 2002/58/EC). With respect to future steps, the Commission refers to its reply to Parliamentary Question E-5140/12 <sup>(1)</sup>.

---

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

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-005215/12**  
**adresată Comisiei**  
**Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**  
(23 mai 2012)

*Subiect:* Suspendarea plăților în cadrul POSDRU — România

Oficialitățile române au anunțat că, în urma rezultatelor a două misiuni de audit, Comisia Europeană intenționează să suspende plățile în cadrul POSDRU (programul operațional pentru dezvoltarea resurselor umane). Potrivit oficialilor români, deficiențele constatate în proiectele finanțate sunt legate de nivelul salarizării persoanelor implicate. Comisia este rugată să prezinte un punct oficial de vedere cu privire la aceste afirmații.

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

Auditorii Comisiei Europene au identificat deficiențe grave în sistemele de gestionare și de control ale Programului operațional privind dezvoltarea resurselor umane pentru perioada 2007-2013, în cursul misiunii de audit desfășurate în România în lunile aprilie și mai ale acestui an. Deficiențele au fost legate în principal de selecția operațiunilor și de verificările de gestiune, incluzând cazuri de salarii disproporționate și nejustificate. Comisia analizează în prezent aceste constatări.

În conformitate cu procedura oficială aflată în vigoare, proiectul de raport de audit în limba engleză va fi trimis României în termen de două luni de la sfârșitul perioadei de lucru pe teren (la sfârșitul lunii iunie 2012). După primirea proiectului de raport de audit în limba română, autoritățile române au la dispoziție două luni pentru a formula un răspuns (procedura contradictorie) și a prezenta un plan de acțiune care să abordeze recomandările din proiectul de raport de audit. Auditorii Comisiei au la dispoziție o lună pentru a analiza răspunsul și a elabora raportul final de audit. Recomandările vor trebui apoi puse în aplicare de România, în conformitate cu planul de acțiune stabilit și cu termenele corespunzătoare.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005215/12  
to the Commission**

**Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**

(23 May 2012)

*Subject:* Suspension of POSDRU payments in Romania

The Romanian authorities have announced that, based on the findings of two audit missions, the Commission intends to suspend payments under the POSDRU operational programme for the development of human resources. According to Romanian officials, the shortcomings detected in the projects financed relate to the salary levels of those involved in the projects. What is the Commission's official position as regards these assertions?

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

(28 June 2012)

The European Commission's auditors have identified serious deficiencies in the management and control systems of the Human Resources Development Operational Programme 2007-2013 during the audit mission carried out in Romania in April and May this year. The deficiencies were mainly related to the selection of operations and management verifications, including cases of disproportionate and unjustified salaries. The Commission is currently analysing the findings.

In accordance with the formal procedure in place, the draft audit report in English will be sent to Romania within two months from the end of the field work (end June 2012). After receiving the draft audit report in Romanian, the Romanian authorities have up to two months to reply (contradictory procedure) and to present an Action Plan addressing the recommendations in the draft audit report. The Commission auditors have one month to analyse the reply and to draft the final audit report. The recommendations will then have to be implemented by Romania, according to the established Action Plan and the corresponding deadlines.

---

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-005216/12**  
**adresată Comisiei**  
**Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**  
(23 mai 2012)

*Subiect:* Schimbarea procedurii de numire a procurorului general și a procurorilor șefi

Noul Guvern din România a anunțat că intenționează să adopte măsuri pentru schimbarea procedurii de numire a procurorului general și a procurorilor șefi ai DNA (Direcția Națională Anticorupție) și DIICOT (Direcția de Investigare a Infracțiunilor de Criminalitate Organizată și Terorism). Având în vedere prevederile cuprinse în Mecanismul de Cooperare și Verificare (Decizia Comisiei 2006/928/CE din 13 decembrie 2006 de stabilire a unui mecanism de cooperare și de verificare a progresului realizat de România în vederea atingerii anumitor obiective de referință specifice în domeniul reformei sistemului judiciar și al luptei împotriva corupției), Comisia este rugată să comenteze această propunere anunțată.

**Răspuns dat de dl Barroso în numele Comisiei**  
(9 iulie 2012)

Comisia nu are cunoștință de nicio inițiativă juridică pentru schimbarea procedurii de numire a procurorului general și a procurorilor șefi ai Direcției Naționale Anticorupție (DNA).

În contextul mecanismului de cooperare și de verificare (Decizia 2006/928/CE a Comisiei din 13 decembrie 2006 <sup>(1)</sup>), România s-a angajat să asigure stabilitatea juridică și instituțională a cadrului de combatere a corupției din România și să mențină procedura de numire și de revocare a procurorului general și a procurorilor șefi ai Direcției Naționale Anticorupție (DNA).

Modificarea acestor proceduri ar constitui, prin urmare, o abatere de la angajamentele asumate de România la momentul aderării, în contextul mecanismului de cooperare și de verificare.

---

(<sup>1</sup>) JO L 354, 14.12.2006.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005216/12  
to the Commission**

**Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**

(23 May 2012)

*Subject:* Change of procedure for the appointment of the Attorney General and Chief Prosecutors

The new Romanian Government has announced its intention to adopt measures to change the procedure for appointing the Attorney General and Chief Prosecutors of the National Anti-Corruption Directorate (NDA) and the Directorate for the Investigation of Organised Crime and Terrorism Offences (DIOCT). Given the provisions set out in the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism (Commission Decision 2006/928/EC of 13 December 2006 establishing a mechanism for cooperation and verification of progress made in Romania to address specific benchmarks in the areas of judicial reform and the fight against corruption), can the Commission comment on the announced proposal?

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

(9 July 2012)

The Commission is not aware of any legal initiative to change the appointment procedure for the Prosecutor General and the Chief Prosecutor of the National Anti-Corruption Directorate (DNA).

In the context of the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism (Commission Decision 2006/928 EC of 13 December 2006 <sup>(1)</sup>), Romania committed to ensure the legal and institutional stability of the Romanian anti-corruption framework and to maintain the nomination and revocation procedure for the General Prosecutor and the Chief Prosecutor of the National Anti-Corruption Directorate (DNA).

Changes to these procedures would therefore go counter Romania's commitments taken upon accession in the context of the CVM.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 354, 14.12.2006.

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-005217/12**  
**adresată Comisiei**  
**Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**  
(23 mai 2012)

*Subiect:* Studiu realizat de Asociația Slovacă a Consumatorilor

În 2009 am adresat Comisiei întrebarea E-4962/2009, în care sesizam faptul că, în UE, produsele sunt oferite uneori în diferite țări sub aceeași marcă, însă cu o formulă diferită a produsului. Supun atenției Comisiei rezultatele unui studiu realizat în acest an de Asociația Slovacă a Consumatorilor. În cadrul studiului, au fost testate produse cumpărate din supermarketuri din opt state membre ale UE: Germania, Austria, Republica Cehă, Polonia, Slovacia, Ungaria, România și Bulgaria. Concluziile au arătat că produsele de o mai proastă calitate erau destinate „noilor” state membre și nu erau prezente în Germania sau Austria. Asociația a apreciat că, în cazul în care companiile oferă garanții de calitate, acestea ar trebui să fie onorate în toate țările de distribuție.

Ca răspuns la întrebarea menționată E-4962/2009, Comisia a afirmat că „lucrează în mod continuu la îmbunătățirea nivelului de protecție a intereselor economice ale consumatorilor europeni, în special prin punerea la dispoziția acestora a unor mijloace pentru a le permite să ia decizii comerciale informate și prin interzicerea practicilor comerciale neloiale”. Ce măsuri a adoptat Comisia pentru a reglementa situațiile precum cele menționate, din 2009 până în prezent? Ce măsuri intenționează să propună având în vedere rezultatele studiului citat?

**Răspuns dat de dl Dalli în numele Comisiei**  
(3 iulie 2012)

Comisia recomandă distinsului membru să consulte răspunsul său la întrebările scrise E-04388/2011, E-09773/2011, E-11053/2011 și E-001581/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

Astfel cum se indică în răspunsul Comisiei la întrebarea scrisă E 4962/2009, este posibil ca utilizarea unei mărci bine-cunoscute pentru comercializarea, într-o anumită țară, a unor produse de o calitate inferioară celor disponibile pe alte piețe să fie, în anumite circumstanțe, înșelătoare, și astfel interzisă în temeiul Directivei privind practicile comerciale neloiale <sup>(2)</sup> („Directiva PCN”). Cu toate acestea, este de competența principală a autorităților și a instanțelor naționale să investigheze practicile societăților individuale în lumina legislației UE.

Agenda consumatorului european <sup>(3)</sup> adoptată recent indică punerea în aplicare a Directivei PCN drept una dintre activitățile sale prioritare. Experiența acumulată cu privire la aplicarea directivei a arătat necesitatea asumării unui rol mai important de către Comisie în ceea ce privește supravegherea și coordonarea punerii în aplicare a directivei de către statele membre. Pentru aceasta, Comisia va spori coordonarea acțiunilor de aplicare a normelor privind practicile comerciale neloiale și va actualiza ghidul privind aplicarea directivei.

Ca un prim pas, Comisia intenționează să publice un raport privind aplicarea Directivei PCN în septembrie 2012. Acest raport va oferi, în special, o imagine de ansamblu a punerii în aplicare a directivei în statele membre și va furniza o listă a celor mai frecvente practici comerciale neloiale întâlnite.

În cadrul celui mai recent Summit european dedicat consumatorilor, din data de 29 mai 2012, a fost lansat un dialog cu părțile interesate pentru elaborarea unor coduri de bună conduită, a unor ghiduri de bune practici și a unor orientări pentru asigurarea unor instrumente de comparare a prețurilor și a calității transparente și fiabile — anunțate în Comunicarea privind comerțul electronic din 2012 <sup>(4)</sup>.

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

<sup>(2)</sup> Directiva 2005/29/CE privind practicile comerciale neloiale, JO L 149, 11.6.2005.

<sup>(3)</sup> Comunicarea Comisiei intitulată „O agendă a consumatorului european — stimularea încrederii și a creșterii economice”, COM (2012) 225 final.

<sup>(4)</sup> Comunicarea Comisiei privind un cadru coerent pentru consolidarea încrederii în piața unică digitală pentru comerțul electronic și serviciile online (ianuarie 2012).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005217/12  
to the Commission**

**Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**

(23 May 2012)

*Subject:* Study carried out by the Slovak Association of Consumers

In 2009, I addressed a question to the Commission (E-4962/2009), in which I cited the fact that in the EU, products are sometimes on offer under the same brand name in different countries, but with a different product formulation. I would draw the Commission's attention to the results of a study carried out this year by the Slovak Association of Consumers. In the study, products bought from supermarkets in eight Member States were tested: Germany, Austria, the Czech Republic, Poland, Slovakia, Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria. The findings showed that poorer quality products were destined for the 'new' Member States and were not on sale in Germany or Austria. The Association said that, where companies offer quality guarantees, they should be honoured in all countries of distribution.

In response to Question E-4962/2009, the Commission stated that it 'is continuously working on improving the level of protection of the economic interests of European consumers, in particular by empowering them to take informed transactional decisions and by prohibiting unfair commercial practices'. What measures has the Commission adopted to regulate situations such as those referred to above, from 2009 until now? What measures does it intend to propose in view of the results of the above study?

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

(3 July 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Questions E-04388/2011, E-09773/2011, E-11053/2011, and E-001581/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

As indicated in its reply to Written Question E 4962/2009, it is possible that the use of a well-known brand to market, in a particular country, products of a lower quality than those offered elsewhere could under certain circumstances be misleading and thus prohibited under the Unfair Commercial Practices Directive <sup>(2)</sup> (the 'UCPD'). It is however the primary competence of national authorities and courts to investigate the conduct of individual companies in the light of EU legislation.

The recently adopted European Consumer Agenda <sup>(3)</sup> indicates enforcement of the UCPD as one of its priority actions. Experience in applying the directive has shown that the Commission needs to take a more prominent role in monitoring and coordinating enforcement of the directive by the Member States. To that end, the Commission will step up coordination of enforcement action on unfair commercial practices and update the guidance document on application of the directive.

As a first step, the Commission plans to publish a report on the application of the UCPD in September 2012. This report will, in particular, give an overview of the implementation of the directive in the Member States and provide a list of the most common unfair commercial practices encountered.

A dialogue with stakeholders to develop codes of good conduct, good practice guides and guidelines for transparent and reliable price and quality comparison tools — announced in the communication on E-commerce from 2012 <sup>(4)</sup> — was launched at the latest European Consumer Summit on 29 May 2012.

---

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

<sup>(2)</sup> Directive 2005/29/EC on Unfair Commercial Practices, OJ L 149, 11.6.2005.

<sup>(3)</sup> Commission Communication 'A European Consumer Agenda — Boosting confidence and growth', COM(2012) 225 final.

<sup>(4)</sup> Commission communication on a coherent framework for building trust in the Digital Single Market for e-commerce and online services (January 2012).

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-005219/12**

**alla Commissione**

**Mario Borghezio (EFD)**

(23 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: L'UE intervenga per proteggere Pompei

Il «caso Pompei», anche a seguito della pubblicazione sulla «prima» del supplemento culturale di «Le Monde» di un documentato reportage sulla situazione di incuria e di vergognoso abbandono di tale area archeologica, è ormai conosciuto a livello internazionale.

Tale denuncia non solo scoperchia una realtà che merita una condanna senza appello dell'incapacità totale delle Autorità di Roma e di Napoli a tutelare un patrimonio storico-archeologico unico al mondo, ma determina anche la necessità e l'urgenza di un intervento protettivo da parte dell'UE.

Quali iniziative intende attuare la Commissione per mettere fine alla vergognosa situazione di incuria che minaccia la stessa integrità del sito archeologico di Pompei?

Inoltre, non intende la Commissione verificare la congruità dell'impiego dei fondi europei eventualmente stanziati per finalità attinenti al patrimonio archeologico italiano e in particolare a Pompei?

**Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione**

(22 giugno 2012)

La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-2184/12 <sup>(1)</sup>.

Il «Grande Progetto Pompei» (costo totale ammissibile: 105 milioni di euro) è stato approvato il 28 marzo 2012 e prevede la messa in sicurezza e il restauro dell'area di scavo del sito archeologico, con interventi per arrestare e neutralizzare gli effetti del processo di degrado delle strutture murarie e degli elementi decorativi e architettonici, contenere il rischio idrogeologico e migliorare in generale le condizioni del sito.

Il progetto prevede l'applicazione di un metodo d'intervento innovativo, al fine di salvaguardare e proteggere il sito archeologico, sfruttando le conoscenze più recenti in materia di restauro.

La Commissione verificherà, come di consueto, che sia stato fatto un uso appropriato del Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale, nel rispetto delle condizioni stabilite nella decisione relativa all'adozione del progetto.

---

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

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-005219/12  
to the Commission**

**Mario Borghezio (EFD)**

(23 May 2012)

*Subject:* The EU must intervene to save Pompeii

The international community is now aware of the plight of Pompeii, not least following the publication of a front-page report in *Le Monde's* arts supplement documenting the neglect and shameful abandonment of this archaeological site.

The report not only reveals a situation deserving outright condemnation, given the total inability of the Rome and Naples authorities to protect a unique part of the world's archaeological and historical heritage, but also highlights the urgent need for protective action by the EU.

What initiatives will the Commission implement in order to put an end to the disgraceful neglect that threatens to destroy the Pompeii archaeological site?

Will the Commission not verify in addition whether appropriate use has been made of the European funds allocated to Italian archaeological heritage and particularly to Pompeii?

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

(22 June 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-21 84/12 <sup>(1)</sup>.

The major project on Pompeii (total eligible cost: EUR 105 million) was approved on 28 March 2012 and provides for the consolidation and restoration of the excavated area of the archaeological site, stopping and reversing the effects of the process of deterioration of the buildings, the decorative and architectural fittings, limiting the hydrogeological risk and improving in general the condition of the site.

The major project envisages the application of an innovative method of intervention in order to preserve and protect the archaeological area while using the latest knowledge of restoration operations.

The Commission will, as always, verify that appropriate use has been made of the European Regional Development Fund, in line with the conditions laid down in the decision adopting the project.

---

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

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005220/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)**  
(23 Μαΐου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Αναθεώρηση ΕΣΠΑ

Στην ερώτησή μου (E-007159/2011) σχετικά με την αναθεώρηση του ελληνικού ΕΣΠΑ 2007-2013, η Επιτροπή απάντησε ότι: «Οι ελληνικές αρχές δρομολόγησαν μια συνολική αξιολόγηση των προγραμμάτων, σχέδιο προς σχέδιο, ώστε να εντοπιστούν όλα τα «αδρανή» σχέδια και οι ανενεργές αναθέσεις για τα οποία έχουν διατεθεί κονδύλια, αλλά η υλοποίησή τους δεν άρχισε ποτέ. Αναμένεται ότι τα εν λόγω «αδρανή» σχέδια και ανενεργές αναθέσεις θα αντικατασταθούν από ώριμα και βιώσιμα σχέδια υψηλής ποιότητας, κατά πρώτον και κυρίως σε στρατηγικούς τομείς ιδιαίτερα σημαντικούς για την ανταγωνιστικότητα και την ανάπτυξη». Με δεδομένη την παραπάνω απάντηση και το χρονικό διάστημα που έχει παρέλθει, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Ολοκληρώθηκε η «συνολική αξιολόγηση των προγραμμάτων από την ελληνική κυβέρνηση»; Αν ναι ποιά είναι η ακολουθητέα διαδικασία για την αναθεώρηση του ΕΣΠΑ;
2. Ποιοί τομείς συγκεκριμένα θεωρούνται «στρατηγικοί και ιδιαίτερα σημαντικοί για την ανταγωνιστικότητα και την ανάπτυξη»;
3. Έχουν εντοπιστεί από τις ελληνικές αρχές τα «αδρανή» σχέδια και οι ανενεργές αναθέσεις για τα οποία έχουν διατεθεί κονδύλια, αλλά η υλοποίησή τους δεν άρχισε ποτέ; Αν ναι, ποιά είναι τα βασικότερα ώριμα και βιώσιμα σχέδια υψηλής ποιότητας που θα αντικαταστήσουν τα «αδρανή» σχέδια και τις ανενεργές αναθέσεις; Ποιά οικονομικά στοιχεία μπορεί να παράσχει για τους προϋπολογισμούς των έργων που εντάσσονται και, στη συνέχεια, εξαιρούνται από το ΕΣΠΑ (2007-2013);

**Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(11 Ιουλίου 2012)

Οι ελληνικές αρχές άρχισαν την αναθεώρηση του Εθνικού Στρατηγικού Πλαισίου Αναφοράς (ΕΣΠΑ) τον Απρίλιο του 2012. Η Επιτροπή θα ήθελε να παραπέμψει τον κ. βουλευτή στην απάντησή της στη γραπτή ερώτηση E-004613/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

Υπάρχουν διάφοροι στρατηγικοί τομείς, που είναι στενά συνδεδεμένοι με τη στρατηγική «Ευρώπη 2020», η οποία είναι ιδιαίτερα σημαντική για την ανταγωνιστικότητα και την ανάπτυξη στην Ελλάδα, όπως διαφαίνεται από τον κατάλογο των σχεδίων προτεραιότητας που καταρτίστηκε το 2011. Στα σχέδια αυτά συμπεριλαμβάνονται η καινοτομία και η επιχειρηματικότητα για τις ΜΜΕ, οι τεχνολογίες πληροφόρησης και επικοινωνίας, το περιβάλλον, η ενέργεια και οι μεταφορές.

Οι ελληνικές αρχές έχουν εντοπίσει τις ανενεργές αναθέσεις και τα «αδρανή» σχέδια. Σύμφωνα με την αρχή της επιμερισμένης διαχείρισης που χρησιμοποιείται για τη διαχείριση της πολιτικής συνοχής, η αρμοδιότητα για την επιλογή, την έγκριση και την αξιολόγηση των σχεδίων ανήκει στις εθνικές αρχές και όχι στην Επιτροπή, συμπεριλαμβανομένων εκείνων που θα μπορούσαν να αντικαταστήσουν τα αποσυρθέντα αδρανή σχέδια και τις ανενεργές αναθέσεις.

Ο κ. βουλευτής θα βρει αναλυτικές πληροφορίες σχετικά με τους προϋπολογισμούς για τα σχέδια που αποτελούν μέρος του 2007-2013 NSRF στον δικτυακό τόπο: [www.anartyxi.gov.gr](http://www.anartyxi.gov.gr).

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

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005220/12  
to the Commission**

**Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)**

(23 May 2012)

*Subject:* Revision of the NSRF

In reply to my Question E-007159/2011 on the revision of the Greek NSRF 2007-13, the Commission stated that: 'The Greek authorities have launched a comprehensive project-by-project assessment of the programmes in order to identify all "sleeping" projects and inactive delegations for which funds have been reserved but implementation never started. It is expected that these "sleeping" projects will be replaced with mature and viable projects of high quality, first and foremost in strategic sectors particularly important for competitiveness and growth.' Given the above answer and the time that has elapsed since, will the Commission answer the following:

1. Has the 'comprehensive assessment' of the programmes by the Greek Government been completed? If so, what is the procedure for the revision of the NSRF?
2. Which sectors, specifically, are considered to be 'strategic sectors particularly important for competitiveness and growth'?
3. Have the 'sleeping' projects and inactive delegations for which funds have been reserved but implementation never started been identified by the Greek authorities? If so, what are the mature and viable projects of high quality that will replace the 'sleeping' projects and inactive delegations? What economic data can be provided for budgets for works that are included in and, consequently, required by the NSRF (2007-13)?

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

(11 July 2012)

The revision of the National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF) was initiated by the Greek authorities in April 2012. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-004613/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

There are several strategic sectors, closely aligned with the Europe 2020 strategy, that are particularly important for competitiveness and growth in Greece, as highlighted by the list of priority projects established in 2011. These include innovation and entrepreneurship for SMEs, information and communication technologies, environment, energy and transport.

The Greek authorities have identified the inactive delegations and sleeping projects. In line with the shared management principle used for the administration of cohesion policy, it is the responsibility of the national authorities and not of the Commission to select, approve and appraise projects, including those that could replace withdrawn sleeping projects and inactive delegations.

The Honourable Member will find detailed information concerning the budgets for projects forming part of the 2007-2013 NSRF on the website: [www.anaptyxi.gov.gr](http://www.anaptyxi.gov.gr).

---

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

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005221/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Niki Tzavela (EFD)**  
(23 Μαΐου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Μελέτες σχετικά με το κόστος των μέσων πληρωμής

Σε απάντηση στη γραπτή ερώτηση E-00624/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>, η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή δηλώνει ότι: «Αν και από την πλευρά του καταναλωτή, η πληρωμή με πιστωτική κάρτα είναι σε ορισμένες περιπτώσεις ακριβότερη από τη χρήση μετρητών, άλλες μορφές πληρωμής, όπως οι μεταφορές πίστωσης και οι άμεσες χρεώσεις, είναι πλήρως συγκρίσιμες. Σε ορισμένα κράτη μέλη, η χρήση μεταφορών πίστωσης και άμεσων χρεώσεων είναι ακόμα πιο συμφέρουσα από τη χρήση μετρητών».

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη ότι η απάντηση της Επιτροπής αφορά κυρίως το κόστος που γίνεται άμεσα ορατό από τον καταναλωτή τη στιγμή της πληρωμής, και λαμβάνοντας υπόψη ότι οι διάφορες μέθοδοι πληρωμής συνδέονται με πολλές άλλες χρεώσεις, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των χρεώσεων χρήσης πιστωτικής κάρτας, της προμήθειας που επιβαρύνει τους εμπόρους, των τραπεζικών προμηθειών και των προμηθειών συναλλαγών και μεταφοράς μετρητών:

Θα μπορούσε η Επιτροπή να παραπέμψει σε συναφή δεδομένα και μελέτες που συγκρίνουν το συνολικό κόστος της πληρωμής με μετρητά και άλλων τρόπων πληρωμής — ομοίως προς την έκθεση της Εθνικής Τράπεζας του Βελγίου που αφορά το ίδιο θέμα;

**Απάντηση του κ. Barnier εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(17 Ιουλίου 2012)

Το κόστος των μετρητών και των λοιπών μέσων πληρωμής στην ΕΕ αποτελεί ολοένα και περισσότερο αντικείμενο ενδιαφέροντος από την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή. Πρόσφατες εκτιμήσεις στις οποίες προέβη ο κλάδος των πληρωμών <sup>(2)</sup> δείχνουν ότι το συνολικό κόστος των μετρητών στην ΕΕ όσον αφορά όλα τα νομίσματα μπορεί να ανέρχεται σε 84 δισ. ευρώ ετησίως ή σε 130 ευρώ ανά κάτοικο. Όσον αφορά τη ζώνη του ευρώ αποκλειστικά, τα εν λόγω στοιχεία εκτιμώνται σε 40 έως 45 δισ. ευρώ, που αντιστοιχούν σε περίπου 0.4 % του ΑΕΠ της ζώνης του ευρώ. Σύμφωνα με την World Payments Report, (έκθεση σχετικά με την παγκόσμια αγορά πληρωμών), η αύξηση στη χρήση των ηλεκτρονικών μέσων πληρωμής και η μείωση της κυκλοφορίας ευρώ σε μετρητά σε επίπεδο συγκρίσιμο με εκείνο των ΗΠΑ θα απέφερε οικονομίες ύψους 20 δισ. ευρώ περίπου ετησίως στις οικονομίες της ζώνης του ευρώ.

Μια ολοκληρωμένη μελέτη σχετικά με το κόστος των μετρητών και των πιστωτικών καρτών διεξάγεται από τη Γενική Διεύθυνση Ανταγωνισμού της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής. Η εν λόγω μελέτη, τα αποτελέσματα της οποίας αναμένονται στα μέσα του 2013, καλύπτει 10 χώρες ΕΟΧ οι οποίες αντιπροσωπεύουν ποσοστό άνω του 85 % του κύκλου εργασιών των λιανικών πωλήσεων. Αξίζει να σημειωθεί ότι η εν λόγω μελέτη μετρά μόνον τις δαπάνες που επιβαρύνουν τους εμπόρους, σε αντίθεση με τις μελέτες σχετικά με τις κοινωνικές δαπάνες των πληρωμών, ήτοι τις συνολικές δαπάνες όλων των ενδιαφερόμενων φορέων, όπως είναι οι καταναλωτές, οι έμποροι, τα χρηματοπιστωτικά ιδρύματα και οι κρατικοί οργανισμοί.

Για να βελτιωθεί η γενικότερη κατανόηση ως προς το κόστος των διαφόρων μέσων πληρωμής από ευρωπαϊκής και κοινωνικής πλευράς, η Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα έχει αναλάβει τον συντονισμό μιας σημαντικής μελέτης σχετικά με το κοινωνικό κόστος των μέσων πληρωμής στις λιανικές πωλήσεις σε διαφορετικά κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ σε συνεργασία με τις αντίστοιχες εθνικές κεντρικές τράπεζες. Οι εθνικές εκθέσεις της Ουγγαρίας, Φινλανδίας και Δανίας είναι ήδη διαθέσιμες στους ιστότοπους των εν λόγω κεντρικών τραπεζών. Περαιτέρω εκθέσεις για άλλες χώρες ενδέχεται να είναι επίσης σύντομα διαθέσιμες. Είναι σημαντικό να σημειωθεί ότι η μελέτη της ΕΚΤ σχετικά με το κοινωνικό κόστος των μέσων πληρωμής στις λιανικές πωλήσεις δεν συνδέεται με καμία μελέτη που έχει διεξαχθεί από την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+WQ+E-2012-000624+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN&language=EN>.

<sup>(2)</sup> Πχ αξιολογήσεις της ΕΟΠ σχετικά με το κόστος των μετρητών του 2010, World Payments Report («έκθεση σχετικά με την παγκόσμια αγορά πληρωμών») 2011.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005221/12  
to the Commission  
Niki Tzavela (EFD)  
(23 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Studies on the cost of means of payment

In response to Written Question E-00624/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>, the Commission states: 'While from the perspective of a consumer, credit card payments are in some situations more expensive to use than cash, other forms of payment, such as credit transfers and direct debits, are fully comparable. In some Member States it is even more advantageous to use credit transfers and direct debits than cash'.

The Commission's response deals mainly with the costs that are immediately apparent to a consumer at the point of payment. There are many other costs associated with different payment methods, including card user fees, merchants' fees, bank charges, and cash handling and transport charges.

With this in mind, can the Commission refer to any relevant data and studies which compare the total cost of cash and other means of payment — along the lines of the National Bank of Belgium's report on the same subject?

**Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission  
(17 July 2012)**

The cost of cash and of other means of payment in the EU is increasingly in the focus of attention of the European Commission. Recent estimations undertaken by the payments industry <sup>(2)</sup> suggested that the total cost of cash in the EU for all currencies could be as high as EUR 84 billion annually or EUR 130 per inhabitant. For the euro area alone these figures were estimated at EUR 40 to 45 billion, equivalent to around 0.4% of the euro area GDP. According to the World Payments Report, an increase in the use of electronic means of payment and reduction of the euro cash in circulation to the level comparable with the USA would bring about savings of around EUR 20 billion annually in the euro area economies.

A comprehensive study on the cost of cash and cards is being carried out by the Directorate-General for Competition of the European Commission. This study, whose results are expected in mid-2013, covers 10 EEA countries which account for over 85% of retail turnover. It is important to note that this study will only measure the costs borne by merchants, as opposed to the studies on the social costs of payments, i.e. the total costs of all stakeholders, such as consumers, merchants, financial institutions and government organisations.

In order to enhance the general understanding of the cost of different payment instruments from a European and social perspective, a major study on the social cost of retail payment instruments in different EU member states is currently being coordinated by the European Central Bank in cooperation with the respective national central banks. Country reports for Hungary, Finland and Denmark are already available on the websites of these central banks. Further reports for other countries may also become available. It is important to note that the ECB study on the social costs of retail payment instruments is not linked to any study carried out by the European Commission.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+WQ+E-2012-000624+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN&language=EN>.

<sup>(2)</sup> e.g. EPC assessments of the cost of cash from 2010, World Payments Report 2011.

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-005222/12**

**à la Commission**

**Robert Goebbels (S&D)**

(23 mai 2012)

*Objet:* Exploitation des hydrates de méthane en Europe

M. Steven Chu, secrétaire du département de l'énergie des États-Unis, vient d'annoncer que les États-Unis soutiennent activement la recherche pour l'exploitation des hydrates de méthane et qu'ils y voient une source d'énergie potentielle prometteuse.

Comme les hydrates de méthane sont très abondants le long des bassins sédimentaires de pratiquement tous les continents, ils pourraient constituer une source d'énergie également pour l'Union européenne.

La Commission dispose-t-elle d'informations sur le potentiel des hydrates de méthane le long des côtes européennes?

La Commission entend-elle soutenir la recherche sur cette forme d'énergie potentielle?

Quel avenir la Commission voit-elle pour l'exploitation des hydrates de méthane dans le bouquet énergétique européen?

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

(5 juillet 2012)

Les hydrates de méthane ont été étudiés dans le cadre de programmes de recherche soutenus par l'Union européenne <sup>(1)</sup>. Cependant, et même si elle suit les recherches en cours, telles que celles entreprises dans le cadre d'un projet du programme des Nations unies pour l'environnement (PNUE) <sup>(2)</sup>, la Commission ne dispose pas d'informations détaillées concernant le potentiel de ces hydrates dans les eaux européennes. La prospection et l'exploration des sources de gaz naturel en Europe, de même que la production éventuelle ainsi que les développements technologiques qui y sont rattachés devraient, en premier lieu, être financés par des entreprises commerciales. Le travail de la Commission vise à assurer l'intégrité environnementale de toute opération d'une telle nature ainsi qu'à encore améliorer l'infrastructure et les conditions qui prévalent sur ce marché, ce qui faciliterait également la commercialisation de gaz naturel provenant de sources alternatives.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Exemple: Hydratech (Techniques for the quantification of methane hydrate in European continental margins; <http://www.hydratech.bham.ac.uk/>) ou Hydramed (Geological assessment of gas hydrates in the Mediterranean Sea; [http://cordis.europa.eu/fetch?CALLER=RESULINK\\_EN&ACTION=D&RCN=49454](http://cordis.europa.eu/fetch?CALLER=RESULINK_EN&ACTION=D&RCN=49454)).

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.methanegashydrates.org/>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005222/12  
to the Commission**

**Robert Goebbels (S&D)**

(23 May 2012)

*Subject:* Exploitation of methane hydrates in Europe

Dr Steven Chu, the United States Secretary of Energy, has just announced that the United States is actively supporting research into the exploitation of methane hydrates and that it views them as a promising potential source of energy.

As methane hydrates are found in high abundance along the sedimentary basins of almost all continents, they could also represent a source of energy for the European Union.

Does the Commission have any information on the potential of methane hydrates along European coasts?

Does the Commission plan to support research into this potential form of energy?

What future does the Commission see for the exploitation of methane hydrates in Europe's energy mix?

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

(5 July 2012)

Methane hydrates have been addressed by EU supported research programmes <sup>(1)</sup>. The Commission does not, however, possess comprehensive information on the methane hydrate potential in European waters, but follows ongoing research e.g. in the context of a project undertaken by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) <sup>(2)</sup>. Prospecting and exploration for sources of natural gas in Europe, possible production as well as related technological developments should primarily be financed by commercial enterprises. The Commission focuses its work on ensuring the environmental integrity of any such operations as well as on further improving gas market conditions and infrastructure, which would also facilitate the possible commercialisation of natural gas from alternative sources.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> For example HYDRATECH (Techniques for the quantification of methane hydrate in european continental margins; <http://www.hydratech.bham.ac.uk/>) or HYDRAMED (Geological assessment of gas hydrates in the Mediterranean Sea; [http://cordis.europa.eu/fetch?CALLER=RESULINK\\_EN&ACTION=D&RCN=49454](http://cordis.europa.eu/fetch?CALLER=RESULINK_EN&ACTION=D&RCN=49454)).

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.methanegashydrates.org/>

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005224/12**  
**alla Commissione**  
**Mario Mauro (PPE)**  
(23 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Strage di cristiani in Nigeria e in Kenya

Ancora una strage di cristiani in Africa. Domenica 29 aprile 2012 la Nigeria e il Kenia sono stati la scena principale di due attentati terroristici contro fedeli raccolti in preghiera durante la messa della domenica. Tali attentati hanno causato la morte di 21 persone e il ferimento di numerose altre.

Kano, nel nord della Nigeria, è stato negli ultimi mesi teatro di sanguinosi attentati contro la minoranza cristiana da parte dei talebani nigeriani di Boko Haram, la setta islamica che vuole imporre la Sharia nel paese. Lo stesso gruppo fondamentalista è ritenuto responsabile anche degli attacchi durante la messa di Natale del 2010 in due chiese cristiane a Jos, della strage alla sede dell'ONU di Abuja dell'agosto 2011, nonché del rapimento e della morte dell'ostaggio italiano Franco Lamolinara e dell'inglese Christopher McManus. A Nairobi, invece, è stata lanciata una granata all'interno di una chiesa della congregazione «Casa dei miracoli di Dio», nel quartiere popolare di Ngara, a nord-ovest dalla capitale, poco prima dell'inizio della messa.

Secondo fonti ufficiali, le vittime di Boko Haram sono almeno 1 400 dal 2009 a oggi, ovvero dal momento in cui il gruppo terroristico ha formalmente «dichiarato guerra» al governo centrale. È drammaticamente evidente la strategia del fondamentalismo islamico in Africa: eliminare la presenza dei cristiani nel paese attraverso minacce, violenze e attacchi.

1. Ciò premesso, può la Commissione far sapere se è informata di quanto sta accadendo in questi paesi?
2. Attraverso quali politiche intende affrontare questa grave violazione dei diritti umani e della libertà religiosa?
3. Come intende garantire un pronto, efficace ed effettivo processo contro gli autori di questo eccidio?
4. Quali misure di prevenzione intende adottare per evitare il dilagare di queste stragi contro le minoranze cristiane?

**Risposta dell'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione**  
(8 agosto 2012)

I recenti attentati terroristici in Nigeria hanno preso di mira senza distinzione, oltre alle chiese, edifici del governo e dei servizi di sicurezza, mercati, scuole e civili innocenti. Si tratta di atti criminali condannati dall'UE, anche con la dichiarazione rilasciata dall'Alto Rappresentante il 19 giugno 2012.

La collaborazione tra UE e Nigeria intende aiutare il paese a realizzare l'obiettivo di una sicurezza duratura, affrontando i molteplici fattori socioeconomici e politici che conducono alla radicalizzazione.

L'Unione ha già reindirizzato una parte dei suoi programmi di cooperazione verso il nord del paese in modo da velocizzare le iniziative per la lotta alla povertà e alle privazioni.

Di recente, l'UE ha inoltre fornito sostegno allo sviluppo delle capacità di mediazione in una delle aree più a rischio avvalendosi dei fondi provenienti dal progetto pilota per il sostegno alla mediazione (EEAS BL 2238) varato dal Parlamento europeo.

In Kenya sono stati compiuti diversi attentati ed esiste il rischio di rappresaglie da parte di gruppi militanti dopo l'incursione di truppe kenyote in territorio somalo nell'ottobre 2011. È probabile che almeno alcuni di questi attentati siano stati commessi dai sostenitori di Al-Shabab o da gruppi estremisti analoghi, ma non è dimostrato che sia così per tutti gli attacchi. Nei suoi rapporti con le autorità del Kenya l'UE solleva periodicamente le questioni della sicurezza per migliorare la situazione nel paese.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005224/12  
to the Commission  
Mario Mauro (PPE)  
(23 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Massacre of Christians in Nigeria and Kenya

Yet another massacre of Christians in Africa. On Sunday, 29 April 2012, Nigeria and Kenya were the scene of two terrorist attacks against worshippers gathered for prayer during Sunday mass. These attacks killed 21 people and injured many others.

In recent months, Kano in northern Nigeria has been the scene of bloody attacks against the Christian minority by the Nigerian Taliban-style Boko Haram, an Islamic sect that aims to impose Sharia law in the country. This fundamentalist group is also responsible for attacks during the 2010 Christmas mass in two Christian churches in Jos, the massacre at Abuja's UN headquarters in August 2011 and the abduction and killing of Italian and British hostages Franco Lamolinara and Christopher McManus. In Nairobi, meanwhile, a grenade was thrown inside the God's House of Miracles Church in the Ngara district northwest of the capital shortly before the start of mass.

According to official sources, Boko Haram has claimed at least 1 400 victims since 2009 — in other words, from when the terrorist group formally 'declared war' on the central government. It is dramatically evident that the strategy of Islamic fundamentalism in Africa is to eliminate the presence of Christians in the country through threats, violence and attacks.

1. Can the Commission state whether it is aware of what is happening in these countries?
2. Which policies will it use to tackle this serious violation of human rights and religious freedom?
3. How does it intend to ensure that swift, efficient and effective proceedings are taken against the perpetrators of this massacre?
4. What preventive measures does it intend to take to avoid the spread of these massacres against Christian minorities?

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

The recent attacks by terrorists in Nigeria have targeted government and security buildings, markets, schools and innocent civilians of all kinds as well as churches. All such attacks are criminal activities and have been condemned as such by the EU, including in the HR/VP's statement of 19 June 2012.

The EU is working together with Nigeria to help it tackle the challenges of creating durable security and dealing with the multiple socioeconomic and political factors conducive to radicalisation.

The EU has already reoriented parts of its cooperation programme with Nigeria to the north of the country to accelerate action against poverty and deprivation there.

In addition, the EU has recently provided capacity building for mediation in one of the most fragile areas making use of funds from the mediation support project (EEAS BL 22 38) initiated by the European Parliament.

In Kenya, several attacks have been carried out and there is a risk of retaliatory action by militant groups since Kenya's incursion into Somali territory in October 2011. It is likely that at least some of these attacks are perpetrated by affiliates of Al-Shabab or similar extremist groups, but this is not proven in the case of all such attacks. The EU regularly raises security concerns in its dialogue with Kenyan authorities in order to improve the security situation in the country.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005226/12**

**an die Kommission**

**Karl-Heinz Florenz (PPE)**

(23. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Tiertransportverordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2005

In Kapitel 6 von Anhang 1 der Tiertransportverordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2005 sind zusätzliche Bedingungen für die lange Beförderung (Transporte, die länger als 8 Stunden dauern) von Hausequiden, Hausrindern, Hausschafen, Hausziegen und Hausschweinen festgelegt. Die Transportfahrzeuge für Beförderungen über lange Strecken müssen unter anderem mit einer entsprechenden Wasserversorgungsanlage, einem Belüftungssystem und einem Satellitennavigationssystem ausgestattet sein. Eine Zulassung für Transportfahrzeuge wird folglich von der zuständigen Behörde nur dann gewährt, wenn die Fahrzeuge die Bestimmungen aus Anhang 1 Kapitel 6 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2005 erfüllen bzw. einhalten.

Berichte der FVO, die zwischen 2009 und 2011 in 14 Mitgliedstaaten erstellt worden sind, zeigen jedoch, dass die zuständigen Behörden in den Mitgliedstaaten häufig Fahrzeuge zugelassen haben, die den Bestimmungen der Tiertransportverordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2005, Anhang 1 Kapitel 6, nicht entsprechen.

In diesem Zusammenhang ergeben sich folgende Fragen:

1. Wie stellt die Kommission sicher, dass die Mitgliedstaaten die Tiertransportverordnung in naher Zukunft besser umsetzen, insbesondere was die Zulassung von Fahrzeugen zur Beförderung von Tieren über lange Strecken angeht, wobei auch die Tatsache zu berücksichtigen ist, dass die Verordnung bereits vor 6 Jahren in Kraft getreten ist?
2. Liegen der Kommission Analysen über den Nutzen und die Vorteile einer Höchstdauer von maximal 8 Stunden für Lebeltiertransporte vor, und trägt sie dabei der Tatsache Rechnung, dass Mitgliedstaaten die Bestimmungen der Tiertransportverordnung für die Zulassung von Langstreckentransportfahrzeugen nicht einhalten?

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

(24. August 2012)

1. Die Kommission veranstaltet regelmäßige Sitzungen mit den im Rahmen der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2005 über den Schutz von Tieren beim Transport <sup>(1)</sup> benannten Kontaktstellen <sup>(2)</sup> der Mitgliedstaaten. Zu den wichtigsten Zielen dieser Sitzungen zählt die Unterstützung der zuständigen Mitgliedstaaten bei der Durchsetzung der Bestimmungen der Verordnung 1/2005. Auf der Sitzung vom Dezember 2011 wurde beispielsweise das Thema der Zulassung von Fahrzeugen gemäß Artikel 7 Absatz 1 der Verordnung erörtert. Ein erfahrener Inspektor aus einem Mitgliedstaat demonstrierte dort die Abnahme eines LKW und gab praktische Ratschläge zu den Punkten, die dabei zu beachten sind.

2. Schwierigkeiten bei der Zulassung von Fahrzeugen für Langstreckentransporte können nicht als Anlass zur Neuregelung der zulässigen Transportdauer sein. Die Kommission ist der Auffassung, dass sie die Frage der Zulassung von Fahrzeugen für Langstreckentransporte getrennt behandeln sollte. Daher konzentriert sie sich zusammen mit den Mitgliedstaaten auf die praktischen Aspekte der technischen Durchsetzung.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2005 des Rates vom 22. Dezember 2004 über den Schutz von Tieren beim Transport und damit zusammenhängenden Vorgängen sowie zur Änderung der Richtlinien 64/432/EWG und 93/119/EG und der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1255/97. ABl. L 3 vom 5.1.2005, S. 1.

<sup>(2)</sup> Gemäß Artikel 24 Absatz 2 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2005 über den Schutz von Tieren beim Transport.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005226/12  
to the Commission**

**Karl-Heinz Florenz (PPE)**

(23 May 2012)

*Subject:* Animal Transport Regulation (EC) No 1/2005

Chapter 6 of Annex A to Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations sets out additional provisions for the long-distance transport (transport for longer than eight hours) of domestic horses, cattle, sheep, goats and pigs. Among other things, the vehicles used for long-distance transport must be equipped with adequate water supply, ventilation and satellite navigation systems. Accordingly, transport vehicles may only be approved by the competent authority provided that they comply with the requirements of Annex A, Chapter 6 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.

Reports from the Food and Veterinary Office produced in 14 Member States between 2009 and 2011, show, however, that the competent authorities in the Member States have frequently approved vehicles that do not comply with the provisions set out in Annex A, Chapter 6 of the Animal Transport Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.

The following questions arise in this context:

1. How will the Commission ensure that the Member States implement the regulation on the protection of animals during transport more effectively in the immediate future, in particular in relation to the approval of vehicles for transporting animals over long distances, also taking account of the fact that the regulation has already been in force for six years?
2. Does the Commission have analyses in relation to the benefits and advantages of a maximum period of eight hours for live animal transport and does it take account of the fact that Member States are failing to comply with the provisions of the Animal Transport Regulation in relation to the approval of long-distance transport vehicles?

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

(24 August 2012)

1. The Commission organises regular meetings with the Member States' contact points <sup>(1)</sup> of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport <sup>(2)</sup>. One main objective of these meetings is to assist the competent authorities of the Member States in enforcing the provisions of Regulation 1/2005. For example, during the meeting held in December 2011 the issue of vehicle approval in accordance to Article 7(1) of the regulation was discussed. In particular an experienced inspector from one of the Member States demonstrated a truck approval and gave practical advice on what to consider during these approvals.

2. Difficulties in approving long journey vehicles cannot be the basis for a review of transport times. The Commission considers that it should address the issue of long journey vehicle approval separately. Hence, the Commission is focusing its efforts on the practicalities of technical enforcement with the Member States.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> As referred to in Article 24(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport.

<sup>(2)</sup> Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 of 22 December 2004 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations and amending Directives 64/432/EEC and 93/119/EC and Regulation No 1255/97; OJ L 3, 5.1.2005, p. 1.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005230/12  
to the Commission  
Claude Moraes (S&D)  
(23 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Noise pollution caused by aviation

According to the United Kingdom's Civil Aviation Authority, more than one quarter of the people in Europe who are affected by noise pollution caused by aviation live in the Heathrow flight path, in my constituency in London. It is estimated that air traffic will continue to increase by 5% per year, meaning that noise pollution from aircraft is set to increase both in London and across Europe.

In 2005 the EU-funded RANCH Project found that continued exposure to aircraft noise at home and at school has a detrimental effect on children's development. Furthermore, noise pollution has implications for all people in terms of stress and anxiety. The European network CALM has also been researching noise abatement technology in order to provide guidance and advice to policy-makers at all levels of government. In 2002, Directive 2002/30/EC <sup>(1)</sup> was adopted in order to promote the development of airport capacity in harmony with the environment, to facilitate noise abatement and to protect the environment in the most cost-effective manner.

— What is the Commission's assessment of the effectiveness of the directive, and do all the Member States comply with this legislation?

— Is the Commission still looking at ways to improve the scope and provisions of this legislation, as indicated in its February 2008 report (COM/2008/0066)? <sup>(2)</sup>

**Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission  
(13 June 2012)**

1. Directive 2002/30/EC has contributed to the harmonisation of the noise assessment methods across Europe and it has facilitated the phase-out of the noisiest aircraft in the fleet, the so-called 'marginally compliant aircraft'. This is important as the noisiest aircraft contribute in a disproportional way to air traffic noise. Such phase-out then allows air traffic to grow and to reduce the noise impact at the same time. The Commission has not received any substantiated complaint on non-compliance with the directive by Member States.

2. On 1 December 2011 the Commission proposed to repeal Directive 2002/30/EC and to replace it by a regulation <sup>(3)</sup>. A regulation is deemed to be more appropriate to enhance the harmonisation and the quality of the noise assessment process. The scope of the proposed Regulation was amended to make it more converging with the scope of Directive 2002/49/EC, the environmental noise directive, with the view to promoting synergies between the underlying noise assessments and noise measures. The objective of the proposal is to achieve the most cost-effective solution for identified noise problems. The proposed legislation focuses on the decision-making process. It leaves the Member States or the relevant local authorities decide on the noise abatement objectives and on the combination of measures. The proposal also introduces a stricter definition of 'marginally compliant aircraft', so that the relevant authorities use this measure as a cost-effective solution to mitigate air traffic noise.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://europa.eu/legislation\\_summaries/environment/noise\\_pollution/l28068\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/environment/noise_pollution/l28068_en.htm)

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52008DC0066:EN:NOT>

<sup>(3)</sup> COM(2011) 0828.



(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005232/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Franz Obermayr (NI)**  
(23. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Illegale Grenzübertritte vor allem in Griechenland

In den letzten drei Monaten des Jahres 2011 haben nach Angaben der Kommission über 30 000 Menschen illegal die Grenzen des Schengen-Raumes passiert. Die Hälfte dieser Übertritte fand in Griechenland statt.

Daher stellen sich folgende Fragen:

1. Ist Griechenland als Mitglied des Schengen-Raums noch tragbar?
2. Wenn ja: Welche Pläne hat die Kommission, um illegale Grenzübertritte in Griechenland in Zukunft zu verhindern?
3. Wird die Kommission anstreben, weiter in die Sicherung der Grenzen Griechenlands zu investieren?
4. Kann sich die Kommission vorstellen, den Schengen-Raum wegen dieser unglaublich vielen illegalen Grenzübertritte zu verkleinern, d. h. auf Länder zu beschränken, die die Grenzen auch effektiv schützen können?

**Antwort von Frau Malmström im Namen der Kommission**  
(11. Juli 2012)

Die Kommission ist besorgt über den Zustrom irregulärer Migranten in die Mittelmeerregion, insbesondere nach Griechenland, und unterstützt die Umsetzung einer umfassenden Strategie zur Bewältigung dieses Problems. Insbesondere ist es wichtig, die Frontex-Einsätze an der griechisch-türkischen Grenze in der bisherigen Intensität fortzuführen und Griechenland weiterhin finanzielle und operative Unterstützung für den Aufbau eines wirksamen Grenzmanagementsystems zu gewähren, u. a. für die Rückführung irregulärer Migranten. Auch wird der rasche Abschluss des kürzlich von der EU und der Türkei paraphierten Rückübernahmeabkommens wesentlich zur Verbesserung der Situation beitragen.

Darüber hinaus hat die Kommission legislative Änderungen vorgeschlagen, um die Verwaltung des Schengen-Raums zu stärken und insbesondere die Außengrenzen wirksamer zu überwachen. Diese Änderungen umfassen eine Schutzklausel für Ausnahmefälle, die eine auf EU-Ebene koordinierte vorübergehende Wiedereinführung einiger Binnengrenzkontrollen ermöglicht. Dies würde Zeit und Raum schaffen, um schwerwiegende und anhaltende Mängel in einem Mitgliedstaat zu beheben. Die EU hätte so die Möglichkeit, kritischen Situationen (z. B. Versagen der Kontrollen an den Außengrenzen in einem Mitgliedstaat) wirksam zu begegnen, jedoch würde dies nicht zum vorläufigen oder endgültigen Ausschluss eines Mitgliedstaats aus dem Schengen-Raum führen. Über den Vorschlag wird derzeit im Europäischen Parlament und im Rat beraten.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005232/12  
to the Commission  
Franz Obermayr (NI)  
(23 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Illegal border crossings, particularly in Greece

According to information from the Commission, over 30 000 people illegally crossed the borders of the Schengen area in the last three months of 2011. Half of these crossings took place in Greece.

In view of the above:

1. Can Greece be allowed to remain a Member of the Schengen zone?
2. If so, what plans does the Commission have to prevent illegal border crossings into Greece in the future?
3. Will the Commission try to invest further in securing Greece's borders?
4. Can the Commission envisage reducing the Schengen zone due to this unbelievably large number of border crossings, i.e. by restricting it to countries that can effectively protect the borders?

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

The Commission is concerned about the flow of irregular migrants in the Mediterranean region, especially into Greece and is supporting the implementation of a comprehensive strategy to tackle this problem. In particular, it is important to maintain the high intensity of the current Frontex operations at the Greek/Turkish border, and to continue to provide financial and operational assistance to Greece in building an effective border management system, including the return of irregular migrants. The rapid conclusion of the readmission agreement, which has recently been initialled by the EU and Turkey, will also make an important contribution to improving the situation.

The Commission has, moreover, proposed legislative changes aimed at strengthening the governance of the Schengen area, in particular to ensure the effectiveness of the control of its external borders. The proposed changes would include a safeguard clause, to be resorted to only in exceptional circumstances, enabling some internal border controls to be temporarily reintroduced, in a coordinated way at the EU level, to provide the time and space for the persistent and serious failures by a Member State to be remedied. This would allow the EU to deal effectively with critical situations involving a breakdown in external border control by a Member State, but would not result in the exclusion or suspension of any Member State from the Schengen area. This proposal is currently the subject of negotiations in the European Parliament and the Council.

---

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005235/12  
an die Kommission**

**Konrad Szymański (ECR) und Martin Kastler (PPE)**

(23. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Mittel aus dem EU-Haushalt und Zielvorgaben für Sterilisationen in Indien

2009 hat die indische Regierung von der Kommission unter der Haushaltslinie 19 10 01 01 99 Mio. EUR erhalten. Die Mittel gingen an das nationale Programm für die Gesundheit von Müttern und Kindern, das Teil der nationalen Mission für die Verbesserung der Gesundheitssituation in ländlichen Gebieten (National Rural Health Mission) ist. Die 2005 begonnene National Rural Health Mission ist ein Achtjahresplan zur Verbesserung des Zugangs zu grundlegenden Gesundheitsdiensten in den ländlichen Gebieten Indiens als Beitrag zur Erfüllung der Millennium-Entwicklungsziele.

Verschiedene indische Regierungsprogramme bieten jungen Paaren finanzielle Anreize, wenn diese einwilligen, ihre Familienplanung auf einen späteren Zeitpunkt zu verschieben, länger zwischen den Geburten abzuwarten oder sich sterilisieren zu lassen. Entsprechende Praktiken enthalten u. a. die Programme Jansankhya Sthirata Kosh und Prerna. Andere Programme, darunter Santushti, werden von der Regierung für die Erfüllung bestimmter Zielvorgaben für Sterilisationen belohnt. Der EU-Haushalt unterliegt spezifischen Bestimmungen hinsichtlich des Verbots und der Bekämpfung von Zwangssterilisationen.

— Sind der Kommission die in diesen Programmen verwendeten Praktiken bekannt?

— Ist sie der Auffassung, dass durch solche Praktiken Zwang ausgeübt wird?

— Verwendet sie Mittel des Instruments für Entwicklungszusammenarbeit zur Unterstützung solcher Praktiken?

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

(9. Juli 2012)

Zwischen 2009 und 2013 wird die Kommission sektorbezogene Budgethilfe in Höhe von 99 Mio. EUR für das nationale Programm für reproduktive und Kindergesundheit bereitstellen, das im Rahmen der National Rural Health Mission (Programm zur Verbesserung der Gesundheit im ländlichen Raum) der indischen Regierung durchgeführt wird.

Weder das Santushti Programm noch Jansankhya Sthirata Kosh sind Teil des nationalen Programms für reproduktive und Kindergesundheit.

Gemäß der aktuellen Politik der indischen Regierung und wie das indische Ministerium für Gesundheit und Familienfürsorge bestätigt, gibt es weder Familienplanungsprogramme, die Zwang ausüben, noch Zielvorgaben für Sterilisationen. Der Schwerpunkt einiger Programme liegt auf der Empfehlung und Durchführung von Sterilisation nach der Geburt des dritten Kindes. Die Sterilisationen beruhen jedoch immer auf freiwilliger Basis und stehen in Einklang mit der Politik der Bevölkerungsstabilisierung. Familienplanungsmethoden wie das Hinauszögern der ersten Geburt, das Einhalten größerer Abstände zwischen den Geburten oder die Sterilisation werden auf der Grundlage von Beratung und freiwilligen und fundierten Entscheidungsprozessen eingesetzt.

Außerdem haben von der EU finanzierte Nichtregierungsorganisationen (NRO), die sich mit Gesundheitsfragen in Indien beschäftigen, keine Fälle von Zwangssterilisation in den letzten Jahren gemeldet.

---

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005235/12  
do Komisji**

**Konrad Szymański (ECR) oraz Martin Kastler (PPE)**

(23 maja 2012 r.)

*Przedmiot:* Fundusze z budżetu UE a cele w zakresie sterylizacji w Indiach

W 2009 r. w ramach pozycji 19 10 01 01 w budżecie Komisja przekazała rządowi Indii 99 milionów EUR. Środki te zostały przeznaczone na realizację krajowego programu na rzecz zdrowia reprodukcyjnego i zdrowia dzieci, który jest obsługiwany przez Krajową Misję na rzecz Zdrowia na Obszarach Wiejskich. Utworzona w 2005 r. Krajowa Misja na rzecz Zdrowia na Obszarach Wiejskich to ośmioletni plan mający na celu zapewnienie lepszego dostępu do podstawowej opieki zdrowotnej na obszarach wiejskich w Indiach oraz realizację milenijnych celów rozwoju.

W ramach różnych programów rządu indyjskiego młodym parom udzielane są dotacje finansowe za to, że wstrzymują się z posiadaniem potomstwa, dłużej czekają z posiadaniem kolejnych dzieci i poddają się sterylizacji. Do tego rodzaju programów należą m.in. Jansankhya Sthirata Kosh i Prerna. Inne programy, takie jak program Santushti, rząd wynagradza za osiągnięcie określonych celów w zakresie sterylizacji. W budżecie UE zawarto szczegółowe przepisy zakazujące przymusowej sterylizacji i służące walce z nią.

Czy Komisja jest świadoma tego, jakie praktyki są stosowane w ramach tych programów?

Czy zdaniem Komisji programy te mają charakter środków przymusu?

Czy do finansowania tych praktyk Komisja wykorzystuje środki pieniężne pochodzące z instrumentu finansowania współpracy na rzecz rozwoju?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Andrisa Piebalga w imieniu Komisji**

(9 lipca 2012 r.)

W latach 2009-2013 Komisja przeznaczy 99 mln EUR sektorowego wsparcia budżetowego na realizację krajowego programu na rzecz zdrowia reprodukcyjnego i zdrowia dzieci, który jest obsługiwany przez Krajową Misję na rzecz Zdrowia na Obszarach Wiejskich rządu Indii.

Krajowy program na rzecz zdrowia reprodukcyjnego i zdrowia dzieci nie obejmuje ani programu Santushti, ani programu Jansankhya Sthirata Kosh.

Jeśli chodzi o obecną politykę rządu Indii, ministerstwo zdrowia i dobrobytu rodziny potwierdziło, że nie istnieją represyjne programy planowania rodziny ani cele w zakresie sterylizacji. Niektóre z tych programów koncentrują się na zalecaniu sterylizacji i jej realizacji po urodzeniu trojga potomstwa, sterylizacja jest jednak zawsze przeprowadzana w sposób dobrowolny i zgodnie z polityką stabilizacji ludności. Metody planowania rodziny, takie jak opóźnianie narodzin pierwszego potomka czy sterylizacja, realizowane są w oparciu o doradztwo oraz świadomie i dobrowolnie podejmowane decyzje.

Ponadto wspierane ze środków UE organizacje pozarządowe zajmujące się problematyką zdrowotną w Indiach nie przedstawiły żadnych doniesień o przypadkach przymusowej sterylizacji w ostatnich kilku latach.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005235/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Konrad Szymański (ECR) and Martin Kastler (PPE)**  
(23 May 2012)

*Subject:* Funds from the EU budget and sterilisation targets in India

In 2009, under budget line 19 10 01 01, the Commission gave EUR 99 million to the government of India. The funds went to the National Programme on Reproductive and Child Health, which is run by the National Rural Health Mission. Introduced in 2005, the National Rural Health Mission is an eight-year plan designed to provide better access to basic healthcare in rural areas of the country and fulfil the Millennium Development Goals.

Various Indian government programmes provide financial incentives to young couples in exchange for delaying having children, waiting longer between births and undergoing sterilisation. Jansankhya Sthirata Kosh and Prerna are among the programmes that use these schemes. The government rewards other programmes, such as the Santushti programme, for achieving certain sterilisation targets. The EU budget has specific provisions prohibiting and combating forced sterilisation.

— Is the Commission aware of the practices used in these programmes?

— Does the Commission consider these schemes to be coercive?

— Is the Commission using money from the Development and Cooperation Instrument to fund these practices?

**Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission**  
(9 July 2012)

Between 2009 and 2013, the Commission will provide EUR 99 million of sector budget support to the National Programme on Reproductive and Child Health, which is run by the National Rural Health Mission of the Government of India.

The National Programme on Reproductive and Child Health includes neither the Santushti programme nor the Jansankhya Sthirata Kosh.

As per Government of India's policy today and confirmation from the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, there are neither coercive family planning schemes nor targets for sterilization. Some schemes focus on recommending and implementing sterilization after the birth of a third child, yet the basis for sterilization is always voluntary and in line with the policy for population stabilisation. Family planning methods, such as delay of first birth, spacing, or sterilization are taking place on the basis of counseling and voluntary and informed decision processes.

Additionally, EU-funded non-governmental organisations (NGOs) working on health issues in India have not reported any cases of forced sterilization in the last few years.

---

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005236/12  
an die Kommission**

**Konrad Szymański (ECR) und Martin Kastler (PPE)**

(23. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Mittel unter dem Siebten Rahmenprogramm für Zwangssterilisationen in Namibia

In einem kürzlichen Bericht der Internationalen Gemeinschaft der mit HIV/Aids lebenden Frauen werden Fälle von Zwangssterilisation von Frauen mit HIV/Aids in Namibia beschrieben. Einige Frauen wurden von Ärzten und medizinischem Personal unter Druck gesetzt, indem ihre Einwilligung zur Sterilisation als Vorbedingung für die Durchführung eines Kaiserschnitts gefordert wurde. Anderen Frauen wurde das Formular über die Zustimmung zu einer Sterilisation ohne ausreichende Erklärung zusammen mit anderen Formularen vorgelegt. In allen dokumentierten Fällen wurde nicht angemessen über den Sterilisationsvorgang aufgeklärt. Eine von der namibischen Regierung durchgeführte Untersuchung kam dagegen zu dem Ergebnis, dass in den Krankenhäusern und Gesundheitseinrichtungen, die der Menschenrechtsverletzung beschuldigt werden, alle vorgeschriebenen Verfahren eingehalten werden. Darüber hinaus hat die Regierung bisher kein grundsätzliches Verbot der Zwangssterilisation eingeführt.

2009 erhielt Namibia Mittel unter dem Siebten Rahmenprogramm (Haushaltslinie 08 02 01, Zusammenarbeit und Gesundheit). Der Hauptempfänger war EquitAble, ein Vierjahresprogramm zur Schaffung eines umfassenden und gleichberechtigten Zugangs zu Gesundheitsdiensten für hilfsbedürftige Menschen, die in einem ressourcenarmen Umfeld leben.

— Kann die Kommission angeben, ob es eine Verbindung zwischen dem Programm EquitAble und der namibischen Regierung gibt?

— Kann sie nachweisen, dass EquitAble nicht in den Krankenhäusern und Gesundheitseinrichtungen tätig ist, in denen Fälle von Sterilisation ohne wirkliche Zustimmung belegt sind?

— Kann sie nachweisen, dass EquitAble nicht an der Sterilisation von Frauen ohne deren wirkliche Einwilligung beteiligt war?

**Antwort von Frau Geoghegan-Quinn im Namen der Kommission**

(9. Juli 2012)

Ziel des Projekts EquitAble (2,6 Mio. EUR) ist es, benachteiligten Bevölkerungsgruppen mit geringen Ressourcen einen allgemeinen und gleichberechtigten Zugang zur medizinischen Versorgung zu ermöglichen. Im Rahmen des Projekts wird ermittelt, welche Hindernisse aus Sicht der Patienten sowie der Anbieter von Gesundheitsdiensten für den Zugang zur medizinischen Versorgung im Sudan, in Namibia, Malawi und Südafrika bestehen und welche Faktoren den Zugang begünstigen. Ein besonderer Fokus des Programms sind Menschen mit Behinderungen.

Die Forschungsarbeit besteht vor allem im Dokumentenstudium sowie in qualitativen und quantitativen Erhebungen. Sie wurde von verschiedenen Ethikkommissionen (School of Medicine Ethics Committee & School of Psychology Ethics Committee, Trinity College Dublin, Research and Publication Committee, University of Namibia, Ethics Committee Ministry of Health and Social Services) positiv begutachtet.

Die Regierung Namibias ist kein Forschungspartner. Die Partner des Projekts EquitAble haben aber die Absicht, die Regierung über die Projektergebnisse zu unterrichten, um sie zu ermutigen, den Bedürfnissen von Menschen mit Behinderungen bei neuen gesundheitspolitischen Konzepten Rechnung zu tragen.

Die Tätigkeiten im Rahmen des Projekts schließen weder Behandlungen noch die Sterilisation von Frauen ein.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005236/12  
do Komisji**

**Konrad Szymański (ECR) oraz Martin Kastler (PPE)**

(23 maja 2012 r.)

*Przedmiot:* Fundusze z siódmego programu ramowego wykorzystywane na przymusową sterylizację w Namibii

W ostatnim sprawozdaniu sporządzonym przez Międzynarodowe Stowarzyszenie Kobiet Żyjących z HIV/AIDS opisuje się przypadki przymusowej sterylizacji kobiet z HIV/AIDS w Namibii. Niektóre kobiety były zmuszane do sterylizacji przez lekarzy i personel medyczny, który żądał wyrażenia zgody na sterylizację jako warunku koniecznego do przeprowadzenia cesarskiego cięcia. Inne kobiety otrzymały formularz umowy dotyczącej sterylizacji wraz z innymi dokumentami bez uzyskania odpowiedniego wyjaśnienia. We wszystkich udokumentowanych przypadkach brakowało jasnego wyjaśnienia dotyczącego procedury sterylizacji. Rząd Namibii przeprowadził oficjalne dochodzenie, w którym ustalono, że szpitale i kliniki oskarżone o naruszanie praw człowieka spełniały wszystkie wymagane procedury. Ponadto rząd nie wprowadził żadnego kategorycznego zakazu przymusowej sterylizacji.

W 2009 r. Namibia otrzymała środki na podstawie siódmego programu ramowego (pozycja w budżecie 08 02 01, współpraca – zdrowie). Dotacja przeznaczona była na czteroletni program EquitAble, którego celem jest zapewnienie powszechnego i sprawiedliwego dostępu do opieki zdrowotnej dla osób znajdujących się w trudnej sytuacji i mieszkających na obszarach o niewielkich zasobach.

— Czy Komisja jest w stanie wykazać, czy istnieją powiązania między programem EquitAble a rządem Namibii?

— Czy Komisja może udowodnić, że program EquitAble nie jest realizowany w klinikach i szpitalach, gdzie wykryto przypadki sterylizacji bez świadomej zgody?

— Czy Komisja może dowiedzieć, że program EquitAble nie ma nic wspólnego ze sterylizacją kobiet bez ich świadomej zgody?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Geoghegan Quinn w imieniu Komisji**

(9 lipca 2012 r.)

Celem projektu EquitAble o wartości 2,6 mln euro jest umożliwienie powszechnego i sprawiedliwego dostępu do opieki zdrowotnej osobom w trudnej sytuacji mieszkającym na obszarach ubogich w zasoby. W ramach tego programu badane są bariery i czynniki ułatwiające dostęp do opieki zdrowotnej z punktu widzenia pacjentów i podmiotów zapewniających opiekę zdrowotną w Sudanie, Namibii, Malawi i Republice Południowej Afryki. Przedmiotem szczególnej uwagi są osoby niepełnosprawne.

Na metodologię badań składają się przede wszystkim przeglądy dokumentacji oraz badania jakościowe i ilościowe. Badanie uzyskało akceptację etyczną Komitetu ds. Etyki Wydziału Medycyny oraz Komitetu ds. Etyki Wydziału Psychologii Trinity College w Dublinie; Komitetu ds. Badań i Publikacji Uniwersytetu Namibijskiego, a także Komitetu Etyki Ministerstwa Zdrowia i Świadczeń Społecznych.

Rząd Namibii nie jest partnerem w tym projekcie badawczym. Jednakże partnerzy projektu EquitAble zamierzają poinformować rząd o wynikach projektu, by zachęcić go do uwzględnienia potrzeb osób niepełnosprawnych przy opracowywaniu nowej polityki zdrowotnej.

Działania zrealizowane w ramach projektu nie obejmują opieki klinicznej, ani nie wiążą się ze sterylizacją kobiet.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005236/12  
to the Commission  
Konrad Szymański (ECR) and Martin Kastler (PPE)  
(23 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Funds under the Seventh Framework Programme for forced sterilisation in Namibia

A recent report by the International Community of Women Living with HIV/AIDS details cases of forced sterilisation of women with HIV/AIDS in Namibia. Some women were put under pressure by doctors and medical staff who required consent to sterilisations as a precondition for receiving caesarean sections. Others were given the sterilisation agreement form together with other documents without appropriate explanation. In all documented cases a clear explanation of the sterilisation process was lacking. An official investigation by the Namibian Government determined that hospitals and clinics accused of human rights abuses followed all required procedures. Furthermore, the government has not introduced any outright ban on forced sterilisation.

In 2009, Namibia received funds under the Seventh Framework Programme (budget line 08 02 01, Cooperation and Health). The grant recipient was EquitAble, a four-year programme to provide universal and equitable access to healthcare for vulnerable people in poor resource settings.

— Can the Commission indicate whether there are links between the EquitAble programme and the Government of Namibia?

— Can the Commission demonstrate that EquitAble does not work in the clinics and hospitals where cases of sterilisation lacking true consent were identified?

— Can the Commission demonstrate that EquitAble was not involved in the sterilisation of women without true consent?

**Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission  
(9 July 2012)**

The EquitAble project (EUR 2,6 million) aims to enable universal and equitable access to healthcare for vulnerable people in poor resource settings. It studies the barriers and the facilitators to access to care, from a patient and healthcare provider's perspective in Sudan, Namibia, Malawi and South Africa. It has a special focus on disabled people.

The research methodology consists of document reviews and qualitative and quantitative surveys. The research has received ethics approval from the School of Medicine Ethics Committee & School of Psychology Ethics Committee, Trinity College Dublin, the Research and Publication Committee, University of Namibia and the Ethics Committee Ministry of Health and Social Services.

The Government of Namibia is not a partner in the research. However, the partners in the EquitAble project intend to inform the Government of the project results in order to encourage them to take the needs of disabled people into consideration when developing new health policies.

The activities carried out in the context of the project do not include care and it does not involve the sterilisation of women.

---



(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005237/12  
an die Kommission**

**Konrad Szymański (ECR) und Martin Kastler (PPE)**

(23. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Mittel aus dem EU-Haushalt für Zwangssterilisationen in Ruanda

Ein ruandischer Gesetzesentwurf von 2009 enthielt Bestimmungen zu obligatorischen HIV/Aids-Tests und Zielvorgaben für die Zwangssterilisation von Menschen mit geistigen Behinderungen. Im Februar 2011 kündigte die Regierung von Ruanda einen Dreijahresplan zur Durchführung von 700 000 Vasektomien zur Abbremsung des Bevölkerungswachstums und der Verbreitung von HIV an. Für den EU-Haushalt gelten spezifische Bestimmungen hinsichtlich des Verbots und der Bekämpfung von Zwangssterilisationen. 2010 erhielt das ruandische Gesundheitsministerium von der Kommission Mittel unter dem Siebten Rahmenprogramm für das Projekt, das unter Führung von TRAC Plus, einem Behandlungs- und Forschungszentrum für ansteckende Infektionskrankheiten, darunter HIV/Aids und sexuell übertragbare Krankheiten, durchgeführt wird.

- Ist das Programm TRAC Plus an der Zwangssterilisation von Menschen mit geistigen Behinderungen beteiligt?
- Wenn ja, wird TRAC Plus durch die EU-Mittel beim Erreichen seiner Zielvorgaben für die Sterilisationen unterstützt?
- Ist TRAC Plus in irgendeiner Weise an dem Dreijahresplan der Regierung zur Durchführung von 700 000 Vasektomien zur Abbremsung des Bevölkerungswachstums beteiligt?
- Wenn ja, wird durch die EU-Mittel TRAC Plus beim Erreichen seiner Zielvorgaben für die Sterilisationen unterstützt?

**Antwort von Frau Geoghegan-Quinn im Namen der Kommission**

(4. Juli 2012)

Das 2007 im Gesundheitsministerium Ruandas gegründete Behandlungs- und Forschungszentrum für AIDS, Malaria, Tuberkulose und andere Epidemien (TRAC Plus) gehört zu den 15 Partnern des Projekts HEALTHY FUTURES (Gesundheit, Umweltveränderungen und Anpassungskapazität: Kartierung, Analyse und Antizipation künftiger Risiken wasserbezogener, vektorübertragener Krankheiten in Ostafrika) <sup>(1)</sup>, das vom Trinity College in Dublin koordiniert und aus dem Siebten Rahmenprogramm für Forschung und technologische Entwicklung (RP7, 2007-2013) kofinanziert wird.

Die Ziele des Projekts und die Tätigkeiten von TRAC Plus im Zusammenhang mit dem Projekt haben mit einer Sterilisierung von Menschen mit geistigen Behinderungen nichts zu tun. Am TRAC Plus tätige Forscher untersuchen die Auswirkungen von Umweltveränderungen auf die Entstehung und Ausbreitung von Malaria und entwerfen Modelle für das Verhältnis zwischen Umwelt und Krankheitsübertragung.

Weder aus dem Europäischen Entwicklungsfonds noch aus dem Finanzierungsinstrument für die Entwicklungszusammenarbeit werden EU-Mittel für die Sterilisation von Menschen mit Behinderungen bereitgestellt.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Das Projekt ist im Januar 2011 für eine Dauer von 48 Monaten mit einer Gesamtbeteiligung der EU von höchstens 3 378 000 EUR angelaufen. Weitere Informationen unter: [www.healthyfutures.eu](http://www.healthyfutures.eu).

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005237/12  
do Komisji**

**Konrad Szymański (ECR) oraz Martin Kastler (PPE)**

(23 maja 2012 r.)

*Przedmiot:* Fundusze z budżetu UE wykorzystywane na przymusową sterylizację w Rwandzie

W 2009 r. w projekcie ustawy w Rwandzie zawarto przepisy dotyczące obowiązkowych testów na HIV/AIDS i cele dotyczące obowiązkowej sterylizacji osób upośledzonych umysłowo. W lutym 2011 r. rząd Rwandy ogłosił trzyletni plan przeprowadzenia 700 000 wazektomii w celu zahamowania przyrostu naturalnego i rozprzestrzeniania się HIV. W budżecie UE zawarto szczegółowe przepisy zakazujące przymusowej sterylizacji i służące walce z nią. W 2010 r. Komisja zapewniła Ministerstwu Zdrowia Rwandy środki finansowe z siódmego programu ramowego na przedsięwzięcie prowadzone przez TRAC Plus – centrum leczenia i badań w zakresie epidemicznych chorób zakaźnych, łącznie z HIV/AIDS i chorobami przenoszonymi drogą płciową.

- Czy program TRAC Plus uczestniczy w obowiązkowej sterylizacji osób upośledzonych umysłowo?
- Jeśli tak, to czy finansowanie UE pomaga programowi TRAC Plus osiągnąć swoje cele w zakresie sterylizacji?
- Czy TRAC Plus uczestniczy w jakikolwiek sposób w trzyletnim rządowym planie przeprowadzenia 700 000 wazektomii w celu zahamowania przyrostu naturalnego?
- Jeśli tak, to czy finansowanie UE pomaga programowi TRAC Plus osiągnąć swoje cele w zakresie sterylizacji?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Máire Geoghegan-Quinn w imieniu Komisji**

(4 lipca 2012 r.)

Centrum leczenia oraz badań nad AIDS, malarią, gruźlicą i innymi chorobami zakaźnymi (Centre for Treatment and Research on AIDS, Malaria, Tuberculosis and other Epidemics), założone w 2007 r. w ramach Ministerstwa Zdrowia Rwandy, jest jednym z 15 partnerów projektu HEALTHY FUTURES ( ZDROWA PRZYSZŁOŚĆ: zdrowie, zmiany środowiskowe i zdolności adaptacyjne: identyfikacja terytorialna, analiza i przewidywanie zagrożeń związanych z wektorowymi chorobami zakaźnymi przenoszonymi przez wodę we wschodniej Afryce) <sup>(1)</sup>, koordynowanego przez Trinity College w Dublinie i współfinansowanego z siódmego programu ramowego w zakresie badań i rozwoju technologicznego (7PR, 2007-2013).

Cele projektu, a co za tym idzie działania TRAC Plus w ramach projektu, nie mają nic wspólnego ze sterylizacją osób niepełnosprawnych umysłowo. Naukowcy działający w ramach TRAC Plus są odpowiedzialni za badanie wpływu zmian środowiskowych na występowanie i rozprzestrzenianie się malarii oraz modelowanie związków dotyczących zakażeń pomiędzy środowiskiem a chorobą.

Na sterylizację osób niepełnosprawnych nie są przeznaczane żadne środki unijne – ani z Europejskiego Funduszu Rozwoju, ani z instrumentu finansowania współpracy na rzecz rozwoju.

<sup>(1)</sup> Projekt rozpoczął się w styczniu 2011 r., potrwa 48 miesięcy, a łączny wkład UE wyniesie maksymalnie 3 378 000 EUR. Więcej informacji: [www.healthyfutures.eu](http://www.healthyfutures.eu).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005237/12  
to the Commission  
Konrad Szymański (ECR) and Martin Kastler (PPE)  
(23 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Funds from the EU budget for forced sterilisation in Rwanda

In 2009, a draft law in Rwanda included provisions for compulsory HIV/AIDS testing and targets for the compulsory sterilisation of people with intellectual disabilities. In February 2011, the Rwandan Government announced a three-year plan to provide for 700 000 vasectomies in order to curb population growth and the spread of HIV. The EU budget contains specific provisions prohibiting and combating forced sterilisation. In 2010, the Commission provided the Rwandan Ministry of Health with funding under the Seventh Framework Programme for the project led by TRAC Plus, which is a centre for treatment and research on epidemic infectious diseases, including HIV/AIDS and sexually transmitted infections.

— Is the TRAC Plus programme involved in the compulsory sterilisation of people with intellectual disabilities?

— If so, is EU funding helping TRAC Plus achieve its sterilisation targets?

— Is TRAC Plus contributing in any way to the government's three-year plan to provide for 700 000 vasectomies with a view to curbing population growth?

— If so, is EU funding helping TRAC Plus achieve its sterilisation targets?

**Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission  
(4 July 2012)**

The Centre for Treatment and Research on AIDS, Malaria, Tuberculosis and other Epidemics, founded in 2007 within the Ministry of Health of Rwanda is one of the 15 partners of the project HEALTHY FUTURES (Health, environmental change and adaptive capacity: mapping examining and anticipating future risks of water-related vector-borne diseases in eastern Africa) <sup>(1)</sup>, coordinated by Trinity College Dublin and co-funded by the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013).

The project objectives and subsequently TRAC Plus activities in the project have nothing to do with sterilisation of people with intellectual disabilities. TRAC Plus researchers are responsible for examining the effects of environmental changes on the emergence and spread of malaria and modelling environment-disease transmission relationships.

No EU funds are provided from either the European Development Fund or the Development Cooperation Instrument for sterilisation of disabled people.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> The project started in January 2011 for a duration of 48 months, with a total EU contribution of maximum EUR 3 378 000. For more information: [www.healthyfutures.eu](http://www.healthyfutures.eu).

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005238/12  
an die Kommission**

**Konrad Szymański (ECR) und Martin Kastler (PPE)**

(23. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Mittel aus dem EU-Haushalt und Zwangssterilisation in Südafrika

2010 beabsichtigten 12 Frauen eine Klage gegen die südafrikanische Regierung wegen Zwangssterilisation, die bei ihnen durchgeführt wurde. 2009 erhielt Südafrika Mittel aus dem Siebten Rahmenprogramm (Haushaltslinie 08 02 01, „Zusammenarbeit und Gesundheit“). Der Empfänger der Finanzierung war EquitAble, ein Vierjahresprogramm zur Schaffung eines umfassenden und gleichberechtigten Zugangs zu Gesundheitsdiensten für hilfsbedürftige Menschen, die in einem ressourcenarmen Umfeld leben. Über diese Gelder hinaus erhielt die südafrikanische Regierung von der Kommission weitere Finanzmittel ohne nähere Angaben unter der Haushaltslinie 21 06 02, „Beziehungen zu Südafrika“.

— Falls festgestellt wird, dass die südafrikanischen Frauen tatsächlich zwangssterilisiert wurden, kann die Kommission nachweisen, dass keine der vorgenannten Mittel im Zusammenhang mit der Zwangssterilisation von Frauen in Südafrika verwendet wurden?

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

(29. Juni 2012)

Ziel des mit 2 654 943 EUR ausgestatteten Programms EquitAble ist es, benachteiligten Bevölkerungsgruppen mit geringen Ressourcen einen allgemeinen und gleichberechtigten Zugang zur medizinischen Versorgung zu ermöglichen. Im Rahmen des Programms wird ermittelt, welche Hindernisse aus Sicht der Patienten sowie der Anbieter von Gesundheitsdiensten für den Zugang zur medizinischen Versorgung bestehen und welche Faktoren den Zugang begünstigen. Ein besonderer Fokus des Programms sind Menschen mit Behinderungen. EquitAble ist ein kooperatives Forschungsprojekt, an dem Wissenschaftler aus Irland, Norwegen, Sudan, Namibia, Malawi und Südafrika teilnehmen.

Die Forschungsarbeit besteht vor allem im Dokumentenstudium sowie in qualitativen und quantitativen Erhebungen. Mit den Forschungsergebnissen soll sichergestellt werden, dass die Bedürfnisse von Menschen mit Behinderungen bei der Ausarbeitung neuer gesundheitspolitischer Strategien berücksichtigt werden.

Die Regierung Südafrikas ist kein Partner des Forschungsvorhabens, beteiligt sich aber aktiv an der Verbreitung der Projektergebnisse. Im Rahmen des Programms wird keine klinische Behandlung angeboten, und das Programm ist nicht an der Sterilisierung von Frauen beteiligt.

Im Rahmen ihrer bilateralen Entwicklungszusammenarbeit (Haushaltslinie 21 06 02) finanziert die Kommission ein Unterstützungsprogramm für den Gesundheitssektor in Südafrika. Den Mittelpunkt dieses Programms bilden die zentralen Ziele des südafrikanischen Gesundheitssektors: Senkung der Mütter- und Kindersterblichkeit, Erhöhung der Lebenserwartung, Bekämpfung von HIV und AIDS und Verringerung der Krankheitsbelastung durch Tuberkulose sowie Verbesserung der Wirksamkeit des Gesundheitssystems.

Diese EU-Unterstützung wird nicht vom Gesundheitsministerium verwendet, um laufende Ausgaben der Einrichtungen des Gesundheitswesens zu finanzieren. Sie zielt vielmehr darauf ab, innovative Maßnahmen und Pilotaktionen anzustoßen, die den Einrichtungen der primären Gesundheitsversorgung vor dem Hintergrund der allgemeinen gesundheitspolitischen Reformen eine neue Dynamik verleihen.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005238/12  
do Komisji**

**Konrad Szymański (ECR) oraz Martin Kastler (PPE)**

(23 maja 2012 r.)

*Przedmiot:* Fundusze z budżetu UE a przymusowa sterylizacja w RPA

W 2010 r. dwanaście kobiet planowało pozwać rząd RPA do sądu. Twierdziły, że poddano je przymusowej sterylizacji. W 2009 r. RPA otrzymała środki w ramach siódmego programu ramowego (pozycja w budżecie 08 02 01, współpraca – zdrowie). Dotacja przeznaczona była na czteroletni program EquitAble, którego celem jest zapewnienie powszechnego i sprawiedliwego dostępu do opieki zdrowotnej dla osób znajdujących się w trudnej sytuacji i mieszkających na obszarach o niewielkich zasobach. Rząd RPA skorzystał nie tylko z przedmiotowej dotacji, ale otrzymał również od Komisji liczne dotacje bez specyfikacji w ramach pozycji w budżecie 21 06 02, stosunki z RPA.

— Jeśli sąd stwierdzi, że kobiety z RPA rzeczywiście zostały poddane przymusowej sterylizacji, czy Komisja będzie w stanie udowodnić, że żadna część wyżej wspomnianych środków nie została przeznaczona na przymusową sterylizację kobiet w RPA?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Andrisa Piebalga w imieniu Komisji**

(29 czerwca 2012 r.)

Program EquitAble, na który przyznano środki w wysokości 2 654 943,00 EUR, ma zapewnić powszechny i równy dostęp do opieki zdrowotnej osobom znajdującym się w trudnej sytuacji i mieszkającym na obszarach o niewielkich zasobach. W ramach tego programu badane są bariery dostępu do opieki zdrowotnej oraz czynniki ułatwiające taki dostęp z punktu widzenia pacjenta i podmiotu zapewniającego opiekę zdrowotną w Sudanie, Namibii, Malawi i Republice Południowej Afryki. Szczególną uwagę zwraca się na osoby niepełnosprawne. Program EquitAble stanowi wspólny projekt badawczy realizowany przez naukowców z Irlandii, Norwegii, Sudanu, Namibii, Malawi i Republiki Południowej Afryki.

Na metodologię badań składają się przede wszystkim przeglądy dokumentacji oraz badania jakościowe i ilościowe. Wyniki badań mają zagwarantować, że potrzeby osób niepełnosprawnych zostaną uwzględnione przy tworzeniu nowych polityk w zakresie zdrowia.

Rząd RPA nie jest partnerem w badaniach, lecz zainteresowaną stroną zaangażowaną w rozpowszechnianie ich wyników. Program jako taki nie zapewnia opieki klinicznej, ani nie jest częścią planu sterylizacji kobiet.

W ramach dwustronnej współpracy na rzecz rozwoju (pozycja w budżecie 21 06 02) Komisja finansuje program wsparcia sektora podstawowej opieki zdrowotnej w RPA. W programie kładzie się nacisk na główne cele w sektorze zdrowia w tym kraju: zmniejszenie wskaźnika umieralności wśród matek i dzieci, wydłużenie średniego trwania życia; walka z HIV oraz AIDS, zmniejszenie obciążeń zdrowotnych wynikających z zachorowań na gruźlicę, a także poprawa skuteczności systemu opieki zdrowotnej.

Departament Zdrowia nie przeznaczają środków z UE na finansowanie bieżących wydatków zakładów opieki zdrowotnej. Unia Europejska udziela wsparcia w celu zapoczątkowania innowacyjnych i pilotażowych działań, które mogą przyczynić się do rewitalizacji zakładów podstawowej opieki zdrowotnej w kontekście ogólnych reform polityki dotyczącej krajowego systemu ubezpieczeń zdrowotnych.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005238/12  
to the Commission  
Konrad Szymański (ECR) and Martin Kastler (PPE)  
(23 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Funds from the EU budget and forced sterilisation in South Africa

In 2010, 12 women were planning to take the South African Government to court, claiming they had been forcibly sterilised. In 2009, South Africa received funds under the Seventh Framework Programme (budget line 08 02 01, 'Cooperation and Health'). The recipient of the grant was EquitAble, a four-year programme designed to provide universal and equitable access to healthcare for vulnerable people in poor-resource settings. In addition to receiving this grant, the South African Government has also received bulk grants, with no specifications, from the Commission under budget line 21 06 02, 'Relations with South Africa'.

— If it is concluded that these South African women were indeed forcibly sterilised, can the Commission demonstrate that none of the abovementioned funds were used in connection with the forcible sterilisation of women in South Africa?

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

The EUR 2 654 943.00 EquitAble programme aims to enable universal and equitable access to healthcare for vulnerable people in poor resource settings. It researches the barriers to and the facilitators of access to care, from a patient and healthcare provider's perspective in Sudan, Namibia, Malawi and South Africa. It has a special focus on the disabled. The programme is a collaborative research project comprised of researchers from Ireland, Norway, Sudan, Namibia, Malawi and South Africa.

The research methodology consists mainly of document reviews and qualitative and quantitative surveys. Results of the research aim to ensure that the needs of the disabled are included when new health policies are developed.

The Government of South Africa is not a partner in the research, though a stakeholder for the dissemination of the findings. The programme as such does not provide clinical care and is not involved in the sterilisation of women.

Through its bilateral development cooperation (budget line 21 06 02), the Commission funds a Primary Health Care Sector support programme in South Africa. This programme focuses on key objectives of the South African health sector: decreasing maternal and child mortality; increasing life expectancy; combating HIV and AIDS and decreasing the burden of disease from tuberculosis; and strengthening health systems' effectiveness.

This EU support is not used by the Department of Health to fund recurrent expenditures of the health systems facilities. It aims to initiate innovative and piloting actions that can contribute to the revitalisation of the primary healthcare facilities in the context of the overall National Health Insurance policy reforms.

---

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005239/12  
an die Kommission**

**Konrad Szymański (ECR) und Martin Kastler (PPE)**

(23. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Mittel aus dem EU-Haushalt für Zwangssterilisationen in Vietnam

Derzeit gibt es Hinweise auf die Beteiligung der vietnamesischen Regierung an Programmen für Zwangsmaßnahmen im Bereich der Reproduktionsmedizin im zentralen Hochland des Landes. Vertretern der dort ansässigen Montagnards zufolge wurden von der vietnamesischen Regierung missbräuchliche Maßnahmen einschließlich chirurgischer Zwangssterilisationen durchgeführt. 2009 erhielt Marie Stopes International von der Kommission 1 837 855 EUR für ein Programm mit der Bezeichnung „Aufbau von Kapazitäten bei lokalen Behörden und Privatunternehmen als Dienstleister im Bereich sexuelle und reproduktive Gesundheit in Vietnam und Kambodscha“.

Darüber hinaus erhielt die vietnamesische Regierung 43 Mio. EUR aus dem Instrument für Entwicklungszusammenarbeit für die Armutsbekämpfung in Vietnam. Für den EU-Haushalt gelten spezifische Bestimmungen, die dem Verbot und der Bekämpfung von Zwangssterilisation dienen sollen. In der Haushaltslinie 19 10 01 01 zur Unterstützung von Vietnam ist geregelt, dass ein Teil der Mittel „unter Beachtung der Vorschriften der Haushaltsordnung, zur Verbesserung der Situation von Frauen, vorrangig in den Bereichen Bildung und Gesundheit“ dienen soll.

— Ist der Kommission bekannt, dass Vietnam an Praktiken der Zwangssterilisation beteiligt ist?

— Kann die Kommission nachweisen, dass Marie Stopes International und die vietnamesische Regierung die Mittel aus dem Instrument für Entwicklungszusammenarbeit nicht für Zwangssterilisationen an der Bevölkerung des zentralen Hochlands verwendet?

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

(4. Juli 2012)

Der Hohen Vertreterin/Vizepräsidenten sind die Behauptungen, wonach die Regierung Vietnams Zwangssterilisationen unter den ethnischen Minderheiten veranlasst haben soll, bekannt.

Allerdings wurden diese Behauptungen weder von unabhängigen Menschenrechtsorganisationen noch vom Amt des Hohen Kommissars der Vereinten Nationen für Menschenrechte (UNHCHR) bestätigt. Auch im Abschlussbericht des unabhängigen Sachverständigen der UN für Minderheitenfragen, der im Juli 2010 nach Vietnam reiste, wurden derartige Praktiken nicht erwähnt.

Die Zwangssterilisation gehört nicht zur Gesundheitspolitik der vietnamesischen Regierung und unseres Wissen gibt es auch keine Belege für eine solche Praxis. Die Delegation der Europäischen Union in Hanoi, die die Maßnahmen der EU zur Unterstützung der Gesundheitsprogramme der Regierung überwacht, ist auf keine Fälle dieser Art gestoßen.

Bei Marie Stopes International handelt es sich um eine etablierte Organisation, die auf Fragen der Gesundheit von Müttern und Kindern spezialisiert ist und Zwangssterilisationen weder befürwortet noch vornimmt. Wir haben überhaupt keine Anhaltspunkte dafür, dass die Hilfspgelder der EU für Vietnam — einschließlich der Mittel, die über Marie Stopes International geleitet werden — zur Durchführung von Zwangssterilisationen unter den Bergvölkern im zentralen Hochland Vietnams oder für ähnliche Zwecke anderswo im Land missbraucht werden. Die genannte NRO ist nicht einmal im zentralen Hochland Vietnams tätig.

Die EU beobachtet die Lage in Bezug auf die Rechte ethnischer Minderheiten in Vietnam sehr genau. Bei ihren Kontakten mit den vietnamesischen Behörden, so z. B. anlässlich der ersten Runde des verstärkten Menschenrechtsdialogs EU-Vietnam im Juli 2012 in Hanoi, bringt sie diesbezügliche Sorgen regelmäßig zur Sprache. Die EU-Delegation in Hanoi und die Botschaften der EU-Mitgliedstaaten werden diesen Fragen weiterhin höchste Aufmerksamkeit widmen.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005239/12  
do Komisji**

**Konrad Szymański (ECR) oraz Martin Kastler (PPE)**

(23 maja 2012 r.)

*Przedmiot:* Fundusze z budżetu UE wykorzystywane na przymusową sterylizację w Wietnamie

Istnieją obecnie dowody na to, że wietnamski rząd jest zamieszany w represyjne programy dotyczące zdrowia reprodukcyjnego w Regionie Płaskowyżu Centralnego. Ludność Degar twierdzi, że wietnamski rząd stosuje naruszające prawo środki, łącznie z przymusową sterylizacją chirurgiczną. W 2009 r. organizacja Marie Stopes International otrzymała od Komisji 1 837 855 EUR na program pt. „Budowanie zdolności we władzach lokalnych i sektorze prywatnym, świadczącym usługi z zakresu zdrowia seksualnego i reprodukcyjnego w Wietnamie i Kambodży”.

Ponadto wietnamski rząd otrzymał 43 mln EUR z instrumentu finansowania współpracy na rzecz rozwoju – pomoc finansowa służąca ograniczaniu ubóstwa w Wietnamie. W budżecie UE zawarte są szczegółowe przepisy zakazujące przymusowej sterylizacji i służące walce z nią. Pozycja w budżecie 19 10 01 01, fundusze na rzecz Wietnamu, stanowi, że część tych środków „jest przeznaczona, z pełnym uwzględnieniem rozporządzenia finansowego, na poprawę sytuacji kobiet, przede wszystkim na działania w obszarze zdrowia i edukacji”.

Czy Komisja jest świadoma tego, że Wietnam uczestniczy w praktykach przymusowej sterylizacji?

Czy Komisja jest w stanie udowodnić, że organizacja Marie Stopes International i wietnamski rząd nie wykorzystują funduszy z instrumentu finansowania współpracy na rzecz rozwoju, aby zmuszać ludność Degar do sterylizacji?

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

(4 lipca 2012 r.)

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca jest świadoma zarzutów pod adresem rządu Wietnamu dotyczących przeprowadzania przez niego przymusowej sterylizacji wśród mniejszości etnicznych.

Te doniesienia nie zostały jednak potwierdzone przez niezależne organizacje ochrony praw człowieka ani przez Biuro Wysokiego Komisarza NZ ds. Praw Człowieka. W sprawozdaniu końcowym niezależnej ekspert ds. praw mniejszości ONZ, która w lipcu 2010 r. złożyła wizytę w Wietnamie, nie znalazły się informacje o występowaniu tego rodzaju praktyk.

Polityka zdrowia publicznego rządu wietnamskiego nie obejmuje tego rodzaju praktyk i, o ile nam wiadomo, nie istnieją dowody na to, aby takie praktyki miały miejsce. Delegatura Unii Europejskiej w Hanoi podczas kontroli własnego wsparcia udzielanego rządowym programom w zakresie zdrowia nie spotkała się z podobnymi przypadkami.

Marie Stopes International jest organizacją o ugruntowanej pozycji, która zajmuje się głównie zagadnieniami zdrowia matki i dziecka, i która nie popiera, ani nie stosuje przymusowej sterylizacji w Wietnamie. Nie posiadamy żadnych dowodów na to, że pomoc UE dla Wietnamu (w tym pomoc udzielona za pośrednictwem organizacji Marie Stopes International) miałyby zostać wykorzystana do propagowania przymusowych programów w dziedzinie rozrodczości na terenie Płaskowyżu Centralnego w Wietnamie, aby „zmuszać ludność Degar do sterylizacji”, ani na innym obszarze kraju. Wspomniana organizacja pozarządowa nie działa zresztą na terenie wietnamskiego Płaskowyżu Centralnego.

UE przygląda się bardzo uważnie sytuacji praw mniejszości etnicznych w Wietnamie. Unia regularnie zgłasza władzom wietnamskim zastrzeżenia dotyczące sytuacji praw mniejszości etnicznych, również podczas pierwszej tury poszerzonego dialogu UE-Wietnam na temat praw człowieka w styczniu 2012 r. w Hanoi. Delegatura UE w Hanoi wraz z ambasadami państw członkowskich UE będzie nadal uważnie śledzić te zagadnienia.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005239/12  
to the Commission  
Konrad Szymański (ECR) and Martin Kastler (PPE)  
(23 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Funds from the EU budget for forced sterilisation in Vietnam

There is currently evidence that the Government of Vietnam is involved in coercive reproductive health programmes in the country's Central Highlands. According to the Degar Montagnard people, the Vietnamese Government has taken abusive measures, including forced surgical sterilisation. In 2009, Marie Stopes International received EUR 1 837 855 from the Commission for a programme called 'Building Capacity in Local Authority and Private Sector Sexual and Reproductive Healthcare providers in Vietnam and Cambodia'.

In addition, the Government of Vietnam has received EUR 43 million from the Development and Cooperation Instrument, aid money intended to help reduce poverty in Vietnam. The EU budget has specific provisions that are meant to prohibit and combat forced sterilisation. Budget line 19 10 01 01, funding Vietnam, states that it is also 'intended to be used, with due regard for the Financial Regulation, to improve the situation of women, with priority for actions in the fields of health and education'.

— Is the Commission aware that Vietnam is involved in forced sterilisation practices?

— Can the Commission demonstrate that Marie Stopes International and the Government of Vietnam are not using Development and Cooperation Instrument funds to forcibly sterilise the Montagnard people?

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

The High Representative/Vice-President is aware of allegations that the Government of Vietnam performed forced sterilisations among ethnic minorities.

However, such allegations have not been confirmed by independent human rights organisations, nor by the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights. The final report of the UN Independent Expert on Minority Issues, who visited Vietnam in July 2010, did not mention the existence of such practices.

Such a practice is not part of the public health policies of the Vietnamese Government, and there is also, to the best of our knowledge, no evidence that such practices are taking place. The European Union Delegation in Hanoi, in monitoring its own support to the Government's health programmes, has not come across such cases.

Marie Stopes International is a well-established organisation specialised in mother and child health issues, which does not advocate or practise forced sterilisations in Vietnam. We have no evidence at all that EU aid to Vietnam (including aid channelled through Marie Stopes International) would have been used to promote coercive reproductive health programmes in the country's Central Highlands in order 'to forcibly sterilise the Montagnard people', nor elsewhere in the country. This NGO does actually not work in Vietnam's Central Highlands.

The EU has monitored very closely the situation of ethnic minorities' rights in Vietnam. It has raised it regularly, including during the first round of the enhanced EU-Vietnam human rights dialogue held in January 2012 in Hanoi, concerns pertaining to ethnic minorities' rights with Vietnamese authorities. The EU Delegation in Hanoi, together with EU Member States' embassies, will continue to monitor these issues closely.

---

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005240/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Franz Obermayr (NI)**  
(23. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Konsequenzen für die EU wegen Blockade der Nato-Arbeit durch die Türkei

Die Türkei belastet wegen ihrer unversöhnlichen Haltung gegenüber Israel und Zypern zunehmend die Arbeit der Nato. Das bekommt auch die EU zu spüren. So wird die EU beim Nato-Gipfel Ende Mai in Chicago auf Betreiben Ankaras zu einem Treffen mit Partnern der Allianz nicht eingeladen. Grund für diese Blockade ist das gespannte Verhältnis der Türkei zum EU-Mitgliedsland Zypern. Dies bedeutet, dass die Türkei indirekt antieuropäische Politik betreibt. Daher stellen sich diesbezüglich folgende Fragen:

1. Wird die Kommission Druck auf die Türkei ausüben, damit sie diese der EU schadende Politik beendet?
2. Wenn nein, warum nicht?
3. Kann sich die Kommission vorstellen, falls die Türkei weiter gegen Zypern interveniert, die Heranführungshilfe zu streichen?
4. Wenn nein, warum nicht?

**Antwort von Frau Catherine Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission**  
(6. Juli 2012)

Die EU kann sich nicht zur Politik eines Drittstaats in einer anderen internationalen Organisation äußern. Alle Entscheidungen des Nordatlantikrates der NATO sind das Ergebnis eines Verhandlungsprozesses zwischen den Mitgliedern und werden einvernehmlich getroffen. Die Entscheidungen werden deshalb von allen 28 Mitgliedern vollständig mitgetragen.

Im Dezember 2011 vermittelte der Europäische Rat eine klare Botschaft, als er seine große Besorgnis hinsichtlich der Stellungnahmen der Türkei und der Drohungen gegen einen Mitgliedstaat zum Ausdruck brachte und forderte, dass die Rolle des Ratsvorsitzes, die ein im Vertrag verankertes grundlegendes institutionelles Merkmal der EU ist, uneingeschränkt geachtet wird. Zudem hat der Rat immer wieder hervorgehoben, wie wichtig Fortschritte bei der Normalisierung der Beziehungen zwischen der Türkei und allen EU-Mitgliedstaaten, einschließlich der Republik Zypern, sind. Die Kommission betont nach wie vor, dass die Zypernfrage dringend gelöst werden muss, und fordert alle Parteien dazu auf, mit diesem Thema konstruktiv umzugehen.

Darüber hinaus wird die Kommission die Haltung der Türkei gegenüber Zypern und die Einhaltung des Verhandlungsrahmens für die Beitrittsverhandlungen mit der Türkei aus dem Jahr 2005 weiterhin genau verfolgen. Eine abschließende Bewertung veröffentlicht die Kommission in ihrem jährlichen Fortschrittsbericht.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005240/12  
to the Commission  
Franz Obermayr (NI)  
(23 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Consequences for the EU of Turkey's obstruction of NATO's work

Turkey is increasingly obstructing NATO's work due to its intransigent attitude towards Israel and Cyprus. This also has an impact on the EU. For example, at the behest of Ankara, the EU has not been invited to attend a meeting with partners of the Alliance as part of the NATO summit in Chicago at the end of May. The reason for this obstruction is the tense relationship between Turkey and EU Member State, Cyprus. This means that Turkey is indirectly following an anti-European policy. In view of the above:

1. Will the Commission exert pressure on Turkey to put an end to this policy, which is damaging to the EU?
2. If not, why not?
3. Could the Commission consider the possibility of cancelling pre-accession aid if Turkey continues to intervene against Cyprus?
4. If not, why not?

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

The EU is not in the position to comment on the policy of a third state in another international organisation. All decisions of NATO's North Atlantic Council are the result of a negotiating process between its members and taken by consensus. Decisions are therefore fully endorsed by all 28 allies.

In December 2011 a clear message was transmitted, when the European Council expressed serious concern with regard to Turkish statements and threats towards a Member State and called for full respect of the role of the Presidency of the Council, which is a fundamental institutional feature of the EU provided for in the Treaty. Also, the Council has continuously underlined the importance of progress in the normalisation of relations between Turkey and all EU Member States, including the Republic of Cyprus. The Commission continues to stress that a solution to the Cyprus problem is urgent and encourages all parties to treat this issue constructively.

Furthermore the Commission will continue to monitor closely Turkey's position on Cyprus and its compliance with the 2005 Negotiating Framework for the accession negotiations with Turkey. Its assessment is presented in the Commission's annual Progress Report.

---

(Svensk version)

**Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-005241/12  
till kommissionen**

**Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)**

(23 maj 2012)

*Angående:* Uppföljning av resolutionen om avtalet för synskadade i EU:s handelsförbindelser

Under de senaste åren har kommissionen slutit flera omfattande frihandelsavtal med tredje parter, bl.a. Cariforum, och nyligen Colombia och Peru. Dessa avtal och pågående förhandlingar ger kommissionen en möjlighet att införliva nyskapande bestämmelser som kan garantera synskadade personers tillgång till böcker och andra trycksaker, och därmed ta itu med den extrema bristen på läsmaterial i rätt format för miljontals synskadade personer i tredjeländer, samt tillgodose behovet av åtgärder på EU-nivå i enlighet med dess politiska mål om utveckling, universella mänskliga rättigheter och skyddet för personer med funktionshinder.

När det gäller undantag och begränsningar beträffande upphovsrätten som tillåts av internationell rätt, har kommissionen vidtagit åtgärder för att införliva synskadade personers tillgång till böcker och andra trycksaker i internationella avtal, i enlighet med parlamentets resolution (P7\_TA-PROV(2012)0059) om framställning nr 0924/2011 ingiven av Dan Pescod (brittisk medborgare) för European Blind Union/Royal National Institute of Blind People? <sup>(1)</sup>

— Kan kommissionen ge någon information till parlamentet vad gäller framsteg som gjorts i detta sammanhang?

**Svar från Karel De Gucht på kommissionens vägnar**

(26 juni 2012)

Kommissionen stödjer helt det arbete som Världsorganisationen för den intellektuella äganderätten (Wipo) utför vad gäller synskadade personers tillgång till böcker och andra trycksaker. EU deltar aktivt i diskussionen om ett framtida internationellt instrument och betonar vikten av det praktiska arbete som Wipo parallellt bedriver genom att föra dialog med berörda parter.

EU:s frihandelsavtal innehåller i allmänhet en hänvisning till undantagen i upphovsrätten enligt Wipofördragen och multilaterala avtal. När ett internationellt instrument för gränsöverskridande distribution av böcker för synskadade personer finns på plats, och Wipos arbete är avslutat, kommer detta instrument att beaktas när EU:s frihandelsavtal förhandlas fram.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=MOTION&reference=B7-2012-0062&language=SV>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005241/12  
to the Commission**

**Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)**

(23 May 2012)

*Subject:* Following up the resolution on the Treaty for the Blind in EU trade relations

In the past few years, the Commission has concluded several extensive free trade agreements with third parties, among others CARIFORUM and, recently, Colombia and Peru. These agreements, and still ongoing negotiations, provide an opportunity for the Commission to incorporate progressive provisions ensuring access for visually impaired persons to books and other printed material, and thereby address the extreme shortage of properly formatted reading material for millions of visually impaired persons in third countries, and the need for the EU to act in coherence with its policy objectives with regard to development, universal human rights and the protection of disabled persons.

In the area of exceptions and limitations to copyright as enabled by international law, is the Commission acting to push for the inclusion in international agreements of facilities for access by visually impaired people to books and other printed products, in line with the Parliament's resolution (P7\_TA-PROV(2012)0059) on Petition 0924/2011 by Dan Pescod (British), on behalf of European Blind Union (EBU)/Royal National Institute of Blind People (RNIB)?<sup>(1)</sup>

— What information can the Commission provide to Parliament regarding any progress made in this connection?

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

(26 June 2012)

The Commission is fully supportive of the work being carried out in the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO) as regards access to books and other printed products by visually impaired people. The European Union is an active participant in the discussions on a future international instrument and recognises the importance of the practical work being done in parallel by the WIPO Stakeholder Dialogue.

The EU Free Trade Agreements (FTA) generally refer to the copyright exceptions in the WIPO Treaties and multilateral agreements. Once the work in WIPO has concluded, and a specific international instrument comes into existence for the cross-border distribution of special format works for the visually impaired, this will be taken into consideration in negotiations of the FTAs.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=MOTION&reference=B7-2012-0062&language=EN>.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005242/12  
a la Comisión**

**Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)**

(23 de mayo de 2012)

*Asunto:* Puerto de superyates en Marina Port Vell

Existe un proyecto de reforma que pretende cambiar la concesión de dominio público de titularidad en Marina Port Vell, S.A.U en el Puerto de Barcelona. Es un proyecto de la Autoridad Portuaria de Barcelona y del ayuntamiento para construir un puerto privado de yates de lujo.

La Marina Port Vell está situada en el centro de la ciudad, entre el barrio de la Barceloneta y el Barrio Gótico de Barcelona, en un espacio muy sensible a los cambios por su integración dentro de la trama urbana de Ciutat Vella.

Este proyecto tendrá graves consecuencias para la zona. Convertir Marina Port Vell en un embarcadero de superyates supone un grave impacto visual, ya que estos barcos tienen unas dimensiones muy grandes y no permitirán la visión a través del puerto. A la vez, se propone la creación de edificios más altos y barreras de seguridad de 1,80 metros que también crearan grandes barreras visuales.

La conversión del puerto también impactará de forma negativa en el tejido urbano de la ciudad, rompiendo el modelo de diversidad social del barrio de la Barceloneta creando un puerto elitista y excluyente, contrario al modelo del puerto ciudadano necesario para Barcelona. El proyecto también generará graves problemas ambientales ya que los superyates consumen mucha más energía y generalmente usan combustibles fósiles que producirán un gran aumento de la contaminación atmosférica. El proyecto también significará un aumento del uso del vehículo privado en la zona.

Considerando la Directiva de Evaluación de Impacto Ambiental (85/337/EEC):

- ¿Tiene la Comisión constancia de esta propuesta del Ayuntamiento de Barcelona?
- ¿Piensa la Comisión emprender alguna acción contra el tema?

**Respuesta del Sr. Potočník en nombre de la Comisión**

(17 de julio de 2012)

La Comisión no tiene conocimiento de la propuesta del Ayuntamiento de Barcelona relativa al proyecto de construcción de un puerto privado de yates de lujo reconvirtiendo las instalaciones de Marina Port Vell.

Debe observarse que, dependiendo de las características del proyecto, las disposiciones de la Directiva 2011/92/UE <sup>(1)</sup> (conocida como la Directiva sobre la evaluación de impacto ambiental, o Directiva EIA) podrían ser aplicables al presente caso. Los puertos de recreo están cubiertos por el punto 12, letra b), del anexo II de la Directiva EIA.

El procedimiento de EIA garantiza que se determinen y evalúen las consecuencias medioambientales de los proyectos antes de que la autoridad competente conceda la autorización correspondiente. Los ciudadanos pueden dar su opinión y deben tomarse en consideración todas las consultas realizadas. También debe informarse a los ciudadanos del contenido de la autorización.

Las autoridades competentes españolas todavía no han adoptado una decisión final sobre este proyecto. Por consiguiente, la Comisión no observa ningún indicio de infracción de la legislación de la UE sobre medio ambiente y, por el momento, no se puede tomar ninguna medida.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> DO L 26 de 28.1.2012, pp. 1-16 (versión codificada de la Directiva 85/337/CEE, relativa a la evaluación de las repercusiones de determinados proyectos públicos y privados sobre el medio ambiente, modificada).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005242/12  
to the Commission**

**Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)**

(23 May 2012)

*Subject:* Superyacht harbour at Marina Port Vell

A draft reform has been proposed to change the public concession held by the company Marina Port Vell, S.A.U. in the Port of Barcelona. The Barcelona Port Authority and Barcelona City Council plan to build a private marina for luxury yachts.

Marina Port Vell is located in the centre of Barcelona, between the Barceloneta district and the Gothic Quarter, in an area that is very sensitive to change as it forms part of the Old Town's urban fabric.

This plan will have serious implications for the area. Turning Marina Port Vell into a superyacht marina will greatly change the appearance of the area since these boats are very large and, together with the taller buildings and 1.80-metre safety barriers included in the plans, will block views across the harbour.

The port's transformation will also damage the city's urban fabric, harming the social diversity of the Barceloneta district by creating an elitist and exclusive port that stands at odds with the citizens' port that Barcelona needs. The plan will also create serious environmental problems as superyachts consume much more energy and generally use fossil fuels, greatly increasing air pollution. The plan will also increase private vehicle traffic in the area.

In view of the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive (85/337/EEC):

- Is the Commission aware of Barcelona City Council's proposal?
- Will the Commission take any action on the issue?

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

(17 July 2012)

The Commission is not aware of Barcelona City Council's proposal regarding the project to build a private marina for luxury yachts, reconverting the installations of Marina Port Vell.

It should be noted that, depending on the characteristics of the project, the provisions of Directive 2011/92/EU<sup>(1)</sup> (known as the Environmental Impact Assessment or EIA Directive) could be applicable to this case. Marinas projects are covered by point 12 b) of Annex II of the EIA Directive.

The EIA procedure ensures that environmental consequences of projects are identified and assessed before development consent is granted by the competent authority. The public can give its opinion and all the consultations must be taken into consideration. The public should also be informed of the content of the development consent.

It appears that the competent Spanish authorities have not taken yet a final decision on this project. Therefore, the Commission can find no evidence of a breach of EU environmental law at this stage and no further action can be taken.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 26, 28.1.2012, p. 1-16 (codified version of Directive 85/337/EEC on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment, as amended).

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005244/12**

**alla Commissione**

**Mara Bizzotto (EFD)**

(23 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Gassificatore di Cassola e protezione dei cittadini dai rischi di inquinamento ambientale

Le società che producono impianti per lo smaltimento dei rifiuti in base al procedimento della cosiddetta «gassificazione in camera stagna» pubblicizzano questa particolare tecnologia come innovativa e rivoluzionaria. Le società produttrici sostengono che questo tipo di impianti — capaci di smaltire 100 tonnellate al giorno di materiale — sia in grado, a differenza degli inceneritori, di convertire diversi tipi di rifiuti in energia, in modo sicuro per le persone e sostenibile per l'ambiente. L'installazione di un impianto di smaltimento di rifiuti con gassificazione è allo studio presso il Comune di Cassola, in provincia di Vicenza.

Occorre tenere presente che lo studio intitolato «Verifica della fattibilità di un impianto di trattamento termico dei rifiuti a tecnologia innovativa nella Provincia di Torino» ha messo invece in luce che il «syngas», ovvero il gas sprigionato dal trattamento dei rifiuti, viene poi utilizzato per produrre energia attraverso la combustione, e che quindi il trattamento comprende, di fatto, anche una fase di incenerimento. Inoltre l'ordinamento italiano, visto il Decreto Legislativo n. 133 del 2005 che recepisce la direttiva 2000/76/CE, parifica la gassificazione all'incenerimento. L'impianto di Cassola dovrebbe trattare, a centro metri di distanza dalla prima abitazione civile, 100 tonnellate di rifiuti al giorno, 24 ore su 24, per una potenzialità annua di circa 36 mila tonnellate.

1. La Commissione ritiene che tali impianti realizzino effettivamente un processo innovativo e diverso dall'incenerimento?

2. Ha intenzione di definire un quadro normativo unico, fondato su uno studio accurato del fenomeno, che stabilisca i parametri di sicurezza in termini di distanza degli impianti di smaltimento dal centro abitato e la capitalizzazione minima delle società, partecipate o private, che acquistano questi impianti, affinché forniscano garanzie sufficienti nel caso di problemi tecnici suscettibili di provocare danni alle persone e all'ambiente?

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

(10 luglio 2012)

Il funzionamento di un gassificatore, come quello cui fa riferimento l'onorevole parlamentare, è disciplinato dalla direttiva 2008/1/CE sulla prevenzione e la riduzione integrate dell'inquinamento <sup>(1)</sup> e dalla direttiva 2000/76/CE sull'incenerimento dei rifiuti <sup>(2)</sup>. Entrambe le direttive sono sostituite dalla direttiva 2010/75/UE relativa alle emissioni industriali <sup>(3)</sup>. Tali direttive specificano che nei processi di incenerimento e coincenerimento rientra anche la gassificazione a condizione che le sostanze risultanti siano successivamente incenerite. La gassificazione è esclusa dai requisiti minimi per l'incenerimento o il coincenerimento soltanto se i gas prodotti sono purificati in misura tale da non costituire più rifiuti prima del loro incenerimento e da generare emissioni non superiori a quelle derivanti dalla combustione di gas naturale.

La Commissione ritiene che questi requisiti siano sufficienti per la protezione dell'ambiente e della salute umana.

Inoltre, un gassificatore quale quello descritto dall'onorevole parlamentare rientra nell'ambito di applicazione della direttiva 2011/92/UE del Consiglio concernente la valutazione dell'impatto ambientale di determinati progetti pubblici e privati <sup>(4)</sup>.

Sulla base delle informazioni fornite nell'interrogazione scritta e poiché l'impianto non è ancora stato costruito, la Commissione non è in grado di riscontrare alcuna violazione delle direttive.

<sup>(1)</sup> GUL 24 del 29.1.2008.

<sup>(2)</sup> GUL 332 del 28.12.2000.

<sup>(3)</sup> GUL 334 del 17.12.2010.

<sup>(4)</sup> GUL 26 del 28.1.2012.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005244/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Mara Bizzotto (EFD)**  
(23 May 2012)

*Subject:* Gasifier in Cassola and protection of the public from environmental pollution hazards

The companies that produce waste disposal plants based on the 'gasification in a sealed chamber' procedure advertise this particular technology as being innovative and revolutionary. The producers maintain that this type of plant, which is able to dispose of 100 tonnes of material per day, is able — unlike incinerators — to convert various types of waste into energy in a way that is safe for people and environmentally sustainable. The municipality of Cassola, province of Vicenza, is currently considering installing a waste disposal plant using gasification technology.

A study entitled 'Testing the feasibility of a thermal waste treatment plant using innovative technology in the Province of Turin', however, has pointed out that 'syngas', i.e. the gas released during waste treatment, is used to generate energy through combustion and that therefore the treatment also includes an incineration stage. Furthermore, Italian legislation, more specifically Legislative Decree No 133 of 2005, transposing Directive 2000/76/EC, puts gasification on the same footing as incineration. The Cassola plant is supposed to treat 100 tonnes of waste per day, 24 hours a day, for a potential annual capacity of some 36 000 tonnes, at only 100 metres from the nearest residential building.

1. Does the Commission believe that these plants genuinely use an innovative process that differs from incineration?
2. Will it establish a single regulatory framework, based on a careful study of the issue, laying down safety parameters in terms of the distance of waste disposal plants from residential areas and minimum capital requirements for the companies (publicly held or private) which purchase these plants, to ensure they provide sufficient guarantees in the event of technical problems which could cause harm to people and/or the environment?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission**  
(10 July 2012)

Operation of a waste gasification plant, as described by the Honourable Member, falls under Directive 2008/1/EC concerning integrated pollution prevention and control <sup>(1)</sup> and Directive 2000/76/EC on the incineration of Waste <sup>(2)</sup>. These Directives are being replaced by Directive 2010/75/EU on industrial emissions <sup>(3)</sup>. They all make clear that incineration and co-incineration includes gasification if the resulting substances are subsequently incinerated. Gasification is only excluded from the minimum requirements for incineration or co-incineration if the resulting gases are purified to such an extent that they are no longer waste prior to their incineration and result in emissions no higher than those resulting from the burning of natural gas.

The Commission considers that these requirements are sufficient to protect the environment and human health.

Furthermore, a gasification plant as previously described falls under the scope of Council Directive 2011/92/EU on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment <sup>(4)</sup>.

Based on the information contained in the written question, and given that the installation has yet to be constructed, the Commission cannot identify any breaches of the directives.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 24, 29.1.2008.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 332, 28.12.2000.

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ L 334, 17.12.2010.

<sup>(4)</sup> OJ L 26, 28.1.2012.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005245/12**

**alla Commissione**  
**Mara Bizzotto (EFD)**  
(23 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Delocalizzazione FiliVivi in Veneto

Il 9 maggio 2012 la Filivivi Srl, azienda tessile di Piovene Rocchette in Veneto, ha deciso in seguito alla crisi di chiudere lo stabilimento di filatura, di avviare la procedura di mobilità per 127 dipendenti e di procedere alla contestuale delocalizzazione della produzione dall'Italia alla Romania.

— La Commissione è a conoscenza della situazione?

— Ritene di attivare il FEG in favore dei dipendenti licenziati dalla Filivivi?

— In quale modo intende arginare il problema della delocalizzazione che sempre più colpisce il tessuto industriale europeo, i lavoratori e le loro famiglie?

— Quali azioni intende intraprendere riguardo alle difformità amministrative, burocratiche e previdenziali ancora presenti nel mercato unico e che fortemente distorcono la competitività fra i diversi Stati europei?

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

(16 luglio 2012)

La Commissione non era a conoscenza del licenziamento di lavoratori da parte della società Filivivi nella regione Veneto. Essa invita l'onorevole deputata a mettersi in contatto con il referente del Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione in Italia <sup>(1)</sup> per accertare se è in corso una richiesta di intervento in seguito a tali licenziamenti.

La Commissione rinvia inoltre l'onorevole deputata alle risposte che ha dato alle interrogazioni E-4567/2012 (sugli interventi relativi alle delocalizzazioni in generale) nonché E-5126/2012 ed E-5243/2012 (sulle misure cofinanziate dal Fondo sociale europeo nella regione Veneto che potrebbero essere applicate ai lavoratori licenziati da Filivivi).

La Commissione si adopera costantemente per migliorare il funzionamento del mercato unico assicurando che le singole persone, i consumatori e le imprese colgano appieno i benefici delle «quattro libertà» — la libertà di movimento delle persone, dei beni, dei servizi e dei capitali sancite nel trattato. Esempi recenti comprendono il rilancio del mercato unico con il Single Market Act <sup>(2)</sup> e le iniziative dell'8 giugno 2012 in merito a una governance migliore per il mercato unico <sup>(3)</sup> e al «pacchetto servizi» <sup>(4)</sup>.

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

<sup>(2)</sup> Comunicazione sull'Atto per il mercato unico — Dodici leve per stimolare la crescita e rafforzare la fiducia «Insieme per una nuova crescita», COM(2011)206 final.

<sup>(3)</sup> Comunicazione su «Una governance migliore per il mercato unico», COM(2012)259 final.

<sup>(4)</sup> Comunicazione sull'attuazione della direttiva sui servizi «Un partenariato per una nuova crescita nel settore dei servizi 2012-2015» corredata di tre documenti di lavoro della Commissione, SWD(2012)146 final, SWD(2012)147 final e SWD(2012)148 final.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005245/12  
to the Commission  
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)  
(23 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Relocation of Filivivi in the Veneto region

On 9 May 2012, Filivivi Srl, a textile company from Piovene Rocchette in the Veneto region, decided due to the crisis to close its spinning facility, began the redundancy process for its 127 employees and proceeded with the concomitant relocation of production from Italy to Romania.

— Is the Commission aware of the situation?

— Will it mobilise the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund for employees made redundant by Filivivi?

— How does it intend to stem the problem of relocation which is increasingly hitting the European textile industry, its employees and their families?

— What measures does it intend to take regarding the administrative, bureaucratic and social security discrepancies still present in the single market and which strongly distort competitiveness between the various EU Member States?

**Answer given by M. Andor on behalf of the Commission  
(16 July 2012)**

The Commission was not aware of the workers made redundant by the Filivivi company in the Veneto Region. It invites the Honourable Member to contact the contact person for the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund in Italy <sup>(1)</sup> to find out whether any application is in the pipeline following those redundancies.

The Commission would also refer the Honourable Member to the answers it gave to questions E-4567/2012 (on action relating to relocation in general) and E-5126/2012 and E-5243/2012 (on measures co-financed by the European Social Fund in the Veneto Region which could benefit the workers made redundant by Filivivi).

The Commission is constantly working at improving the functioning of the single market, ensuring that individuals, consumers and businesses take full benefits of the 'four freedoms' — the free movement of people, goods, services and capital enshrined in the Treaty. Recent examples include the relaunch of the single market through the Single Market Act <sup>(2)</sup> and the 8 June 2012 initiatives on better governance for the single market <sup>(3)</sup> and the 'services package' <sup>(4)</sup>.

---

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

<sup>(2)</sup> Communication on the Single Market Act — Twelve levers to boost growth and strengthen confidence 'Working together to create new growth', COM(2011) 206 final.

<sup>(3)</sup> Communication on a 'Better governance for the single market', COM(2012) 261 final.

<sup>(4)</sup> Communication on the Implementation of the Services Directive, 'A partnership for new growth in services 2012-2015' accompanied by three Commission Staff Working Documents, SWD(2012) 146 final, SWD(2012) 147 final and SWD(2012) 148 final.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005246/12**  
**alla Commissione**  
**Mara Bizzotto (EFD)**  
(23 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Riapertura dei territori interdetti nell'area di Chernobyl

Recenti dichiarazioni del Primo Ministro ucraino lasciano intendere che la volontà del governo sia di riaprire le zone interdette ed evacuate a soli 26 anni dal disastro nucleare di Chernobyl. Il Primo Ministro sostiene che vi è la possibilità di riqualificare e decontaminare la maggior parte delle aree ora interdette, ma, secondo i dati forniti dagli specialisti e dalle associazioni ambientaliste, tali territori sono contaminati da elementi radioattivi quali il cesio-137, con emivita di 30,17 anni, lo stronzio-90, che ha un'emivita di 29 anni, e il plutonio-240, con tempo di decadimento di 24 000 anni; appare evidente come i rischi non sarebbero solo per gli eventuali nuovi abitanti di queste zone, ma anche per i prodotti agricoli ivi coltivati.

Inoltre la situazione nel luogo dell'incidente è tutt'altro che stabile e risolta; infatti la struttura del così detto «sarcofago» col quale si ricoprì il reattore numero 4 per contenerne le emissioni non è più considerata sicura, tanto che nel 1997 è stato fondato il Chernobyl Shelter Fund, col compito di reperire finanziamenti presso l'Unione europea, gli Stati Uniti d'America e l'Ucraina per la costruzione di una nuova cupola contenitiva, la cui realizzazione è prevista entro il 2015.

— La Commissione è a conoscenza di questi fatti?

— Può indicare i costi del progetto di messa in sicurezza del sito dell'incidente e quantificare l'investimento dell'UE?

— Qual è la posizione della Commissione circa la proposta del Primo Ministro ucraino?

**Risposta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione**  
(12 luglio 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza delle intenzioni dell'Ucraina circa la zona di esclusione di Chernobyl.

L'UE contribuisce alle attività svolte a livello internazionale per limitare le conseguenze dell'incidente di Chernobyl con uno stanziamento complessivo di oltre 500 milioni di euro.

I costi relativi all'iniziativa internazionale di maggior portata per la messa in sicurezza del sito di Chernobyl e in particolare per la costruzione di una cupola di contenimento definitiva sul reattore numero 4 ammontano a circa 2 miliardi di euro. I contributi dell'UE a tali progetti, attraverso il Chernobyl Shelter Fund e il Nuclear Safety Account (gestito dalla Banca europea per la ricostruzione e lo sviluppo), sono finora pari a circa 400 milioni di euro.

L'UE contribuisce inoltre ad attività di decontaminazione, in particolare alla gestione di rifiuti nucleari, per un ammontare ad oggi superiore a 100 milioni di euro. Sono stati stanziati circa 6,6 milioni di euro per progetti recenti che affrontano questioni sociali e di assistenza sanitaria alla popolazione locale colpita dagli effetti dell'incidente.

Le autorità ucraine possono aver riconsiderato l'utilizzo di terreni all'interno dell'area interdetta sulla base delle informazioni relative alle condizioni di vita nei territori contaminati al di fuori della stessa area <sup>(1)</sup>.

La Commissione non è stata consultata dalle autorità ucraine in merito a tale decisione.

Quanto alla possibile esportazione di prodotti agricoli dall'area in questione verso l'UE, va precisato che, secondo il Regolamento (CE) n. 733/2008 del Consiglio <sup>(2)</sup>, l'osservanza delle tolleranze massime di cesio radioattivo in alcuni prodotti agricoli (latte, carne, funghi non coltivati, ecc.) originari dell'Ucraina dev'essere controllata dagli Stati membri prima dell'immissione in libera pratica nell'Unione. Tale norma continua a trovare piena applicazione.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://rem.jrc.ec.europa.eu/RemWeb/pastprojects/atlasfiles/TEXT/ENGLISH.PDF>

<sup>(2)</sup> Regolamento (CE) n. 733/2008 del Consiglio, del 15 luglio 2008, relativo alle condizioni d'importazione di prodotti agricoli originari dei paesi terzi a seguito dell'incidente verificatosi nella centrale nucleare di Chernobyl (versione codificata) (GUL 201 del 30.7.2008, pag. 1); modificato dal Regolamento (CE) n. 1048/2009 del Consiglio, del 23 ottobre 2009 (GUL 290 del 6.11.2009, pag. 4).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005246/12  
to the Commission  
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)  
(23 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Reopening of exclusion zones in the area around Chernobyl

Recent statements by the Ukrainian Prime Minister suggest that the government intends to reopen the evacuated exclusion zones just 26 years after the Chernobyl nuclear disaster. The Prime Minister believes it is possible to reclaim and decontaminate most of the currently restricted areas, but according to data provided by specialists and environmental organisations, these areas are contaminated with radioactive elements such as caesium-137 with a half-life of 30.17 years, strontium-90 with a half-life of 29 years, and plutonium-240 with a half-life of 24 000 years. It seems clear that the risks would affect not only any new residents in these zones, but also the agricultural produce grown there.

Furthermore, the situation at the site of the accident is far from stable and resolved. The structure of the so-called 'sarcophagus' erected around reactor 4 to contain the radiation is no longer regarded as safe, as a result of which the Chernobyl Shelter Fund was established in 1997 for the purpose of raising funds from the European Union, the US and Ukraine for the construction of a new containment dome, which is expected to be built by 2015.

— Is the Commission aware of these facts?

— Can it indicate the costs of the project to make the accident site safe, and give figures for the EU's investment?

— What is the Commission's position with regard to the Ukrainian Prime Minister's proposal?

**Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission  
(12 July 2012)**

The Commission is aware of the intentions of Ukraine concerning the Chernobyl Exclusion Zone.

The EU support to the international efforts to mitigate the consequences of the Chernobyl accident amounts to over EUR 500 million in total.

The major international initiative to restore the Chernobyl site to an environmentally safe condition, in particular the construction of a permanent shelter over Reactor 4, amounts to some EUR 2 billion. The contributions of the EU to these projects, through the Chernobyl Shelter Fund and the Nuclear Safety Account (managed by the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development), represent up to now some EUR 400 million.

In addition, the EU support to remediation activities — nuclear waste management in particular — amounts to more than EUR 100 million to date. Recent projects to address social and healthcare issues for the local population affected by the consequences of the accident amount to some EUR 6.6 million.

The Ukrainian authorities may have re-evaluated land usages within the restricted zone based on the experience feedback from living conditions in the contaminated territories outside the restricted zone <sup>(1)</sup>.

The Commission has not been consulted by the Ukrainian Authorities on this decision.

Concerning the possible export of agricultural products from the area in question into the EU, it should be noted that, according to Council Regulation (EC) No 733/2008 <sup>(2)</sup>, the compliance with the maximum permitted levels of radio caesium in certain agricultural products (milk, meat, non-cultivated mushrooms, etc.) originating from Ukraine shall be checked by the Member States before release for free circulation in the EU. This rule continues to be fully applied.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://rem.jrc.ec.europa.eu/RemWeb/pastprojects/atlasfiles/TEXT/ENGLISH.PDF>

<sup>(2)</sup> Council Regulation (EC) No 733/2008 of 15 July 2008 on the conditions governing imports of agricultural products originating in third countries following the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power station (codified version), OJ L 201, 30.7.2008, p.1; amended by Council Regulation (EC) No 1048/2009 of 23 October 2009, OJ L 290, 6.11.2009, p.4.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-005247/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)**  
(24 Μαΐου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Η επικινδυνότητα των προϊόντων υγρής νικοτίνης

Σύμφωνα με πληροφορίες του Συστήματος Ταχείας Ανταλλαγής Πληροφοριών για Ασφάλεια Προϊόντων πλιν Τροφίμων (RAPEX) της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης (ΕΕ), έχουν εντοπιστεί στην ευρωπαϊκή αγορά προϊόντα υγρής νικοτίνης, τα οποία θεωρούνται ότι περικλείουν κινδύνους. Τα προϊόντα αυτά χρησιμοποιούνται στις συσκευές ηλεκτρονικών τσιγάρων (υποκατάστατα καπνίσματος) και τα μείγματα που περιέχουν ταξινομούνται ως πολύ τοξικά για την ανθρώπινη υγεία και επικίνδυνα για το περιβάλλον. Επιπλέον, τα προϊόντα αυτά κυκλοφορούν στην αγορά χωρίς την απαιτούμενη από την νομοθεσία συσκευασία και σήμανση επικινδυνότητας, με αποτέλεσμα την παραπληροφόρηση των χρηστών. Στις περισσότερες περιπτώσεις, το ηλεκτρονικό τσιγάρο προωθείται στην αγορά ως μέθοδος διακοπής του καπνίσματος, γεγονός που αμφισβητείται από ιδρύματα διεθνούς κύρους, όπως η Ευρωπαϊκή Πνευμονολογική Εταιρεία.

Είναι εξίσου σημαντικό ότι το ηλεκτρονικό τσιγάρο δεν ρυθμίζεται από την οδηγία για τα καπνικά προϊόντα, ούτε εμπίπτει στις πρόνοιες αυτής της οδηγίας. Αυτή τη στιγμή δεν διενεργείται κανένας έλεγχος σε ό,τι αφορά τα προϊόντα αυτά, που δεν καλύπτονται από καμία νομοθεσία, θέτοντας, έτσι, σε κίνδυνο την υγεία του καταναλωτή.

Τα ερωτήματα που τίθενται στην Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή είναι άμεσα:

1. Ποια η θέση της σε ένα τέτοιο ζήτημα, κατά το οποίο τα δικαιώματα των καταναλωτών δεν προστατεύονται και η υγεία τους τίθεται σε κίνδυνο;
2. Με ποιες άμεσες και αποτελεσματικές ενέργειες θα επιληφθεί του ζητήματος;
3. Προτίθεται να προχωρήσει στη θέσπιση ενός νομικού πλαισίου σε επίπεδο ΕΕ, το οποίο να διασφαλίζει την προστασία των καταναλωτών από τέτοιου είδους προϊόντα;

**Απάντηση του κ. Dalli εξ' ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(21 Ιουνίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή έχει υπόψη τις ετερογενείς προσεγγίσεις που εφαρμόζουν τα κράτη μέλη όσον αφορά τα προϊόντα που περιέχουν νικοτίνη. Οι αρχές των κρατών μελών έχουν όλες τις εξουσίες να λάβουν περιοριστικά μέτρα για τα προϊόντα αυτά, αν παρουσιάζουν κίνδυνο για την υγεία και την ασφάλεια των καταναλωτών.

Η Επιτροπή αναλύει επί του παρόντος διάφορες επιλογές για τον τρόπο ρύθμισης των προϊόντων που περιέχουν νικοτίνη, αξιολογώντας μεταξύ άλλων αν θα ήταν σκόπιμο τα εν λόγω προϊόντα να ρυθμιστούν στο πλαίσιο της οδηγίας για τα προϊόντα καπνού. Η Επιτροπή δεν έχει λάβει θέση σχετικά με το θέμα αυτό. Η νομοθετική πρόταση για την αναθεώρηση της οδηγίας για τα προϊόντα καπνού προβλέπεται να εγκριθεί πριν από το τέλος του 2012.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-005247/12  
to the Commission  
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)  
(24 May 2012)**

*Subject:* The dangers of liquid nicotine products

According to information from the EU rapid alert system for non-food products posing a serious risk (RAPEX), liquid nicotine products have been found on the European market that are considered to represent a danger. These products are used in electronic cigarette devices (smoking substitutes) and the blends that they contain are classified as extremely toxic to human health and environmentally hazardous. Moreover, the products circulate in the market without the legally required packaging and warning signs, resulting in misinformation for users. In most cases the electronic cigarette is promoted in the market as a way of stopping smoking, a view which is disputed by internationally reputed foundations such as the European Respiratory Society.

Equally important is the fact that electronic cigarettes are not regulated by the Tobacco Products Directive, nor do they fall under the provisions of that directive. Presently no checks are being conducted on these products, which are not covered by any legislation, thus placing the health of the consumer in jeopardy.

The questions the European Commission is asked to answer are quite direct:

1. What is its position on such a question, whereby no protection is being accorded to consumers, whose health is being put at risk?
2. Through what direct and effective actions could a solution to the problem be provided?
3. Does it intend to proceed with establishment of a legal framework at EU level to ensure consumer protection from products of this kind?

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

The Commission is aware of the heterogeneous approaches taken by Member States on nicotine-containing products. Member States' authorities have all powers to take restrictive measures on such products if the latter present a risk to the health and safety of consumers.

The Commission is currently analysing a number of options on how to regulate nicotine-containing products including assessing whether it would be opportune to regulate such products under the Tobacco Products Directive. The Commission has not reached a position on this matter. The legislative proposal for the revision of the Tobacco Products Directive is planned for adoption before the end of 2012.

---

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005248/12  
a la Comisión**

**Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)**

(24 de mayo de 2012)

*Asunto:* Consecuencias del déficit de la tarifa energética en España

El déficit de tarifa, es decir, la diferencia entre los ingresos regulados y los costes recogidos en el sistema eléctrico que recae en los balances de las compañías eléctricas, ha crecido este año en España de modo exponencial: durante los tres primeros meses del año acumuló un total de 1 352 millones de euros, aproximándose al tope legal permitido de 1 500 millones para todo el ejercicio de 2012, según consta en la liquidación de dicho periodo efectuada por la Comisión Nacional de la Energía (CNE) <sup>(1)</sup>.

Estos datos no recogen el impacto de las medidas aprobadas a finales de marzo por el Ejecutivo para frenar dicho desajuste, ni la subida del 7 % en el recibo de la luz de la última revisión. El Ministro de Industria y Energía, avanzó que la segunda fase de la reforma energética se aprobará durante la segunda quincena del mes que viene. No obstante, reconoció que si los desequilibrios entre los ingresos y los costes del sistema seguían haciendo inviable el objetivo de eliminar el déficit en 2013, la factura de la electricidad para los usuarios de la TUR (Tarifa de Último Recurso) —la gran mayoría de los clientes—, debería subir «en algún momento». El organismo prevé que, si no se introducen nuevas medidas, la brecha del déficit en 2012 ascienda a 3 385 millones de euros, más del doble del máximo legal. En términos acumulados, el déficit total alcanza los 24 000 millones de euros.

Teniendo en cuenta además que los beneficios de las empresas eléctricas han sido equivalentes a 52 300 millones de euros en los últimos seis años, y que solamente Endesa, Iberdrola y Gas Natural-Fenosa han repartido en conjunto a sus accionistas más de 28 123 millones de euros <sup>(2)</sup>,

¿Qué consecuencias cree la Comisión que tendrá un incremento del 7 % en la factura de la luz para la economía española?

¿Cree la Comisión que el mejor método para reducir el déficit es aumentar la tarifa para los ciudadanos o puede haber otras opciones?

**Respuesta del Sr. Oettinger en nombre de la Comisión**

(17 de julio de 2012)

De acuerdo con la información de que dispone la Comisión, en marzo de 2012 el Gobierno español adoptó algunas medidas para reducir el déficit tarifario. El aumento de la tarifa regulada de último recurso debería generar un ingreso adicional de aproximadamente 1 400 millones EUR, mientras que las medidas para reducir los costes de generación, distribución, transmisión, supervisión por el regulador, etc. podrían reportar alrededor de 1 700 millones EUR <sup>(3)</sup>.

Estas medidas a corto plazo deben ir seguidas de una reforma profunda del sistema de tarifas reguladas, con el fin de que estas reflejen los precios de mercado, y de una revisión de los regímenes de ayuda a la producción de electricidad.

Solo a través de una combinación equilibrada de medidas de este tipo España podrá abordar eficazmente el déficit tarifario acumulado y garantizar a largo plazo la sostenibilidad económica de las actividades eléctricas y un marco jurídico estable y seguro para los inversores.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.abc.es/20120522/economia/abci-deficit-tarifa-electrico-roza-201205221913.html>

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.publico.es/dinero/418212/el-deficit-de-tarifa-equivale-a-los-dividendos-repartidos-por-las-electricas-desde-2005>

<sup>(3)</sup> Para más información, véase el documento SWD(2012) 310 final, pp. 23-24.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005248/12  
to the Commission**

**Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)**

(24 May 2012)

*Subject:* Consequences of the energy rate deficit in Spain

The energy rate deficit — the difference between the regulated electricity-system revenues and the costs incurred in that system, which is reflected in the balance sheets of electricity companies — has grown exponentially this year in Spain. During the first three months of 2012, the rate deficit reached a total of EUR 1 352 million, close to the legal ceiling of EUR 1 500 million for the entire 2012 financial year, according to an analysis by the National Energy Committee (CNE) <sup>(1)</sup>.

These data do not reflect the impact of the measures to halt the imbalance that were approved at the end of March by the Executive, or the 7% increase in electricity bills in the most recent review. The Minister for Industry and Energy has indicated that the second phase of energy reform will be approved in the second half of June 2012. However, he acknowledged that if the disparities between the system's revenues and costs continue to fail to eliminate the deficit in 2013, then electricity bills for users paying the last-resort rate — the vast majority of customers — would have to increase 'at some point'. The CNE predicts that without new measures, the deficit gap in 2012 will reach EUR 3 385 million, more than twice the legal limit. In cumulative terms, the total deficit stands at EUR 24 000 million.

It should be noted that electricity companies have made profits of approximately EUR 52 300 million during the past six years, and that Endesa, Iberdrola and Gas Natural-Fenosa have together paid dividends of more than EUR 28 123 million to their shareholders <sup>(2)</sup>.

What consequences does the Commission think that a 7% increase in electricity bills will have for the Spanish economy?

Does the Commission think that the best method for reducing the deficit is to increase the Spanish public's electricity bills, or could there be other options?

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

(17 July 2012)

According to information available to the Commission, in March 2012 the Spanish Government took some steps to reduce the tariff deficit. The increase in the regulated tariff of last resort should generate an additional income of around EUR 1 400 million, while measures to reduce costs in generation, distribution, transmission, oversight by the regulator, etc. would bring around EUR 1 700 million <sup>(3)</sup>.

These short-term measures should be followed by an in-depth reform of the regulated tariff system, so that tariffs reflect market prices, and a review of the support schemes for power generation.

It is only through a whole-rounded combination of such measures that Spain may effectively tackle the accumulated tariff deficit and ensure in the long run the economic sustainability of the electricity activities and a stable and certain legal framework for investors.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.abc.es/20120522/economia/abci-deficit-tarifa-electrico-roza-201205221913.html>

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.publico.es/dinero/418212/el-deficit-de-tarifa-equivale-a-los-dividendos-repartidos-por-las-electricas-desde-2005>.

<sup>(3)</sup> See SWD(2012) 310 final, pp. 23-24 for details.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005250/12  
to the Commission  
Nicole Sinclair (NI)  
(24 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Shortcomings in agri-environment support

Agri-environment support is a key EU policy involving EUR 2.5 billion per annum. The Court of Auditors, in its Special Report No 7 (2011), has highlighted numerous deficiencies and shortcomings in this area.

Could the Commission advise me as to what consultations have taken place with UK farmers on the matter of agri-environment support?

**Answer given by Mr Ciołoş on behalf of the Commission  
(9 July 2012)**

As described in the respective UK rural development programmes for Northern Ireland, England, Scotland and Wales, the UK farmer representatives have been consulted during the programme preparation on all the schemes and in particular on agri-environment support.

This is a pre-requisite for the approval of the rural development programmes as set out in Article 6 (Partnership) of Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005 of 20 September 2005 on support for rural development for EAFRD <sup>(1)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 277, 21.10.2005, p. 1.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005251/12  
to the Commission  
Nicole Sinclair (NI)  
(24 May 2012)**

*Subject:* CAP reform — consultation procedures

Regarding CAP reform:

Could the Commission advise me what consultation processes are currently under way with UK farmers?

How is information disseminated to farmers regarding reform proposals and timetables?

**Answer given by Mr Ciołoş on behalf of the Commission  
(4 July 2012)**

Between 12 April and 11 June 2010 the Commission organised a public debate on the future of the common agricultural policy, following which **more than 5 500 contributions** (145 from the UK) were received. They were discussed at a conference held on 19-20 July 2010 in Brussels, which contributed to the preparation of the November 2010 Communication on the CAP 2020. On 12 October 2011 the Commission presented its legal proposals for the reformed CAP, and discussed them in conference-debates targeting stakeholders, press and national/local administrations, organised in all the 27 Member States on 12-13 October 2011.

Since then, many Commission officials attended meetings and events at national and local level in the MS to explain the proposed policy, including in the UK where for example the Member of the Commission responsible for Agriculture and Rural Development attended a NFU Conference on the 21 February 2012.

On the 13 July 2012 a new Conference will be organised by the Agriculture and Rural Development Directorate-General: 'The CAP towards 2020 — taking stock with civil society'.

In addition to this, the UK farmers, for example as members of European farmers' organisations, are invited to attend the Commission Advisory group on the CAP. Meetings are convened on a regular basis and information and explanation is given on the content of the CAP package proposals as well as on the timetable for the negotiations in other institutions. During the meetings there is always an exchange of views and the experts/NGOs have therefore a possibility to ask questions and express their positions.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005252/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(24 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Associazione «Le Antiche Ville»

L'associazione «Le Antiche Ville» è stata costituita nell'ottobre 1997 da alcuni soci fondatori animati da spirito di servizio e volontà di operare per la tutela dell'ambiente rurale e lo sviluppo della comunità, acquisendo lo stato di Organizzazione Non Lucrativa di Utilità Sociale (ONLUS) fin dalla nascita. Il suo documento programmatico trae ispirazione dalla dichiarazione di Cork del 9 novembre 1996 a conclusione della conferenza europea sullo sviluppo rurale intitolata «Una campagna viva».

L'associazione si propone di tutelare, valorizzare e sviluppare un'ampia area pedecollinare della provincia di Bari. L'area si trova quasi interamente in territorio di Mola, ma è al centro dei popolosi comuni di Rutigliano, Noicattaro e Conversano. Quest'area, antico luogo di villeggiatura e di cure balsamiche e vera oasi di pace, si caratterizza per l'insediamento di alcune decine di splendide antiche ville settecentesche, ottocentesche e del primo Novecento, rimaste miracolosamente intatte pur se bisognose di manutenzioni spesso anche radicali. L'area contiene biotopi interessanti, beni paesaggistici meravigliosi, flora e fauna mediterranea tipica e è legata a tradizioni storiche, artistiche e di vita vissuta significative. Negli spazi del «Centro Servizi» nascono realtà culturali importanti: due rassegne di eventi artistici intitolate «Viali della Memoria», una mostra permanente di fotografie digitali, un ambiente autentico ricostruito con arredi d'epoca, una galleria iconografica per conoscere le più interessanti risorse architettoniche, paesaggistiche e vegetazionali del Poggio. Tra i servizi si annovera il progetto di una biblioteca rurale da ospitare in un'antica villa, quello per la promozione dei prodotti enogastronomici tipici e di qualità del Poggio, l'elaborazione e implementazione di un itinerario di penetrazione didattica nel Poggio (da far visitare specie alle scolaresche) con relativi materiali illustrativi, il sostegno della rinascita a nuova vita di antiche ville abbandonate ecc. Altro servizio innovativo di utilità collettiva è l'Ecomuseo del Poggio delle Antiche Ville.

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

1. se l'associazione summenzionata ha in precedenza fatto richiesta di fondi europei;
2. in caso di risposta negativa, se è possibile per la stessa, visto il grande impegno messo in atto in campo culturale e ambientale, usufruire di fondi diretti per migliorare le manifestazioni organizzate?

**Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione**

(19 luglio 2012)

1. In base alle informazioni di cui dispone la Commissione, l'associazione «Le Antiche ville» non ha chiesto alcun finanziamento nell'ambito del Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale (FESR) o del Fondo europeo agricolo per lo sviluppo rurale (FEASR).
2. La Commissione ha notevolmente ridotto i fondi messi direttamente a disposizione dal FESR e dal FEASR per interventi tecnici di assistenza ed essi tra l'altro non possono essere usati per progetti del tipo suggerito dall'onorevole parlamentare. Tali progetti potrebbero rientrare nel campo di applicazione del programma FESR in seno alla priorità «Progetti integrati di rinnovamento urbano e rurale» o del programma FEASR in seno alla misura «Tutela e riqualificazione del patrimonio rurale».

Per maggiori informazioni, la Commissione suggerisce all'onorevole parlamentare di contattare direttamente le autorità di gestione dei programmi FESR e FEASR per la regione Puglia:

Autorità di Gestione POR Puglia, Viale Japigia, n. 145, 70126 BARI; [adgfesr@regione.puglia.it](mailto:adgfesr@regione.puglia.it)

Regione Puglia, Assessorato alle risorse agroalimentari, Settore agricoltura, Lungomare Nazario Sauro, 45-47, 70121 BARI

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005252/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(24 May 2012)

*Subject:* The Ancient Villas [Le Antiche Ville] Association

The Ancient Villas Association was formed in October 1997 by several co-founders driven by a spirit of service and willingness to work for the protection of the rural environment and development of the community. The association has held the status of a not-for-profit organisation since its formation. Its policy document draws inspiration from the Cork Declaration of 9 November 1996, issued at the end of the European Conference on Rural Development entitled 'A living countryside'.

The association aims to protect, enhance and develop a large hillside area in the Italian province of Bari. The area lies almost entirely in the territory of Mola, but is at the heart of the populated municipalities of Rutigliano, Noicattaro and Conversano. This area, an ancient resort providing balsamic treatments, is a true haven of tranquillity. Dozens of beautiful old villas dating back to the 18th, 19th and early 20th centuries are found here and have remained miraculously intact, despite being in need of often radical maintenance. The area contains interesting biotopes, wonderful landscape heritage, flora and fauna typical of the Mediterranean and is tied to meaningful historic, artistic and cultural traditions. In the 'Service Centre' areas, important cultural centres have been created: two artistic exhibitions entitled 'Viali della Memoria' [Memory Lanes], a permanent exhibition of digital photographs, an authentic setting reconstructed with period furnishings and a visual gallery where visitors can discover the most remarkable features of architecture, landscape and vegetation of this hillside region. Services include a project for a rural library in an old house, promoting quality food and wines from the region, elaborating and implementing an educational guided tour of the area (particularly aimed at schoolchildren) with explanatory materials, supporting the renovation of old, abandoned houses, etc. Another innovative community-led service is an 'ecomuseum' [Ecomuseo del Poggio delle Antiche Ville].

In view of the above, can the Commission state:

1. whether the above-mentioned association has previously requested European funds;
2. if not, whether it would be possible for this association, given its huge commitment to the environment and culture, to benefit from direct funding to improve the events it organises?

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

(19 July 2012)

1. According to the information at the disposal of the Commission, the association 'Antiche Ville' has not requested any funding under the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) or European Agricultural Regional Development Fund (EAFRD).
2. Under the ERDF and EAFRD, the Commission has very limited direct funding available for technical assistance-type measures and it cannot be used for the projects suggested by the Honourable Member. Such projects could fall within the scope of the ERDF or EAFRD programmes for the Puglia region, under the priority for 'integrated projects for urban and rural regeneration' of the ERDF programme or the 'conservation and upgrading of the rural heritage' measure of the EAFRD programme.

For more information, the Commission suggests that the Honourable Member contacts directly the managing authorities of respectively the ERDF and EAFRD programmes for the region Puglia:  
Autorità di Gestione POR Puglia, Viale Japigia, n. 145, 70126 BARI; [adgfer@regione.puglia.it](mailto:adgfer@regione.puglia.it)  
Regione Puglia, Assessorato alle risorse agroalimentari, Settore agricoltura, Lungomare Nazario Sauro, 45-47,  
70121 BARI

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005253/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(24 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Creme solari e sviluppo dell'endometriosi

Tra le sostanze chimiche contenute in alcune creme solari e lo sviluppo dell'endometriosi potrebbe esserci un collegamento, il che suggerisce di utilizzare con cautela certi prodotti.

L'interazione tra sostanze chimiche e salute è da sempre dibattuta e, sebbene sia risaputo che ogni sostanza ha un impatto sull'organismo, ancora oggi nessuno si sente di affermare con certezza che le sostanze utilizzate nella produzione di cosmetici e creme solari abbiano un impatto negativo. Uno studio ha analizzato l'urina di 625 donne con diagnosi di endometriosi. Le analisi hanno mostrato che queste donne presentavano maggiori livelli di sostanze utilizzate nella produzione di filtri solari. Lo studio pertanto suggerisce che vi possa essere una correlazione tra l'assorbimento di alcune sostanze chimiche e il rischio di endometriosi, un disturbo che interessa l'utero e che causa non solo dolore ma può anche portare all'infertilità femminile.

Le sostanze chimiche utilizzate nei filtri solari sono note come Benzophenone-type UV filters (o Benzofenone) e dovrebbero proteggere la pelle dai raggi ultravioletti del sole, anche se simulano gli effetti degli ormoni estrogeni femminili.

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

1. se è a conoscenza del nuovo studio sui possibili effetti delle sostanze chimiche contenute nelle creme solari;
2. se, vista la necessità di ulteriori studi che facciano luce sui possibili rischi derivanti dall'assorbimento di determinate sostanze, ritiene di finanziare la ricerca summenzionata;
3. se, visto il grande interesse dimostrato dall'Unione europea nel campo della tutela della salute e della sicurezza dei consumatori, ritiene di dover approfondire la ricerca in questione e in caso di riscontro negativo di prendere ulteriori provvedimenti per il ritiro della autorizzazione alla vendita degli stessi?

**Risposta di J. Dalli a nome della Commissione**

(5 luglio 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza dello studio che analizza le concentrazioni di filtri UV al benzofenone (BP) nelle urine di donne statunitensi e l'associazione di tale fenomeno con l'endometriosi. Lo studio conclude che piccoli quantitativi di ingredienti di tipo BP, contenuti in taluni prodotti solari e altri prodotti per l'igiene personale, possono essere assorbiti dalla pelle e passare nel sangue, dove imitano gli effetti dell'estrogeno.

Anche se interessanti, i risultati del suddetto studio sono preliminari. Si tratta del primo studio del suo tipo che esamina i livelli di BP in relazione all'endometriosi e quindi, prima di stabilire orientamenti specifici sul livello di esposizione e sulla sicurezza umana in generale, si devono effettuare ulteriori ricerche. I programmi quadro UE nel settore della ricerca, pur avendo stanziato notevoli finanziamenti per studi sui vari interferenti endocrini <sup>(1)</sup>, non hanno ancora finanziato ricerche sulla tematica specifica in questione. Nella proposta della Commissione relativa ad Orizzonte 2020, — Programma quadro di ricerca e innovazione 2014-2020 <sup>(2)</sup>, le tematiche «Sanità, cambiamenti demografici e benessere» sono considerate una delle sei sfide della società da affrontare. Tuttavia è però ancora troppo presto per stabilire quali potrebbero essere le tematiche specifiche nell'ambito della ricerca.

Solo uno dei derivati BP testati, 2-idrossi-4-metossibenzofenone (benzofenone-3), è autorizzato come filtro UV nell'UE e per tale sostanza non sono state rilevate tendenze significative.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/research/endocrine/index\\_en.html](http://ec.europa.eu/research/endocrine/index_en.html)

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/research/horizon2020/index\\_en.cfm?pg=h2020-documents](http://ec.europa.eu/research/horizon2020/index_en.cfm?pg=h2020-documents).

Il nuovo regolamento sui prodotti cosmetici <sup>(3)</sup>, che sarà applicabile a partire dall'11 luglio 2013, dedica particolare attenzione alla tematica degli interferenti endocrini. È prevista una revisione del regolamento sui prodotti cosmetici per quanto riguarda gli interferenti endocrini non appena saranno disponibili criteri concordati a livello internazionale o dell'UE per la loro identificazione, o al più tardi entro il 2015.

---

---

(3) <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:342:0059:0209:it:PDF>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005253/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(24 May 2012)

*Subject:* Sun creams and the development of endometriosis

It is possible that there is a link between chemicals contained in some sun creams and the development of endometriosis, which suggests using certain products with caution.

The interaction between chemicals and health has always been debated and, although it is well known that all chemicals have an impact on the body, nobody can yet confirm with certainty whether chemicals used in the production of cosmetics and sun creams have a negative impact. A study analysed the urine of 625 women diagnosed with endometriosis. The analysis showed that these women had higher levels of chemicals used in the manufacture of sunscreens. The study therefore suggests that there may be a correlation between the absorption of certain chemicals and the risk of endometriosis, a disorder that affects the uterus and causes not only pain, but can also lead to infertility in women.

The chemicals used in sunscreens are known as benzophenone-type UV filters which aim to protect the skin from the sun's ultraviolet rays, although they mimic the effects of oestrogen hormones.

In view of the above, can the Commission state:

1. whether it is aware of the new study on the possible effects of chemical substances contained in sun creams;
2. given the need for further research focusing on the possible risks resulting from absorption of certain chemicals, whether it will fund the above-mentioned research;
3. given the extensive interest demonstrated by the European Union in protecting consumer health and safety, whether it considers it necessary to closely examine the research in question and, in the case of negative results, to take further steps to have the authorisation for sale of these products withdrawn?

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

(5 July 2012)

The Commission is aware of the study examining urinary concentrations of benzophenone (BP)-type UV filters in U.S. women and their association with endometriosis. The study concludes that small amounts of BP-type ingredients, contained in some sunscreens and other personal care products, can pass through the skin and be absorbed into the blood, where they mimic the effects of oestrogen.

Study results, while interesting, are preliminary. As this study was the first of its kind to examine BP levels and endometriosis, additional research is needed before specific guidelines about exposure level and human safety in general can be determined. The EU research Framework programmes, although having allocated significant amounts of funding to various effects of endocrine disrupting chemicals <sup>(1)</sup>, have not funded research on this particular issue. The Commission's proposal for Horizon 2020 — The framework Programme for Research and Innovation 2014-2020 <sup>(2)</sup> — identifies 'Health, demographic change and well-being' as one of the six societal challenges to be tackled. However, it is yet too premature to ascertain which could be the specific research issues addressed.

Only one of the tested BP-derivatives, 2-hydroxy-4-methoxybenzophenone (benzophenone-3), is authorised as an UV filter in the EU. No significant trend was observed for this substance.

The new Cosmetics Regulation <sup>(3)</sup>, which will be applicable as from 11 July 2013, pays particular attention to the issue of substances with endocrine-disrupting properties. A review of the Cosmetics Regulation is planned with regard to endocrine-disruptors, when EU or internationally agreed criteria for their identification become available or at the latest, by 2015.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/research/endocrine/index\\_en.html](http://ec.europa.eu/research/endocrine/index_en.html)

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/research/horizon2020/index\\_en.cfm?pg=h2020-documents](http://ec.europa.eu/research/horizon2020/index_en.cfm?pg=h2020-documents).

<sup>(3)</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:342:0059:0209:en:PDF>.



(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005254/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(24 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Immigrati nel sud Italia

Immigrati fatti giungere in Italia con false promesse di lavoro e ridotti invece in schiavitù per lavorare nei campi per molte ore al giorno e vivere in condizioni disumane: per questo reato sedici persone sono state arrestate dalle forze dell'ordine in un'azione congiunta tra Puglia, Calabria, Campania, Sicilia e Toscana. L'organizzazione, stando a quanto hanno accertato gli investigatori, operava a Nardò (Lecce) — centro che in estate ospita centinaia di immigrati che giungono da ogni parte della Puglia e del resto d'Italia per lavorare nei campi, soprattutto nella raccolta delle angurie — Rosarno (Reggio Calabria) e altre città del Sud.

L'indagine denominata «Sabr» è stata avviata nel gennaio 2009. Nell'organizzazione c'erano italiani, algerini, tunisini e sudanesi operanti in Puglia, Sicilia, Calabria e Tunisia. Gli indagati avrebbero favorito l'ingresso clandestino di extracomunitari, in prevalenza di tunisini e ghanesi, da destinare alla raccolta di angurie e pomodori. Il «reclutamento» avveniva prevalentemente in Tunisia, dove numerose persone, spinte dalla disperazione, venivano convogliate in falsi viaggi della speranza verso la Sicilia e, successivamente, nella penisola, per lavorare prima nell'agro pachinese, nel Siracusano, poi in quello neretino, in provincia di Lecce. A Nardò, per questo chiamata anche «Anguria city», si era costituito una sorta di «cartello» tra datori di lavoro e «caporali», che forniva manodopera per i lavori agricoli stagionali in diverse regioni. I clandestini venivano relegati lontano dai centri abitati, privati del denaro che avevano con sé, retribuiti con somme irrisorie, alloggiati in baracche senza acqua corrente, servizi igienici e corrente elettrica messe a disposizione dagli stessi «datori» di lavoro. Venivano costretti a turni di lavoro di 10-12 ore, anche durante il Ramadan, periodo durante il quale molti lavoratori di religione islamica si astenevano dal bere e dal mangiare. Da questa attività i componenti dell'organizzazione traevano profitti «rilevanti» evadendo tasse e contributi.

Alla luce di quanto sovraesposto, può la Commissione far sapere se:

1. è a conoscenza del blitz operato dalle forze dell'ordine italiane;
2. se ritiene opportuno aumentare i controlli alle frontiere anche tramite l'Agenzia europea FRONTEX e attivare norme europee più severe per i reati contro la persona?

**Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione**

(11 luglio 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza dei recenti fatti verificatisi nel Sud Italia e condanna con fermezza tutte le pratiche illegali che implicano o comportano lo sfruttamento dei lavoratori. Un'attenzione particolare è rivolta ai lavoratori più vulnerabili, tra cui i migranti irregolari.

La direttiva 2009/52/CE <sup>(1)</sup> vieta l'impiego di migranti irregolari provenienti da paesi terzi e punisce i datori di lavoro con sanzioni amministrative e, nei casi più gravi, sanzioni penali. La direttiva non prevede sanzioni contro i lavoratori, anzi li tutela con misure volte a rimediare alle ingiustizie subite, ad esempio imponendo ai datori di lavoro di pagare gli arretrati.

Nel 2010 la Commissione ha presentato una proposta di direttiva sul lavoro stagionale dei migranti provenienti da paesi terzi <sup>(2)</sup> che mira a disciplinare l'ingresso, il soggiorno e i diritti dei cittadini di paesi terzi. Una volta che il Parlamento europeo e il Consiglio l'avranno adottata, la direttiva contribuirà a impedire lo sfruttamento dei lavoratori stagionali.

I controlli di frontiera sono competenza nazionale, anche se Frontex coordina la cooperazione operativa tra gli Stati membri alle frontiere esterne dell'Unione <sup>(3)</sup> ed ha concluso un accordo operativo con Europol per una più stretta cooperazione su più fronti, primo fra tutti la tratta di esseri umani.

<sup>(1)</sup> GUL 168 del 30.6.2009, pag. 24.

<sup>(2)</sup> COM(2010)379 definitivo.

<sup>(3)</sup> Regolamento (UE) n. 1168/2011.

Fenomeno legato all'assunzione illegale è per l'appunto la tratta degli esseri umani. La direttiva 2011/36/UE <sup>(\*)</sup> prevede un solido quadro giuridico di contrasto di questo e altri fenomeni, come lo sfruttamento del lavoro nel settore agricolo. La lotta contro lo sfruttamento di manodopera è altresì uno degli obiettivi della strategia dell'UE per l'eradicazione della tratta degli esseri umani 2012-2016.

---

---

<sup>(\*)</sup> GUL 101 del 15.4.2011, pag. 1.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005254/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(24 May 2012)

*Subject:* Immigrants in southern Italy

A joint operation by police forces in Apulia, Calabria, Campania, Sicily and Tuscany has led to the arrest of 16 members of an organisation that has been luring immigrants to Italy with false promises of work and then enslaving them as they work for hours on end each day in the fields and live in inhumane conditions. According to reports by the investigators, this organisation was operating in Nardò (Lecce), Rosarno (Reggio Calabria) and other cities in southern Italy. Nardò in summer houses hundreds of immigrants arriving from all over Apulia and the rest of Italy to work in the fields, mainly to harvest watermelons.

The investigation, codename 'Sabr', started in January 2009. Italians, Algerians, Tunisians and Sudanese were working for the organisation in Apulia, Sicily, Calabria and Tunisia. The individuals under investigation allegedly encouraged the illegal entry of nationals from non-EU countries, mainly Tunisia and Ghana, to work harvesting watermelons and tomatoes. Most of them were 'recruited' in Tunisia, where numerous people, driven by desperation, were given false hope and transported first to Sicily, and then on to the Italian peninsula. Here they worked first in fields in Pachino, Syracuse, then in Nardò, in the province of Lecce. In Nardò, also known as 'Watermelon City', a sort of 'cartel' was formed between employers and 'gang leaders' who provided labour for seasonal agricultural jobs in different regions. The illegal immigrants were kept away from populated areas, deprived of any money they had on them, paid derisory sums and housed in shacks provided by the 'employers', which had no running water, sanitation services or electricity. They were forced to work 10 to 12-hour shifts, even during Ramadan when many Muslim workers abstained from eating and drinking. By not paying taxes or social security contributions, the organisation's members made 'significant' profits from this.

1. Is the Commission aware of the arrests following the swoop by the Italian police?
2. Does it feel border controls, including via the EU's agency Frontex, should be stepped up and more stringent EU regulations introduced for crimes against the person?

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

(11 July 2012)

The Commission is aware of the latest events which occurred in the South of Italy and strongly condemns all illegal practices entailing or leading to the exploitation of workers. Special attention is given to the most vulnerable workers, including irregular migrants.

Directive 2009/52/EC<sup>(1)</sup> prohibits the employment of irregularly-staying third-country nationals, and punishes employers through fines, administrative sanctions and, in the most serious cases, criminal sanctions. It does not provide for any sanctions against the irregularly staying migrant workers and protective measures are designed to redress injustices, e.g. for migrants who are owed back payments by their employers.

In 2010, the Commission presented the proposal for a directive on seasonal employment of third-country migrants<sup>(2)</sup> which aims to regulate the entry, residence and rights of third-country nationals. Once adopted by co-legislators, the directive should be instrumental in preventing the exploitation of seasonal workers.

Border control is a matter of national competence, although Frontex coordinates the operational cooperation between Member States at the external borders of the Union<sup>(3)</sup> and has also entered into a working arrangement with Europol for a closer cooperation on various issues, one of them being trafficking in human beings.

A phenomenon related to illegal employment is trafficking in human beings. Directive 2011/36/EU<sup>(4)</sup> provides for a robust legal framework to address trafficking in human beings, including labour exploitation that could occur in the agricultural sectors. Countering labour exploitation is also addressed in the EU Strategy towards the Eradication of Trafficking in Human Beings 2012-2016.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Directive 2009/52/EC.

<sup>(2)</sup> COM(2010)379 final.

<sup>(3)</sup> Regulation No 1168/2011.

<sup>(4)</sup> Directive 2011/36/EU.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005256/12  
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(24 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Rapimento in Afghanistan

Come reso noto dal portavoce del governo provinciale, Abdul Mahroof Rasekh, un commando armato ha sequestrato oggi nella provincia nord-orientale afghana di Badakhshan cinque persone di una organizzazione umanitaria svizzera, fra cui due donne, «un'africana e un'europea», e tre afghani impegnati nella distribuzione di viveri presso bambini e donne incinte. Il rapimento è avvenuto nell'area di Yaftal.

Una squadra di cooperanti che viaggiava a dorso di mulo, stava visitando uno dei loro ambulatori in una zona dove la strada è stata distrutta da un'alluvione. Il portavoce del governo ha sostenuto che l'organizzazione non avrebbe comunicato alle autorità locali la propria presenza e attività.

A tuttora, i rapitori non avrebbero rivendicato l'atto né chiarito le motivazioni e l'eventuale riscatto. Le autorità afghane e straniere rimangono dunque in attesa di ulteriori sviluppi, mentre proseguono le indagini.

Alla luce di quanto sovraesposto, può l'Alto Rappresentante far sapere:

1. se è a conoscenza della vicenda e ritiene di dover prendere provvedimenti immediati per facilitare il rilascio degli ostaggi;
2. quali azioni ha intrapreso e intende intraprendere per evitare che si verifichino in futuro casi come quello accaduto di recente?

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

(25 luglio 2012)

L'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente è al corrente dell'attuale situazione in Afghanistan, in particolare per quanto riguarda le difficili condizioni di sicurezza e i rapimenti. Nel caso citato, fortunatamente i cooperanti rapiti sono stati liberati dalle forze della coalizione internazionale il 2 giugno scorso, mentre un membro del personale locale era già stato rilasciato in precedenza.

Le ragioni alla base di questo e di altri episodi violenti sono complesse e possono essere affrontate soltanto nel lungo periodo. Nonostante negli ultimi anni in Afghanistan siano stati compiuti molti progressi, il paese rimane una delle nazioni meno sviluppate del mondo. La mancanza di opportunità economiche e sociali è quindi uno dei fattori che creano instabilità, la quale a sua volta fornisce un terreno fertile per gli attacchi estremisti.

L'UE è uno dei grandi donatori di aiuti pubblici allo sviluppo ed assistenza umanitaria all'Afghanistan. L'assistenza fornita dal bilancio dell'UE si concentra su tre settori: sviluppo rurale, buon governo e sanità. L'Unione fornisce però anche assistenza a progetti che sostengono la protezione sociale e la cooperazione regionale. (La situazione attuale figura in allegato.)

Insieme a partner internazionali quali la NATO e l'ONU, l'UE sostiene inoltre gli sforzi del paese per il mantenimento dell'ordine e lo Stato di diritto. Attraverso un impegno internazionale a lungo termine, l'Afghanistan può essere aiutato a superare decenni di violenti conflitti, sviluppare le proprie istituzioni e migliorare il buon governo. Soltanto in questo modo può essere incoraggiata una crescita economica generalizzata, disincentivando così l'attività di coloro che ricorrono a tali forme di violenza.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005256/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(24 May 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Abduction in Afghanistan

Provincial government spokesman Abdul Mahroof Rasekh has announced that five people — two women, 'an African and a European', and three Afghans — working for a Swiss humanitarian organisation on the distribution of food to babies and pregnant women have been kidnapped today by an armed commando in the north-eastern Afghan province of Badakhshan. The abduction occurred in the area of Yaftal.

The team of aid workers were travelling on mules to visit one of their clinics in an area where the road had been destroyed by flooding. The government spokesman maintained that the organisation had not told the local authorities about the workers' presence there or their work.

No one has claimed responsibility for the kidnapping so far, nor have any reasons for it been given or a ransom demanded. The Afghan and foreign authorities are awaiting further developments therefore, while investigations continue.

1. Is the High Representative aware of this event and does she believe she should take immediate action to facilitate the release of the hostages?
2. What action has she taken and will she take to prevent cases like this one occurring in the future?

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

(25 July 2012)

The HR/VP is aware of the current situation in Afghanistan, notably with respect to the difficult security conditions including abductions. In this case the abducted aid workers were, fortunately, rescued by the international coalition forces on 2 June, while one local staff member had been released prior to this.

The underlying reasons for these and other violent incidents are complex and can only be addressed over time. While much progress has been made in Afghanistan over the last years it remains one of the least developed nations in the world. The lack of economic and social opportunity is one of the driving factors of instability, which provides fertile ground for extremist attacks.

The EU is one of the major donors providing official development assistance (ODA) and humanitarian assistance to Afghanistan. Assistance under the EU budget concentrates on three focal areas: rural development, governance and health but also provides assistance to projects in support of social protection and regional cooperation. (The current 'State of Play' is attached.)

The EU, together with international partners such as NATO and the UN, also supports Afghan efforts to strengthen policing and the rule of law. Through long-term international engagement Afghanistan can be assisted to overcome decades of violent conflict, develop its institutions and improve governance, only in this way can broad based economic growth be encouraged, so reducing, the incentives for those who resort to such forms of violence.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005258/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(24 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Programmi per fondi diretti, città di Campobasso

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: il programma Cultura, il programma per l'occupazione e la solidarietà sociale Progress, il programma cittadinanza («Europa per i cittadini»), quello per l'ambiente Life +, quello per gestire i flussi migratori («Solidarietà e gestione dei flussi migratori»), quello dedicato alle risorse umane («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 Campobasso ha fatto richiesta?
2. In caso affermativo, quali sono i progetti che hanno avuto accesso a fondi europei e con quali risultati i suddetti programmi sono stati portati a termine?

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

(16 luglio 2012)

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

La Commissione nota che l'onorevole parlamentare è interessato ai finanziamenti concessi direttamente alle città italiane nel quadro di specifici programmi UE gestiti dalla Commissione. Qualora l'onorevole parlamentare lo desiderasse, la Commissione è disposta a fornire una tabella contenente queste informazioni per le principali città italiane che potrebbero partecipare ai programmi in questione; 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-005258/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(24 May 2012)

*Subject:* Direct funding programmes for Campobasso

Local authorities, such as municipalities and provinces, are often the first beneficiaries of direct funding from the Commission's Directorates-General. Among the funds available are the Culture Programme, the Progress Programme for employment and social solidarity, the Europe for Citizens citizenship programme, the Life+ Programme for the environment, the Solidarity and the Management of Migration Flows Programme for migration flow management, the Investing in People Programme focused on human resources, and many more.

1. Could the Commission clarify whether the town of Campobasso has applied for funding from any such programmes?
2. If so, which projects gained EU funding, and what were the results after completion?

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

(16 July 2012)

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

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005259/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Fiona Hall (ALDE)**

(24 May 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Treatment of Ahmadiyya Muslims in Pakistan

Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the case of Abdul Qudoos Ahmad, an Ahmadiyya Muslim who was detained and tortured by the police in Chenab Nagar in the Punjab province of Pakistan and later died from his injuries?

Mr Qudoos was a schoolteacher and the president of the Nusrat Abad chapter of the Ahmadiyya Jamaat (Community). It is reported that he was taken into custody without charge by the police on 10 February 2012 and was kept in a private cell where he was tortured until 26 March when his health deteriorated. It is alleged that as well as being tortured he was deprived of access to legal representation. Mr Qudoos was released but died of his injuries on 30 March 2012.

Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of this incident and will she raise with the Pakistani authorities concerns about how Ahmadiyya Muslims are being treated in the country?

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

(20 July 2012)

The EU follows closely the situation of religious minorities in Pakistan. We are well aware of the vulnerable situation of persons belonging to religious minorities in Pakistan. This concerns not only Ahmadis, but also Shias, Christians, Hindus and others. It should be noted that Pakistan's constitution provides for freedom of religion and requires the state to safeguard the rights of minorities. This said, Ahmadis are prohibited by law in Pakistan from describing themselves as Muslim although they consider themselves as such.

The EU is in regular contact with groups representing minorities including the Ahmadi community. It is a fact that members of minority groups face serious difficulties. Many live peacefully alongside fellow Muslims, especially in urban areas, but they are often subject to discrimination. Moreover with fundamentalism and sectarianism on the rise religious intolerance appears to be increasing. Unfortunately religious sentiment can easily be manipulated for political purposes.

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 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, including the visit by the HR to Islamabad on 5 June 2012. 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.

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.

---



(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005260/12**  
**alla Commissione**  
**Oreste Rossi (EFD)**  
(24 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Comunicando l'adolescenza tramite i social network

L'adolescenza è forse il periodo più difficile della vita umana. Se non viene affrontata bene può provocare la chiusura comportamentale e l'isolamento. Nell'era tecnologica in cui viviamo, in soccorso degli adolescenti con difficoltà arriva un social network che è in grado di consigliarli.

Gli adolescenti, con questo sistema, potranno sentirsi meno isolati e potranno avere un aiuto e un sostegno psicologico. Ciò che sorprende è che gli «assistenti» non sono degli esperti, ma giovani che hanno affrontato e superato gli stessi ostacoli dei «pazienti». L'assistenza avviene attraverso i social network, chattando, comunicando on-line, telefonando, mandando e-mail. I ragazzi supporter sono giovanissimi, di età inferiore ai 20 anni, preparati con corsi di formazione adeguati che prevedono lezioni da parte di medici, psicologi ed esperti di comunicazione. Il metodo utilizzato giunge direttamente all'obiettivo: coinvolgere gli adolescenti e indurli ad aprirsi agli altri per comunicare i propri disagi. È risaputo infatti che un ragazzo ascolta molto più volentieri un coetaneo piuttosto che un adulto.

Considerando che questo progetto interregionale, finanziato dal Ministero della salute italiano e che ha come capofila la Regione Toscana, potrebbe essere il pioniere di un network europeo, chiedo alla Commissione se è a conoscenza del progetto e se intenda promuovere una rete simile per fornire assistenza a tutti gli adolescenti europei.

**Risposta di Androulla Vassiliou a nome della Commissione**  
(9 agosto 2012)

La Commissione desidera incoraggiare i promotori di progetti di questo tipo a diffondere i risultati dei progetti in modo che altri possano imparare dalla loro esperienza in fatto di sviluppo di progetti interdisciplinari che coinvolgono pienamente i giovani come co-produttori e fornitori di servizi per altri giovani.

Tale approccio ben si inserisce nella Strategia per la gioventù <sup>(1)</sup> dell'Unione, che valorizza la partecipazione dei giovani, nonché in un approccio intersettoriale a problemi quali la salute e il benessere in età giovanile. Nell'ambito della suddetta strategia la Commissione sta attualmente rielaborando il proprio Portale europeo per i giovani <sup>(2)</sup>. Il portale futuro comprenderà elementi interattivi per stimolare un maggior numero di scambi e condivisioni di esperienze tra i giovani a livello europeo nei campi d'azione contemplati dalla Strategia per la gioventù dell'Unione.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Risoluzione del Consiglio del 27 novembre 2009 su un quadro rinnovato di Cooperazione europea nell'ambito delle politiche giovanili (2010-2018).

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://europa.eu/youth>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005260/12  
to the Commission**

**Oreste Rossi (EFD)**

(24 May 2012)

*Subject:* Coping with adolescence with the help of social networks

Adolescence is perhaps the hardest time of our lives. If adolescents find it difficult to cope, they may become withdrawn and isolated. In this technological age, there is now a social network that can help advise adolescents experiencing difficulties.

This system will help adolescents feel less isolated and give them assistance and psychological support. Surprisingly, the 'advisers' are not experts, but young people who have experienced and overcome similar difficulties to the 'patients'. Support is provided through social networks, chat rooms, online communication, telephone calls and e-mails. The supporters are very young, less than 20 years old. They are prepared for their role through tailored training courses that include lectures from doctors, psychologists and communication experts. This is a very direct method that involves adolescents and persuades them to open up and talk about their problems. It is well known that a young person would rather listen to one of his or her peers than an adult.

This inter-regional project, funded by the Italian Ministry of Health and led by the Tuscany Regional Authorities, could be the forerunner of a European network. Is the Commission therefore aware of the project and will it promote a similar network to support all European adolescents?

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

(9 August 2012)

The Commission would encourage the promoters of such projects to disseminate their project results so that others can learn from their experience in developing multi-disciplinary projects that fully involve young people as co-producers and providers of services for other young people.

Such an approach is in line with the EU Youth Strategy <sup>(1)</sup> that advocates youth participation as well as a cross-sectoral approach to issues such as the health and well-being of young people. As part of this strategy, the Commission is currently redeveloping its European Youth Portal <sup>(2)</sup>. The future portal will include interactive features to encourage more exchanges and sharing of experience between young people across Europe in the fields of action addressed by the EU Youth Strategy.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Council resolution on a renewed Framework for European Cooperation in the Youth Field (2010-2018), 27.11.2009.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://europa.eu/youth>

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005261/12**

**alla Commissione**

**Oreste Rossi (EFD)**

(24 maggio 2012)

**Oggetto:** Sport e disabilità, quale futuro per gli atleti diversamente abili

Lo sport è una risorsa molto importante per i diversamente abili che scoprono così un nuovo mondo di opportunità e di integrazione sociale. Gli sport paralimpici hanno avuto un notevole sviluppo negli ultimi decenni e oggi le discipline sportive alle quali possono accedere i disabili sono numerose.

I bambini, i giovani o gli adulti disabili che hanno la possibilità di praticare uno sport anche a livello agonistico non sono molti, nonostante vi siano le federazioni dedicate a loro che promuovono lo sport paralimpico e le attività sportive come strumento per migliorare il benessere fisico e morale dei disabili. Dal momento che in Europa il 15 % della popolazione (ovvero circa 80 milioni di persone) è colpita da una forma di disabilità, è necessario e importante prevedere misure di integrazione sociale specifiche. A tale proposito, la Commissione ha proposto di utilizzare i fondi strutturali 2014-2020 anche per migliorare il benessere delle persone diversamente abili in vari settori tra cui quello del lavoro, dell'istruzione, della salute.

Considerato che le barriere sia architettoniche che sociali sono ancora di ostacolo alla libera espressione dei disabili in ambito sportivo, intende la Commissione prevedere tra le azioni finanziabili con i fondi strutturali 2014-2020 la promozione della partecipazione sportiva dei disabili in linea con la Strategia europea per la disabilità 2010-2020?

**Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione**

(19 luglio 2012)

La Strategia europea in materia di disabilità 2010-2020 adottata nel dicembre 2010 considera lo sport un importante strumento per la partecipazione e l'inclusione sociale delle persone disabili.

La Commissione europea sostiene quindi il miglioramento dell'accessibilità delle attività sportive. Nell'utilizzo dei finanziamenti dell'UE sarà prestata particolare attenzione all'accessibilità di tutte le infrastrutture e di tutti gli eventi finanziati, comprese le infrastrutture e le competizioni sportive, le persone disabili dovrebbero poter avere pieno accesso agli eventi sportivi, siano loro atleti o sostenitori. I fondi strutturali possono avere un ruolo significativo nel rafforzamento dell'accessibilità in vari ambiti della vita quotidiana. Per tale ragione, nel corso dell'attuazione dei fondi del QSC, gli Stati membri devono adottare le opportune disposizioni al fine di prevenire qualsiasi discriminazione fondata sulla disabilità; tutte le strutture finanziate dai fondi, comprese quelle sportive, dovranno inoltre rispettare tale requisito. La lotta alla discriminazione fondata sulla disabilità rappresenta altresì una specifica priorità di investimento dell'FSE.

Nell'ambito della Strategia europea in materia di disabilità, la Commissione europea è inoltre impegnata a: sviluppare e diffondere norme sull'accessibilità di organizzazioni, attività, strutture, eventi e luoghi d'incontro sportivi, ricreativi e culturali; promuovere la partecipazione di persone disabili agli eventi sportivi europei e l'organizzazione di eventi riservati ai disabili, come i Giochi Olimpici Speciali; rendere prioritaria l'integrazione sociale attraverso e nello sport, con particolare riguardo alle persone disabili, nell'ambito della politica e delle misure di incentivazione future della Commissione nel settore dello sport.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005261/12  
to the Commission  
Oreste Rossi (EFD)  
(24 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Sport and disability: what is the future for disabled athletes?

Sport is a very important resource for disabled people, through which they discover new opportunities and social integration. Paralympic sports have developed considerably in recent years, and today there are many accessible sports for disabled people.

Few disabled children, young people and adults have the opportunity to take up a sport, including at competitive level. However, some associations promote paralympic sports and sports activities to improve the physical and moral wellbeing of people with disabilities. Given that 15% of the European population (about 80 million people) is affected by some form of disability, it is necessary and important to provide specific measures for social integration. To that end, the Commission has proposed using the Structural Funds 2014-2020 to also improve the wellbeing of disabled people in various areas, such as work, education and health.

Given that disabled people are still faced with both architectural and social barriers when expressing themselves through sport, does the Commission intend to include the promotion of sport for disabled people among the actions funded by the Structural Funds 2014-2020, in line with the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission  
(19 July 2012)**

The European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 adopted in December 2010 sees sports as an important vehicle for the participation and inclusion in society of persons with disabilities.

The European Commission therefore supports the improvement of the accessibility of sports. Particular consideration in the use of all EU funding will be given to accessibility of all infrastructure and events financed, including sports infrastructure and competitions: persons with disabilities should be able to have full access to sport events, as either athletes or supporters. Structural funds can play an important role in strengthening accessibility in several fields of everyday life. Therefore, during the implementation of all CSF funds, Member States shall take appropriate steps to prevent any discrimination based on disability, and all facilities, including those in sport, supported by the funds will have to fulfil this requirement. Moreover, combating disability based discrimination is a specific investment priority of the ESF.

Moreover, in the context of the European Disability Strategy, the European Commission is committed to developing and disseminating standards for accessibility of sports, leisure, and recreation organisations, activities, events and venues; to promoting the participation of people with disabilities in European sport events as well as the organisation of disability-specific events including Special Olympics; to including a priority on social inclusion through and in sport, with a particular regard to persons with disabilities, in the future Commission policy and incentive measures in the field of sport.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005262/12  
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**

**Oreste Rossi (EFD)**

(24 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Yemen: emergenza sanitaria e cure mediche per i profughi eritrei

Sono decine di migliaia i civili in fuga dagli scontri tribali nel nord del paese e dai nuovi combattimenti tra truppe governative e gruppi di miliziani nel sud, nella nuova ondata di esodi interni che sta interessando lo Yemen. Nonostante l'accordo di pace siglato dal governo yemenita e Al-Houtis nel giugno 2010, la situazione nel nord del paese resta precaria. L'insicurezza ostacola un rientro su vasta scala e limita seriamente l'accesso da parte delle agenzie umanitarie. L'Alto Commissariato delle Nazioni Unite per i Rifugiati (UNHCR) continua a gestire due campi per gli sfollati yemeniti nel nord e presta assistenza agli sfollati nei campi e nelle comunità locali che li accolgono.

Una delle principali agenzie locali riferisce che circa duecentoquaranta profughi eritrei sono trattenuti nelle carceri yemenite in condizioni disumane; circa settanta di loro hanno contratto in carcere una malattia che provoca forti emorragie. Per evitare il contagio, gli agenti di custodia li hanno isolati, abbandonandoli in un cortile circondato da alte mura, esposti alle intemperie e senza alcun intervento medico. Molti si stanno ammalando di tubercolosi ma non ricevono alcun tipo di assistenza.

Tale deplorabile situazione costituisce un evidente atto di violenza contro i profughi che, di fatto, si traduce in una coscrizione forzata per giovani e adulti, in violenze sessuali e sfruttamento a fini sessuali per le donne, in uno stato di detenzione arbitraria, in un ostacolo all'attività delle organizzazioni di assistenza umanitaria. È indubbia la totale violazione dei diritti fondamentali dell'individuo, delle persone, del malato, del rifugiato, in particolare del diritto alla vita, alla libertà e alla sicurezza della persona, del diritto alla salute e del diritto a essere liberi da tortura o trattamenti crudeli, disumani o degradanti.

Visti il crescente esodo e il peggioramento delle condizioni di sicurezza che limitano i movimenti degli operatori internazionali sia nel sud che nel nord del paese, intende l'Alto Rappresentante, Lady Ashton, intervenire per garantire a queste persone il diritto a ricevere cure mediche e affinché questi profughi vengano consegnati ai più vicini centri di assistenza medica locale nonché alle organizzazioni di protezione internazionale, nel rispetto dei loro diritti fondamentali?

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

(27 luglio 2012)

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente è a conoscenza della terribile situazione dei profughi del Corno d'Africa in Yemen. L'UE sta facendo tutto il possibile, fornendo più aiuti umanitari, per cercare di soddisfare le necessità immediate dei profughi. Intraprende tali attività collaborando e coordinandosi strettamente con altri operatori internazionali che sostengono attivamente i profughi e gli sfollati in Yemen.

Il caso specifico, estremamente doloroso, di un gruppo di profughi tenuti prigionieri in una zona remota del governatorato di Hodeidah è stato portato all'attenzione dell'UNHCR (presente nella regione), che lo segue attivamente. L'Organizzazione Internazionale per le Migrazioni (OIM), anch'essa presente nella regione con un ufficio secondario a Haradh, fornisce una serie di servizi per soddisfare le necessità immediate dei migranti (irregolari) abbandonati a se stessi nella zona.

Attraverso la delegazione UE a Sana'a l'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente porterà il caso all'attenzione delle autorità yemenite e insisterà sulla necessità di trattare i profughi umanamente. I servizi sanitari di Hodeidah, la regione più povera dello Yemen, non sono però sufficienti per l'intera popolazione. Vista la loro entità, i fondi UE destinati allo sviluppo nel settore sanitario possono finanziare soltanto la salute riproduttiva e la nutrizione, che sono due problemi urgenti del paese.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005262/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Oreste Rossi (EFD)**

(24 May 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Yemen: health and medical care emergency for Eritrean refugees

Tens of thousands of civilians are fleeing tribal clashes in northern Yemen and there is renewed fighting between Government troops and militant groups in the south. This has created a new wave of internal migration in Yemen. The situation in the north remains precarious in spite of the peace agreement signed by the Yemeni Government and the Houthis in June 2010. Lack of security prevents people returning on a large scale and is seriously limiting access for humanitarian agencies. The United Nations Refugee Agency (UNHCR) continues to manage two camps for displaced Yemenis in the north and provides aid for refugees in the camps and in local communities which welcome them.

A major local agency has reported that around 240 Eritrean refugees are being held in Yemeni prisons in inhumane conditions; around 70 have contracted a disease in prison that causes serious haemorrhaging. To avoid contagion, prison officers have isolated them: abandoning them in a high-walled courtyard, exposed to the elements and without any medical attention. Many are suffering from tuberculosis but have not received any help.

This deplorable situation is a clear act of violence against the refugees, amounting to forced conscription for children and adults, sexual violence and sexual exploitation for women and a state of arbitrary detention which prevents aid by humanitarian aid agencies. It is a gross violation of the fundamental rights of individuals, the sick and refugees. It violates the right to life, liberty, personal safety, health and the right to be free from torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment.

Given the increasing displacement and the worsening security situation, which restrict international aid workers' movements in both in the north and south of the country, does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to intervene to guarantee the right to medical care and ensure that these refugees are transferred to the nearest local medical-aid centres and to international aid agencies, in accordance with their fundamental rights?

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

(27 July 2012)

The HR/VP is aware of the dire situation of refugees from the Horn of Africa in Yemen. Through increased EU humanitarian assistance all efforts are made to help addressing the immediate needs of these refugees. The EU undertakes these efforts in close collaboration and coordination with other international actors actively supporting refugees and internally displaced persons in Yemen.

The particular and extremely distressing case of a group of refugees held captive in a remote area of Hodeidah Governorate has been brought to the attention of the UNHCR (present in the region) which actively follows up this case. The International Organisation for Migration (IOM) also present in the region through its sub-office in Haradh operates a number of facilities that cater to the emergency needs of (irregular) migrants that are stranded in the area.

Through the EU Delegation in Sana'a the HR/VP will bring this case to the attention of the Yemeni authorities and insist on humane treatment of these refugees. The health services in Hodeidah, the poorest region of Yemen, are however not sufficient to serve its population. The EU development portfolio in the health sector can only fund, due to its limited size, reproductive health and nutrition — both pressing problems of the country.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-005263/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Gerard Batten (EFD)**  
(24 May 2012)

*Subject:* Article 4 of the MiFID Implementing Directive 2006 and the MiFID Review 2012

Article 4 of Commission Directive 2006/73/EC of 10 August 2006 implementing Directive 2004/39/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards organisational requirements and operating conditions for investment firms states that 'Member States may retain or impose requirements additional to those in this directive only in those exceptional cases where such requirements are objectively justified and proportionate so as to address specific risks to investor protection or to market integrity that are not adequately addressed by this directive, and provided that' at least one of a number of additional conditions is met.

Member States are required to notify the Commission at least one month in advance of their intention to impose any such requirement. Contrary to the original intent that this Article be used rarely, if at all, as expressed by the terms 'exceptional cases', it has been used by a number of regulatory authorities in different Member States since Directives 2004/39/EC and 2006/73/EC entered into force to justify gold-plating of the directives for their own purposes. Of these, the UK FSA has been by far the largest user, often imposing an extra burden on the financial services sector in the UK and giving justifications in their notifications to the European Commission that do not always seem to make the 'exceptional... objectively justified and proportionate' case that is required.

In the Commission's proposal for a directive on markets in financial instruments repealing Directive 2004/39/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council (Recast), and in the European Parliament's draft response to this proposal, there is no reference to any provision of the kind that appears in Article 4 of implementing Directive 2006/73/EC.

— Given that the entire Directive is to be recast and repealed, can the Commission confirm that there is no intention to grandfather in the provisions of Article 4 when the implementing Directive to the recast Directive is negotiated?

— Will this, together with the role of ESMA in writing and enforcing legally binding European-wide technical standards to ensure consistent implementation of regulations across the EU, mean that national supervisory authorities will no longer be able to produce at will rules that are super-equivalent to the standards in the directive to the detriment of businesses in their own Member States?

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

Article 4 of Commission Directive 2006/73/EC Implementing MiFID <sup>(1)</sup> regulates the possibility for Member States to impose requirements additional to those in the directive in certain cases and subject to specific conditions.

The Commission has adopted on 20 October 2011 two legislative proposals for the review of MiFID, a directive and a regulation (so-called 'level 1') <sup>(2)</sup>. The proposals are under negotiation in the European Parliament and in the Council in the context of the ordinary legislative procedure.

After the final adoption of the legislation, the Commission will adopt the relevant implementing measures, including regulatory or implementing technical standards that will be drafted by ESMA. Existing measures implementing the current MiFID, including Directive 2006/73/EC, should thus be repealed.

In relation to the first question posed by the Honourable Member, and in the light of the ongoing negotiations on the Commission proposals (level 1), the Commission cannot at this stage anticipate the content of the final outcome of the negotiations in the European Parliament and the Council and thus of the future implementing measures. In relation to the second question, one of the objectives of the review of MiFID is the establishment of a European single rule book. The European Securities and Markets Authority, mentioned by the Honourable Member, will play an important role in actively fostering supervisory convergence and consistent application of EU rules across the Union.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Directive 2004/39/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on markets in financial instruments.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0656:FIN:EN:PDF>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005265/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Claude Moraes (S&D)**  
(24 May 2012)

*Subject:* Recognition of EU marriage certificates

Following an inquiry from a constituent, I would like to ask the Commission if it can provide information on any plans it may have to harmonise the recognition of EU marriage certificates, particularly with reference to the confusion that can arise from the lack of recognition, checking and centralised confirmation of the names and marriage status of the persons concerned.

My constituent — a UK citizen — is experiencing an ongoing situation in which Italian authorities have misstated her surname on Italian-issued marriage certificates, causing Italian authorities to believe that she lives in Italy — with negative legal ramifications — even though she lives in the UK. As the relevant UK authorities are unable to rectify the situation directly, my constituent fears that in future she will be unable to make full use of her right to freedom of movement within the EU — such as when accompanying her dual-citizenship Italian-British daughter to Italy — without facing legal obstacles put in her way by Italian authorities. The European Court of Justice has, in the case of my constituent, clearly stated its view that national marriage law takes precedence over marriage laws in other Member States. Can the Commission, therefore, clarify what potential remedies are available in situations arising when a EU citizen, marrying in a Member State where he or she is not resident, is — for whatever reason — confronted with the fact that the marriage is not recognised, or has uncertain legal status, in the country of residence?

Is the Commission aware of any such similar cases, and does it have any plans to address this complicated situation?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission**  
(12 July 2012)

The existing EC law does not cover the effects of civil status in general. However, civil status questions are not new for the EU which has already dealt with them, in particular, as regards, marriage. According to Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003 ('Brussels II a regulation'), if a judgment relating to divorce, legal separation or marriage annulment is given in one Member State, no special procedure is required for updating the civil-status records in another Member State.

Since the increasing mobility of citizens within the EU has highlighted the need for mutual recognition in the field of civil status, the Commission seeks to make it easier for citizens to exercise their right to freedom of movement within the EU by simplifying the recognition in one Member State of the effects of civil status records issued in another Member State. This is why the Commission has started its preparatory work for an initiative related to the recognition of the effects of certain civil status records in cross border situations, which is foreseen by the Stockholm Programme Action Plan for the end of 2013.

The concrete case raised by the Honourable Member is to be considered under Italian law, which provides mechanisms aimed at rectifying mistakes in a marriage certificate. In the first instance, the Commission suggests that you invite your constituent to directly contact the Italian authority which has issued her marriage certificate in order to request the necessary modification.

The Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that it is not aware of similar cases.

---



(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005266/12  
alla Commissione  
Mario Mauro (PPE)  
(24 maggio 2012)**

Oggetto: Programma operativo regionale Liguria Obiettivo 3 2000-2006. Programma integrato «Ricomincio da 40»

Con delibera n. 341 del 7 aprile 2006, la Giunta regionale della Regione Liguria ha approvato il Programma integrato «Ricomincio da 40» finalizzato all'attivazione di interventi individuali di ricollocazione professionale. Il programma era rivolto a 500 lavoratori delle province liguri (di cui almeno il 50 % donne) con almeno 40 anni di età, disoccupati o in mobilità.

In totale sono stati stanziati 1 200 000 euro a valere sul Programma operativo regionale Obiettivo 3 del Fondo sociale europeo per il periodo 2000-2006.

Il programma si è concluso nel giugno 2008. Le risorse effettivamente utilizzate ammontano a 844 361,65 euro, pur restando molto critica la condizione occupazionale in Liguria, come nel resto d'Italia.

Quasi un terzo del finanziamento totale stanziato, pari a 355 638,35 euro, non è stato effettivamente impiegato;

Può la Commissione far sapere se:

- è a conoscenza di questo mancato impiego di risorse;
- questo mancato impiego di risorse corrisponde al vero;
- intende verificare se quanto assegnato alla Regione Liguria dal Fondo sociale europeo per il POR Obiettivo 3 2000-2006 è stato effettivamente speso e in che misura?

**Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione  
(28 giugno 2012)**

La Commissione è a conoscenza del programma integrato «Ricomincio da 40», nell'ambito del programma operativo regionale Liguria. Come ha indicato nella sua risposta all'interrogazione parlamentare E-006648/2011 <sup>(1)</sup> relativa allo stesso programma, su 500 lavoratori interessati, 304 sono stati ricollocati, di cui 99 con contratto a tempo indeterminato, 122 con contratti di più di 4 mesi e 83 con contratti inferiori a 4 mesi. La differenza tra l'importo impegnato e l'importo speso è dovuto alla parziale implementazione del programma integrato da parte di due province.

Il programma operativo FSE 2000-2006 relativo alla Liguria ha certificato spese per un importo complessivo superiore al 100 % del bilancio disponibile fornendo tutte le informazioni necessarie per la chiusura. La Commissione europea ha eseguito il pagamento finale nel 2011 per un importo complessivo pari al 100 % del contributo comunitario previsto (165 720 774,00 euro).

---

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

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005266/12  
to the Commission  
Mario Mauro (PPE)  
(24 May 2012)**

*Subject:* 2000-2006 Regional Operational Programme for Liguria under Objective 3 — integrated Programme 'Ricomincio da 40' [Starting again at 40]

By Decision No 341 of 7 April 2006, the Regional Council of Liguria approved the 'Ricomincio da 40' [Starting again at 40] Integrated Programme, the aim of which was to facilitate individual professional outplacement measures. The programme targeted 500 workers from the provinces of Liguria (at least 50% of whom were women) who were 40 years old at least, unemployed or placed on a so-called 'mobility' list.

A total of EUR 1.2 million was allocated under the Regional Operational Programme under Objective 3 of the European Social Fund for the period 2000-2006.

The programme came to an end in June 2008. The amount spent was EUR 844 361.65. Although the employment situation in Liguria is still extremely difficult, as it is in the rest of Italy, almost a third of the total funding allocated, namely EUR 355 638.35, has not been used.

— Is the Commission aware that this funding was not used?

— Can it confirm whether the amount of funding not used is correct?

— Does the Commission intend to check whether the amount allocated to the Region of Liguria by the European Social Fund for the 2000-2006 ROP under Objective 3 was actually spent and to what extent?

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

The Commission is aware of the integrated programme 'Ricomincio da 40', within the regional operational programme Liguria. As indicated in its reply to the parliamentary Question E-006648/2011 <sup>(1)</sup> on the same programme, out of the 500 workers involved, 304 have been relocated, including 99 under open-ended contract, 122 under labour contracts lasting more than 4 months and 83 contracts under contracts lasting less than 4 months. The difference between the amount committed and the amount spent is due to the partial implementation of the integrated programme by two provinces.

The 2000-2006 ESF operational programme Liguria has certified expenditures for a total amount higher than 100% of the available budget, providing all necessary information for the closure. The European Commission executed the final payment in 2011, for an overall cumulated amount equal to 100% of the foreseen Community contribution (EUR 1 657 207 74.00)

---

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

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005267/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Spyros Danellis (S&D)**  
(24 Μαΐου 2012)

Θέμα: Διασφάλιση επιτυχούς εφαρμογής του πρασινίσματος στη νέα ΚΓΠ

1. Τι ειδους ποιοτικά και ποσοτικά αποτελέσματα επιδιώκει η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή να επιτύχει από το «πρασίνισμα»;
2. Με ποια κριτήρια προτείνει η Επιτροπή να κριθεί στο μέλλον η επιτυχία ή μη της εφαρμογής αυτού του μέτρου;
3. Προβλέπεται να γίνει ενδιάμεση αξιολόγηση αποτελεσμάτων, περί το μέσο της περιόδου 2014-2020, ώστε να γίνουν οι απαραίτητες διορθώσεις;

**Απάντηση του κ. Cíolos εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(28 Ιουνίου 2012)

1) Οι στόχοι της πράσινης διάστασης και ο αναμενόμενος αντίκτυπος της εξετάστηκαν διεξοδικά στην εκτίμηση επιπτώσεων. Συνολικά, στόχος των πράσινων υποχρεώσεων του πυλώνα I είναι να επιτευχθούν σημαντικά και αποδεδειγμένα κλιματικά και περιβαλλοντικά οφέλη και, συνεπώς, μια πλέον βιώσιμη γεωργία. Το περιβαλλοντικό πολλαπλασιαστικό αποτέλεσμα των πράσινων μέτρων θα είναι σημαντικό λόγω της εφαρμογής τους σε σχεδόν όλες τις μεμονωμένες εκμεταλλεύσεις, εξασφαλίζοντας την ευρύτερη δυνατή κάλυψη σε όλη την ΕΕ.

2) Ο προτεινόμενος μελλοντικός οριζόντιος κανονισμός<sup>(1)</sup> καθορίζει, στο άρθρο 110, κοινό πλαίσιο παρακολούθησης και αξιολόγησης με στόχο τη μέτρηση της αποδοτικότητας της κοινής γεωργικής πολιτικής (ΚΓΠ) και, μεταξύ άλλων, της πράσινης διάστασης. Προβλέπεται ότι ο αντίκτυπος της ΚΓΠ υπολογίζεται, μεταξύ άλλων, σε σχέση με τον στόχο της βιώσιμης διαχείρισης των φυσικών πόρων τον οποίο αφορούν τα πράσινα μέτρα. Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, θα αναπτυχθούν κατάλληλοι δείκτες για να διευκολυνθεί η αξιολόγηση και να επιτραπεί η μέτρηση της αποτελεσματικότητας των ειδικών μέσων, όπως των πράσινων μέτρων σε σχέση με τους στόχους αυτούς. Για τον σκοπό αυτό, θα καθοριστούν ειδικοί δείκτες στις εκτελεστικές πράξεις και θα επιλεγούν σύμφωνα με τους στόχους των διάφορων μέτρων. Για παράδειγμα, μπορούμε να υποθέσουμε ότι για ένα μέτρο που αφορά τη βιοπικικιλότητα, όπως οι Περιοχές Οικολογικής Εστίασης, ο δείκτης θα εξετάζει το θέμα της βιοπικικιλότητας και θα αξιολογούνται άλλα περιβαλλοντικά θέματα σε σχέση με τις πράσινες υποχρεώσεις, όπως η ποιότητα των υδάτων ή η δέσμευση του άνθρακα.

3) Δεν προβλέπεται ειδική ενδιάμεση αξιολόγηση. Ωστόσο, στο άρθρο 110 παράγραφος 4 της ανωτέρω πρότασης προβλέπεται η υποχρέωση για την Επιτροπή να υποβάλλει κάθε τέσσερα έτη στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο και στο Συμβούλιο έκθεση για την εφαρμογή του πλαισίου παρακολούθησης και αξιολόγησης.

(<sup>1</sup>) COM(2011)628 τελικό/2.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005267/12  
to the Commission  
Spyros Danellis (S&D)  
(24 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Ensuring the successful 'greening' of the new Common Agricultural Policy (CAP)

1. What type of qualitative and quantitative results does the Commission hope to gain from 'greening' the CAP?
2. What criteria does the Commission suggest using to assess success or otherwise when implementing this measure in the future?
3. Does it plan to carry out a mid-term assessment of results during the 2014-20 period in order to make the necessary adjustments?

**Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission  
(28 June 2012)**

1. The goals of greening and its expected impacts have been examined thoroughly in the impact assessment. All in all, the objective of the greening obligations of Pillar I is to bring significant and proven climate and environmental benefits and therefore, contribute to a more sustainable agriculture. The environmental leverage of the greening measures will be considerable due to their implementation on almost all individual farms, ensuring the widest possible coverage across the EU.
2. The proposed future Horizontal Regulation <sup>(1)</sup> establishes in Article 110 a common monitoring and evaluation framework with a view to measuring the performance of the common agricultural policy (CAP) and *inter alia* greening. It is foreseen that the impacts of the CAP shall be measured, amongst other, against the objective of sustainable management of natural resources to which the greening measures are related. In this context appropriate indicators will be developed to facilitate the assessment and to allow for measuring the effect of specific instruments, such as the greening measures, against their objectives. For this purpose, precise indicators will be defined in implementing acts and selected according to the objectives of the various measures. For example, one may already assume that for a measure related to biodiversity such as Ecological Focus Area the indicator will tackle the question of biodiversity. But also other environmental issues related to the greening obligations, such as water quality or carbon sequestration, should be assessed.
3. No specific 'mid-term evaluation' is foreseen. But, paragraph 4 of Article 110 of the abovementioned proposal establishes an obligation for the Commission to present to the European Parliament and the Council every four years a report on the implementation of the monitoring and evaluation framework.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2011) 628 final/2.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005268/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Spyros Danellis (S&D)**  
(24 Μαΐου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Ανάγκη τροποποίησης του ορισμού για τον όρο «μόνιμα λιβάδια»

Ένα από τα μέτρα της «οικολογικής διάστασης» είναι η διατήρηση των υφιστάμενων μόνιμων λιβαδιών που περιλαμβάνονται σε μια εκμετάλλευση. Ο ορισμός του όρου «μόνιμα λιβάδια» που προβλέπεται στο άρθρο 4 του προτεινόμενου κανονισμού για τις άμεσες ενισχύσεις (COM(2011)0625) περιορίζει την επιλεξιμότητα στα «αγρωστώδη ή άλλα ποώδη κτηνοτροφικά φυτά», εξαιρώντας κατ' αυτό τον τρόπο από τις «πράσινες ενισχύσεις» κάθε έκταση γης με «μη ποώδη κτηνοτροφικά φυτά». Ωστόσο, η γη που χρησιμοποιείται για την ανάπτυξη μη ποωδών κτηνοτροφικών φυτών με φυσικό τρόπο (αυτοφυή φυτά) χρησιμοποιείται ως επί το πλείστον στο πλαίσιο της εκτατικής εκτροφής αιγοειδών και προβατοειδών, σε αρκετές περιοχές της νότιας Ευρώπης, γεγονός που επίσης τείνει να ενισχύει τη βιοποικιλότητα.

1. Εάν ο στόχος του ανωτέρω μέτρου «οικολογικής διάστασης» είναι όντως η ενίσχυση της βιοποικιλότητας, τότε, μήπως θα έπρεπε να γίνεται αναφορά στη διατήρηση «μόνιμων βοσκοτόπων» και όχι «μόνιμων λιβαδιών» ούτως ώστε να αποκλεισθεί, στο πλαίσιο εφαρμογής της ΚΓΠ, κάθε πιθανότητα χορήγησης «πράσινων ενισχύσεων» στα ανοιχτά γήπεδα ποδοσφαίρου;
2. Αναγνωρίζει η Επιτροπή τη συμβολή των μη ποωδών κτηνοτροφικών φυτών, τα οποία αναπτύσσονται με φυσικό τρόπο, στην ενίσχυση της βιοποικιλότητας; Εάν όχι, μπορεί η Επιτροπή να παρουσιάσει τα αντεπιχειρήματά της; Εάν η Επιτροπή αναγνωρίζει την εν λόγω συμβολή, εξετάζει άραγε το ενδεχόμενο τροποποίησης του προτεινόμενου ορισμού για τα «μόνιμα λιβάδια» ούτως ώστε να μην αποκλεισθεί η γη που χρησιμοποιείται για την ανάπτυξη μη ποωδών κτηνοτροφικών φυτών με φυσικό τρόπο (αυτοφυή φυτά) από τη χορήγηση «πράσινων ενισχύσεων»;

**Απάντηση του κ. Cίολος εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(25 Ιουνίου 2012)

Στη νομοθετική πρόταση της τον Οκτώβριο 2011 όσον αφορά την ΚΓΠ με χρονικό ορίζοντα το 2020, η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή πρότεινε νέο ορισμό για τους «μόνιμους βοσκοτόπους<sup>(1)</sup>». Με τον προτεινόμενο ορισμό, ο οποίος διευρύνει τον υφιστάμενο ορισμό των «μόνιμων λειμώνων», είναι δυνατόν να θεωρείται μόνιμος βοσκοτόπος, η γη στην οποία υπάρχουν μη ποώδη κτηνοτροφικά φυτά εφόσον επικρατούν τα αγρωστώδη και λοιπά ποώδη κτηνοτροφικά φυτά.

Επιπλέον, κατά τη συνεδρίαση του Συμβουλίου για τη Γεωργία τον Μάιο 2012, η Επιτροπή επέδειξε ανοικτό πνεύμα όσον αφορά τη συμπλήρωση του προτεινόμενου ορισμού των μόνιμων βοσκοτόπων με την πιθανή συμπερίληψη ορισμένων εκτάσεων που χρησιμοποιούνται στο πλαίσιο εκτατικών παραδοσιακών κτηνοτροφικών/γεωργικών συστημάτων με στόχο την αναγνώριση του σημαντικού ρόλου των εκτάσεων αυτών για τη βιοποικιλότητα και την πρόληψη της διάβρωσης του εδάφους και της ελευθέρωσης άνθρακα.

Αυτό μπορεί να επιτευχθεί αν θεωρηθούν επιλέξιμες οι εκτάσεις στις οποίες δεν επικρατούν παραδοσιακά τα αγρωστώδη και λοιπά ποώδη κτηνοτροφικά φυτά ωστόσο παραμένουν κατάλληλα για βόσκηση και αποτελούν μέρος παραδοσιακών κτηνοτροφικών συστημάτων.

Επιπλέον, όσον αφορά τη χορήγηση των ενισχύσεων, θα πρέπει να τηρούνται συμπληρωματικές διατάξεις όπως αυτές για την ενεργοποίηση των δικαιωμάτων ενίσχυσης, τα επιλέξιμα εκτάρια καθώς και τον «ενεργό γεωργό».

<sup>(1)</sup> Ως «μόνιμος βοσκοτόπος» νοείται η γη που χρησιμοποιείται για την ανάπτυξη αγρωστών ή άλλων ποωδών κτηνοτροφικών φυτών με φυσικό τρόπο (αυτοφυή) ή με καλλιέργεια (σπαρμένα) και δεν έχει περιληφθεί στην αμειψισπορά επί πέντε έτη ή μακρύτερο διάστημα· μπορεί να περιλαμβάνει άλλα είδη κατάλληλα για βόσκη υπό τον όρο ότι επικρατούν τα αγρωστώδη και λοιπά ποώδη κτηνοτροφικά φυτά.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005268/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Spyros Danellis (S&D)**  
(24 May 2012)

*Subject:* The need for the definition of 'permanent grassland' to be changed

One of the measures constituting 'greening' is the maintenance of existing permanent grassland on a holding. The definition provided for 'permanent grassland' in Article 4 of the proposed regulation for direct payments (COM(2011)0625) restricts eligibility to 'grasses or other herbaceous forage', thus excluding from 'green payments' any land with 'non-herbaceous forage'. However, land used to grow non-herbaceous forage naturally (self-seeded) is predominantly used in extensive goat and sheep farming in several regions of southern Europe, which is also conducive to the enhancement of biodiversity.

1. If the goal of the abovementioned greening measure is indeed to enhance biodiversity, should it not refer to the maintenance of 'permanent pastures' rather than 'permanent grassland,' in order for the implementation of the CAP to exclude any possibility of granting 'green payments' to open football fields?
2. Does the Commission acknowledge the contribution of naturally grown non-herbaceous forage to the enhancement of biodiversity? If not, could the Commission disclose its counter-arguments? If the Commission does acknowledge that contribution, would it consider changing the proposed definition of 'permanent grassland,' so as not to exclude land used to grow non-herbaceous forage naturally (self-seeded) from 'greening' payments?

**Answer given by Mr Ciołoş on behalf of the Commission**  
(25 June 2012)

In its legislative proposal of October 2011 on the CAP towards 2020, the European Commission proposed a new definition for 'permanent grassland' <sup>(1)</sup>. With the proposed definition, which extends the current definition of 'permanent pasture', it is very well possible to consider as permanent grassland, land on which non-herbaceous forage is present as long as grasses and other herbaceous forage remain predominant.

Moreover, at the Agricultural Council meeting of May 2012, the Commission has shown openness to complementing the proposed definition of permanent grassland with the possible inclusion of some areas used within extensive traditional pastoral/agricultural systems with a view to recognising the key role such areas play for biodiversity and the prevention of soil erosion and carbon release.

This could be done by considering as eligible, areas where grasses and other herbaceous forage are traditionally not predominant but still suitable for grazing and that form part of traditional agricultural systems.

Moreover, with regard to the actual granting of support, additional provisions such as those on the activation of payment entitlements, eligible hectares as well as active farmer, will have to be complied with.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> 'permanent grassland' means land used to grow grasses or other herbaceous forage naturally (self-seeded) or through cultivation (sown) and that has not been included in the crop rotation of the holding for five years or longer; it may include other species suitable for grazing provided that the grasses and other herbaceous forage remain predominant.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005269/12  
do Komisji**

**Konrad Szymański (ECR) oraz Nirj Deva (ECR)**

(24 maja 2012 r.)

*Przedmiot:* Środki UE dla organizacji wspierających aborcję, działających w krajach rozwijających się, w których jest ona nielegalna

Dwoma głównymi beneficjentami funduszy UE przeznaczonych na programy dotyczące zdrowia seksualnego i reprodukcyjnego są Międzynarodowa Federacja Planowanego Rodzicielstwa (IPPF) i Marie Stopes International (MSI). Na przykład organizacja MSI otrzymała co najmniej 3,5 mln euro na swoje nowe przedsięwzięcia w 2007 r. i ponad 9 mln euro na lata 2005 i 2009, jak podaje w swoich sprawozdaniach dla Komisji.

MSI i IPPF przyznają w swoich sprawozdaniach, że stosują „regulację menstruacyjną” w wielu miejscach, w których prowadzą działalność. Dotyczy to również przedsięwzięć finansowanych przez UE w państwach takich jak Kenia, Bangladesz i Indonezja.

„Regulacja menstruacyjna” jest zabiegiem polegającym na zastosowaniu ręcznej pompy próżniowej do opróżnienia macicy, w której prawdopodobnie zagnieżdżył się już zarodek. W rzeczywistości celem tego zabiegu jest obejście prawa i wykonywanie aborcji w krajach, w których jest ona nielegalna.

W sprawozdaniach przedłożonych Komisji przez obie organizacje wyraźnie wskazano, że działania te są częścią programów finansowanych przez UE.

Czy Komisja zdaje sobie sprawę z tego, jakie usługi świadczą IPPF i MSI – zwłaszcza regulację menstruacyjną – wykorzystując środki Komisji?

Dlaczego Komisja nie podejmuje działań w celu dopilnowania tego, by programy na rzecz zdrowia seksualnego i reprodukcyjnego były zgodne z prawem UE, tzn. nie obejmowały wykonywania aborcji?

Czy Komisja może wyjaśnić, dlaczego istnieją tak duże rozbieżności pomiędzy danymi na temat unijnego finansowania podanymi w sprawozdaniach IPPF i MSI dla Komisji a danymi opublikowanymi w opracowaniach EuroMapping?

Czy Komisja nadal zamierza przydzielać środki na przedsięwzięcia realizowane przez IPPF lub MSI?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Andrisa Piebalgsa w imieniu Komisji**

(13 lipca 2012 r.)

Komisji znane są działania finansowane z funduszy rozwojowych UE. Działania te – w tym dotyczące zdrowia seksualnego i reprodukcyjnego w Bangladeszu, Indonezji i Kenii – są przeprowadzane z poszanowaniem uzgodnionej polityki UE w tym obszarze z pełnym uwzględnieniem prawodawstwa państw, w których działania te są realizowane, zgodnie z programem działań przyjętym podczas Międzynarodowej Konferencji na temat Ludności i Rozwoju (ICPD).

Organizacje otrzymujące unijne środki finansowe mogą zapewnić pełny pakiet usług w zakresie zdrowia reprodukcyjnego zatwierdzony przez państwa będące beneficjentami pomocy. W Bangladeszu, Indonezji i Kenii regulacja menstruacyjna jest dozwolona przez władze i powszechnie dostępna. Komisja pragnie również zwrócić uwagę Szanownego Pana Posła na odpowiedź udzieloną na pisemne pytanie E-005275/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

Co się tyczy zarzutu rozbieżności w danych liczbowych przedstawionych w różnych sprawozdaniach, sprawozdanie EuroMapping nie zawiera żadnych informacji na temat finansowania poszczególnych organizacji pozarządowych lub też finansowania działań przez te organizacje.

Komisja zamierza nadal realizować zobowiązania UE w zakresie zdrowia seksualnego i reprodukcyjnego, zgodnie z unijną polityką rozwojową i instrumentami w tej dziedzinie, przyznając środki finansowe organizacjom społeczeństwa obywatelskiego na podstawie obiektywnej oceny wniosków otrzymanych w ramach zaproszeń do ich składania.

Z powyższych względów nie ma podstaw, aby Komisja podejmowała działania przeciwko dwóm organizacjom wymienionym w zapytaniu lub wyłączała je z udziału w zaproszeniach do składania wniosków.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/pl/parliamentary-questions.html>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005269/12  
to the Commission  
Konrad Szymański (ECR) and Nirj Deva (ECR)  
(24 May 2012)**

*Subject:* EU funds for abortion providers in developing countries in which abortion is illegal

The two major beneficiaries of the EU funds allocated to sexual and reproductive health are the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF) and Marie Stopes International (MSI). For example, MSI received at least EUR 3.5 million for its new projects in 2007 and more than EUR 9 million for the years 2005 and 2009, as it states in its reports to the Commission.

MSI and the IPPF acknowledge in their reports that they are administering 'menstrual regulation' at many of their locations. These include projects funded by the EU in countries such as Kenya, Bangladesh and Indonesia.

'Menstrual regulation' is a process in which a manual vacuum aspirator is used to empty a uterus in which an embryo has probably already implanted. In fact, the purpose of the process is to circumvent the law and offer abortion in countries where abortion is illegal.

Reports submitted to the Commission by both organisations clearly indicate that these activities are part of the programmes funded by the EU.

Is the Commission aware of the services that the IPPF and MSI are providing using Commission funds, especially menstrual regulation?

Why is the Commission failing to take action to ensure that sexual and reproductive health programmes are in line with EC law and thus do not include the supply of abortion?

Can the Commission explain why there are such major discrepancies between the EU funding figures listed in the IPPF and MSI reports to the Commission and the figures published by EuroMapping?

Does the Commission intend to continue allocating funds to projects carried out by the IPPF or MSI?

**Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission  
(13 July 2012)**

The Commission is aware of activities funded by EU development funds. These activities — including sexual and reproductive health in Bangladesh, Indonesia and Kenya — are conducted in respect of the agreed EU policy in the domain which fully respects the legislation of the countries where they take place, as specified in the Programme of Action of the International Conference of Population and Development (ICPD).

The organisations receiving EU funding can provide the entire package of reproductive health services authorised by the recipient countries. In Bangladesh, Indonesia and Kenya menstrual regulation is accepted by the authorities and is generally available. The Commission would also refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-005275/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

As regards the allegation of discrepancies between figures in different reports, the EuroMapping report does not include any information on funding to or by specific NGOs.

The Commission intends to continue implementing the EU's sexual and reproductive health related commitments, in line with EU development policy and instruments, allocating funding to civil society organisations based on objective evaluation of applications received under calls for proposals.

The Commission therefore does not have grounds for action against the two organisations in question, or to exclude them from participating in calls for proposals.

---

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



(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005270/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**  
(24. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Lebensmittelbetrug in Restaurants — Schutz der Bürgerinnen und Bürger

Laut einer aktuellen Studie der Verbraucherzentrale in Hamburg werden Verbraucher in Restaurants immer wieder mit billigen Imitaten oder Fertigprodukten getäuscht. Laut der Zentrale sollen bis zu 80 % aller servierten Speisen aus vorgefertigten Gerichten, also Tütensuppen, Fertigsaucen oder Backmischungen bestehen. Und dies, obwohl es gesetzliche Regelungen gibt.

1. Gibt es eine europaweit einheitliche Regelung zur Kennzeichnung der Inhalte eines Gerichtes in Europa für Restaurants, Hotels etc.? Wenn nein, gedenkt die Kommission, hier tätig zu werden?
2. Gibt es EU-weite Untersuchungen oder Statistiken zu diesem Thema?
3. Es darf davon ausgegangen werden, dass neben Deutschland ähnliche Probleme auch in weiteren Mitgliedstaaten bestehen. Welchen Handlungsbedarf sieht die Kommission, um die Bürgerinnen und Bürger vor diesem gesundheitsschädlichen Betrug zu schützen?

**Antwort von Herrn Dalli im Namen der Kommission**  
(27. Juli 2012)

Zu dem von der Frau Abgeordneten angeführten Thema gibt es keine EU-weiten Statistiken. Laut dem Verbraucherbarometer<sup>(1)</sup> scheinen Cafés, Gaststuben und Restaurants hinsichtlich Auswahl, Vergleichbarkeit, Vertrauen, Problemen und Zufriedenheit aus Sicht der Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher gut zu funktionieren (dieser Markt erhielt Platz 5 unter den 30 Dienstleistungsmärkten, auf die sich die Studie erstreckte).

Die Verordnung zur Information der Verbraucher über Lebensmittel<sup>(2)</sup> verbietet irreführende Informationen über Lebensmittel hinsichtlich deren Merkmalen, vor allem ihrer Art, Eigenschaften oder Herstellungsmethode. Außerdem verbietet sie unfaire Informationspraktiken, bei denen durch das Aussehen, die Bezeichnung oder bildliche Darstellungen das Vorhandensein eines bestimmten Lebensmittels oder einer Zutat suggeriert wird, obwohl tatsächlich in dem Lebensmittel ein von Natur aus vorhandener Bestandteil oder eine normalerweise in diesem Lebensmittel verwendete Zutat durch einen anderen Bestandteil oder eine andere Zutat ersetzt wurde. Diese allgemeinen Grundsätze gelten auch für das Bewerben bzw. die Aufmachung von durch Restaurants und Catering-Betrieben zubereiteten Gerichten.

Wurde in einem Lebensmittel eine Zutat, von der die Verbraucher erwarten, dass sie normalerweise darin enthalten ist oder natürlich darin vorkommt, ersetzt, muss die Bezeichnung der Ersatzzutat in unmittelbarer Nähe der Bezeichnung des Lebensmittels und mit ähnlicher Deutlichkeit dargestellt angebracht sein. Bei nicht vorverpackten Lebensmitteln entscheiden die Mitgliedstaaten, ob und welche Informationen zwingend vorgeschrieben werden sollten. Die Verbraucher sollten allerdings immer über enthaltene Stoffe informiert werden, die allergische Reaktionen oder Unverträglichkeiten verursachen können, und zwar auch bei Gerichten, die in Restaurants serviert werden. Die neuen Vorschriften werden ab dem 13. Dezember 2014 gelten.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/consumer\\_research/editions/cms6\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/consumer_research/editions/cms6_en.htm)

<sup>(2)</sup> Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1169/2011 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 25. Oktober 2011 betreffend die Information der Verbraucher über Lebensmittel und zur Änderung der Verordnungen (EG) Nr. 1924/2006 und (EG) Nr. 1925/2006 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates und zur Aufhebung der Richtlinie 87/250/EWG der Kommission, der Richtlinie 90/496/EWG des Rates, der Richtlinie 1999/10/EG der Kommission, der Richtlinie 2000/13/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates, der Richtlinien 2002/67/EG und 2008/5/EG der Kommission und der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 608/2004 der Kommission, ABl. L 304 vom 22.11.2011, S. 18.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005270/12  
to the Commission  
Angelika Werthmann (NI)  
(24 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Food fraud in restaurants/protection of citizens

A recent study by the Hamburg Consumer Association (Verbraucherzentrale) has found that restaurants are consistently deceiving customers with cheap imitations or ready-made products. According to the study, up to 80% of all meals served are pre-prepared, consisting of packet soups, ready-made sauces or baking mixtures — in spite of the existence of legislation.

1. Is there a uniform Europe-wide rule for indicating the contents of meals in restaurants, hotels, etc? If not, does the Commission intend to introduce one?
2. Are there EU-wide investigations or statistics on this matter?
3. We can assume that similar problems are encountered in other Member States apart from Germany. What action does the Commission consider necessary in order to protect citizens from this scam, one which is damaging to health?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission  
(27 July 2012)**

There is no EU-wide statistic on the specific matter raised by the Honourable Member. However, according to the Consumer Markets Scoreboard <sup>(1)</sup>, cafés, bars and restaurants seem to function well for consumers in terms of choice, comparability, trust, problems and satisfaction (this market ranks fifth among 30 services markets included in the study).

The regulation on the provision of food information to consumers <sup>(2)</sup> prohibits misleading food information as to the characteristics of food, in particular as to its nature, properties or method of production. It also forbids unfair information practices which suggest, by means of the appearance, the description or pictorial representations, the presence of a particular food or an ingredient, while in reality a component naturally present or an ingredient normally used in that food has been substituted. These general principles also apply to the advertising or presentation of cooked meals prepared by restaurants and catering establishments.

In the case of foods in which an ingredient that consumers expect to be normally used or naturally present has been substituted, it is required to label the name of the substitute in close proximity to the name of the food and with a similar level of prominence. However, for non-prepacked foods it is up to Member States to decide whether and which mandatory information should be required. However, information on the presence of substances likely to cause allergic reactions or intolerances should always be provided to consumers, including in the case of meals delivered in restaurants. The new rules will apply from 13 December 2014.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/consumer\\_research/editions/cms6\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/consumer_research/editions/cms6_en.htm)

<sup>(2)</sup> Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2011 on the provision of food information to consumers, amending Regulations (EC) No 1924/2006 and (EC) No 1925/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council, and repealing Commission Directive 87/250/EEC, Council Directive 90/496/EEC, Commission Directive 1999/10/EC, Directive 2000/13/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council, Commission Directives 2002/67/EC and 2008/5/EC and Commission Regulation (EC) No 608/2004, OJ L 304, 22.11.2011, p. 18.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005271/12  
an die Kommission**

**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**

(24. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Filmfestspiele von Cannes

Vom 16. bis 27. Mai finden im französischen Cannes die Internationalen Filmfestspiele statt.

1. Wird diese Veranstaltung direkt oder indirekt aus EU-Mitteln unterstützt?
2. Wurden Filme, die in diesem Jahr in Cannes zur Aufführung kommen, aus EU-Mitteln finanziert oder mitfinanziert? Wenn ja, um welche Filme und Förderbeträge handelt es sich konkret?
3. Gibt es neben dem Beispiel Cannes andere Filmfestivals in Europa, die direkt oder indirekt aus EU-Mitteln finanziert oder mitfinanziert werden? Wenn ja, um welche Filmfestspiele und Förderbeträge handelt es sich konkret?

**Antwort von Frau Vassiliou im Namen der Kommission**

(9. Juli 2012)

Filmfestivals mit breiter europäischer Dimension werden aus dem Programm MEDIA gefördert. Ziel dabei ist es, europäische Filme einem größeren Publikum nahezubringen. Aus dem Programm werden pro Jahr rund 90 Festivals in 32 Ländern unterstützt, bei denen mindestens 70 % der präsentierten Filme europäische Werke sein müssen. Für das Jahr 2012 verfügt MEDIA über eine Mittelausstattung von 3,5 Millionen EUR, wobei je Veranstaltung Finanzhilfen in Höhe von 25 000 bis 75 000 EUR gewährt werden.

Aus dem MEDIA-Programm werden ferner 40 Fachmärkte und Wirtschaftsforen unterstützt, von denen einige im Rahmen von Festivals stattfinden. Ferner wird die Teilnahme europäischer Fachkreise an internationalen Filmfachmärkten gefördert. Dabei geht es darum, ihnen einen besseren Marktzugang und bessere Chancen für länderübergreifende Vorhaben zu verschaffen und eine bessere internationale Verbreitung europäischer Filme zu erreichen.

Die Internationalen Filmfestspiele von Cannes werden nicht direkt mit MEDIA-Mitteln gefördert. MEDIA unterstützt jedoch Maßnahmen zugunsten der europäischen Fachkreise, und zwar durch den „Marché du Film“. Im Rahmen der Veranstaltung „Producers on the Move“ werden beispielsweise junge europäische Produzenten an die internationale Filmwirtschaft herangeführt. Der Stand des Programms MEDIA auf den Filmfestspielen in Cannes ermöglicht es ferner jedes Jahr über 100 europäischen Regisseuren und Vertretern der Filmindustrie, sich in Cannes zu positionieren.

Im Jahr 2012 wurden in den verschiedenen Wettbewerbskategorien 18 Filme gezeigt, die mit insgesamt rund 2,2 Millionen EUR aus dem MEDIA-Programm unterstützt wurden. Darunter waren der Film „Amour“ („Liebe“) von Michael Haneke, dem die Goldene Palme verliehen wurde, und der Film „Reality“ von Matteo Garrone, der den Großen Preis der Jury im offiziellen Wettbewerb erhielt. Darüber hinaus wurden beim diesjährigen Festival noch weitere europäische Filmemacher für ihre mit MEDIA-Mitteln geförderten Filme ausgezeichnet, darunter Ken Loach (Preis der Jury) und Christian Mungiu (Bestes Drehbuch). In der Kategorie „Un Certain Regard“ wurde der Film „A Perdre la Raison“ mit dem Preis für die beste weibliche Darstellerin ausgezeichnet.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005271/12  
to the Commission  
Angelika Werthmann (NI)  
(24 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Cannes Film Festival

The International Film Festival was held in Cannes, France, from 16 to 27 May 2012.

1. Is this event supported either directly or indirectly using EU funds?
2. Were any partly or fully EU-funded films screened at Cannes in 2012? If so, which films were they, and how much did the funding amount to?
3. In addition to Cannes, are there any other European film festivals that are financed or co-financed using EU funds? If so, which ones and how much funding is involved?

**Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission  
(9 July 2012)**

The MEDIA Programme supports Film festivals with a broad European dimension as a way to increase access to European films for the general audience. It provides funding to approximately 90 festivals every year across 32 countries, screening a minimum of 70% European films. The budget in 2012 is EUR 3 500 000, with grants ranging from EUR 25 000 to EUR 75 000 per event.

MEDIA also invests EUR 9 million in the co-funding of 40 markets or Business to Business meetings, some attached to festivals. It also supports the participation of European professionals in international film markets in order to increase their access to markets and their capacity to work transnationally, and to improve the international circulation of European films.

The Cannes film festival is not supported directly by MEDIA. However, MEDIA supports activities in favour of European professionals in the context of its Marché du Film. For example, Producers on the Move offers young European producers an introduction to the international industry at large. Additionally, the MEDIA stand provides more than 100 European filmmakers and industry representatives a base every year from which to operate in the Cannes market.

At the 2012 Festival, 18 films, having received approximately EUR 2.2 million from the MEDIA Programme, were shown in the different sections. These included, Michael Hanneke's 'Amour' which won the Palme d'Or while Matteo Garrone won the Grand Prix du Jury with 'Reality' in the official competition. Other European film makers also received an award this year with MEDIA supported films, such as Ken Loach (Grand Prix) and Christian Mungüi (Best Screenplay). Also, 'A Perdre la Raison' received the best actress prize of Un certain Regard.

---

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005272/12  
an die Kommission  
Angelika Werthmann (NI)  
(24. Mai 2012)**

*Betrifft:* Salzburger Festspiele

Jedes Jahr finden in Salzburg die sogenannten Pfingstfestspiele und die Salzburger Festspiele statt. In diesem Jahr werden die Pfingstfestspiele vom 25. bis 28. Mai und die Festspiele vom 20. Juli bis 2. September abgehalten.

1. Wurden und werden diese Veranstaltungen direkt oder indirekt durch Mittel aus dem EU-Budget unterstützt? Wenn ja, bitte eine detaillierte Aufstellung über das Förderjahr, Projekte und Beträge.
2. Sind im kommenden MFF (2014-2020) Mittel für eine Unterstützung dieser Veranstaltungen eingeplant?
3. Verfügt die Kommission über eine Strategie zur Unterstützung dieser sowie ähnlicher kultureller Großveranstaltungen in Europa?

**Antwort von Frau Vassiliou im Namen der Kommission  
(30. Juli 2012)**

Die Kommission möchte die Frau Abgeordnete darüber informieren, dass weder die Pfingstfestspiele noch die Salzburger Festspiele derzeit aus dem Programm „Kultur“ gefördert werden oder in der Vergangenheit gefördert wurden.

Die Kommission unterstützt Kulturveranstaltungen in Europa wie Festspiele oder Festivals im Rahmen des Programms „Kultur“, um deren wichtige Rolle bei der Sensibilisierung der Menschen für die Vielfalt und den Reichtum Europas an Kultur und Sprachen zu unterstreichen.

Für den Zeitraum 2014-2020 hat die Kommission das Programm „Kreatives Europa“ mit einer Mittelausstattung von 1,8 Mio. EUR vorgeschlagen, was eine Steigerung um 37 % gegenüber dem derzeitigen Finanzierungszeitraum bedeutet. Ziel ist die Unterstützung der Kultur- und Kreativbranche bei ihrer wichtigen Funktion im Kulturbereich und ihrer Mitwirkung an der Umsetzung der Strategie „Europa 2020“ in Bezug auf soziale Eingliederung (Allgemeinwohl), Beschäftigung und nachhaltiges Wirtschaftswachstum.

Das Programm „Kreatives Europa“ bietet in seinem Aktionsbereich Kultur zahlreiche Finanzierungsmöglichkeiten für Kulturveranstaltungen, z. B. durch Zusammenarbeit, Netze und Plattformen. Das vorgeschlagene Finanzierungsinstrument könnte auch für Festspiele und Festivals von Interesse sein. Der Wettbewerb in dem Auswahlverfahren, das mithilfe externer Fachleute durchgeführt wird, ist jedoch sehr stark, und nur die besten Anträge erhalten eine Finanzhilfe.

Weitere Informationen über das Programm „Kultur“ und das künftige Programm „Kreatives Europa“ sind auf folgender Website zu finden: [http://ec.europa.eu/culture/index\\_de.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/culture/index_de.htm)

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005272/12  
to the Commission  
Angelika Werthmann (NI)  
(24 May 2012)**

*Subject:* The Salzburg Festival

Every year, Salzburg hosts the Salzburg Whitsun Festival, as well as the Salzburg Festival. This year's Whitsun Festival is to be held from 25 to 28 May 2012 and the dates of the Festival proper are 20 July to 2 September 2012.

1. Have these events been supported either directly or indirectly with EU funds in the past and/or do they currently receive support? If so, I would request a detailed list of the years that have been funded, the particular projects and the amounts involved.
2. Are there provisions for funds to support these events in the forthcoming multiannual financial framework (2014-2020)?
3. Does the Commission have a strategy to support these and other major cultural events across Europe?

**Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission  
(30 July 2012)**

The Commission informs the Honourable Member that neither the Salzburg Whitsun Festival, nor the Salzburg Festival are currently supported or have been supported in the past by the Culture Programme.

The Commission supports European festivals under the Culture Programme, reflecting the role they play in raising people's awareness of Europe's great cultural and linguistic diversity and richness.

The Commission has proposed the Creative Europe Programme for the period 2014-20, with a budget of 1.8 billion Euros, a 37% increase as compared with the current period. The aim is to support the cultural and creative sectors to strengthen both their intrinsic cultural role and their contribution to the Europe 2020 strategy in terms of social inclusion (wellbeing), jobs and sustainable economic growth.

Creative Europe will provide festivals with multiple funding opportunities under the Culture Strand, such as cooperation, networks and platforms. The proposed financial facility could also be of interest to festivals. It should be noted however that the selection process, managed with the help of independent external experts, is highly competitive and only the very best applications receive a grant.

Further information about the Culture Programme and the future Creative Europe Programme is available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/culture/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/culture/index_en.htm)

---

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005273/12**

**an die Kommission**

**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**

(24. Mai 2012)

**Betrifft:** Ökologischer Fußabdruck

Der World Wildlife Fund hat in seinem „Living Planet Report 2012“ aktuelle Zahlen des Global Footprint Network veröffentlicht, das den ökologischen Fußabdruck jährlich berechnet. Der ökologische Fußabdruck zeigt auf, wie viel Fläche nötig ist, damit wir unseren Lebensstandard dauerhaft beibehalten können. Er berechnet sowohl Anbauflächen für Lebensmittel, Rohstoffverbrauch oder auch den verbrauchten Mülllagerplatz mit ein und wird in Hektar pro Person angegeben. Als zweite Kennzahl steht dem Fußabdruck die Biokapazität gegenüber. Sie beschreibt die biologisch aktive Fläche, die notwendig ist, um all das zu produzieren, was der Mensch verbraucht. Aber auch die Fähigkeit dieser Fläche, Abfälle aufzunehmen, ist in der Biokapazität mitberechnet. Weltweit hat jeder Mensch im Durchschnitt einen ökologischen Fußabdruck von 2,7 Hektar.

1. Welche Größen und Maßangaben legt die Kommission ihren Analysen und Bewertungen zum ökologischen Verhalten der Bürgerinnen und Bürger zugrunde?
2. Fließen in diese Analysen die oben genannten WWF-Bewertungsgrößen mit ein? Wenn ja, in welcher Form und zu welchen Anteilen?
3. Gedenkt die Kommission, aufgrund der WWF-Zahlen Maßnahmen zu ergreifen, um innerhalb der Union den ökologischen Fußabdruck je Bürgerin und Bürger zu verringern?

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

(5. Juli 2012)

1. Die Kommission nutzt ein sehr breites Spektrum an Daten und Indikatoren, um das Umweltverhalten der europäischen Bürger zu bewerten — von Eurobarometern bis hin zu detaillierten Umweltindikatoren, die Fragen von Wasser über Abfall bis hin zu Bodennutzung und Treibhausgasemissionen abdecken. Der Bericht der Europäischen Umweltagentur über „Die Umwelt Europas — Zustand und Perspektiven (SOER-Bericht 2010)“ *gibt einen Überblick* über den Zustand und die Entwicklungstendenzen der Umwelt in Europa.
  2. Die Kommission legt für die Politiküberwachung nicht den ökologischen Fußabdruck zugrunde, da zwischen Wissenschaftlern und Interessenträgern in Bezug auf bestimmte methodologische Aspekte kein ausreichender Konsens besteht. Der ökologische Fußabdruck/ die Biokapazität Europas gehören jedoch zu den Leitindikatoren, anhand deren die Kommission die Fortschritte bei der Durchführung der Biodiversitätsstrategie der EU für 2020 überwacht. Dieser Indikator basiert auf Daten des „Global Footprint Network“, bei dem der WWF Partner ist.
  3. Im September 2011 hat die Kommission einen Fahrplan für ein ressourceneffizientes Europa angenommen, der eine Vision für den Strukturwandel der europäischen Wirtschaft bis 2050 sowie Meilensteine für 2020 enthält und darauf abzielt, die Ressourceneffizienz zu verbessern und das Wirtschaftswachstum von der Ressourcennutzung und ihren Umweltauswirkungen zu entkoppeln. Der Fahrplan sieht auch eine Reihe von Ressourceneffizienzindikatoren vor, die die bereits existierenden und vereinbarten Indikatoren für Klimawandel, Energie- und Energieeffizienz ergänzen sollen. Die Kommission erarbeitet weitere Indikatoren und will bis 2013 einen breiten Konsens mit den Interessenträgern hinsichtlich der Art und Weise der Fortschrittsbewertung und der Festsetzung der Ziele für die die Bewältigung der Herausforderung erzielen.
-

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005273/12  
to the Commission  
Angelika Werthmann (NI)  
(24 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Ecological footprint

In the Living Planet 2012 report, the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) has published the latest figures from the Global Footprint Network, which every year calculates our ecological footprint. The ecological footprint shows how much space is needed in order for us to maintain our standard of living in the long term. It calculates the amount of farmland necessary for food, the consumption of raw materials and even the space required to store waste. It is expressed in hectares per person. The second key figure alongside the footprint is biocapacity. This describes the biologically active area required to produce everything that human beings consume, and it includes the ability of this area to absorb waste. Worldwide, each person has an average ecological footprint of 2.7 hectares.

1. What parameters and values does the Commission use to analyse and evaluate the ecological behaviour of European citizens?
2. Are the aforementioned WWF evaluation parameters used in these analyses? If so, how and in what proportion?
3. Following the publication of the WWF figures, is the Commission considering taking steps to reduce the ecological footprint of our citizens?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission  
(5 July 2012)**

1. The Commission uses a very broad range of data and indicators to assess ecological behaviour of European citizens, from Eurobarometers to detailed environmental indicators, covering issues from water to waste, from the use of soil to greenhouse gas emissions. 'The European environment — state and outlook 2010 (SOER 2010)', published by the European Environment Agency, provides an overview of the European environment's state and trends.
  2. The Commission is not using the Ecological Footprint for policy monitoring, as there is no sufficient consensus among academics and stakeholders on some methodological aspects. However the European Ecological Footprint and biocapacity is one of the headline indicators that the Commission is using to monitor progress in implementing the EU 2020 Biodiversity Strategy. It is based on data from the Global Footprint Network of which WWF is a partner.
  3. In September 2011 the Commission adopted a Roadmap to a Resource Efficient Europe. The Roadmap sets out a vision for the structural change in Europe's economy by 2050, with milestones to be reached by 2020, with the aim of increasing resource efficiency and decoupling economic growth from resource use and its environmental impact. It also presents a set of resource efficiency indicators that complement the already existing and agreed indicators on climate change, energy and energy efficiency. The Commission is continuing the work on indicators, and has the objective of reaching a broad agreement with stakeholders on how to measure progress and to set the targets needed to meet the challenge by 2013.
-



(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005274/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)**  
(24 Μαΐου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Διαφάνεια στις διαδικασίες ιδιωτικοποίησης

Σύμφωνα με την απάντηση της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής (E-003005/2012), οι εκτιμώμενες τιμές των περιουσιακών στοιχείων που πρόκειται να πωληθούν από την ελληνική κυβέρνηση, ώστε να επιτευχθεί ο στόχος των ιδιωτικοποιήσεων, ύψους 50 δις ευρώ, αποτελούν «ευαίσθητες πληροφορίες» και επομένως «η Επιτροπή δεν μπορεί να αποκαλύψει τις εκτιμώμενες τιμές που της διαβίβασαν το Υπουργείο Οικονομικών και/ή το Ταμείο Ανάπτυξης Περιουσιακών Στοιχείων της Ελληνικής Δημοκρατίας (ΤΑΠΣΕΔ) σχετικά με τις εκτιμήσεις των τιμών».

Με δεδομένο ότι τυχόν δημοσιοποίηση των εκτιμώμενων τιμών των περιουσιακών στοιχείων που η ελληνική κυβέρνηση σκοπεύει να εκποιήσει θα μπορούσε να λειτουργήσει ως κατώτατο όριο στις διαδικασίες ιδιωτικοποιήσεων, σε μια περίοδο που οι αγορές καταρρέουν, αλλά και εκπληρώνει την ανάγκη διαφάνειας των διαδικασιών, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Είναι νόμιμος ο καθορισμός ελάχιστης τιμής εκποίησης των περιουσιακών στοιχείων του δημοσίου στις διαδικασίες ιδιωτικοποιήσεων; Είναι θεμιτός; Εάν όχι, γιατί;
2. Μπορεί η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή να διευκρινίσει γιατί οι εκτιμώμενες τιμές των προς πώληση περιουσιακών στοιχείων της Ελλάδας αποτελούν «ευαίσθητη πληροφορία»; Υπάρχει κοινοτική νομοθεσία η οποία να απαγορεύει τη δημοσιοποίηση εκτιμώμενων τιμών στις διαδικασίες ιδιωτικοποιήσεων;
3. Η άρνηση της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής ή/και της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης να δημοσιοποιήσουν τις εκτιμώμενες τιμές των προς πώληση περιουσιακών στοιχείων δεν αποτελούν ευθεία παραβίαση της αρχής της διαφάνειας στις οικονομικές δραστηριότητες ενός κράτους μέλους;

**Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(3 Αυγούστου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή πιστεύει ότι είναι νόμιμος ο καθορισμός ελάχιστης τιμής. Είναι σύμφωνος άλλωστε με το δίκαιο της ΕΕ, ενώ σύμφωνα με το ελληνικό δίκαιο, και συγκεκριμένα με τον Νόμο 3986/2011 [Εφημερίδα της Κυβερνήσεως, τεύχος Α' 152/01.07.2011], τα προς ιδιωτικοποίηση περιουσιακά στοιχεία πρέπει να πωλούνται στις ισχύουσες τιμές της αγοράς.

Εξάλλου, έχουν προσληφθεί κατάλληλοι εμπειρογνώμονες για την εκτίμηση της αξίας των περιουσιακών στοιχείων, για τα οποία έχουν καθορισθεί κατώτατες τιμές, ώστε να αποφευχθούν πιθανές καταχρήσεις.

Η Επιτροπή δεν επιτρέπεται, για λόγους απορρήτου, να αποκαλύψει τις εκτιμώμενες τιμές που διαβίβασαν το Υπουργείο Οικονομικών ή/και το ΤΑΠΣΕΔ, κάτι που δεν αποτελεί επ' ουδενί ευθεία παραβίαση της αρχής της διαφάνειας.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005274/12  
to the Commission**

**Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)**

(24 May 2012)

*Subject:* Privatisation process transparency

According to the European Commission's answer (E-003005/2012), the estimated price of assets to be sold by the Greek Government to fulfil the privatisation target (amounting to EUR 50 billion) is 'market sensitive information and the Commission is not allowed to reveal the estimated prices provided by the Ministry of Finance and/or the Hellenic Republic Asset Development Fund (HRADF)'.

Given that publicising the estimated prices of the assets that the Greek Government intends to sell could be used as the lower threshold in the privatisation process, at a time when the markets are falling, but also fulfils the need for transparency in this process, will the Commission say:

1. Is it legal to set a minimum sale price for public assets in the privatisation process? Is it legitimate? If not, why not?
2. Can the Commission clarify why the estimated prices of the Greek for-sale assets are 'market sensitive information'? Does EU legislation forbid publishing estimated prices in privatisation processes?
3. By refusing to publish the estimated prices of the for-sale assets, are the European Commission and/or the Greek Government committing a direct breach of the transparency principle applicable to Member States' economic activities?

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

(3 August 2012)

The Commission believes it is legal to have a reserve price. This is compatible with EC law, while in the context of Greek law, according to Law 3986/2011 [Government Gazette A' 152/01.07.2011], assets ready for privatisation have to be sold at prevailing market prices.

The appropriate experts have been hired to evaluate the value of assets, for which thresholds are established, avoiding therefore any possible abuse.

The Commission is not allowed to reveal the estimated prices provided by the Ministry of Finance and/or the HRADF, for confidentiality purposes, which does not imply a direct breach of transparency.

---

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005275/12  
do Komisji**

**Konrad Szymański (ECR) oraz Nirj Deva (ECR)**

(24 maja 2012 r.)

**Przedmiot:** Przeprowadzanie aborcji jako element „zdrowia seksualnego i reprodukcyjnego”

Międzynarodowa Federacja Planowanego Rodzicielstwa (IPPF) i Marie Stopes International (MSI) otrzymywały i cały czas otrzymują finansowanie od Unii Europejskiej w ramach pomocy rozwojowej oraz budżetu przeznaczanego na zdrowie publiczne na projekty związane ze „zdrowiem seksualnym i reprodukcyjnym”. Obie organizacje uznają aborcję za zasadniczą usługę związaną ze „zdrowiem seksualnym i reprodukcyjnym”. Jeżeli dotacje Komisji przeznaczone są na przeprowadzanie aborcji, to w ostatecznym rozrachunku płacą za nie podatnicy w UE. Chociaż wśród państw członkowskich osiągnięto powszechny konsensus, jeśli chodzi o zapewnianie pomocy unijnej krajom rozwijającym się, nie ma podobnego przyzwolenia na przeznaczanie tej pomocy na przeprowadzanie aborcji.

Czy Komisja jest zdania, że pojęcie „zdrowia seksualnego i reprodukcyjnego” obejmuje przeprowadzanie aborcji?

Czy Komisja dostrzega sprzeczność pomiędzy prawną definicją pojęcia „zdrowia seksualnego i reprodukcyjnego” a przeznaczaniem środków UE na takie organizacje jak IPPF czy MSI?

Jakie działania zamierza podjąć Komisja, aby zapobiec przeznaczaniu środków na projekty, które obejmują przeprowadzanie aborcji oraz administrowanie i zarządzanie podmiotami przeprowadzającymi aborcję?

Mając na uwadze rażący konflikt pomiędzy tym, że w UE panuje zakaz promowania oraz finansowania aborcji, a kluczowym elementem strategii IPPF i MSI, jakim jest przeprowadzanie aborcji, czy Komisja przyzna, że mądrzej i bezpieczniej byłoby przeznaczyć dostępne finansowanie na projekty organizacji, które działają w pełni zgodnie z unijną definicją „zdrowia seksualnego i reprodukcyjnego” oraz jej przestrzegają?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Andrisa Piebalgsa w imieniu Komisji**

(12 lipca 2012 r.)

Komisja nie zajmuje stanowiska co do pojęcia zdrowia seksualnego i reprodukcyjnego, lecz odnosi się do programu działania Międzynarodowej Konferencji na temat Ludności i Rozwoju (ICPD, która odbyła się w Kairze w 1994 r. oraz działań następczych), który stanowi zatwierdzoną podstawę działań UE w dziedzinie zdrowia seksualnego i reprodukcyjnego. Program działania ICPD zawiera postanowienia dotyczące usług bezpiecznej aborcji, o ile przeprowadzanie aborcji (podlegające ograniczeniom bądź też nie) jest zgodne z przepisami prawa krajowego i lokalnego (ust. 7.6 i 8.25). W programie tym uznano również, że przepisy prawne w sprawie aborcji podlegają suwerennym decyzjom każdego z państw.

Współfinansowane przez UE działania realizowane przez organizacje partnerskie są prowadzone z uwzględnieniem prawodawstwa krajów, w których mają one miejsce. Szczególną uwagę zwraca się na zagwarantowanie zgodności wykorzystywania unijnych środków finansowych na rzecz rozwoju z prawodawstwem kraju partnerskiego w momencie przeprowadzania oceny propozycji projektów i podejmowania decyzji o finansowaniu. Ścisłe monitorowana jest również realizacja programu, także pod kątem przestrzegania warunków umownych.

Komisja nie posiada żadnych dowodów jakichkolwiek uchybień w tym zakresie ze strony organizacji Marie Stopes International ani Międzynarodowej Federacji Planowanego Rodzicielstwa (IPPF). Nie ma zatem podstaw prawnych do wykluczenia tych organizacji z otrzymywania unijnych środków finansowych na rzecz rozwoju.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005275/12  
to the Commission  
Konrad Szymański (ECR) and Nirj Deva (ECR)  
(24 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Provision of abortion as a part of 'sexual and reproductive health'

The International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF) and Marie Stopes International (MSI) have been receiving — and continue to receive — funding from the European Union development aid and public health budgets for projects related to 'sexual and reproductive health'. Both organisations are known to consider abortion to be a core service related to 'sexual and reproductive health'. If the Commission grants are used to provide abortions, ultimately it is the EU's taxpayers who pay for it. While there is wide consensus among Member States that the EU should provide aid to developing countries, there is no such consensus that this aid should include the provision of abortions.

Does the Commission take the view that the term 'sexual and reproductive health' includes the provision of abortion?

Does the Commission see a conflict between the legal definition of 'sexual and reproductive health' and the allocation of EU funds to such organisations as IPPF and MSI?

What measures does the Commission take to prevent the allocation of funds to projects that include the provision of abortions or the administration and management of abortion providers?

Given the striking conflict between the fact that the EU is prohibited from promoting or funding abortion and the fact of abortion provision being at the core of IPPF's and MSI's strategy, would the Commission agree that it would be wiser and safer to allocate the available project funds to organisations that are fully in line with, and respect, the EU's definition of 'sexual and reproductive health'?

**Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission  
(12 July 2012)**

The Commission does not take any position regarding the term of sexual and reproductive health but refers to the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD, Cairo, 1994 and follow-up) which is the endorsed basis for EU action in the field of sexual and reproductive health. The ICPD includes provision of safe abortion services when abortions are (with or without restrictions) in accordance with national and local laws (Article 7.6 and 8.25). It also recognises that legal provisions on abortion are sovereign decisions for each state.

The EU-funded activities implemented by the partner organisations are conducted in respect of the legislation of the countries where they take place. Close attention is paid to ensure that EU development funds are used according to the national laws of the partner country when project proposals are evaluated and funding decisions are made. Programme implementation is also closely followed, including respect for the agreed contractual terms.

The Commission does not have any evidence of misconduct of Marie Stopes International or International Planned Parenthood Federation in this regard and, therefore, no legal grounds exist to exclude these organisations from receiving EU development funding.

---

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005276/12**

**à Comissão**

**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**

(24 de maio de 2012)

Assunto: Reprogramação de verbas do Fundo de Coesão para a Madeira

Tendo em conta que:

- A Lei Orgânica n.º 2/2010, de 16 de junho, que fixou os meios que asseguram o financiamento das iniciativas de apoio e reconstrução na Região Autónoma da Madeira na sequência da intempérie de fevereiro de 2010, prevê, no Capítulo respeitante a Financiamento e limites de endividamento, no seu artigo 3.º, sob a epígrafe «Comparticipação do Governo», que o Governo de Portugal participe com um valor total de 740 milhões de euros, entre os quais, parte será concretizada através de «b) reforço das verbas do Fundo de Coesão afetas à Região Autónoma da Madeira»;
- A mesma lei prevê, no seu artigo 5.º, o reforço das verbas previstas no Fundo de Coesão destinadas à Madeira no montante de 265 milhões de euros, através de reprogramação dos programas operacionais;
- Até ao momento, não foi ainda possível ao Governo de Portugal dar efetivo cumprimento ao comando legal, não tendo sido ainda aprovada qualquer reafetação de verbas ao abrigo da reprogramação de programas operacionais;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Como encara e analisa as citadas previsões legais constantes da citada lei?
2. Considera a Comissão que o Estado português estava em condições de garantir a eficácia da norma aprovada?
3. Pode a Comissão garantir que a Região Autónoma da Madeira terá efetivo acesso às verbas prometidas a reprogramar por parte do Estado português?

**Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão**

(16 de julho de 2012)

- 1-2. O conteúdo e o objetivo da lei a que se refere o Senhor Deputado são da plena responsabilidade das autoridades portuguesas. Por conseguinte, a Comissão não faz quaisquer observações sobre a questão.
3. A Comissão remete o Senhor Deputado para a resposta dada à pergunta escrita E-005277/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

---

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

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005276/12  
to the Commission  
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)  
(24 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Reprogramming the Cohesion Fund allocations to Madeira

Organic Law No 2/2010 of 16 June 2010 sets out the financing regulations for support and reconstruction initiatives in the Autonomous Region of Madeira following the storm of February 2010. In the chapter on financing and borrowing limits (Article 3), under the heading 'Government Co-financing', it stipulates that the Portuguese Government is co-financing EUR 740 million, of which part shall be applied by 'b) adding to the Cohesion Fund allocation to the Autonomous Region of Madeira'. Article 5 of the same law increases the allocation stipulated for Madeira in the Cohesion Fund to EUR 265 million, by reprogramming the operational programmes. The Portuguese Government is unable fully to comply with this legal obligation, as no reallocation of funds has been approved as part of the reprogramming of the operational programmes.

I ask the Commission:

1. How does it characterise and assess the above legal provisions contained in this organic law?
2. Does the Commission believe that the Portuguese Government was in a position to comply with the legislation adopted?
3. Can the Commission guarantee that the Autonomous Region of Madeira will have proper access to the appropriations promised as a result of reprogramming by the Portuguese Government?

**Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission  
(16 July 2012)**

1-2. The content and purpose of the law mentioned by the Honourable Member is the full responsibility of the Portuguese authorities. Therefore, the Commission does not comment on this issue.

3. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-005277/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

---

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

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005277/12**

**à Comissão**

**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**

(24 de maio de 2012)

Assunto: Reprogramação de verbas do Fundo de Coesão para a Madeira

Tendo em conta que:

- A Lei Orgânica n.º 2/2010, de 16 de junho, que fixou os meios que asseguram o financiamento das iniciativas de apoio e reconstrução na Região Autónoma da Madeira na sequência da intempérie de fevereiro de 2010, prevê, no seu artigo 5.º, o reforço das verbas previstas no Fundo de Coesão destinadas à Madeira no montante de 265 milhões de euros, através de reprogramação dos programas operacionais;
- Recentemente, numa resposta a um requerimento apresentado por um deputado à Assembleia da República, o Ministro da Economia do Governo de Portugal afirmou que a Comissão Europeia tem dúvidas «sobre a efetiva capacidade» da Madeira em executar as «intervensões previstas» no âmbito dos projetos de reconstrução apresentados para financiamento do Fundo de Coesão;
- O Ministro da Economia afirma que o pedido de reafetação de verbas apresentado pelo Governo português, enviado a 11 de julho de 2011, foi chumbado pela Comissão Europeia pelo motivo supra referido, e ainda por alegadamente o Fundo de Coesão não ser o meio indicado para a reconstrução depois de catástrofes e a Região não ter fundamentado de forma adequada os montantes de investimento.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Confirma o chumbo do pedido de reafetação de verbas do Fundo de Coesão destinadas à Madeira no âmbito do pedido apresentado pelo Estado português a 11 de julho de 2011?
2. Confirma que os motivos subjacentes a esse alegado chumbo coincidem com os argumentos apresentados pelo Ministro da Economia português?
3. Qual o atual ponto de situação relativamente ao pedido de reprogramação dos programas operacionais apresentado pelo Governo de Portugal, nomeadamente, no que toca à reafetação de verbas do Fundo de Coesão destinadas à Madeira?

**Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão**

(3 de julho de 2012)

1. O Governo português não apresentou uma proposta formal à Comissão com vista a reforçar a atual dotação financeira do Fundo de Coesão para a Madeira, no âmbito da correspondente prioridade do programa Valorização do Território.

Essa possibilidade foi, de facto, debatida informalmente no âmbito do exercício de reprogramação do Quadro de Referência Estratégico Nacional (QREN) de 2011 e a Comissão emitiu um parecer negativo a este respeito. Este parecer negativo deveu-se à falta de uma justificação para tal aumento e à necessidade de afetar recursos suficientes para outras prioridades de investimento no programa acima referido.

2. A Comissão não emite qualquer comentário sobre os argumentos apresentados pelo Ministro da Economia português.
3. As autoridades portuguesas não apresentaram ainda quaisquer outras propostas. No entanto, prevê-se para um futuro próximo uma proposta de reprogramação global do Quadro de Referência Estratégico Nacional.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005277/12  
to the Commission  
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)  
(24 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Reallocating Cohesion Fund monies to Madeira

Article 5 of Organic Law No 2/2010 of 16 June 2010, establishing the resources that ensure funding for initiatives supporting the reconstruction of Madeira following the February 2010 storms, lays down that Cohesion Fund monies allocated to Madeira are increased by EUR 265 million through the reorganisation of operational programmes. Recently, in answer to a request by a member of the Portuguese Parliament, the Portuguese Minister of Economy stated that the Commission had doubts about Madeira's 'effective ability' to implement the planned measures involved in reconstruction projects using Cohesion Fund monies. The Minister of Economy states that the request to reallocate monies submitted by the Portuguese Government on 11 July 2011 was rejected by the Commission for this reason, and also allegedly because the Cohesion Fund is not the right way to rebuild after disasters and the region had not adequately justified the investment amounts.

1. Will the Commission confirm that the request submitted by the Portuguese Government on 11 July 2011 to reallocate Cohesion Fund monies to Madeira was rejected?
2. Will it confirm that the underlying reasons for this supposed rejection coincide with the arguments put forward by the Portuguese Minister of Economy?
3. What is the current state of play regarding the request to readjust operational programmes submitted by the Portuguese Government, particularly regarding the reallocation of Cohesion Fund monies to Madeira?

**Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission  
(3 July 2012)**

1. The Portuguese Government has not presented a formal proposal to the Commission to reinforce the existing Cohesion Fund financial allocation for Madeira within the corresponding priority of the *Valorização do Território* programme.

Such a possibility was indeed informally discussed within the scope of the National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF) 2011 reprogramming exercise, and the Commission expressed a negative opinion on this. This was due to the absence of a justification for such an increase and the need to allocate sufficient resources to other investment priorities in the aforementioned programme.

2. The Commission has no comments regarding the arguments put forward by the Portuguese Minister of Economy.
  3. The Portuguese authorities have not presented any further proposals yet. A global re-programming proposal of the NSRF is however expected in the near future.
-



*(Versão portuguesa)*

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005278/12**

**à Comissão**

**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**

*(24 de maio de 2012)*

*Assunto:* Classificação do Centro Internacional de Negócios da Madeira (CINM)

Tendo em conta que:

- A OCDE avaliou a situação do Centro Internacional de Negócios da Madeira (CINM) e considerou que as regras de supervisão aplicáveis cumprem os requisitos internacionais de transparência e de troca de informações;
- O CINM é muitas vezes, de forma errónea e tecnicamente incorreta, apresentado como sendo uma praça «offshore»;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

Tem conhecimento de que o CINM conste de alguma lista negra de praças financeiras «offshore» por parte de organismos internacionais credíveis?

**Resposta dada por Algirdas Šemeta em nome da Comissão**

*(4 de julho de 2012)*

A Comissão não tem conhecimento de que o Centro Internacional de Negócios da Madeira tenha sido incluído em qualquer lista negra elaborada por organismos internacionais como a OCDE ou o GAFI, embora não possa ser excluída a possibilidade de existirem outras listas negras potenciais.

O facto de determinado regime constar de uma lista negra elaborada de acordo com critérios considerados pertinentes pelo organismo responsável pela sua criação não é, em última instância, relevante para efeitos da avaliação desse mesmo regime segundo as regras em matéria de auxílios estatais ou o código de conduta no domínio da fiscalidade das empresas.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005278/12  
to the Commission  
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)  
(24 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Classification of the Madeira International Business Centre (IBC)

Given that:

- The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development has assessed the Madeira International Business Centre (IBC) and concluded that the applicable supervisory rules meet international requirements for transparency and information exchange;
- The Madeira IBC is often described — mistakenly and, from the technical point of view, incorrectly — as an offshore financial centre,

Has the Madeira IBC been placed on any blacklist of offshore financial centres by a credible international body?

**Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission  
(4 July 2012)**

The Commission is not aware that the IBC of Madeira appears today as being blacklisted by an international body such as OECD or FATF, but this does not exclude any other potential blacklisting.

The fact that a particular regime is included in a blacklist or not, under the criteria considered relevant by the body establishing such blacklist, is ultimately not relevant for its review under state aid rules, or under the Code of Conduct for business taxation.

---

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005279/12**

**à Comissão**

**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**

(24 de maio de 2012)

Assunto: Inserção do Centro Internacional de Negócios da Madeira (CINM) no contexto concorrencial da UE

Tendo em conta que:

- O Centro Internacional de Negócios da Madeira (CINM) goza de um regime fiscal preferencial que o torna concorrente de praças financeiras congéneres, das quais se podem destacar as de pequenas regiões insulares, como as ilhas britânicas de Jersey, Guernsey e Man, e ainda a existente em Malta;
- No caso de Jersey, Guernsey ou Man, estas três praças não necessitam de obter autorização comunitária pelo facto de gozarem de um regime fiscal próprio e excepcional;
- O volume de negócios gerado nestas três praças representa 45 % do PIB de Man (com 29 095 empresas instaladas), 43 % no caso de Jersey (com 32 722 empresas) e 39 % em Guernsey (com 18 456 empresas instaladas) de acordo com dados estatísticos divulgados pelas entidades locais;
- O dossier de revisão dos *plafonds* máximos de matéria tributável que beneficia de uma taxa de imposto menor está neste momento em análise na Comissão.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Não considera que as condições de funcionamento que atualmente estão impostas ao CINM representam uma discriminação negativa relativamente às outras praças europeias concorrentes?
2. Como compatibiliza, do ponto de vista da política de concorrência e do regime de ajudas e auxílios de Estado, a manutenção da situação atual do CINM por comparação com as outras praças e tendo em perspetiva as derrogações previstas e que decorrem do estatuto da ultraperiferia constantes do artigo 349.º do TFUE?

**Resposta dada por Joaquín Almunia em nome da Comissão**

(6 de julho de 2012)

1. A Comissão salienta que, na sequência de um processo da UE, Malta adaptou sua legislação fiscal a fim de dar cumprimento à legislação da UE em matéria de auxílios estatais <sup>(1)</sup>. A legislação da UE em matéria de auxílios estatais não é aplicável nas ilhas do Canal da Mancha e na Ilha de Man, que estão, por conseguinte, numa situação objetivamente diferente da da Madeira. Uma vez que a Comissão baseia a sua apreciação da compatibilidade do regime relativo ao Centro Internacional de Negócios da Madeira (CINM) nas regras em matéria de auxílios estatais aplicáveis a qualquer outro regime de auxílios estatais na UE, o princípio da igualdade de tratamento é respeitado.

Além disso, é de salientar que Jersey e a Ilha de Man alteraram os respetivos regimes fiscais para eliminar eventuais elementos prejudiciais. Estas alterações foram efetuadas no seguimento de uma apreciação por parte do Grupo do Código de Conduta sobre a fiscalidade das empresas, subscrita pelo Conselho, que considerou esses regimes fiscais prejudiciais. Guernsey deverá também alterar o seu regime fiscal, que tinha já sido considerado prejudicial pelo Grupo do Código de Conduta. Esta apreciação foi formalmente confirmada pelo Conselho.

2. Em conformidade com as regras em matéria de auxílios regionais <sup>(2)</sup>, os auxílios ao funcionamento de carácter permanente, como o concedido no âmbito do regime relativo ao CINM, podem ser autorizados, nas regiões ultraperiféricas, na medida em que se destinem a compensar os custos adicionais decorrentes, para a prossecução de uma atividade económica, dos fatores identificados no artigo 349.º do Tratado sobre o Funcionamento da União Europeia. As circunstâncias específicas das regiões ultraperiféricas, reconhecidas pelo Tratado são, pois, igualmente tomadas em consideração no âmbito das regras em matéria de auxílios estatais.

<sup>(1)</sup> Decisão da Comissão de 22 de março de 2006, nos processos E 6/2005, NN 26/2005, E 11/2005 e NN 35/2005 — Incentivos fiscais de Malta a favor de empresas comerciais internacionais e de empresas com rendimento estrangeiro, não publicada, disponível em: ([http://ec.europa.eu/eu\\_law/state\\_aids/comp-2005/e006-05.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/eu_law/state_aids/comp-2005/e006-05.pdf)).

<sup>(2)</sup> Ver ponto 80 das Orientações relativas aos auxílios estatais com finalidade regional para o período 2007/2013, JO C 54 de 4.3.2006, p. 13.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005279/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**  
(24 May 2012)

*Subject:* Making the Madeira International Business Centre (IBC) competitive at EU level

Given that:

- The Madeira IBC has a preferential tax regime and is thus in competition with similar financial markets, first and foremost those in small island regions such as the British islands of Jersey, Guernsey, and the Isle of Man, and, moreover, with the Maltese market;
  - The markets in Jersey, Guernsey and the Isle of Man do not need EU authorisation, as they have their own special tax regime;
  - The turnover generated by these three markets accounts for 45% of GDP in the Isle of Man (with 29 095 businesses established), 43% in Jersey (32 722 businesses) and 39% in Guernsey (18 456 businesses), according to statistics published by local authorities;
  - The Commission is now in the process of reviewing the tax ceilings for low-tax areas.
1. Does the Commission believe that the conditions under which the Madeira IBC currently has to operate put it at a disadvantage compared with rival European markets?
  2. From the point of view of competition policy, support schemes and state aids, how does it reconcile continuation of the status quo for the Madeira IBC with the conditions applying on other markets, bearing in mind the exemptions arising from outermost region status as laid down in Article 349 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union?

**Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission**  
(6 July 2012)

1. The Commission wishes to point out that, as a consequence of an EU proceeding, Malta has amended its tax legislation to comply with EU State aid law <sup>(1)</sup>. EU State aid law is not applicable in the Channel Islands and in the Isle of Man, which are therefore in a situation that is objectively different from Madeira's. Since the Commission bases its compatibility assessment of the Madeira IBC scheme on the state aid rules that apply to any other state aid scheme in the EU, the principle of equal treatment is respected.

Moreover, it should be noted that Jersey and the Isle of Man have amended their tax regimes to remove any harmful elements. This followed an assessment by the Code of Conduct Group on Business Taxation, endorsed by the Council, which considered these tax regimes as harmful. Guernsey is also expected to amend its tax regime, which has already been considered as harmful by the Code of Conduct Group. The assessment was formally confirmed by the Council.

2. In accordance with regional aid rules <sup>(2)</sup>, permanent operating aid, such as the aid granted under the IBC scheme, may be authorised in outermost regions insofar as it is intended to offset the additional costs arising, in the pursuit of economic activity, from the handicaps identified in Article 349 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. The specific situations of outermost regions recognised by the Treaty are thus also taken into account under state aid rules.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Commission decision of 22 March 2006 in cases E 6/2005, NN 26/2005, E 11/2005 and NN 35/2005 — Malta tax incentives in favour of international trading companies and companies with foreign income, not published, available on [http://ec.europa.eu/eu\\_law/state\\_aids/comp-2005/e006-05.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/eu_law/state_aids/comp-2005/e006-05.pdf)

<sup>(2)</sup> See paragraph 80 of the Guidelines on national regional aid for 2007-2013, OJ C 54, 4.3.2006, p. 13.

*(Versão portuguesa)*

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005280/12**

**à Comissão**

**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**

*(24 de maio de 2012)*

*Assunto:* Isenção de retenção na fonte da distribuição de dividendos no Centro Internacional de Negócios da Madeira (CINM)

Tendo em conta que:

- O Governo de Portugal, no último Orçamento de Estado para 2012, eliminou a norma que garantia a isenção de retenção na fonte em sede de IRS na distribuição de dividendos aos sócios das empresas instaladas no Centro Internacional de Negócios da Madeira.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Essa eliminação e consequente retenção na fonte em sede de IRS na distribuição de dividendos aos sócios de empresas instaladas no CINM resulta de algum tipo de imposição ou obrigação resultante do Memorando de Entendimento celebrado entre o Estado Português e a «troika» (Comissão Europeia, FMI e BCE), no âmbito do Programa de Assistência e Ajuda Financeira?
2. Não sendo esse o caso, houve da parte da «troika» e seus representantes em Portugal algum tipo de recomendação, orientação ou aconselhamento nesse sentido?
3. Em caso afirmativo, que motivos estiveram subjacentes a tais recomendações, orientação ou aconselhamento?

**Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão**

*(30 de julho de 2012)*

A eliminação deste diploma e consequente retenção na fonte em sede de IRS na distribuição de dividendos aos sócios de empresas instaladas no CINM não resulta de nenhuma imposição ou obrigação resultante do Memorando de Entendimento. A Troika não deu nenhuma recomendação, orientação ou aconselhamento relativamente a esta questão.

Como é do conhecimento do Senhor Deputado, ao abrigo do direito da União Europeia, os Estados-Membros e as suas subdivisões políticas têm total liberdade para conceber os seus sistemas fiscais da forma mais adequada a fim de atingirem os seus objetivos políticos nacionais. No exercício dos seus direitos de tributação, os Estados-Membros devem respeitar as suas obrigações ao abrigo dos Tratados e, por conseguinte, não estão autorizados a exercer discriminações com base na nacionalidade ou a aplicar restrições injustificadas ao exercício das liberdades fundamentais do Tratado. Contudo, dentro destes parâmetros, os Estados-Membros continuam livres de escolher as suas leis fiscais, incluindo no que diz respeito à retenção na fonte no pagamento de dividendos.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005280/12  
to the Commission  
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)  
(24 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Dividend payment exemption from withholding tax in the Madeira International Business Centre (IBC)

In the 2012 budget, the Portuguese Government abolished the rule exempting partners in companies based in the Madeira IBC, for personal income tax purposes, from withholding tax on dividend payments.

1. Do the abolition of this rule and its consequence, namely withholding tax for personal income tax purposes on dividend payments to partners in MIBC companies, arise from any stipulation laid down in, or obligation under, the memorandum of understanding signed between the Portuguese Government and the Troika (the Commission, the IMF, and the ECB) under the financial assistance programme?
2. If not, have the Troika and its Portuguese representatives given any recommendations, guidance or advice on this point?
3. If so, what are the underlying reasons?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission  
(30 July 2012)**

The abolition of this rule and its consequence, namely withholding tax for personal income tax purposes on dividend payments to partners in MIBC companies, do not arise from any stipulation laid down in, or obligation under, the memorandum of understanding. The Troika has not given any recommendation, guidance or advice on this point.

As the Honourable Member is aware, under European Union law, Member States and their political subdivisions have broad freedom to design their tax systems in the most appropriate way in order to meet their domestic policy objectives. In the exercise of their taxation rights, Member States must respect their obligations under the Treaties and are therefore not allowed to discriminate on the basis of nationality or to apply unjustified restrictions to the exercise of the fundamental Treaty freedoms. However, within these parameters, Member States remain free to choose their tax rules, including as regards withholding tax on dividend payments.

---

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005281/12**

**à Comissão**

**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**

(24 de maio de 2012)

Assunto: Revisão dos plafonds máximos de tributação no Centro Internacional de Negócios da Madeira (CINM)

Tendo em conta que:

- No passado dia 30 de dezembro de 2011, Portugal notificou Bruxelas de que pretendia alterar o regime de auxílios de Estado atualmente em vigor no Centro Internacional de Negócios da Madeira (CINM);
- De acordo com o regime atualmente em vigor, o *plafond* máximo de matéria coletável que beneficia de uma taxa de imposto mais reduzida, que é de 4 % em 2012 e 5 % entre 2013 e 2020, é de euros 150 000 000,00 (cento e cinquenta milhões de euros);
- A notificação feita pelo Estado português visa rever este *plafond* para um nível que a torne concorrencial face a outras praças financeiras como as que existem por exemplo no Luxemburgo, Holanda, Chipre ou Malta.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Quais são as taxas de tributação que se encontram em vigor nestas praças financeiras com regimes fiscais preferenciais, nomeadamente, no Luxemburgo, Holanda, Chipre e Malta?
2. Existe algum tipo de *plafond* máximo em termos de matéria coletável nestas praças que limite ou condicione o benefício fiscal que pode ser obtido pelas sociedades aí instaladas?
3. Nas Canárias foram recentemente revistos os *plafonds* máximos de matéria coletável suscetíveis de beneficiar de uma taxa de imposto menor. Quais eram os *plafonds* máximos existentes antes e quais os que resultam dessa revisão?
4. Como se pode justificar o facto de, num horizonte temporal próximo, a Comissão ter aceitado rever os *plafonds* máximos de matéria coletável nas Canárias, geograficamente próxima da Madeira e beneficiando da mesma condição de região ultraperiférica da União, e tarde agora em aceitar fazê-lo relativamente ao CINM?

**Resposta dada por Joaquín Almunia em nome da Comissão**

(11 de julho de 2012)

A Comissão não tem conhecimento de quaisquer regimes fiscais preferenciais que ofereçam taxas de tributação mais baixas do que as normalmente praticadas nos mercados financeiros, nomeadamente nos referidos Estados-Membros. A Comissão considera que a potencial atratividade fiscal destes Estados-Membros para os mercados financeiros baseia-se em características gerais dos seus sistemas fiscais que não são nem seletivas nem prejudiciais. A ausência de quaisquer taxas de tributação mais baixas e especiais implica que os limites máximos em termos de matéria coletável não são aplicáveis.

Na medida em que existiram no passado regimes fiscais específicos envolvendo elementos de auxílio estatal nos Estados-Membros mencionados pelo Senhor Deputado, todos eles foram investigados pela Comissão e tiveram de ser alterados a fim de dar cumprimento à legislação da UE em matéria de auxílios estatais.

No que diz respeito à referência feita pelo Senhor Deputado para a *Zona Especial Canaria* (ZEC), a última alteração foi aprovada em 2008 <sup>(1)</sup> e não consistiu no aumento dos limites máximos. Existe atualmente uma taxa de tributação reduzida de 4 % sobre as sociedades aplicável até um limite máximo de matéria coletável anual que é variável em função do número de postos de trabalho criados. Se, por exemplo, forem criados 3 a 8 postos de trabalho, o limite máximo correspondente é de 1 500 000 euros ou de 1 800 000 euros, consoante a atividade do beneficiário. Estes benefícios fiscais são comparáveis aos atualmente aplicados ao abrigo do regime relativo ao Centro Internacional de Negócios da Madeira (CINM) <sup>(2)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Ver Decisão da Comissão de 7 de maio de 2008 relativa ao processo N 741/2007, Zona Especial Canaria (ZEC), a publicar no JO, disponível no seguinte endereço: ([http://ec.europa.eu/eu\\_law/state\\_aids/state\\_aids\\_pt.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/eu_law/state_aids/state_aids_pt.htm)).

<sup>(2)</sup> Ver Decisão da Comissão de 27 de junho de 2007, sobre o processo N 421/2006, Zona Franca da Madeira, JO C/240/2007, disponível em: ([http://ec.europa.eu/eu\\_law/state\\_aids/state\\_aids\\_pt.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/eu_law/state_aids/state_aids_pt.htm)).



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005281/12  
to the Commission**

**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**

(24 May 2012)

*Subject:* Revising the maximum tax ceilings of the Madeira International Business Centre (MIBC)

On 30 December 2011, Portugal notified Brussels of its intention to amend the state aid scheme currently in place for the MIBC. Under the current scheme, the maximum taxable amount eligible for a lower tax rate, 4% in 2012 and 5% between 2013 and 2020, is EUR 150 million. The Portuguese Government aims to revise this ceiling to a level that enables it to compete with other financial markets such as those in Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Cyprus and Malta.

I would ask the Commission:

1. What tax rates are in force in financial markets with preferential tax regimes, particularly in Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Cyprus and Malta?
2. Is a maximum tax ceiling in place in markets that limit or place conditions on the tax benefits available to companies established there?
3. Maximum tax ceilings benefiting from a lower tax rate were recently revised in the Canary Islands. What were the previous maximum ceilings and what are they now, after the revision?
4. How can the Commission justify the fact that, within a short space of time, it has agreed to revise the maximum tax ceilings in the Canary Islands, located near Madeira and benefiting from the same EU outermost region status, but is now slow to agree the same for the MIBC?

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

(11 July 2012)

The Commission is not aware of any preferential tax regimes offering lower than general tax rates in financial markets, particularly in the mentioned Member States. It is the Commission's understanding that the potential 'tax' attractiveness of these Member States for the financial market is based on general features of their tax system that are neither selective nor harmful. The absence of any special, lower tax rates implies that maximum tax ceilings are not applicable.

To the extent that specific fiscal regimes involving state aid elements existed in the past in the Member States mentioned by the Honourable Member, they were all investigated by the Commission and they had to be amended to comply with EU state aid law.

As regards the reference made by the Honourable Member to the Zona Especial Canaria scheme (ZEC), the last amendment was approved in 2008 <sup>(1)</sup> and did not consist in increasing the ceilings. Currently, a reduced corporate tax rate of 4% is applicable up to an annual tax base ceiling which varies according to the number of jobs created. For instance, if 3 to 8 jobs are created, the corresponding ceiling is EUR 1 500 000 or EUR 1 800 000, depending on the activity of the beneficiary. These tax benefits are comparable to those currently applied under the Madeira IBC scheme <sup>(2)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> See Commission decision of 7 May 2008 on case N 741/2007, Zona Especial Canaria (ZEC), to be published in the OJ, available on [http://ec.europa.eu/eu\\_law/state\\_aids/state\\_aids\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/eu_law/state_aids/state_aids_en.htm)

<sup>(2)</sup> See the Commission decision of 27 June 2007 on case N 421/2006, Zona Franca Madeira, OJ C/240/2007, available on [http://ec.europa.eu/eu\\_law/state\\_aids/state\\_aids\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/eu_law/state_aids/state_aids_en.htm)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005282/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Paul Murphy (GUE/NGL)**  
(24 May 2012)

*Subject:* Amending Regulation (EC) No 1/2005: provisions regarding the protection of poultry and rabbits during transport

Experience over many years has shown that enforcement of the existing and previous legislation alone has not led to satisfactory results in this field.

Guides to best practice are not an adequate tool for addressing the gap between EU legislation and the European Food Safety Authority recommendations concerning poultry and rabbits. Such guides can be useful with regard to those requirements of the regulation which necessarily leave some room for interpretation, but they are not appropriate as a means of remedying its basic shortcomings, as they are not legally binding and are therefore not enforceable.

In 2010, at the request of the Commission, the EFSA provided a scientific opinion on the welfare of animals during transport. This opinion contains several recommendations that are stricter than the requirements of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, for example:

- concerning the transport of poultry: broiler fowl should only be transported at temperatures between 5 and 25°C; for journeys of four hours or over, vehicles should be equipped with mechanical ventilation systems; journey time should include loading and unloading, standing periods, etc.;
- concerning the transport of rabbits: inside crate temperature should be between 5 and 20°C; journey time should be defined as commencing when the first animal is loaded into a container, and as ending when the last animal is unloaded from a container, and should not exceed seven hours; cage height for rabbits going for slaughter should be at least 35 cm.

In the case of the EFSA recommendations listed above, there is no need to leave any room for interpretation, as it is clearly possible to define minimum standards (e.g. for deck heights, journey times, temperature, etc). Only by amending the existing legislation can an adequate level of both animal protection and legal certainty for the inspection authorities be guaranteed.

1. When is the Commission planning to start work on amending the legislation concerning the protection of poultry and rabbits during transport in order to bring it into line with the EFSA recommendations?
2. What is the reason for the delay in amending Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the basis of the content of the EFSA opinion, despite the fact that this is a clear requirement set out in the regulation itself, and any further delays would be inconsistent with the provisions of Article 13 TFEU?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission**  
(3 August 2012)

1. The Commission is at present not considering proposing any changes to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport <sup>(1)</sup>.
2. It should be highlighted that a recital to legislation does not include normative provisions; it rather specifies the statement of reasons for the adoption of the legislation and motivates the chief provisions of the enacting terms. Hence, the wording of recital (9) of Regulation 1/2005, which makes a reference to proposals on specific provisions for poultry, cats and dogs when the relevant opinions of the European Commission the European Food Safety Authority <sup>(2)</sup> (EFSA) are available, should be seen as an explanation to why these species were not part of Regulation 1/2005.

<sup>(1)</sup> Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations; OJ L 3, 5.1.2005, p. 1.

<sup>(2)</sup> Established through Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 January 2002 laying down the general principles and requirements of food law, establishing the European Food Safety Authority and laying down procedures in matters of food safety; OJ L 31, 1.2.2002, p. 1.

In addition it must be pointed out that scientific risk assessment alone does not provide all the information on which a risk management decision should be based. Other factors relevant to the matter should legitimately be taken into account including societal, economic, traditional, ethical and environmental factors and the feasibility of controls.

---

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-005283/12  
to the Commission  
Nicole Sinclaire (NI)  
(24 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Eurobonds

Could the Commission explain to me how the proposed issue of 'Eurobonds' is compatible with Article 125 of the Lisbon Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission  
(25 July 2012)**

The compatibility of eurobonds with Article 125 of the Treaty depends on their concrete design. It is therefore not possible to provide an answer to this question at this stage.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-005284/12**

**alla Commissione  
Matteo Salvini (EFD)**

(24 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Terremoto in Emilia-Romagna

Domenica 20 maggio 2012, forti scosse di terremoto hanno colpito l'Emilia-Romagna, con ripercussioni nelle Regioni limitrofe, quali la Lombardia e il Veneto. Il sisma è stato avvertito anche dalle popolazioni di Friuli Venezia Giulia, Toscana e Liguria.

Il sisma, di magnitudo 6, ha provocato la morte di 7 persone, oltre cento feriti, cinquemila sfollati e crolli che hanno devastato il patrimonio architettonico di un territorio di estrema importanza per l'economia italiana, specialmente in settori come quelli del turismo e dell'industria agroalimentare e manifatturiera.

Le province maggiormente colpite sono quelle di Bologna, Modena e Ferrara e lo sciame sismico ha continuato a terrorizzare la popolazione con scosse protrattesi per giorni.

La vera emergenza riguarda ora le persone che sono rimaste senza casa: duemila sono state accolte nei campi allestiti dalla Protezione Civile, ma la maggior parte degli sfollati rimane ancora sprovvista di un alloggio. Numerose sono le aziende la cui attività rischia di non ripartire.

Vista l'estrema gravità della situazione e le ingenti somme di denaro necessarie per ripristinare le infrastrutture danneggiate dal sisma, riterrà opportuno la Commissione, una volta che le competenti autorità nazionali avranno inviato la richiesta e quantificato i danni, intervenire tramite il Fondo di solidarietà dell'Unione europea e precisare se le caratteristiche dell'evento lo potrebbero far classificare come «catastrofe naturale»?

Considerato che eventi come terremoti e alluvioni sono sempre più frequenti e negli ultimi anni hanno colpito duramente numerose aree dell'Unione, è nelle intenzioni della Commissione elaborare un piano strategico che possa prevedere un apposito programma di finanziamenti destinato alla prevenzione di queste calamità attraverso una progressiva, ma rapida messa in sicurezza delle abitazioni e dei luoghi di lavoro?

**Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione**

(4 luglio 2012)

1. La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole deputato alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-005139/12 <sup>(1)</sup>.
2. Il 20 dicembre 2011 la Commissione ha adottato la proposta di decisione del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio che istituisce un meccanismo di protezione civile dell'Unione europea <sup>(2)</sup>. Tale proposta è attualmente in discussione in seno al Parlamento e al Consiglio. Vi si può accedere on line all'indirizzo:  
[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/about/COM\\_2011\\_proposal-decision-CPMechanism\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/about/COM_2011_proposal-decision-CPMechanism_en.pdf).

Una delle principali proposte innovative contenute in questo pacchetto consiste nell'ampliare il campo di intervento del meccanismo di protezione civile dell'UE per coprire la prevenzione delle catastrofi al fine di attuare appieno la politica UE di prevenzione dei rischi legati alle catastrofi come indicato nella comunicazione del 2009 sulla prevenzione <sup>(3)</sup>. La proposta prevede il sostegno della Commissione agli Stati membri affinché essi sviluppino ulteriormente i loro strumenti di valutazione del rischio e di mappatura. La Commissione invita gli Stati membri a inviarle entro il 2016 i loro piani di gestione del rischio; essa organizzerà quindi uno scambio di esperienze. La Commissione contribuirà inoltre ad innalzare il livello di prevenzione dei rischi nell'UE assicurando che tutti gli Stati membri intraprendano azioni informate per affrontare i rischi cui si trovano confrontati quali indicati nelle valutazioni nazionali del rischio.

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

<sup>(2)</sup> COM(2011)934 definitivo.

<sup>(3)</sup> COM(2009)82 definitivo.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-005284/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Matteo Salvini (EFD)**  
(24 May 2012)

*Subject:* Earthquake in Emilia-Romagna

On Sunday 20 May 2012, a strong earthquake struck Emilia-Romagna, with repercussions in neighbouring areas such as Lombardy and the Veneto. The tremor was also reported by people in the regions of Friuli-Venezia Giulia, Tuscany and Liguria.

The magnitude-six earthquake killed seven people and injured more than 100, while 5 000 people have been left homeless. Buildings have collapsed, devastating the architectural heritage of an area that is extremely important for the Italian economy, especially in terms of tourism, farming and manufacturing.

The provinces worst hit are Bologna, Modena and Ferrara, with aftershocks continuing to affect the population for days.

The real emergency now relates to the people who have been left homeless: the camps set up by the Civil Protection officials are providing shelter for 2 000 people, but the majority of those displaced are still without accommodation. There are many companies which risk having to close down for good.

Given the extreme gravity of the situation and the enormous sums of money required to rebuild the infrastructure damaged by the earthquake, will the Commission take action through the European Union Solidarity Fund, once the relevant national authorities have sent a request and assessed the damage, and will it specify whether the nature of the event could classify it as a 'natural disaster'?

Given that events such as earthquakes and floods are becoming more frequent and that many areas of the European Union have been badly hit in recent years, does the Commission intend to develop a strategic plan which could provide a dedicated funding programme whose aim is to prevent these disasters by progressively yet swiftly making homes and workplaces safer?

**Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission**  
(4 July 2012)

1. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-005139/12 <sup>(1)</sup>.
2. On 20 December 2011, the Commission adopted a Proposal for a decision of the European Parliament and of the Council on a Union Civil Protection Mechanism <sup>(2)</sup>. This proposal is currently under discussion with the Parliament and the Council. It can be accessed online at [http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/about/COM\\_2011\\_proposal-decision-CPMechanism\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/about/COM_2011_proposal-decision-CPMechanism_en.pdf)

One of the main innovative proposals in this package is to enlarge the scope of the EU Civil Protection Mechanism to cover the prevention of disasters in order to fully implement the EU disaster risk prevention policy, as outlined in the 2009 Prevention Communication <sup>(3)</sup>. The proposal includes Commission support to Member States for further developing their risk assessment and mapping tools. The Commission invites Member States to send their risk management plans to the Commission by 2016; it will then organise an exchange of experience. The Commission will also help raise the level of risk prevention in the EU by ensuring that all Member States take informed actions to address the risks they are facing as assessed in the national risk assessments.

---

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

<sup>(2)</sup> COM(2011) 934 final.

<sup>(3)</sup> COM(2009) 82 final.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005285/12**

**an die Kommission**

**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**

(24. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Kosten der Stresstests an Atomkraftwerken in der EU

Im März 2011 verursachte ein Erdbeben vor der japanischen Küste einen Tsunami, der das Atomkraftwerk in Fukushima überflutete und einen nuklearen GAU mit mehreren Kernschmelzen auslöste. Daraufhin hat die Europäische Union im Juni 2011 beschlossen, Stresstests an den Atomkraftwerken in der EU durchzuführen. Diese umfassten neben der Auswertung von Berichten der nationalen Regulierungsbehörden auch Ortsbesuche von Review-Teams an einigen Kraftwerksstandorten. Mit der Schweiz und der Ukraine nahmen auch Nicht-EU-Staaten an diesen Stresstests teil.

Welche Kosten sind für die Planung, Durchführung und Nachbereitung der AKW-Stresstests insgesamt entstanden?

Wer trägt diese Kosten zu welchem Anteil? Wie hoch sind die genauen Kosten für die Kommission?

Welche Kosten sind für die Ortsbesuche der Review-Teams an den Kraftwerks-Standorten entstanden? Wer hat diese Kosten (z. B. Reise- und Unterkunftskosten) getragen?

Wie hoch war die Vergütung bzw. Kostenerstattung für die Experten aus den Review-Teams?

Wer trägt die Kosten für die Durchführung der Stresstest in den Atomkraftwerken der Schweiz und der Ukraine?

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

(5. Juli 2012)

Die Prüfungen der Kernkraftwerke wurden in allen 17 Teilnehmerländern (in 15 EU-Mitgliedstaaten, der Schweiz und der Ukraine) von den Anlagenbetreibern durchgeführt und von den zuständigen nationalen Regulierungsbehörden überwacht; die Kosten dieser Prüfungen wurden auf nationaler Ebene und von den Kernkraftwerksbetreibern getragen, sie wurden nicht aus dem EU-Haushalt gedeckt. Auch die Kosten für Anpassungen, die zur Verbesserung der Sicherheit der Kernkraftwerke notwendig sind, werden von den Kernkraftwerksbetreibern übernommen.

Was die Personenarbeitsstunden angeht, wurde der Arbeitsaufwand auf der zweiten öffentlichen Sitzung zu den Stresstests und Peer Reviews in Reaktion auf Fukushima am 8. Mai 2012 in Brüssel<sup>(1)</sup> auf „rund 500 bei der Durchführung der Stresstests und Peer Reviews anfallende Personenarbeitsjahre“ geschätzt.

Die Kommission hat einen Beitrag zur Deckung der Kosten der Peer-Review-Prüfungen geleistet, insbesondere für die Organisation vorbereitender, themen- und länderbezogener Sitzungen (Topical Reviews und Country Reviews), für die Beteiligung von Kommissionsbediensteten am Stresstestverfahren und für eine teilweise Aufwandsentschädigung für die Peer-Review-Experten (Reisekosten und Tagegelder<sup>(2)</sup>), einschließlich der mit Kernkraftwerksbesuchen verbundenen Kosten. Der Gesamtbetrag der Aufwendungen beläuft sich auf rund 440 000 EUR.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/Standard/files/15-summary.pdf>

<sup>(2)</sup> Die Kommission zahlt keine Vergütungen oder Honorare an Peer-Review-Experten; diese werden auf nationaler Ebene getragen.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005285/12  
to the Commission**

**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**

(24 May 2012)

*Subject:* Cost of stress tests on EU nuclear power stations

In March 2011 an earthquake off the Japanese coast caused a tsunami that flooded the Fukushima nuclear power station. It triggered a nuclear meltdown involving several reactor cores. Subsequently, in June 2011, the European Union decided to carry out stress tests on nuclear power stations in the EU. As well as evaluating reports from national regulatory authorities, the stress tests also involved review teams visiting a number of nuclear power stations. The non-EU states Switzerland and Ukraine also participated in these tests. Can the Commission say:

What were the overall costs for planning, implementing and following up the nuclear power station stress tests?

Who will bear what proportion of these costs? What precise costs will be borne by the Commission?

What costs were incurred by the review teams' visits to the nuclear power stations? Who paid these costs (e.g. travel and accommodation costs)?

How much was spent on paying the review team experts or reimbursing their costs?

Who will pay for carrying out the stress tests in Swiss and Ukrainian nuclear power stations?

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

(5 July 2012)

The assessments of the nuclear power plants, with regard to all 17 participating countries (15 EU Member States, Switzerland and Ukraine), were carried out by the operators of the plants and were verified by the competent national regulatory authorities; the costs of these assessments were borne at national level and by the nuclear power plant operators, and were not covered by the EU budget. Likewise, the cost of modifications required to improve the safety of nuclear power plants will be borne by the nuclear operators.

In terms of man hours, reference to an overall estimate of 'roughly 500 man-years devoted to completing the stress tests and peer reviews' was made at the second public meeting on the Post-Fukushima stress tests peer reviews, which took place in Brussels, on 8 May 2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

The Commission has contributed to the costs of the peer reviews, in particular the costs of organising preparatory, topical review and country review meetings, Commission staff participating in the stress tests process and partial reimbursement of peer review experts (travel and subsistence costs <sup>(2)</sup>), including those costs relating to visits to nuclear power stations. The overall amount of these costs is approximately EUR 440 000.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/15-Summary.pdf>

<sup>(2)</sup> The Commission is not paying remuneration or emoluments to peer review experts; these are paid at national level.



(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005286/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**  
(24. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Förderung des Großflughafens Berlin-Brandenburg International

Anfang Mai 2012 wurde bekannt gegeben, dass die Eröffnung des neuen Großflughafens Berlin-Brandenburg International nicht wie geplant Anfang Juni erfolgen kann, sondern erst im Frühjahr 2013. Die Kosten für den Bau des Flughafens werden in Medienberichten mit etwa 2,8 Mrd. EUR angegeben.

Wird der Bau des Flughafens Berlin-Brandenburg International auch aus Fördermitteln der Europäischen Union mitfinanziert? Wenn ja, aus welchen Fördertöpfen wird der Flughafen mitfinanziert und welche Fördermittel sind bereits in den Bau des Flughafens geflossen?

Haben die Verzögerungen bei der Eröffnung des Großflughafens Auswirkungen auf Beihilfen seitens der Europäischen Union?

Wird sich die EU an möglichen Zusatzkosten beteiligen, die durch die verspätete Eröffnung des Flughafens auftreten könnten?

**Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission**  
(3. Juli 2012)

Bisher wurde aus Mitteln des Europäischen Fonds für regionale Entwicklung ein Betrag von 46 264 775 EUR für KMU und Straßenbauprojekte im Zusammenhang mit dem Flughafen Berlin Brandenburg International bereitgestellt und wie folgt aufgeteilt:

- in den Planungszeiträumen 2000-2006 und 2007-2013 wies Brandenburg EFRE-Mittel in Höhe von 38 Mio. EUR für den Bau von Straßen im Umfeld des Flughafens zu (siehe Tabelle im Anhang <sup>(1)</sup>).
- Weitere EFRE-Mittel in Höhe von 8 264 775 EUR wurde 4 kleinen und mittleren Unternehmen zur Verfügung gestellt (siehe Liste im Anhang).

Der Bau des Flughafens Berlin-Brandenburg International wurde außerdem mit TEN-V-Mitteln kofinanziert. Die Europäische Union hat insgesamt bis zu 34,5 Mio. EUR für Planung und Entwicklung des Flughafens zur Verfügung gestellt:

- 1997: Auslegungsstudien und Studien zum Schienen- und Straßenzugang (Kofinanzierung mit bis zu 1 Mio. EUR aus TEN-V-Mitteln)
- 1999: Auslegungs- und Zugangsstudien (Kofinanzierung mit bis zu 1 Mio. EUR aus TEN-V-Mitteln)
- 2001: Planung für Verkehrsanbindung (Straße und Schiene) (Kofinanzierung mit bis zu 2 Mio. EUR aus TEN-V-Mitteln)
- 2006: Plangenehmigung für den Bau eines an den Bahnhof der DB AG angebundenen Fahrgastterminals (Kofinanzierung mit bis zu 2 Mio. EUR aus TEN-V-Mitteln)
- 2009: Strukturarbeiten für die Stahl/Glaskonstruktion des Fahrgastterminals und der Piers: (Kofinanzierung mit bis zu 29 576 020 Mio. EUR aus TEN-V-Mitteln)

Die Durchführungsfrist des endgültigen Beschlusses von 2009 endete im Dezember 2011. Seitdem wurden für Planung und Bau des Flughafens keine TEN-V-Mittel mehr gebunden.

Neue TEN-V-Mittel oder EFRE-Mittel wurden nach den uns vorliegenden Informationen nicht beantragt. An möglichen zusätzlichen Kosten ist die Europäische Union daher nicht beteiligt.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Die Anhänge werden dem Herrn Abgeordneten sowie dem Generalsekretariat des Parlaments direkt übermittelt.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005286/12  
to the Commission  
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)  
(24 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Funding for Berlin-Brandenburg International Airport

At the beginning of May 2012, it was announced that the new Berlin-Brandenburg International Airport would not now open at the beginning of June 2012 as scheduled but only in Spring 2013. According to media reports, the airport will cost around EUR 2.8 billion to build.

Is the European Union co-funding Berlin-Brandenburg International Airport's construction? If so, which specific funds are being used for co-financing the airport and what funds have already been spent on this construction project?

Will the delays in the airport's opening impact on the assistance provided by the European Union?

Will the EU be involved in shouldering any additional costs that may arise as a result of the delay in opening?

**Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission  
(3 July 2012)**

The amount of EUR 46.264.775 was allocated so far for SMEs and road construction projects in the context of the Berlin Brandenburg International Airport from the European Regional Development Fund distributed as follows:

- In the programming periods 2000-2006 and 2007-2013 Brandenburg allocated EUR 38 million of ERDF for the construction of roads in the surroundings of the airport (see annex table attached <sup>(1)</sup>).
- An additional EUR 8.264.775 ERDF contribution was allocated to four small and medium-sized enterprises (see list attached in annex).

The construction of the Berlin-Brandenburg International airport has also been co-financed from TEN-T funding. The European Union has committed a total funding amount of up to EUR 34.5 million for the planning and development of the airport:

- 1997: Layout studies and studies for rail and road access (up to EUR 1 million TEN-T co-financing)
- 1999: Layout and access studies (up to EUR 1 million TEN-T co-financing)
- 2001: Planning services for transport connections (rail and road) (up to EUR 2 million TEN-T co-financing)
- 2006: Planning approval for the construction of a passenger terminal directly located to the railroad station of the DB AG (up to EUR 2 million TEN-T co-financing)
- 2009: Structural works for the core and shell of steel and glass of the passenger terminal building as well as the piers: (up to EUR 29,576,020 TEN-T co-financing)

The execution date of the final decision of 2009 ended in December 2011. Since then no TEN-T funding has been committed for the planning and construction of the airport.

There is currently no new request known for TEN-T or ERDF co-funding. Consequently, there is no involvement of the European Union in possible additional costs.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> The annexes are sent directly to the Honourable Member and to the Secretariat of Parliament.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005287/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**  
(24. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Kapazitätsbedarf und Kosten der TEN-Ausbaustrecke St. Pölten-Loosdorf

Im Rahmen des transeuropäischen Netzes (TEN) wird in Österreich die Westbahn als Teil des prioritären Projekts 17 zwischen St. Pölten und Loosdorf vierspurig für die Güterzugumfahrung von St. Pölten ausgebaut. Die Planung wurde bereits im Jahr 1991 begonnen. Da nach dem Baubeginn 1999 jedoch zwischenzeitlich noch kein Bedarf an erhöhten Kapazitäten bestand, wurde im Jahr 2000 ein Baustopp verhängt. Seit 2009 sind die Bauarbeiten wieder aufgenommen, so dass bis 2017 mit einer Fertigstellung des Lückenschlusses gerechnet wird.

Mit welchem Kapazitätsbedarf für die Ausbaustrecke rechnet die Kommission bei Fertigstellung des Projekts im Jahr 2017? Wie stellt sich aktuell der Kapazitätsbedarf für den Abschnitt St. Pölten-Loosdorf dar, und welche Veränderungen beim Bedarf gab es seit dem Baustopp im Jahr 2000?

Welche Kosten sind bisher für den Ausbau der Strecke St. Pölten-Loosdorf entstanden, und welcher Anteil der Kosten wird von der EU getragen?

Welche Zusatzkosten sind durch die Überarbeitung und die Neuevaluierung entstanden, die nach dem rund 10-jährigen Baustopp nötig wurden? Wer trägt diese zusätzlichen Kosten?

Welche Kosten sind speziell für die drei Tunnelprojekte des Streckenabschnitts (Pummersdorfer Tunnel, Radlleitentunnel und Bründlkapellentunnel) entstanden? Haben sich die Kosten für die Tunnelbauten seit Beginn der Planungen verändert? Wenn ja, welche Kostensteigerungen oder -einsparungen sind durch die Tunnelprojekte entstanden?

Welche Kosten sind speziell für die auf dem Streckenabschnitt gelegenen 23 Brücken entstanden? Haben sich die Kosten für den Bau der Brücken seit Beginn der Planungen verändert? Wenn ja, welche Kostensteigerungen oder -einsparungen sind im Rahmen der Brückenbauten entstanden?

**Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission**  
(28. Juni 2012)

Die Güterzugumfahrung St. Pölten-Loosdorf umfasst drei Teile: den Knoten Wagram, St. Pölten und den Knoten Rohr. Der Abschnitt wird derzeit pro Tag von 300 Zügen befahren; für 2025 wird mit 445 bis 485 Zügen pro Tag gerechnet. Die Arbeiten wurden nie ganz eingestellt. Einige Arbeiten wurden seit 2001 durch TEN-V-Mittel oder durch das Europäische Konjunkturprogramm (EERP) kofinanziert. Die Kommission hat neun Beschlüsse über die Kofinanzierung der Arbeiten angenommen:

Nr. des Beschlusses	Abschnitt	VORHABEN	Höchstbeitrag EU in Mio. EUR
2001-AT-1002-P	St. Pölten-Wien	Ausbau Knoten Wagram	1
2002-AT-1001-P	Umfahrung Enns/Knoten Rohr	Bauarbeiten	0.5
2002-AT-1002-P	St. Pölten-Wien	Ausbau Knoten Wagram	4
2003-AT-1001-P	Umfahrung Enns/Knoten Rohr	Bauarbeiten	1.3
2003-AT-1002-P	St. Pölten-Wien	Ausbau Knoten Wagram	3.1
2004-AT-1001-P	Umfahrung Enns/Knoten Rohr	Bauarbeiten	4
2004-AT-1002-P	St. Pölten-Wien	Ausbau Knoten Wagram	4.8
2005-AT-1001-P	Umfahrung Enns/Knoten Rohr	Bauarbeiten	7.65
2009-AT-17100-E	Loosdorf-St. Pölten	Arbeiten an Gütergleisen Burgstaller Tunnel (EERP)	2.6
INSGESAMT			28.95

Zu den erwähnten Tunneln liegt kein Beschluss vor. Der neueste Beschluss (2009-AT-17100-E) — EERP Haushalt — sieht eine Kofinanzierung von höchstens 2,6 Mio. EUR oder bis zu 20 % der förderfähigen Kosten für den Bau von zwölf Brückenelementen vor. Die Arbeiten wurden im Juni 2011 abgeschlossen; die Abschlusszahlung erfolgt zum gegebenen Zeitpunkt.

Wir möchten den Herrn Abgeordneten auch auf die TEN-TEA-Webseite mit ausführlichen Informationen über die TEN-V-Mittel verweisen ([http://tentea.ec.europa.eu/en/ten-t\\_projects/](http://tentea.ec.europa.eu/en/ten-t_projects/)), die Projekte seit 2006 enthält.

Für alle generellen Aspekte bezüglich der Mittel und der Finanzierung von TEN-V-Vorhaben verweist die Kommission den Herrn Abgeordneten auf den allgemeinen Teil der Antworten auf E-12343/2011 und zur Subsidiarität auf die Antworten auf die schriftlichen Anfragen E-12344/2011 und E-012345/2011 <sup>(1)</sup>.

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

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005287/12  
to the Commission**

**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**

(24 May 2012)

*Subject:* Upgrading the St. Pölten-Loosdorf section as part of the Trans-European Network (TEN) project: required capacity and associated costs

As part of TEN Priority Project 17, Austria's western rail line is to be upgraded to four tracks in the section between St. Pölten and Loosdorf, so that goods trains can by-pass St. Pölten. Planning began in 1991. However, the project was halted in 2000, after a year's building work, when the increased capacity was discovered to be unnecessary. Building work resumed in 2009 and the gap in the line is expected to be closed by 2017.

What capacity requirement does the Commission expect that the upgraded section will have to meet when the project is completed in 2017? What is the current capacity requirement for the St. Pölten-Loosdorf section and how has it changed since construction was halted in 2000?

How much money has been spent thus far on upgrading the St. Pölten-Loosdorf section and what proportion of the cost has been borne by the EU?

What additional costs were generated by the need to revise and reassess the project after the 10-year stoppage? Who will bear these additional costs?

What specific costs have been generated by the three tunnel projects (the Pummersdorf, Radlleiten and Bründlkapelle Tunnels)? Have the relevant costs changed since the plans were first drawn up? If so, what cost increases or savings are involved?

What specific costs have been generated by the 23 bridges? Have the relevant costs changed since the plans were first drawn up? If so, what cost increases or savings are involved?

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

(28 June 2012)

The freight rail bypass St Pölten-Loosdorf covers three parts: node Wagram, St Pölten and Rohr node. The section is today used by 300 trains/day; in 2025, 445-485 trains/day are expected. The works never stopped completely. Some works were co-funded from TEN-T funds or the European Economic Recovery Plan (EERP) since 2001; nine decisions were taken by the Commission to co-fund the works:

No of decision	Section	Project	Max. EC contribution in EUR mio
2001-AT-1002-P	St Pölten-Vienna	upgrading of node Wagram	1
2002-AT-1001-P	Enns deviation/Rohr node	works	0.5
2002-AT-1002-P	St Pölten-Vienna	upgrading of node Wagram	4
2003-AT-1001-P	Enns deviation/Rohr node	works	1.3
2003-AT-1002-P	St Pölten-Vienna	upgrading of node Wagram	3.1
2004-AT-1001-P	Enns deviation/Rohr node	works	4
2004-AT-1002-P	St Pölten-Vienna	upgrading of node Wagram	4.8
2005-AT-1001-P	Enns deviation/Rohr node	works	7.65
2009-AT-17100-E	Loosdorf- St Pölten	works on freight tracks (EERP)	2.6
SUM			28.95

No decision covers the tunnels mentioned. The most recent decision (2009-AT-17100-E) — EERP funding — covers a maximum co-funding of EUR 2.6million or up to 20% of the eligible costs to support the construction of 12 bridge elements. The works were completed by June 2011; the final payment will be executed in due course.

The Honourable Member is invited to consult the TEN-TEA website with more detailed information on the TEN-T funding ([http://tentea.ec.europa.eu/en/ten-t\\_projects/](http://tentea.ec.europa.eu/en/ten-t_projects/)) covering projects since 2006.

For all general aspects regarding the funding and financing of TEN-T projects, the Commission refers the Honourable Member to the general part in the answers on E-12343/2011 and on subsidiarity in the answers on written question on E-12344/2011 and E-012345/2011 <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-005288/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**  
(24. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Auswirkungen der Verzögerungen beim Projekt Stuttgart 21 auf die Bahnstrecke Karlsruhe-München

In seiner Antwort auf die schriftlichen Anfragen E-012344/2011 und E-012345/2011 von Hans-Peter Martin zur Fertigstellung des TEN-Projekts Stuttgart 21 bzw. zu den Auswirkungen von Verzögerungen im Zusammenhang mit diesem Projekt schreibt Kommissar Kallas, dass Verzögerungen im Streckenabschnitt Stuttgart-Wendlingen-Ulm auch dazu führen, dass „im Abschnitt Karlsruhe-München die angestrebten Verbesserungen für den Personenverkehr beeinträchtigt werden“.

Welche Beeinträchtigungen haben sich durch die Verzögerungen beim Projekt Stuttgart 21 bisher für den Streckenabschnitt Karlsruhe-München ergeben? Wie lange werden diese Beeinträchtigungen nach Ansicht der Kommission noch fortbestehen? Erwartet die Kommission bis zur geplanten Fertigstellung des Projekts Stuttgart 21 noch weitere Beeinträchtigungen für den Abschnitt Karlsruhe-München?

Welche konkreten Auswirkungen haben die Verzögerungen beim Projekt Stuttgart 21 speziell für den angeschlossenen Streckenabschnitt Karlsruhe-Stuttgart?

Welche konkreten Auswirkungen haben die Verzögerungen beim Projekt Stuttgart 21 speziell für den angeschlossenen Streckenabschnitt Ulm-München?

Sieht die Kommission eine Gefahr, dass Verzögerungen beim Projekt Stuttgart 21 auch Auswirkungen auf weitere Streckenabschnitte der Magistrale Paris-Bratislava haben könnten?

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005289/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**  
(24. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Kosten der Beeinträchtigung der Bahnstrecke Karlsruhe-München durch Verzögerungen beim Projekt Stuttgart 21

In seiner Antwort auf die schriftlichen Anfragen E-012344/2011 und E-012345/2011 von Hans-Peter Martin zur Fertigstellung des TEN-Projekts Stuttgart 21 bzw. zu den Auswirkungen von Verzögerungen im Zusammenhang mit diesem Projekt schreibt Kommissar Kallas, dass Verzögerungen im Streckenabschnitt Stuttgart-Wendlingen-Ulm auch dazu führen, dass „im Abschnitt Karlsruhe-München die angestrebten Verbesserungen für den Personenverkehr beeinträchtigt werden“.

Welche zusätzlichen Kosten sind durch die Beeinträchtigungen im Streckenabschnitt Karlsruhe-München entstanden?

In welchen konkreten Bereichen haben die Beeinträchtigungen im Abschnitt Karlsruhe-München zusätzliche Kosten verursacht?

Wer übernimmt die zusätzlichen Kosten? Welcher Anteil der entstandenen Kosten wird von der Europäischen Union getragen?

**Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission**  
(3. Juli 2012)

In Bezug auf sämtliche Förder- und Finanzierungsaspekte dieses Projekts verweist die Kommission den Herrn Abgeordneten auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftlichen Anfragen E-12343/2011, E-12344/2011 und E-012345/2011 <sup>(1)</sup>. Die TEN-V-Förderung beschränkt sich auf die in diesen Antworten genannten Beschlüsse.

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

Der Begünstigte hat um eine Verlängerung des Beschlusses „Stuttgart-Wendlingen“ bis Ende 2015 gebeten, über die noch nicht entschieden wurde. Dies wird keine Auswirkungen auf die vereinbarte maximale EU-Förderung oder die maximalen Kofinanzierungsanteile haben.

Mit den Arbeiten am Abschnitt „Stuttgart-Wendlingen“ wurde 2010 begonnen, mit den Arbeiten am Abschnitt „Wendlingen-Ulm“ im Mai 2012. Die Kommission ist sich der Tatsache bewusst, dass diese Abschnitte bis Ende 2020 in Dienst gestellt werden sollen. Damit wird die Fahrtzeitverkürzung von rund 30 Minuten erst mit einer Verzögerung von einem Jahr erreicht werden.

---



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005288/12  
to the Commission**

**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**

(24 May 2012)

*Subject:* Delays in the Stuttgart 21 project and impact on the Karlsruhe-Munich rail line

In his answer to Written Questions E-012344/2011 and E-012345/2011 from Hans-Peter Martin on completing the Stuttgart 21 TEN project and the impact of delays in connection with this project, Commissioner Kallas writes that delays in the Stuttgart-Wendlingen-Ulm section would also 'hamper improvements to passenger transport along the section Karlsruhe-Munich'.

To date, what impact have the Stuttgart 21 project delays had on the Karlsruhe-Munich section? How long does the Commission expect these negative effects to last? Does it expect further negative impact on the Karlsruhe-Munich section before the Stuttgart 21 project is complete?

What specific impact have the delays in the Stuttgart 21 project had on the adjoining Karlsruhe-Stuttgart section in particular?

What specific impact have the delays in the Stuttgart 21 project had on the adjoining Ulm-Munich section in particular?

Does the Commission believe that delays in the Stuttgart 21 project could also impact on other sections of the Magistrale high-speed railway corridor between Paris and Bratislava?

**Question for written answer E-005289/12  
to the Commission**

**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**

(24 May 2012)

*Subject:* Negative impact and costs for the Karlsruhe-Munich rail line caused by delays in the Stuttgart 21 project

In his answer to Written Questions E-012344/2011 and E-012345/2011 from Hans-Peter Martin on completing the Stuttgart 21 TEN project and the impact of delays in connection with this project, Commissioner Kallas writes that delays in the Stuttgart-Wendlingen-Ulm section would also 'hamper improvements to passenger transport along the section Karlsruhe-Munich'. Can the Commission say:

What additional costs were incurred owing to the negative impact on the Karlsruhe-Munich section?

In which specific areas have additional costs occurred due to the negative impact on the Karlsruhe-Munich section?

Who will pay the additional costs? What proportion of the costs incurred will be borne by the European Union?

**Joint answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission**

(3 July 2012)

For all aspects regarding the funding and financing related to this project, the Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answers on written questions E-12343/2011, E-12344/2011 and E-012345/2011 <sup>(1)</sup>. The TEN-T funding is limited to the decisions referred to in these answers.

The beneficiary requested a prolongation of the decision 'Stuttgart-Wendlingen' until end 2015 which is not decided yet. This will not have any effect on the agreed maximum EU-funding or the max. co-funding rates.

The works on the Stuttgart-Wendlingen started in 2010, the works on Wendlingen-Ulm in May 2012. The Commission is aware that these sections shall be put into service by end 2020. Thus the time savings of about 30 minutes will materialize with a delay of one year.

---

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

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005290/12**

**an die Kommission**

**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**

(25. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Einstufung des TEN-V-Projekts „Semmeringtunnel“

Ende April 2012 wurde mit den Arbeiten für den Bau des Semmeringtunnels begonnen, der im Rahmen der transeuropäischen Verkehrsnetze (TEN-T) zu einer verbesserten Eisenbahnverbindung auf der baltisch-adriatischen Achse von Polen bis zum Mittelmeer beitragen soll. Verschiedene Medien berichten, dass die Einstufung der baltisch-adriatischen Achse als TEN-Netzwerk und damit die Höhe der möglichen Fördermittel in der Kommission umstritten seien.

1. Wird der Bau des Semmeringtunnels im Rahmen der TEN-V zu den Projekten des Kernnetzwerkes gezählt oder lediglich in das erweiterte TEN-Netz eingestuft?
2. Mit welchen Fördersummen aus EU-Mitteln wäre für das Projekt „Semmeringtunnel“ zu rechnen, wenn es in das Kernnetzwerk eingestuft würde? Welche Fördersumme könnte in das Projekt fließen, wenn es lediglich in das erweiterte Netzwerk aufgenommen würde?

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005292/12**

**an die Kommission**

**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**

(25. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Einstufung des TEN-V-Projekts „Koralmtunnel“

Der im Rahmen der transeuropäischen Verkehrsnetze (TEN-T) geplante Koralmtunnel soll zu einer verbesserten Eisenbahnverbindung auf der baltisch-adriatischen Achse von Polen bis zum Mittelmeer beitragen. Verschiedene Medien berichten, dass die Einstufung der baltisch-adriatischen Achse als TEN-Netzwerk und damit die Höhe der möglichen Fördermittel in der Kommission umstritten seien.

1. Wird der Bau des Koralmtunnels im Rahmen der TEN-V zu den Projekten des Kernnetzwerkes gezählt oder lediglich in das erweiterte TEN-Netz eingestuft?
2. Mit welchen Fördersummen aus EU-Fördermitteln wäre für das Projekt „Koralmtunnel“ zu rechnen, wenn es in das Kernnetzwerk eingestuft würde? Welche Fördersumme könnte in das Projekt fließen, wenn es lediglich in das erweiterte Netzwerk aufgenommen würde?

**Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission**

(27. Juni 2012)

Die Kommission hat am 19.10.2011 einen Vorschlag zur einer Verordnung über neue Richtlinien zum transeuropäischen Verkehrsnetz (TEN-V) und einen Vorschlag zu einer Verordnung über die Fazilität „Connecting Europe“ (CEF) zur künftigen Finanzierung von Investitionen entlang des TEN-V <sup>(1)</sup> vorgelegt. Beide Vorschläge werden im ordentlichen Gesetzgebungsverfahren verabschiedet.

Mit den Arbeiten entlang des „Koralmtunnels“ wurde am 20.3.2009 begonnen, mit den Vorbereitungsarbeiten am „Semmering Basistunnel — neu“ am 25.4.2012. Beide Abschnitte, die Wien mit Venedig/Ravenna verbinden sollen, sind Teil des künftigen Kernnetzes entsprechend dem Kommissionsvorschlag zum TEN-V. Dies war ebenfalls bei dem vorab ermittelten Projekt für Modernisierung und Arbeiten im Rahmen der vorgeschlagenen baltisch-adriatischen Achse im CEF-Vorschlag vorgesehen.

(<sup>1</sup>) KOM(2011)650 und KOM(2011)665.

Der CEF-Vorschlag sieht für Studien eine Kofinanzierung durch die EU von bis zu 50 % vor, für Arbeiten von bis zu 20 %, für Arbeiten zur Beseitigung von Verkehrsengpässen von bis zu 30 % und für grenzüberschreitende Abschnitte von bis zu 40 %. Im Kommissionsvorschlag wird hinsichtlich der EU-Kofinanzierungsraten nicht zwischen TEN-T-Kernnetzabschnitten und Abschnitten entlang Verkehrskorridoren unterschieden. Allerdings hat die Kommission vorgeschlagen, dass 80 bis 85 % der vorgesehenen CEF-Haushaltsmittel für Verkehr vorrangig für Projekte eingesetzt werden sollen, die in der Liste in Anhang 1 der CEF-Verordnung aufgeführt werden.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005290/12  
to the Commission**

**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**

(25 May 2012)

*Subject:* Classification of the 'Semmering Tunnel', part of the TEN-T project

Work on the construction of the Semmering Tunnel began in April 2012 as part of the trans-European transport network (TEN-T) that is intended to enhance the rail connection on the Baltic-Adriatic axis from Poland to the Mediterranean. There have been reports in various media that the classification of the Baltic-Adriatic axis as part of the TEN network, and therefore the level of possible funding, is under debate in the Commission.

1. Will the construction of the Semmering Tunnel as part of the TEN-T plan be included among the core network projects or will it be simply classified as part of the extended TEN network?
2. What level of EU funding could be expected for the Semmering Tunnel project if it were classified as part of the core network? What funding might the project receive if it were simply included in the extended network?

**Question for written answer E-005292/12  
to the Commission**

**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**

(25 May 2012)

*Subject:* Classification of the Koralm Tunnel, part of the TEN-T project

The planned Koralm Tunnel, part of the trans-European transport network (TEN-T), is intended to enhance the rail connection on the Baltic-Adriatic axis from Poland to the Mediterranean. There have been reports in various media that the classification of the Baltic-Adriatic axis as part of the TEN network, and therefore the level of possible funding, is under debate in the Commission.

1. Will the construction of the Koralm Tunnel as part of the TEN-T plan be counted among the core network projects or will it simply be classified as part of the extended TEN network?
2. What level of EU funding could be expected for the Koralm Tunnel project if it were classified as part of the core network? What funding might the project receive if it were simply included in the extended network?

**Joint answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission**

(27 June 2012)

The Commission proposed on 19 October 2011 two proposals for Regulations: one for new guidelines for the trans-European transport network (TEN-T) and one for the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) for the future funding along the TEN-T <sup>(1)</sup>. The proposals are both subject to the ordinary legislative procedure.

The works along the 'Koralmtunnel' started on 20 March 2009, the preparatory works at 'Semmering Basistunnel — neu' on 25 April 2012. Both sections are part of the future core network of the Commission's TEN-T proposal connecting Vienna with Venice/Ravenna. This alignment was also included into the CEF-proposal as 'pre-identified project' for upgrading and works as part of the proposed 'Baltic-Adriatic-Corridor'.

The CEF proposal foresees up to 50% EU-cofunding for studies, up to 20% for works, up to 30% for works to overcome 'bottlenecks' and up to 40% for cross-border sections. The Commission's proposal does not make a distinction between TEN-T core-network sections and sections along corridors with regard to EU-cofunding rates. However, the Commission proposed that 80 to 85% of the foreseen CEF budget for transport be concentrated on the list of projects laid down in Annex I of the CEF Regulation.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2011)650 and COM(2011)665.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005291/12**

**an die Kommission**

**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**

(25. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Probleme beim Bau des TEN-V-Projekts „Semmeringtunnel“

Ende April 2012 wurde mit den Arbeiten für den Bau des Semmeringtunnels begonnen, der im Rahmen der transeuropäischen Verkehrsnetze (TEN-T) zu einer verbesserten Eisenbahnverbindung auf der baltisch-adriatischen Achse von Polen bis zum Mittelmeer beitragen soll. Der Tunnel soll zudem die über 150 Jahre alte Trasse der Ghega-Bahn entlasten.

Gegen die im Rahmen des Projekts durchgeführte Umweltverträglichkeitsprüfung wurden vor dem österreichischen Verwaltungsgerichtshof mehrere Beschwerden eingereicht. Im Bundesland Niederösterreich gibt es außerdem mehrere naturschutzrechtliche Einsprüche gegen das Projekt, und für den Bau einer 110-KV-Leitung fehlen bisher die Genehmigungen gemäß Wasserrecht, Abfallrecht, Denkmalschutz und Luftrecht.

1. Wie bewertet die Kommission die Entscheidung der österreichischen Behörden, mit dem Tunnelbau zu beginnen, obwohl noch nicht alle benötigten Genehmigungen vorliegen und Gerichtsverfahren anhängig sind?
2. Hält es die Kommission für möglich, dass die Vielzahl an Beschwerden, Einsprüchen und fehlenden Genehmigungen zu einem Scheitern des Tunnel-Projekts führen könnte?
3. Hält es die Kommission für möglich, dass die genannten Schwierigkeiten Auswirkungen auf die Finanzierung des Tunnels haben könnten? Wenn ja, könnte dies nach Ansicht der Kommission zu Finanzierungsproblemen führen?
4. Wird der Bau des Semmeringtunnels nach Ansicht der Kommission Auswirkungen auf die als Unesco-Weltkulturerbe deklarierte Ghega-Bahn haben? Wenn ja, welche Probleme sieht die Kommission in diesem Zusammenhang? Würde die Kommission eine Aberkennung des Weltkulturerbe-Titels der Ghega-Bahn für den Bau des Semmeringtunnels in Kauf nehmen?

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

(28. Juni 2012)

Welche Maßnahmen zur Umsetzung von Verkehrsinfrastrukturprojekten am besten geeignet sind und welche Dienstleistungen angeboten werden sollen, entscheidet der Mitgliedstaat. Dabei haben die Mitgliedstaaten sicherzustellen, dass bei der Umsetzung die nationalen und europäischen Rechtsvorschriften eingehalten werden. Der Kommission liegt keinerlei Beschwerde oder Hinweis auf eine Verletzung bezüglich der Einhaltung der EU-Rechtsvorschriften vor. Das erwähnte Vorhaben erhält bisher noch keine TEN-V-Förderung.

Die Arbeiten am „Semmering-Basistunnel neu“ haben am 25.4.2012 begonnen und werden voraussichtlich bis 2024 fertig gestellt. Der „Semmering-Basistunnel neu“ soll Teil des künftigen Kernnetzes und der „Baltisch-Adriatischen Achse“ sein (siehe die Antwort auf E-005290/2012<sup>(1)</sup>). Das Kernnetz soll spätestens bis zum Jahr 2030 in Dienst gestellt werden. Der Kommission liegen keine Informationen darüber vor, dass der „Semmering-Basistunnel neu“ in Österreich zur Schließung der Ghega-Bahn führen soll.

---

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

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005291/12  
to the Commission**

**Hans-Peter Martin (NI)**

(25 May 2012)

*Subject:* Problems with the construction of the 'Semmering Tunnel', part of the TEN-T project

Work on the construction of the Semmering Tunnel began in April 2012 as part of the trans-European transport network (TEN-T), intended to enhance the rail connection on the Baltic-Adriatic axis from Poland to the Mediterranean. The tunnel is also intended to provide relief for the Ghega Railway, which is over 150 years old.

Several complaints have been made to the Austrian Administrative Court in relation to the environmental impact studies carried out as part of the project. In addition, there have been several objections to the project in Lower Austria under conservation law and, to date, no licences have been granted under the laws pertaining to water and waterways, waste management, the protection of historic buildings and air quality.

1. How does the Commission view the decision of the Austrian authorities to commence construction of the tunnel, despite the fact that not all the necessary licences have been obtained and court cases are pending?
2. Does the Commission believe that the large volume of complaints and objections, and the lack of licences, might lead to the failure of the tunnel project?
3. Does the Commission consider it possible that the aforementioned difficulties could impact on the financing of the tunnel and lead to further financial problems?
4. In the Commission's view, will the construction of the Semmering Tunnel have an impact on the Ghega Railway, which has been declared a Unesco World Heritage site? If so, what problems does the Commission foresee in this context? Would the Commission accept the possible loss of the Ghega Railway's World Heritage status as a consequence of the construction of the Semmering Tunnel?

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

(28 June 2012)

It is up to the Member State to decide on the most appropriate implementation of transport infrastructure and the services provided. In doing so, Member States have to secure the implementation according to national and European law. The Commission is not aware of any complaint or infringement concerning non-compliance with EC law. The project mentioned does not receive any TEN-T funding yet.

The works on the 'Semmering-Basistunnel neu' started on 25 April 2012 and are expected to be finished by 2024. The 'Semmering Basistunnel — neu' is proposed to be part of the future core network and the 'Baltic-Adriatic-Corridor' (see answer to E-005290/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>). The core network shall be operational by 2030. The Commission has no knowledge that the Austrian 'Semmering-Basistunnel neu' will lead to a closure of the Ghega Railway.

---

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

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005293/12  
alla Commissione**

**Claudio Morganti (EFD)**

*(25 maggio 2012)*

Oggetto: Debito europeo detenuto dalla Cina

Negli ultimi mesi si è assistito in diversi paesi europei, in particolar modo in quelli dell'Eurozona, a profonde difficoltà per rifinanziare i diversi debiti pubblici; da più parti si è chiesto in proposito un intervento di «soccorso» cinese.

La detenzione di rilevanti quote di debito sovrano ha ingentissime ripercussioni politiche: alla luce anche delle preoccupazioni espresse dal Parlamento europeo nella recente risoluzione del 23 maggio sugli squilibri commerciali UE-Cina, può la Commissione europea indicare quale sia la quantità e la percentuale del debito di ogni paese dell'Unione detenuto dalla Repubblica Popolare Cinese, sia in maniera diretta che attraverso soggetti ad essa riferibili?

Nel caso non disponga di questi dati, la Commissione europea non ritiene doveroso stabilire un sistema coordinato che preveda di individuare rapidamente i diversi detentori di debito sovrano, sia pubblici che privati?

**Risposta di Olli Rehn a nome della Commissione**

*(9 luglio 2012)*

La Commissione non è in grado di indicare l'importo o la percentuale del debito emesso dagli Stati membri che è detenuta dalla Repubblica popolare cinese. Sotto l'egida del comitato economico e finanziario sono tuttavia in corso lavori per definire un sistema che possa consentire in futuro di individuare la localizzazione geografica degli acquirenti o dei venditori di titoli di Stato, purché la controparte di tale operazione sia un operatore principale nel relativo mercato dei titoli di Stato.

Il sistema si baserà sull'uso, da parte degli operatori principali, di un formato comune di presentazione per comunicare i dati pertinenti agli organismi di gestione del debito degli Stati membri dell'area dell'euro. Il modello armonizzato si applica alle operazioni definitive di acquisto o vendita sui mercati primari e secondari di obbligazioni e certificati denominati in euro emessi dagli organismi di gestione del debito dell'area dell'euro. La maggior parte degli organismi di gestione del debito degli Stati membri ha stabilito che i dati aggregati per l'area dell'euro siano pubblicati dal segretariato del comitato economico e finanziario sul sito web di tale comitato, su base trimestrale e a distanza di tre mesi.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005293/12  
to the Commission  
Claudio Morganti (EFD)  
(25 May 2012)**

*Subject:* European debt held by China

In recent months, various European countries, particularly in the euro area, have experienced severe difficulties in refinancing public debt. Many are calling for intervention in the form of 'aid' from China.

Holding significant amounts of sovereign debt has enormous political repercussions. In view of Parliament's concerns expressed in the resolution of 23 May 2012 on trade imbalances between the EU and China, can the Commission state the amount and percentage of debt in each EU country held by the People's Republic of China, be it directly or through entities connected to it?

If this information cannot be provided, should the Commission not establish a coordinated system to identify swiftly the various holders, be they public or private, of sovereign debt?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission  
(9 July 2012)**

The Commission is not able to state the amount or percentage of debt issued by Member States that is held by the People's Republic of China. However, there are works ongoing, under the auspices of the Economic and Financial Committee, on a scheme that would in the future allow to identify the geographical location of buyers or sellers of government bonds, as long as the counterparty of the transaction is a primary dealer in the respective government bond market.

The scheme will be based on a common reporting format used by primary dealers to report to euro-area Member States' Debt Management Offices (DMO). The harmonised format applies to outright purchases and sales on the primary and secondary markets of euro denominated bonds and bills issued by euro area DMO's. Most Member States' DMOs agreed that aggregated data for the euro area would be published by the Economic and Financial Committee (EFC) Secretariat on the EFC website on a quarterly basis with a 3-month lag.

---



(České znění)

**Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-005294/12**

**Komisi**

**Zuzana Roithová (PPE)**

(25. května 2012)

*Předmět:* Šumava – Natura 2000

Byla jsem oslovena odborníky na lesní hospodářství, kteří mě upozorňují na velmi vážný stav věci na Šumavě. Z usychajících lesů na bavorské straně hranic přelétá masivně na českou stranu škodlivý kůrovec, který devastuje porosty na obou stranách hranice. Mám následující otázky:

1. Vnímá Evropská komise situaci na Šumavě?
2. Může Komise aktivně zahájit účinnou pomoc, aby tato oblast, jež je součástí programu Natura 2000, měla šanci stát se opět přírodním parkem, a nikoli pařezovým hřbitovem?
3. Může Komise pomoci lépe koordinovat správu Natura 2000 mezi českou a bavorskou stranou?

**Odpověď komisaře Potočnicka jménem Komise**

(10. července 2012)

Od roku 2011 obdržela Komise několik stížností týkajících se správy Národního parku Šumava, který se kryje s lokalitami sítě Natura 2000. Ve stížnostech se uvádí, že orgány České republiky porušily ustanovení článku 6 směrnice Rady 92/43/EHS ze dne 21. května 1992 o ochraně přírodních stanovišť, volně žijících živočichů a planě rostoucích rostlin (směrnice o přírodních stanovištích) <sup>(1)</sup>. Týká se to lokalit sítě Natura 2000 SCI 0240314 Šumava a SPA 0311041 Šumava. Stížnosti byly podány v souvislosti s opatřeními přijatými v důsledku napadení lokality kůrovcem v roce 2011 a se způsobem, jakým byla tato opatření povolena, prováděna a vyhodnocena ve vztahu k jejich dopadu na lokality sítě Natura 2000. Komise v červnu 2011 zahájila šetření v rámci projektu EU Pilot a obdržela od České republiky několik odpovědí. Člen Komise odpovědný za životní prostředí zaslal dne 14. června 2012 českým orgánům dopis, v němž vyjádřil obavy z rozsahu těžby dřeva v Národním parku Šumava kvůli rostlinolékařským opatřením, protože těžba může mít zásadní vliv na celistvost lokality sítě Natura 2000 na Šumavě.

Pokud jde o koordinaci mezi lokalitami sítě Natura 2000, Komise v současnosti zahajuje novou iniciativu pro různé biogeografické oblasti v EU, jejímž cílem je posílit řízení a obnovu. Tato iniciativa může poskytnout rámec, jenž napomůže spolupráci mezi lokalitami v sousedících státech, tedy i mezi Českou republikou a Německem.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Úř. věst. L 206, 22.7.1992.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005294/12  
to the Commission**

**Zuzana Roithová (PPE)**

(25 May 2012)

*Subject:* Šumava — Natura 2000

Forestry experts have drawn my attention to a very serious state of affairs in the Šumava forest. Huge numbers of harmful bark beetles are flying from forests undergoing dieback on the Bavarian side of the border across to the Czech side, devastating vegetation on both sides.

1. Is the European Commission aware of the situation in the Šumava forest?
2. Can the Commission take steps to provide effective assistance so that this region, which is covered by the Natura 2000 programme, has a chance of once again becoming a natural park rather than a cemetery of tree stumps?
3. Can the Commission help to ensure better coordination of the management of Natura 2000 between the Czech and Bavarian sides?

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

(10 July 2012)

Since 2011 the Commission has received several complaints concerning the management of the Šumava National Park, which at the same time overlaps with Natura 2000 sites. The complainants allege that the Czech authorities have breached provisions of Article 6 of Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora (the Habitats Directive) <sup>(1)</sup>. This involves the Natura 2000 sites SCI 0240314 Šumava and SPA 0311041 Šumava. These alleged breaches are presented in connection with measures adopted against the bark beetle outbreak in 2011 and the way these measures were authorised, implemented and assessed as concerns their effect on the Natura 2000 sites. The Commission opened an EU Pilot in June 2011 and received a series of responses from the Czech Republic. The Member of the Commission responsible for Environment sent a letter to the Czech authorities on the 14 June 2012 voicing his concerns about the large scale logging in the Šumava Park for phytosanitary measures which might significantly affect the integrity of the Natura 2000 Šumava site.

As concerns coordination between Natura 2000 sites the Commission is currently launching a new initiative for different Biogeographic regions of the EU to strengthen management and restoration. This may also provide a framework to help collaboration between sites in neighbouring Member States, including the Czech Republic and Germany.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.

(České znění)

**Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-005295/12**

**Komisi**

**Zuzana Roithová (PPE)**

(25. května 2012)

*Předmět:* Celní kodex – TIR

Stávající celní právní předpisy EU zakazují používání označení TIR, přestože Celní úmluva o mezinárodní přepravě zboží (Úmluva TIR uzavřená v Ženevě roku 1975) jej umožňuje.

1. Souhlasí Komise s tím, že evropské právní předpisy jsou s Úmluvou TIR v rozporu?
2. Zvažuje Komise opětovné zavedení označení TIR, které by 12 milionům evropských nákladních vozidel umožnilo využívat výhod celního režimu TIR?
3. Je si Komise vědoma, že toto opětovné zavedení by omezilo prakticky naprostý monopol malého počtu firem provozujících silniční přepravu, které díky stávajícímu systému finančních záruk v současnosti ovládají 99 % evropské nákladní dopravy?
4. Mohla by Komise zvážit návrh na změnu článku 93 celního kodexu Společenství doplněním následujícího textu: „c) se přeprava provádí mezi dvěma místy v rámci jednoho členského státu nebo mezi dvěma členskými státy na celním území Společenství“, čímž by došlo k opětovnému zavedení označení TIR?

**Odpověď A. Šemety jménem Komise**

(21. června 2012)

Celní kodex Evropské unie <sup>(1)</sup> umožňuje používat celní tranzitní režim TIR v EU pro „mezinárodní přepravu“, která začíná nebo končí mimo Unii nebo která se uskutečňuje mezi dvěma místy v Unii přes území třetí země. Pro režim vnitřního tranzitu EU nabízí kodex výhradně tranzitní režim Evropské unie.

Článek 2 Úmluvy TIR stanoví, že: „Tato úmluva se vztahuje na přepravu zboží ..., přes jedny nebo více státních hranic...“. Členské státy EU odstranily vzájemné celní překážky již v roce 1968 zavedením celní unie a vytvořením vnitřního trhu v roce 1992 zrušily zbývající daňové hranice. Z právního hlediska umožňuje článek 48 Úmluvy TIR zvláštní předpisy pro celní unie. Na technické úrovni vylučuje absence vnitřních hranic možnost používat karnety TIR pro vnitřní přepravu v EU. A z hlediska celní politiky jde o rozhodnutí nevracet se do situace, jež předcházela zavedení vnitřního trhu.

Odpověď na otázky 1, 2 a 4 vážené paní poslankyně je proto záporná.

Komise nemůže sdílet názor paní poslankyně (vyjádřený v otázce 3) o privilegovaném postavení určitých společností s ohledem na finanční záruky. Tranzitní režim Evropské unie nabízí svým uživatelům širokou škálu možností a ponechává jim volbu, pokud jde o způsob poskytování celních záruk.

<sup>(1)</sup> Podle čl. 91 odst. 2 písm. b) nařízení Rady (EHS) č. 2913/92 ze dne 12. října 1992, Úř. věst. L 302, 19.10.1992, s. 1.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005295/12  
to the Commission  
Zuzana Roithová (PPE)  
(25 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Customs Code — TIR

Current EU customs legislation forbids the use of the TIR designation, although the Customs Convention on the International Transport of Goods (TIR Convention, Geneva 1975) allows it.

1. Does the Commission agree that European legislation contradicts the TIR Convention?
2. Is the Commission considering reintroduction of the TIR designation to allow 12 million European freight vehicles to benefit from the TIR customs regime?
3. Is the Commission aware of the fact that such a reintroduction would reduce the virtual monopoly exercised by a small number of road haulage firms, which currently control 99% of European freight transport, thanks to the existing system of financial guarantees?
4. Would the Commission consider a proposal to amend Article 93 of the Community Customs Code, with the insertion of the following text: '(c) carriage is effected between two locations within a single Member State or between two Member States, inside the customs territory of the Community', in order to reintroduce the TIR designation?

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

The Customs Code of the European Union <sup>(1)</sup> allows the use of the TIR customs transit procedure in the EU for 'international movements' which begin or end outside the Union; or which take place between two points in the Union through the territory of a third country. For EU internal transit operations, the Code offers exclusively the European Union transit procedure.

Article 2 of the TIR Convention stipulates that: 'This Convention shall apply to the transport of goods ..., across one or more frontiers...'. EU Member States have removed customs barriers between themselves already with the introduction of the customs union in 1968 and eliminated remaining fiscal frontiers with the internal market in 1992. From a legal point of view, Article 48 of the TIR Convention allows for special provisions for customs unions. On technical level, the absence of internal borders excludes the possibility to use TIR carnets for EU internal transports. And from a customs policy point of view, it is a choice not to revert to a situation which predated the introduction of the internal market.

Therefore, the answer to questions 1, 2 and 4 of the Honorable Member is no.

The Commission cannot share the Honorable Member's view, as expressed in question 3, about a privileged position of certain companies in relation to financial guarantees. The European Union transit procedure offers a wide range of options to its users and leaves them the choice of how a guarantee is provided to customs.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> According to Article 91 (2)(b), Council Regulation (EEC) No 2913/92 of 12 October 1992, OJ L 302, 19.10.1992, p. 1.

(České znění)

**Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-005297/12**

**Komisi**

**Zuzana Roithová (PPE)**

(25. května 2012)

*Předmět:* Prodej kočičích a psích kůží

Po dlouhé diskusi se Parlament v roce 2008 rozhodl zakázat prodej kočičích a psích kůží v EU. Dochází však k obcházení tohoto nařízení.

1. Podle nařízení (ES) č. 1523/2007 nesmí být výrobky z kůže domácích koček a psů uváděny na trh v EU. Je si Komise vědoma toho, že nařízení je zjevně obcházeno, a to prostřednictvím „dalšího prodeje“ nebo „prodeje z druhé ruky“ výše uvedených výrobků?
2. Jaké kroky podniká Komise k tomu, aby dohlédla na to, zda je nařízení (ES) č. 1523/2007 prováděno v plné míře? Vznesla Komise námitku proti nějakým pokusům o obcházení nařízení, které by se podobaly těm výše popsaným?
3. Plánuje Komise změnit dané nařízení tím, že zákaz rozšíří na všechny podoby prodeje, včetně „prodeje z druhé ruky“, nebo tento druh prodeje alespoň omezit?

**Odpověď Johna Dalliho jménem Komise**

(4. července 2012)

V souladu s čl. 2 odst. 3 nařízení (ES) č. 1523/2007<sup>(1)</sup>, kterým se zakazují kočičí a psí kůže, „uváděním na trh“ se rozumí „držení kočičí nebo psí kůže nebo výrobku obsahujícího tyto kůže za účelem prodeje, včetně nabídky k prodeji, prodeje a distribuce“. Tato definice zakazuje veškeré formy prodeje včetně „dalšího prodeje“ a prodeje „z druhé ruky“.

V roce 2011 Komise shromáždila informace od členských států o provádění zákazu týkajícího se kočičích a psích kůží v letech 2009 a 2010. Tyto informace nepoukazují na žádné významné problémy při provádění zákazu týkajícího se kočičích a psích kůží.

---

(<sup>1</sup>) Úř. věst. L 343, 27.12.2007, s. 1.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005297/12  
to the Commission**

**Zuzana Roithová (PPE)**

(25 May 2012)

*Subject:* Sale of cat and dog fur

After much debate, Parliament decided to forbid the sale of cat and dog fur in the EU in 2008. However, the regulation concerned is being circumvented.

1. Under Regulation (EC) No 1523/2007, products made from the fur of domestic cats and dogs cannot be placed on the market in the EU. Is the Commission aware that the regulation is apparently being circumvented by the 're-sale' or 'second-hand sale' of the aforementioned products?
2. What steps is Commission taking to monitor whether Regulation (EC) No 1523/2007 is being implemented in full? Has the Commission objected to any attempts to circumvent the regulation similar to those described above?
3. Does the Commission plan to amend the regulation by extending the scope of the ban to cover all forms of sale, including 'second-hand sale', or at least to limit this form of sale?

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

(4 July 2012)

According to Article 2(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1523/2007 <sup>(1)</sup> banning cat and dog fur, 'placing on the market' means 'the holding of cat and/or dog fur or a product containing such fur for the purpose of sale, which includes offer for sale, sale and distribution'. This definition bans all forms of sales including 're-sale' or 'second hand' sale.

In 2011, the Commission collected information from the Member States on the implementation of the ban on cat and dog fur in 2009 and 2010. From this information, there does not appear to be any significant issue for the implementation of the ban on cat and dog fur.

---

(1) OJ L 343, 27.12.2007, p. 1.

(České znění)

**Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-005298/12**

**Komisi**

**Zuzana Roithová (PPE)**

(25. května 2012)

**Předmět:** Přístupnost internetových stránek pro zrakově postižené osoby

Komise přislíbila předložit návrhy ohledně toho, jak učinit internetové stránky veřejných služeb přístupnějšími pro zrakově postižené uživatele. Cílem opatření č. 64 Digitální agendy pro Evropu je zajistit, aby byly internetové stránky veřejného sektoru (a stránky poskytující občanům základní služby) plně přístupné do roku 2015. Vzhledem k tomu, kolik informací a služeb je občanům a spotřebitelům v celé EU v současnosti poskytováno především prostřednictvím internetu, je takový cíl zcela logický.

Posoudila Komise, jaký by mohlo mít dopad na hospodářství EU, kdyby se tohoto cíle nepodařilo dosáhnout? Pokud ano, mohla by to Komise doložit konkrétními údaji?

**Odpověď N. Kroesové jménem Komise**

(2. července 2012)

Předpokládá se, že návrh legislativního zásahu EU týkajícího se přístupnosti internetových stránek bude v brzké době předložen k přijetí. Většina členských států vyvinula pro oblast přístupnosti internetových stránek vlastní koncepcce a specifikace, což vede na trhu k roztržitosti a nejistotě pro vývojáře internetových stránek. Uvedený návrh má tyto přístupy harmonizovat. K návrhu bude připojeno posouzení dopadů, které uvádí informace o hospodářských dopadech v souvislosti s dosahováním tohoto cíle. Toto jsou některá zjištění:

Trh související s přístupností internetových stránek veřejného sektoru EU by se mohl rychle zdvojnásobit a generovat 540 milionů EUR ročně.

Z hlediska přínosů pro veřejnou správu lze předpokládat, že bez příslušného zásahu by úroveň přístupnosti, jíž má být dosaženo do roku 2015, splnilo v EU-27 pouze 45 % internetových stránek veřejného sektoru poskytujících základní služby. Pokud by byl v důsledku zásahu týkajícího se přístupnosti internetových stránek daný cíl splněn na 100 %, přínosy by převážily nad náklady o nejméně 200 milionů EUR.

Obecně vzato, z lepšího přístupu ke stěžejním „základním veřejným službám“ by měli mít prospěch všichni občané, neboť by jim to ušetřilo náklady na dopravu i čas. Dojde-li navíc i k přesahu do soukromého sektoru, spotřebitelé by porovnáním služeb na vnitřním trhu<sup>(1)</sup> mohli ušetřit přibližně 300 milionů EUR ročně. Přístup ke konkurenceschopnějším nabídkám a nižším cenám přinese občanům do roku 2015 výhody v odhadované výši 500 milionů EUR.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Studie o přístupnosti produktů a služeb informačních a komunikačních technologií pro zdravotně postižené a starší osoby, příloha II a V.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005298/12  
to the Commission**

**Zuzana Roithová (PPE)**

(25 May 2012)

*Subject:* Website accessibility for the visually impaired

The Commission has promised to publish proposals to help make public service websites more accessible for visually impaired users. The aim of Action 64 of the Digital Agenda for Europe is to ensure that public-sector websites (and websites providing basic services to citizens) are fully accessible by 2015. Given the amount of information and services now primarily delivered online to citizens and consumers across the EU, this objective makes perfect sense.

Has the Commission assessed the potential impact on the EU's economy of failing to achieve this objective? If so, could the Commission provide data to illustrate this?

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

(2 July 2012)

The proposal for an EU legislative intervention on web-accessibility is expected to be submitted for adoption shortly. Most Member States have developed their own policies and specifications for web-accessibility, resulting in fragmentation and uncertainty in the market for web developers. The proposal seeks to harmonise these approaches. The proposal will be accompanied by an Impact Assessment, which provides information on the economic effects of achieving this objective. Some of its findings are:

The market for the web-accessibility of the public sector websites in EU could double rapidly, reaching EUR 540 million per year.

As regards the benefits for governments, it can be assumed that without intervention the accessibility compliance level achieved by 2015 would be only 45% of basic public websites in EU-27. If the web accessibility intervention results in 100% compliance, the benefits would outweigh the costs by at least EUR 200 million.

In general, all citizens would benefit from better access to essential 'basic public services', saving transport cost and time. Furthermore, if the spill-over into the private sector is realised, consumers would benefit from savings of an estimated EUR 300 million a year by comparing services in the internal market <sup>(1)</sup>. Access to more competitive offers and lower prices will provide citizens with benefits estimated at above EUR 500 million by 2015.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Study on Accessibility of ICT products and services to Disabled and Older People, Annex II and V.



(České znění)

**Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-005301/12**

**Komisi**

**Zuzana Roithová (PPE)**

(25. května 2012)

*Předmět:* Prodej krokodýlího masa

Byla jsem informována, že české Ministerstvo zemědělství požádalo Komisi o schválení vnitrostátních právních předpisů, které by umožňovaly zabíjení krokodýlů chovaných ke komerčním účelům a prodej jejich masa.

1. Ví Komise o tomto požadavku?
2. Kdy českému ministerstvu odpoví a jak?
3. Domnívá se Komise, že by chov plazů ke komerčním účelům, který v Evropě nemá žádnou tradici, měl být povolen?

**Odpověď komisaře Dalliho jménem Komise**

(5. července 2012)

Komise potvrzuje, že obdržela od českých orgánů oznámení týkající se předlohy nařízení o veterinárních požadavcích pro porážku krokodýlů a další zpracování masa a živočišných produktů pocházejících z krokodýlů (oznámení č. 2012/220/CZ ze dne 6. dubna 2012).

Príslušné útvary Komise nyní toto oznámení posuzují a Komise zde nemůže předjímat svůj konečný postoj k oznámené předloze nařízení. Tříměsíční doba pozastavení pro oznámení 2012/220/CZ končí dnem 9. července 2012. Jakákoli reakce na oznámenou předlohu nařízení by měla být vydána před koncem této doby pozastavení.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005301/12  
to the Commission**

**Zuzana Roithová (PPE)**

(25 May 2012)

*Subject:* Sale of crocodile meat

I have been informed that the Czech Ministry of Agriculture has requested that the Commission approve national regulations allowing the slaughter of commercially bred crocodiles and the sale of their meat.

1. Is the Commission aware of this request?
2. When will it answer the Czech ministry, and what will its answer be?
3. Does the Commission take the view that the commercial breeding of reptiles, which has no tradition in Europe, should be allowed?

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

(5 July 2012)

The Commission confirms that it has received from the Czech authorities a notification of a draft Regulation on the veterinary requirements for slaughtering crocodiles and further processing of meat and animal products originating from crocodiles (notification No 2012/220/CZ dated 6 April 2012).

This notification is currently under examination by the competent Commission services and the Commission can not preclude here its final position as regards the notified draft regulation. The three months standstill period for notification 2012/220/CZ expires on 9 July 2012. Any reaction to the notified draft regulation should be issued before the end of this standstill period.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005302/12**

**alla Commissione**

**Mara Bizzotto (EFD)**

(25 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Acquisizione ed archiviazione dei dati personali dei cellulari da parte della polizia Londinese

A Londra la Polizia Metropolitana sta lanciando in 16 distretti un nuovo sistema di acquisizione di dati personali dai cellulari dei fermati e dei sospetti, che permetterà in pochi secondi di fare una copia digitale dell'intero contenuto del telefono: sms, contatti, storico delle chiamate. Tale copia sarà archiviata e mantenuta dalle forze dell'ordine anche nel caso in cui il sospetto fosse scagionato dalle accuse.

La procedura standard finora era quella di inviare il terminale al reparto forense della polizia che avrebbe effettuato i rilevamenti del caso.

— La Commissione è a conoscenza di questa iniziativa?

— Reputa che si profili una violazione della carta dei diritti dell'uomo con l'acquisizione di dati personali effettuata in questo modo su qualunque persona anche solo sospettata di un crimine e nel caso di mantenimento dei dati personali acquisiti anche di indagati poi scagionati dalle accuse?

— Ha la Commissione informazioni circa la durata del «data retention» di questi dati?

— Ritieni che vi sia la possibilità che si effettui un uso indiscriminato di tale tecnologia da parte delle forze dell'ordine?

**Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione**

(18 luglio 2012)

L'attuale normativa UE sulla protezione dei dati non riguarda le attività di polizia a livello nazionale poiché ciò è escluso dal campo di applicazione della normativa stessa (articolo 3, paragrafo 2, della direttiva 95/46/CE e articolo 1, paragrafo 2, della decisione quadro 2008/977/GAI del Consiglio).

Consapevole di tale situazione giuridica e in linea con il piano d'azione di Stoccolma <sup>(1)</sup>, che sottolinea l'importanza per l'Unione di «introdurre un regime completo in materia di protezione dei dati personali che ricomprenda tutte le competenze dell'Unione» e di «assicurare l'applicazione sistematica del diritto fondamentale alla protezione dei dati», la Commissione europea ha proposto il 25 gennaio 2012 una nuova direttiva <sup>(2)</sup> per il trattamento dei dati da parte delle autorità giudiziarie e di polizia che mira, tra le altre cose, a colmare a livello nazionale le lacune evidenziate. La proposta legislativa è attualmente in fase di discussione al Consiglio e al Parlamento europeo.

Gli Stati membri sono comunque vincolati a rispettare la Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea, in particolare gli obblighi enunciati agli articoli 7 e 8.

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2009)262 e COM(2010)171 rispettivamente.

<sup>(2)</sup> Proposta di direttiva del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio concernente la tutela delle persone fisiche con riguardo al trattamento dei dati personali da parte delle autorità competenti a fini di prevenzione, indagine, accertamento e perseguimento di reati o esecuzione di sanzioni penali, e la libera circolazione di tali dati; COM/2012/010 final — 2012/0010 (COD).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005302/12  
to the Commission  
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)  
(25 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Capturing and storing personal data from mobile phones by the London police

In London, the Metropolitan Police Service is launching a new system in 16 districts to capture personal data from the mobile phones of detainees and suspects, which will allow the entire contents of the phone — text messages, contacts and call history — to be copied digitally within a few seconds. This copy will be filed and held by the police even when the suspect is cleared of the charges.

Until now, it has been standard practice to send the phone to the forensics department which would carry out the appropriate work.

— Is the Commission aware of this initiative?

— Does it believe that capturing personal data in this way is a breach of human rights both if the person concerned is only suspected of a crime and if personal data from suspects who are then cleared of the charges is stored?

— Does the Commission have information on the data retention period?

— Does it consider that the police may possibly use this technology indiscriminately?

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

The current EU data protection legislation does not cover police activities at the mere domestic level because it is excluded from the scope of this legislation (Article 3 (2) of the directive 95/46/EC) and Council Framework Decision 2008/977/JHA (Article 1(2)).

Being aware of this legal situation and in line with the Stockholm Action Plan <sup>(1)</sup>, which stresses the need for the Union to 'establish a comprehensive personal data protection scheme covering all areas of EU competence' and 'ensure that the fundamental right to data protection is consistently applied', the European Commission proposed on 25 January 2012 a new Directive <sup>(2)</sup> for the area of data processing by judicial and police authorities which aims — *inter alia* — to close the abovementioned gap at the domestic level. The respective legal proposal is currently discussed with the Council and the European Parliament.

Member States are in any case bound by the Charter of Fundamental Rights, and in particular to respect the obligations under Articles 7 and 8 thereof.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2009) 262 and COM(2010) 171 respectively.

<sup>(2)</sup> Proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by competent authorities for the purposes of prevention, investigation, detection or prosecution of criminal offences or the execution of criminal penalties, and the free movement of such data; COM(2012) 010 final — 2012/0010 (COD).

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005303/12**

**alla Commissione**  
**Fiorello Provera (EFD)**  
(25 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Contraffazione di farmaci antimalarici

Alcuni ricercatori del Fogarty International Centre presso l'Istituto nazionale di sanità negli Stati Uniti hanno pubblicato nella rivista *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* i risultati di uno studio dai quali si evince che un terzo dei farmaci antimalarici è contraffatto. I ricercatori hanno esaminato 1 500 campioni di sette farmaci antimalarici provenienti da sette paesi del Sud-est asiatico e, oltre a metterne in luce la qualità molto scarsa, hanno rilevato la presenza di compresse false, cosa che provoca la resistenza al farmaco e quindi l'insuccesso del trattamento. Alcune ricerche svolte in 21 paesi dell'Africa subsahariana, su 2 500 campioni di farmaci, sono giunte ai medesimi risultati. Gli studi svolti nella zona di confine tra Thailandia e Cambogia hanno rivelato che anche i più moderni farmaci a base di artemisinina sono inutili contro i parassiti malarici e che il problema peggiora sempre più. La maggior parte dei farmaci antimalarici destinati ai paesi poveri dell'Africa e dell'Asia sono fabbricati in Cina e in India, dove i test eseguiti non sono sufficienti.

La malaria è una malattia endemica in oltre 100 paesi e, secondo il direttore della ricerca, significa che, in tutto il mondo, 3,3 miliardi di persone sono a rischio malarico. Tra 655 000 e 1,2 milioni di persone muoiono ogni anno di malaria causata dal parassita *Plasmodium falciparum*.

Il 7°PQ della Commissione è dedicato alle attività di ricerca e di sviluppo di nuove terapie e di nuovi strumenti diagnostici e preventivi. Nell'ambito di tale programma sono stati assegnati 15 milioni di euro allo sviluppo di farmaci antimalarici. Nel sito web della Commissione si legge che la ricerca sulla malaria finanziata nell'ambito del 7°PQ rappresenterà un utile contributo al programma mondiale di ricerca sulla malattia.

1. È la Commissione a conoscenza dei risultati della ricerca pubblicati sulla rivista *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*?
2. Quali misure intende la Commissione adottare per assicurare che i farmaci antimalarici fabbricati nell'UE siano caratterizzati da un elevato livello qualitativo?
3. Può la Commissione far sapere se l'UE importa farmaci antimalarici dall'India o dalla Cina e se esistono misure per controllarne la qualità?
4. È la Commissione pronta a sostenere, o già sostiene, iniziative per promuovere in Asia e in Africa i farmaci antimalarici fabbricati nell'UE?
5. Alla luce di quanto sopra esposto, quali azioni la Commissione è pronta ad adottare per migliorare i test dei farmaci nei paesi in cui la malaria è endemica?

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

(9 luglio 2012)

1. La Commissione è a conoscenza delle risultanze pubblicate da *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*.
2. L'UE dispone di regole per la fabbricazione dei prodotti medicinali. Tali regole sono esposte nel titolo IV del codice comunitario relativo ai prodotti medicinali per uso umano<sup>(1)</sup>. Tali regole si applicano anche ai medicinali fabbricati nell'UE ed esportati successivamente.
3. La malaria non è una malattia diffusa nell'UE. Per tale motivo è lecito presumere che il volume di medicinali antimalarici importati nell'UE sia basso. La Commissione non dispone di informazioni quanto al fatto che tali medicinali siano fabbricati in India o in Cina.

Le vigenti regole dell'UE sono riportate nell'articolo 51, paragrafo 1, del codice comunitario relativo ai medicinali per uso umano. Tali regole prevedono controlli dei medicinali importati.

<sup>(1)</sup> GUL 311 del 28.11.2001, pag. 67.

4. La Commissione finanzia il Fondo globale per la lotta contro l'AIDS, la tubercolosi e la malaria che reca un sostegno ai paesi fornendo loro medicinali di qualità. Il Fondo acquista soltanto medicinali che siano autorizzati per uso umano nell'UE, negli USA e/o in Canada o siano prequalificati dall'Organizzazione mondiale della sanità.

5. La Commissione promuove l'accesso ai medicinali di qualità per i paesi in via di sviluppo. Essa sostiene programmi volti a migliorare l'accesso ai medicinali di qualità attraverso il sostegno strategico e tecnico agli Stati dell'Africa, dei Caraibi e del Pacifico (ACP) rafforzando tutte le componenti del loro sistema farmaceutico. A partire dal 2003 la Commissione europea sostiene attivamente il partenariato Europa-Paesi in via di sviluppo per gli studi clinici (EDCTP) per sostenere gli studi clinici relativi a medicinali nuovi o migliorati volti a prevenire o curare la malaria e le correlate misure di rafforzamento di capacità nell'Africa sub-sahariana, anche al fine di evitare la diffusione della resistenza ai farmaci antimalarici.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005303/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Fiorello Provera (EFD)**  
(25 May 2012)

*Subject:* Counterfeit malaria drugs

Researchers from the Fogarty International Centre at the United States' National Institutes of Health have published findings in *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* showing that one third of anti-malarial drugs are counterfeit. The researchers looked at 1 500 samples of seven malaria drugs from seven countries in South East Asia and discovered their poor quality and that fake tablets are leading to drug resistance and treatment failure. Studies in 21 countries in sub-Saharan Africa, involving 2 500 drug samples, showed similar results. On the Thai-Cambodian border, malaria researchers have discovered that even the most modern artemisinin drugs are unable to resist malaria parasites and the problem is getting worse. Most of the anti-malarial drugs destined for poor countries in Africa and Asia are manufactured in China and India, where insufficient testing is being done.

Malaria is endemic in over 100 countries, which means, according to the lead researcher in the study, that 3.3 billion people are at risk from the disease worldwide. Between 655 000 and 1.2 million people die every year from malaria caused by the *Plasmodium falciparum* parasite.

The Commission's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7) is devoted to research into developing 'new therapies and diagnostic and preventive tools'. It has allocated EUR 15 million to the development of anti-malarial drugs. According to the Commission's website, 'FP7-funded malaria research should thus usefully contribute to the global research agenda in malaria research'.

1. Is the Commission aware of the findings published in *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*?
2. What steps is the Commission taking to ensure that anti-malarial drugs manufactured in the EU are of a high standard?
3. Does the EU import anti-malarial drugs from India or China and what measures are in place to control their quality?
4. Is the Commission prepared to support, or already supporting, initiatives to promote EU-manufactured anti-malarial drugs in Asia and Africa?
5. In light of the above, what steps is the Commission prepared to take to improve drug testing in countries where malaria is endemic?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission**  
(9 July 2012)

1. The Commission is aware of the findings published by *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*.
2. The EU has rules for the manufacturing of medicinal products. These rules are set out in Title IV of the Community Code relating to medicinal products for human use<sup>(1)</sup>. These rules also apply to medicinal products manufactured in the EU and subsequently exported.
3. Malaria is not a common disease in the EU. Therefore, one can assume that the volume of anti-malaria medicines imported into the EU is low. The Commission does not have information whether these medicines are manufactured in India or China.

The applicable EU rules are set out in Article 51(1) of the Community Code relating to medicinal products for human use. These rules provide for controls of imported medicinal products.

4. The Commission finances the Global Fund to fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria which provides support to countries through the provision of quality medicines. The Fund only purchases medicines that are authorised for human use in the EU, USA, and/or Canada or pre-qualified by the World Health Organisation.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 311, 28.11.2001, p. 67.

5. The Commission promotes access to quality manufactured drugs for developing countries. It is supporting programmes to improve access to quality medicines through strategic and technical support to African, Caribbean and Pacific Island (ACP) countries in strengthening all components of their pharmaceutical system. Since 2003 the European Commission is actively supporting the European and Developing Countries Clinical Trials Partnership (EDCTP) to support clinical studies on new or improved medicines to prevent or treat malaria and related capacity strengthening measures in Sub-Saharan Africa and to avoid the spread of antimalarial drug resistance.

---



(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005304/12  
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**

**Fiorello Provera (EFD)**

(25 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — spostamento verso destra degli islamisti egiziani alla vigilia delle elezioni presidenziali

Stando a varie notizie riportate dai media, i principali candidati islamisti alle elezioni presidenziali in Egitto hanno preso una posizione più pronunciata a destra, attaccando l'Occidente e progettando l'attuazione di cambiamenti nel paese in linea con la legge islamica.

Uno dei candidati, Mohamed Morsi dei Fratelli musulmani, che ha svolto i propri studi negli Stati Uniti, ha lanciato un appello per il rilascio di Omar Abdel-Rahman, coinvolto nell'attentato dinamitardo al World Trade Center del 1993. L'altro candidato islamista è Abdel Moneim Aboul Fotouh, classificato come un «islamista liberale» indipendente.

Sebbene in precedenza Fotouh abbia affermato di volere un sistema politico pluralista e di non desiderare l'imposizione della legge della Sharia, negli ultimi giorni ha espresso opinioni diverse. Durante un comizio tenutosi nel paese presso il delta del Nilo, molti dei suoi discorsi erano incentrati sul tema del vero ruolo della donna. Egli ha accusato i paesi occidentali di trascurare la vita familiare, sostenendo che hanno spinto la società a commettere qualsiasi tipo di peccato — sesso, alcol, tutto — e aggiungendo che siamo tutti soldati nel progetto dell'Islam. Lo spostamento verso destra di Aboul Fotouh è iniziato dopo che ha ricevuto il sostegno del movimento ultraconservatore salafita. Fotouh ha affermato anche che avrebbe chiuso l'industria locale di alcolici in Egitto; i salafiti hanno chiesto addirittura di cessare la vendita di bevande alcoliche e di consentirne il consumo ai cristiani solo nelle loro abitazioni. Ha parlato di Israele come del «nemico» e non di un avversario, termine utilizzato invece da Amr Moussa.

Tra i candidati, Amr Moussa e Ahmed Shafiq sono attualmente in testa ai sondaggi. In seguito alle elezioni, il potere esecutivo sarà trasferito dall'esercito per la formazione di un governo civile. Si tratta delle prime elezioni con più candidati in Egitto da decenni. Le elezioni hanno luogo in assenza di una costituzione.

1. Può il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante comunicare la sua posizione in merito ai possibili risultati dalle elezioni presidenziali in Egitto?
2. Qual è la sua posizione in merito alla possibilità di vittoria di un islamista?
3. Qual è la sua valutazione dell'imposizione di leggi islamiche più severe in Egitto, come auspicato dai due candidati islamisti favoriti?

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

(6 luglio 2012)

La responsabilità di una trasformazione e un futuro democratici in Egitto è fondamentale nelle mani degli Egiziani stessi. L'UE è impegnata a sostenere riforme democratiche, una maggiore partecipazione della società civile, nonché la crescita e lo sviluppo dell'economia del paese ed è pronta ad avviare un dialogo con la nuova leadership egiziana in merito a tali obiettivi. Il rispetto dei valori democratici e dei diritti umani è alla base delle relazioni tra l'UE e l'Egitto, come stabilito dall'articolo 2 dell'accordo di associazione. Di conseguenza l'UE confida che la nuova leadership egiziana rispetterà gli impegni internazionali in materia di diritti umani assunti dal paese.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005304/12**  
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**  
**Fiorello Provera (EFD)**  
(25 May 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Egyptian Islamists move to the right on eve of presidential election

Various media reports have stated that Egypt's prime Islamist candidates in the country's presidential elections have moved further to the right in their stance, by attacking the West and by planning to implement changes in the country in line with Islamic law.

One of the candidates, the Muslim Brotherhood's Mohamed Morsi, who was educated in the United States, has called for the release of Omar Abdel-Rahman, who was involved in the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Centre. The other Islamist candidate is Abdel Moneim Aboul Fotouh, who is classified as an independent 'liberal Islamist'.

Although Mr Fotouh has previously said that he wants a pluralist political system and does not wish to impose Sharia law, in recent days he has expressed different views. At a rally in the country's Nile delta, he devoted much of his speeches to the issue of the proper role of women. He accused Western countries of neglecting family life: 'They have opened up society to commit all sins — sex, drink, everything'. 'We are all soldiers in the project of Islam'. Aboul Fotouh's shift to the right began after he received the endorsement of the ultraconservative Salafi movement. Fotouh has also said he would close down Egypt's indigenous alcohol industry, and the Salafis have even demanded that its sale be stopped and that Christians only be allowed to drink it in their homes. He has referred to Israel as the 'enemy', not just as an adversary, the term used by Mr Amr Moussa.

Among the candidates currently leading in the polls are Amr Moussa and Ahmed Shafiq. After the elections, executive power will be transferred from the military to form a civilian government. This is the first multi-candidate election for Egypt in decades. The elections are taking place without a constitution in place.

1. What is the position of the Vice-President/High Representative on the possible outcome of Egypt's presidential election?
2. What is her position on the possibility of an Islamist victory?
3. What is her assessment regarding the imposition of stricter Islamic laws in Egypt, as favoured by the two leading Islamist candidates?

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

The responsibility for Egypt's democratic transformation and future is ultimately in the hands of the Egyptians themselves. The EU is committed to support democratic reforms, greater participation of civil society, economic growth and development in the country and stands ready to engage with the new Egyptian leadership on these objectives. The respect of democratic values and human rights is a cornerstone in the relations between the EU and Egypt as stipulated in Article 2 of the Association Agreement. Accordingly, the EU expects that the new Egyptian leadership will respect the international Human Rights commitments undertaken by Egypt.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005305/12  
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**

**Fiorello Provera (EFD)**

(25 maggio 2012)

**Oggetto:** VP/HR — Condanna da parte di un tribunale tunisino del direttore di un'emittente televisiva in una causa sulla libertà di espressione

Il 3 maggio 2012 cinque giudici tunisini hanno condannato il direttore di un'emittente televisiva, Nabil Karoui, per «disturbo dell'ordine pubblico» e «offesa alla moralità comune» a seguito della diffusione del film «Persepolis» che contiene un'immagine di Dio. Al direttore dell'emittente è stata inflitta un'ammenda di 1 600 dollari americani, mentre a due suoi dipendenti che avevano l'incarico di verificare la moralità del film e rilevare eventuali problemi giuridici, è stata comminata un'ammenda di 800 dollari ciascuno. I magistrati del pubblico ministero, e gli avvocati che rappresentavano il gruppo islamico, hanno sostenuto che il direttore, proprietario dell'emittente, avrebbe dovuto essere condannato a cinque anni di reclusione. Due avvocati avevano invocato la pena di morte.

Abada Kefi, uno dei difensori del direttore dell'emittente, ha affermato di aver sperato che quel giorno sarebbe stato ricordato per l'affermazione della libertà di espressione e dei mezzi d'informazione in Tunisia, ma che invece è stato un giorno di lutto. La sentenza, secondo il difensore, è un attacco alla creatività e alla libertà di espressione. Dopo la diffusione del film l'abitazione di Nabil Karoui è stata assalita ed ora è difesa da guardie armate. Prima della caduta dell'ex presidente Zine El Abidine Ben Ali, il film «Persepolis» era stato proiettato nei cinema per due mesi senza alcun incidente, solo dopo la diffusione tramite il canale satellitare di Karoui sono iniziate le controversie.

Gordon Gray, ambasciatore degli Stati Uniti in Tunisia, ha pubblicamente condannato la sentenza del tribunale e la condanna di Nabil Karoui. L'ambasciatore si è detto preoccupato e sconcertato per la condanna dell'emittente Nessma dovuta alla diffusione di un film d'animazione la cui distribuzione era già stata approvata dal governo tunisino e ha affermato che essa è fonte di preoccupazione per la tolleranza e la libertà di espressione in Tunisia.

1. Può il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante far sapere la sua posizione in merito alle accuse mosse a Nabil Karoui?
2. Ritiene il personale del SEAE che in Tunisia stia emergendo una nuova cultura di autocensura provocata dalla sentenza contro Karoui?
3. Ritiene il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante che la libertà di espressione in Tunisia sia minacciata da elementi religiosi da quando Ben Ali è stato spodestato?
4. Hanno i salafiti tunisini assunto un ruolo nell'ambito dei mezzi d'informazione del paese? In caso affermativo, quale?

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

(25 luglio 2012)

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ritiene che il rispetto dei dritti dell'uomo, compresa la libertà d'espressione, sia aumentato notevolmente in Tunisia da quando l'ex presidente Ben Ali è stato spodestato. Tuttavia casi come quello esposto dall'onorevole parlamentare sono fonte di preoccupazione. In tale contesto è importante che le autorità tunisine consolidino il rispetto della libertà di espressione con opportune disposizioni legislative: la questione è al centro del dialogo tra Unione europea e Tunisia.

Per quanto riguarda i mezzi d'informazione, la rivoluzione tunisina ha permesso a tutte le forze politiche legalmente riconosciute, comprese quelle di tipo religioso, di creare i loro canali di comunicazione personali. Il servizio europeo per l'azione esterna segue attentamente e monitora il rispetto della libertà di stampa.

L'Unione europea conferma la sua disponibilità ad approfondire e intensificare l'impegno nei confronti delle autorità e della società civile tunisine per attuare le riforme necessarie a far fronte al legittimo desiderio dei cittadini tunisini di ottenere la democrazia e una società basata su di una crescita equa, sostenibile e inclusiva.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005305/12**  
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**  
**Fiorello Provera (EFD)**  
(25 May 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Tunisian court fines Tunisian TV director in free-speech case

On 3 May 2012, five Tunisian judges convicted TV station director Nabil Karoui of 'disturbing public order' and 'threatening public morals' after the broadcasting of the French movie *Persepolis*, which contained an image of God. Karoui was fined USD 1 600, while two members of his staff, whose jobs are to check films for moral and legal problems, were each fined USD 800. Prosecutors, and lawyers representing Islamist groups, had argued that the owner should be sentenced to prison for up to five years. Two lawyers had called for the death penalty.

One of Karoui's attorneys, Abada Kefi, said that he 'hoped that today would be a celebration of freedom of expression and media here in Tunisia, but this is rather an occasion for mourning. This decision is a strike against creativity and freedom of expression'. After the broadcasting of the movie, Karoui's house was attacked, and he now has an armed guard. Before the fall of former President Zine El Abidine Ben Ali, *Persepolis* was shown in the cinema for two months without incident; only after Karoui's satellite channel aired it did it generate controversy.

The US Ambassador to Tunisia, Gordon Gray, issued a statement which condemned the decision of the court and the treatment of Karoui: 'I am concerned and disappointed by this conviction for Nessma television's broadcast of an animated film previously approved for distribution by the Tunisian Government. [...] His conviction raises serious concerns about tolerance and freedom of expression in the new Tunisia'.

1. What is the position of the Vice-President/High Representative regarding the charges against Nabil Karoui?
2. Do EEAS staff believe that a new culture of self-censorship within Tunisia is emerging as a result of the Karoui case?
3. Does the Vice-President/High Representative believe that freedom of expression in Tunisia has been coming under attack from religious elements since the ousting of Ben Ali?
4. What role, if any, do Tunisia's Salafists play within the country's media?

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

The High Representative/Vice-President is aware that respect for human rights including freedom of expression has dramatically increased in Tunisia since the ousting of former President Ben Ali. Nonetheless cases such as those highlighted by the Honourable Member are a cause for concern. In this context it is important that the Tunisian authorities consolidate with appropriate legal provisions respect for freedom of expression. This is a central issue in the EU's dialogue with Tunisia.

As regards the media environment, the Tunisian revolution has made it possible for all legally established political forces, including religious ones, to set up their own communication channels. The EEAS is following and monitoring respect for press freedoms closely.

The EU remains ready to deepen and intensify its engagement with the Tunisian authorities and civil society with regard to implementing reforms in order to respond to the legitimate aspirations of the Tunisian people for democracy and a society based on equitable, sustainable and inclusive growth.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005306/12  
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**

**Fiorello Provera (EFD)**

(25 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Islamisti maliani a Timbuctù

Il 23 maggio 2012, l'European Strategic Intelligence and Security Center (centro europeo di intelligence e sicurezza strategica) ha reso noto che, secondo i mezzi d'informazione maliani, terroristi legati ai gruppi islamisti Ansar Eddine e al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb hanno distrutto vari luoghi religiosi nella città di Timbuctù demolendo anche un monumento iscritto nell'elenco del patrimonio mondiale UNESCO. I due gruppi islamisti hanno conquistato la città lo scorso marzo promulgando poi la Sharia. Hanno imposto il divieto di ascoltare musica e bere alcol e le donne e gli uomini non sposati non possono più frequentare i medesimi luoghi. Le donne sono ora obbligate a indossare il velo che copre il loro volto. L'approvvigionamento alimentare dalla capitale, Bamako, è stato interrotto e secondo la BBC i residenti di Timbuctù si sentono come detenuti nelle loro case.

Tra i Tuareg e gli islamisti separatisti entrati nel nord del Mali vi sono anche algerini. Si teme che il Mali diventi una nuova roccaforte di al-Qaeda. Il gruppo Ansar Eddine è comandato da un Tuareg aristocratico di nome Iyad Ag Ghaly che negli anni 90 ha guidato le insurrezioni contro i governi del Mali e del Niger. Secondo un esperto di questioni militari, Ghaly si è avvicinato ai salafiti radicali durante un soggiorno in Arabia Saudita. Si valuta che al gruppo Ansar Eddine appartengano tra 100 e 200 combattenti, molti dei quali hanno meno di 18 anni. Il gruppo, opponendosi al Movimento nazionale di liberazione di Azawad (MNLA), un movimento laico che si batte per l'indipendenza del Mali settentrionale, combatte per uno Stato islamico e gode della protezione dell'Algeria che confina a nord con il Mali.

1. Può il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante far sapere qual è la sua posizione rispetto alle tensioni tra MNLA e Ansar Eddine e rispetto all'imposizione di un governo radicale islamico nel Mali settentrionale?
2. Secondo il SEAE, esistono serie probabilità che al-Qaeda fondi una base strategica nel Mali settentrionale?
3. Intende il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante chiedere ragione al governo algerino di Abdelaziz Bouteflika del suo presunto sostegno al gruppo Ansar Eddine?

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

(11 luglio 2012)

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente segue attentamente la competizione tra MNLA e Ansar Eddine. Le relazioni e i rapporti di forza tra i due gruppi avranno infatti una considerevole incidenza su una potenziale soluzione negoziata con le autorità maliane, e quindi sul futuro del paese.

In merito all'imposizione di un governo radicale islamista, l'AR/VP segue con preoccupazione anche il deteriorarsi della situazione dei diritti umani nella regione, in particolare per quanto riguarda la libertà di coscienza e l'uguaglianza di genere, e appoggia la decisione dell'Ufficio del procuratore della Corte penale internazionale di seguire attentamente la situazione nel Mali.

Il peggioramento della situazione ha trasformato il Mali settentrionale in un vasto spazio senza governo, in balia del terrorismo e della criminalità. La situazione si è notevolmente degradata da quando è in mano a gruppi estremisti. Esiste ora il rischio che prendano il sopravvento estremisti legati al gruppo al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb. Per tale motivo seguiamo con particolare attenzione l'evolversi della situazione.

Al fine di trovare una soluzione politica negoziata della crisi, siamo convinti dell'importanza della collaborazione con i paesi limitrofi, tra cui l'Algeria.

Quest'ultima ha fatto sapere di essere in contatto con le autorità del Mali, il cui primo ministro si è recato in visita ad Algeri il 13 giugno, e con altre parti coinvolte nel conflitto. Manteniamo contatti regolari con l'Algeria, che ha anche ribadito il suo impegno a combattere il terrorismo e il suo attaccamento all'integrità territoriale del Mali.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005306/12**  
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**  
**Fiorello Provera (EFD)**  
(25 May 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Malian Islamists in Timbuktu

On 23 May 2012, the European Strategic Intelligence and Security Center reported that, according to Malian media reports, terrorists linked to the Islamic group Ansar Eddine and al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb had destroyed various religious sites in the town of Timbuktu, including a monument registered as a Unesco heritage site. The two Islamist groups took control of the town in March and have declared Sharia law. They have banned citizens from listening to music and drinking alcohol, and unmarried men and women can no longer mix. Women are now obliged to wear face veils. Food supplies from the capital, Bamako, have been disrupted, and the BBC has reported that residents of Timbuktu feel like 'prisoners in their houses'.

The Tuareg and Islamist separatists who have entered northern Mali also include Algerian nationals. There are fears that Mali could become a new stronghold for al-Qaeda. Ansar Eddine is led by an aristocratic Tuareg called Iyad Ag Ghaly. In the 1990s he led rebellions against governments in both Mali and Niger. One military affairs expert has suggested that Ghaly became involved with radical Salafis while spending time in Saudi Arabia. Ansar Eddine is estimated to have between 100 to 200 fighters, many of whom are under the age of 18. Ansar Eddine is opposed to the secular National Movement for the Liberation of Azawad (MNLA), which is fighting for independence in the north of Mali. Ansar Eddine, unlike the MNLA, is fighting for an Islamic state, and receives protection from Algeria, which lies to the north of Mali.

1. What is the position of the Vice-President/High Representative with regard to the tensions between the MNLA and Ansar Eddine, and with regard to the imposition of radical Islamic rule across northern Mali?
2. In the view of the EEAS, how serious is the potential for al-Qaeda to form a strategic base within northern Mali?
3. Is the Vice-President/High Representative prepared to ask the Algerian government of President Abdelaziz Bouteflika about its alleged support for Ansar Eddine?

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

The Vice-President/High Representative follows closely the competition between the MNLA and Ansar Eddine. Indeed, their relations and the balance of power between the two will have a significant bearing on a potential solution negotiated with the Malian authorities, and therefore on the future of the country.

Regarding the imposition of radical Islamist rule, the HR/VP follows also with great concern the deterioration of human rights in the region, especially freedom of conscience and gender equality and supports the decision of the prosecutor's office of the International Criminal Court (ICC) to follow closely the situation in Mali.

The worsening of the situation has converted Northern Mali into a large ungoverned space open to terrorist and criminal activities. The situation has deteriorated considerably with extremist groups in control. There is now a risk that extremists linked with AQIM get the upper hand. We therefore follow the situation with particular attention.

To find a political and negotiated solution to the crisis, we are convinced of the importance to work with neighbouring countries, including Algeria.

Algeria has indicated that it is in contact with the authorities of Mali, whose Prime Minister visited Algiers on June 13<sup>th</sup>, and other parties involved in the conflict. We remain in regular contact with Algeria which has also reaffirmed its commitment to fight terrorism and their attachment to the territorial integrity of Mali.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005307/12  
a la Comisión**

**Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)**

(25 de mayo de 2012)

*Asunto:* Directiva 96/53/CE del Consejo, de 25 de julio de 1996

Desde diferentes ámbitos relacionados con actividades productivas y el tráfico marítimo se plantea el incremento de capacidad de carga de vehículos pesados, con carácter general, hasta las 44 TM, limitada actualmente, con algunas excepciones, a 40 TM. Esta imposibilidad genera obstáculos de competitividad para las empresas y genera problemas en las importaciones cuando el vehículo es cargado con un peso superior en el país origen.

Esta cuestión no solamente afecta al transporte interior, sino también al internacional.

En el ámbito del transporte interior, diferentes países han adoptado medidas para ampliar con carácter general el peso máximo autorizado hasta las 44 TM en vehículos articulados (tractor y remolque). Recientemente lo han hecho Francia e Italia. Pero en el caso del transporte internacional, ese cambio solamente sería posible con la modificación de la Directiva 96/53/CE del Consejo, de 25 de julio de 1996.

1. ¿Qué opina la Comisión de modificar la Directiva 96/53/CE para ampliar el PMA hasta las 44 TM con carácter general, en composiciones 2+3 preferentemente y, en cualquier caso, en composiciones 3+3? Concretamente se trataría de modificar el anexo 1 de la Directiva 96/53/CE por lo que hace referencia al peso máximo autorizado de vehículos articulados de 5 o 6 ejes, incorporando 44 TM a todos los apartados del punto 2.2.2.

2. ¿No cree la Comisión que este cambio comportaría un ahorro energético, reducción de emisiones contaminantes, reducción de la congestión y aprovechamiento de la flota, e incrementaría la competitividad de las empresas?

**Respuesta del Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión**

(29 de junio de 2012)

La Comisión está trabajando actualmente en una posible revisión de la Directiva 96/53/CE y el tema de las 44 toneladas se examina en este contexto. No es posible prever en este momento si la Comisión va a proponer algún cambio en las normas sobre el peso, ya que el asunto se está empezando a estudiar. Entre diciembre de 2011 y febrero de 2012 se llevó a cabo una consulta pública, cuyos resultados se incluirán en el estudio de las diferentes opciones de revisión y sus consecuencias. La aprobación de la propuesta de la Comisión está prevista a finales de 2012. Se le adjuntará una evaluación de impacto que abordará temas como los mencionados por Su Señoría, desde las emisiones y la congestión hasta la competitividad del sector del transporte en su conjunto.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005307/12  
to the Commission**

**Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)**

(25 May 2012)

*Subject:* Council Directive 96/53/EC of 25 July 1996

A general increase in heavy vehicles' load capacity from the current limit of 40 tonnes to 44 tonnes (with some exceptions) has been proposed for sectors relating to manufacturing and shipping. This limitation makes companies less competitive and causes problems with imports when the vehicle is loaded to above that weight in the country of origin.

This issue affects both domestic and international transportation.

As regards domestic transportation, a number of countries — France and Italy for instance — have adopted measures for a generalised increase in the maximum authorised weight of articulated vehicles (cabs and trailers) to 44 tonnes. However, this could only be done at international level by amending Council Directive 96/53/EC of 25 July 1996.

1. What is the Commission's view of amending Directive 96/53/EC to increase the general maximum authorised weight to 44 tonnes, preferably for vehicles with two plus three axles and certainly for vehicles with three plus three axles? Specifically, this would require the amendment of Annex A of Directive 96/53/EC, which concerns the maximum authorised weight of five- or six-axle articulated vehicles, by inserting 44 tonnes into all paragraphs of item 2.2.2.
2. Does the Commission not believe that this change would save energy, reduce contaminating emissions, reduce congestion and fleet use and make companies more competitive?

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

(29 June 2012)

The Commission is currently working on a possible revision of Directive 96/53 and the issue of 44 tonnes is studied in this context. It is not possible to anticipate at present whether the Commission will propose any change to the weight rules, as a study is being currently undertaken. A public consultation was carried out between December 2011 and February 2012, the results of which will feed into the study of different options for the revision and their impacts. The Commission proposal is expected to be adopted at the end of 2012. It will be accompanied by an impact assessment covering issues such as those mentioned by the Honourable Member, from emissions and congestion to competitiveness of the transport sector as a whole.

---



(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005308/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**  
(25 Μαΐου 2012)

Θέμα: Project bonds

Στις 22 Μαΐου 2012, ο Αντιπρόεδρος της Επιτροπής κ. Ό. Ρεν εξέφρασε την ικανοποίησή του για την πολιτική συμφωνία για τα ομόλογα έργων (project bonds). Στην δήλωσή του αναφέρει ότι, δυνητικά, η προσπάθεια αυτή σε πιλοτικό στάδιο μπορεί να απελευθερώσει μέχρι και 4,6 δις ευρώ για την ενίσχυση των υποδομών και την διεκπεραίωση διακρατικών έργων.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Που βασίζεται ο ισχυρισμός ότι οι επιπτώσεις μόχλευσης των 230 εκ. ευρώ μπορεί να αποφέρει συνολικές επενδύσεις άνω των 4,5 δις ευρώ;
2. Καθώς στην ίδια δήλωση αναφέρεται πως η Επιτροπή καλεί τα κράτη μέλη στην δέσμευση άλλων 10 δις ευρώ από την Ευρωπαϊκή Τράπεζα Επενδύσεων, για την στήριξη της ανάπτυξης και των θέσεων απασχόλησης, είναι σε θέση η Επιτροπή να εξειδικεύσει τα μέτρα που προτείνει για την αξιοποίηση των χρημάτων αυτών προς τις δύο προαναφερόμενες κατευθύνσεις;

**Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(7 Αυγούστου 2012)

1. Στο πλαίσιο της πρωτοβουλίας της ΕΕ-ΕΤΕπ για τα ομόλογα χρηματοδότησης έργων, συνεισφορά ύψους 230 εκατ. ευρώ από τον προϋπολογισμό της ΕΕ θα χρησιμεύσει ως μέσο άμβλυνσης του κινδύνου για να χρηματοδοτήσει η ΕΤΕπ τα υποκείμενα έργα, ενώ η ΕΤΕπ θα πρέπει να καλύψει τους υπόλοιπους κινδύνους. Στην περίπτωση συνδυασμού των κεφαλαίων του προϋπολογισμού της ΕΕ με τη χρηματοδότηση της ΕΤΕπ μπορεί να επιτευχθεί σε αυτό το επίπεδο πολλαπλασιαστικό αποτέλεσμα περίπου της τάξης του 3.

Ωστόσο, η πιστωτική ενίσχυση της ΕΤΕπ θα καλύψει έως και 20 % του κύριου χρέους του έργου. Κατά συνέπεια, μπορεί να επιτευχθεί το τελικό πολλαπλασιαστικό αποτέλεσμα, όσον αφορά τον προϋπολογισμό της ΕΕ, της τάξης του 15-20 σε σύγκριση με το ύψος της επένδυσης. Επομένως, το συνολικό ύψος του προϋπολογισμού των 230 εκατ. ευρώ αναμένεται να κινητοποιήσει επενδύσεις ύψους έως 4,6 δις. ευρώ.

2. Κατόπιν προτάσεων της Επιτροπής και της ΕΤΕπ, το Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο του Ιουνίου κατέληξε στο συμπέρασμα ότι το καταβλημένο κεφάλαιο της ΕΤΕπ πρέπει να αυξηθεί κατά 10 δις. ευρώ, με σκοπό την ενίσχυση της βάσης κεφαλαίου της, καθώς και την αύξηση της συνολικής δανειοδοτικής της ικανότητας κατά 60 δις. ευρώ και, συνεπώς, την αποδέσμευση έως και 180 δις. ευρώ πρόσθετων επενδύσεων προς διάθεση σε ολόκληρη την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των πιο ευάλωτων χωρών. Η εν λόγω απόφαση πρέπει να ληφθεί από το Διοικητικό Συμβούλιο της ΕΤΕπ ώστε να διασφαλισθεί ότι θα τεθεί σε ισχύ το αργότερο έως τις 31 Δεκεμβρίου 2012.

Οι εκτιμήσεις δανεισμού βασίζονται στην αποδεδειγμένη ικανότητα μόχλευσης του ισολογισμού της ΕΤΕπ και στα προηγούμενα ποσοστά συγχρηματοδότησης των ιδιωτών δανειστών. Τα κεφάλαια θα χρησιμοποιηθούν για επενδύσεις σε κύριους τομείς της οικονομίας της ΕΕ, όπως καινοτομία και δεξιότητες, ΜΜΕ και εταιρείες μεσαίας κεφαλαιοποίησης, αποδοτικότητα πόρων και στρατηγικές υποδομές.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005308/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**  
(25 May 2012)

*Subject:* Project bonds

On 22 May 2012, Olli Rehn, Vice-President of the Commission, expressed his satisfaction at the political agreement on project bonds. In his statement he said that this initiative, which is already at pilot stage, could potentially unlock up to EUR 4 600 million to support infrastructure projects and complete transnational projects.

Will the Commission answer the following:

1. Can it explain how leveraging EUR 230 million will produce total investments of over EUR 4 500 million?
2. In the same statement, Olli Rehn said that the Commission is calling upon Member States to pledge another EUR 1 000 million from the European Investment Bank to support growth and jobs. Is the Commission in a position to specify its measures for using this money to support the abovementioned aims?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission**  
(7 August 2012)

1. Under the EU-EIB project bond initiative, EUR 230 million contribution from the EU budget will provide some risk cushion for the EIB to finance the underlying projects, whereas the EIB would have to cover the remaining risk. When EU budget funds are combined with the EIB financing, a multiplier effect at this level of around 3 can be achieved.

However, the EIB credit enhancement would cover up to 20% of the project senior debt. Thus, the final multiplier effect in terms of EU budget compared to the investment amount of around 15-20 can be achieved. Therefore, the total budget amount of EUR 230 million is expected to mobilise investments of up to EUR 4.6 billion.

2. Following proposals by the Commission and the EIB, the June European Council concluded that the EIB's paid-in capital should be increased by EUR 10 billion, with the aim of strengthening its capital basis as well as increasing its overall lending capacity by EUR 60 billion, and thus unlock up to EUR 180 billion of additional investment, spread across the whole European Union, including in the most vulnerable countries. This decision should be taken by the EIB Board of Governors so as to ensure that it enters into force no later than 31 December 2012.

The lending estimates are based on the proven leverage capacity of the EIB's balance sheet and on past co-financing ratios with private lenders. The funds will be deployed for investments in key sectors of the EU economy, such as innovation and skills, SMEs and mid-cap companies, resource efficiency and strategic infrastructure.

---

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005309/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**  
(25 Μαΐου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Αίτημα της Ελλάδας για αύξηση του προγράμματος της δωρεάν διανομής τροφίμων σε απόρους

Η Ελλάδα πρόσφατα ζήτησε από την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή την αύξηση στα 30 εκατ. ευρώ του συνολικού προϋπολογισμού του προγράμματος της δωρεάν διανομής τροφίμων σε απόρους για το 2013, λόγω της δύσκολης οικονομικής κατάστασης και του αυξανόμενου αριθμού απόρων. Παράλληλα έχει ζητηθεί να περιληφθούν τυριά, ζυμαρικά, ρύζι και ελαιόλαδο στα αγαθά που καλύπτει το συγκεκριμένο πρόγραμμα καθώς είναι συμβατά προϊόντα με την ελληνική διατροφή αλλά και συνδέονται με την παραγωγική αλυσίδα της χώρας.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Έγινε αποδεκτό το αίτημα της Ελλάδας για αύξηση του προϋπολογισμού για το συγκεκριμένο πρόγραμμα;
2. Εξετάζει θετικά το ενδεχόμενο να συμπεριληφθούν τα προϊόντα που πρότείνει η ελληνική πλευρά στο πρόγραμμα;
3. Είναι της άποψης η Επιτροπή ότι σε χώρες που πλήττονται ιδιαίτερα από την παρούσα οικονομική συγκυρία θα πρέπει να αναθεωρηθεί προς τα πάνω ο προϋπολογισμός του προγράμματος της δωρεάν διανομής τροφίμων σε απόρους;

**Απάντηση του κ. Ciolos εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(21 Ιουνίου 2012)

Σύμφωνα με την ισχύουσα νομοθεσία, τα κράτη μέλη που επιθυμούν να συμμετάσχουν στο σύστημα διανομής τροφίμων στους απόρους πρέπει να αποστέλλουν τα εθνικά τους προγράμματα διανομής τροφίμων μέχρι τις 31 Μαΐου <sup>(1)</sup>. Όσον αφορά το ετήσιο πρόγραμμα 2013, η Επιτροπή έλαβε 20 αιτήσεις για συμμετοχή, συμπεριλαμβανομένου του ελληνικού αιτήματος, τα οποία βρίσκονται τώρα σε στάδιο επεξεργασίας.

Ως επακόλουθο της έναρξης ισχύος του νέου νομικού πλαισίου του καθεστώτος <sup>(2)</sup>, τα κράτη μέλη επιλέγουν τα τρόφιμα προς διανομή στους απόρους με βάση αντικειμενικά κριτήρια, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της θρεπτικής αξίας και της καταλληλότητας για διανομή. Ως εκ τούτου, η επιλογή των τροφίμων δεν περιορίζεται πλέον σε όσα έχουν σχέση με προϊόντα για τα οποία εφαρμόζεται παρέμβαση, αλλά όλα τα είδη προϊόντων διατροφής, όπως το ελαιόλαδο, μπορούν τώρα να διανεμηθούν εφόσον τούτο προβλέπεται από το εθνικό πρόγραμμα διανομής τροφίμων. Η Επιτροπή υπενθυμίζει στο Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου ότι προϊόντα όπως το τυρί, τα ζυμαρικά και το ρύζι ήταν πάντα επιλέξιμα για διανομή.

Η Επιτροπή οφείλει να εγκρίνει το ετήσιο πρόγραμμα 2013 πριν την 1η Οκτωβρίου <sup>(3)</sup>. Για τους σκοπούς της κατανομής των διαθέσιμων πόρων μεταξύ των συμμετεχόντων κρατών μελών, η Επιτροπή θα λάβει υπόψη τις πλέον άρτιες εκτιμήσεις για τον αριθμό των απόρων στα οικεία κράτη μέλη, καθώς και τον τρόπο κατά τον οποίο πραγματοποιήθηκαν οι εργασίες και χρησιμοποιήθηκαν οι πόροι σε προηγούμενα έτη.

<sup>(1)</sup> Άρθρο 27 παράγραφος 2 του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1234/2007 του Συμβουλίου, και άρθρο 1 παράγραφος 2 του κανονισμού (ΕΕ) αριθ. 807/2010 της Επιτροπής.

<sup>(2)</sup> Κανονισμός (ΕΕ) αριθ. 121/2012 του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, με το οποίο τροποποιήθηκαν οι κανονισμοί (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1290/2005 και (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1234/2007.

<sup>(3)</sup> Άρθρο 2 του κανονισμού (ΕΕ) αριθ. 807/2010.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005309/12  
to the Commission**

**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**

(25 May 2012)

*Subject:* Greece requests a boost to the food distribution programme for the poor

Greece recently asked the European Commission for an increase in the EUR 30 million budgeted for the food distribution programme for the poor in 2013, due to the difficult economic situation and the rising number of poor people. At the same time, it asked that cheese, pasta, rice and olive oil be included in the goods provided under this programme since they are part of the Greek diet and also align with the country's supply chain.

Will the Commission answer the following:

1. Was Greece's request for an increase in the budget of this programme acceptable?
2. Is it likely to include the products suggested by Greece in the programme?
3. Does the Commission think that, in countries especially hard hit by the current economic crisis, the budget to distribute free food to the poor should be adjusted upwards?

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

(21 June 2012)

According to the applicable legislation, Member States wishing to participate in the food distribution scheme for the most deprived persons have to send their national food distribution programmes by 31 May <sup>(1)</sup>. As regards the 2013 annual plan, the Commission has received 20 requests for participation, including the Greek request, which are currently being processed.

Following the entry into force of the new legal frame of the scheme <sup>(2)</sup>, Member States shall choose food products to be distributed to the most deprived people on the basis of objective criteria, including nutritional values and suitability for distribution. Therefore, the choice of food stuffs is no longer limited to those having a link with products for which intervention applies but all kinds of food products, including olive oil, can now be distributed, if so provided by the National food distribution programme. The Commission reminds the Honourable Member that products as cheese, pasta and rice have always been eligible for distribution.

The Commission has to adopt the 2013 annual plan before 1 October <sup>(3)</sup>. For the purpose of allocating the available resources among the participating Member States, the Commission will take account of the best estimates of the number of the most deprived persons in the Member States concerned as well as of the way in which the operations were carried out and the uses made of the resources in previous years.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Article 27(2) of Council Regulation (EC) 1234/2007 and Article 1(2) of Commission Regulation (EU) No 807/2010.

<sup>(2)</sup> Regulation (EU) No 121/2012 of the European Parliament and the Council, which amended Council Regulations (EC) No 1290/2005 and (EC) No 1234/2007.

<sup>(3)</sup> Article 2 of Regulation (EU) No 807/2010.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005310/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**  
(25 Μαΐου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Πρόγραμμα Digi Mobile

Το πρόγραμμα Digi Mobile είναι ένα ακόμη ευρωπαϊκό πρόγραμμα που αποσκοπεί στην ενδυνάμωση των νέων επιχειρήσεων παρέχοντας νέες ψηφιακές δυνατότητες και υπηρεσίες υψηλής προστιθέμενης αξίας. Το πρόγραμμα αυτό επιδιώκει να βοηθήσει ακόμη περισσότερο τις επιχειρήσεις να συμβαδίσουν με τις νέες τεχνολογικές εξελίξεις, αλλά ταυτόχρονα και να ενισχύσει τις προσφερόμενες υπηρεσίες στους πελάτες τους.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Ποιο είναι το ποσό που έχει διατεθεί στις ελληνικές επιχειρήσεις για το σκοπό αυτό;

Ποιος άξονας επιχειρησιακού προγράμματος προβλέπεται να προσφέρει πόρους για το εν λόγω πρόγραμμα;

Ποιο είναι το συνολικό ύψος χρηματοδότησης αυτού του προγράμματος;

**Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(11 Ιουλίου 2012)

Το σχέδιο Digi-mobile συγχρηματοδοτείται στο πλαίσιο της προτεραιότητας 1 του προγράμματος ψηφιακής σύγκλισης, που συγχρηματοδοτείται από το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης.

Με την υπουργική απόφαση (ΦΕΚ 1450/Β') της 2ας Μαΐου 2012, το διαθέσιμο ποσό για τη συγχρηματοδότηση του εν λόγω σχεδίου ανέρχεται στα 30 150 000 ευρώ.

Οι προτάσεις επενδύσεων που υποβλήθηκαν από τις επιχειρήσεις βρίσκονται στη φάση αξιολόγησης· συνεπώς δεν έχει προκύψει ακόμη καμία δαπάνη, γεγονός που σημαίνει ότι δεν έχουν ακόμη γίνει πληρωμές στις επιχειρήσεις. Ο ενδιαμέσος φορέας για την υλοποίηση του σχεδίου αυτού είναι η εταιρεία «Κοινωνία της Πληροφορίας ΑΕ». Περισσότερες πληροφορίες σχετικά με το σχέδιο διατίθενται στην αποκλειστική δικτυακή πύλη: <http://digi-mobileportal.digitalaid.gr/>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005310/12  
to the Commission**

**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**

(25 May 2012)

*Subject:* Digi-Mobile programme

The Digi-Mobile programme is another European programme aimed at supporting new enterprises by providing new digital opportunities and high added-value services. The programme aims to help to enterprises keep up with new technological developments while simultaneously supporting the services offered to their customers.

Will the Commission answer the following:

How much funding has been made available to Greek enterprises for this purpose?

Where will the funding come from for this programme?

What is the total amount of funding for this programme?

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

(11 July 2012)

The project Digi-mobile is co-financed under priority 1 of the Digital Convergence Programme, co-financed by the European Regional Development Fund.

As per ministerial decision (ΦΕΚ 1450/Β') of 2 May 2012, the amount available to co-finance this project amounts to EUR 30 150 000.

The investment proposals submitted by enterprises are in the evaluation stage; hence no expenditure has occurred yet, which means that no payments have yet been made to the enterprises. The Intermediate Body for implementing this project is the Information Society SA. Further details concerning the project can be obtained via the dedicated web portal: <http://digi-mobileportal.digitalaid.gr/>

---

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005311/12**

**an die Kommission**

**Ulrike Rodust (S&D)**

(25. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Fischerei vor der Küste Somalias

Die außereuropäischen Aktivitäten der EU-Fischereipolitik stehen in der Kritik der europäischen Öffentlichkeit. Es steht der Vorwurf im Raum, europäische Trawler würden die Lebensgrundlagen vieler Fischer an den Küsten West- und Ostafrikas vernichten. Folge sei die Verarmung vieler Fischer in Afrika, die sich daher zum Teil der Piraterie an den Küsten Somalias zuwendeten oder zumindest von der Piraterie dort insofern profitierten, als sie die internationalen Fischereiaktivitäten am Horn von Afrika einschränke.

Sind der Kommission Zahlen bezüglich des Fischerei-Aufkommens vor der Küste Somalias bekannt?

Wird seitens der EU etwas unternommen, um sicherzustellen, dass die Menschen, die in Somalia an der Küste wohnen und sich vom Fischfang ernährten, wieder mehr Fisch im Meer vorfinden?

Was unternimmt die EU, um illegale Fischerei durch Schiffe unter der Flagge eines europäischen Staates oder anderer Staaten zu verhindern?

Welche Maßnahmen unternimmt die Europäische Union am Horn von Afrika, um die Fischerei als Lebensgrundlage der örtlichen Bevölkerung des entsprechenden Küstenstreifens in Somalia zu erhalten — vor allem in Anbetracht der Tatsache, dass kein funktionierender Staat vorhanden ist, der seine Küstengewässer vor illegaler Fischerei schützen könnte?

Ist der Kommission bekannt, was die zuständigen UN-Gremien (die Regionale Fischerei Management Organisationen IOTC und SWIOFC) zum nachhaltigen Management der Fischbestände am Horn von Afrika unternehmen?

**Antwort von Frau Damanaki im Namen der Kommission**

(31. Juli 2012)

Der Kommission ist die Situation vor der Küste Somalias bekannt. Nähere Informationen zum Fischfang im Indischen Ozean finden sich auf der Website der IOTC <sup>(1)</sup>.

Zusätzlich zu den Kontroll- und Überwachungsmaßnahmen der Mitgliedstaaten überprüft die Europäische Kommission die Aufzeichnungen des Satellitenüberwachungssystems <sup>(2)</sup> der EU-Schiffe in dem Gebiet und fordert die Behörden des Flaggenstaats auf, entsprechende Maßnahmen zu ergreifen, sobald ein Verstoß festgestellt wird. Dies war jedoch nicht der Fall, wie im Rahmen der Operation EU NAVFOR Atalanta <sup>(3)</sup> bestätigt wurde.

Als größter Geldgeber am Horn von Afrika und in Somalia finanziert die EU unzählige Soforthilfemaßnahmen/Maßnahmen zur Armutsbekämpfung, um für wirtschaftliche Entwicklung, Friedenskonsolidierung und politische Stabilität zu sorgen. Künftig könnte die EU auch den somalischen Strategie- und Aktionsplan unterstützen, durch den das Übel der Piraterie an den Wurzeln gepackt werden soll. Ziel dieser Strategie ist es, dass Somalia eigene Lösungen zur Verhinderung und Verdrängung von Piraterie entwickelt. Darüber hinaus sollen somalische Behörden und Gemeinschaften im Kampf gegen Piraterie unterstützt werden, wobei die Unterstützung auf den Erfahrungen der Zwischenstaatlichen Entwicklungsbehörde aufbauen wird.

EU-Unterstützung für Somalia ist auch im Rahmen des 10. Europäischen Entwicklungsfonds vorgesehen, um die für den Küstenstreifen zuständigen staatlichen und privaten Institutionen zu stärken. Dies schließt auch die Förderung der örtlichen Fischereiwirtschaft, des Handels und der Beschäftigung ein. Die diesbezügliche Pilotaktion wird sich zunächst auf Somaliland konzentrieren.

<sup>(1)</sup> Thunfischkommission für den Indischen Ozean: <http://www.iotc.org/English/data/databases.php#dl>

<sup>(2)</sup> Schiffüberwachungssystem (VMS, Vessel Monitoring System).

<sup>(3)</sup> EU-Seestreitkräfte im Indischen Ozean zur Bekämpfung von Piraterie, die über Fischfangaktivitäten in somalischen Gewässern berichtet.

Die EU als Vollmitglied und größter Geldgeber der IOTC hält sich an die entsprechenden Vorgaben und fördert eine nachhaltige Bestandsbewirtschaftung, damit es in Zukunft genug Fisch für alle gibt. Die EU ist nicht Mitglied der Thunfischkommission für den südwestlichen Indischen Ozean (SWIOTC), verfolgt aber deren Maßnahmen und beteiligt sich an einigen von ihnen.

---



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005311/12  
to the Commission  
Ulrike Rodust (S&D)  
(25 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Fishing off the Somali coast

Activities undertaken outside Europe under the common fisheries policy are the subject of much public criticism in Europe. Complaints are being made that European trawlers are destroying the livelihoods of many fishermen on the coasts of East and West Africa. This results in impoverishment among many fishermen in Africa, with the result that some of them have turned to piracy along the Somali coast while others profit from piracy, which restricts international fishing activity off the Horn of Africa.

Does the Commission have figures for the level of fishing off the coast of Somalia?

Is the EU taking steps to ensure that coastal dwellers in Somalia, who have traditionally lived on fish, will once again be able to catch fish?

What steps are being taken by the EU to prevent illegal fishing by ships operating under the flags of European or other states?

What is the European Union doing in the Horn of Africa to maintain fishing as the livelihood of the local population of the coastal areas of Somalia, particularly in view of the fact that this is not a fully functional state that is capable of protecting its coastal waters from illegal fishing?

Is the Commission aware of what the responsible UN bodies (the regional fishery management organisations of the IOTC (Indian Ocean Tuna Commission) and SWIOFC (Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission)) are doing to manage fish stocks sustainably in the Horn of Africa?

**Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission  
(31 July 2012)**

The Commission is aware of the situation off the coast of Somalia. Further information on fisheries in the Indian Ocean is available on the IOTC <sup>(1)</sup> website.

In addition to the control and monitoring carried out by the Member States, the European Commission monitors the satellite tracking records <sup>(2)</sup> of EU vessels in the area and asks the flag state authorities to take appropriate action if untoward activity is identified. This has not been the case, as confirmed by the EU Navfor Atalanta <sup>(3)</sup>.

As the first donor in Horn of Africa and Somalia, the EU funds a multitude of actions aiming at urgent relief/poverty alleviation promoting economic development, peace consolidation and political stability. In the future, the EU may support the Somalia Inland Strategy and Action Plan to address the root causes of piracy. The aim of this Strategy is to initiate home grown solutions to prevent and repress piracy and to support Somali administrations and communities in addressing piracy. This support will build on the Intergovernmental Authority on Development's experience.

EU support to Somalia is also foreseen under the 10th European Development Fund in order to strengthen public and private sector institutions responsible for the coastline. This also targets the promotion of local fish production, trade and employment. The pilot action under this framework will first target Somaliland.

The EU is a full member and the main financial contributor of the IOTC, complying with its rules and upholding sustainable fisheries management so that there is enough fish for all for the future. The EU is not a member of South West Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (SWIOTC) but follows its activities and contributes to some of them.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Indian Ocean Tuna Commission <http://www.iotc.org/English/data/databases.php#dl>.

<sup>(2)</sup> Vessel Monitoring System.

<sup>(3)</sup> EU naval force, operating in the Indian Ocean, fighting piracy, which reports on fishing in Somali waters.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005313/12**  
**a la Comisión**  
**Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)**  
(25 de mayo de 2012)

*Asunto:* Consecuencias de la nacionalización de Bankia en el mercado energético

La nacionalización de la matriz de Bankia, BFA, por parte del Gobierno español ha supuesto que éste haya entrado a formar parte de la junta de accionistas de diversas grandes empresas. Entre ellas se encuentra Iberdrola, en la cual BFA tenía el 5,37 % de las acciones de la corporación energética que han pasado a ser propiedad del Estado español.

Paralelamente, tal y como alertaba el diario *Expansión* en su edición del día 14 de mayo <sup>(1)</sup>, el Estado tiene participaciones de otras empresas del sector energético a través de la SEPI como es el caso del 20 % de Red Eléctrica y el 5 % de Enagás.

Además, el Gobierno central ha declarado que se plantea la posibilidad de nacionalizar también Nova Galicia y Catalunya Caixa <sup>(2)</sup>. De confirmarse tal extremo, el Gobierno central pasaría a controlar también el 8 % de Sacyr, que a su vez controla el 10 % de Repsol, que a su vez controla el 30 % de Gas Natural. También Catalunya Caixa tiene el 1,5 % de las acciones de Gas Natural.

A la luz del capítulo 1 del Título VII del Tratado de Lisboa, ¿cree la Comisión que las participaciones del Gobierno central en distintas empresas del sector energético pueden significar un obstáculo a la competencia en el sector energético?

¿Cree la Comisión que el Gobierno español mediante sus entidades debería liquidar parte de las participaciones que controla indirectamente en el sector energético?

**Respuesta del Sr. Almunia en nombre de la Comisión**  
(12 de julio de 2012)

Aunque los Estados miembros tengan participaciones dominantes en varias empresas, estas pueden considerarse empresas independientes si tienen poder de decisión autónomo.

Por lo que se refiere a la primera pregunta, si la participación del Estado español no es dominante o las empresas conservan poder de decisión autónomo, no se plantea ningún problema en virtud de las normas sobre concentraciones.

La segunda pregunta sólo es relevante si: i) el Estado español ha adquirido el control y ii) las empresas no retienen poder de decisión autónomo. En tales casos, las adquisiciones pueden constituir una operación de notificación obligatoria en virtud de la normativa de la UE sobre concentraciones. Si se constata que la concentración obstaculiza significativamente la competencia efectiva, puede ser necesario tomar medidas correctoras que pueden incluir las cesiones para hacer que la operación sea compatible con el mercado común.

Por lo que se refiere a las normas sobre ayudas estatales, la Comisión es consciente de la situación actual de Bankia/BFA. No obstante, como el caso al que se refiere Su Señoría es un asunto en curso, la Comisión no puede entrar en los detalles del caso.

En general, como Su Señoría sabe, la Comisión siempre ha exigido tres elementos a los bancos en reestructuración en toda Europa: el primero de ellos, contar con un plan creíble para volver a la viabilidad, el segundo, reducir los costes para el Estado al mínimo necesario y garantizar un adecuado reparto de las cargas, y, por último, limitar el impacto negativo sobre la competencia. En cuanto a la reducción de los costes para el Estado, la Comisión considera positivamente toda medida que obtenga capital de inversores privados a través de, por ejemplo, el refuerzo del capital de la entidad por parte de sus actuales acreedores, o que movilice recursos internos del banco, por ejemplo, las cesiones de activos con un valor de mercado superior al valor contable.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.gba.es/AEF/IMAG/20120514/20120514-0321.pdf>

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.vozpopuli.com/economia/3569-economia-planea-un-banco-malo-unico-para-las-entidades-nacionalizadas>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005313/12  
to the Commission**

**Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)**

(25 May 2012)

*Subject:* Consequences of the nationalisation of Bankia for the energy market

The nationalisation of Bankia's parent company, Banco Financiero y de Ahorro (BFA), by the Spanish Government means that the state now has stakes in numerous large companies. These include the energy company Iberdrola, 5.37% of whose shares were owned by BFA and have now become property of the Spanish Government.

At the same time, as reported on 14 May by the newspaper *Expansión* <sup>(1)</sup>, the Spanish Government is a shareholder in other energy-sector companies through the Sociedad Estatal de Participaciones Industriales: it owns 20% of Red Eléctrica and 5% of Enagás, for example.

Moreover, the Spanish Government has said it is also looking into nationalising Nova Galicia and Catalunya Caixa <sup>(2)</sup>. If this were to happen, the Spanish Government would also take over an 8% stake in Sacyr, which in turn owns 10% of Repsol, which in turn owns 30% of Gas Natural. Catalunya Caixa also owns 1.5% of the shares in Gas Natural.

In view of Title VII, Chapter 1 of the Treaty of Lisbon, does the Commission believe that the Spanish Government's ownership of stakes in various energy-sector companies could represent an obstacle to competition in the sector?

Does the Commission believe that the Spanish Government should sell off some of the stakes that it indirectly controls in the energy sector?

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

(12 July 2012)

Even if Member States have controlling interests in several companies, these companies can be considered as independent companies if they have an independent power of decision.

As regards the first question, if the stake of the Spanish state is non-controlling or the companies retain independent power of decision, no issue arises under the merger rules.

The second question is only pertinent if (i) the Spanish state has acquired control and (ii) the companies do not retain independent powers of decision. The acquisitions may then constitute a notifiable operation under the EU merger rules. Should the merger then be found to significantly impede effective competition; remedies that may include divestitures may be required to render the operation compatible with the common market.

As regards the state aid rules, the Commission is aware of the current situation Bankia/BFA. However, as the case the Honourable Member refers to is an ongoing case, the Commission is not in the position of entering in the details of the case.

In general, as the Honourable Member knows, the Commission has consistently required three elements to banks under restructuring across Europe: first to have a credible plan for returning to viability, second to reduce the cost to the State to the minimum necessary and ensure appropriate burden sharing, and finally to limit the negative impact on competition. In regards to the reduction of cost to the State, the Commission views positively any measure that raises capital from private investors through, for example by strengthening the capital of the entity by its current creditors, or that mobilises resources internal to the bank, for example divestments of assets with a market value above book value.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.gba.es/AEF/IMAG/20120514/20120514-0321.pdf>

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.vozpopuli.com/economia/3569-economia-planea-un-banco-malo-unico-para-las-entidades-nacionalizadas>

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005314/12**  
**à Comissão**  
**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)**  
(29 de maio de 2012)

*Assunto:* Concessão de preferências comerciais autónomas de emergência ao Paquistão

Em Portugal, representantes dos setores da indústria do calçado, componentes, artigos de pele e seus sucedâneos têm vindo, com insistência, a expressar a sua preocupação com o impacto que terá nestes setores a proposta de concessão de preferências comerciais autónomas de emergência ao Paquistão. Recorde-se que esta proposta surgiu na sequência das cheias que afetaram o país em 2010. Como então afirmámos, impunham-se formas de ajuda efetiva e uma solidariedade genuína com as populações deste país. Mas as cheias acabaram por ser apenas um pretexto para satisfazer os interesses daqueles que, na Europa, vão beneficiar com estas medidas, mesmo que com prejuízo dos países e regiões mais dependentes das indústrias como o têxtil, vestuário, calçado, componentes, artigos de pele e seus sucedâneos.

Entre outros aspetos, os setores referidos têm vindo salientar que consideram imperioso que:

- Por um lado, que todos os produtos incluídos nas posições NC 64.03 integrem a lista de produtos mais sensíveis;
- Por outro lado, que a vigência das medidas seja apenas de 1 ano (2013) já que o ano de 2012 está totalmente programado, impedindo assim que fossem postos em causa os compromissos assumidos e as expectativas criadas.

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

1. Qual o ponto de situação das negociações relativamente a esta questão?
2. Está a Comissão disponível para acolher estas preocupações?
3. De que forma está o agravamento da situação económica em países, como Portugal, e regiões mais dependentes destas indústrias a ser considerado pela Comissão nesta discussão?
4. Como está a ser considerada a questão das restrições à exportação de matéria-prima (algodão, peles e curtumes) — direitos e outras — por parte do Paquistão?

**Resposta dada por Karel De Gucht em nome da Comissão**  
(20 de junho de 2012)

No seguimento do pedido feito nas Conclusões do Conselho Europeu de setembro de 2010 no sentido de serem concedidas preferências comerciais ao Paquistão devido à situação causada pelas inundações, a Comissão apresentou uma proposta de regulamento que permitirá ao Paquistão exportar para a UE, com isenção de direitos, um número limitado de produtos por um curto período. Em fevereiro de 2012, a Organização Mundial do Comércio (OMC) concedeu à UE um instrumento denominado renúncia — uma derrogação da cláusula de nação mais favorecida — permitindo-lhe a concessão dessas preferências. A renúncia concede menos privilégios do que a UE propôs, devido às preocupações expressas por outros membros da OMC.

Na sequência da decisão da OMC, o Conselho retomou os seus trabalhos relativos à proposta de regulamento e, face à situação económica de certos Estados-Membros, acordou, em maio de 2012, em introduzir novos ajustamentos no pacote de medidas económicas, tais como um aumento dos contingentes pautais e uma redução dos volumes, bem como a introdução de uma cláusula de salvaguarda.

O diálogo tripartido está prestes a começar, na sequência da decisão da Comissão INTA do Parlamento Europeu de avançar com esse diálogo com base nas alterações anteriores, votadas em plenário em março de 2011.

O compromisso proposto pelo Conselho reduzirá de forma significativa as preferências que a Comissão tinha proposto, tanto em termos da cobertura dos produtos como da duração, a fim de acolher as preocupações expressas por vários Estados-Membros, a situação económica atual nalguns deles, bem como as restrições que o Paquistão mantém sobre as suas exportações de determinadas matérias-primas. Porém, ao abrigo desse compromisso, o Paquistão continua ainda assim a receber apoio, tal como preconizado pelo Conselho Europeu, para nos esforços de recuperação da sua economia, afetada pelas inundações de 2010 e também de 2011.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005314/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)**  
(29 May 2012)

*Subject:* Granting emergency autonomous trade preferences for Pakistan

In Portugal, representatives from the footwear, components, leather goods and leather substitutes sectors have repeatedly expressed concern about the impact that the proposal for granting emergency autonomous trade preferences for Pakistan will have on their sectors. It should be noted that this proposal arose as a result of the floods that hit the country in 2010. As we then argued, the situation called for effective forms of aid and genuine solidarity with the people of this country. But the floods ended up being a cover for satisfying the interests of those in Europe that will benefit from these measures, to the detriment of countries and regions that are more dependent on industries such as textiles, clothing, footwear, components, leather goods and leather substitutes.

Among other things, these sectors emphasise that they consider it essential:

- that all products under tariff heading CN 64.03 be included in the list of the most sensitive products;
- that the measures last for only one year (2013) since 2012 is fully scheduled, so as not to jeopardise the commitments made and expectations raised.

In view of the above, can the Commission state:

1. What is the current state of play of negotiations on this issue?
2. Is the Commission willing to accommodate these concerns?
3. How will the Commission take account in these discussions of the worsening economic situations in regions and countries, such as Portugal, that are most dependent on these industries?
4. How will Pakistan's export restrictions on raw materials (cotton, leather and hides) — rights and duties — be taken into account?

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

Following the European Council conclusions of September 2010 calling for trade preferences to be granted to Pakistan following the floods, the Commission put forward a proposal for a regulation which would allow Pakistan to import duty-free into the EU a limited number of products for a short period of time. In February 2012, the World Trade Organisation (WTO) granted the EU a so-called waiver — an exception from the Most Favoured Nation rule — allowing it to grant these preferences. The waiver gives less than what the EU proposed following concerns expressed by other WTO Members.

Following the WTO decision, the Council resumed its work on the proposed Regulation and, against the background of the economic situation in certain Member States, agreed in May 2012, to further adjustments on the economic package, such as an increase in tariff-rate quotas and a reduction of the volumes as well as the introduction of a safeguard clause.

The trilogue is about to start following the European Parliament's INTA Committee decision to proceed with the trilogue on the basis of the previous amendments voted in plenary in March 2011.

The Council compromise would significantly reduce the preferences the Commission had proposed, both in terms of product coverage and duration, in order to take into account the concerns expressed by a number of Member States, the current economic situation in some Member States as well as the restrictions Pakistan maintains on its export of certain raw material. On the other hand, it would still give support to Pakistan, as called for by the European Council, to assist in the recovery of Pakistan's economy from the 2010, but also 2011 floods.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-005316/12  
alla Commissione**

**Debora Serracchiani (S&D)**

(29 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Ecobonus

Considerando che:

- l'Ecobonus è l'incentivo nazionale diretto a tutte le imprese di autotrasporto con l'obiettivo di sostenerle a fare il miglior uso possibile delle rotte marittime, trasferendo così quote crescenti di merci dalla gomma alle più convenienti e meno inquinanti vie del mare;
- Allo stato attuale i mezzi pesanti che utilizzano abitualmente le cosiddette «Autostrade del Mare» sono circa 1 500 000 l'anno. In tali condizioni le navi delle Autostrade del Mare possono contare su una capacità di riempimento di stiva che si attesta intorno al 50 %. Un ulteriore aumento pari al 50 % è pertanto ottenibile senza aggiuntivi costi economici, sociali ed ambientali;
- Risulta che l'incentivo è stato approvato dal governo italiano, ma prima di essere effettivamente erogato deve ottenere l'approvazione della Commissione europea. La richiesta di approvazione è stata inviata dall'Italia a metà marzo 2012;
- Un maggior utilizzo dell'Autostrade del Mare in Italia è sempre più fondamentale in considerazione della morfologia del territorio;
- Proprio le normative sui tempi di guida e riposo e sugli orari di lavoro particolarmente stringenti per l'Italia, possono avere un impatto più accettabile se vengono incrementate le quote dei mezzi merci viaggianti su navi e pertanto sarebbe importante la concessione dell'Ecobonus per il 2012 e per gli anni successivi;

Può la Commissione accelerare la procedura che autorizza il governo italiano a sbloccare l'erogazione dei fondi relativi al 2010 ed al 2011, già destinati all'Ecobonus?

Può la Commissione introdurre delle misure incentivanti del trasporto intermodale, tipo Ecobonus, in vista anche del ruolo strategico delle Autostrade del Mare?

**Risposta di Joaquín Almunia a nome della Commissione**

(22 giugno 2012)

La Commissione sta valutando la conformità della notifica formale, presentata dalle autorità italiane, con la normativa vigente sugli aiuti di Stato.

Tuttavia, la notifica del regime Ecobonus è considerata ancora incompleta. L'ultima richiesta di informazioni supplementari è stata inviata alle autorità italiane il 16 maggio 2012 e una volta che tutte le informazioni necessarie saranno pervenute, la Commissione adotterà una decisione il prima possibile.

La notifica formale presentata dalle autorità italiane concerneva esclusivamente la proroga del regime Ecobonus per gli anni 2010 e 2011 e non conteneva alcuna indicazione dell'intenzione delle autorità italiana di estendere il programma anche al 2012 e oltre.

Le autostrade del mare sono una delle priorità del programma della rete transeuropea di trasporto, che sostiene lo sviluppo di infrastrutture di trasporto e di soluzioni di interesse comune, come ad esempio i sistemi elettronici interoperabili per lo scambio dei dati e carburanti alternativi più ecologici per la navigazione. Il programma Marco Polo sostiene il trasferimento delle merci dalla strada verso altri modi più rispettosi dell'ambiente (compreso il trasporto marittimo a corto raggio). Queste azioni di supporto continueranno nell'ambito del nuovo meccanismo «Connecting Europe Facility» <sup>(1)</sup>, il quadro generale proposto per i settori del trasporto, dell'energia e delle infrastrutture a banda larga.

(<sup>1</sup>) La documentazione è disponibile in lingua inglese agli indirizzi in [http://ec.europa.eu/transport/infrastructure/connecting\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/transport/infrastructure/connecting_en.htm) e [http://ec.europa.eu/transport/infrastructure/revision-t\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/transport/infrastructure/revision-t_en.htm)

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-005316/12  
to the Commission  
Debora Serracchiani (S&D)  
(29 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Ecobonus

Given that:

- The Ecobonus is an Italian incentive scheme for all road transport businesses that aims to help them make the best possible use of sea connections, thereby shifting increasing volumes of freight from roads to more convenient and less polluting sea routes;
- Around 1 500 000 HGVs per year make use of the so-called 'Marine Highways'. This means that Marine Highway ships can reckon with a hold-filling capacity of approximately 50%, a figure which could hence be increased by a further 50% without any additional economic, social or environmental costs;
- The incentive seems to have been approved by the Italian Government, but must be approved by the European Commission before financing is disbursed. The application for approval was sent by Italy in mid-March 2012;
- Greater use of the Marine Highways in Italy is all the more vital in view of the country's topography;
- The impact of Italy's particularly stringent rules on driving and rest times and work schedules could be mitigated by an increase in the volume of goods vehicles travelling by ship, making it important that the Ecobonus be granted for 2012 and subsequent years.

Can the Commission speed up the authorisation process to allow the Italian Government to unblock the funding for 2010 and 2011 already earmarked for the Ecobonus?

Given the strategic role of the Marine Highways, can the Commission introduce other incentives for inter-modal transport, along the lines of the Ecobonus?

**Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission  
(22 June 2012)**

The Italian authorities have submitted a formal notification which is under assessment for compliance with applicable state aid rules.

The Commission still considers the notification of the Ecobonus scheme to be incomplete. The last request for additional information was sent to the Italian authorities on 16 May 2012. Once all relevant information is received, the Commission will adopt a decision as soon as possible.

The formal notification submitted by the Italian authorities exclusively concerned the prolongation of the Ecobonus scheme for 2010 and 2011. There is currently no indication that the Italian authorities intend to extend the scheme to 2012 and beyond.

Motorways of the sea are one of the priorities of the trans-European transport network programme, which provides support to the development of transport infrastructure as well as to solutions of wider benefit, like interoperable electronic data exchange systems and alternative cleaner fuels for shipping. The Marco Polo programme supports transfer of freight from road to more sustainable modes of transport (including short sea shipping). These support actions will continue under the broader framework proposed for the area of transport, energy and broadband infrastructure: 'Connecting Europe Facility' <sup>(1)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> The documentation can be found in: [http://ec.europa.eu/transport/infrastructure/connecting\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/transport/infrastructure/connecting_en.htm) and in: [http://ec.europa.eu/transport/infrastructure/revision-t\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/transport/infrastructure/revision-t_en.htm).



(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005317/12  
a la Comisión**

**Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)**

(29 de mayo de 2012)

*Asunto:* Proyecto de unificación de organismos reguladores

El pasado 24 de febrero el Gobierno español aprobó un Anteproyecto de Ley de creación de la Comisión Nacional de Mercados y Competencia que conllevará, en caso de aprobarse en dichos términos, la unificación de todos los reguladores existentes (Comisión Nacional de Competencia, Comisión Nacional de Energía, Comisión del Mercado de las Telecomunicaciones y Comisión Nacional del Sector Postal) en un nuevo y único organismo supervisor.

En cualquier organismo regulador la garantía de independencia es fundamental, por ello, las Directivas europeas establecen con claridad que los miembros de los consejos de las autoridades reguladoras se nombran para un mandato fijo. Las citadas Directivas establecen (en sus artículos 35 y siguientes y 39 y siguientes, respectivamente) que los Estados miembros han de garantizar que éstos solo puedan ser destituidos durante su mandato cuando ya no cumplan las condiciones establecidas en la propia Directiva o hayan sido declarados culpables de falta con arreglo al Derecho interno (artículo 35, apartado 5 y artículo 39, apartado 5, respectivamente). Similares garantías de independencia contienen igualmente la Directiva Marco 2002/21/CE y la Directiva 97/67/CE.

El Anteproyecto prevé el cese anticipado a todos los Consejos de los distintos organismos reguladores, sin que medie ninguna de las causas anteriores y sin norma transitoria alguna. De hecho, la puesta en marcha de la nueva Comisión empieza justamente con el cese de los Consejos de los organismos reguladores. Con ello se socava la independencia en evidente contravención del Derecho de la Unión.

Una norma parecida ha sido aprobada en Hungría, que ha sido llevada al Tribunal de Justicia de la UE por la Comisión Europea por socavar la independencia de sus organismos reguladores y contravenir el Derecho de la Unión.

1. ¿Cree la Comisión que, con la aprobación de este anteproyecto de ley que propone la disolución de las comisiones reguladoras existentes, para «evitar duplicidades y contradicciones» que no se acreditan y «generar ahorros» no detallados, y que propone el cese anticipado de los consejeros, se puede reforzar la credibilidad de las comisiones así como la independencia de los consejeros?

2. ¿Tiene en cuenta la Comisión el precedente de Hungría para analizar el caso español?

**Respuesta de la Sra. Kroes en nombre de la Comisión**

(6 de julio de 2012)

Tal como indica en su respuesta a las preguntas escritas E-3083/12 y E-4856/12 <sup>(1)</sup>, la Comisión está al tanto de que el Gobierno español ha anunciado planes para el establecimiento de una sola entidad reguladora nacional, la Comisión Nacional de los Mercados y la Competencia (CNMC), que integra a la Comisión Nacional de Competencia (CNC) y a distintos reguladores de sector, incluidas la Comisión del Mercado de las Telecomunicaciones (CMT) y la Comisión Nacional de Energía (CNE). La Comisión ha recibido una notificación del programa nacional de reformas, que prevé la aprobación de una ley a tal fin. No obstante, hasta el momento no se ha remitido a las Cortes el anteproyecto definitivo.

Al amparo del Derecho de la UE, los Estados miembros gozan de un alto grado de autonomía a la hora de establecer sus órganos reguladores de sector y de la competencia, y asignarles las distintas funciones, siempre que se cumplan todos los requisitos impuestos por el Derecho de la UE en la creación de estos órganos y el desempeño de sus cometidos. En los sectores de las comunicaciones electrónicas y de la energía, por ejemplo, las Directivas de la UE pertinentes establecen disposiciones en materia de independencia de las entidades reguladoras, especialmente la prohibición de recibir instrucciones de otros órganos. Concretamente, el artículo 3 de la Directiva 2002/21/CE <sup>(2)</sup>, en el sector de las comunicaciones electrónicas, y el artículo 35 de la Directiva 2009/72/CE y el artículo 39 de la Directiva 2009/73/CE <sup>(3)</sup>, en el sector de la energía, establecen requisitos específicos relativos a las condiciones aplicables al cese del responsable de la entidad reguladora nacional.

La Comisión concede una gran importancia al principio de independencia de las entidades reguladoras nacionales y va a examinar si las propuestas definitivas que se adopten cumplen el Derecho de la UE.

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

<sup>(2)</sup> Directiva 2002/21/CE modificada por la Directiva 2009/140/CE, DO L 337 de 18.12.2009.

<sup>(3)</sup> Directiva 2009/72/CE, DO L 211 de 14.8.2009, y Directiva 2009/73/CE, DO L 211 de 14.8.2009.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005317/12  
to the Commission**

**Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)**

(29 May 2012)

*Subject:* Project to unify regulatory bodies

On 24 February 2012, the Spanish Government approved a draft bill to create the National Markets and Competition Authority, which, if adopted under the proposed terms, will unify all of the existing regulators (the National Competition Authority, the National Energy Authority, the Telecommunications Market Authority and the National Postal Sector Authority) into a new, single supervisory body.

Guaranteed independence is vital in any regulatory body. Therefore, EU directives clearly establish that members of regulatory authority councils are to be appointed for a fixed term of office. Articles 35 et seq. and 39 et seq. of these directives state that Member States must guarantee that councillors can only be removed during their term of office if they no longer fulfil the conditions laid down in the directive in question, or when they are found guilty of misconduct under national law (Article 35(5), and Article 39(5), respectively). Framework Directive 2002/21/EC and Directive 97/67/EC contain similar guarantees of independence.

The draft bill provides for early removal from office in all of the Councils of the various regulatory bodies, without any of the above causes existing and without any transitional rule. In fact, the new Authority starts up precisely as the Councils of the regulatory bodies cease to be. This undermines independence, in clear contravention of European Union law.

Hungary has approved a similar rule, which caused the Commission to take it to the Court of Justice of the EU for undermining the independence of its regulatory bodies and contravening European Union law.

1. Does the Commission believe that approval of this draft bill — which proposes the dissolution of the existing regulatory authorities, and the early removal from office of councillors, in order to ‘avoid duplications and contradictions’ that are not established and ‘generate savings’ that are not detailed — can enhance the credibility of the regulatory authorities and the independence of councillors?
2. Does the Commission take account of the precedent of Hungary when studying the Spanish case?

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

(6 July 2012)

As indicated in our replies to written questions E-3083/12 and E-4856/12 <sup>(1)</sup>, the Commission is aware of the Spanish Government’s announced plans for the establishment of a single national regulatory authority, the National Commission for Markets and Competition (CNMC), merging the national competition authority (CNC) and different sector regulators, including the Telecommunications Market Commission (CMT) and the National Energy Commission (CNE). The Commission received notification of the Spanish National Reform Programme which foresees the adoption of a law to this effect. However, the final draft law has so far not been submitted to the Spanish Parliament.

Under EC law, Member States have a considerable degree of autonomy in deciding how to set up their competition and sector regulatory bodies and to allocate functions between them provided that any requirements imposed by EC law in setting up these bodies and in carrying out their tasks are duly complied with. In the electronic communications and in the energy sectors for instance, the relevant EU Directives contain specific provisions about the independence of regulatory authorities, especially a prohibition to receive instructions from other bodies. In particular, for electronic communications Article 3 of Directive 2002/21/EC <sup>(2)</sup> and for energy Article 35 of Directive 2009/72/EC and Article 39 of Directive 2009/73/EC <sup>(3)</sup> contain specific requirements regarding the conditions for dismissal of the head of the national regulatory authority.

The Commission attaches great importance to the principle of independence of the national regulatory authorities, and will analyse the compliance with EC law of the final proposals to be adopted.

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

<sup>(2)</sup> Directive 2002/21/EC as amended by Directive 2009/140/EC, OJ L 337, 18.12.2009.

<sup>(3)</sup> Directive 2009/72/EC, OJ L 211, 14.8.2009 and Directive 2009/73/EC, OJ L 211, 14.8.2009.

(Dansk udgave)

**Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-005318/12**  
**til Kommissionen**  
**Jens Rohde (ALDE)**  
(29. maj 2012)

Om: Støtte til bilproducenter

Den økonomiske krise har ført til et fald i salget af personbiler i EU. Kommissionens egne tal viser at, i perioden fra januar til april i år er der blevet solgt 7,5 procent færre personbiler i EU end i 2011. Krisen skaber samtidig store forskelle fra land til land i forhold til salget. Eksempelvis er salget i Tyskland kun gået 2 procent frem, mens salget i Frankrig er faldet med hele 18 procent.

Ifølge en pressemeddelelse fra EU's industrikommissær Antonio Tajani mødes denne onsdag den 6. juni 2012 med lederen af brancheorganisationen European Automobile Manufacturers' Association (ACEA) for at diskutere, hvordan bilbranchen kan hjælpes.

Hvad er Kommissionens vurdering af sektorens økonomiske situation særligt i forhold til, om den skulle være ramt forholdsmæssigt hårdere af den økonomiske krise? Kan Kommissionen garantere at eventuelle tiltage, som den måtte påtænke at iværksætte, fuldt ud vil respektere det indre marked?

**Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Antonio Tajani**  
(13. juli 2012)

Kommissionen henviser det ærede medlem til sit svar på skriftlig forespørgsel E-005202/2012 af Sergio Berlato (PPE).

Bilindustrien er under særligt pres i den nuværende økonomiske situation. Det skal dog bemærkes, at det ikke er en generel krise, da der findes store forskelle mellem virksomheder og markeder. Foranstaltninger, som Kommissionen eventuelt måtte træffe, vil naturligvis overholde de almindelige principper for det indre marked og om muligt forstærke disse.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005318/12  
to the Commission  
Jens Rohde (ALDE)  
(29 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Support for car manufacturers

The economic crisis has led to a fall in car sales in the EU. From January to April 2012, the Commission's figures show a 7.5% drop in EU car sales compared to the same period in 2011. At the same time, the crisis has caused large sales differences in other countries. For example, sales in Germany increased by 2%, while sales in France fell by as much as 18%.

In a press release, EU Commissioner for Industry and Entrepreneurship Antonio Tajani has announced a meeting this Wednesday, 6 June 2012, with the head of the European Automobile Manufacturers' Association (ACEA), to discuss how best to help the automotive industry.

What is the Commission's view on this sector's economic situation? In particular, does it consider the sector is being hit harder than other sectors by the economic crisis? Can the Commission guarantee that any measures it may be envisaging will fully respect the single market?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission  
(13 July 2012)**

The Commission would like to kindly refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-005202/2012 by Mr Sergio Berlato (PPE).

The automotive industry is under particular pressure in the current economic situation. It has to be noted, however, that it is not a general crisis, as large differences exist among companies and markets. Any measures the Commission might undertake will naturally respect and where possible even reinforce single market principles.

---

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005319/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Werner Langen (PPE)**  
(29. Mai 2012)

*Betrifft:* Entsprechungsklauseln im EU-Beihilferecht

Die von der Kommission eingesetzte Hochrangige Sachverständigengruppe für Schlüsseltechnologien (KET) kommt in ihrem Abschlussbericht vom Juni 2011 zu dem Schluss, dass die geltende Entsprechungsklausel im Bereich Forschung, Entwicklung und Innovation auf die Bereiche Produktentwicklung und Produktion ausgedehnt werden sollte. Dies sollte es den Mitgliedstaaten ermöglichen, ohne Verletzung von WTO-Recht Produktentwicklung und -herstellung so zu fördern, dass ihre Unternehmen im Vergleich mit ihren globalen Mitbewerbern nicht im Nachteil sind. Andernfalls könne Europa im Bereich der Schlüsseltechnologien erheblich ins Hintertreffen geraten.

Kann die Kommission dazu folgende Fragen beantworten:

1. Zieht die Kommission aus dieser Forderung der von ihr eingesetzten Expertengruppe konkrete Konsequenzen?
2. Falls ja, welches sind die nächsten Schritte, die dazu geplant sind?
3. Wie sehen die Erfahrungen mit der Entsprechungsklausel im Bereich Staatsbeihilfen aus?

**Antwort von Herrn Tajani im Namen der Kommission**  
(13. Juli 2012)

Die Kommission ist sich bewusst, dass Europa im Bereich der Entwicklung und Herstellung von auf Schlüsseltechnologien (KET) basierenden Produkten ständig unter hohem Wettbewerbsdruck steht. Weltweit herrscht starke Konkurrenz bei der Entwicklung von KET und bei der Herstellung darauf basierender Produkte. Obwohl Europa bei der Forschung und Entwicklung (FuE) unangefochten führend ist, hat es Schwierigkeiten dabei, aus diesem Wissen vermarktbar Produkte zu machen und wettbewerbsfähige Unternehmen aufzubauen, die KET-basierte Produkte herstellen.

Die Kommission tritt für eine integrierte und ausgereifte KET-Politik ein, die sicherstellt, dass die EU ihr Potenzial maximal ausschöpft, die KET in der Industrie zum Einsatz kommen und die Wettbewerbsmärkte effizient funktionieren. Die Kommission hat dafür am 26. Juni 2012 die Mitteilung „Eine europäische Strategie für Schlüsseltechnologien — Eine Brücke zu Wachstum und Beschäftigung“ angenommen.

Die Kommission ist der Ansicht, dass FuE-Aktivitäten und großangelegte Investitionen in die KET durch den bestehenden Rahmen für staatliche Beihilfen für Forschung, Entwicklung und Innovation (FuEu) gefördert werden können.

Die „Entsprechungsklausel“ ist im Rahmen für staatliche Beihilfen für FuEu ausdrücklich vorgesehen, wobei die Kommission darauf hinweist, dass bislang noch kein Mitgliedstaat sich auf die Klausel berufen oder sie in Anspruch genommen hat. Die Kommission leitete Anfang dieses Jahres eine öffentliche Konsultation über den Rahmen für staatliche Beihilfen für FuEu ein und untersuchte in diesem Zusammenhang auch die Inanspruchnahme und die Notwendigkeit/Relevanz der „Entsprechungsklausel“. Sie analysiert derzeit die Antworten, die von den Mitgliedstaaten und anderen Interessenträgern eingegangen sind.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005319/12  
to the Commission  
Werner Langen (PPE)  
(29 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Matching clauses in EC law on state aid

In its final report of June 2011, the High Level Expert Group on Key Enabling Technologies appointed by the Commission concludes that the current matching clause in the area of research, development and innovation should be expanded to include product development and production. This should enable the Member States to support product development and production in such a way that their businesses are not placed at a disadvantage in comparison with their global competitors, while still avoiding any breach of World Trade Organisation law. Otherwise, there is a danger that Europe could be left far behind in the area of key technologies.

In this regard, can the Commission answer the following:

1. Has the Commission drawn any specific conclusions from this call by its expert group?
2. If so, what steps does it plan to take next in this matter?
3. What experience has been gained with matching clauses in the area of state aid?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission  
(13 July 2012)**

The Commission recognises that Europe's competitive position as a developer and manufacturer of KETs based products is continually being challenged. There is intense global competition to develop KETs and manufacture KET-based products. Despite Europe's considerable leadership in the R & D domain it has difficulties, however, transforming this knowledge into marketable products and building competitive companies in KET-based products.

The Commission will advocate for an integrated, fully fledged KETs policy allowing for a maximum exploitation of the EU's potentials and the industrial deployment of KETs in the EU, while ensuring efficient and competitive markets. To this aim the Commission adopted on 26 June 2012 the communication on 'A European strategy for KETs — a bridge to growth and jobs'.

The Commission is of the opinion that R & D activities and large scale investments in KETs can be facilitated under the existing Community Framework for State Aid for R & D&I.

The 'matching clause' is expressly provided in the framework for State Aid for R & D&I and the Commission points out that it has never been invoked or exploited by any Member State until now. The Commission launched a public consultation on the R & D&I State Aid Framework in the beginning of this year and enquired in this context also about the use and necessity/relevance of the 'matching clause'. The Commission is now analysing the replies received from Member States and other interested parties.

---

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005320/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)**  
(29 Μαΐου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Κατάργηση διατάξεων για μείωση κατώτερων μισθών και για συλλογικές συμβάσεις εργασίας στην Ελλάδα

Κατά τη διάρκεια της προεκλογικής περιόδου στην Ελλάδα όλα τα ελληνικά πολιτικά κόμματα, όλοι οι φορείς εργοδοτών και όλοι οι φορείς εργαζομένων εξέφρασαν την άποψη ότι πρέπει να καταργηθούν οι νομοθετικές διατάξεις με τις οποίες αφ' ενός μειώθηκε ο κατώτατος μισθός κατά 22 % και κατά 35 % για τους νεοεισερχόμενους στην αγορά εργασίας, και αφ' ετέρου καταργήθηκε η λεγόμενη μετενέργεια, δηλαδή ο αυτονόητος νομικός κανόνας, ότι μετά τη λήξη μιας συλλογικής σύμβασης εργασίας, και εφόσον δεν είχε υπογραφεί νέα, πρέπει να παρατείνονται οι όροι της προηγούμενης μέχρι την υπογραφή της νέας. Αυτή η ρύθμιση, που υπονομεύει τον θεσμό των συλλογικών διαπραγματεύσεων έχει ήδη προκαλέσει την άρνηση των εργοδοτών να προσέλθουν σε διαπραγματεύσεις, γεγονός που οδηγεί αυτόματα στη μείωση των μέσων μισθών κατά 20 % - 40 % περίπου.

Με δεδομένο λοιπόν ότι οι πολιτικοί και κοινωνικοί φορείς στην Ελλάδα έχουν δεσμευτεί να καταργήσουν τις ανωτέρω νομικές ρυθμίσεις και ότι οι διατάξεις αυτές προβλέπονται από το Μνημόνιο, προτίθεται η Επιτροπή να συνεργαστεί με την όποια ελληνική κυβέρνηση προκύψει από τις εκλογές για την κατάργηση των ανωτέρω διατάξεων;

**Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(3 Αυγούστου 2012)

Ο ισχυρισμός του Αξιότιμου Μέλους του Κοινοβουλίου ότι όλα τα πολιτικά κόμματα τάσσονται υπέρ της κατάργησης των διατάξεων στις οποίες αναφέρεται, δεν ανταποκρίνεται στην πραγματικότητα.

Συγκεκριμένα, η προηγούμενη Ελληνική Κυβέρνηση υπέγραψε το μνημόνιο στο όνομα και προς το συμφέρον της χώρας, γεγονός που δεσμεύει την επόμενη κυβέρνηση. Εμείς θα συνεργαστούμε και θα ενισχύσουμε την προσπάθεια της επόμενης κυβέρνησης να εφαρμόσει το πρόγραμμα προσαρμογής και να πραγματοποιήσει τις μεταρρυθμίσεις που είναι αναγκαίες για την οικονομική και κοινωνική ανάκαμψη της Ελλάδας.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005320/12  
to the Commission**

**Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)**

(29 May 2012)

*Subject:* Repeal of provisions on reducing minimum wages and on collective employment agreements in Greece

During the pre-election period in Greece all the Greek political parties and all employers' and workers' organisations expressed the view that the following should be repealed: (i) the legal provisions reducing the minimum wage by 22%, and by 35% for new entrants into the job market, and (ii) the so-called 'continuation of terms', i.e. the implicit legal stipulation that, after the expiry of a collective employment agreement, and provided no new agreement has been signed, the terms of the previous agreement continue to apply until a new agreement is signed. This arrangement, which undermines the institution of collective bargaining, has already led to employers refusing to enter into negotiations, a fact that has automatically caused average wages to drop by 20-40%.

Given therefore that political and social organisations in Greece are committed to repealing the above legal arrangements and that these provisions are specified by the Memorandum, does the Commission intend to cooperate with whatever Greek Government emerges from the elections to repeal the above provisions?

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

(3 August 2012)

The statement of the Honourable Member of the European Parliament that all political organisations want to repeal the mentioned provisions does not seem to represent the various positions correctly.

More fundamentally, the previous Greek Government has signed the memoranda in the interest and on behalf of the country, and this binds the next government. We are looking forward to cooperating with the next government and supporting it in its effort to deliver the adjustment programme and the reforms which are necessary for the economic and social recovery of Greece.

---



(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005322/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)**  
(29 Μαΐου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Απόφαση ΕΤΧΣ για περικοπή δανειακής δόσης

Το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Χρηματοπιστωτικής Σταθερότητας (ΕΤΧΣ) επρόκειτο να καταβάλει στην Ελλάδα την προγραμματισμένη δόση δανείου στις 10 Μαΐου 2012 συνολικού ποσού 5,2 δισ. ευρώ. Το Διοικητικό Συμβούλιο του ΕΤΧΣ αποφάσισε να μην καταβάλει ολόκληρο το προγραμματισμένο ποσό των 5,2 δισ. ευρώ αλλά να εκταμιεύσει το πόσο των 4,2 δισ. ευρώ. Ανακοινώθηκε ότι το υπόλοιπο ποσό του 1 δισ. ευρώ θα καταβληθεί ανάλογα με τις χρηματοδοτικές ανάγκες του ελληνικού κράτους. Επειδή στο κεφάλαιο 3 της Σύμβασης Χρηματοδοτικής Διευκόλυνσης μεταξύ του ΕΤΧΣ, της Ελληνικής Δημοκρατίας και της Τράπεζας της Ελλάδος δεν υπάρχει όρος που να δικαιολογεί την ανωτέρω ενέργεια, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή: Σε ποια άρθρα της Σύμβασης Χρηματοδοτικής Διευκόλυνσης βασίστηκε η απόφαση του ΕΤΧΣ να εκταμιεύσει μέρος μόνο του συνολικού ποσού της δόσης προς την Ελλάδα και όχι το σύνολο του ποσού; Μπορεί μονομερώς το ΕΤΧΣ, χωρίς καν επίσημη αιτιολογία και χωρίς να υπάρχει προσβολή των όρων της δανειακής σύμβασης εκ μέρους της Ελληνικής Κυβέρνησης, να μειώνει και να καθυστερεί τις δόσεις εκταμίευσης του δανείου;

**Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(9 Αυγούστου 2012)

Το ΕΤΧΣ αποτελεί ανεξάρτητη οντότητα την οποία δεν είναι σε θέση να σχολιάσει η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή. Ωστόσο, αντιλαμβανόμαστε ότι το ΕΤΧΣ έχει τη διακριτική ευχέρεια να μοιράσει σε μερίδες τυχόν εγκεκριμένη δόση στο πλαίσιο της συμφωνίας διευκόλυνσης οικονομικής ενίσχυσης με την Ελλάδα. Κατά συνέπεια, στις 9 Μαΐου 2012, το Διοικητικό Συμβούλιο του ΕΤΧΣ επιβεβαίωσε την αποδέσμευση, έως τα τέλη Ιουνίου, ποσού 5,2 δισ ευρώ από την πρώτη δόση ύψους 39,4 δισ ευρώ. Το ποσό των 4,2 δισ ευρώ εκταμιεύθηκε στις 10 Μαΐου 2012. Καθώς το εναπομένον χρηματικό ποσό του 1,0 δισ ευρώ θεωρήθηκε ότι δεν χρειαζόταν πριν τα τέλη Ιουνίου, θα εκταμιευθεί ανάλογα με τις πραγματικές χρηματοδοτικές ανάγκες της Ελλάδας.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005322/12  
to the Commission**

**Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)**

(29 May 2012)

*Subject:* EFSF decision to cut loan instalments

The European Financial Stability Facility (EFSF) was to supply Greece with a scheduled loan instalment on 10 May 2012 totalling EUR 5.2 billion. However, the Board of Directors of the EFSF decided not to supply the full scheduled amount of EUR 5.2 billion but to pay out EUR 4.2 billion. It announced that the remaining EUR 1 billion would be paid according to the financial needs of the Greek State.

Since Chapter 3 of the Financial Assistance Facility Agreement between the EFSF, the Hellenic Republic and the Bank of Greece does not set any condition which justifies the abovementioned action, will the Commission say:

On which Articles of the Financial Assistance Facility Agreement has the EFSF based its decision to pay only part of the total instalment to Greece and not the whole amount?

Can the EFSF unilaterally reduce and delay the loan instalment payments without even any formal justification and without there being any breach by the Greek Government of the terms of the loan agreement?

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

(9 August 2012)

The EFSF is an independent entity on which the European Commission is not in a position to comment. However, we understand that it is the EFSF's discretion to split into tranches any approved instalment under the Financial Assistance Facility Agreement with Greece. Consequently, on 9 May 2012, the EFSF Board has confirmed the release of an amount of EUR 5.2 billion from the first instalment of EUR 39.4 billion by the end of June. An amount of EUR 4.2 billion was disbursed on 10 May 2012. As the remaining funds of EUR 1.0 billion were considered as not needed before end-June, they will be disbursed depending on the actual financing needs of Greece.

---

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005323/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**  
(29 Μαΐου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Πορεία κατασκευής φράχτη στον Έβρο

Η κατασκευή του φράχτη, μήκους 10,3 χιλιομέτρων και ύψους τριών μέτρων, που δημιουργείται με σκοπό την ανακοπή του κύματος των λαθρομεταναστών, έχει εγκριθεί και ανατεθεί ήδη από τον Δεκέμβριο του 2011. Αν και για την κατασκευή του φράχτη δεν έχουν δεσμευτεί κοινοτικοί πόροι, ενημερώνεται η Επιτροπή για την πορεία υλοποίησης των έργων; Παρέχεται ή έχει ζητηθεί από την ίδια τεχνική ή συμβουλευτική βοήθεια για την υλοποίηση του έργου; Είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει για το τελικό κόστος κατασκευής του φράχτη, όπως αυτό κοινοποιήθηκε στην Επιτροπή από την ελληνική κυβέρνηση;

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

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση δεν χρηματοδοτεί εξ ολοκλήρου ή εν μέρει την κατασκευή του φράχτη στον οποίο αναφέρεται το Αξιοτίμητο Μέλος. Όπως αντιλαμβάνεται η Επιτροπή, η Ελλάδα έχει σκοπό να ολοκληρώσει την κατασκευή του φράχτη εντός του 2012. Η Επιτροπή δεν έχει παράσχει τεχνική ή άλλου είδους βοήθεια στην Ελλάδα σχετικά με αυτό το έργο και δεν γνωρίζει το τελικό προβλεπόμενο κόστος.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005323/12  
to the Commission**

**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**

(29 May 2012)

*Subject:* Progress in the construction of the fence in Evros

The construction of a fence 10.3 km long and 3 m high to stem the incoming tide of illegal immigrants was approved and the contracts were awarded in December 2011. Although no EU resources have been committed to the fence's construction, does the Commission know how the project is progressing? Is it supplying, or has it received a request for, technical or consultancy assistance for the project? Is it in a position to provide details of the final cost of the fence as indicated to it by the Greek government?

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

(25 July 2012)

The fence, to which the Honourable Member refers, is not being financed, in whole or in part, with funding from the European Union. The Commission understands that it is Greece's intention to complete the fence during 2012. The Commission has been giving no technical or other assistance to Greece regarding this project and is not aware of its final projected cost.

---

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005324/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**  
(29 Μαΐου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Ελληνικό εθνικό σχέδιο για την ένταξη των Ρομά

Με ανακοίνωσή της στις 23.5.2012, η Επιτροπή καλεί τα κράτη μέλη να εφαρμόσουν τις εθνικές τους στρατηγικές για να βελτιώσουν την οικονομική και κοινωνική ένταξη των 10-12 εκατομμυρίων Ρομά της Ευρώπης. Μάλιστα τα περισσότερα κράτη μέλη παρουσίασαν ειδικά μέτρα για τον τρόπο με τον οποίο σκοπεύουν να επιτύχουν τους συμφωνηθέντες στόχους, μερικά εκ των οποίων παρουσιάζονται ως καλά παραδείγματα.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Παρουσίασε η Ελλάδα συγκεκριμένα ειδικά μέτρα, τα οποία αξιολογεί η Επιτροπή ως ικανοποιητικά για να επιτύχουν τους προκαθορισμένους στόχους;
2. Είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει η Επιτροπή για το ποσό, αφενός από εθνικούς πόρους, και αφετέρου από πόρους της ΕΕ, που δήλωσε η Ελλάδα πως θα αξιοποιήσει στο πλαίσιο του εθνικού της σχεδίου για τους Ρομά;

**Απάντηση της κας Reding εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(11 Ιουλίου 2012)

Μετά την ανακοίνωση COM(2011)173 της Επιτροπής τον Απρίλιο του 2011 σχετικά με το πλαίσιο της ΕΕ για τις εθνικές στρατηγικές ένταξης των Ρομά, όλα τα κράτη μέλη έστειλαν στην Επιτροπή στρατηγικές στις οποίες ανέλυαν τα ισχύοντα ή προβλεπόμενα μέτρα για την υποστήριξη της ένταξης των Ρομά μέχρι το 2020.

Η Ελλάδα υπέβαλε την στρατηγική της στις 30 Δεκεμβρίου 2011. Η στρατηγική αυτή βασίζεται στο πρόγραμμα δράσης «Ολοκληρωμένο Πρόγραμμα Δράσης για την Κοινωνική Ένταξη των Ελλήνων Τσιγγάνων» που εφαρμόστηκε από το 2001 έως το 2008. Το έγγραφο που υπέβαλε η Ελλάδα καλύπτει όλους τους σχετικούς τομείς πολιτικής (εκπαίδευση, απασχόληση, υγεία και στέγαση), καθώς και τις διαθρωτικές απαιτήσεις και τη χρηματοδότηση. Στις 21 Μαΐου 2012, η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή ενέκρινε την πρώτη έκθεση αξιολόγησης των εθνικών στρατηγικών ένταξης των Ρομά που υπέβαλαν τα κράτη μέλη<sup>(1)</sup>. Η ανακοίνωση αυτή συνοδεύεται από έγγραφο εργασίας των υπηρεσιών της Επιτροπής το οποίο παρέχει λεπτομερή στοιχεία σχετικά με τα πλεονεκτήματα και τα μειονεκτήματα των εγγράφων που προσκόμισαν τα κράτη μέλη, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της Ελλάδας<sup>(2)</sup>.

Προς το παρόν, η Επιτροπή δεν είναι σε θέση να αναφέρει το ακριβές ποσό χρηματοδότησης που θα χρησιμοποιήσει η Ελλάδα από τους εθνικούς πόρους και τους πόρους της ΕΕ.

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2012)226 τελικό.

<sup>(2)</sup> SWD(2012)133 τελικό ([http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/com2012\\_226\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/com2012_226_en.pdf)).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005324/12  
to the Commission  
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)  
(29 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Greek national plan for Roma integration

In a communication of 23 May 2012, the Commission called upon Member States to implement their national strategies to improve economic and social integration for Europe's 10 to 12 million Roma. Most Member States have presented specific measures for achieving the agreed goals and some of these measures are held up as good examples.

1. Has Greece presented specific measures to achieve these goals? Is the Commission satisfied with them?
2. Is the Commission in a position to state the amount of funding Greece has agreed to use — both from national and EU resources — in its national plan for the Roma?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission  
(11 July 2012)**

Following the communication COM(2011)173 of April 2011 on the EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies, all Member States have sent to the Commission a strategy detailing the existing or foreseen measures to support Roma integration by 2020.

Greece submitted its strategy on 30 December 2011. It is based on the previously implemented 'Integrated Action Plan for the Social integration of Greek Gypsies' carried out from 2001 to 2008. The document submitted by Greece covers all the policy areas concerned (education, employment, health and housing) as well as structural requirements and funding. On 21 May 2012, the European Commission adopted its first assessment report of the National Roma Integration Strategies submitted by the Member States <sup>(1)</sup>. This communication is accompanied by a Staff Working Document which provides detailed feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of the documents provided by the Member States, including Greece <sup>(2)</sup>.

For the time being, the Commission is not yet in a position to indicate the exact amount of funding Greece will use from national and EU resources.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2012) 226 final.

<sup>(2)</sup> SWD(2012) 133 final ([http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/com2012\\_226\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/com2012_226_en.pdf)).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005325/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Kay Swinburne (ECR)**

(29 May 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Brazilian Awá tribe

I am concerned about the future of the Awá tribe in Brazil, who are one of the world's most endangered tribes. They are slowly being forced to leave their homelands owing to the practice of illegal logging. Despite efforts to curb this practice, rapid deforestation continues to threaten the tribe's ability to remain in the forest.

The EU's strategy for Brazil acknowledges the importance of supporting the country's indigenous population and sets curbing deforestation as one of the EU's priorities.

Can the High Representative clarify:

1. Whether the EU's strategy will focus on assisting the Awá tribe in their plight?
2. What political pressure, if any, the EU can exert on the Brazilian authorities to ban illegal deforestation of the Awá tribe's home?

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

(6 July 2012)

The European Union is very much aware of the situation faced by the Awá tribe as well as other indigenous tribes in Brazil.

In 1992, the Brazilian Government responded to land grabbing problems in tribal areas by recognising the full right of use of indigenous lands and tribal areas to indigenous populations, through strict land demarcations and registration schemes. In 2002 it ratified the International Labour Organisation (ILO) Convention No 169 on indigenous and tribal people. It appears, however, that the Brazilian Government is finding it difficult to ensure the full enforcement of the tribal land rights.

The situation of Brazilian indigenous people and their rights are being addressed in the framework of the EU-Brazil Human Rights Dialogue. Moreover, the EU Delegation and Member States are in regular contact with relevant Brazilian civil society organisations and indigenous peoples' representatives. The Delegation also maintains regular contacts with the National Indigenous Foundation (FUNAI), the government agency responsible for indigenous issues.

The EU currently funds several cooperation projects which focus on Indigenous Peoples in Brazil, i.e. the project 'Economic and Social Inclusion of Indigenous Populations' (EIDHR/2011/228-638), managed by Planet Finance, and the project 'Promotion of Pataxó Culture for Ethno-Development' (DCI — HUM/2010/207-560), which is run by Tribo Jovens. The first aims to combat socioeconomic exclusion of Indigenous Peoples in urban areas; it directly benefits over 500 men and women in the State of Pará. The second project seeks to promote Pataxó culture and way of life by training its leaders and involving Indigenous know-how in sustainable development alternatives of the targeted population, Pataxó communities in the State of Bahia.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005326/12  
to the Commission  
Kay Swinburne (ECR)  
(29 May 2012)**

*Subject:* EU rules on bestiality

It has been brought to my attention that bestiality is still legal in a number of EU Member States. It has been reported that a number of 'bestiality brothels' exist in Germany <sup>(1)</sup>, despite the distribution of animal pornography being punishable by law.

Given that the EU has been very vocal on animal welfare issues, it would seem appropriate for the EU to intervene and introduce some common EU-wide rules to illegalise bestiality and animal pornography and ensure that animals are adequately protected, as they are in my own Member State.

Can the Commission clarify whether:

1. It is aware of this continued practice in some EU Member States?
2. This will be taken into account when looking at animal protection law across the EU?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission  
(27 July 2012)**

The Commission is not aware of the type of abuses mentioned by the Honourable Member of the European Parliament.

According to Article 13 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union <sup>(2)</sup>, animal welfare is taken into consideration only in areas where the treatment of animals may interfere with some EU policies <sup>(3)</sup>, like agriculture or internal market.

Therefore, this matter remains under the sole competence of the Member States.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> See <http://www.thelocal.de/society/20120203-40531.html>

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ C 83, 30.3.2010, p. 47.

<sup>(3)</sup> Agriculture, fisheries, transport, internal market, research and technological development and space policies.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005327/12  
to the Commission  
Kay Swinburne (ECR)  
(29 May 2012)**

*Subject:* SME growth

The Commission has always been keen to publicly emphasise its support for SMEs. It promises in particular to reduce SME reliance on bank lending and likes to promote venture capital funds, business angels, stock market listings and bond issuances as alternative financing mechanisms. Exploring new ways of financing SME expansion is indeed crucial if Europe is to return to consistent growth, particularly when two thirds of the EU labour force is employed by SMEs.

It is therefore a matter of great concern that hardly anything is known about non-bank financing of SMEs and in particular about the role of stock market listings. The industry is unfortunately unable to provide any detailed information about alternative financing of smaller companies, including the characteristics of European small and mid-caps, the persons who invest in quoted SMEs or the different market practices.

Can the Commission:

1. Explain whether there is a lack of data and whether its absence is hindering effective policy-making?
2. Indicate whether it would be willing to either conduct detailed research of its own accord or to fund industry initiatives to that effect?
3. Explain to what extent DG Enterprise and DG Markt are cooperating in supporting capital market access by SMEs?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission  
(11 July 2012)**

The Commission has proposed a series of measures to strengthen the monitoring of SME financing in the action plan to improve access to finance for SMEs <sup>(1)</sup>.

1. Various industry associations provide information on SME financing such as leasing, factoring, business angel or venture capital or stock listing <sup>(2)</sup>. Collection of comparable data at EU level is generally difficult due to the lack of a harmonised methodology.
2. The Commission regularly monitors SME financing trends through tools such as the European Commission/ European Central Bank survey on SMEs' access to finance which provide information on different sources of finance, such as bank lending, venture capital, business angels, mezzanine financing, trade credit, microcredit and leasing at EU and national level <sup>(3)</sup>. The Commission is working together with industry associations to reinforce the analytical framework for SME financing, striving for more coherent methodology and better comparative data. The Commission is carrying out studies on the business angel market and securitisation and will soon launch a study on how to improve research on listed SMEs in order to increase investors' interest in this market segment.
3. The Commission has put forward a series of regulatory proposals designed to improve SMEs' access to capital markets. These include measures to make SME markets (in the Markets in Financial Instruments Directive) and SME shares (in the Transparency Directive) more visible. Furthermore, the Commission is proposing to reduce the costs and burden for SMEs (Transparency and Prospectus Directive) by simplifying and reducing reporting requirements. The Commission will also contribute to information campaigns to promote access to capital markets by SMEs.

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2011) 870 final.

<sup>(2)</sup> See websites of European associations such as Euroleasing, EBAN, EVCA, FESE.

<sup>(3)</sup> [ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/finance/data/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/finance/data/index_en.htm); [www.ecb.europa.eu/stats/money/surveys/sme/html/index.en.html](http://www.ecb.europa.eu/stats/money/surveys/sme/html/index.en.html)

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005330/12**  
**aan de Commissie**  
**Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE)**  
(29 mei 2012)

*Betref:* Wijziging van de Amerikaanse Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (CALEA)

De Amerikaanse Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (CALEA) werd in 1994 van kracht. CALEA vormt de rechtsgrond voor de technische mogelijkheid om telefoongesprekken en e-mailberichten af te tappen. Voor dergelijke af luisteractiviteiten is een gerechtelijk bevel vereist.

De FBI heeft onlangs bevestigd dat zij aandringt op een wijziging van CALEA die internetbedrijven, waaronder Apple, Microsoft, Facebook, Yahoo en Google, in staat stelt een „achterdeur” te installeren in hun communicatiesoftware om toezicht door de overheid mogelijk te maken.

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van deze mogelijke wijziging van CALEA, die op bijna alle vormen van communicatie via het internet betrekking heeft?
2. Realiseert de Commissie zich dat de installatie van „achterdeuren” in communicatiesoftware onbeperkte controle mogelijk maakt van de onlineactiviteiten van EU-burgers door de Amerikaanse overheid of inlichtingendiensten, ondanks het feit dat dergelijke activiteiten plaatsvinden op het grondgebied van de EU? Beschouwt de Commissie dit als een schending van het rechtsgebied van de EU?
3. Denkt de Commissie dat het mogelijk is dat derde landen die geen gerechtelijk bevel nodig hebben voor overheidstoezicht deze achterdeuren zullen gebruiken om de onlinecommunicatie van EU-burgers te controleren?
4. Is de Commissie van mening dat de uitbreiding van de werkingssfeer van CALEA de Europese wetgeving op het gebied van gegevensbescherming en privacy in juridisch of praktisch opzicht kan verstoren? Hoe kan de Commissie garanderen dat alle onlineactiviteiten binnen de EU volledig onder de EU-wetgeving vallen, en dat Amerikaanse wetten geen extraterritoriale invloed hebben met gevolgen voor de rechten van de EU-burgers?
5. Is de Commissie voornemens om, indien er in de Verenigde Staten een officieel voorstel wordt ingediend om de wijziging aan te nemen, opmerkingen te maken in het kader van de Amerikaanse wetgevingsprocedure om de belangen van de EU-burgers op het gebied van privacy en gegevensbescherming te verdedigen?

**Antwoord van mevrouw Reding namens de Commissie**  
(13 juli 2012)

Conform het internationaal publiekrecht kan een wet die door een derde land werd uitgevaardigd niet rechtstreeks en automatisch op het grondgebied van de EU worden toegepast, tenzij het recht van de Unie of van de lidstaten — uitzonderlijk — de gevolgen van een dergelijke wet in de respectieve jurisdicties erkent. De Commissie is van mening dat, indien een rechtshandhavingsinstantie in de VS inlichtingen nodig heeft van buiten haar jurisdictie, zij deze gegevens moet verkrijgen via de bestaande samenwerkingsmechanismen met EU-lidstaten waar de gegevens zich bevinden, zoals de overeenkomst betreffende wederzijdse rechtshulp tussen de EU en de VS en de bilaterale rechtshulpovereenkomsten.

Wat de Amerikaanse *Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act* betreft, merkt de Commissie op dat de mogelijke wijziging nog wordt besproken en nog niet ter goedkeuring is voorgelegd.

In de voorstellen van de Commissie van 25 januari 2012<sup>(1)</sup> voor een richtlijn en een verordening betreffende gegevensbescherming wordt de noodzaak erkend om, in bepaalde gevallen, samen te werken zodat persoonsgegevens kunnen worden uitgewisseld om gewichtige redenen van algemeen belang, bijvoorbeeld in het geval van autoriteiten die bevoegd zijn voor het voorkomen, opsporen, onderzoeken en vervolgen van strafbare feiten.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2012:0011:FIN:NL:PDF>.

Indien een onderneming rechtstreeks ingaat op een verzoek van de Amerikaanse autoriteiten, is het mogelijk dat zij daarbij de nationale voorschriften ter uitvoering van het gegevensbeschermingsacquis van de EU schendt. Onverminderd de bevoegdheden van de Commissie als hoedster van de Verdragen moeten de nationale toezichhoudende autoriteiten erop toezien dat de doorgifte van persoonsgegevens op rechtmatige wijze gebeurt. Indien er aanwijzingen zijn dat een lidstaat zijn Verdragsverplichtingen niet nakomt, kan de Europese Commissie beoordelen of het nodig is maatregelen te treffen.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005330/12  
to the Commission  
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE)  
(29 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Amendment of the US Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (CALEA)

The US Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (CALEA) entered into force in 1994. CALEA provides the legal basis for the technical possibility of wiretapping telephone calls and e-mail messaging. US authorities need a court order to be able to proceed with such wiretapping activities.

The FBI has recently confirmed that it is pushing for an amendment of CALEA that would require Internet companies, including Apple, Microsoft, Facebook, Yahoo and Google, to install built-in 'back doors' in their Internet-based communications tools to allow government surveillance.

1. Is the Commission aware of this possible amendment of CALEA, which will affect almost all forms of communication over the Internet?
2. Does the Commission consider that the installation of 'back doors' in Internet-based communication tools would allow unlimited monitoring of the online activities of EU citizens by the US authorities or secret services, despite the fact that such activity takes place within EU territory? Does the Commission consider this a violation of EU jurisdiction?
3. Does the Commission consider it possible that third countries which do not require court warrants for government surveillance will be able to use these back doors to monitor the online communications of EU citizens?
4. Does the Commission consider that the expansion of the scope of CALEA could lead to legal or practical interference with European data protection and privacy laws? How will the Commission ensure that all online activity within the EU is fully covered by EU legislation, and that US laws do not have extraterritorial impact, affecting the rights of EU citizens?
5. If the amendment is formally proposed for adoption in the US, does the Commission intend to make submissions under the US legislative procedure, in order to defend the interest of EU citizens with regard to privacy and data protection?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission  
(13 July 2012)**

As a matter of public international law, a legal act enacted by a third country cannot be directly and automatically applied in the territory of the EU unless — exceptionally — Union law or Member States law explicitly recognises effects of such an act in their respective jurisdiction. The Commission considers that when a law enforcement authority in the US realises that necessary information is outside its jurisdiction, the appropriate mechanism to obtain the data should be the cooperation mechanisms in place with EU Member States where those data are located, such as the EU-US and the bilateral Mutual Legal Assistance agreement.

With regard to the US Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act, the Commission notes that this possible amendment is still under discussion and has not yet been tabled for adoption.

The Commission proposals of 25 January 2012 <sup>(1)</sup> for a directive and a regulation on data protection acknowledge the necessity of cooperation, in certain cases, in order to allow for the exchange of personal data on important grounds of public interest, e.g. for authorities responsible for the prevention, detection, investigation and prosecution of crime.

When responding directly to requests from US authorities, companies may be in breach of national rules implementing the EU data protection *acquis*. Without prejudice to the competencies of the Commission as guardian of the treaties, it is up to the national supervisory authorities to ensure that transfers of personal data are made lawfully. When there is an indication that a Member State does not comply with its obligations under the Treaties, the European Commission may assess the need for appropriate action.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2012:0011:FIN:EN:PDF>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005332/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Charles Tannock (ECR)**

(29 May 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Azerbaijan's conduct with regard to fundamental human rights during the Eurovision Song Contest

The High Representative will be well aware that Azerbaijan is hosting the 2012 Eurovision Song Contest, a pan-European music competition dating from 1956, watched by hundreds of millions of European citizens. A recent BBC documentary on the subject of Azerbaijan's preparations for hosting the contest made allegations of possible misconduct by the Azeri authorities towards its citizens, including serious civil rights violations.

For example, it is alleged by the BBC that residents of entire blocks of flats were forcibly evicted, without compensation, in order for the government to possess land earmarked for the purpose-built Eurovision complex. Further allegations raised include the forced dispersal by internal security services of peaceful protests, and trials of individuals critical of the Baku regime, which frequently end in lengthy jail terms. Allegations of press intimidation also abound, as do allegations of widespread political corruption.

Does the High Representative agree that as a member of the Council of Europe, the OSCE, the EU's Eastern Partnership and the United Nations Human Rights Council, Azerbaijan has a duty to uphold its commitments to human rights, including the right to freedom of expression and freedom to protest peacefully without intimidation? As the world observes Azerbaijan's conduct closely during the Eurovision competition, will the High Representative take this opportunity to outline the EU's concerns to Baku over these worrying human rights allegations in the EU's Eastern Neighbourhood?

**Question for written answer E-005595/12  
to the Commission**

**Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)**

(4 June 2012)

*Subject:* Political prisoners in Azerbaijan

There has been a sharp increase in the politically motivated harassment of oppositionists in Azerbaijan.

Over the past two years, several leading members of the Müsavat opposition party and activists from other opposition parties have been convicted on charges of 'promoting social disorder'. There is a strong suspicion that these arrests were politically motivated and that political opponents of the Aliyev regime have been denied access to due process of law.

The Azeri authorities are failing to meet their commitments under the European Convention on Human Rights and their obligations under the partnership and cooperation agreement with the EU. Currently, the Commission is negotiating an association agreement with Azerbaijan which also entails obligations to respect political pluralism and the rule of law.

Therefore, the Commission is asked to answer the following questions:

1. Is it aware that there has been a deterioration in political pluralism in Azerbaijan?
2. Is this deterioration in, and abuse of, the rule of law being taken into account in the negotiations with Azerbaijan over the association agreement?
3. Is the Commission asking the Azeri authorities to honour their commitments to respect the human rights and fundamental freedoms of political opponents?
4. Is the Commission raising the issue of the politically motivated arrests of political opponents with the Azeri authorities?

**Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission***(25 July 2012)*

The HR/VP is fully aware of the situation of human rights in Azerbaijan. In recent months no less than ten EU statements have been issued highlighting the EU concerns regarding areas such as freedom of expression, assembly and evictions. During the Eurovision Song Contest in Baku, the spotlight of the world media was on Azerbaijan. The reaction to the protest actions by the opposition and the civil society days ahead of the Eurovision contest showed that a big opportunity to improve the country's image was missed. A positive note at that time, however, was the release of Bakhtiar Hajiyev, a political activist who participated in the April 2011 actions, which the HR/VP welcomed in a statement on 8 June.

However, on 22 June, the remaining nine imprisoned participants of the peaceful rally held on 2 April 2011 were released. The HR/VP welcomed this as a 'laudable step taken by Azerbaijan in its efforts to restore civil rights in the country and to gradually move on the path of ensuring the freedoms of assembly and of speech'.

The ENP Progress Report and the Roadmap issued on 15 May clearly reflect the EU concerns and the areas where Azerbaijan will need to work harder to meet its own commitments towards the EU, including in the framework of the Eastern Partnership, the Council of Europe, OSCE and the UN. The Association Agreement negotiations provide an important opportunity for the EU to recall that Azerbaijan's political approximation and economic integration with the EU are based on shared values.

On a number of occasions the EU has raised issues of freedom of expression, assembly and evictions with the authorities. The EU will continue to monitor the domestic situation in Azerbaijan and will try to constructively engage with the authorities to help improve the country's human rights record.

---

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-005334/12**  
**adresată Comisiei**  
**Elena Băsescu (PPE)**  
(29 mai 2012)

*Subiect:* Măsurile pentru sprijinirea tinerilor întreprinzători

Deciziile Consiliului European din martie 2012 au subliniat necesitatea de a asigura creșterea economică, prin crearea de locuri de muncă, stimularea spiritului antreprenorial și a inovării.

În acest context, un rol foarte important le revine IMM-urilor, care reprezintă coloana vertebrală a economiei europene, fiind o sursă majoră de creștere și dezvoltare și putând genera numeroase locuri de muncă.

În special, stimularea spiritului întreprinzător și inovator al tinerilor poate reprezenta o soluție pentru a reduce nivelul ridicat al șomajului cu care aceștia se confruntă la nivel european.

Ce măsuri concrete a luat Comisia pentru a sprijini, prin programe specifice, tinerii întreprinzători, precum și pentru a încuraja și facilita crearea de IMM-uri de către tineri? Ce acțiuni are în vedere Comisia în acest domeniu pentru perioada următoare? Cum încurajează Comisia politicile și programele statelor membre pentru susținerea tinerilor întreprinzători?

**Răspuns dat de dl Tajani în numele Comisiei**  
(30 iulie 2012)

Învățământului îi revine un rol important în atragerea mai multor tineri spre o carieră antreprenorială, iar UE a identificat spiritul antreprenorial ca una dintre competențele-cheie ale învățării pe tot parcursul vieții. Comisia lucrează în strânsă cooperare cu autoritățile naționale, iar eforturile se concentrează pe sprijinirea punerii în aplicare a strategiilor naționale. A fost stabilit un grup tematic de experți din statele membre pentru a elabora un set de instrumente politice, care urmează să fie publicat în 2013. Comisia a publicat, de asemenea, două cereri specifice de propuneri pe tema educației antreprenoriale, în 2009 și în 2012. Există dovezi care arată că este mai probabil ca participanții la educația antreprenorială și nu alte grupuri să înființeze o întreprindere și că aceștia obțin un loc de muncă mai repede după ce își termină studiile.

Sprijinul specific pentru persoanele fizice include programul Erasmus pentru tineri antreprenori, oferind oportunități unice pentru tinerii care doresc să creeze sau au creat recent propria întreprindere. Aceștia beneficiază de îndrumarea și de cele mai bune sfaturi ale unui antreprenor cu experiență privind modul în care să creeze și să administreze o societate recent înființată. Programul contribuie nu numai la înființarea de noi întreprinderi dar, de asemenea, permite participanților să se extindă pe piețele internaționale, să stabilească contacte sau să coopereze în străinătate. Instrumentul european de microfinanțare Progress crește nivelul de disponibilitate a microcreditelor pentru înființarea sau dezvoltarea unei întreprinderi mici, aducând beneficii tinerilor defavorizați în ceea ce privește accesul la finanțare. De asemenea, Comisia va utiliza 3 milioane EUR din asistența tehnică a FSE pentru a se concentra, printre altele, pe crearea unor mecanisme de sprijin pentru tinerii care înființează întreprinderi. Cu toate acestea, este necesară o strategie globală pentru a sprijini spiritul antreprenorial în rândul tinerilor, atât la nivel european, cât și la nivelul statelor membre. De aceea, Comisia lansează un „Act privind spiritul antreprenorial 2020”, a cărui adoptare este planificată până la sfârșitul anului 2012.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005334/12  
to the Commission  
Elena Băsescu (PPE)  
(29 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Measures to support young entrepreneurs

The European Council Decisions of March 2012 stressed the need to ensure economic growth by creating jobs and by stimulating entrepreneurship and innovation.

SMEs, which are the backbone of the European economy, have a very important role to play in this respect. They are a major source of growth and development and are able to generate numerous jobs.

In particular, stimulating entrepreneurship and innovation amongst young people can help reduce the high level of youth unemployment across Europe.

What concrete measures has the Commission taken to support young entrepreneurs and to encourage and facilitate the creation of SMEs by young people through targeted programmes? What actions does the Commission envisage taking in this area in the coming future? How does the Commission encourage Member State policies and programmes in support of young entrepreneurs?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission  
(30 July 2012)**

Education has an important role to play in attracting more young people to an entrepreneurial career, and the EU has identified entrepreneurship as one of the lifelong learning key competences. The Commission is working in close cooperation with national authorities, and efforts focus on supporting the implementation of national strategies. A Thematic Group of experts from Member States has been established to develop a policy tool kit, to be published in 2013. The Commission also published two specific calls for proposals on the theme of entrepreneurship education, in 2009 and in 2012. Evidence shows that participants in entrepreneurship education are more likely than other groups to start a business, and that they get a job earlier after finishing their studies.

Specific support for individuals includes Erasmus for Young entrepreneurs, offering unique opportunities to young people who wish to create their own business or have recently started up. They receive coaching and first-hand advice from an experienced entrepreneur on how to create and manage a startup company. The program helps not only start new businesses, but it also allows participants to expand to international markets, to establish contacts or to cooperate abroad. The European Progress Microfinance Facility increases the availability of microcredit for setting up or developing a small business, benefiting young people disadvantaged in accessing finance. The Commission will also use EUR 3 million of ESF Technical Assistance to focus, among others, on setting up support schemes for young people starting businesses. However, a global strategy is necessary to support youth entrepreneurship, both at European level and in the Member States. This is why the Commission is launching an 'Entrepreneurship 2020 Act', which is planned to be adopted by the end of 2012.

---



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005336/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Emer Costello (S&D)**  
(29 May 2012)

*Subject:* Assessing the impact of public services cuts on the most vulnerable in society

Further to the Commission's memo of 10 January 2012 (MEMO/12/3) in which it states (page 4, English version) that '... methods still need to be developed to fully assess the impact of cuts in public services provision, that are likely to affect more strongly the most vulnerable populations', what action is currently being taken, or is planned, by the Commission to develop such a methodology?

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

The Commission has co-financed an OECD project to establish a methodology to estimate the redistributive impact of publically provided social services. By pointing out their important poverty reduction impact, the Commission hopes to raise awareness about the potential negative impact of cutting expenditure in these areas. Results based on this methodology were presented in the Commission 2011 Annual Review on Employment and Social Developments in Europe and in a dedicated EC/OECD report published in January 2012.

The report highlights a number of methodological challenges that limit the reliability of the results for policy analysis, including the lack of appropriate data needed to determine the monetary value of the services, and the allocation of this value to different population groups.

Eurostat is now investigating, as a part of a dedicated 'STIK' project (Social transfers in kind), what sources and methods could be used to address the identified methodological challenges, with proposals due in November 2013. In this context, it might be envisaged to slightly adapt some European statistics data requirements to improve the valuation of specific services and their allocation to different population groups.

Also, the Commission<sup>(1)</sup> is conducting a project on 'Social Impact Assessment: Methodological Support', to run from January 2012 till June 2013, to assess existing and develop further methodologies and models for the quantitative analysis of social impacts of various policy measures.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> DG Employment Social Affairs and Inclusion and Joint Research Centre.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005337/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Emer Costello (S&D)**  
(29 May 2012)

*Subject:* Au pairs

How has the Commission responded to Parliament's resolution of 19 October 2010 on precarious women workers (P7\_TA(2010)0365) and, in particular, to paragraph 23 thereof which called on the Commission to propose a new European agreement on the rules regarding au pairs, and to Parliament's resolution of 12 May 2011 on domestic workers (P7\_TA(2011)0237), in particular recital G thereof, which reiterated Parliament's call for au pairs to be given the same protection as other domestic workers?

When will the Commission publish the results of the impact assessment study launched by its Directorate-General for Justice, Freedom and Security on au pairs and on possible amendments to Council Directive 2004/114/EC on the conditions of admission of third-country nationals for the purposes of studies, pupil exchange, unremunerated training or voluntary service?

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

The Commission is aware of the specific needs of persons placed au pair. In 1984, it recommended that the Member States ratify the European Agreement on au pair of the Council of Europe <sup>(1)</sup> so as to lay down rules on their living and working conditions, education, social security as well as on the rights and duties of the host family. More recently, the Commission developed information on au pair work in its European youth portal <sup>(2)</sup>. The Commission initiatives in the field of trafficking in Human Beings <sup>(3)</sup> could be relevant in preventing abuses in the situation of au pairs.

The Commission has followed the discussions leading to the adoption of the Domestic Workers Convention, 2011 (No 189) of the ILO and agrees with the need to address the situation of domestic workers, who frequently belong to vulnerable groups or are in informal or precarious employment. The Convention does however not specifically address the situation of au-pairs and exempts from the scope of the Convention, persons performing domestic work only occasionally or sporadically and not on an occupational basis.

The Commission plans to present in December 2012 <sup>(4)</sup> a modification of Directives 2004/114 <sup>(5)</sup> and 2004/71 <sup>(6)</sup> which regulate the conditions of admission of third-country national students, school pupils, unremunerated trainees, volunteers and researchers. The personal scope of the proposal and the possibility to include au pairs are being examined in the impact assessment which will accompany the proposal. The Commission will take into account the study on third-country national au pairs, carried out by an independent external contractor and will make its outcome available.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Commission Recommendation 85/64/EEC of 20 December 1984 concerning a European Agreement on au pair placement sponsored by the Council of Europe.

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://europa.eu/youth/working/au\\_pair/index\\_eu\\_en.html](http://europa.eu/youth/working/au_pair/index_eu_en.html)

<sup>(3)</sup> EU strategy towards the eradication of trafficking in Human Beings 2012-2016, COM(2012)286 of 19.06.2012.

<sup>(4)</sup> Roadmap: 'Admission of third-country nationals for the purposes of scientific research, studies, pupil exchange, unremunerated training or voluntary service', [http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/planned\\_ia/roadmaps\\_2012\\_en.htm#HOME](http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/planned_ia/roadmaps_2012_en.htm#HOME).

<sup>(5)</sup> Council Directive 2004/114/EC of 13 December 2004 on the conditions of admission of third-country nationals for the purposes of studies, pupil exchange, unremunerated training or voluntary service, OJ L 375, 23.12.2004.

<sup>(6)</sup> Council Directive 2005/71/EC of 12 October 2005 on a specific procedure for admitting third-country nationals for the purposes of scientific research, OJ L 289, 3.11.2005.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005339/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Emer Costello (S&D)**  
(29 May 2012)

*Subject:* Closure of Palestinian NGOs in Jerusalem

On 25 October 2011, the Israeli police issued closure orders to four registered Palestinian Jerusalem-based NGOs which provide services for the Palestinian community in Jerusalem: the Shua'a Women's Association, the Al Quads Development Foundation, the Saeed Education Centre, and Work Without Borders. Since August 2001, the Israeli authorities have closed approximately 28 organisations serving the Palestinian community and its social, cultural and economic development. This is part of a broader policy through which the Israeli authorities seek to stifle Palestinian development in Jerusalem and to strengthen Israel's occupation of East Jerusalem, and which also includes the violation of housing rights and the revocation of residency, ultimately resulting in the forced displacement of Palestinians from Jerusalem.

East Jerusalem is recognised under international law as an integral part of the occupied Palestinian territory over which the Palestinian people are entitled to exercise their right to self-determination. As a fundamental principle of international human rights law, the right to self-determination includes the right of peoples to freely pursue their social, cultural, and economic development.

To the Commission's knowledge, how many and which Palestinian NGOs based in Jerusalem have received closure orders in the past three years? How many of these NGOs had received funding from the EU? What has happened to this EU funding?

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

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its replies to previous written questions E-010447/2011 and E-010667/2011 <sup>(1)</sup>.

---

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

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005341/12  
to the Commission  
Emer Costello (S&D)  
(29 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Country-by-country reporting concerning conflict minerals

How is the Commission planning to respond to Parliament's resolution of 13 September 2011 on an effective raw materials strategy for Europe (P7\_TA(2011)0364), most notably to paragraph 65, which called on the Commission 'to come forward with a proposal of its own on country-by-country reporting concerning conflict minerals and to establish legally binding requirements for extractive companies to publish their revenue payments for each project and country they invest in, following the example of the US Dodd-Frank bill'?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission  
(11 July 2012)**

As stated in its 2011 Communication on raw materials the Commission is strongly committed to ensuring transparency of physical markets, of payments and of supply chains.

The Commission adopted a legislative proposal on Country-by-Country Reporting on 25 October 2011. The proposal requires mandatory disclosure of payments to governments on a country and project basis by all listed and large unlisted EU companies with activities in the oil, gas, mining and logging sectors with the objective to promote good governance. With regards to conflict minerals, the Commission proposed to 'examine ways to improve transparency throughout the supply chain and tackle in coordination with key trade partners situations where revenues from extractive industries are used to fund wars or internal conflicts'. The Commission and the EEAS are following initiatives promoting conflict free minerals supply chains, in particular the implementation of the OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from Conflict-Affected and High-Risk Areas. In addition, on 22 May 2012, the EEAS convened the meeting of the International Task Force on illegal exploitation and trade of natural resources in the Great Lakes region, an informal political forum where interested stakeholders can exchange information on illegal exploitation and trade in the region as well as on conflict minerals to formulate better analysis and coherent policy response. Finally, on 25 October 2011 a new European Strategy on Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) was adopted which takes into account the importance of internationally agreed CSR guidelines and principles.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005342/12  
to the Commission  
Emer Costello (S&D)  
(29 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Cross-border credit management by SMEs

How has the Commission responded, or how is it responding, to Parliament's resolution of 12 May 2011 on the Small Business Act review (P7\_TA(2011)0235), most notably to paragraph 3, which urged the Commission to implement the approved pilot project 'to support SMEs in setting up efficient credit managements systems, facilitating cross-border debt recovery'?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission  
(11 July 2012)**

Further to the European Parliament resolution referred to by the Honorable Member, in May 2011 the Commission started the implementation of the pilot project 'Rapid and efficient enforcement of outstanding claims by small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) operating across borders'. Consequently, the implementation was conceived through a call for tender aiming at drafting guidelines on the rapid and efficient enforcement of outstanding claims by SMEs, and a call for proposals aiming at helping SMEs to optimise their business procedures and improve their awareness of the available EU legal instruments for cross-border enforcement of claims. While the call for tender was not awarded, the call for proposal resulted in the award of 13 grants for the organisation of special seminars which will be held throughout 2012. These seminars — organised in Belgium, Bulgaria, Greece, Spain, France, Italy, Romania, Slovenia and Slovakia, will provide SMEs with information on credit management, claims management and the available legal instruments, especially for commercial transactions across borders within the EU. More information on these seminars can be found on the Directorate-General Enterprise and Industry website <sup>(1)</sup>.

Additionally a new pilot project will be launched this year. It will include three actions: the preparation of practice-based guidelines to introduce the subject and methodology of credit and claims management, the organisation of events/seminars in all EU Member States and Croatia and the preparation of teaching modules whose content can be integrated in advanced vocational training and advanced training of young entrepreneurs.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/business-environment/cross-border-enforcement/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/business-environment/cross-border-enforcement/index_en.htm)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005343/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Emer Costello (S&D)**  
(29 May 2012)

*Subject:* Cross-contamination of food by allergens

Concerns have been expressed to me by coeliacs about the issue of cross-contamination of food by allergens. It is my understanding that, under existing EU rules, food producers must state on the label if their products contain food allergens. However, a concern remains regarding the risk that naturally gluten-free products may be 'cross-contaminated' by gluten from other food products in factories where the food is prepared.

In response, food manufacturers use the phrase 'may contain gluten' on their labels. Concerns have been expressed to me that, while this wording is legally correct, it may dissuade people with gluten intolerance from consuming products suitable for them.

Furthermore, I am informed that the use of this phrase has increased in anticipation of the entry into force of new rules from January 2012, which reduce the permitted gluten limit from 200 parts per million to 20 parts per million, thereby depriving coeliacs of an even wider range of products.

Will the Commission consider drafting proposals to revise the EU's food labelling legislation such that it requires that product labels specify the precise quantity of gluten contained in a product?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission**  
(4 July 2012)

Before the adoption of Commission Regulation (EC) No 41/2009 <sup>(1)</sup> concerning the composition and labelling of food suitable for people intolerant to gluten, there was no harmonised threshold on the indication of the absence of gluten; the previous threshold of 200 ppm that applied in most Member States was based on Codex Alimentarius Standard of 1979.

Regulation (EC) No 41/2009, applicable since 1 January 2012, establishes two sets of rules: foods may be labelled as a) 'gluten-free' when the gluten content is not higher than 20 ppm and b) 'very low gluten' when not higher than 100 ppm. These rules are based on the latest scientific advice and taking into account that coeliacs can recognise and use such labelling statements in order to make informed choices within the EU and find on the market a variety of foods appropriate for their needs and level of sensitivity.

The Commission has no indications that labelling of the precise quantity of gluten would provide additional benefits for people intolerant to gluten. To the contrary, given the associated burden, it could result in fewer products on the market presented as suitable for coeliacs and impact the final price for consumers.

The new Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 <sup>(2)</sup> on food information to consumers provides for the Commission to set up rules concerning the use of voluntary information on the unintentional presence of allergens. This would enable the Commission to frame warning labels on allergen cross-contamination on the basis of harmonised criteria and wordings and would limit the misuse of messages such as 'may contain'.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 14, 20.1.2009, p. 5.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 304, 22.11.2011, p. 18.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005344/12  
to the Commission  
Emer Costello (S&D)  
(29 May 2012)**

*Subject:* 'Dial to Stop Drug Dealing' service

As a member of the Dublin North Inner City Drugs Taskforce, I have received an increasing number of reports of low-level violence, harassment and intimidation of the families, including the elderly parents, of drug users and addicts over drug debts, often involving very small amounts.

In 2008, the 'Dial to Stop Drug Dealing' service was launched in Ireland. This provides a confidential telephone line for reporting drug dealing. Since then, there have been more than 9 000 calls to this service, resulting in more than 2 500 reports to the National Drugs Unit of the Irish police.

Will the Commission give consideration to introducing a common, Europe-wide 'dial to stop drug dealing' telephone number, similar to the Europe-wide numbers for missing children, child helplines and emotional support introduced in 2007 and the numbers for crime victims and non-emergency medical calls launched in 2009?

Will it also give consideration to supporting and funding this useful public service under the EU Drugs Action Plan for 2009-2012 and the Daphne programme?

What other EU funding programmes might be of interest to community groups working with people suffering from this type of harassment and intimidation, and when will the next call for proposals under these programmes be made?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission  
(11 July 2012)**

Thank you for drawing the Commission's attention to the 'Dial to stop Drug Dealing' service which was introduced in Ireland in 2008. The Commission welcomes the success of this initiative in Ireland.

There is no programme available at this moment in time which would allow the financing of an identical service at EU level. In particular, the Daphne programme does not address drug-related issues, nor does it cover violence in general. Using the Daphne programme would not be appropriate as the programme rather targets violence against women, children and young people.

At this moment in time, the Commission has no plans to consider the introduction of a Europe-wide 'Dial to stop Drug Dealing' telephone number. Should the EU Member States express an interest in organising an information exchange among them on this topic, the Commission could look at possible ways to support such initiatives.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005345/12  
to the Commission  
Emer Costello (S&D)  
(29 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Dog management in the EU

What action is the Commission taking, or planning to take, in response to Parliament's written declaration of 13 October 2011 on dog population management in the EU (P7\_TA(2011)0444)? I refer in particular to the call on the Commission to encourage Member States to introduce mandatory identification and registration of every dog by means of EU-wide compatible systems, in order to avoid the spread of diseases.

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission  
(4 July 2012)**

The European Union is active in promoting and encouraging good practices on companion animal welfare in various ways. In November 2010, the Council adopted conclusions on the welfare of dogs and cats <sup>(1)</sup> where it calls in particular on the Commission 'To study and propose, if justified, options for facilitating compatible systems of identification and registration of dogs and cats in order to ensure better guarantees to the citizen through more efficient traceability of those animals (...)'.  

---

As a consequence, in the framework of the EU strategy for the protection and welfare of animals 2012-2015, the Commission has committed itself to perform a study on the welfare of dogs and cats involved in commercial practices. In the light of the results of this study, the Commission will consider whether further actions are necessary in this field.

Since 2003 the identification of dogs is regulated at EU level when those animals are moved across EU borders. Although their registration is not regulated at EU level, some Member States have implemented a mandatory registration of dogs for purposes other than animal health, and some of them have even put in place a national database.

As regards possible future developments of legislation in this area, the EU has limited competence in relation to pet animals. Therefore, any possible Union initiative should be in line with the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms\\_data/docs/pressdata/en/agricult/118076.pdf](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/agricult/118076.pdf)



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005347/12  
to the Commission  
Emer Costello (S&D)  
(29 May 2012)**

*Subject:* EU legislative initiative on carers' leave

What is the current situation with regard to the Commission's plans to launch a European legislative initiative on carers' leave?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission  
(18 July 2012)**

In line with the strategy for equality between women and men 2010-15, the Commission strongly supports initiatives aimed at improving the reconciliation between private, family and work life in the EU.

The Commission has launched a study to identify possible policy options at EU level in relation to carers' leave (leave to take care of ill, disabled or impaired family members).

Another Commission's study analyses elderly care in Europe from the perspective of female employment and gender equality. Based on the reports of the national experts of the EGGE network <sup>(1)</sup>, this comparative analysis covers 33 European countries including all 27 EU Member States as well as EFTA/EEA countries and candidate countries. The study focuses on availability and affordability of elderly care provisions as well as pay, working conditions and balance between care and work for caregivers.

The Commission will carefully assess the results of both researches conducted and look at the appropriate follow up.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> EU expert group on gender and employment.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005348/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Emer Costello (S&D)**  
(29 May 2012)

*Subject:* EU support for start-ups and small innovative companies

How has or is the Commission responding to Parliament's resolution of 12 May 2011 on the Small Business Act review (P7\_TA(2011)0235), most notably to paragraph 15, which called for the establishment of a European Fund for Venture Capital, urged the EU to expand permanent risk-sharing products offered by the European Investment Bank via the Risk-Sharing Finance Facility, and highlighted the important role the EIB could play, in particular by fostering programmes such as Jasmine and Jeremie, in providing support to SMEs?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission**  
(11 July 2012)

For the next financial framework 2014-2020, the Commission has proposed <sup>(1)</sup> financial instruments in the new Programme for Competitiveness of Enterprises and SMEs (COSME) as well as Horizon 2020 — the new framework for research and innovation. Both proposals foresee under an integrated equity facility the possibility to invest in all stages and demand-driven equity investments via funds-of-funds schemes investing across borders established by the European Investment Fund (EIF) or other entrusted entities. The purpose of such a scheme is to catalyse private sector involvement over a longer-term perspective and to overcome market fragmentation.

Furthermore, the Commission has mandated the European Investment Bank (EIB) to expand the Risk Sharing Finance Facility (RSFF). For this purpose, the Risk Sharing Instrument (RSI) <sup>(2)</sup> has been created under the RSFF <sup>(3)</sup>. Under the RSI pilot scheme, the Commission together with the EIF offers a risk-sharing mechanism for banks lending to R & D and innovation driven SMEs and small midcaps.

In the framework of cohesion policy Member States may use the 2014-2020 financial instruments in relation to all thematic objectives covered by Regional Operational Programmes. Rules have also been made clearer to better enable the combination of financial instruments with other forms of support (i.e. grants). There is a more pronounced focus on SMEs: it is proposed that 80% of ERDF <sup>(4)</sup> in more developed regions and 50% of ERDF funding in less developed regions is allocated to thematic objectives like R & D and innovation, SMEs and a shift to a low carbon economy.

There are additional opportunities in expanding the cooperation between the EIB Group and Member States, for example, the Greek SME guarantee fund <sup>(5)</sup> as well as Jeremie Holding Funds with the EIB providing senior lending.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> The Commission proposals of 30 November 2011, COSME: <http://ec.europa.eu/cip/cosme> and Horizon 2020: <http://ec.europa.eu/research/horizon2020>.

<sup>(2)</sup> RSI: [http://www.eif.org/what\\_we\\_do/guarantees/RSI/index.htm](http://www.eif.org/what_we_do/guarantees/RSI/index.htm)

<sup>(3)</sup> Being aimed at providing only non-financial support services for micro-credit providers in the EU, Jasmine (Joint Action to Support Microfinance Institutions in Europe) is not concerned by the provisions of the RSFF, although contributing to the development of sound microcredit lending (< EUR 25 000) in the EU.

<sup>(4)</sup> European Regional Development Fund.

<sup>(5)</sup> Using Structural Funds as collateral for the EIB loans.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005349/12  
to the Commission  
Emer Costello (S&D)  
(29 May 2012)**

*Subject:* European Charter on the workplace rights of cancer patients and chronically sick people and European social dialogue

Further to its answer of 26 November 2010 to Written Question E-8399/10 and specifically to its comments on Parliament's previous call on it to draw up a European Charter on the workplace rights of cancer patients and chronically sick people, could the Commission outline what steps, if any, it has taken since that answer, or outline what plans it has to raise this specific issue in the context of European social dialogue?

**Question for written answer E-005363/12  
to the Commission  
Emer Costello (S&D)  
(29 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Rehabilitating and reintegrating cancer patients in the workplace

Further to its answer of 26 November 2010 to Written Question E-8399/2010 and specifically to its comments on the European Parliament's previous call on it to draw up a charter on the workplace rights of cancer patients and chronically sick people, could the Commission outline what steps, if any, it has taken since that answer, or outline what plans it has to raise this specific issue in the context of the European social dialogue?

**Joint answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission  
(16 July 2012)**

As stated in its reply to Question E-8399/10 <sup>(1)</sup> the Community Strategy on Health and Safety at Work 2007-2012 <sup>(2)</sup> encourages Member States to incorporate into their national strategies specific measures (financial assistance, training tailored to individual needs, etc.) to improve the rehabilitation and reintegration of workers excluded from the workplace for a long period of time because of an accident at work, an occupational illness or a disability.

The Commission is currently evaluating the results of this Strategy and will in due course address, in this light, the issue of how to reintegrate chronically sick people.

EU social partners and their affiliates, both at cross-industry and sectoral levels, are key players for the promotion of health and safety at the work place. In this regard, the EU social partners, in particular in the industrial sectors, have already contributed to reducing the exposure to carcinogenic substances through the adoption of an autonomous agreement on worker's protection from the silica crystalline dust. The Commission is committed to promote EU social dialogue, and it will support the social partner initiatives in the area of occupational health and safety while fully respecting their autonomy.

---

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

<sup>(2)</sup> COM(2007) 62 final.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005350/12  
to the Commission**

**Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)**

(29 May 2012)

*Subject:* Car hire agreements

Many citizens, when hiring a car, are offered both a 'collision damage waiver' and a further 'excess insurance policy' to give them peace of mind whilst the vehicle is in their care. Broadly speaking, a collision damage waiver (CDW) is a policy that covers the hirer of a rental vehicle for incidents such as theft or damage by accident, vandalism or weather (such as hail), meaning that rather than the customer paying for this while the vehicle is in their care, the insurance will cover the cost to the rental company.

CDW may not, however, cover every eventuality — such as cracked windscreens — or may not cover damage beneath a specific threshold, such as EUR 500. An additional excess policy can be taken out to cover these eventualities.

Many consumers take out CDW when initially booking the rental, only to have their attention drawn to the need for a further excess policy by representatives when collecting the vehicle.

Although consumers are usually free to decide which policy to opt for, some may prefer the up-front peace of mind of the more comprehensive CDW and excess policy when making their reservation. Many consumers are either unaware of what CDW does and does not cover, or are unaware when making their initial booking that excess insurance is available.

1. Is the Commission aware of this business practice?
2. Will it consider investigating it further, to ensure consumers are able to make informed decisions about comprehensive insurance when making their rental booking?
3. Does the Commission see such practices as contradicting Council Directive 93/13/EEC of 5 April 1993 on unfair terms in consumer contracts?

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

(12 July 2012)

The Commission is aware of the alleged practice. The business practice referred to by the Honourable Member relates to the so-called comprehensive or first party motor insurance cover which is not regulated by the Motor Insurance Directive 2009/103/EC. The Commission considers it important that consumers are well-informed before they take out a motor insurance policy and thus has the intention to include car rental companies in the scope of the Insurance Mediation Directive 2002/92/EC in its upcoming proposal which shall improve the information provision by insurance intermediaries to consumers.

In any case, the Commission considers that such practice should be assessed under the Unfair Commercial Practices Directive 2005/29/EC rather than under the Unfair Contract Terms Directive 1993/13/EEC.

Indeed, Directive 2005/29/EC requires traders to display in a clear and timely manner material information that consumers need to take an informed purchase decision, such as the main characteristics of product offered for sale including the results and benefits to be expected from its use.

Any alleged breach of the directive should be brought to the attention of national authorities and/or, if necessary, submit to the courts which are primarily responsible for the enforcement of this legislation. Consumers which have been victims of such practices should report their case to the relevant competent authorities, whose contact details can be found using the following link: [http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/empowerment/cons\\_networks\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/empowerment/cons_networks_en.htm)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005352/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)  
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)  
(29 May 2012)**

*Subject:* VP/HR — Area C evictions and demolitions

Palestinian residential structures in Area C of the West Bank and in particular around the Jerusalem periphery, Jordan Valley and South Hebron Hills continue to face demolition.

The Kurshan compound of the Khan al-Ahmar Arab al-Jahalin Bedouin community has been issued with eviction and demolition notices by the Israeli Civil Administration. Another demolition notice was issued to the Az-Zayyem Arab al-Jahalin Bedouin community.

Is the High Representative aware of these eviction and demolition notices? What representations are being made to the Israelis regarding the demolition of property and displacement of residents?

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

The HR/VP was aware of the eviction and demolition notices referred to by the Honourable Member. Indeed, the EU regularly makes representations to the Israeli authorities following incidents leading to the demolition of property as well as regarding the displacement of residents. The issues are also raised in the framework of the EU-Israel political dialogue.

In its Council conclusions of 14 May 2012, the EU expressed deep concern about developments on the ground which threaten to make a two-state solution impossible, including the worsening living conditions of the Palestinian population in Area C as well as plans of forced transfer of the Bedouin communities, in particular from the wider E1 area.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005353/12  
to the Commission**

**Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)**

(29 May 2012)

*Subject:* Renewable Energy Directive (2009/28/EC)

The Commission is planning to issue its first progress report, as required by the Renewable Energy Directive (2009/28/EC), this year. This will include biofuel reporting obligations under Articles 17, 18 and 23.

In April 2012, the international anti-poverty non-governmental organisation ActionAid published a report compiled by Anders Dahlbeck entitled 'Fuel for thought — Addressing the social impacts of EU biofuels policies'.

Is the Commission aware of this report? Will the Commission's assessment reflect any of the concerns highlighted within it?

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

(10 July 2012)

The Commission is aware of the report in question and has discussed it with stakeholders.

As required by the EU Renewable Energy Directive 2009/28/EC, the Commission will report before end of 2012 on the environmental and social impacts of the EU biofuels policy on developing countries, including on the impact of increased biofuels production on social sustainability, food security, land use etc.

The assessment of impacts in the report will be based on multiple information sources, including the reports of the EU Member States, scientific literature, data of relevant international organisations and outcomes of the dialogue with third countries, civil society and relevant stakeholders.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005354/12  
to the Commission  
Emer Costello (S&D)**

(29 May 2012)

*Subject:* European universities together — administrative, technical and support staff in third-level institutions who assist research workers engaged in cross-border research

In relation to the issues raised in its answer of 25 May 2007 to Written Question E-0729/2007, could the Commission indicate what, if any, current EU funding programmes, including the Marie Curie, Leonardo, Erasmus and Grundtvig programmes, could be of interest in helping to build up a European-wide network for administrative, technical and support staff in third-level institutions who provide student support, assist teaching staff and work with research workers engaged in cross-border research?

— What consideration is being given towards including such support staff under the next EU Research Framework Programme and under the Bologna Process?

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

(9 August 2012)

At the moment, the Lifelong Learning Programme and the Marie Curie Actions do not offer the possibility to fund European-wide networks for staff at higher education institutions engaged in student support, and those who provide assistance to teaching and research staff.

However, multilateral projects within the Lifelong Learning Programme and its mobility schemes offer possibilities for teachers, administrative and technical staff to work together on transnational projects focused on specific themes, or engage in transnational mobility for specific work-related training.

Under the future Erasmus For All programme, it is proposed to focus more attention on building transnational strategic partnerships between institutions to raise their capacities to reform and modernise. Staff members at higher education institutions could collaborate on targeted activities, also linked to student support, student mobility or towards long-term teaching staff exchanges between partner institutions. These activities could be complemented by staff visits to share best practices in supporting internationalization of their institutions. The main objective of these strategic partnerships is not however, to support transnational research, like the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions, as they will be called from 2014. One of the actions proposed supports flexible exchanges of highly skilled research and innovation staff between sectors, countries and disciplines.

The Bologna Process provides a forum for policy exchange and development. While the European Union contributes to the cost of running the Secretariat, costs for participation and any initiatives such as conferences etc are borne by the countries themselves.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005355/12  
to the Commission  
Emer Costello (S&D)  
(29 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Fairer practices in business-to-business relationships

1. What are the Commission's broad intentions with regard to its planned late 2012 Communication on fairer practices in business-to-business relationships?
2. What legislative proposals or initiatives is it considering at this stage to tackle abusive clauses in supply contracts with small and medium-sized enterprises, as a follow up to this communication?

**Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission  
(26 July 2012)**

Following the Resolution of the European Parliament of 5 July 2011 (report of Mrs Corazza-Bildt MEP), the Commission's own analysis <sup>(1)</sup> and several consultations with interested parties on the subject, the Commission has identified unfair trading practices in business-to-business relations along the retail supply chain as one of the major problems this sector faces.

As announced in the single market Act, the Commission plans to launch an initiative to combat unfair business-to-business commercial practices, in order to identify the nature and scale of the problems associated with unfair commercial practices between professional operators throughout the supply chain, list current regulations within the Member States, to assess their implementation and, finally, identify the various possible options.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Retail Market Monitoring Report 'Towards more efficient and fairer retail services in the internal market for 2020' COM(2010)355 final.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005356/12  
to the Commission  
Emer Costello (S&D)  
(29 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Future of the Enterprise Europe Network under the COSME Programme (2014-2020)

The Enterprise Europe Network (EEN) is currently being co-funded under the Entrepreneurship and Innovation Programme within the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme (CIP).

Paragraph 18 of Parliament's resolution of 12 May 2011 on the Small Business Act review (P7\_TA(2011)0235) reiterated Parliament's support for the CIP and called for it to remain an independent flagship programme for SMEs.

Could the Commission confirm that it envisages that networks such as the EEN will continue to be able to apply for co-funding under its proposal for the CIP's successor programme, the Competitiveness and SMEs Programme 2014-2020 (see COM(2011)0834), which was introduced on 30 November 2011 and which is currently being examined by Parliament and the Council?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission  
(11 July 2012)**

The Commission can confirm that its proposal for a Programme for the Competitiveness of Enterprises and SMEs (COSME, 2014-2020) foresees the continuation of financial support to the Enterprise Europe Network. It is envisaged that the activities will build on the experiences and successes achieved during the current financial perspectives and that the co-funding will cover all activities currently performed. With close to 600 member organisations across the EU and beyond, the Enterprise Europe Network helps small business to make the most of the European marketplace. Future activities would include:

- information and advisory services on EU initiatives and legislation,
- support for enhancing the management capacities of SMEs,
- support for improving the financial knowledge and expertise related to energy efficiency and environmental issues of SMEs,
- promotion of EU funding programmes and financial instruments,
- facilitation of cross-border business, R & D, technology and innovation partnerships,
- and provision of a communication channel between SMEs and the Commission.

It is also planned that the Enterprise Europe Network may be used to deliver services on behalf, and with the resources, of other EU programmes such as Horizon 2020.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005357/12  
to the Commission  
Emer Costello (S&D)  
(29 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Implementation of the revised Late Payments Directive

The revised Late Payments Directive (Directive 2011/7/EU) is due to be transposed into domestic law by 16 March 2013 at the latest. In its resolution of 12 May 2011 on the review of the Small Business Act (P7\_TA(2011)0235), Parliament called for the swift implementation of this legislation.

— Which Member States have transposed this directive so far?

— From the Commission's viewpoint, what would be the merits of implementing this directive before the agreed deadline, particularly for small and medium-sized enterprises?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission  
(11 July 2012)**

The political will of the Commission to recognise a central role for SMEs in the economy of the Union is reflected *inter alia* in its decision to make Directive 2001/7/EU on late payment in commercial transactions a part of the Small Business Act. Through its resolution referred to by the Honourable Member, highlighting the detrimental effects of late payments on Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (SMEs), the European Parliament draws attention to a swift implementation of the directive. Considering the magnitude of late payments throughout the Union and the related obstacles to the free movement of goods in the single market, the Commission called upon Member States to consider early transposition and implementation as a pre-requisite for effective support for SMEs to overcome the economic crisis. While some Member States provided information on their efforts for an early transposition before end 2012, to date none has yet finalised the legislative procedure leading to adoption of their national measures.

The merit of early transposition and implementation stems directly from the support needed by SMEs during a time of crisis, with the view to increase their capacity to enhancing growth and strengthening competitiveness.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005358/12  
to the Commission  
Emer Costello (S&D)  
(29 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Incentive measures to favour the mobility of disabled drivers

In accordance with the directive on the taxation of energy products (2003/96/EC), approved unanimously by all Member States' finance Ministers in 2003, it was agreed that the fuel excise duty exemptions for disabled drivers that are in place in a number of Member States would be abolished by the end of 2006 at the latest.

To the Commission's knowledge, in place of such exemptions, what alternative incentive measures favouring the mobility of disabled drivers have been introduced, or are being considered, in these Member States?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission  
(11 July 2012)**

The Commission would point out that directive 2003/96/EC <sup>(1)</sup> allowed only Ireland, until the end of 2006, to exempt from excise duty motor fuels used in motor vehicles by disabled drivers. The Commission has not been informed about alternative incentive measures put in place by Ireland. It should also be observed that Article 5 of this directive allows all Member States to apply reduced rates of energy taxation for energy products used by disabled people, provided the minimum levels of taxation are respected.

Furthermore and as a different initiative, the Commission has developed a European Disability Parking card which aims at facilitating the mobility of disabled drivers in the EU and continues to raise awareness about this European model, as specified in the EU Disability Strategy 2010-2020 <sup>(2)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 283, 31.10.2003.

<sup>(2)</sup> 'COM(2010) 636 final' and 'SEC(2010) 1324 final' (accompanying background document).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005359/12  
to the Commission  
Emer Costello (S&D)  
(29 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Insurance against damage caused by floods

1. What is the current situation with regard to the Commission's analysis of Member States' regimes regarding insurance against damage caused by natural disasters such as flooding, as announced by the Commissioner for Internal Market and Services in March 2010?
2. What initiatives, if any, is the Commission considering on this issue?

**Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission  
(24 July 2012)**

The Joint Research Centre of the European Commission is going to publish a final report on 'Natural Catastrophes: Risk Relevance and Insurance Coverage in the European Union' during the third quarter of 2012. The Commission will consider appropriate possible follow up actions in the light of the report.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005360/12  
to the Commission  
Emer Costello (S&D)  
(29 May 2012)**

*Subject:* EU-Mercosur Association Agreement

1. How is the Commission responding to the call on it to come forward with a detailed impact assessment of the proposed EU-Mercosur Association Agreement, as set out in paragraph 68 of the European Parliament's resolution of 23 June 2011 on the CAP towards 2020 (P7\_TA(2011)0297)?
2. In carrying out this assessment, in addition to the agricultural sector will the Commission analyse the potential impact, both positive and negative, for other sectors including industry and services and on employment by Member States, and also on the developing countries?

**Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission  
(3 July 2012)**

1. A detailed Sustainable Impact Assessment of the proposed EU-Mercosur Association Agreement has already been conducted and has been publicly available since March 2009 <sup>(1)</sup>. In addition, the Commission decided, in 2010, to commission updated economic studies on the impact of this proposed agreement. The preliminary results of these updated economic studies were presented to the INTA Committee of the European Parliament on 21 June 2011 while the final versions of these studies were sent to the European Parliament on 15 July 2011. They are also now publicly available <sup>(2)</sup>.
2. These assessments analyse the impact in the EU as a whole in other economic sectors besides agriculture for a number of key economic variables such as sector value-added and trade. This includes in particular industry and services. Impacts in the Mercosur as a region are similarly analysed, while potential impacts for other developing countries in specific are out of the remit of these studies. The SIA further provides a qualitative assessment on possible impacts in terms of employment for both the EU and Mercosur, as well as a quantitative review on wage impacts.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/trade/analysis/sustainability-impact-assessments/assessments/>

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/trade/analysis/chief-economist/>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005361/12  
to the Commission  
Emer Costello (S&D)  
(29 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Parental Leave Directive

1. Which Member States have yet to notify the Commission of their transposition into domestic law of the new Parental Leave Directive (2010/18/EU), which should have been transposed by 8 March 2012?
2. What action has the Commission taken, or is it considering taking, against those Member States that have yet to notify it of their transposition of this directive, in accordance with their obligations under EC law?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission  
(11 July 2012)**

All Member States have informed the Commission about the state of implementation of the revised Parental Leave Directive <sup>(1)</sup> into national law.

Nineteen Member States have notified full transposition. Six Member States (Denmark, Ireland, Luxembourg, Poland, Slovenia and the United Kingdom) have requested the additional period of one year to comply with the directive, in accordance with Article 3(2) of the directive. This means that their implementation deadline has been extended until 8 March 2013.

Two Member States have so far <sup>(2)</sup> only notified partial transposition. If these Member States do not officially communicate all implementation measures soon, the Commission will take appropriate action by launching infringement procedures.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Council Directive 2010/18/EU of 8 March 2010 implementing the revised Framework Agreement on parental leave concluded by BUSINESSEUROPE, UEAPME, CEEP and ETUC and repealing Directive 96/34/EC, OJ L 68, 18.3.2010, p. 13-20.

<sup>(2)</sup> As of 12 June 2012.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005362/12  
to the Commission  
Emer Costello (S&D)  
(29 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Planned 2012 regulation on EU hotline for missing children

1. What is the current situation with regard to the Commission's planned 2012 draft regulation on EU hotlines for missing children, as announced in the Commission's Green Paper of 20 April 2010 on its planned initiatives for the next five years in the field of justice, security and freedom (COM(2010)0171)?
2. Does the Commission plan to propose the co-funding of these hotlines by the EU and the Member States?
3. If not, what steps is the Commission considering in order to ensure that these hotlines are properly funded in all Member States?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission  
(29 June 2012)**

The Universal Service Directive requires Member States to make every effort to ensure that citizens have access to the 116 000 hotline for missing children and contains other specific requirements relating to the hotline <sup>(1)</sup>. The hotline is still not operational in 10 Member States <sup>(2)</sup>. The Commission has sent a letter to those 10 Member States, reminding them of their obligations and requesting that they provide the Commission with all information on measures taken to fulfil them. Should there be no progress, the Commission will not hesitate to take further action. In such a case and as indicated in the communication 'Dial 116 000: The European hotline for missing children' <sup>(3)</sup> the Commission will also consider a legislative proposal.

In 2012, the Commission has allocated EUR3 million for operating grants to run or set up new 116 000 hotlines. On 21 May 2012 <sup>(4)</sup>, EUR1.9 million was allocated to organisations in 14 Member States <sup>(5)</sup>. Furthermore, a second call for proposals for operating grants was launched to allow other Member States to profit from the remaining EUR1.1m funding available in 2012 and three applications for funding have been received. As a result of this funding, the hotline is expected to be rendered operational by the end of the year in several Member States. The Commission will continue to earmark funding to improve children's situation on the ground. However, the funding for the hotlines should be seen as the responsibility of Member States.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> See Article 27a of the Universal Service Directive 2002/22/EC of 7 March 2002, as amended by Directive 2009/136/EC of 25 November 2009.  
<sup>(2)</sup> The hotline is not yet operational in: AT, BG, CY, CZ, FI, IE, LV, LT, LU, SE. The number has not yet been assigned to a service provider in: FI, LV, LT. For details on the current state of implementation of the 116 000 hotlines, the Honourable Member is invited to consult the following website: [http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/rights-child/hotline/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/rights-child/hotline/index_en.htm).  
<sup>(3)</sup> COM(2010)674 final.  
<sup>(4)</sup> C(2012) 3435 final. Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/justice/newsroom/files/decision\\_daphne\\_116\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/justice/newsroom/files/decision_daphne_116_en.pdf).  
<sup>(5)</sup> BE, BG, CY, DK, EE, ES, HU, IE, IT, NL, PL, RO, SK, UK.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005364/12  
to the Commission  
Emer Costello (S&D)  
(29 May 2012)**

*Subject:* VAT gap

On 6 December 2011, the Commission published a communication on the future of VAT (COM(2011)0851), according to which a study carried out on its behalf some years ago concluded that 12% of 'theoretical VAT' in the Member States is not collected due to fraud, errors, negligence and bankruptcy. Did the study provide estimates of the VAT gap by Member State? If so, what was the study's estimate of the VAT gap in Ireland?

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

The study ordered by the European Commission to Reckon LLP assessed the size of the VAT gap in 24 Member States between the years 2000 and 2006. The VAT gap was calculated using a top-down approach, which compares the total theoretical VAT liability with the accrued VAT receipts. It should be noted that the VAT gap is not a measure of fraud. It might include VAT not paid as a result of legitimate tax avoidance measures or VAT not collected due to insolvencies arising as a result of regular business activity.

The VAT gaps assessed for Ireland were: 5% (2000), 6% (2001), 3% (2002), 7% (2003), 4% (2004), 3% (2005) and 2% (2006).

More details on the assessments made for Ireland and remaining Member States can be obtained from the Reckon report that is available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/taxation\\_customs/resources/documents/taxation/tax\\_cooperation/combating\\_tax\\_fraud/reckon\\_report\\_sep2009.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/taxation/tax_cooperation/combating_tax_fraud/reckon_report_sep2009.pdf)

---



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005365/12  
to the Commission  
Emer Costello (S&D)  
(29 May 2012)**

*Subject:* VAT on 'topical and IV medications'

Currently in Ireland, oral medications are charged at 0% VAT, while 'topical and IV' medications are charged at the full rate of 23% VAT.

The reason for this given by the Irish Government is that the VAT rates are in line with the EU VAT Directive, with which Irish VAT laws must comply. The VAT rates for oral medications and for topical and IV medications were both set on 1 January 1991 and cannot be changed, but whereas the rate for the former was set at 0%, the rate for the latter was set at the full 23%.

— Is it absolutely the case that, under the EU VAT Directive, the VAT rate for topical and IV medications cannot be lowered to the same 0% rate that applies to oral medications?

— In the context of the proposal to revise the EU VAT Directive presented by the Commission in December 2011, what leeway, if any, might be available to the Irish Government to reduce the VAT rate for topical and IV medicines from 23%?

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

Zero rates constitute exceptions to the general rules on VAT rates. They form part of temporary derogations granted to certain Member States on the basis that such rates were in force before 1st January 1991 and continue to be limited to the goods to which they were applied at the time.

The EU VAT law <sup>(1)</sup> provides for the application of a standard rate of a minimum of 15% to taxable operations and allows, but does not oblige, Member States to apply one or two reduced rates of a minimum of 5% to an exhaustive list of supplies of goods and services which notably covers pharmaceutical products of a kind normally used for healthcare, prevention of illnesses and as treatment for medical and veterinary purposes, including products used for contraception and sanitary protection <sup>(2)</sup>.

Within this basic framework and in conformity with the principle of subsidiarity, it is up to each Member State to set its rates, without EU prior authorisation, in accordance with its fiscal or budgetary policy and other national priorities.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Council Directive 2006/112/EC of 28 November 2006 on the common system of value added tax — OJ L 347, 11.12.2006, p. 1.  
<sup>(2)</sup> Category (3) in Annex III to Council Directive 2006/112/EC.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005366/12  
to the Commission  
Emer Costello (S&D)  
(29 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Working time of self-employed drivers

Further to its answer of 27 April 2011 to Written Question E-002669/2011, what is the current situation with regard to the Commission's correspondence with the Irish authorities on the transposition of Directive 2002/15/EC, specifically in relation to self-employed drivers?

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

On 8 February 2012 the Irish authorities officially notified to the Commission their statutory instrument (S.I. No 36 of 2012 European Communities (Road Transport) (Organisation of working time of persons performing mobile road transport activities) Regulations 2012), which was adopted and entered into force on 20 January 2012 giving full effect to Directive 2002/15/EC.

---

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-005367/12  
do Komisji**

**Paweł Robert Kowal (ECR)**

(29 maja 2012 r.)

*Przedmiot:* Wpływ jednolitego patentu europejskiego na innowacyjność i MŚP

Według doniesień medialnych Komisja Europejska finalizuje obecnie prace nad stworzeniem jednolitego patentu europejskiego (JPE). Wiele organizacji pozarządowych i przedsiębiorców z krajów Unii zwraca jednak uwagę, że przepisy dotyczącego JPE faworyzują duże przedsiębiorstwa kosztem małych i średnich oraz mogą doprowadzić do ograniczenia konkurencyjności i innowacyjności wśród mniej zamożnych krajów Unii Europejskiej. Zapisy o JPE mogą wprowadzać również zbyt dużo uprawnień kontrolnych dla państw, co również może godzić w interes przedsiębiorców. Według niektórych organizacji uprawnienia te są porównywalne do tych, które przewidziane są w kontrowersyjnej umowie ACTA.

W związku z powyższym zwracam się do Komisji z następującymi pytaniami:

1. Jak jednolity patent europejski wpłynie na innowacyjność, w szczególności w mniej zamożnych krajach Unii Europejskiej i dlaczego?
2. Jakie środki ochrony praw patentowych przewidziane są w rozporządzeniach dotyczących jednolitego patentu europejskiego?
3. Jakie środki ochrony, w szczególności dla małych i średnich przedsiębiorstw, przewidziane są w rozporządzeniach dotyczących jednolitego patentu europejskiego?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Michela Barniera w imieniu Komisji**

(17 lipca 2012 r.)

Prawa własności intelektualnej, a w szczególności patenty, stanowią najważniejsze aktywa strategii innowacyjnych przedsiębiorstw. Patenty zabezpieczają inwestycje w badania i rozwój oraz przyciągają kapitał przeznaczony na inwestycje, umożliwiając przedsiębiorstwu rozwój, niezależnie od wielkości przedsiębiorstwa.

Obecny system ochrony praw patentowych w Europie jest złożony, częściowo podzielony i kosztowny, w szczególności dla MŚP, ponieważ uzyskanie ochrony patentowej w Europie może kosztować od dziesięciu do piętnastu razy więcej niż patent w USA. Nadrzędnym celem patentu europejskiego o jednolitym skutku jest umożliwienie przedsiębiorstwom osiągnięcia znacznych oszczędności. Przyczyni się on również w znacznym stopniu do uproszczenia procedur administracyjnych dzięki wyeliminowaniu konieczności potwierdzenia ważności patentów na szczeblu krajowym.

Patent europejski o jednolitym skutku uzupełnia zestaw narzędzi przedsiębiorstw na rzecz innowacyjności: mogą one wybrać patent krajowy, szereg patentów krajowych lub patent europejski o jednolitym skutku. O jednolitą ochronę patentową można ubiegać się po otrzymaniu patentu europejskiego. Odpowiednie wymagania dotyczące zdolności patentowej zostały zawarte w konwencji o patencie europejskim. Skutki i ograniczenia nowego patentu europejskiego o jednolitym skutku określono w zaproponowanym rozporządzeniu.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-005367/12  
to the Commission**

**Paweł Robert Kowal (ECR)**

(29 May 2012)

*Subject:* The impact of the Single European Patent on innovation and SMEs

According to media reports, the European Commission is currently finalising work on creating a Single European Patent. However, many NGOs and entrepreneurs in the Member States have noted that the provisions concerning the Single European Patent favour large enterprises at the expense of SMEs and have the potential to limit competitiveness and innovation in the less affluent Member States. Single European Patent provisions may also introduce too many national monitoring powers, which may damage the interests of entrepreneurs. According to some organisations, these powers are comparable to those provided for in the controversial Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement.

In view of the above, I would like to ask the Commission the following:

1. How will the Single European Patent impact innovation, particularly in less affluent Member States, and why?
2. What patent protection measures are provided for in the regulations on the Single European Patent?
3. What patent protection measures, in particular for SMEs, are provided for in the regulations on the Single European Patent?

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

(17 July 2012)

Intellectual property and patents in particular are a core asset in companies' innovation strategies. Patents offer a protection for R & D investment and also attract capital for investment to allow a company to grow, irrespective of whether the company is big or small.

The current European patent system is complex, partially fragmented and costly in particular for SME as obtaining patent protection in Europe can cost up to ten to fifteen times more than a US patent. The overall aim of the European patent with unitary effect is that companies will enjoy significant cost-savings and it will contribute largely to the simplification of administrative procedures through the elimination of the need to validate these patents at national level.

The European patent with unitary effect would complete the innovation toolbox of companies: they can opt for a national patent, several national patents or a unitary patent. The unitary protection can be requested once a European patent has been granted. The relevant patentability requirements are thus contained in the European Patent Convention. The effects and the limitations of the new unitary patent are defined in the proposed regulation.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-005368/12  
to the Commission  
Catherine Stihler (S&D)  
(29 May 2012)**

*Subject:* Internet cookies

A KPMG survey in April found that 95% of companies have still to comply with the new rules on HTTP cookies. The UK Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) has repeatedly said that it's extremely unlikely that non-compliance will result in a fine.

1. How does the Commission feel the implementation of the privacy and electronic communications directive is going, given that the implementation deadline (25 May 2012) has now passed?
2. For small businesses, the rules may present a costly and difficult process. Does the Commission find 'implied consent' to be satisfactory, rather than an explicit decision to opt in or out?

**Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission  
(21 June 2012)**

The amended ePrivacy Directive 2002/58/EC, which includes revised rules on the Internet 'cookies', had to be transposed by Member States by 25 May 2011. However, only a few Member States, including the UK, transposed the amended ePrivacy Directive on time. A majority of others were late and have only transposed the directive recently, following infringement proceedings launched by the Commission. On 31 May 2012, the Commission decided to refer five countries (BE, NL, PL, PT, SI) to the Court of Justice since they had still not transposed and notified the adopted measures. The Commission has also asked the Court to impose a daily penalty payment on each Member State <sup>(1)</sup>.

It is the duty of the competent authorities in Member States to ensure compliance with the e-Privacy Directive and, particularly, to examine user complaints. As regards the question of user consent, in current EC law, consent has to be freely given, specific and informed. There can be different technical ways to obtain valid user consent for cookies and each solution has to be assessed individually. Some of the competent national authorities, such as the UK Information Commissioner, have issued practical advice to the organisations on how to ensure compliance.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/12/524&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005370/12**

**alla Commissione**

**Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)**

(29 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Proprietà del sito di Corcolle

Considerate:

- l'apertura della procedura d'infrazione 2011/4021 nei confronti dello Stato italiano per la gestione della discarica di Malagrotta, nella provincia di Roma;
- le decisioni delle autorità locali, che hanno portato al commissariamento della discarica e alla scelta di un nuovo sito presso la località di Corcolle nelle vicinanze di Villa Adriana (patrimonio UNESCO);
- la risposta del prefetto G. Pecoraro (Prot. n. 85186/2012) alla lettera in cui chiedevo maggiori spiegazioni sulla proprietà del sito di Corcolle, in cui si afferma che è in atto la conclusione della stipula di un contratto di compravendita, dalla società BRIXIA Verwaltungs A.G con sede a Coira (Svizzera) alla società «Castello di Corcolle S.r.l. — Società Agricola» con sede a Roma, avente ad oggetto il trasferimento di porzioni di terreno, in località Corcolle, nell'area individuata per la realizzazione del sito di discarica provvisoria,

può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Ritene fattibile una discarica a ridosso del sito UNESCO?
2. Ritene possibile una discarica su un sito di proprietà di una società svizzera?

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

(11 luglio 2012)

Le decisioni relative all'ubicazione e all'autorizzazione di una discarica devono essere adottate dalle autorità competenti degli Stati membri interessati. La Commissione non può interferire con la decisione delle autorità nazionali competenti in merito all'ubicazione della discarica (compreso il suo impatto sul territorio circostante), purché tale decisione sia adottata nel rispetto degli obblighi previsti in materia dalla normativa UE, in particolare dalla direttiva 2008/98/CE<sup>(1)</sup> relativa ai rifiuti (la «direttiva quadro sui rifiuti»), dalla direttiva 1999/31/CE<sup>(2)</sup> relativa alle discariche di rifiuti (la «direttiva sulle discariche») e dalla direttiva 2011/92/UE<sup>(3)</sup> concernente la valutazione dell'impatto ambientale di determinati progetti pubblici e privati (la «direttiva VIA»).

Al momento la Commissione non dispone di alcuna informazione specifica da cui risulti che il progetto di costruzione di una nuova discarica in località Corcolle non sarebbe conforme alla pertinente legislazione dell'UE.

La direttiva sulle discariche non contiene alcun requisito in merito alla nazionalità del gestore della discarica o del proprietario del terreno dove essa verrà realizzata.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> GUL 312 del 22.11.2008.

<sup>(2)</sup> GUL 182 del 16.7.1999.

<sup>(3)</sup> GUL 26 del 28.1.2012.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005370/12  
to the Commission**

**Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)**

(29 May 2012)

*Subject:* Ownership of the Corcolle site

With reference to the following:

- the opening of infringement proceedings 2011/4021 against the Italian Government on management of the Malagrotta landfill site in the province of Rome;
  - the local authority decisions which caused the landfill site to enter receivership and the choice of a new site in Corcolle, close to Villa Adriana (a Unesco heritage site);
  - Prefect G. Pecoraro's reply (file No 85186/2012) to my letter requesting further explanations on the ownership of the Corcolle site. It states that a contract is being drawn up to sell portions of land in Corcolle, in the areas identified for developing the provisional landfill site. The company BRIXIA Verwaltungs AG, headquartered in Coira (Switzerland) is selling to the company Castello di Corcolle S.r.l. — Società Agricola [agricultural company], headquartered in Rome;
1. Does the Commission consider it feasible to have a landfill near a Unesco site?
  2. Does it consider it possible to have a landfill on a site owned by a Swiss company?

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

(11 July 2012)

Decisions about the location and authorisation of a landfill are to be taken by competent authorities in the Member States concerned. The Commission cannot interfere with the national competent authorities as to the location of the landfill (including its impact on the surroundings), insofar as such a decision is taken in compliance with the relevant requirements in EC law, particularly Directive 2008/98/EC<sup>(1)</sup> on waste (the 'Waste Framework Directive'), Directive 1999/31/EC<sup>(2)</sup> on the landfill of waste (the 'Landfill Directive') and Directive 2011/92/EU<sup>(3)</sup> on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment (the 'EIA Directive').

At this stage, the Commission does not have any specific information indicating that the project to build a new landfill in Corcolle would not be compliant with relevant EU legislation.

The Landfill Directive contains no requirements concerning the nationality of the landfill operator or the ownership of the land where a landfill is to be located.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 312, 22.11.2008.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 182, 16.7.1999.

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ L 26, 28.1.2012.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005371/12  
do Komisji**

**Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)**

(29 maja 2012 r.)

*Przedmiot:* Przyszłość INDECT

INDECT to jeden z największych projektów badawczych Unii Europejskiej koordynowanych przez polską uczelnię. W tworzenie inteligentnego systemu informacyjnego wspierającego obserwację, detekcję i wyszukiwanie na potrzeby bezpieczeństwa obywateli w środowiskach miejskich zaangażowanych jest 17 podmiotów – uczelni, instytucji i firm europejskich. Uczestniczą w nim także naukowcy z Niemiec, Anglii, Francji i Hiszpanii. Na jego realizację przeznaczono 15 mln euro, z czego 75 % pochodzi ze środków Unii Europejskiej. Naukowcy pracują nad sprawnością systemu, ale jak sami podkreślają, to, jak on zostanie użyty i przez kogo, jest poza zakresem ich projektu.

Z oświadczenia Komisji wiadomo, że INDECT nie będzie testowany podczas Euro 2012, ponieważ INDECT to projekt badawczy i nie jest przeznaczony do natychmiastowej realizacji.

Polski minister Jacek Cichocki w kwietniu podjął decyzję o wstrzymaniu współpracy policji nad projektem INDECT. Zapewnił, że Ministerstwo Spraw Wewnętrznych nie będzie brało udziału zarówno w samych pracach nad projektem, jak i wykorzystaniem jego efektów. Dziś wiemy, że możliwe jest częściowe wycofanie się z tej deklaracji. W związku z tym powraca temat tego projektu i obawy obywateli co do jego przeznaczenia.

1. Zwracam się z zapytaniem, w jaki sposób INDECT będzie wdrażany w Unii Europejskiej?
2. Czy Komisja może udzielić gwarancji co do bezpieczeństwa stosowania tego systemu?

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

(17 lipca 2012 r.)

Technologie opracowane w ramach INDECT są przeznaczone dla policji i innym organów ścigania. Wykorzystywanie tych nowych technologii pozostaje w gestii organów państw członkowskich, rzecz jasna z uwzględnieniem przepisów krajowych dotyczących prawa obywateli do ochrony danych osobowych. Komisja oczekuje, że państwa członkowskie wezmą pod uwagę wszelkie możliwe aspekty wykorzystywania tych technologii, aby zapewnić ochronę danych osobowych oraz innych praw podstawowych.

Jeżeli państwa członkowskie zamierzają wykorzystywać takie nowe technologie, są zobowiązane do przestrzegania krajowych oraz, w stosownych przypadkach, unijnych praw podstawowych.

---



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005371/12  
to the Commission  
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)  
(29 May 2012)**

*Subject:* The future of Indect

Indect is one of the largest EU research projects coordinated by a Polish university. There are 17 partners — European universities, institutions and companies — working together to create an intelligent information system which supports surveillance, detection and searches for the safety of urban citizens. Scientists from Germany, England, France and Spain are also taking part in the project. EUR 15 million has been allocated for its implementation, 75% of which comes from European Union funds. The scientists are working on the functioning of the system, but as they themselves point out, it is not for them to decide how and by whom it will be used.

From the Commission's statement, we know that Indect will not be tested during the Euro 2012 Championship because it is a research project and is not intended for immediate implementation.

In April, Polish minister Jacek Cichoński decided to suspend police cooperation on the Indect project. He stated that the Ministry of the Interior would not be participating in work on the research project, and nor would it be making use of its findings. Today we know that at least a partial U-turn on this decision could well be possible, and so issues surrounding the project and public concerns over what it will actually be used for are being raised once again.

1. How will Indect be implemented in the European Union?
2. Can the Commission guarantee the safe use of this system?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission  
(17 July 2012)**

The technologies developed under INDECT are intended for police and other law enforcement authorities. It remains within the responsibility of the authorities of the Member States to use these new technologies, taking into account, of course, the national regulations on the citizen's right to the protection of personal data. The Commission expects that Member States will consider all possible aspects of using such technologies so as to fully respect the protection of personal data and other fundamental rights.

Should Member States intend to use such new technologies, they are bound to respect national and, when applicable, EU fundamental rights.

---

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005372/12  
do Komisji**

**Paweł Robert Kowal (ECR)**

(29 maja 2012 r.)

*Przedmiot:* Działania niektórych państw a bezpieczeństwo energetyczne UE

Zgodnie z doniesieniami medialnymi bułgarski minister do spraw gospodarki, energetyki i turystyki Delyan Dobrev poinformował, że 11 % rabat na zakup gazu z Rosji, jaki otrzymać ma Bułgaria, będzie miał związek z szybką realizacją projektu South Stream.

Nowa umowa gazowa ma zostać podpisana bezpośrednio z Gazpromem i nie będzie uwzględniać pośredników. Według polityka ma opiewać na siedem lat od 2013 r. Będzie, zdaniem Dobreva, zawierała rabat w wysokości jedenastu procent. Ma to być forma gratyfikacji za współpracę z Rosją w ramach South Stream.

1. W związku z tym chciałbym zapytać Komisję o stosunek do działań państw członkowskich, które coraz mocniej angażują się w South Stream jako projekt konkurencyjny dla Nabucco (także w wersji Nabucco-West).
2. Czy działania takie jak Bułgarii są zgodne z interesami energetycznymi całej Unii Europejskiej?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Günthera Oettingera w imieniu Komisji**

(5 lipca 2012 r.)

1. Projekty South Stream i Nabucco (a także inne projekty w ramach południowego korytarza gazowego) nie wykluczają się wzajemnie. Każde państwo członkowskie samo decyduje o udziale w projekcie South Stream lub w jakimkolwiek innym projekcie budowy gazociągu. Rolą Komisji jest dopilnowanie, aby wszystkie projekty zostały zakończone i funkcjonowały zgodnie z prawodawstwem europejskim.
2. Komisja zwróciła się do Bułgarii z wnioskiem o informacje o jakichkolwiek nowych umowach międzyrządowych, które mogą być przedmiotem negocjacji między Bułgarią i Rosją, oraz o wpływie takich umów na stosowanie trzeciego pakietu dotyczącego wewnętrznego rynku energii w Bułgarii.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005372/12  
to the Commission**

**Paweł Robert Kowal (ECR)**

(29 May 2012)

*Subject:* Actions by certain Member States and the EU's energy security

According to media reports, the Bulgarian Minister for the Economy, Energy and Tourism, Delyan Dobrev has stated that the 11% discount which Bulgaria was supposed to be granted on gas bought from Russia will be linked to the rapid implementation of the South Stream project.

The intention is for a new gas agreement to be signed directly with Gazprom, without any intermediaries. According to Mr Dobrev, it will run for seven years from 2013 and will include an 11% discount. It is supposed to be a reward for cooperating with Russia on South Stream.

1. In connection with the above, what is the Commission's attitude towards the actions of those Member States that are becoming increasingly involved in South Stream as a rival project to Nabucco (including Nabucco-West)?
2. Are actions such as those taken by Bulgaria compatible with the energy interests of the European Union as a whole?

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

(5 July 2012)

1. South Stream and the Nabucco projects (as well as other projects in the Southern Gas Corridor) are not mutually exclusive. It is the choice of Member States whether to engage in South Stream or any other pipeline project. The Commission's role is to ensure that all projects are completed and operated in compliance with European legislation.
  2. The Commission has requested information from Bulgaria about any new Intergovernmental agreements that may be negotiated between Bulgaria and Russia and the impact thereof on the application of the Third Internal Energy Market Package in Bulgaria.
-

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005373/12**  
**alla Commissione**  
**Mario Borghezio (EFD)**  
(29 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Crimini rituali in Gabon

Da alcuni anni gli organi di stampa del Gabon riportano in prima pagina notizie agghiaccianti riguardanti episodi di spaventosi crimini rituali.

Il padre di uno dei ragazzi mutilati e sacrificati ha creato un'associazione, che ha censito 37 casi di crimini rituali nel 2010, 42 nel 2009 e 44 nel 2008.

Dalle notizie di stampa risulterebbe che, per ragioni di credenze superstiziose, questi orrendi riti sarebbero ritenuti da esponenti politici particolarmente propizi in vista di elezioni o di nomine pubbliche, e in tal caso gli organi dei minori sacrificati vengono depositati ritualmente nei templi.

Purtroppo, generalmente questi crimini non sono perseguiti dalle competenti autorità, poiché le persone accusate di averli perpetrati, se arrestate, vengono regolarmente rilasciate senza ulteriori conseguenze.

— Intende la Commissione intervenire per porre fine a questa orribile piaga in Gabon?

— Quali aiuti intende offrire la Commissione alle famiglie delle vittime che si sentono abbandonate a se stesse dalle autorità locali?

**Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione**  
(9 luglio 2012)

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente condivide le preoccupazioni riguardanti il verificarsi di crimini rituali in Gabon. La delegazione dell'Unione europea in Gabon solleva la questione nell'ambito del dialogo politico in corso con il governo del paese e con altri attori non governativi e incoraggia una più intensa attività investigativa per far sì che gli autori di tali crimini siano identificati e assicurati alla giustizia. La delegazione è inoltre in stretto contatto con l'Associazione per la lotta ai crimini rituali (ALCR), un'ONG locale.

Il governo gabonese ha recentemente rilasciato una dichiarazione nella quale ha ribadito che tali pratiche sono inaccettabili. Su iniziativa del presidente Ali Bongo Ondimba, si è tenuta una riunione di alto livello con i ministeri competenti per individuare le modalità per porre fine alle uccisioni rituali. Il presidente gabonese ha dichiarato pubblicamente che la pratica deve terminare e che i colpevoli saranno identificati, arrestati e perseguiti.

A causa della lunga tradizione e degli usi legati a tali rituali e stregonerie, non solo nel Gabon ma in tutta la regione, i cittadini hanno paura di prendere posizione apertamente contro la pratica. Rompere il silenzio che circonda questa delicata questione è quanto mai importante e l'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente apprezza notevolmente la posizione espressa pubblicamente e con forza dal governo gabonese.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005373/12  
to the Commission**

**Mario Borghezio (EFD)**

(29 May 2012)

*Subject:* Ritual crimes in Gabon

For several years, the Gabon press has been reporting disturbing news stories about horrifying ritual crimes.

A father, whose son was mutilated and sacrificed, has formed an association which recorded 37 cases of ritual crimes in 2010, 42 in 2009 and 44 in 2008.

According to press reports, due to superstitious belief, these rituals are considered particularly auspicious by major political figures in the run-up to elections or public appointments, when sacrificed children's organs are ritualistically placed in temples.

Unfortunately, these crimes are generally not prosecuted by the relevant authorities because, if arrested, the accused are often released without further consequences.

— Does the Commission intend to intervene to end this terrible situation in Gabon?

— What help does the Commission intend to offer the victims' families, who feel abandoned by the local authorities?

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

(9 July 2012)

The High Representative/Vice-President shares the concerns about the occurrence of ritual crimes in Gabon. The Delegation of the European Union in Gabon raises the issue in its ongoing political dialogue with the Government of Gabon and non-state actors and encourages stronger investigation to ensure that perpetrators of these crimes are identified and brought to justice. The EU Delegation is also in close contact with the local non-governmental organisation (NGO) Association to Fight Ritual Crimes (ALCR).

The Gabonese Government has recently made a statement recalling that these practices are unacceptable. At the initiative of President Ali Bongo Ondimba, a high level meeting was held with the relevant ministers to address ways how to bring ritual killings to an end. The Gabonese President has publicly stated that the practice must stop and that perpetrators would be identified, arrested and prosecuted.

Due to the long held traditions and customs of such rituals and sorcery, not just in Gabon but in the region, people are afraid to speak out against the practice. The breach of silence around this sensitive issue is all the more important and the HR/VP appreciates the public and vocal position by the Gabonese Government on the issue as a very welcome move.

---

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005374/12**

**à Comissão**

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**

(29 de maio de 2012)

*Assunto:* Envolvimento da Comissão em iniciativas na Irlanda, durante a campanha eleitoral

Em dezembro de 2009, em resposta a uma pergunta (E-4955/2009) sobre a participação da Comissão Europeia na campanha que antecedeu o segundo referendo ao Tratado de Lisboa na Irlanda, a Comissão admitiu o financiamento de diversas iniciativas e atividades, «com o objetivo de fomentar uma maior compreensão da UE junto dos irlandeses». Nessa mesma resposta, afirmava-se que «o Parlamento Europeu e a Comissão Europeia assinaram, em janeiro de 2009 e por três anos, um memorando de entendimento para comunicar sobre a Europa em parceria com o Governo irlandês».

Solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Durante a campanha eleitoral para o referendo ao Tratado sobre a Estabilidade, Coordenação e Governança na União Económica e Monetária, teve lugar alguma iniciativa financiada ao abrigo do supracitado memorando de entendimento?
2. A Comissão teve alguma participação ou financiou, de alguma outra forma, alguma iniciativa durante o período de campanha eleitoral na Irlanda? Qual(ais) essa(s) iniciativa(s)? Quais as verbas envolvidas?
3. Que verbas foram afetas ao supracitado memorando de entendimento? Quais os montantes envolvidos e qual a proveniência das verbas em questão? Quando cessará esse memorando?

**Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão**

(28 de junho de 2012)

1. A Comissão não financiou nenhuma iniciativa no âmbito do memorando de entendimento, durante a campanha sobre o referendo ao Tratado sobre a Estabilidade, Coordenação e Governança na União Económica e Monetária.
2. A Comissão remete o Senhor Deputado para a resposta dada à pergunta escrita E-4955/2009 <sup>(1)</sup>.
3. A Representação da Comissão Europeia na Irlanda, o Governo irlandês e o Gabinete do Parlamento Europeu na Irlanda estão a desenvolver um vasto leque de atividades de comunicação, com o objetivo de promover uma melhor compreensão das atividades da União Europeia junto da população irlandesa. O memorando assinado em 29 de janeiro de 2009, para um período de três anos, com prorrogação tácita por períodos subsequentes de três anos, visa garantir uma abordagem coordenada entre os três parceiros. Contudo, cada um dos parceiros é inteiramente responsável pelo financiamento dos seus próprios projetos de comunicação.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> (<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+WQ+E-2009-4955+0+DOC+XML+V0//PT>).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-005374/12  
to the Commission**

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**

(29 May 2012)

*Subject:* The Commission's involvement in initiatives in Ireland during the referendum campaign

In December 2009, the Commission responded to Question E-4955/2009 regarding the Commission campaigning in the run-up to the second Irish referendum on the Treaty of Lisbon by admitting to funding a wide range of activities 'with the aim of promoting greater public understanding of the EU in Ireland'. In the same response it stated that 'the European Parliament and the European Commission signed a three year Memorandum of Understanding on Communicating Europe in Partnership with the Irish Government in January 2009'.

I would like the Commission to provide the following information:

1. Have any initiatives been financed under the abovementioned memorandum of understanding during the campaign for the referendum on the Treaty on Stability, Coordination and Governance in the Economic and Monetary Union?
2. Has the Commission in any other way financed or participated in any initiative during a campaign in Ireland? If so, what initiative(s) and what sums were involved?
3. What allocations were made to the abovementioned memorandum of understanding? What sums were involved and what was the source of the allocations? When will this memorandum expire?

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

(28 June 2012)

1. No initiatives have been financed by the Commission under the memorandum of understanding during the campaign for the Referendum on the Treaty on Stability, Coordination and Governance in the Economic and Monetary Union.
2. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-4955/2009 <sup>(1)</sup>.
3. The European Commission Representation in Ireland, the Irish Government and the European Parliament Office in Ireland engage in a wide range of communication activities with the aim of promoting greater public understanding of the activities of the European Union in Ireland. The Memorandum signed on 29 January 2009 for a three year period, and tacitly extended for further three year periods, aims to ensure a coordinated approach between the three partners. However, each of the partners remains fully responsible for the financing of its own communication projects.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+WQ+E-2009-4955+0+DOC+XML+V0//FR&language=FR>.