

## 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 199 E/01)

Treść	Strona
<b>E-000021/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Electromobility	
Slovenské znenie .....	13
English version .....	14
<b>P-000188/12</b> by Tomasz Piotr Poręba to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Secoded National Experts (SNEs)	
Wersja polska .....	15
English version .....	16
<b>E-000191/12</b> by Mirosław Piotrowski, Ryszard Czarnecki, Zbigniew Ziobro, Jacek Olgierd Kurski, Tadeusz Cymański, Janusz Wojciechowski and Marek Józef Gróbarczyk to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Discrimination against TV Trwam by Poland's National Broadcasting Council (KRRiT)	
Wersja polska .....	17
English version .....	18
<b>E-000199/12</b> by Michail Tremopoulos to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Greek economic adjustment programme (also) causing environmental setbacks	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	19
English version .....	20
<b>E-000211/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Protest by demonstrators in North African countries and military repression	
Versione italiana .....	21
English version .....	23
<b>E-000251/12</b> by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Use of antibiotics in livestock and poultry feed	
Versiunea în limba română .....	24
English version .....	25

<b>P-000286/12</b> by Jean-Luc Bennahmias to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The new Hungarian constitution in the context of respect for fundamental EU values and rights	
Version française .....	26
English version .....	27
<b>P-000294/12</b> by Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Animal welfare: 'foie gras' production methods	
Versiunea în limba română .....	28
English version .....	29
<b>E-000298/12</b> by Claude Turmes to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Use of antibiotics in animal breeding	
Deutsche Fassung .....	30
English version .....	31
<b>E-000307/12</b> by Morten Messerschmidt to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Pollution from bunker oil	
Dansk udgave .....	32
English version .....	33
<b>E-000318/12</b> by Anna Záborská to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Freedom of religion: proposal for a Council decision establishing a Multiannual Framework for the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights for 2013-17	
Version française .....	34
Slovenské znenie .....	35
English version .....	36
<b>E-000360/12</b> by Spyros Danellis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Livestock exports to Turkey	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	37
English version .....	38
<b>E-000378/12</b> by Nessa Childers to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Article 16 of the Staff Regulations	
English version .....	39
<b>E-000382/12</b> by Nuno Melo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Danish tax	
Versão portuguesa .....	40
English version .....	41
<b>E-000388/12</b> by Oreste Rossi to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Saving energy through smart street lighting	
Versione italiana .....	42
English version .....	43
<b>E-000395/12</b> by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Referendum on independence in Scotland	
Versión española .....	44
English version .....	45
<b>E-000495/12</b> by Michael Cashman, Ulrike Lunacek, Sophia in 't Veld, Raül Romeva i Rueda, Sirpa Pietikäinen, Cornelis de Jong, Mojca Kleva, Kinga Göncz, Zita Gurmai, Edit Herczog, Csaba Sándor Tabajdi and Sarah Ludford to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Impact of restrictive definitions of 'family' on EC law	
Versión española .....	46
Deutsche Fassung .....	47
Magyar változat .....	48
Nederlandse versie .....	49
Slovenska različica .....	50
Suomenkielinen versio .....	51
English version .....	52

<b>E-000509/12</b> by Laurence J.A.J. Stassen to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Impact of the ETS on the European aviation industry	
Nederlandse versie .....	53
English version .....	54
<b>E-000510/12</b> by Lucas Hartong to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> New logo for the European Commission	
Nederlandse versie .....	55
English version .....	56
<b>E-000511/12</b> by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Honey and GMOs	
Version française .....	57
English version .....	58
<b>E-000544/12</b> by Nikolaos Chountis, Kartika Tamara Liotard and Sabine Wils to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The 'Schmallenberg' virus, public health and food safety	
Deutsche Fassung .....	59
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	61
Versione italiana .....	63
Nederlandse versie .....	65
Versiunea în limba română .....	67
English version .....	69
<b>E-000684/12</b> by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> 'Schmallenberg virus' — evolution and evaluation	
Deutsche Fassung .....	59
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	61
Versione italiana .....	63
Nederlandse versie .....	65
Versiunea în limba română .....	67
English version .....	69
<b>E-001530/12</b> by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Cattle, sheep and goats: new virus discovered in Europe	
Deutsche Fassung .....	59
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	61
Versione italiana .....	63
Nederlandse versie .....	65
English version .....	69
<b>E-000655/12</b> by Jens Rohde to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Import of counterfeit pesticides into the EU	
Dansk udgave .....	71
English version .....	74
<b>E-001175/12</b> by Dan Jørgensen to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Import of illegal pesticides into the EU	
Dansk udgave .....	71
English version .....	74
<b>E-000554/12</b> by Spyros Danellis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> A disturbing increase in 'counterfeit' pesticides in the EU	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	73
English version .....	74
<b>E-000593/12</b> by Liam Aylward to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Amateur radio producers and the EMC Directive	
English version .....	76
<b>E-000609/12</b> by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> New forms of public funding for European companies	
Versão portuguesa .....	77
English version .....	79

<b>E-000612/12</b> by Artur Zasada to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Cracks on the wings of Airbus A380 aircraft	
Wersja polska .....	81
English version .....	82
<b>E-000613/12</b> by Frieda Brepoels to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Directive 2010/31/EU — nearly zero-energy new buildings by 2020	
Nederlandse versie .....	83
English version .....	84
<b>E-000812/12</b> by Barry Madlener to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Greek military purchases amounting to billions of euros	
Nederlandse versie .....	85
English version .....	86
<b>E-000616/12</b> by Nigel Farage to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The purchase of German and French military hardware	
English version .....	86
<b>E-000623/12</b> by Michail Tremopoulos to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Construction of a dam on the River Aliakmonas in the Elafi area, Grevena region	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	87
English version .....	88
<b>E-000654/12</b> by Anne E. Jensen to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Airline passengers' rights (Regulation (EC) No 261/2004)	
Dansk udgave .....	89
English version .....	91
<b>E-000671/12</b> by Andreas Mölzer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Electric cars — lack of infrastructure	
Deutsche Fassung .....	93
English version .....	94
<b>E-000675/12</b> by Jim Higgins to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Water conservation	
English version .....	95
<b>E-000685/12</b> by Rareş-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> World production and world stocks of maize, wheat and soya	
Versiunea în limba română .....	96
English version .....	97
<b>E-000690/12</b> by Ana Miranda to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Use of EU funds on bullfighting I	
Versión española .....	98
English version .....	100
<b>E-000691/12</b> by Ana Miranda to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Use of EU funds on bullfighting II	
Versión española .....	98
English version .....	100
<b>E-000692/12</b> by Ana Miranda to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Use of EU funds on bullfighting III	
Versión española .....	99
English version .....	101
<b>E-000700/12</b> by Jim Higgins to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on safety of offshore oil and gas prospection, exploration and production activities	
English version .....	102

<b>E-000701/12</b> by Jim Higgins to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on safety of offshore oil and gas prospection, exploration and production activities English version .....	102
<b>E-006078/12</b> by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> GMO contamination of rice imported from India Versiunea în limba română .....	103
English version .....	104
<b>E-006079/12</b> by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Taxation of farm subsidies Versiunea în limba română .....	105
English version .....	106
<b>E-006080/12</b> by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Exclusion of non-Italian children from central kindergartens Versiunea în limba română .....	107
English version .....	108
<b>E-006082/12</b> by Maria Eleni Koppa to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Upholding the human rights of Palestinian hunger strikers Ελληνική έκδοση .....	109
English version .....	110
<b>E-006083/12</b> by David Martin to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> EU-Central Asia 'New Partnership' and human rights English version .....	111
<b>E-006084/12</b> by Auke Zijlstra to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Cruelty to animals in Egypt Nederlandse versie .....	112
English version .....	113
<b>E-006086/12</b> by Anna Rosbach to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Eel fishing Dansk udgave .....	114
English version .....	115
<b>E-006087/12</b> by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Properties abandoned as a result of the crisis Deutsche Fassung .....	116
English version .....	117
<b>E-006088/12</b> by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Increase under heading 4 Deutsche Fassung .....	118
English version .....	119
<b>E-006089/12</b> by Georgios Papastamkos to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Small Business Act SME Envoy Ελληνική έκδοση .....	120
English version .....	121
<b>E-006090/12</b> by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Diesel fumes causing lung cancer — the impact of health costs on the EU budget Deutsche Fassung .....	122
English version .....	123
<b>E-006091/12</b> by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Diesel fumes causing lung cancer Deutsche Fassung .....	124
English version .....	125

<b>E-006092/12</b> by Sarah Ludford to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — EU citizens arrested in UAE	
English version .....	126
<b>E-006093/12</b> by David Martin to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Mahmoud Sarsak, Palestinian hunger striker	
English version .....	127
<b>E-006094/12</b> by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Malnutrition in Europe	
Deutsche Fassung .....	128
English version .....	129
<b>E-006096/12</b> by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Sexualisation of girls	
Deutsche Fassung .....	130
English version .....	131
<b>E-006097/12</b> by Angelika Werthmann to the Council <i>Subject:</i> Maternity leave in Europe	
Deutsche Fassung .....	132
English version .....	133
<b>E-006098/12</b> by Alf Svensson to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Making democracy and human rights a priority in EU-Cuba relations	
Svensk version .....	134
English version .....	136
<b>E-006099/12</b> by Alf Svensson to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Making democracy and human rights a priority in EU-Cuba relations	
Svensk version .....	134
English version .....	136
<b>E-006100/12</b> by Daciana Octavia Sârbu to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> EU action in the field of child mental health	
Versiunea în limba română .....	138
English version .....	139
<b>E-006101/12</b> by Niki Tzavela to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Measures in the Greek smoking industry	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	140
English version .....	141
<b>E-006102/12</b> by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Council <i>Subject:</i> Spanish Government and bail-out	
Versión española .....	142
English version .....	143
<b>E-006104/12</b> by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Request for additional funding for the Amygdaleza detention centre for illegal immigrants (Attica)	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	144
English version .....	145
<b>E-006106/12</b> by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> EUR 500 m liquidity instrument for young people and SMEs in Greece	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	146
English version .....	147
<b>E-006107/12</b> by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Report by Transparency International	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	148
English version .....	149

<b>E-006108/12</b> by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Information from Greece concerning reception centres and facilities for illegal immigrants	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	150
English version .....	151
<b>E-006109/12</b> by Mario Mauro to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Convention on Domestic Workers	
Versione italiana .....	152
English version .....	153
<b>E-006110/12</b> by Marek Henryk Migalski to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Repressive measures against Belarusian political prisoner by prison authorities	
Wersja polska .....	154
English version .....	155
<b>E-006111/12</b> by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Ecological volume of the Ebro River	
Versión española .....	156
English version .....	157
<b>E-006113/12</b> by Christine De Veyrac to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Under-utilisation of European funding in Greece	
Version française .....	158
English version .....	159
<b>E-006114/12</b> by Mario Borghezio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Greece and Goldman Sachs	
Versione italiana .....	160
English version .....	161
<b>E-006115/12</b> by Barry Madlener to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Record high unemployment	
Nederlandse versie .....	162
English version .....	163
<b>E-006116/12</b> by Filip Kaczmarek to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Prevention against pneumonia and diarrhoea for children under the age of 5 in Africa and Asia	
Wersja polska .....	164
English version .....	165
<b>E-006120/12</b> by Filip Kaczmarek to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> State of the prison system in Belarus	
Wersja polska .....	166
English version .....	167
<b>P-006121/12</b> by Ashley Fox to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> High-speed broadband	
English version .....	168
<b>E-006123/12</b> by Fiorello Provera to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — The treatment of Libyan detainees	
Versione italiana .....	169
English version .....	171
<b>E-006124/12</b> by Auke Zijlstra to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Closer cooperation between the EU and Turkey in the field of energy	
Nederlandse versie .....	173
English version .....	174
<b>E-006125/12</b> by Auke Zijlstra to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Turkey's anticipation of visa-free travel within the EU	
Nederlandse versie .....	175
English version .....	176

<b>E-006127/12</b> by Mario Borghezio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Trafficking in Europe of arms from the Balkans and need for EU action	
Versione italiana .....	177
English version .....	178
<b>E-006128/12</b> by Mario Borghezio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The Balkan route a threat to Member States — the EU should take action	
Versione italiana .....	179
English version .....	180
<b>E-006129/12</b> by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Possible EU funding for the Gendiag and CEGAT project to develop a new type of genetic screening for cardiovascular diseases	
Versione italiana .....	181
English version .....	183
<b>E-006130/12</b> by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Use by the 27 Member States of EU funding under the 2007-2013 Financial Perspective	
Versione italiana .....	185
English version .....	186
<b>E-006131/12</b> by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Further information about the Commission's answer to Written Question E-004127/2012 about the Europe Direct information network	
Versione italiana .....	187
English version .....	188
<b>P-006133/12</b> by Antolín Sánchez Presedo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Illegal aerial pesticide spraying and public health (death of bees)	
Versión española .....	189
English version .....	190
<b>P-006134/12</b> by Antonio Cancian to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Earthquakes in north-eastern Italy — what funds are available to firms to help them resume business as soon as possible?	
Versione italiana .....	191
English version .....	192
<b>E-006135/12</b> by Antolín Sánchez Presedo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Milk market under pressure and differences in point-of-origin and point-of-sale pricing	
Versión española .....	193
English version .....	195
<b>E-006136/12</b> by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Follow-on question from E-003896/2012	
Versión española .....	197
English version .....	198
<b>E-006137/12</b> by Esther Herranz García to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Pests affecting citrus fruits from South Africa and Brazil	
Versión española .....	199
English version .....	200
<b>E-006138/12</b> by Ingeborg Gräßle to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Possible waste of EU funds on railings for a cycle path along the E261 in Poland	
Deutsche Fassung .....	201
English version .....	202



<b>E-006139/12</b> by Georgios Koumoutsakos, Barbara Matera, Renate Sommer, Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa and Philippe Boulland to the Council	
<i>Subject:</i> Official Turkish non-recognition of the Presidency of the EU Council and the freezing of relations with the EU during next semester	
Deutsche Fassung .....	203
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	204
Version française .....	205
Versione italiana .....	206
Wersja polska .....	207
English version .....	208
<b>E-006142/12</b> by Paweł Zalewski to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Visa facilitation for Ukrainian citizens	
Wersja polska .....	209
English version .....	210
<b>E-006144/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Tibetan monk dies in Chinese prison	
Versione italiana .....	211
English version .....	212
<b>E-006146/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Energy drink warning	
Versione italiana .....	213
English version .....	214
<b>E-006149/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Increased incidence of tumours among Malagrotta residents	
Versione italiana .....	215
English version .....	216
<b>E-006150/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Death of an Italian soldier in Kosovo	
Versione italiana .....	217
English version .....	218
<b>E-006152/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Shipwreck off the Salento coast — seven North Africans missing	
Versione italiana .....	219
English version .....	220
<b>E-006154/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Plastic that decomposes in a few days	
Versione italiana .....	221
English version .....	222
<b>E-006155/12</b> by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Implementation of Directive 2009/48/EC	
Versione italiana .....	223
English version .....	224
<b>E-006156/12</b> by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Establishment of free trade zones with zero tax and bureaucracy to help the economy of the Emilia Romagna, Lombardy and Veneto regions	
Versione italiana .....	225
English version .....	226
<b>E-006157/12</b> by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Harmonised standards	
Versione italiana .....	227
English version .....	228

<b>E-006158/12</b> by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Penetration of international markets by EU companies damaged by unfair Chinese financial competition policies	
Versione italiana .....	229
English version .....	230
<b>E-006159/12</b> by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Seizures in Italy of toys 'Made in China' which are in breach of safety regulations	
Versione italiana .....	231
English version .....	233
<b>E-006160/12</b> by Mario Borghezio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> EU response to the persecution of Tibetan monks	
Versione italiana .....	234
English version .....	235
<b>E-006161/12</b> by Sergio Berlato to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Breach in the enforcement of Recommendation C(2007) 2551 of 13 June 2007	
Versione italiana .....	236
English version .....	237
<b>E-006163/12</b> by Laurence J.A.J. Stassen and Lucas Hartong to the Council	
<i>Subject:</i> Absorption rates of EU rail projects	
Nederlandse versie .....	238
English version .....	239
<b>E-006164/12</b> by Laurence J.A.J. Stassen and Lucas Hartong to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Absorption rates of EU rail projects	
Nederlandse versie .....	240
English version .....	241
<b>E-006165/12</b> by Jacek Włosowicz and Tadeusz Cymański to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Planning and construction of noise barriers in Końskie and Radoszyce municipalities	
Wersja polska .....	242
English version .....	243
<b>E-006166/12</b> by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Germany	
Versão portuguesa .....	244
English version .....	254
<b>E-006167/12</b> by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Austria	
Versão portuguesa .....	244
English version .....	254
<b>E-006168/12</b> by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Belgium	
Versão portuguesa .....	244
English version .....	254
<b>E-006169/12</b> by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Bulgaria	
Versão portuguesa .....	245
English version .....	255
<b>E-006170/12</b> by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Cyprus	
Versão portuguesa .....	245
English version .....	255
<b>E-006171/12</b> by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Denmark	
Versão portuguesa .....	246
English version .....	255

<b>E-006172/12</b> by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Slovakia	
Versão portuguesa .....	246
English version .....	256
<b>E-006173/12</b> by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Slovenia	
Versão portuguesa .....	246
English version .....	256
<b>E-006174/12</b> by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Spain	
Versão portuguesa .....	247
English version .....	256
<b>E-006175/12</b> by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Estonia	
Versão portuguesa .....	247
English version .....	257
<b>E-006176/12</b> by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Finland	
Versão portuguesa .....	247
English version .....	257
<b>E-006177/12</b> by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — France	
Versão portuguesa .....	248
English version .....	257
<b>E-006178/12</b> by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Greece	
Versão portuguesa .....	248
English version .....	258
<b>E-006180/12</b> by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Ireland	
Versão portuguesa .....	248
English version .....	258
<b>E-006181/12</b> by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Italy	
Versão portuguesa .....	249
English version .....	258
<b>E-006182/12</b> by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Latvia	
Versão portuguesa .....	249
English version .....	259
<b>E-006183/12</b> by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Lithuania	
Versão portuguesa .....	249
English version .....	259
<b>E-006184/12</b> by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Luxembourg	
Versão portuguesa .....	250
English version .....	259
<b>E-006185/12</b> by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Malta	
Versão portuguesa .....	250
English version .....	260

<b>E-006186/12</b> by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — the Netherlands	
Versão portuguesa .....	250
English version .....	260
<b>E-006187/12</b> by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Poland	
Versão portuguesa .....	251
English version .....	260
<b>E-006188/12</b> by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Portugal	
Versão portuguesa .....	251
English version .....	261
<b>E-006189/12</b> by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Czech Republic	
Versão portuguesa .....	251
English version .....	261
<b>E-006190/12</b> by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Romania	
Versão portuguesa .....	252
English version .....	261
<b>E-006191/12</b> by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Sweden	
Versão portuguesa .....	252
English version .....	262
<b>E-006192/12</b> by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — United Kingdom	
Versão portuguesa .....	252
English version .....	262

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000021/12**

**Komisií**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(11. januára 2012)

Vec: Elektromobilita

Problematika elektromobility patrí medzi diskutované otázky. Súvisí s vývojom nových, inovatívnych a energeticky efektívnych riešení. Medzi hlavné prekážky úspechu takýchto vozidiel v členských krajinách patrí vysoká počiatočná investícia, krátky dojazd a skutočnosť, že veľká časť elektriny sa stále nevyrába z obnoviteľných zdrojov. Podľa plánu Európskej komisie by sa mal počet automobilov s konvenčným pohonom do roku 2030 znížiť o polovicu a do roku 2050 by sa mali postupne úplne prestať používať. Zavádzanie elektromobilov by malo obmedziť hluk, emisie či preťaženie ciest v Európe. V členských krajinách západnej Európy sa už začali spúšťať schémy prenajímania takýchto vozidiel, v strednej Európe sa ešte len začínajú budovať prvé nabíjacie stanice. Elektromobily sú realitou v Nemecku, Švajčiarsku, Belgicku či vo Francúzsku.

Má Komisia nejaké špeciálne plány na podporu projektov elektromobility v strednej a východnej Európe?

**Odpoveď pána Kallasa v mene Komisie**

(10. februára 2012)

V oznámení Komisie „Európska stratégia pre čisté a energeticky úsporné vozidlá“ z 28. apríla 2010 <sup>(1)</sup> sa identifikuje 45 konkrétnych opatrení, ktoré sa už zavádzajú alebo sa majú zaviesť v Európskej únii počas nasledujúcich rokov. Ide aj o opatrenia na podporu urýchleného uvedenia na trh nových technológií dopravných prostriedkov, napríklad elektrických automobilov.

V záujme uľahčenia širokého prenikania elektrických vozidiel na trh Komisia podporuje Európsky demonstračný projekt v rámci iniciatívy pre ekologické automobily, ktorá je zahrnutá do siedmeho rámcového programu v oblasti výskumu a technického rozvoja. Tento projekt s názvom Green eMotion bol vybraný na základe verejnej výzvy na predloženie návrhov v EÚ. Na tomto demonstračnom projekte, ktorý by mal prispieť k vývoju trhu v záujme elektromobility v Európe, sa zúčastňujú partneri z mnohých európskych podnikov a regiónov. Informácie nájdete na tejto webovej stránke: [www.greenemotion-project.eu/](http://www.greenemotion-project.eu/). V súčasnosti je otvorená výzva na predloženie návrhov v oblasti logistiky nákladnej dopravy v mestách s využitím elektromobilov. Žiadne osobitné akcie sa nezameriavajú na konkrétne členské štáty.

Elektromobilita sa pokladá za jednu z hlavných možností alternatívnych palív v rámci iniciatívy Komisie v oblasti čistých dopravných systémov, prostredníctvom ktorej sa vypracuje stratégia alternatívnych palív, ako sa navrhuje v iniciatíve 24 v bielej knihe o doprave (Plán jednotného európskeho dopravného priestoru – Vytvorenie konkurencieschopného dopravného systému efektívne využívajúceho zdroje <sup>(2)</sup>). Informácie o Iniciatíve v oblasti čistých dopravných systémov sú dostupné na webovej lokalite Komisie:

[http://ec.europa.eu/transport/urban/vehicles/road/clean\\_transport\\_systems\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/transport/urban/vehicles/road/clean_transport_systems_en.htm)

<sup>(1)</sup> KOM(2010) 186 v konečnom znení.

<sup>(2)</sup> KOM(2011) 144 v konečnom znení.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000021/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(11 January 2012)

*Subject:* Electromobility

The issue of electromobility is a much-debated question. It is associated with the development of new, innovative and energy efficient solutions. The main obstacles to the success of such vehicles in Member States include high initial investment, short range of the vehicles and the fact that much of the electricity is still not produced from renewable sources. Under the plan, the Commission should reduce the number of conventionally-fuelled cars by one half and these should be phased out altogether by 2050. The introduction of electric vehicles should limit noise, emissions and road congestion in Europe. A leasing scheme for such vehicles is already under way in the Member States of Western Europe; in Central Europe the building of the first charging stations is only now being commenced. Electric vehicles are a reality in Germany, Switzerland, Belgium and France.

Does the Commission have any special plans to promote electromobility projects in central and eastern Europe?

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

(10 February 2012)

The Commission's Communication on 'A European strategy on clean and energy efficient vehicles' of 28 April 2010 <sup>(1)</sup> identifies 45 concrete actions already under way or to be put in place over the next years in the European Union. Measures in support of an accelerated market introduction of new vehicle technologies, such as electric cars, are included.

In order to facilitate a broad market penetration of electric vehicles, the Commission supports a European demonstration project within the Green Car Initiative of the 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development. This project, called Green eMotion, has been selected following an open call of proposals within the EU. Partners from many European companies and regions are participating in this demonstration project, which should contribute to the development of a market for electromobility in Europe. Information is available on the following website: [www.greenemotion-project.eu/](http://www.greenemotion-project.eu/). Currently, a call on urban freight logistics with electric vehicles is open for proposals. No special actions are focused on specific Member States.

Electromobility is identified as one of the main options of alternative fuels for the Clean Transport Systems (CTS) initiative of the Commission, which will develop a European alternative fuels strategy, as proposed in initiative 24 of the Transport White Paper ('Roadmap to a Single European Transport Area — Towards a competitive and resource efficient transport system' <sup>(2)</sup>). Information on the Clean Transport Systems (CTS) initiative is available from the Commission website: [http://ec.europa.eu/transport/urban/vehicles/road/clean\\_transport\\_systems\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/transport/urban/vehicles/road/clean_transport_systems_en.htm)

---

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2010)186 final.

<sup>(2)</sup> COM(2011)144 final.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-000188/12  
do Komisji**

**Tomasz Piotr Poręba (ECR)**

(16 stycznia 2012 r.)

*Przedmiot:* Oddelegowani eksperci krajowi

Do realizacji swoich zadań Komisja może zatrudniać oddelegowanych ekspertów krajowych. Eksperci ci są obywatelami państw członkowskich UE dysponującymi konkretną wiedzą, która może być wykorzystywana przez Komisję przy okazji prac nad aktualnymi i szczególnymi zagadnieniami przez określony czas.

W odróżnieniu od pracowników administracji Komisji oddelegowani eksperci krajowi podlegają rygorystycznym wymogom z zakresu niezależności, przejrzystości i konfliktu interesów<sup>(1)</sup>.

W niektórych przypadkach trudno jednak uniknąć konfliktu interesów. Może się tak zdarzyć w przypadku obywateli państw członkowskich, które mają szczególny interes w promowaniu i/lub forsowaniu niektórych kwestii.

Na przykład w odniesieniu do hazardu wydaje się, że eksperci krajowi oddelegowani przez rząd Malty uczestniczą w sporządzaniu zielonej księgi Komisji w sprawie gier hazardowych oferowanych w Internecie<sup>(2)</sup>, a także zajmują się związanymi z nią działaniami następczymi. Może to budzić pewne zastrzeżenia: wpływy brutto Malty z gier hazardowych wynoszą mniej więcej 8 % PKB, tj. 11 razy więcej niż średnia UE, która wynosi jedynie 0,68 % PKB.

Przedstawiciel Komisji, wypowiadający się na temat wkładu, jaki gry hazardowe mają w krajowe gospodarki UE, przyznał niedawno, że Malta „nie jest normalnym krajem”<sup>(3)</sup>.

Czy Komisja zamierza podjąć dodatkowe działania mające na celu zapobieganie w przyszłości tego rodzaju konfliktom interesów w odniesieniu do oddelegowanych ekspertów krajowych?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Maroša Šefčoviča w imieniu Komisji**

(16 lutego 2012 r.)

Oddelegowani eksperci krajowi podlegają rygorystycznym wymogom dotyczącym konfliktu interesów i poufności zgodnym z obowiązującą decyzją Komisji, do której odsyła ona Szanownego Pana Posła, a w szczególności do jej art. 7 lit. a), b), d) i e)<sup>(4)</sup>. W przypadku wystąpienia konfliktu interesów Komisja podejmuje odpowiednie środki, które mogą polegać na zakończeniu oddelegowania.

Przytoczony przez Szanownego Pana Posła cytat jest niekompletny. W artykule w rzeczywistości wyjaśniono dalej: „Odrzucając sugestie, jakoby Malta nie dysponowała żadnymi regułami w tym sektorze, albo też ignorowała pewne rozporządzenia, przedstawiciel Komisji powiedział: »Malcie udało się przyciągnąć dużą liczbę firm internetowych dzięki korzystnym zachętom podatkowym. Malta posiada jednak dobrze działający system regulacyjny«”.

Komisja, angażując oddelegowanych ekspertów krajowych, poszukuje najbardziej doświadczonych kandydatów z danej dziedziny. Jak podkreślono wyżej, Malta jest państwem członkowskim o długiej tradycji dobrze działającego systemu regulacyjnego, a zatem pozyskanie oddelegowanego eksperta krajowego z Malty pozwala na osiągnięcie tego celu.

Ponadto, wszelkie wnioski sporządzone przez Komisję lub podjęte przez nią decyzje pozostają w zakresie odpowiedzialności kolegium komisarzy, a przygotowuje się je w wyniku konsultacji wewnętrznych zapewniających ochronę ogólnego interesu Unii.

Komisja uważa zatem, że jej obecna praktyka w dostateczny sposób zapobiega wystąpieniu konfliktu interesów i nie uważa za stosowne podejmowania dalszych kroków w przyszłości.

<sup>(1)</sup> Decyzja Komisji C(2008) 6866 z dnia 12 listopada 2008 r. dotycząca zasad mających zastosowanie do oddelegowanych ekspertów krajowych i ekspertów krajowych odbywających kształcenie zawodowe w ramach służb Komisji.

<sup>(2)</sup> Zielona księga Komisji z dnia 24 marca 2011 r. w sprawie gier hazardowych oferowanych w Internecie w obrębie rynku wewnętrznego (COM(2011) 0128 wersja ostateczna).

<sup>(3)</sup> „Malta europejskim centrum gier hazardowych – Bruksela”, Times of Malta, 25 marca 2011 r.

<sup>(4)</sup> Decyzja Komisji C(2008) 6866 z dnia 12 listopada 2008 r. dotycząca zasad mających zastosowanie do oddelegowanych ekspertów krajowych i ekspertów krajowych odbywających kształcenie zawodowe w ramach służb Komisji.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-000188/12  
to the Commission**

**Tomasz Piotr Poręba (ECR)**

(16 January 2012)

*Subject:* Seconded National Experts (SNEs)

The Commission can recruit Seconded National Experts (SNEs) to carry out its duties. SNEs are nationals from EU Member States who have a specific knowledge that can be of benefit to the Commission on topical and specific issues and for fixed terms.

Not unlike the administration of the Commission, SNEs are subject to strict obligations with respect to independence, transparency and conflict of interest <sup>(1)</sup>.

In some cases, however, conflicts of interest are difficult to avoid. This might be the case for nationals from Member States which have critical interests to promote and/or to protect.

For example, in the context of gambling, it seems that a SNE from the Maltese Government is involved in the drafting and follow-up of the Commission's Green Paper on online gambling <sup>(2)</sup>. This is likely to raise some concerns: Malta's gross gaming revenue amounts to about 8 % of its GDP, i.e. 11 times more than the EU average, which stands at just 0.68 % of GDP.

Commenting on gambling's contribution to the EU's national economies, a representative from the Commission recently admitted that Malta is 'not a normal country' <sup>(3)</sup>.

Does the Commission intend to take further steps to avoid any such conflicts of interest with SNEs in the future?

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

(16 February 2012)

Seconded National Experts (SNEs) are subject to strict obligations with respect to conflicts of interest and confidentiality in accordance with the applicable Commission decision and it kindly refers the Honourable Member to it, in particular Article 7(a), (b), (d) and (e) <sup>(4)</sup>. Should there be a conflict of interest the Commission takes appropriate measures, which can be ending the secondment.

The quote referred to by the honourable MEP is incomplete. Indeed the press article further explained: 'dismissing suggestions that Malta did not have any rules in this sector or turned a blind eye on certain regulations, the Commission official said: "Malta has managed to attract a big number of online companies due to its favourable tax incentives. However, Malta has a good functioning regulatory system."'

In having SNEs the Commission services seek for the most experienced candidates in a field. As highlighted above Malta being one of the Member States with a long standing and well functioning regulatory system, recruiting a Maltese SNE meets this objective.

In addition, any proposal or decision made by the Commission remain under the responsibility of the College of Commissioners and are prepared by internal consultations ensuring the protection of the general interest of the Union.

Therefore, the Commission considers that its current rules and implementing practices sufficiently prevent that conflict of interest arise and does not consider it necessary to take further steps in the future.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Commission Decision C(2008)6866 of 12 November 2008 laying down rules on the secondment to the Commission of national experts and national experts in professional training.

<sup>(2)</sup> Commission Green Paper on online gambling in the internal market of 24 March 2011 (COM(2011) 0128 final).

<sup>(3)</sup> 'Malta is Europe's gambling hub — Brussels', *Times of Malta*, 25 March 2011.

<sup>(4)</sup> Commission Decision C(2008)6866 of 12 November 2008 laying down rules on the secondment to the Commission of national experts and national experts in professional training.



(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000191/12  
do Komisji**

**Mirosław Piotrowski (ECR), Ryszard Czarnecki (ECR), Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD), Jacek Olgierd Kurski (EFD),  
Tadeusz Cymański (EFD), Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR) oraz Marek Józef Gróbarczyk (ECR)**

(11 stycznia 2012 r.)

*Przedmiot:* Dyskryminacja Telewizji Trwam w działaniach Krajowej Rady Radiofonii i Telewizji

W związku z odrzuceniem przez polską Krajową Radę Radiofonii i Telewizji wniosku fundacji Lux Veritatis, dotyczącego przyznania miejsca Telewizji Trwam (telewizja katolicka) na cyfrowym multipleksie, my niżej podpisani, posłowie do Parlamentu Europejskiego pragniemy zapytać, jakie kroki zamierza podjąć Komisja w obszarze transparentności cyfryzacji i poszanowania równych zasad konkurencyjności podmiotów na rynku w Polsce.

Jaka jest opinia Komisji w sprawie dyskryminowania mediów ze względu na ich katolicki charakter?

Po odrzuceniu wniosku fundacji Lux Veritatis o koncesję na miejsce dla TV Trwam na multipleksie cyfrowej telewizji naziemnej jeden z członków KRRiT stwierdził, że Telewizja Trwam nie gwarantuje powodzenia finansowego multipleksu, co nie jest zgodne z prawdą, gdyż Telewizja Trwam takie zabezpieczenie posiada. Niepokój budzi fakt, że koncesje na nadawanie w systemie cyfrowym otrzymały stacje posiadające o wiele mniejsze aktywa finansowe niż TV Trwam. Już od wielu lat Telewizja Trwam ma stałą widownię, oglądają ją setki tysięcy ludzi. Decyzja KRRiT pozbawia tego nadawcę możliwości dalszego rozwoju na rynku medialnym. Wyjaśnienia sprawy nieprzyznania koncesji Telewizji Trwam domaga się również Episkopat Polski. Przypomnieć należy, że decyzja KRRiT sprzeczna jest z poszanowaniem podstawowych wartości UE, do których należy m.in. zasada niedyskryminacji ze względu na poglądy religijne.

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Neelie Kroes w imieniu Komisji**

(22 lutego 2012 r.)

Komisja Europejska zawsze wspierała pluralizm w mediach i zwalczała jakiegokolwiek objawy dyskryminacji ze względu na przekonania.

Zgodnie z unijnymi przepisami w zakresie telekomunikacji, uwzględniając odpowiednie wartości częstotliwości radiowych, państwa członkowskie zapewniają skuteczne zarządzanie tymi częstotliwościami i przyznają prawa do ich wykorzystania w oparciu o obiektywne, przejrzyste, niedyskryminujące i proporcjonalne kryteria oraz obiektywne, przejrzyste, niedyskryminujące i proporcjonalne procedury otwarte.

Procedury krajowe mogą przewidywać szczególne kryteria oceny, w tym takie, które dotyczą sytuacji finansowej uczestników, pod warunkiem że wyżej wymienione zasady są przestrzegane. Z tego względu, biorąc pod uwagę koszty związane z obecnością w multipleksach, Komisja odnotowuje, że stabilność finansowa każdego nadawcy dzielącego multipleks może mieć decydujące znaczenie dla funkcjonowania całego przedsiębiorstwa i w związku z tym można ją uznać za uzasadnione kryterium oceny.

Z drugiej strony, ocena dotycząca prawidłowego stosowania tego kryterium przez władze polskie w Pana konkretnym przypadku należy przede wszystkim do sądów krajowych, do których strony mają prawo odwołać się w tej kwestii, zgodnie z unijnymi przepisami w zakresie telekomunikacji.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000191/12  
to the Commission**

**Mirosław Piotrowski (ECR), Ryszard Czarnecki (ECR), Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD), Jacek Olgierd Kurski (EFD),  
Tadeusz Cymański (EFD), Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR) and Marek Józef Gróbarczyk (ECR)**

(11 January 2012)

*Subject:* Discrimination against TV Trwam by Poland's National Broadcasting Council (KRRiT)

Poland's National Broadcasting Council has rejected an application from the Lux Veritatis foundation with a view to obtaining a digital broadcasting licence for TV Trwam (a Catholic TV channel). With this in mind, what steps is the Commission intending to take as regards transparency in digitisation and to ensure that, where competitiveness is concerned, there is a level playing field for operators on the Polish market?

What is the Commission's view of media operators being discriminated against because they are Catholic?

Following the rejection of the Lux Veritatis foundation's application for a licence to broadcast TV Trwam on digital terrestrial television, a KRRiT member stated that granting such a licence to TV Trwam would not be financially beneficial for the multiplex concerned. This is untrue, as TV Trwam is financially sound. It is a matter of concern that digital broadcasting licences have been granted to TV stations with far fewer financial assets than TV Trwam. TV Trwam has had a loyal audience for many years. It is watched by hundreds of thousands of people. KRRiT's decision means that TV Trwam cannot develop any further on the media market. The Polish Episcopate is also demanding explanations as to why TV Trwam was not granted a licence. KRRiT's decision clearly runs counter to the EU's fundamental values, including the principle of non-discrimination with regard to religious beliefs.

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

(22 February 2012)

The European Commission has been always supporting pluralism in media and fought any symptoms of discrimination based on beliefs.

According to the EU telecom rules, in view of the relevant value of radio frequencies Member States shall ensure the effective management of radio frequencies and shall grant rights to use frequencies on the basis of objective, transparent, non-discriminatory and proportionate criteria and objective, transparent, non-discriminatory, proportionate and open procedures.

The national procedures can foresee specific assessment criteria, including the ones concerning the financial standing of the contestants, provided that the abovementioned principles are respected. In this regard, given the costs related to the presence at a multiplex, the Commission note that the financial reliability of each and every broadcaster sharing the multiplex might be crucial for the functioning of the whole enterprise and therefore it can be considered a legitimate assessment criterion.

On the other hand, the assessment concerning the correct application of this criterion by the Polish authorities in the specific case at stake primarily belongs to the national courts to which the parties have a right to refer the question, in line with EU Telecom rules.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000199/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Michail Tremopoulos (Verts/ALE)**  
(18 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Τα μέτρα για την ελληνική οικονομία φέρνουν (και) περιβαλλοντική οπισθοδρόμηση

Σε κοινή ανακοίνωση <sup>(1)</sup> του διεθνούς, του ευρωπαϊκού και του ελληνικού τμήματος της περιβαλλοντικής οργάνωσης WWF προς την ΕΕ και το ΔΝΤ τονίζεται ότι «η πρωτοφανής κοινωνική κρίση που έχει προκληθεί στην Ελλάδα από τα μέτρα προσαρμογής της οικονομίας συνοδεύεται πλέον και από σοβαρή περιβαλλοντική οπισθοδρόμηση». Στις επιστολές προς τον Πρόεδρο της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής Μανουέλ Μπαρόσο και τη Γενική Διευθύντρια του Διεθνούς Νομισματικού Ταμείου Κριστίν Λαγκάρντ επισημαίνεται ότι με τα μέτρα προσαρμογής της ελληνικής οικονομίας ακυρώνεται η μικρή αλλά σημαντική πρόοδος που σημειώθηκε στην περιβαλλοντική πολιτική και νομοθεσία της Ελλάδας τα τελευταία χρόνια. Την ίδια στιγμή ανοίγει ένας επικίνδυνος δρόμος απαξίωσης του ευρωπαϊκού περιβαλλοντικού κεκτημένου, όχι πλέον από ένα απειθαρχο ελληνικό κράτος αλλά από την ίδια την ΕΕ. Οι σημαντικότερες επιπτώσεις που έχουν σημειωθεί μέχρι σήμερα, όπως καταγράφηκαν από το WWF είναι επιγραμματικά οι εξής:

- α. Βύθιση του Πράσινου Ταμείου στον κρατικό προϋπολογισμό,
- β. Αποδυνάμωση του συστήματος περιβαλλοντικών αδειών για έργα και δραστηριότητες,
- γ. Νομιμοποίηση αυθαιρέτων σε προστατευόμενες περιοχές,
- δ. Άνευ όρων πώληση δημόσιας γης,
- ε. Άνευ όρων αποδυνάμωση ή και κατάργηση των περιβαλλοντικών δημόσιων υπηρεσιών, και
- στ. Ενίσχυση της χρήσης ρυπογόνων καυσίμων.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Πώς θα διασφαλίσει, όπως οφείλει, την εφαρμογή των συνθηκών της ΕΕ, κυρίως όσον αφορά τον πυλώνα της αειφορίας και της προστασίας περιβάλλοντος;
2. Σκοπεύει να αναθεωρήσει τους όρους της συμφωνίας στήριξης της ελληνικής οικονομίας, προς την κατεύθυνση πράσινων και ουσιαστικά βιώσιμων λύσεων, που θα σέβονται τόσο το περιβάλλον όσο και τον άνθρωπο;

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

Η Επιτροπή θα συνεχίσει να μεριμνά για την πλήρη τήρηση του δικαίου της ΕΕ μέσω των υφιστάμενων διαδικασιών (διαδικασίες επί παραβάσει, εξέταση καταγγελιών, στενή συνεργασία με το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο μέσω της Επιτροπής Αναφορών ...) και τηρώντας την αρχή της ίσης μεταχείρισης μεταξύ των κρατών μελών.

Η Επιτροπή θεωρεί ότι τα μέτρα του προγράμματος οικονομικής προσαρμογής για την Ελλάδα δεν επηρεάζουν το περιβάλλον και δεν της έχει περιέλθει κανένα αποδεικτικό στοιχείο περί του αντιθέτου.

(<sup>1</sup>) [http://www.wwf.gr/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=847%3Awwf-&catid=70%3A2008-09-16-12-10-46&Itemid=90](http://www.wwf.gr/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=847%3Awwf-&catid=70%3A2008-09-16-12-10-46&Itemid=90)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000199/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Michail Tremopoulos (Verts/ALE)**  
(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* Greek economic adjustment programme (also) causing environmental setbacks

A joint statement <sup>(1)</sup> by the international, European and Greek sections of the environmental organisation WWF to the EU and the IMF emphasises that the unprecedented social crisis resulting from the economic adjustment programme in Greece is now causing significant environmental setbacks. In letters sent to the Commission President, Manuel Barroso, and International Monetary Fund Managing Director, Christine Lagarde, the WWF emphasises that the economic adjustment programme for Greece is wiping out the limited but significant progress made in environmental policy and legislation in Greece over the last few years. At the same time, there is a threat here of the European environmental *acquis* being undermined, no longer by an undisciplined Greek State, but by the EU itself. The following are, in brief, the most important repercussions to date, as noted by the WWF:

- (a) the scrapping of the 'Green Fund' in the State budget;
- (b) the undermining of the system of environmental permits for works and activities;
- (c) the legalisation of illegal developments in protected areas;
- (d) the uncontrolled sale of public lands;
- (e) the uncontrolled downsizing or dismantling of public environmental services; and
- (f) the support for dirty energy sources.

Will the Commission say:

1. How will it ensure, as it should, that the EU Treaties are implemented, especially in respect of environmental sustainability and environmental protection?
2. Does it intend to review the terms of the agreement to support the Greek economy so that, it offers green and essentially viable solutions that respect both environmental and human needs?

(Version française)

**Réponse donnée par M. Potočník au nom de la Commission**  
(2 mars 2012)

La Commission continuera à veiller à ce que le droit de l'UE soit pleinement respecté par le biais des procédures existantes (procédures d'infraction, traitement des plaintes, coopération étroite avec le Parlement par le biais de la commission des pétitions...) et dans le respect du principe d'égalité de traitement entre les États membres.

La Commission estime que les mesures du programme d'ajustement économique pour la Grèce ne portent pas atteinte à l'environnement et n'a pas reçu d'élément de preuve démontrant le contraire.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://www.wwf.gr/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=847%3Awwf-&catid=70%3A2008-09-16-12-10-46&Itemid=90](http://www.wwf.gr/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=847%3Awwf-&catid=70%3A2008-09-16-12-10-46&Itemid=90)

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000211/12  
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)  
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(18 gennaio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Protesta dei manifestanti nei paesi del Nord Africa e repressioni militari

Negli ultimi mesi, migliaia di manifestanti sono scesi in piazza in Egitto, in Libia, in Siria, nello Yemen ed in Turchia.

I ragazzi e le ragazze che prendono parte ai cortei sono stati, tuttavia, spesso vittime di violenze, di bastonate, sono stati immobilizzati, calpestati e messi a terra dai loro stessi connazionali militari, solo per placare le loro legittime proteste nelle zone in cui si trovano i governi o i parlamenti nazionali.

Membri dell'esercito in divisa si appostano sui tetti degli edifici che sormontano le dimostrazioni per poi gettarsi sui presidi e bloccare e malmenare chiunque si permetta di ribellarsi contro il governo. Decine i morti, migliaia i feriti oggetto di colpi d'arma da fuoco, sassate e bastonate provenienti dall'esercito in tutti i paesi del Nord Africa. I governi di questi paesi si ostinano a negare l'uso della forza militare. Così, anziché gestire con pazienza ed apertura le richieste dei dimostranti, le giunte militari danno ordine ai soldati di attaccare.

A seguito di quanto sopra esposto, può la Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante dire:

1. qual è l'aiuto fattivo che l'UE intende impegnare nei paesi del nord del Mediterraneo, ed in particolare quali sono i principali punti nell'agenda europea per affrontare il dopo-rivolta araba;
2. quali sono i motivi della lentezza dell'azione europea nella regione rispetto ad altre forze internazionali, quando un intervento europeo avrebbe potuto contribuire allo sviluppo democratico, impedendo l'ascesa dei fondamentalisti nei paesi liberati?

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

(4 luglio 2012)

L'Unione Europea ha immediatamente dichiarato di sostenere le richieste di cambiamento e di società più democratiche espresse dalle popolazioni dei paesi del Mediterraneo meridionale. L'8 marzo 2011 una comunicazione congiunta dell'AR e della Commissione <sup>(1)</sup> ha delineato una strategia basata su incentivi per sostenere i paesi impegnati nelle riforme. Il 25 maggio 2011 una comunicazione congiunta sul riesame della Politica europea di vicinato <sup>(2)</sup> ha fornito indicazioni su come trattare tali priorità.

L'Unione Europea ha iniziato rapidamente ad attuare la propria risposta, offrendo assistenza elettorale in Tunisia, Marocco, Egitto, Yemen, Algeria e Libia. Ha reso disponibile un altro miliardo di euro in sovvenzioni finalizzate al miglioramento della governance e ad uno sviluppo inclusivo nei paesi del vicinato. In questo contesto l'UE ha creato il programma globale SPRING, con una dotazione finanziaria iniziale di 350 milioni di euro per il 2011-2012, inteso a fornire l'assistenza dell'UE più rapidamente ai paesi impegnati nel processo di riforma politica. Le possibilità di prestito della BEI <sup>(3)</sup> sono aumentate di 1 miliardo di euro e il mandato della BERS <sup>(4)</sup> è stato esteso ai paesi del Mediterraneo meridionale. L'assistenza macrofinanziaria dell'UE è disponibile, ma subordinata a un programma dell'FMI <sup>(5)</sup>. L'UE ha approvato mandati di negoziazione per accordi di libero scambio globali e approfonditi con Marocco, Giordania, Egitto e Tunisia.

L'AR/VP ha condotto con successo due Task Force in Tunisia e Giordania che hanno riunito l'UE, gli Stati membri, istituzioni finanziarie internazionali, la società civile e il settore privato nel sostegno degli sforzi nel campo delle riforme.

L'UE ha introdotto lo «Strumento per la società civile», fondamentale per una transizione democratica. Sono stati avviati dialoghi sui partenariati per la mobilità con Tunisia e Marocco. I programmi Erasmus Mundus e «Gioventù in azione» sono stati ampliati.

<sup>(1)</sup> «Partenariato per la democrazia e la prosperità condivisa con il Mediterraneo meridionale»; COM(2011)200 def.

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/com\\_11\\_303\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/com_11_303_en.pdf)

<sup>(3)</sup> BEI = Banca europea per gli investimenti.

<sup>(4)</sup> BERS = Banca europea per la ricostruzione e lo sviluppo.

<sup>(5)</sup> FMI = Fondo monetario internazionale.

L'UE continuerà ad attuare la sua risposta e ad instaurare contatti con le nuove leadership che emergono dalla transizione sulla base del rispetto dei diritti dell'uomo e dei valori democratici <sup>(6)</sup>.

---

---

<sup>(6)</sup> L'AR e la Commissione hanno adottato una tabella di marcia dettagliata per l'attuazione delle politiche dell'UE nella regione del Mediterraneo orientale il 15 maggio 2012, JOIN (2012) 14 def. e SWD(2012)121 def.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000211/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President / High Representative)  
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)  
(18 January 2012)**

*Subject:* VP/HR — Protest by demonstrators in North African countries and military repression

In recent months, thousands of demonstrators have taken to the streets in Egypt, Libya, Syria, Yemen and Turkey.

The young men and women taking part in protests have, however, often been victims of violence and beatings. They have been immobilised, trampled upon and pinned to the ground by soldiers who are their fellow countrymen, just to block their legitimate protests in areas where governments or national parliaments are located.

Uniformed members of the military position themselves on the roofs of buildings overlooking areas where demonstrations are taking place, and then leap down on the advancing protesters before blocking and beating up anyone who tries to rebel against the government. Dozens of people have been killed and thousands wounded by gunshot fire, stones and baton blows dispensed by the army, in all the North African countries. The governments of these countries keep denying the use of military force. Thus, instead of handling the protesters' demands with patience and openness, military juntas order soldiers to attack.

Following what has been said above, can the Vice-President/High Representative state:

1. What type of real help does the EU intend to deploy in the northern countries of the Mediterranean, and, in particular, what are the main points on the EU agenda for dealing with the aftermath of the Arab uprisings?
2. Why has the EU been so slow to act in the region compared to other international forces, when intervention by the EU could have contributed to democratic development, preventing the rise of fundamentalists in the liberated countries?

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

The EU immediately expressed its support for the popular call for change and more democratic societies in the Southern Mediterranean. The 8 March 2011 joint Communication of the HR and the Commission <sup>(1)</sup> outlined an incentive-based approach to assist countries committed to reforms. The 25 May 2011 Joint Communication on the review of the European Neighbourhood Policy <sup>(2)</sup> provided direction as to how those priorities will be addressed.

The EU quickly started to implement its response. It has provided electoral assistance in Tunisia, Morocco, Egypt, Yemen, Algeria and Libya. It mobilised an additional EUR 1 billion in grants towards improving governance and inclusive development in the Neighbourhood. In this context, it created the umbrella SPRING Programme, with an initial budget of EUR 350 million for 2011-2012 to deliver EU assistance more quickly to those countries engaged in political reforms. Lending possibilities for the EIB <sup>(3)</sup> have increased by EUR 1 billion and the EBRD <sup>(4)</sup> mandate has been enlarged to the Southern Mediterranean countries. EU macro-financial assistance is available conditional to an IMF <sup>(5)</sup> programme. The EU approved negotiating mandates for deep and comprehensive free trade agreements with Morocco, Jordan, Egypt and Tunisia.

The HR/VP led two successful Task Forces in Tunisia and Jordan. They brought together the EU, its Member States, International Finance Institutions, civil society and the private sector to support reform efforts.

The EU has launched the Civil Society Facility, key for a democratic transition. Dialogues on mobility partnerships have been initiated with Tunisia and Morocco. Erasmus Mundus and Youth In Action programmes have been expanded.

The EU will continue to implement its response and engage with new leaderships emerging from transition on the basis of respect of human rights and democratic values <sup>(6)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> 'A partnership for democracy and shared prosperity with the Southern Mediterranean'; COM(2011) 200 final.

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/com\\_11\\_303\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/com_11_303_en.pdf)

<sup>(3)</sup> EIB = European Investment Bank.

<sup>(4)</sup> EBRD = European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

<sup>(5)</sup> IMF = International Monetary Fund.

<sup>(6)</sup> A detailed road map for the implementation of the EU policies in the southern Mediterranean region was adopted by the HR and the Commission on 15 May 2012, JOIN (2012)14 final and SWD (2012) 121 final.

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000251/12**  
**adresată Comisiei**  
**Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**  
(18 ianuarie 2012)

*Subiect:* Utilizarea antibioticelor în creșterea animalelor și păsărilor pentru consum

În urma unui experiment, s-a descoperit că jumătate dintre puii achiziționați în magazinele din Germania sunt contaminați cu bacterii rezistente la antibiotice și reprezintă un pericol pentru sănătatea umană. Având în vedere faptul că astfel de situații sunt tot mai des întâlnite, Comisia este rugată să precizeze dacă are în vedere noi măsuri care să stopeze utilizarea antibioticelor în creșterea animalelor și păsărilor pentru consum.

**Răspuns dat de dl Dalli în numele Comisiei**  
(20 februarie 2012)

Comisia a adoptat la 15 noiembrie 2011 <sup>(1)</sup> un plan de acțiune cincinal referitor la rezistența antimicrobiană. Printre altele, planul de acțiune respectiv a confirmat faptul că problema rezistenței antimicrobiene va fi pe deplin luată în considerare în cadrul revizuirii aflate în desfășurare a legislației privind produsele veterinare, precum și a legislației furajelor cu conținut medicamentos.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Comunicare a Comisiei către Parlamentul European și Consiliu. Plan de acțiune împotriva amenințărilor tot mai mari reprezentate de rezistența la antimicrobiene [COM (2011) 748].



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000251/12  
to the Commission  
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)  
(18 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Use of antibiotics in livestock and poultry feed

Following an experiment, it was discovered that half the chickens purchased in German shops were contaminated with bacteria resistant to antibiotics and represented a hazard to human health. Given that such situations are becoming increasingly frequent, is the Commission envisaging new measures to end the use of antibiotics in livestock and poultry feed?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission  
(20 February 2012)**

The Commission has adopted on 15 November 2011 <sup>(1)</sup> a five year action plan on antimicrobial resistance. Among others, the action plan confirmed that the issue of anti-microbial resistance will be fully taken into account in the context of the ongoing review of the veterinary products legislation as well as the medicated feed legislation.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council. Action plan against the rising threats from Antimicrobial Resistance, COM(2011) 748.

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-000286/12  
à la Commission**

**Jean-Luc Bennahmias (ALDE)**

(17 janvier 2012)

*Objet:* Nouvelle constitution hongroise: respect des valeurs et droits fondamentaux de l'UE en question

Ce 6 janvier 2012, la nouvelle constitution hongroise est entrée en vigueur. Cette constitution, et les lois cardinales qui l'accompagnent, mettent manifestement en danger la démocratie et l'état de droit en Hongrie et sont contraires aux valeurs fondamentales de l'Union européenne.

Considérant que cette nouvelle constitution porte atteinte de manière irréductible à la liberté de la presse, aux principes essentiels de séparation et d'équilibre des pouvoirs, en ce qu'elle limite l'indépendance du système judiciaire et les pouvoirs des organes de protection des droits et de la démocratie, comme ceux de la Cour constitutionnelle, et que la Hongrie s'est engagée lors de son adhésion à l'Union européenne en 2007 à respecter les critères de Copenhague auxquels elle s'est conformée, nous sommes devant un reniement gravissime des engagements européens.

Considérant que l'article 7 du traité sur l'Union européenne prévoit qu'en cas de risque clair de violation grave par un État membre des valeurs visées à l'article 2 du même traité, à savoir le respect de l'état de droit et des Droits de l'homme, y compris des droits des personnes appartenant à des minorités (ces valeurs sont censées être communes aux États membres dans une société caractérisée par le pluralisme, la non-discrimination, la tolérance, la justice, la solidarité et l'égalité entre les femmes et les hommes), un processus de recommandation et de sanction pouvant conduire à la suspension de certains droits sera appliqué.

1. La Commission considère-t-elle que la Hongrie, avec cette nouvelle constitution, porte atteinte aux valeurs de l'Union?
2. La Commission envisage-t-elle le recours à cet article 7 du TUE?
3. Quelles mesures concrètes la Commission compte-t-elle adopter afin de remédier à cette situation?

**Réponse donnée par Mme Reding au nom de la Commission**

(6 mars 2012)

1 — 3. La Commission a expliqué sa position durant le débat au sein du Parlement européen du 18 janvier 2012. La priorité pour la Commission, en tant que gardienne des traités, est de veiller à ce que la situation en Hongrie soit compatible avec le droit de l'UE. C'est pourquoi la Commission a décidé le 17 janvier d'engager trois procédures d'infraction contre la Hongrie concernant l'âge de départ à la retraite des juges et des procureurs, l'indépendance de l'autorité de contrôle de la protection des données et de la banque centrale nationale. La Commission a également demandé des explications complémentaires sur l'indépendance du pouvoir judiciaire. La Commission européenne a reçu les réponses du gouvernement hongrois le 17 février, ce qui signifie que la Hongrie a respecté le délai d'un mois fixé par la Commission lors de l'ouverture des procédures d'infraction. La Commission traitera les réponses du gouvernement hongrois en urgence et elle effectuera une analyse juridique complète. La Commission a également exprimé ses préoccupations maintes fois réitérées à propos de la liberté des médias. Dans ce contexte, la Commission se félicite que les autorités hongroises consultent actuellement le Conseil de l'Europe. En outre, la Commission a bien sûr pris bonne note de la résolution approuvée par le Parlement européen le 16 février, dans laquelle ce dernier appelait la Commission à surveiller de près toute modification apportée à la législation hongroise ainsi que sa mise en œuvre.

2. Quant au mécanisme visé à l'article 7 du traité UE, la Commission rappelle qu'il s'agit, en dernier ressort, d'un mécanisme correctif et préventif qui permet à l'Union de couvrir les situations qui constituent une violation grave et persistante de principes communs énoncés à l'article 2 du traité UE ou qui créent un risque clair de violation grave de ces principes. Ce mécanisme peut aussi être déclenché par le Parlement européen lorsqu'il existe clairement un risque de violation grave. Comme indiqué plus haut, la Commission a identifié certains points d'incompatibilité avec le droit de l'UE face auxquels les procédures d'infraction constituent le moyen de réaction le plus approprié. La Commission rappelle en outre que le moyen le plus rapide de dissiper les craintes mentionnées serait bien sûr l'action des autorités hongroises elles-mêmes.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-000286/12  
to the Commission**

**Jean-Luc Bennahmias (ALDE)**

(17 January 2012)

*Subject:* The new Hungarian constitution in the context of respect for fundamental EU values and rights

On 6 January 2012 the new Hungarian constitution came into force. This constitution, and the fundamental laws that accompany it, put democracy and the rule of law in Hungary at risk and go against the fundamental values of the European Union.

This new constitution is a very serious violation of press freedoms, the essential principles of the separation and balance of powers, that it limits independence of the judicial system and the powers of bodies responsible for protection of rights and democracy, such as those of the Constitutional Court, and that Hungary undertook to respect the Copenhagen criteria upon accession to the European Union in 2007 and with which it complied, and this constitutes a very serious repudiation of European commitments.

Article 7 of the Treaty on European Union states that in the event of a risk of a breach by a Member State of the values referred to in Article 2 of the Treaty, namely respect for the rule of law and human rights, and the rights of people belonging to minorities (these values are deemed to be shared by Member States within a society characterised by pluralism, non-discrimination, tolerance, justice, solidarity and equality between women and men) a referral and sanction process leading to the suspension of certain rights will be applied.

1. Does the Commission believe that Hungary's new constitution violates the Union's values?
2. Does the Commission plan to have recourse to Article 7 of the Treaty on European Union?
3. What specific measures does the Commission intend to take in order to remedy this situation?

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

(6 March 2012)

1-3. The Commission has explained its position during the European Parliament Debate on 18 January 2012. The priority for the Commission, as the guardian of the Treaties, is to ensure that the situation in Hungary is compatible with EC law. For this reason, the Commission decided on 17 January to launch three infringement proceedings against Hungary relating to the retirement age of judges and prosecutors, the independence of the data protection supervisory authority and of the national central bank. The Commission has also asked for further explanations concerning the independence of the judiciary. The European Commission received the replies from the Hungarian government on 17 February, which means that Hungary has respected the one-month deadline set by the Commission when launching the infringement procedures. The Commission will treat the replies from the Hungarian government as a matter of urgency, and will carry out a full legal analysis. The Commission also expressed its repeated concerns regarding media freedom. In this context the Commission welcomes the ongoing consultation by the Hungarian authorities of the Council of Europe. Furthermore, the Commission has of course taken due note of the Resolution approved by the European Parliament on 16 February where the European Parliament called on the Commission to monitor closely any amendments to and the enforcement of the Hungarian legislation.

2. As for the mechanism contained in Article 7 TEU, the Commission recalls that it is a remedial and preventive mechanism of last resort which enables the Union to cover situations which either constitute a serious and persistent breach of common principles laid down in Article 2 TEU or create a clear risk of a serious breach of the latter. This mechanism can also be triggered by the European Parliament when there is clear risk of a serious breach. As explained above, the Commission has identified certain issues of non-compatibility with EC law for which infringement proceedings are the most appropriate way to move forward. The Commission also recalls that the swiftest way to lay to rest the concerns mentioned would of course be action by the Hungarian authorities themselves.

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris P-000294/12**  
**adresată Comisiei**  
**Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D)**  
(16 ianuarie 2012)

*Subiect:* Bunăstarea animalelor: metode de producție a „foie gras”

Având în vedere faptul că în conformitate cu DG SANCO:

- Comisia recunoaște că animalele sunt ființe sensibile;
- obiectivul general este să se asigure că animalele nu sunt supuse unor dureri sau suferințe;
- proprietarii/deținătorii de animale au obligația de a respecta cerințele minime de bunăstare;
- Comisia a pregătit a doua strategie a UE pentru protecția și bunăstarea animalelor pentru perioada 2011-2015 și
- metodele de producție a „foie gras” reprezintă un tratament crud și inuman al animalelor,

poate Comisia să spună ce abordare adoptă, dacă este aplicabil, față de această problemă specifică privind producția și importul de „foie gras” în UE în vederea asigurării faptului că normele privind bunăstarea animalelor, pe care UE le proclamă în mare măsură, sunt respectate de agricultori și că sunt prevăzute și aplicate penalități în cazul în care acestea sunt încălcate?

**Răspuns dat de dl Dallî în numele Comisiei**  
(14 februarie 2012)

Comisia face trimitere la răspunsul său la întrebarea scrisă E-003959/2009 <sup>(1)</sup> privind cadrul juridic actual care reglementează producția și importul de *foie gras* în UE.

Comisia a adoptat în ianuarie 2012 o comunicare privind o strategie a UE pentru protecția și bunăstarea animalelor <sup>(2)</sup>. Comisia consideră că o mai bună punere în aplicare a legislației actuale reprezintă o prioritate, inclusiv în ceea ce privește normele din Directiva 98/58/CE privind protecția animalelor de fermă <sup>(3)</sup> și recomandările Consiliului Europei referitoare la găște și rațe <sup>(4)</sup>.

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

<sup>(2)</sup> COM(2012)6: [http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/actionplan/actionplan\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/actionplan/actionplan_en.htm)

<sup>(3)</sup> JO L 221, 8.8.1998.

<sup>(4)</sup> [http://wayback.archive-it.org/1365/20090215072750/http://www.coe.int/t/e/legal\\_affairs/legal\\_co-operation/biological\\_safety%2C\\_use\\_of\\_animals/farming/Rec%20Muscovy%20ducks%20E%201999.asp](http://wayback.archive-it.org/1365/20090215072750/http://www.coe.int/t/e/legal_affairs/legal_co-operation/biological_safety%2C_use_of_animals/farming/Rec%20Muscovy%20ducks%20E%201999.asp);  
[http://wayback.archive-it.org/1365/20090215072727/http://www.coe.int/t/e/legal\\_affairs/legal\\_co-operation/biological\\_safety%2C\\_use\\_of\\_animals/farming/Rec%20geese.asp](http://wayback.archive-it.org/1365/20090215072727/http://www.coe.int/t/e/legal_affairs/legal_co-operation/biological_safety%2C_use_of_animals/farming/Rec%20geese.asp)

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-000294/12  
to the Commission  
Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D)  
(16 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Animal welfare: 'foie gras' production methods

Given the fact that according to DG SANCO:

- the Commission recognises that animals are sentient beings,
- the general aim is to ensure that animals do not endure avoidable pain or suffering,
- owners/keepers of animals are obliged to respect minimum welfare requirements,
- the Commission has been preparing the second EU strategy for the protection and welfare of animals for 2011-2015, and
- 'foie gras' production methods constitute cruel and inhumane treatment of animals,

would the Commission say what approach it takes, if any, to this specific problem of 'foie gras' production and import in the EU in order to ensure that animal welfare standards, which the EU so highly proclaims, are respected by farmers and that penalties are laid down and applied where they are breached?

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

The Commission would refer to its answer to Written Question E-003959/2009 <sup>(1)</sup> regarding the current legal framework which covers the production and the import of foie gras in the EU.

The Commission adopted a communication on an EU strategy for the protection and welfare of animals in January 2012 <sup>(2)</sup>. The Commission considers better enforcement of the existing legislation as a priority, including as regards the rules of Directive 98/58/EC on the protection of animals kept for farming purposes <sup>(3)</sup> and of the recommendations of the Council of Europe on geese and ducks <sup>(4)</sup>.

---

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

<sup>(2)</sup> COM(2012) 6: [http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/actionplan/actionplan\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/actionplan/actionplan_en.htm)

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ L 221, 8.8.1998.

<sup>(4)</sup> [http://wayback.archive-it.org/1365/20090215072750/http://www.coe.int/t/e/legal\\_affairs/legal\\_cooperation/biological\\_safety%2C\\_use\\_of\\_animals/farming/Rec%20Muscovy%20ducks%20E%201999.asp](http://wayback.archive-it.org/1365/20090215072750/http://www.coe.int/t/e/legal_affairs/legal_cooperation/biological_safety%2C_use_of_animals/farming/Rec%20Muscovy%20ducks%20E%201999.asp)  
[http://wayback.archive-it.org/1365/20090215072727/http://www.coe.int/t/e/legal\\_affairs/legal\\_cooperation/biological\\_safety%2C\\_use\\_of\\_animals/farming/Rec%20geese.asp](http://wayback.archive-it.org/1365/20090215072727/http://www.coe.int/t/e/legal_affairs/legal_cooperation/biological_safety%2C_use_of_animals/farming/Rec%20geese.asp)

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000298/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE)**  
(19. Januar 2012)

*Betrifft:* Einsatz von Antibiotika in der Tierzucht

Aus Untersuchungen, die diese Woche in der deutschen Presse veröffentlicht wurden, geht hervor, dass in Deutschland in 11 von 20 untersuchten Proben von Hähnchenfleisch antibiotikaresistente Keime gefunden wurden. Ähnliche Monitoringbefunde wurden bereits früher von der deutschen Bundesregierung kommuniziert: Für 2009 wurden Kontaminationsraten von Hähnchen- und Putenfleisch mit MRSA von jeweils 24 % bzw. 43 % festgestellt, und für 2010 eine Kontamination von 32 % in Putenfleisch.

Es ist zu befürchten, dass diese hohen Kontaminationsraten auf die systematische prophylaktische Verwendung von Antibiotika in der Massentierhaltung zurückgehen und damit ein europaweites Problem darstellen.

Aus diesem Grund hat das Europäische Parlament am 27. Oktober 2011 gefordert, dass Antibiotika ausschließlich zur Behandlung von Krankheiten einzusetzen sind, und die Kommission aufgefordert, Legislativvorschläge zu unterbreiten, mit denen der prophylaktische Einsatz von Antibiotika in der Viehzucht stufenweise eingestellt wird. Leider haben diese Forderungen im Aktionsplan der Kommission zur Abwehr der Antibiotikaresistenz, der im November 2011 vorgelegt wurde, keinen Niederschlag gefunden.

Wird die Kommission dennoch Legislativvorschläge vorlegen, mit denen der prophylaktische Einsatz von Antibiotika in der Viehzucht stufenweise eingestellt wird, so wie dies in der Entschließung des Europäischen Parlaments vom 27. Oktober 2011 <sup>(1)</sup> gefordert wird? Wenn nicht, warum nicht? Wenn ja, wann?

Wird die Kommission aktiv werden, um eine Trennung des Verkaufs von Antibiotika von der Verschreibung durch Tierärzte zu empfehlen, um etwaige Interessenkonflikte zu vermeiden?

Inwieweit erwägt die Kommission im Rahmen der Reform der EU-Agrarpolitik konkrete Maßnahmen im Hinblick auf eine extensivere Tierhaltung zur Reduzierung des Einsatzes von Antibiotika?

**Antwort von Herrn Dalli im Namen der Kommission**  
(22. Februar 2012)

Die EU-Rechtsvorschriften über Fütterungsarzneimittel und Tierarzneimittel werden derzeit überarbeitet, und die Kommission wird dafür Sorge tragen, dass das Problem der Antibiotikaresistenz dabei in angemessener Weise berücksichtigt wird. Die Kommission plant, die entsprechenden Legislativvorschläge 2013 vorzulegen.

Im Rahmen der Überarbeitung der Rechtsvorschriften über Tierarzneimittel wurde im Zeitraum 2010-2011 eine externe Studie durchgeführt, mit der die hauptsächlich festgestellten Probleme quantifiziert, mögliche Maßnahmen vorgeschlagen und die jeweiligen Auswirkungen bewertet wurden <sup>(2)</sup>.

Unterdessen hat die Kommission den Mitgliedstaaten mit ihren Vorschlägen für die GAP-Reform die notwendigen Instrumente zur Förderung einer nachhaltigeren und extensiveren Agrarproduktion an die Hand gegeben. Die Umstellung von der klassischen Förderung (in den Ländern, die dieses System anwenden) auf ein Pauschalssystem dürfte dazu führen, dass die Förderung der intensiven Agrarproduktion zugunsten einer extensiveren Weideviehhaltung verringert wird, bei der die Unterstützung pro Hektar im Allgemeinen niedriger ist. Beim Pauschalssystem sind außerdem größere Flächen förderfähig, darunter auch Land, das nur in geringem Maße landwirtschaftlich genutzt wird. Infolge des Vorschlags zugunsten einer freiwilligen produktionsgekoppelten Förderung in sensiblen Sektoren können die Mitgliedstaaten ferner bestimmte Bedingungen festlegen, u. a. eine Begrenzung der Zahl der Tiere.

Im Rahmen der Vorschläge für die Entwicklung des ländlichen Raums können die Mitgliedstaaten außerdem die ökologische Landwirtschaft und die Einhaltung höherer Tierschutzstandards finanziell fördern, wodurch der Einsatz von Antibiotika verringert werden könnte. Mit diesen Vorschlägen wird eine größere Flexibilität hinsichtlich der Vertragsdauer und der Begünstigten eingeführt, wodurch die Systeme für die Erzeuger leichter zugänglich werden dürften.

<sup>(1)</sup> P7\_TA(2011)0473.

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/health/files/veterinary/11-07-2011\\_final\\_report\\_.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/files/veterinary/11-07-2011_final_report_.pdf)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000298/12  
to the Commission**

**Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE)**

(19 January 2012)

*Subject:* Use of antibiotics in animal breeding

Studies published in the German press this week reveal that antibiotic-resistant bacteria have been found in 11 of 20 chicken meat samples in Germany. The German federal government has communicated similar monitoring findings in the past: in 2009 MRSA contamination levels for chicken and turkey meat were 24 % and 43 %, respectively, and in 2010, 32 % of turkey meat was contaminated.

It is feared that these high contamination levels are the result of the systematic preventive use of antibiotics in large-scale animal farming and therefore are a Europe-wide problem.

Accordingly, on 27 October 2011 the European Parliament called for antibiotics to be used exclusively to treat diseases and called on the Commission to submit legislative proposals that would gradually end the preventive use of antibiotics in cattle breeding. Unfortunately, the Commission's action plan of 27 October 2011 to combat resistance to antibiotics did not consider these requests.

Will the Commission nevertheless submit legislative proposals to phase out the preventive use of antibiotics in animal breeding, as called for in the resolution of the European Parliament of 27 October 2011? <sup>(1)</sup> If not, why not? If yes, when?

Will the Commission recommend the separation of the sale of antibiotics from prescriptions authorised by veterinarians in order to avoid possible conflicts of interest?

To what extent is the Commission considering concrete measures within the scope of the EU agricultural policy reform in the light of more extensive animal breeding to reduce the use of antibiotics?

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

(22 February 2012)

The EU legislation on medicated feed and veterinary medicinal products is currently under revision, and the Commission will ensure that the issue of antimicrobial resistance will be addressed appropriately. The Commission has the intention to present the legal proposals in 2013.

In the context of the revision of the legislation on veterinary medicinal products, an external study was carried out in 2010-2011 to quantify the main perceived problems, to suggest policy options and to assess the impact <sup>(2)</sup>.

In the meantime, the Commission's CAP reform proposals provide the Member States with the tools to encourage a more sustainable and more extensive agricultural production. The move away from historical support (in those countries which apply this system) to a flat rate is expected to lead to a reduction in support for more intensive production to the benefit of more extensive grazing livestock where the subsidy per hectare is generally lower. The flat rate system also means that more land will become eligible and will attract a payment, including land on which there is minimal agricultural activity. In addition the proposal to allow voluntary coupled production, for sensitive sectors, allows Member States to apply conditions which could include a limit on the number of animals.

Member States also have the option under the Rural Development proposals to provide funding for organic farming and higher animal welfare standards which could reduce the use of antibiotics. The proposals introduce greater flexibility in terms of length of contract and beneficiaries which should make the schemes more accessible for producers.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> P7\_TA(2011)0473.

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/health/files/veterinary/11-07-2011\\_final\\_report\\_.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/files/veterinary/11-07-2011_final_report_.pdf)

(Dansk udgave)

**Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-000307/12**  
**til Kommissionen**  
**Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)**  
(19. januar 2012)

Om: Forurening fra bunkerolie

Hvilke initiativer agter Kommissionen at gennemføre i forbindelse med den forurening i EU, som udgår fra bunkerolie?

**Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Siim Kallas**  
(23. februar 2012)

Europa-Parlamentets og Rådets direktiv 2005/35/EF<sup>(1)</sup> om forurening fra skibe og indførelsen af sanktioner ved overtrædelser, som ændret, opstiller principielle, strafferetlige sanktioner, som er effektive, står i forhold til overtrædelserne og har en tilstrækkelig afskrækkende virkning. De pålægges ved udtømmning af forurenende stoffer i havet, herunder bunkerfuel, hvad enten det er forsætligt, hensynsløst eller groft uagtsomt. Det Europæiske Agentur for Søfartssikkerhed har i henhold hertil oprettet et overvågningsnetværk for de europæiske farvande (Clean Sea Net), som efter anmodning forsyner medlemsstaterne med satellitbilleder, der gør det muligt at lokalisere havforurening, som skyldes bunkerfuel.

I øvrigt er der i den internationale konvention om det civile ansvar for forureningsskader forårsaget af bunkerfuel, som blev vedtaget i 2001, fastlagt en kompensationsordning til fordel for ofre for havforurening, der giver ret til at rejse direkte krav mod forsikringsgiveren. Konventionen, som trådte i kraft i 2008, gælder al forurening, som finder sted i de kontraherende staters territorialfarvande og eksklusive økonomiske zoner. Kommissionen har gentagne gange påpeget vigtigheden af, at medlemsstaterne tilslutter sig denne konvention. Pr. 31. december 2011 havde toogtyve medlemsstater tilsluttet sig.

Kommissionen har af ovennævnte grunde ikke planer om yderligere tiltag på området.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> EUT L 255 af 30.9.2005, s. 11.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000307/12  
to the Commission**

**Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)**

(19 January 2012)

*Subject:* Pollution from bunker oil

What initiatives does the Commission intend to take in connection with bunker oil pollution in the EU?

(Version française)

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

(23 février 2012)

La directive 2005/35/CE<sup>(1)</sup> relative à la pollution causée par les navires et à l'introduction de sanctions en cas d'infractions telle que modifiée, impose des sanctions en principe de nature pénale, effectives, proportionnées et dissuasives, pour tout rejet en mer de substances polluantes, incluant les hydrocarbures de soute, commis intentionnellement, témérement ou à la suite d'une négligence grave. Dans ce cadre l'Agence européenne de sécurité maritime a mis en place un réseau de surveillance des eaux européennes (Clean Sea Net) qui peut fournir aux États membres, sur leur demande, des images satellitaires permettant de localiser des pollutions marines par des hydrocarbures.

Par ailleurs, la convention internationale sur la responsabilité civile pour des dommages suite à une pollution par les hydrocarbures de soute, adoptée en 2001, prévoit un régime d'indemnisation des victimes de pollution avec un droit d'action directe contre l'assureur. Cette convention, entrée en vigueur en 2008, est applicable à toutes les pollutions causées dans les eaux territoriales et les zones économiques exclusives des États parties. La Commission a plusieurs fois rappelé la nécessité pour les États membres d'adhérer à cette convention à laquelle, au 31 décembre 2011, vingt-deux d'entre eux étaient parties.

Dans ces conditions, la Commission n'envisage pas d'autres initiatives.

---

(<sup>1</sup>) JO L 255 du 30.09.2005, p. 11.

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000318/12**

**à la Commission**

**Anna Záborská (PPE)**

(20 janvier 2012)

*Objet:* Liberté de religion: proposition de décision du Conseil établissant un cadre pluriannuel pour l'Agence des droits fondamentaux de l'Union européenne pour la période 2013-2017

Dans sa proposition de décision du Conseil établissant un cadre pluriannuel pour l'Agence des droits fondamentaux de l'Union européenne pour la période 2013-2017, la Commission propose la liste des domaines thématiques de ladite agence.

Sous le titre «Questions relatives aux droits fondamentaux qui ont été soulevées ces dernières années par le biais des conclusions du Conseil», la Commission omet cependant de faire mention des conclusions de la 297[0-9]<sup>e</sup> réunion du Conseil, qui s'est tenue le 16 novembre 2009.

À l'occasion de cette réunion, le Conseil a émis ses conclusions quant aux questions relatives à la liberté de religion et de conscience (Conclusions du Conseil (page 10 du doc [(15913/09 (Presse 328))]).

Pourquoi la Commission n'a-t-elle pas tenu compte des conclusions du Conseil du 16.11.2009 relatives à la liberté de religion et a-t-elle, par conséquent, incorporé un domaine thématique spécifique dans sa proposition soumise au Conseil?

**Réponse donnée par M<sup>me</sup> Reding au nom de la Commission**

(28 février 2012)

Les conclusions du Conseil et les résolutions du Parlement européen mentionnées au point 1.4 de la proposition de décision du Conseil établissant un cadre pluriannuel pour l'Agence des droits fondamentaux de l'Union européenne pour la période 2013-2017 ne constituent pas une liste exhaustive des conclusions et résolutions desdites institutions relatives aux droits fondamentaux. En tout état de cause, la liberté de religion et les discriminations fondées sur la religion ou les convictions sont mentionnées dans la proposition comme l'une des questions soulevées ces dernières années par le biais de résolutions du Parlement européen relatives aux droits fondamentaux.

La Commission a tenu compte de l'importance de ce sujet pour l'Union et a ainsi inclus la religion parmi les critères des discriminations du domaine thématique (h) de l'Article 2 de sa proposition. Pour des raisons pratiques, la Commission a préféré concentrer les critères des discriminations dans un seul domaine thématique au lieu de proposer un domaine pour chaque critère.

---

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000318/12**

**Komisií**

**Anna Záborská (PPE)**

(20. januára 2012)

Vec: Sloboda náboženského vyznania: návrh rozhodnutia Rady, ktorým sa zriaďuje viacročný rámec pre Agentúru Európskej únie pre základné práva na roky 2013 — 2017

V návrhu rozhodnutia Rady, ktorým sa zriaďuje viacročný rámec pre Agentúru Európskej únie pre základné práva na roky 2013 — 2017, Komisia navrhuje zoznam tematických oblastí, ktorým sa má agentúra venovať.

Pod bodom o otázkach týkajúcich sa základných práv, ktoré vyplynuli v posledných rokoch z uznesení Rady, však Komisia neuviedla závery z 2973. zasadnutia Rady zo 16. novembra 2009.

Na tomto zasadnutí Rada prijala závery týkajúce sa slobody náboženského vyznania alebo viery (závery Rady (strana 10 dokumentu [(15913/09 (Presse 328))]).

Prečo Komisia nevzala na vedomie závery Rady zo 16. novembra 2009 týkajúce sa slobody náboženského vyznania a následne ich nezahrnula ako osobitnú tematickú oblasť do návrhu rozhodnutia Rady?

**Odpoveď pani Redingovej v mene Komisie**

(28. februára 2012)

Závery Rady a uznesenia Európskeho parlamentu uvedené v bode 1.4 návrhu rozhodnutia Rady, ktorým sa zriaďuje viacročný rámec pre Agentúru Európskej únie pre základné práva na roky 2013 — 2017, nepredstavujú kompletný zoznam záverov a uznesení týchto inštitúcií týkajúcich sa základných práv. Sloboda náboženstva a diskriminácia na základe náboženstva alebo viery sa v každom prípade spomínajú v návrhu ako jedna z otázok, ktoré v posledných rokoch vyplynuli z uznesení Európskeho parlamentu týkajúcich sa základných práv.

Komisia zohľadnila význam tejto problematiky pre Úniu a začlenila náboženstvo medzi kritériá diskriminácie v rámci tematickej oblasti uvedenej v článku 2 písm. h) svojho návrhu. Komisia z praktických dôvodov uprednostnila sústrediť kritériá diskriminácie do jednej tematickej oblasti namiesto vytvorenia samostatnej oblasti pre každé kritérium.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000318/12  
to the Commission**

**Anna Záborská (PPE)**

(20 January 2012)

*Subject:* Freedom of religion: proposal for a Council decision establishing a Multiannual Framework for the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights for 2013-17

In its proposal for a Council decision establishing a Multiannual Framework for the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights for 2013-17, the Commission proposes a list of thematic areas to be covered by the agency.

Under the heading 'Issues relating to fundamental rights which have been raised in recent years through the conclusions of the Council', the Commission has, however, omitted to mention the conclusions of the 2973rd meeting of the Council held on 16 November 2009.

At that meeting, the Council issued its conclusions on matters relating to freedom of religion and conscience (Council Conclusions (page 10 of doc [(15913/09 (Press 328))]).

Why has the Commission not taken account of the Council conclusions of 16 November 2009 concerning freedom of religion and, consequently, included a specific thematic area in its proposal to the Council?

(Version française)

**Réponse donnée par M<sup>me</sup> Reding au nom de la Commission**

(28 février 2012)

Les conclusions du Conseil et les résolutions du Parlement européen mentionnées au point 1.4 de la proposition de décision du Conseil établissant un cadre pluriannuel pour l'Agence des droits fondamentaux de l'Union européenne pour la période 2013-2017 ne constituent pas une liste exhaustive des conclusions et résolutions desdites institutions relatives aux droits fondamentaux. En tout état de cause, la liberté de religion et les discriminations fondées sur la religion ou les convictions sont mentionnées dans la proposition comme l'une des questions soulevées ces dernières années par le biais de résolutions du Parlement européen relatives aux droits fondamentaux.

La Commission a tenu compte de l'importance de ce sujet pour l'Union et a ainsi inclus la religion parmi les critères des discriminations du domaine thématique (h) de l'Article 2 de sa proposition. Pour des raisons pratiques, la Commission a préféré concentrer les critères des discriminations dans un seul domaine thématique au lieu de proposer un domaine pour chaque critère.

---

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000360/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Spyros Danellis (S&D)**  
(20 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Εξαγωγές ζώντων ζώων εκμετάλλευσης στην Τουρκία

Σύμφωνα με στοιχεία της Eurostat, τους τελευταίους δώδεκα μήνες, πάνω από ένα εκατομμύριο πρόβατα και βοοειδή εξήχθησαν από την ΕΕ στην Τουρκία. Εκθέσεις έγκυρων οργανώσεων για την ευζωία των ζώων καταδεικνύουν ότι πολλά από αυτά τα ζώα μεταφέρονται κατά τρόπους που παραβιάζουν τον Κανονισμό (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1/2005 του Συμβουλίου περί της προστασίας των ζώων κατά τη μεταφορά.

Πολλές φορές η επιφάνεια που διατίθεται για τη μεταφορά των ζώων, συγκεκριμένα το κενό μεταξύ της κεφαλής των ζώων και της οροφής, είναι ανεπαρκής, τα δε συστήματα αερισμού και παροχής νερού πλημμελή. Τα προβλήματα αυτά εντείνονται από πολύωρες συχνά ή ακόμα και πολυήμερες καθυστερήσεις στα τουρκικά σύνορα εξαιτίας παραλείψεων στα απαιτούμενα συνοδευτικά έγγραφα ή αποκλίσεων που εμφανίζουν τα μεταφερόμενα ζώα από τις αυστηρές προδιαγραφές της Τουρκίας για τις εισαγωγές ζώων.

Συνήθως, κατά τη διάρκεια των καθυστερήσεων τα ζώα εγκαταλείπονται στα οχήματα μεταφοράς, με αποτέλεσμα να βιώνουν τη δοκιμασία της πείνας και της δίψας και το καλοκαίρι να εκτίθενται σε εξαιρετικά υψηλές θερμοκρασίες. Ορισμένες φορές ένας αριθμός ζώων πεθαίνει.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Με ποιες ενέργειες διασφαλίζει ότι οι εξαγωγές ζώντων ζώων στην Τουρκία διεξάγονται σύμφωνα με τον Κανονισμό (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1/2005 του Συμβουλίου;
2. Προτίθεται να οργανώσει συναντήσεις μεταξύ της Τουρκίας και των κρατών μελών που εμπλέκονται σε αυτές τις εμπορικές συναλλαγές, προκειμένου να εξευρεθούν πρακτικές λύσεις στα προβλήματα ευζωίας που παρατηρούνται κατ' αυτές τις εξαγωγές;

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

Για τη μεταφορά ζώων στο εσωτερικό της ΕΕ εφαρμόζεται ο κανονισμός (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1/2005 για την προστασία των ζώων κατά τη μεταφορά<sup>(1)</sup>. Η Επιτροπή αναλαμβάνει ορισμένες δράσεις στο πλαίσιο των αρμοδιοτήτων της για να εξασφαλίζεται η ορθή επιβολή του κανονισμού στο διάστημα που τα ζώα εξακολουθούν να βρίσκονται στην ΕΕ. Οι δράσεις αυτές περιλαμβάνουν επιθεωρήσεις από την υπηρεσία επιθεωρήσεων της Γενικής Διεύθυνσης Υγείας και Καταναλωτών της Επιτροπής (ΓΤΚΘ, Γραφείο Τροφίμων και Κτηνιατρικών Θεμάτων) και τακτική ενημέρωση των κρατών μελών σχετικά με την τρέχουσα κατάσταση. Ειδικότερα, έχει υπενθυμιστεί στα κράτη μέλη ότι είναι αρμόδια για την εξασφάλιση της ορθής εφαρμογής των ενωσιακών κανόνων στο διάστημα που τα ζώα εξακολουθούν να βρίσκονται στην ΕΕ.

Προβλέπεται σύντομα να πραγματοποιηθεί συνεδρίαση μεταξύ των αρχών των ενδιαφερόμενων κρατών, εκπροσώπων των οργανώσεων καλής μεταχείρισης των ζώων και του βιομηχανικού κλάδου. Στις διαπραγματεύσεις προσχώρησης της Τουρκίας θα περιλαμβάνονται οι νομοθετικές διατάξεις για την καλή μεταχείριση των ζώων και ειδικότερα για τη μεταφορά των ζώων. Εντούτοις, η Τουρκία δεν είναι ακόμη μέλος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και επί του παρόντος δεν έχει καμία υποχρέωση συμμόρφωσης με την εν λόγω νομοθεσία.

<sup>(1)</sup> Κανονισμός (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1/2005 του Συμβουλίου για την προστασία των ζώων κατά τη μεταφορά και συναφείς δραστηριότητες: ΕΕ L 3 της 5.1.2005.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000360/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Spyros Danellis (S&D)**  
(20 January 2012)

*Subject:* Livestock exports to Turkey

According to Eurostat data, during the last 12 months, more than one million sheep and cattle were exported from the EU to Turkey. According to reports by reputable animal rights organisations, conditions of livestock transport frequently infringe Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport.

On many occasions, the space provided for livestock transport, specifically clearance between animal heads and the ceiling, is insufficient, while ventilation and water supply systems are defective. These problems are compounded by delays at the Turkish border, often lasting hours — or even days — due to omissions in the requisite accompanying documentation or non-compliance with strict Turkish livestock regulations.

During such delays, the livestock is generally left hungry and thirsty on the transport vehicles where it is also exposed to particularly high temperatures during the summer. The animals do not always survive the ordeal.

In view of this:

1. What action is being taken by the Commission to ensure that livestock exports to Turkey comply with Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005?
2. Does the Commission intend to organise meetings between Turkey and the Member States involved in a bid to find practical ways of resolving problems regarding the well-being of exported livestock during transport?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission**  
(14 March 2012)

Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport <sup>(1)</sup> applies when animals are transported within the EU. The Commission is carrying out a number of actions within their remit to ensure proper enforcement of the regulation while the animals are still in the EU. These actions include inspections by the Commission inspection service of Directorate General for Health and Consumers (FVO, Food and Veterinary Office) and keeping Member States informed on the current situation. In particular, Member States have been reminded of their responsibilities in ensuring proper application of the EU rules while the animals are still in the EU.

A meeting with the authorities from the concerned Member States and representatives from animal welfare organisations and the industry is foreseen within the near future. Accession negotiations with Turkey will include EU legislative provisions on animal welfare and in particular on animal transport. However Turkey is not yet a member of the European Union and is under no obligation to comply with such legislation at this moment.

---

<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.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-000378/12  
to the Commission  
Nessa Childers (S&D)  
(23 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Article 16 of the Staff Regulations

Further to its answer to Question No E-008839/2011, what procedure has the Commission established to remind staff of their obligations under Article 16 of the Staff Regulations when they leave the institution?

What 'appropriate measures' does the Commission take if these rules are breached? How often have such measures been taken in the past year?

**Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission  
(7 March 2012)**

The rules laid down in the Staff Regulations are mandatory for all staff. There are training sessions on ethics issues in general, the Commission has a dedicated website and undertakes different awareness raising actions. These training sessions and actions include the obligation set out in Article 16. Additionally the Commission organises special presentations on the obligations set out in Article 16 of the Staff Regulations to staff preparing for retirement and the rules are set out in the documents that all staff receive and process before leaving the Commission.

Appropriate measures in case of a formal or substantial breach of Article 16 can range from a simple reminder of the person to provide the Appointing Authority with the information required under Article 16 to disciplinary sanctions as set out in Annex IX of the Staff Regulations.

Reminders or warnings to show more circumspection in the future had to be sent in not more than five to ten cases over the last two years.

---

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000382/12**

**à Comissão**

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**

(23 de Janeiro de 2012)

Assunto: Imposto Dinamarquês

Considerando que:

- O Parlamento Dinamarquês está a considerar a aprovação de uma taxa de importação de 22 euros a todas as revistas e periódicos provenientes de países extra-comunitários enviadas para a Dinamarca;
- Os subscritores serão forçados a recolher tais revistas e periódicos nos correios, em vez de as receberem em casa.
- Por sua vez, as subscrições nacionais são entregues em casa;
- Esta proposta poderá, eventualmente, ser contrária ao disposto no Artigo 42.º do Regulamento (CEE) n.º 1186/2009, ao Artigo 30.º do Tratado sobre o funcionamento da UE e ao disposto na Declaração Universal sobre a diversidade cultural, sobre importação de materiais educacionais, culturais e científicos.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Tem conhecimento da intenção do Parlamento Dinamarquês em aprovar a referida taxa?

Considera legal a decisão do Governo Dinamarquês?

**Resposta dada por Algirdas Šemeta em nome da Comissão**

(29 de Fevereiro de 2012)

A Comissão foi efetivamente informada da aplicação, pelos correios dinamarqueses, de uma taxa de desalfandegamento às revistas cuja importação está sujeita a IVA.

A breve trecho, os serviços da Comissão vão dirigir às autoridades dinamarquesas um pedido de esclarecimento sobre a natureza desta taxa, respetivas modalidades e eventual não-conformidade com as disposições do direito da União evocadas pelo Senhor Deputado.

O Senhor Deputado será naturalmente informado da evolução que este procedimento possa vir a conhecer.

---



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000382/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Nuno Melo (PPE)**  
(23 January 2012)

*Subject:* Danish tax

The Danish Parliament is considering approving an import duty of EUR 22 on all magazines and periodicals sent to Denmark from non-Member States. Subscribers will be forced to collect these magazines and periodicals at post offices instead of receiving them at home. Meanwhile, domestic subscriptions are delivered at home. This proposal may be contrary to the provisions of Article 42 of Regulation (EC) 1186/2009, to Article 30 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU and to the provisions of the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity, on the importation of educational, cultural and scientific materials.

Is the Commission aware of the Danish Parliament's intention to approve this import duty?

Does it consider the decision of the Danish Government to be legal?

(Version française)

**Réponse donnée par M. Šemeta au nom de la Commission**  
(29 février 2012)

La Commission a effectivement été informée de l'application par la poste danoise d'une redevance liée au dédouanement de magazines soumis à l'application d'une TVA à l'importation.

Les services de la Commission vont adresser prochainement aux autorités danoises une demande de clarification en ce qui concerne la nature et les modalités de cette redevance et sa non-conformité éventuelle aux dispositions du droit de l'Union citées par l'Honorable Parlementaire.

L'Honorable Parlementaire sera naturellement informé des suites que comportera, le cas échéant, cette procédure.

\_\_\_\_\_

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000388/12  
alla Commissione  
Oreste Rossi (EFD)  
(20 gennaio 2012)**

**Oggetto:** Risparmio energetico con l'illuminazione pubblica intelligente

Un team di ricercatori di due grandi aziende spagnole produttrici di energia elettrica ha collaudato un sistema intelligente di illuminazione pubblica che, se applicato in tutta la Spagna, permetterebbe un risparmio di 250 milioni di euro all'anno.

La tecnologia LUIX regola l'intensità luminosa dei lampioni a seconda delle esigenze. Un sensore posizionato all'interno dei lampioni individua il volume di persone o di vetture presenti e modifica l'angolo luminoso a seconda della velocità o della direzione dell'oggetto in transito. In assenza di veicoli o individui i lampioni abbassano la gradazione luminosa al minimo senza però mai spegnersi.

Un ulteriore vantaggio di LUIX è costituito dal fatto che, grazie al controllo remoto di ogni lampione, l'operatore comunale o privato è avvisato in tempo reale della presenza di problemi e, pertanto, può intervenire tempestivamente alla manutenzione.

Si tratta di un sistema di notevole interesse in quanto è stato verificato che, ad esempio, la città di Gabiria ha risparmiato l'83.84 % riducendo la CO<sub>2</sub> di 7 720 kg in un solo anno.

Risultati sorprendenti che potrebbero arrecare moltissimi vantaggi in termini economici e ambientali ai Comuni. La tecnologia può servire anche al monitoraggio del traffico nei vari settori cittadini visto che il sensore rileva il volume di automobili.

Considerato che il sistema LUIX potrebbe portare molti benefici alle città europee, può dire la Commissione se intende promuoverlo nei paesi membri dell'Unione europea?

**Risposta data da Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione  
(28 febbraio 2012)**

La Commissione non può impegnarsi per promuovere uno specifico prodotto o servizio in quanto ciò potrebbe comportare una distorsione del mercato dell'UE.

La Commissione desidera richiamare l'attenzione dell'onorevole parlamentare sui nuovi criteri dell'UE in materia di appalti pubblici ecologici <sup>(1)</sup>, che comprendono disposizioni relative all'illuminazione stradale efficiente sotto il profilo del consumo energetico, ivi compresi i controlli dell'illuminazione.

Inoltre, ci sono molte iniziative dell'UE a sostegno della dimostrazione e della promozione di prodotti efficienti sotto il profilo del consumo energetico (tra cui l'illuminazione), quali il Programma energia intelligente — Europa, l'assistenza energetica europea a livello locale (ELENA — European Local Energy Assistance), e l'iniziativa CONCERTO. La Commissione desidera inoltre rinviare alle risposte date all'interrogazione scritta E-003185/2011 dell'onorevole parlamentare <sup>(2)</sup> e all'interrogazione scritta E-001464/2011 di Andreas Mølzer <sup>(3)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/gpp/eu\\_gpp\\_criteria\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/gpp/eu_gpp_criteria_en.htm)

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2011-003185&language=IT>.

<sup>(3)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2011-001464&language=IT>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000388/12  
to the Commission  
Oreste Rossi (EFD)  
(20 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Saving energy through smart street lighting

A team of researchers working for two major Spanish electricity companies has tested a smart public lighting system which would generate savings of EUR 250 million a year if used throughout Spain.

The LUIX technology adjusts the intensity of street lamps as needed. A sensor inside each street lamp detects the volume of people or vehicles and changes the angle of illumination according to the speed or direction of the object detected. When there are no vehicles or individuals present, the street lamps reduce illumination to a minimum, but never actually turn off.

A further advantage of the LUIX system is the fact that, because every street light is controlled remotely, municipal or private operators are alerted to problems in real time and can therefore undertake repairs promptly.

This system is extremely useful: the town of Gabiria, for example, has saved 83.84 % on superfluous lighting, reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 7 720 kg in just one year.

These are amazing results, which could have many economic and environmental benefits for municipalities. The technology can also be used to monitor traffic in various urban areas, since the sensors are able to detect the volume of passing cars.

Given that the LUIX system could have many benefits for European town and cities, can the Commission say whether it will promote its use in the Member States?

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

The Commission cannot engage in promoting one specific product or service as it could distort the EU market.

The Commission would like to draw the Honourable Member's attention to the new EU green public procurement criteria <sup>(1)</sup> which include provisions on energy efficient street lighting, including lighting controls.

Moreover, there are several EU initiatives supporting the demonstration and promotion of energy efficient products (including lighting), such as the Intelligent Energy Europe Programme, the European Local Energy Assistance (ELENA), and the Concerto-initiative. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to Written Question E-003185/2011 by the Honourable Member himself <sup>(2)</sup> and to Written Question E-001464/2011 by Mr Mölzer <sup>(3)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/gpp/eu\\_gpp\\_criteria\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/gpp/eu_gpp_criteria_en.htm)

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp>

<sup>(3)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp>

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000395/12  
a la Comisión**

**Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)**

(23 de enero de 2012)

*Asunto:* Referéndum de independencia en Escocia

Escocia celebrará un referéndum de independencia en 2014, según anunció ayer la Viceprimera Ministra escocesa, Nicola Sturgeon, en Edimburgo <sup>(1)</sup>.

En su comparecencia del día 11 de enero de 2012 en la sesión de preguntas al Primer Ministro en la Cámara de los Comunes, el conservador Cameron hizo una gran defensa de la «unión» del Reino Unido con Escocia, pero reconoció que ha llegado la hora de respetar la voluntad de los escoceses.

El Reino Unido forma parte de la UE desde 1973 <sup>(2)</sup>, por lo que los ciudadanos escoceses son también ciudadanos europeos.

¿Podría indicar la Comisión si, en caso de que finalmente los escoceses voten mayoritariamente a favor de su independencia del Reino Unido, el nuevo Estado de Escocia formaría parte, automáticamente, de la UE?

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

(23 de febrero de 2012)

En el momento actual, la Comisión no está en condiciones de expresar ninguna opinión sobre la cuestión planteada por Su Señoría, dado que no se conocen las condiciones ni el resultado de cualquier futuro referéndum, ni tampoco la naturaleza de las posibles relaciones futuras entre las partes interesadas y entre estas partes y los socios de la Unión Europea.

En este contexto, la Comisión recuerda que las condiciones de cualquier Tratado de la Unión Europea son decididas por los Estados miembros de la Unión Europea.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.lavanguardia.com/internacional/20120111/54244255052/escocia-referendum-independencia-2014.html>

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://europa.eu/about-eu/countries/member-countries/unitedkingdom/index\\_es.htm](http://europa.eu/about-eu/countries/member-countries/unitedkingdom/index_es.htm)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000395/12  
to the Commission  
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)  
(23 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Referendum on independence in Scotland

Scotland will hold a referendum on independence in 2014, as recently announced by the Deputy First Minister of Scotland, Nicola Sturgeon, in Edinburgh <sup>(1)</sup>.

During Prime Minister's Question Time in the House of Commons on 11 January 2012, the Conservative Prime Minister, David Cameron, strongly defended the 'Union' of the United Kingdom with Scotland, but recognised that the time has come to respect the will of the Scottish people.

The United Kingdom has been part of the EU since 1973 <sup>(2)</sup>, as a result of which Scottish citizens are also European citizens.

Can the Commission indicate if, should the majority of Scots vote to become independent from the United Kingdom, the new State of Scotland would automatically be part of the EU?

**Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission  
(23 February 2012)**

At the present time, the Commission is not able to express any view on the specific issue raised by the Honourable Member given that the terms and result of any future referendum are unknown, as is the nature of the possible future relationships between the parties concerned and between those parties and European Union partners.

The Commission would recall in this context that the terms of any European Union Treaty are decided by the Member States of the European Union.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.lavanguardia.com/internacional/20120111/54244255052/escocia-referendum-independencia-2014.html>

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://europa.eu/about-eu/countries/member-countries/unitedkingdom/index\\_es.htm](http://europa.eu/about-eu/countries/member-countries/unitedkingdom/index_es.htm)

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000495/12  
a la Comisión**

**Michael Cashman (S&D), Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Cornelis de Jong (GUE/NGL), Mojca Kleva (S&D), Kinga Göncz (S&D), Zita Gurmai (S&D), Edit Herczog (S&D), Csaba Sándor Tabajdi (S&D) y Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE)**  
(27 de enero de 2012)

*Asunto:* Impacto de las definiciones restrictivas de «familia» en la legislación de la UE

El Parlamento húngaro ha adoptado una ley fundamental sobre la protección de la familia (Ley CCXI, de 23 de diciembre de 2011). Esta ley define la noción de «familia» como «la relación entre personas naturales en una comunidad económica y emocional que se basa en el matrimonio entre una mujer y un hombre, o descendiente directo, o tutela familiar».

Además, el Parlamento húngaro también especificó que esta definición se aplicará a todo el ordenamiento jurídico de Hungría. La exposición de motivos de la ley manifiesta que «puesto que varios actos legislativos del ordenamiento jurídico húngaro utilizan la noción de familia o contienen disposiciones relativas a la familia, a fin de evitar incoherencias, es razonable que la definición de familia, tal y como se dispone en esta ley, se aplique a toda la legislación del ordenamiento jurídico húngaro que contenga disposiciones relativas a la familia».

Si bien la ley sobre la familia es competencia exclusiva de los Estados miembros, esta nueva definición, que se aplica a todo el ordenamiento jurídico húngaro, podría repercutir en la aplicación de la legislación de la Unión Europea en diversas áreas de política, concretamente las relacionadas con el asilo, la reagrupación familiar, la libre circulación y la cooperación judicial en materia civil.

1. ¿Puede la Comisión explicar en detalle si esta redefinición restrictiva de la noción de «familia» repercutirá en la aplicación de la legislación de la UE por parte de Hungría, especialmente, aunque no de forma exclusiva, en materia de asilo, reagrupación familiar, libre circulación y cooperación judicial en materia civil?

2. De forma similar, ¿puede la Comisión explicar en detalle si las definiciones restrictivas de «familia» en las constituciones de los Estados miembros repercuten en la aplicación de la legislación de la UE, especialmente, aunque no de forma exclusiva, en dichos ámbitos?

**Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión**

(12 de marzo de 2012)

La definición de «familia» y de «relaciones familiares» es competencia de los Estados miembros, así como el reconocimiento de los matrimonios y de las parejas registradas. Corresponde a los Estados miembros decidir si reconocen en su ordenamiento jurídico interno a las parejas registradas u otras uniones, incluidas las parejas del mismo sexo. El acervo de inmigración y asilo de la UE reconoce las parejas de hecho y las parejas del mismo sexo sólo si la legislación nacional del Estado miembro correspondiente las reconoce en su Derecho nacional. No obstante, el artículo 51, apartado 1, de la Carta de Derechos Fundamentales de la UE obliga a todos los Estados miembro a respetar los principios de no discriminación de la Carta al aplicar la legislación de la UE, en particular en los ámbitos mencionados por Su Señoría.

El derecho de libre circulación y de residencia de los ciudadanos de la Unión y de los miembros de sus familias constituye una de las piedras angulares de la UE. Es un derecho fundamental y personal conferido a todos los ciudadanos de la Unión por el artículo 21 del TFUE. Para aplicar correctamente la Directiva relativa a la libre circulación, los Estados miembros no tienen necesidad de abordar el reconocimiento de las parejas registradas y/u otras uniones. Deben conceder el derecho de entrada y de residencia, y la correspondiente tarjeta a los miembros de la familia y beneficiarios, tal como se define en la Directiva, incluidos el cónyuge o la pareja. La Unión Europea desarrolla también la cooperación judicial en cuestiones civiles con repercusión transfronteriza sobre la base del principio de reconocimiento mutuo.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000495/12  
an die Kommission**

**Michael Cashman (S&D), Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Cornelis de Jong (GUE/NGL), Mojca Kleva (S&D), Kinga Göncz (S&D), Zita Gurmai (S&D), Edit Herczog (S&D), Csaba Sándor Tabajdi (S&D) und Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE)**  
(27. Januar 2012)

*Betrifft:* Auswirkungen restriktiver Definitionen von „Familie“ auf EU-Recht

Das ungarische Parlament hat ein Kardinalgesetz zum Schutz der Familie (Gesetz CCXI vom 23. Dezember 2011) verabschiedet. Das Gesetz definiert „Familie“ als „die Beziehung zwischen natürlichen Personen in einer wirtschaftlichen und emotionalen Gemeinschaft, die auf einer Ehe zwischen einer Frau und einem Mann oder linearer Abstammung oder familienbasierter Vormundschaft beruht“.

Das ungarische Parlament legte auch fest, dass diese Definition für das gesamte ungarische Rechtssystem gelten soll. In der Begründung des Gesetzes ist dargelegt, dass, „da mehrere Rechtsvorschriften im ungarischen Rechtssystem den Begriff der Familie verwenden oder Bestimmungen zu Familien enthalten, es zur Vermeidung von Inkohärenzen sinnvoll ist, dass sich die Definition von Familie gemäß diesem Gesetz auf alle Rechtsvorschriften im ungarischen Rechtssystem erstreckt, die Bestimmungen zu Familien enthalten“.

Obwohl Angelegenheiten des Familienrechts weiterhin in den ausschließlichen Zuständigkeitsbereich der Mitgliedstaaten fallen, wirkt sich diese neue Definition für das gesamte ungarische Rechtssystem möglicherweise in mehreren Politikbereichen, insbesondere Asyl, Familienzusammenführung, Freizügigkeit und justizielle Zusammenarbeit in Zivilsachen, auf die Anwendung von Rechtsvorschriften der Europäischen Union in Ungarn aus.

1. Kann die Kommission im Detail erläutern, ob diese restriktive Neudefinition von „Familie“ Auswirkungen auf die Anwendung von EU-Rechtsvorschriften durch Ungarn hat, insbesondere, aber nicht ausschließlich in den Bereichen Asyl, Familienzusammenführung, Freizügigkeit und justizielle Zusammenarbeit in Zivilsachen?

2. Kann die Kommission gleichermaßen im Detail erläutern, ob sich restriktive Definitionen von „Familie“ in Verfassungen von Mitgliedstaaten auf die Anwendung von EU-Rechtsvorschriften auswirken, insbesondere, aber nicht ausschließlich in diesen Bereichen?

**Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission**

(12. März 2012)

Für die Definition von „Familie“ und „familiären Beziehungen“ sowie die Anerkennung von Ehen und registrierten Partnerschaften sind die Mitgliedstaaten zuständig. Sie entscheiden, ob sie in ihr internes Rechtssystem Vorschriften für registrierte Partnerschaften und/oder andere Verbindungen, einschließlich gleichgeschlechtlicher Paare, aufnehmen. Der EU-Besitzstand im Bereich Einwanderung und Asyl erkennt unverheiratete und/oder gleichgeschlechtliche Paare nur dann an, wenn die nationalen Rechtsvorschriften des betreffenden Mitgliedstaats sie anerkennen. Gemäß Artikel 51 Absatz 1 der Charta der Grundrechte der Europäischen Union haben sich allerdings alle Mitgliedstaaten bei der Umsetzung des EU-Rechts, insbesondere in den Bereichen, auf die die Damen und Herren Abgeordneten verweisen, an die in der Charta enthaltenen Nichtdiskriminierungsgrundsätze zu halten.

Das Recht der Unionsbürger und ihrer Familienangehörigen auf Freizügigkeit und auf freie Wahl des Wohnsitzes ist einer der Grundsteine der EU. Dieses persönliche Grundrecht besitzt jeder Unionsbürger gemäß Artikel 21 AEUV. Für eine ordnungsgemäße Anwendung der Freizügigkeitsrichtlinie ist nicht erforderlich, dass die Mitgliedstaaten die Anerkennung registrierter Partnerschaften und/oder anderer Verbindungen regeln. Sie müssen Familienangehörigen und Begünstigten nach der Definition der Richtlinie, einschließlich Ehegatten oder Partnern, Einreise und Aufenthalt gestatten und den entsprechenden Aufenthaltstitel ausstellen. Außerdem baut die Europäische Union auf der Grundlage des Grundsatzes der gegenseitigen Anerkennung die justizielle Zusammenarbeit in Zivilsachen mit grenzübergreifendem Bezug aus.

(Magyar változat)

**Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-000495/12  
a Bizottság számára**

**Michael Cashman (S&D), Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Cornelis de Jong (GUE/NGL), Mojca Kleva (S&D), Göncz Kinga (S&D), Gurmai Zita (S&D), Herczog Edit (S&D), Tabajdi Csaba Sándor (S&D) és Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE)**  
(2012. január 27.)

Tárgy: A korlátozó jellegű „család” meghatározások hatása az uniós jogra

A magyar parlament elfogadta a családok védelméről szóló sarkalatos törvényt (2011. évi CCXI. törvény, 2011. december 23.). A törvény meghatározása szerint „a család a természetes személyek érzelmi és gazdasági közösségét megvalósító olyan kapcsolatrendszer, amelynek alapja egy férfi és egy nő házassága vagy egyenesági rokoni kapcsolat, vagy a családbafogadó gyámság.”

A magyar parlament ezenkívül azt is kikötötte, hogy ez a meghatározás a teljes magyar jogrendszerre alkalmazandó. A törvény indokolása kimondja, hogy „mivel a magyar jogrendszerben számos jogszabály alkalmazza a család fogalmát vagy tartalmaz a családokra vonatkozó rendelkezéseket, a zavar elkerülése érdekében indokolt, hogy a családnak az e törvényben meghatározott fogalma terjedjen ki a magyar jogrendszer minden olyan jogszabályára, amely családokra vonatkozó rendelkezéseket tartalmaz”.

Bár a családjogi kérdések továbbra is kizárólagosan tagállami hatáskörbe tartoznak, ez a teljes magyar jogrendszerben alkalmazandó új meghatározás hatással lehet az európai uniós jogszabályok Magyarországon való alkalmazására több szakpolitikában, nevezetesen a menekültügy, a családegyesítés, a szabad mozgás és a polgári ügyekben folytatott igazságügyi együttműködés terén.

1. Tud-e a Bizottság részletes felvilágosítással szolgálni arra vonatkozóan, hogy a „család” e korlátozó jellegű meghatározása hatással lesz-e az európai uniós jogszabályok Magyarország általi alkalmazására, különösen — de nem kizárólag — a menekültügy, a családegyesítés, a szabad mozgás és a polgári ügyekben folytatott igazságügyi együttműködés terén?

2. Hasonlóképpen, tud-e a Bizottság részletes felvilágosítással szolgálni arra vonatkozóan, hogy a „család” tagállami alkotmányokban szereplő, korlátozó jellegű meghatározásai kihatnak-e az Európai Unió jogának alkalmazására, különösen — de nem kizárólag — ezeken a területeken?

**Viviane Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében**  
(2012. március 12.)

A „család” és a „családi kapcsolatok” tagállami hatáskörbe tartoznak, csakúgy mint a házasságok és a bejegyzett élettársi közösség elismerése. A tagállamok feladata eldönteni, hogy belső jogrendjükben megállapítanak-e a bejegyzett élettársi közösségre és/vagy egyéb kapcsolatokra vonatkozó rendelkezéseket, beleértve az azonos nemű párokra vonatkozóakat is. A bevándorlásra és menekültügyre vonatkozó uniós vívmányok csak akkor ismerik el a nem házasság és/vagy azonos nemű párokat, amennyiben az érintett tagállam nemzeti jogrendjében elismeri azt. Az Európai Unió Alapjogi Chartája 51. cikkének (1) bekezdése azonban kötelezi valamennyi tagállamot a Charta megkülönböztetésmentes elveinek tiszteletben tartására az Unió jogának végrehajtása során, nevezetesen a tisztelt képviselők által hivatkozott területeken.

Az uniós polgárok és családtagjaik szabad mozgáshoz és tartózkodáshoz való joga az Európai Unió egyik alapkövét jelenti. Ez az EUMSZ 21. cikke által minden uniós polgárra ruházott személyes és alapvető jog. A szabad mozgásról szóló irányelv megfelelő alkalmazása érdekében a tagállamoknak nem kell a bejegyzett élettársi közösség és/vagy egyéb kapcsolatok elismerésének kérdésével foglalkozniuk. Az irányelvben meghatározottak szerint engedélyezniük kell a belépést és a tartózkodást, valamint ki kell állítaniuk a megfelelő tartózkodási engedélyt a családtagok és kedvezményezettek részére, beleértve a házastársakat és partnereket. Az Európai Unió a kölcsönös elismerés elve alapján fejleszti továbbá a határokon átnyúló vonatkozású polgári ügyek tekintetében az igazságügyi együttműködést.



(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000495/12  
aan de Commissie**

**Michael Cashman (S&D), Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Cornelis de Jong (GUE/NGL), Mojca Kleva (S&D), Kinga Göncz (S&D), Zita Gurmai (S&D), Edit Herczog (S&D), Csaba Sándor Tabajdi (S&D) en Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE)**  
(27 januari 2012)

*Betref:* Impact van restrictieve definities van „gezin” op het EU-recht

Het Hongaarse parlement heeft een kardinale wet aangenomen over de bescherming van het gezin (Wet CCXI van 23 december 2011). In de wet wordt „gezin” gedefinieerd als „de relatie tussen natuurlijke personen in een economische en emotionele gemeenschap die gebaseerd is op het huwelijk tussen een man en een vrouw, of afstammelingen in rechte lijn, of familiegebonden voogdijschap”.

Verder bepaalde het Hongaarse parlement dat deze definitie van toepassing zal zijn doorheen het volledige Hongaarse rechtsstelsel. De memorie van toelichting van de wet stelt dat „aangezien meerdere wetgevende documenten in het Hongaarse rechtsstelsel het begrip gezin hanteren of bepalingen met betrekking tot gezinnen omvatten, het met het oog op de coherentie redelijk is om de in deze wet opgenomen definitie van gezin uit te breiden naar alle wetgeving in het Hongaarse rechtsstelsel die bepalingen met betrekking tot gezinnen omvat”.

Hoewel aangelegenheden in verband met familierecht de exclusieve bevoegdheid van de lidstaten blijven, kan deze nieuwe definitie doorheen het Hongaarse rechtsstelsel een invloed hebben op de toepassing van het recht van de Europese Unie in Hongarije in diverse beleidsdomeinen, met name asiel, gezinshereniging, vrij verkeer en justitiële samenwerking in burgerlijke zaken.

1. Kan de Commissie gedetailleerd toelichten of deze restrictieve herdefinitie van „gezin” een impact zal hebben op de toepassing van het EU-recht door Hongarije, voornamelijk, maar niet uitsluitend, in de domeinen asiel, gezinshereniging, vrij verkeer en justitiële samenwerking in burgerlijke zaken?
2. Kan de Commissie eveneens in detail toelichten of restrictieve definities van „gezin” in de grondwet van lidstaten een impact hebben op de toepassing van het EU-recht, voornamelijk, maar niet uitsluitend, in deze domeinen?

**Antwoord van mevrouw Reding namens de Commissie**  
(12 maart 2012)

De definitie van „gezin” en „gezinsbanden” valt onder de bevoegdheid van de lidstaten, alsmede de erkenning van huwelijken en geregistreerde partnerschappen. De lidstaten moeten zelf beslissen of zij in hun interne rechtsorde de mogelijkheid bieden tot geregistreerde partnerschappen en/of andere verbintenissen, bijvoorbeeld voor koppels van hetzelfde geslacht. Het EU-acquis inzake immigratie en asiel erkent ongehuwde koppels en/of koppels van hetzelfde geslacht alleen wanneer ze door de nationale wetgeving van de betrokken lidstaat erkend worden. Volgens artikel 51, lid 1, van het EU-handvest van de grondrechten is elke lidstaat echter verplicht de antidiscriminatie beginselen van het handvest te respecteren bij de tenuitvoerlegging van het EU-recht, met name op de door de geachte Parlementsleden genoemde gebieden.

Het recht van vrij verkeer en verblijf voor alle burgers van de Unie en hun familieleden vormt een van de hoekstenen van de EU. Het is een persoonlijk en fundamenteel recht voor iedere burger van de Unie krachtens artikel 21 VWEU. Lidstaten kunnen de richtlijn vrij verkeer ook correct toepassen zonder dat zij de erkenning van geregistreerde partnerschappen en/of andere verbintenissen hebben geregeld. Zij moeten toegang en verblijf verlenen, en de verblijfskaart toekennen aan familieleden en begunstigen zoals omschreven in de richtlijn, zoals echtgenoten en partners. In de Europese Unie wordt ook justitiële samenwerking in burgerlijke zaken met grensoverschrijdende aspecten ontwikkeld op basis van het beginsel van wederzijdse erkenning.

(Slovenska različica)

**Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-000495/12  
za Komisijo**

**Michael Cashman (S&D), Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Cornelis de Jong (GUE/NGL), Mojca Kleva (S&D), Kinga Göncz (S&D), Zita Gurmai (S&D), Edit Herczog (S&D), Csaba Sándor Tabajdi (S&D) in Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE)**  
(27. januar 2012)

*Zadeva:* Vpliv omejevalnih opredelitev „družine“ na pravo EU

Madžarski parlament je sprejel pomemben zakon o varstvu družine (Zakon CCXI z dne 23. decembra 2011). Zakon opredeljuje „družino“ kot odnos med fizičnimi osebami v ekonomski in čustveni skupnosti, ki temelji na zakonski zvezi med žensko in moškim, na potomstvu v ravni navzdoljni črti ali na skrbništvu v rejniški družini.

Poleg tega je madžarski parlament pojasnil, da se bo ta opredelitev uporabljala v celotnem madžarskem pravnem sistemu. V obrazložitvenem memorandumu zakona je zapisano, da je glede na to, da več zakonodajnih dokumentov v madžarskem pravnem sistemu uporablja pojem družine ali vsebuje določbe, ki se nanašajo nanjo, v izogib neskladnostim smiselno, da se opredelitev družine, zapisana v tem zakonu, uporablja v vsej zakonodaji madžarskega pravnega sistema, ki vsebuje določbe o družini.

Čprav zadeve družinskega prava ostajajo v izključni pristojnosti držav članic, lahko ta nova opredelitev v madžarskem pravnem sistemu vpliva na uporabo prava Evropske unije na več področjih politik, predvsem na področjih azila, združitve družine, prostega gibanja in pravosodnega sodelovanja v civilnih zadevah.

1. Ali lahko Komisija podrobno razloži, ali bo ta omejevalna opredelitev „družine“ vplivala na uporabo prava Evropske unije na Madžarskem, zlasti (vendar ne izključno) na področjih azila, združitve družine, prostega gibanja in pravosodnega sodelovanja v civilnih zadevah?

2. Nadalje, ali lahko Komisija podrobno razloži, ali omejevalne opredelitve „družine“ v ustavah držav članic vplivajo na uporabo prava Evropske unije, in sicer zlasti (vendar ne izključno) na teh področjih?

**Odgovor Viviane Reding v imenu Komisije**  
(12. marec 2012)

Opredelitev „družine“ in „družinskih razmerij“ spada v pristojnost držav članic, kot tudi priznavanje zakonskih zvez in registriranih partnerskih skupnosti. Države članice same odločijo, ali bodo v notranjem pravnem redu priznale registrirane partnerske skupnosti in/ali druge skupnosti, vključno z istospolnimi. Pravni red EU na področju priseljevanja in azila priznava neporočene in/ali istospolne pare samo, če jih priznava tudi nacionalna zakonodaja zadevne države članice. Vendar pa so vse države članice v skladu s členom 51(1) Listine EU o temeljnih pravicah dolžne spoštovati nediskriminatorna načela Listine pri izvajanju prava EU, zlasti na področjih, ki jih omenjajo poslanke in poslanci.

Pravica državljanov Unije in njihovih družinskih članov do prostega gibanja in prebivanja je eden od temeljev EU. Je osebna in temeljna pravica, ki jo člen 21 PDEU podeljuje slehernemu državljanu Unije. Za pravilno uporabo direktive o prostem gibanju ni potrebno, da države članice uredijo vprašanje priznavanja registriranih partnerskih skupnosti in/ali drugih skupnosti. Dovoliti morajo vstop in prebivanje ter izdati ustrezno dovoljenje za prebivanje za družinske člane in upravičence, kakor so opredeljeni v Direktivi, vključno z zakonci ali partnerji. Poleg tega Evropska unija razvija pravosodno sodelovanje v civilnih zadevah s čezmejnimi razsežnostmi, ki temelji na načelu vzajemnega priznavanja.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

**Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-000495/12  
komissiolle**

**Michael Cashman (S&D), Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Cornelis de Jong (GUE/NGL), Mojca Kleva (S&D), Kinga Göncz (S&D), Zita Gurmai (S&D), Edit Herczog (S&D), Csaba Sándor Tabajdi (S&D) ja Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE)**  
(27. tammikuuta 2012)

*Aihe:* Perhettä koskevien rajoittavien määritelmien vaikutus EU:n lainsäädäntöön

Unkarin parlamentti on hyväksynyt tärkeän lain perheen suojelusta (23. joulukuuta 2011 annettu laki CCXI). Kyseisessä laissa ”perhe” määritetään taloudellisen ja tunteellisen yhteisön muodostavien luonnollisten henkilöiden väliseksi suhteeksi, ja sen mukaan perhe perustuu naisen ja miehen väliseen avioliittoon tai suoraan alenevassa suhteessa oleviin jälkeläisiin tai perhepohjaiseen holhoukseen.

Unkarin parlamentti tarkensi myös, että tätä määritelmää on sovellettava Unkarin koko oikeusjärjestelmään. Lakia koskevassa perustelussa todetaan, että useissa Unkarin oikeusjärjestelmään sisältyvissä laeissa käytetään perheen käsitettä tai ne sisältävät perheitä koskevia määräyksiä, joten epäohdonmukaisuuksien välttämiseksi on perusteltua, että tämän lain sisältämä perheen määritelmä laajennetaan koskemaan Unkarin oikeusjärjestelmän koko lainsäädäntöä, joka sisältää perheitä koskevia määräyksiä.

Vaikka perheoikeudelliset asiat sisältyvät edelleen jäsenvaltioiden yksinomaiseen toimivaltaan, tämä koko Unkarin oikeusjärjestelmää koskeva uusi määritelmä saattaa vaikuttaa Euroopan unionin lainsäädännön siirtämiseen osaksi Unkarin lainsäädäntöä useilla eri politiikan aloilla. Näitä ovat muun muassa turvapaikkaan, perheen yhdistämiseen, vapaaseen liikkuvuuteen ja yksityisoikeudelliseen yhteistyöhön liittyvät politiikan alat.

1. Voiko komissio selvittää yksityiskohtaisesti, vaikuttaako ”perhettä” koskeva uusi rajoittava määritelmä EU:n lainsäädännön siirtämiseen osaksi Unkarin lainsäädäntöä, etenkin mutta ei pelkästään silloin, kun on kysymys perheen yhdistämiseen, vapaaseen liikkuvuuteen ja yksityisoikeudelliseen yhteistyöhön liittyvistä kysymyksistä?

2. Voiko komissio lisäksi kertoa yksityiskohtaisesti, vaikuttavatko jäsenvaltioiden perustuslakien sisältämät perhettä koskevat rajoittavat määritelmät EU:n lainsäädäntöön etenkin mutta ei pelkästään kyseisillä aloilla?

**Viviane Redingin komission puolesta antama vastaus**

(12. maaliskuuta 2012)

Perheen ja perhesuhteiden määrittelemisen, samoin kuin avioliittojen ja rekisteröityjen parisuhteiden tunnustaminen, kuuluu jäsenvaltioiden toimivaltaan. On jäsenvaltioiden asia määrittää, säätävätkö ne kansallisessa oikeusjärjestyksessään rekisteröidystä parisuhteesta ja/tai muista liitoista. Tämä koskee myös samaa sukupuolta olevien parien suhteita. Maahanmuutto- ja turvapaikka-asioita koskevassa EU:n säännöstössä naimattomien ja/tai samaa sukupuolta olevien parien suhteet tunnustetaan vain, jos ne tunnustetaan asianomaisen jäsenvaltion kansallisessa lainsäädännössä. EU:n perusoikeuskirjan 51 artiklan 1 kohdassa jäsenvaltiot kuitenkin velvoitetaan kunnioittamaan perusoikeuskirjan syrjinnän vastaisia periaatteita EU:n lainsäädännön täytäntöönpanossa erityisesti niillä aloilla, joihin arvoisat parlamentin jäsenet viittaavat.

Euroopan unionin kansalaisten ja heidän perheenjäsentensä oikeus vapaaseen liikkuvuuteen ja oleskeluun unionin alueella on yksi EU:n kulmakiviä. Se on Euroopan unionin toiminnasta tehdyn sopimuksen 21 artiklan perusteella kullekin unionin kansalaiselle myönnetty henkilökohtainen perusoikeus. Vapaasta liikkuvuudesta annetun direktiivin asianmukainen soveltaminen ei edellytä jäsenvaltiolta, että sen on otettava kantaa rekisteröityjen parisuhteiden ja/tai muiden liittojen tunnustamiseen. Jäsenvaltioiden on päästettävä maahan direktiivissä tarkoitetut perheenjäsenet ja edunsaajat, mukaan lukien puoliset ja kumppanit, ja annettava näiden oleskella alueella asianmukaisen oleskeluluvan turvin. Euroopan unioni kehittää myös vastavuoroisen tunnustamisen periaatteen pohjalta oikeudellista yhteistyötä siviiliasioissa, joilla on rajat ylittäviä ulottuvuuksia.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000495/12  
to the Commission**

**Michael Cashman (S&D), Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Cornelis de Jong (GUE/NGL), Mojca Kleva (S&D), Kinga Göncz (S&D), Zita Gurmai (S&D), Edit Herczog (S&D), Csaba Sándor Tabajdi (S&D) and Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE)**  
(27 January 2012)

*Subject:* Impact of restrictive definitions of 'family' on EC law

The Hungarian Parliament has adopted a cardinal law on family protection (Act CCXI of 23 December 2011). The law defines 'family' as 'the relationship between natural persons in an economic and emotional community that is based on a marriage between a woman and a man, or lineal descent, or family-based guardianship'.

Furthermore, the Hungarian Parliament also specified that this definition shall apply throughout the Hungarian legal system. The explanatory memorandum of the law states that 'since several pieces of legislation in the Hungarian legal system use the notion of family or contain provisions concerning families, in order to avoid incoherencies, it is reasonable that the definition of family as contained in this law shall extend to all legislation in the Hungarian legal system that contain provisions concerning families'.

Although family law matters remain the exclusive competence of Member States, this new definition across the Hungarian legal system may affect the application of European Union law in Hungary in several policy areas, notably asylum, family reunification, free movement and judicial cooperation in civil matters.

1. Can the Commission explain in detail whether this restrictive redefinition of 'family' will impact on the application of EC law by Hungary, especially, but not exclusively, in the fields of asylum, family reunification, free movement, and judicial cooperation in civil matters?
2. Similarly, can the Commission explain in detail whether restrictive definitions of 'family' in Member State constitutions impact on the application of EC law, especially, but not exclusively, in these fields?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission**  
(12 March 2012)

The definition of 'family' and 'family relationships' falls under the competence of the Member States, as well as the recognition of marriages and of registered partnerships. It is for Member States to decide whether they provide in their internal legal order for registered partnerships and/or other unions, including for same-sex couples. EU immigration and asylum *acquis* acknowledges unmarried and/or same-sex couples only if the national legislation of the Member State concerned recognises them in its national law. Article 51(1) of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights obliges, however, every Member State to respect the non-discriminatory principles of the Charter in the course of implementation of EC law, notably in the areas referred to by the Honourable Members.

The right to free movement and residence of Union citizens and their family members constitutes one of the core stones of the EU. It is a personal and fundamental right conferred on every Union citizen by Article 21 TFEU. In order to apply the Free Movement Directive correctly, Member States do not need to address the recognition of registered partnerships and/or other unions. They need to grant entry and residence, and the pertinent card to family members and beneficiaries as defined by the directive, including spouses or partners. The European Union develops also judicial cooperation in civil matters having cross-border implications based on the principle of mutual recognition.

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000509/12**  
**aan de Commissie**  
**Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)**  
(25 januari 2012)

*Betref:* Ernstige consequenties ETS voor de Europese luchtvaartsector

Als antwoord op mijn vragen m.b.t. de consequenties van het Europese emissiehandelsschema ETS stelt de Commissie dat er nog geen formele maatregelen door derde landen zijn genomen, en dat de financiële consequenties voor het Europese bedrijfsleven derhalve speculatief zijn. Ik heb naar aanleiding van dit antwoord de onderstaande vervolgvragen.

1. Aangezien de Commissie meent dat er nog geen formele maatregelen zijn genomen, hoe kwalificeert de Commissie dan het formele protest dat de Amerikaanse Minister van Buitenlandse Zaken Clinton tegen ETS heeft aangetekend en de wetsvoorstellen tegen ETS die reeds door het Amerikaanse Huis van Afgevaardigden en de Transport Commissie van de Senaat zijn aangenomen <sup>(1)</sup>?
2. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat de beleidsvoorstellen die zich tegen ETS keren in een vergevorderd stadium zijn en derhalve zeer serieus moeten worden genomen. Zo neen, waarom niet?
3. Denkt de Commissie werkelijk dat bedrijven gerustgesteld zullen zijn met de gedachte dat de Commissie de financiële consequenties van ETS louter beschouwt als „speculatief”, aangezien het financiële risico voor het bedrijfsleven desalniettemin reëel blijft? Zo ja waarom, zo neen, waarom niet?
4. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat alle toekomstige gebeurtenissen per definitie van speculatieve aard zijn en deze constatering van de Commissie volstrekt niets af doet aan het feit dat de financiële risico's reëel zijn, en daar nu al rekening mee moet worden gehouden om in de toekomst niet voor een voldongen feit te staan? Zo neen, waarom niet?
5. Is de Commissie bereid op te draaien voor de kosten wanneer de louter „speculatieve” financiële consequenties van ETS uitdraaien op werkelijke kosten voor het Europese bedrijfsleven? Zo neen, waarom niet <sup>(2)</sup>?
6. Wat vindt de Commissie van het feit dat de rekening voor ETS uiteindelijk voor een groot gedeelte wordt neergelegd bij passagiers, die structureel meer zullen betalen voor vliegtickets?

**Antwoord van mevrouw Hedegaard namens de Commissie**  
(2 maart 2012)

De Commissie neemt nota van de niet-bindende wijziging van de luchtvaartwetgeving, die het Amerikaans Congres begin februari heeft goedgekeurd en waarin kritiek wordt uitgeoefend op de opname van de luchtvaartsector in het ETS. De Commissie erkent dat derde landen zich zorgen maken over de opname van de luchtvaartsector in de EU-regeling voor de handel in emissierechten (EU ETS) en neemt dit zeer ernstig. De Commissie gaat actief de dialoog aan, zowel bilateraal als in de ICAO, om hierop een antwoord te bieden. De Commissie wijst er ook op dat nu algemeen wordt erkend dat de EU-wetgeving het momentum en de druk heeft verhoogd om zo snel mogelijk overeenstemming te bereiken over wereldwijde maatregelen inzake luchtvaartemissies.

De mate waarin luchtvaartmaatschappijen hun koolstofkosten doorberekenen in hun ticketprijzen, is hun beslissing en wordt niet door de EU ETS geregeld. De Commissie vindt het overigens normaal dat passagiers de kosten dragen van de luchtverontreiniging ten gevolge van hun vluchten. Dit is gewoon in overeenstemming met het „vervuiler betaalt”-principe.

De EU ETS is een niet-discriminerend systeem waarin alle vluchten van alle luchtvaartmaatschappijen van en naar Europese luchthavens zijn opgenomen, zo.a. marktverstoringen worden vermeden. De wetgeving geldt zowel voor EU- als voor niet-EU-luchtvaartmaatschappijen die actief zijn op de EU-markt. De wet zal geen grote economische gevolgen hebben voor de sector of voor de economie in het algemeen. Het merendeel van de emissierechten voor de luchtvaart zal de luchtvaartmaatschappijen gratis worden toegekend. Daarom zijn de extra kosten per vlucht laag.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://op.bna.com/env.nsf/id/smiy-8pptj9/USDFile/HillaryETS.pdf>, <http://transportation.house.gov/news/PRArticle.aspx?NewsID=1357>,  
[http://www.aero-news.net/index.cfm?do=main.textpost\\_textpost&id=38c678e1-af0f-441c-bc2c-29666eb259d1](http://www.aero-news.net/index.cfm?do=main.textpost_textpost&id=38c678e1-af0f-441c-bc2c-29666eb259d1)

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.euractiv.com/transport/lufthansa-plans-charge-customers-ets-news-509930>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000509/12  
to the Commission**

**Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)**

(25 January 2012)

*Subject:* Impact of the ETS on the European aviation industry

In response to my questions concerning the implications of the European Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS), the Commission has stated that no formal action has yet been taken by third countries and that, therefore, the financial consequences for European business are speculative. Further to this reply, I have the following follow-up questions.

1. Since the Commission has taken the view that no formal action has yet been taken, how does the Commission characterise the formal protest expressed by the US Secretary of State, Ms Clinton, against the ETS and how does it characterise the proposed legislation against ETS already adopted by the US House of Representatives and the Senate Transportation Committee? <sup>(1)</sup>
2. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that the policy proposals which are opposed to the ETS have reached an advanced stage and that, therefore, they ought to be taken very seriously. If not, why not?
3. Does the Commission really believe that companies will be reassured by the idea that the Commission considers the financial consequences of ETS as merely 'speculative', given that the financial risk for businesses remains real? If so, why, if not, why not?
4. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that all future events are inherently speculative and that this position of the Commission does not in the least alter the fact that the financial risks are real and that we have to take them into account now so as to avoid being confronted with a *fait accompli* in the future? If not, why not?
5. Will the Commission be prepared to foot the bill when the merely 'speculative' financial implications of the ETS end in actual costs for European businesses? If not, why not?
6. How does the Commission view the fact that most of the bill for the ETS will ultimately land at the door of passengers, who will, from a structural point of view, have to pay more for their air tickets <sup>(2)</sup>?

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

(2 March 2012)

The Commission notes the passage of the non-binding amendment to aviation legislation criticising the inclusion of the aviation by US Congress in early February 2012. The Commission recognises and takes very seriously the concerns about the inclusion of aviation in the EU Emission Trading Scheme (EU ETS) expressed by some third countries, and is engaging actively in discussions both bilaterally and in ICAO in order to address these concerns. At the same time it notes that it is now widely recognised, that the EU legislation has increased the momentum and pressure for global action addressing international aviation emissions to be agreed as soon as possible.

The extent to which airlines reflect their carbon costs in their ticket prices is their decision and not regulated by the EU ETS. This said, the Commission believes it is consistent with the polluter-pays-principle that passengers bear the costs of the pollution associated with their flights

The EU ETS is a non-discriminatory system that includes all flights into and out of European airports by all airlines, thereby avoiding any market distortions. The legislation applies equally to EU and non-EU airlines active in the EU market. The law will not have significant economic impact on the sector or on the economy as a whole. The majority of the emission allowances for aviation will be distributed to the aircraft operators free of charge. The additional costs per flight are therefore low.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://op.bna.com/env.nsf/id/smiy-8pptj9/USD File/HillaryETS.pdf](http://op.bna.com/env.nsf/id/smiy-8pptj9/USD%20File/HillaryETS.pdf)  
<http://transportation.house.gov/news/PRArticle.aspx?NewsID=1357>  
<http://www.aero-news.net/index.cfm?do=main.textpost&id=38c678e1-af0f-441c-bc2c-29666eb259d1>

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.euractiv.com/transport/lufthansa-plans-charge-customers-ets-news-509930>

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000510/12**  
**aan de Commissie**  
**Luca. Hartong (NI)**  
(25 januari 2012)

*Betreft:* Nieuw logo Europese Commissie

Uw Commissie wil een nieuw logo invoeren. De directe ontwerpkosten daarvoor bedragen 1 35 000 euro. Invoering betekent tevens dat al de oude enveloppen, briefpapier, folders en dergelijke worden weggegooid. Daar zit ruim 5 miljoen euro in. Daarna moeten er nieuwe enveloppen en folders worden gedrukt met het nieuwe logo. In dat kader de volgende vragen:

1. Bent u bekend met het gegeven dat uw Commissie een nieuw logo wil invoeren met als directe ontwerpkosten een bedrag van 1 35 000 euro?
2. Bent u bekend met het gegeven dat de indirecte kosten van invoering veel hoger liggen?
3. Vindt u dit verantwoord in tijden van economische recessie, waarbij de burgers hun best moeten doen om de financiële eindjes aan elkaar te knopen?
4. Bent u met de PVV van mening dat de burgers hiermee getuige zijn van verdere verdwazing van de Europese elite, die juist een voorbeeld zou moeten stellen in zuinigheid, prudentie en zo correct mogelijk omgaan met de ons ter beschikking staande natuurlijke materialen?

**Antwoord van mevrouw Reding namens de Commissie**  
(19 maart 2012)

De Europese Commissie voert een nieuwe visuele identiteit in. Die heeft enkel tot doel de huidige situatie te rationaliseren.

In tegenstelling tot de andere EU-instellingen had.d. Europese Commissie tot nu toe geen eenvormig logo of grafisch handvest. De nieuwe visuele huisstijl vervangt dus honderden logo's en grafische handvesten die tot dusver werden gebruikt door de verschillende diensten en programma's van de Europese Commissie. Deze rationalisering zal aanzienlijke besparingen opleveren, daar alle diensten de invoering van nieuwe logo's, visuele identiteiten en grafische handvesten stopzetten en het nieuwe logo en de nieuwe visuele huisstijl zullen gebruiken voor alle nieuwe communicatieactiviteiten en —producten.

Bij de invoering van de nieuwe visuele identiteit wordt zo verantwoord mogelijk gebruikgemaakt van de bestaande middelen. Daarom zal de Commissie het bestaande materiaal, zoals publicaties, folders en ander materiaal (bv. visitekaartjes), blijven gebruiken totdat de voorraden zijn uitgeput.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000510/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Lucas Hartong (NI)**  
(25 January 2012)

*Subject:* New logo for the European Commission

Your Commission wants to introduce a new logo. The direct costs of its design will amount to EUR 135 000. Introduction of the new logo also means that all the old envelopes, letterheaded paper, brochures and the like — worth well over EUR 5 million — will be discarded. New envelopes and brochures will then have to be printed with the new logo. In the light of this, I would like to ask the following questions:

1. Are you aware of the fact that your Commission wants to introduce a new logo with the sum of EUR 135 000 going towards the direct design costs?
2. Are you aware of the fact that the indirect costs will be considerably higher?
3. Do you think this is justified at a time of economic recession, when our citizens are having to do their best to make financial ends meet?
4. Do you share the view of the PVV that EU citizens will interpret this as another foolish act by the European elite, who ought to set the very example of thrift and prudence and manage the natural materials available to us as correctly as possible?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission**  
(19 March 2012)

The European Commission is implementing a new visual identity. This has the simple aim to rationalise the current situation.

Unlike all other EU institutions, the European Commission did not have, until now, a single logo or graphic charter. The new visual brand is therefore replacing hundreds of logos and graphic charters that were so far used by the different European Commission services and programmes. This rationalisation effort will result in considerable savings as all services are ceasing the creation of new logos, visual identities and graphic charters and are incorporating the new logo and visual brand in any new communication activity or product.

Introducing the new visual identity is a process that is being implemented making the most responsible use of existing resources. To this end, the Commission will use all existing material, such as publications, leaflets, and other corporate materials (e.g. business cards) until stocks are exhausted.

---



(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000511/12**  
**à la Commission**  
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**  
(25 janvier 2012)

*Objet:* Miel et OGM

J'apprends, via le journal belge «Le Soir» du 12 janvier 2012, que des apiculteurs français ont manifesté leur mécontentement à la suite de la décision prise par le Conseil d'État français de lever, fin novembre 2011, le moratoire interdisant la culture du maïs MON 810.

Par conséquent, le miel contenant du pollen du maïs MON 810 est désormais interdit à la vente et doit être détruit.

Ce maïs peut être semé au printemps. En juillet, les abeilles devraient donc quitter les régions où il pousse, c'est-à-dire quasiment partout.

Les apiculteurs estiment que la «liberté de produire des OGM» ne permet pas d'interdire à ses voisins de continuer à exercer leurs activités. L'impossibilité de la coexistence a été prouvée avec la pollution du miel par un simple essai OGM en Allemagne. En effet, deux laboratoires d'analyses viennent de publier des résultats révélant qu'une partie du miel récolté dans six ruches proches d'un champ de maïs transgénique à Lussas, en Ardèche, a été contaminé. Le miel récolté contient des traces d'OGM dépassant la limite de 0,9 %, limite au delà de laquelle l'étiquetage est obligatoire. Selon les laboratoires Ampligène de Lyon et Apllica de Brême, en Allemagne, le pollen prélevé onze jours après la mise en place des ruches contenait 0,55 % à 1 % d'OGM.

La Commission peut-elle donner son avis sur la question? Est-il admissible de permettre à l'entreprise Monsanto d'évincer ainsi les productions des apiculteurs? Les apiculteurs ne devraient-ils pas être informés de toutes les plantations d'OGM afin de pouvoir éloigner leurs ruches? Les apiculteurs concernés par une éventuelle contamination ou même ceux qui sont obligés de déplacer un nombre important de ruches ne devraient-ils pas être «dédommagés de manière substantielle»? Des procédures ne devraient-elles pas être mises en place?

**Réponse donnée par M. Dalli au nom de la Commission**  
(6 mars 2012)

Le cadre législatif relatif aux OGM a entre autres pour objectif de garantir la coexistence durable des cultures génétiquement modifiées et d'autres activités agricoles traditionnelles. Dans cette perspective, l'article 26 bis de la directive 2001/18/CE <sup>(1)</sup> invite les États à prendre les mesures techniques et administratives appropriées pour éviter la présence accidentelle d'OGM dans d'autres produits. Cette disposition permettrait à un État membre d'interdire la culture d'OGM sur de vastes zones de son territoire, dès lors que cette interdiction s'avérerait à la fois nécessaire et proportionnée, compte tenu de toutes les circonstances <sup>(2)</sup>.

En outre, selon l'article 31, paragraphe 3, alinéa b, de la directive 2001/18/CE, les États membres doivent établir des registres publics visant à enregistrer la localisation des OGM cultivés à des fins commerciales, notamment pour que les effets de ces OGM sur l'environnement puissent faire l'objet d'un suivi, conformément aux dispositions de cette directive. Ces localisations doivent être notifiées aux autorités compétentes et rendues publiques.

Les questions relatives à la compensation financière ou à la responsabilité des dommages économiques dus à la présence accidentelle d'OGM dans d'autres produits, notamment celle du pollen de cultures génétiquement modifiées dans le miel, relèvent exclusivement de la compétence des États membres.

Enfin, la Commission rappelle à l'auteur de la question qu'à l'heure actuelle aucune méthode permettant de détecter avec précision la présence de pollen génétiquement modifié dans le miel n'a encore été validée, mais le Centre commun de recherche de la Commission s'emploie actuellement à l'élaboration d'une méthode de ce type.

<sup>(1)</sup> JO L 106 du 17.4.2001.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2010:200:0001:0005:FR:PDF>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000511/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**  
(25 January 2012)

*Subject:* Honey and GMOs

I see from the Belgian newspaper *Le Soir* of 12 January 2012 that French beekeepers have expressed their discontent following the decision by the French Council of State to lift the moratorium prohibiting the cultivation of MON 810 maize at the end of November 2011.

As a result, honey containing pollen from MON 810 maize is now prohibited from sale and must be destroyed.

This maize can be sown in spring. Thus in July the bees would be due to leave the regions where it grows, which is almost everywhere.

Beekeepers believe that 'freedom to produce GMOs' does not entitle GMO farmers to prevent neighbours from continuing to operate. The impossibility of coexistence has been demonstrated through the pollution of honey by means of a simple GMO test in Germany. In fact, two laboratories have just published results showing that some of the honey harvested in six hives near a transgenic maize field in Lussas in Ardèche has been contaminated. The honey harvested contains traces of GMOs above the limit of 0.9 %, beyond which labelling is mandatory. According to the laboratories Ampligen in Lyons and Applica in Bremen, Germany, pollen taken 11 days after the hives were formed contained 0.55 % to 1 % of GMOs.

Can the Commission give its opinion on this matter? Is it permissible to allow Monsanto to drive beekeepers out of production in this way? Should not beekeepers be informed of all GMO plantations so they can move their hives? Should not beekeepers affected by possible contamination or even those who are forced to move a large number of hives be 'substantially compensated'? Should not procedures be put in place?

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

The EU legislative framework on GMOs aims, *inter alia*, to ensure that the cultivation of GM crops can coexist in a sustainable manner with other conventional farming activities. To this end Article 26a of Directive 2001/18/EC <sup>(1)</sup> invites Member States to adopt appropriate technical and administrative measures to avoid the unintended presence of GMOs in other products. The above provision would permit a Member State to ban GMO cultivation across large areas of its territory provided that such a ban were both necessary and proportionate in all the circumstances <sup>(2)</sup>.

Furthermore, under Article 31(3)b of Directive 2001/18/EC, Member States must establish public registers for recording the location of GMOs grown for commercial purposes, *inter alia* so that the effects of such GMOs on the environment may be monitored in accordance with the provisions of the directive. The said locations must be notified to the competent authorities and made known to the public.

Matters concerning financial compensation or liability for economic damage due to the unintended presence of GMOs in other products, e.g. pollen from GM crops in honey, are the exclusive competence of Member States.

Finally, the Commission reminds the Honourable Member that, to date, no validated detection methods exist for accurately recording the presence of GM pollen in honey. The Joint Research Centre of the Commission is currently working on such detection methods.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 106, 17.4.2001.

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/biotechnology/docs/new\\_recommendation\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/biotechnology/docs/new_recommendation_en.pdf)

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000544/12  
an die Kommission**

**Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL), Kartika Tamara Liotard (GUE/NGL) und Sabine Wils (GUE/NGL)**

(25. Januar 2012)

*Betrifft:* Das „Schmallenberg-Virus“, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit

Das Schmallenberg-Virus, das von Mücken und Fliegen übertragen wird, wurde kürzlich bei Wiederkäuern entdeckt. Bis heute wurde das Schmallenberg-Virus in 20 deutschen Landwirtschaftsbetrieben (bei Rindern und Schafen), in 52 niederländischen (bei Schafen und Ziegen) und in 14 belgischen Landwirtschaftsbetrieben (bei Schafen) nachgewiesen.

Da das Europäische Zentrum für die Prävention und die Kontrolle von Krankheiten (ECDC) erklärt hat, es sei „zu diesem Zeitpunkt nicht auszuschließen, dass das Virus auch auf den Menschen übergeht“, wird die Kommission um die Beantwortung folgender Fragen ersucht:

1. Welche Maßnahmen hat sie zur Bekämpfung der Krankheit bei den bereits betroffenen Landwirtschaftsbetrieben und allgemein zur Überwachung der Krankheit ergriffen?
2. Sind seither auch in anderen Ländern Fälle bekannt geworden und, wenn ja, in welchen, und welche Sicherheitsmaßnahmen sind hierzu ergriffen worden oder geplant, um ihre Ausbreitung auf weitere Betriebe der betroffenen Länder oder auf andere Mitgliedstaaten einzudämmen?
3. Welche Maßnahmen sind ergriffen worden, um sicherzustellen, dass bei Verdachtsfällen eine Verwendung in der Tierfutter- und Lebensmittelherstellung ausgeschlossen ist?
4. Woher kommt das Virus ursprünglich und inwiefern können sich Tiere direkt untereinander anstecken bzw. kann dieses bestimmte Virus auf den Menschen übertragen werden?
5. Ist die Kommission der Ansicht, dass es im Frühling durch die steigenden Temperaturen sowie durch die Geburt zahlreicher bereits infizierter Jungtiere zu einem verstärkten Anstieg der Krankheitsfälle kommen könnte, und welche Maßnahmen hat sie ergriffen, um einer derartigen Entwicklung entgegenzusteuern?

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000684/12  
an die Kommission**

**Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**

(30. Januar 2012)

*Betrifft:* „Schmallenberg-Virus“ — Entwicklung und Bewertung

Kann die Kommission Informationen über die Entwicklung und Bewertung/Überwachung des Schmallenberg-Virus vorlegen, das in Rinderzuchtbetrieben in Deutschland, den Niederlanden und Belgien aufgetreten ist?

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001530/12  
an die Kommission**

**Mara Bizzotto (EFD)**

(9. Februar 2012)

*Betrifft:* Rinder, Schafe und Ziegen: neues Virus in Europa entdeckt

Anfang Januar warnte die Kommission in einer Pressemitteilung die Mitgliedstaaten vor der Gefahr einer möglichen Tierseuche unter Wiederkäuern, die vom neu entdeckten Schmallenberg-Virus befallen werden könnten. Das Virus wurde letzten Herbst entdeckt und wird von Stechmücken übertragen; es verursacht Fieber, eine dauerhafte Einschränkung der Milchproduktion und sogar angeborene Missbildungen bei Neugeborenen.

Den nun vorliegenden offiziellen Daten zufolge wurden Schafe, Rinder und Ziegen in Deutschland (21), den Niederlanden (55) und Belgien (17) mit dem Virus infiziert, und die Leiter der nationalen Veterinärbehörden in Frankreich, Luxemburg und dem Vereinigten Königreich haben die Landwirte bereits aufgefordert, die Lage aufmerksam zu überwachen.

— Kann die Kommission einen Monat nach dem Nachweis des Virus in Europa aktuelle Angaben zu den Entwicklungen im Hinblick auf die betroffenen Staaten und die Zahl der befallenen Tiere vorlegen? Welche Maßnahmen werden getroffen, um die Verbreitung des Virus einzudämmen? Welche Maßnahmen sind geplant, um den Nutztiersektor, der für die Wirtschaft vieler Gebiete und Regionen in Europa wie etwa Venetien von wesentlicher Bedeutung ist, zu entschädigen und zu unterstützen?

— Im Dezember 2011 erklärte das Europäische Zentrum für die Prävention und die Kontrolle von Krankheiten (ECDC), es sei unwahrscheinlich, dass dieses Virus Erkrankungen des Menschen verursachen wird, dies könne jedoch zu diesem Zeitpunkt nicht ausgeschlossen werden. Ist die Kommission nun in der Lage, eine detaillierte Erklärung zu den potenziellen schädlichen Auswirkungen des Virus auf die menschliche Gesundheit abzugeben?

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

(27. Februar 2012)

Das Schmallenberg-Virus wird seit November 2011 bei Wiederkäuern in Deutschland (314 Fälle), den Niederlanden (in 93 Betrieben), Belgien (in 88 Betrieben), im Vereinigten Königreich (in 11 Betrieben) und in Frankreich (in 66 Schafhaltungsbetrieben) gemeldet (Stand 7. Februar 2012)<sup>(1)</sup>. Dieses Virus ähnelt anderen Viren der Simbu-Serogruppe, die bei Wiederkäuern in Afrika, Asien, Australien und im Nahen und Mittleren Osten auftreten und zu einer leichten Erkrankung bei erwachsenen Tieren sowie zu angeborenen Missbildungen bei neugeborenen Tieren oder lediglich zu einer subklinischen Infektion führen können. Der Ursprung des Virus ist unbekannt.

Die Kommission arbeitet eng mit den Behörden der Mitgliedstaaten, Sachverständigen, der Europäischen Behörde für Lebensmittelsicherheit (EFSA) und dem Europäischen Zentrum für die Prävention und die Kontrolle von Krankheiten (ECDC) zusammen, um dafür zu sorgen, dass auf diesen Ausbruch koordiniert und angemessen reagiert wird. Die vorliegenden Informationen legen nahe, dass mit dem Virus nur ein geringes Risiko für die Tiergesundheit einhergeht. Außerdem gibt es nach Angaben des ECDC keine Anhaltspunkte dafür, dass das Virus zu menschlichen Erkrankungen führen oder die Lebensmittelsicherheit gefährden könnte. Die derzeit vorliegenden Daten untermauern diese Aussage.

Da das Schmallenberg-Virus durch Insektenvektoren übertragen wird, kann es sich als sehr schwierig erweisen, seine weitere Ausbreitung zu verhindern. Die Kommission hat die EFSA gebeten, in dieser Angelegenheit Unterstützung und Beratung zu leisten und dabei sowohl mögliche künftige Szenarien zu berücksichtigen als auch die Auswirkungen dieser Infektion auf die Tiergesundheit insgesamt zu bewerten.

Die Kommission hat einen Leitfaden zu den in der EU in den nächsten Monaten prioritär zu ergreifenden Maßnahmen („Guidance document on the priority actions to be undertaken in the EU in the next months“) erstellt, den die Mitgliedstaaten gebilligt haben.

Darüber hinaus prüft die Kommission, wie sie die Mitgliedstaaten bei der Untersuchung dieses Problems finanziell unterstützen kann.

Schließlich hält die Kommission auch Drittländer auf dem Laufenden. Sie vertritt die Auffassung, dass die Verhängung von Handelsbeschränkungen gegenüber EU-Ausfuhren nicht gerechtfertigt ist und nicht den internationalen Normen der OIE entsprechen würde.

Weitere Informationen finden Sie auf der SANCO-Webseite<sup>(2)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/schmallenberg\\_virus/docs/sv\\_statement\\_11012012\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/schmallenberg_virus/docs/sv_statement_11012012_en.pdf)

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/schmallenberg\\_virus/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/schmallenberg_virus/index_en.htm)

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000544/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL), Kartika Tamara Liotard (GUE/NGL) και Sabine Wils (GUE/NGL)**  
 (25 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Ιός «Schmallenberg», δημόσια υγεία και ασφάλεια τροφίμων

Ο ιός Schmallenberg που μεταδίδεται από κουνούπια και μύγες ανιχνεύτηκε πρόσφατα σε μηρυκαστικά. Μέχρι σήμερα ο ιός Schmallenberg έχει ανιχνευτεί σε 20 αγροκτήματα στη Γερμανία (σε βοοειδή και πρόβατα), σε 52 αγροκτήματα στην Ολλανδία (σε αιγοπρόβατα) και σε 14 στο Βέλγιο (σε πρόβατα).

Δεδομένου ότι το Ευρωπαϊκό Κέντρο Πρόληψης και Ελέγχου Νόσων (ECDC) δήλωσε ότι «δεν είναι δυνατόν στο στάδιο αυτό να αποκλειστεί παντελώς ότι ο ιός αυτός μπορεί να προσβάλει και τον άνθρωπο», ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Τί μέτρα έχει λάβει για την αντιμετώπιση της νόσου στα αγροκτήματα που έχει ήδη ανιχνευτεί και γενικότερα για τη στενή εποπτεία/παρακολούθηση της νόσου;
2. Έχουν, στο μεταξύ, εντοπιστεί κρούσματα και σε άλλες χώρες, σε ποιές, και τί μέτρα ασφαλείας έχει λάβει ή προτίθεται να λάβει ώστε να εμποδιστεί η εξάπλωσή της και σε άλλα αγροκτήματα των πληγεισών χωρών ή σε άλλα κράτη μέλη;
3. Τί μέτρα έχει λάβει ώστε να μην καταλήξουν ύποπτα περιστατικά στις αλυσίδες ζωοτροφών και τροφίμων;
4. Ποια είναι η αρχική προέλευση του ιού, κατά πόσον είναι δυνατή η άμεση μόλυνση μεταξύ των ζώων και κατά πόσον ο συγκεκριμένος ιός μεταδίδεται και στον άνθρωπο;
5. Θεωρεί η Επιτροπή ότι την άνοιξη, αφενός με την άνοδο της θερμοκρασίας, αφετέρου επειδή πολλά μολυσμένα έμβρυα πρόκειται να γεννηθούν τότε, θα μπορούσε να παρουσιαστεί έξαρση της νόσου, και τι μέτρα έχει λάβει ώστε να τεθεί υπό έλεγχο ένα τέτοιο γεγονός;

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000684/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Rares-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**  
 (30 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Θέμα: «Ιός Schmallenberg» — εξέλιξη της αξιολόγησης

Μπορεί η Επιτροπή να παράσχει ενημέρωση για την εξέλιξη της αξιολόγησης/παρακολούθησης που διεξήχθη επί του «ιού Schmallenberg» ο οποίος βρέθηκε σε αγροκτήματα εκτροφής ζώων στη Γερμανία, την Ολλανδία και το Βέλγιο;

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001530/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Mara Bizzotto (EFD)**  
 (9 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Βοοειδή, προβατοειδή και αιγοειδή: ανακάλυψη νέου ιού στην Ευρώπη

Σε ανακοινωθέν Τύπου που εκδόθηκε στις αρχές Ιανουαρίου του 2012, η Επιτροπή προειδοποίησε τα κράτη μέλη για τον κίνδυνο πιθανής ζωονόσου στα μηρυκαστικά, τα οποία φαίνεται ότι προσβάλλονται από τον νέο ιό Schmallenberg. Ο ιός αυτός, ο οποίος ανακαλύφθηκε το περασμένο φθινόπωρο και μεταδόθηκε από κουνούπια και σκνίπες, προκαλεί πυρετό, σταθερά μειούμενη παραγωγή γάλακτος, ακόμα δε και συγγενείς παραμορφώσεις στα νεογνά.

Τα επίσημα στοιχεία που διατίθενται σήμερα δείχνουν ότι προβατοειδή, βοοειδή και αιγοειδή βρέθηκαν να έχουν προσβληθεί από αυτόν τον ιό στη Γερμανία (21), την Ολλανδία (55) και το Βέλγιο (17), ενώ οι επικεφαλής των εθνικών κτηνιατρικών υπηρεσιών στη Γαλλία, το Λουξεμβούργο και το Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο έχουν ήδη προειδοποιήσει τους κτηνοτρόφους, οι οποίοι παρακολουθούν την κατάσταση.

- Ένα μήνα μετά την ανακάλυψη του ιού, μπορεί η Επιτροπή να προβεί σε ενημέρωση σε ό,τι αφορά την πρόοδο του φαινομένου ως προς τις χώρες που επλήγησαν και τον αριθμό των ζώων που έχουν προσβληθεί μέχρι στιγμής; Ποια μέτρα λαμβάνονται προκειμένου να αναχαιτιστεί η εξάπλωση του ιού; Ποια μέτρα σχεδιάζονται για την αποκατάσταση και στήριξη του κτηνοτροφικού τομέα, ο οποίος έχει ζωτική σημασία για την οικονομία πολλών εδαφών και περιοχών της Ευρώπης, όπως η περιοχή του Βένετο;

- Τον Δεκέμβριο του 2011, το Ευρωπαϊκό Κέντρο Πρόληψης και Ελέγχου Νόσων (ECDC) ανέφερε ότι «δεν είναι πιθανό να προσβάλει ο ιός ανθρώπους, αλλά αυτό δεν μπορεί να αποκλεισθεί στο παρόν στάδιο». Είναι η Επιτροπή σε θέση να προβεί σε λεπτομερή δήλωση όσον αφορά την ύπαρξη ή τις ενδεχόμενες επιβλαβείς επιπτώσεις του ιού στην ανθρώπινη υγεία;

### **Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Dalli εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**

(27 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

Ο ιός Schmallenberg (SBV) αναφέρθηκε για πρώτη φορά τον Νοέμβριο 2011 σε μηρυκαστικά στη Γερμανία (314 κρούσματα), τις Κάτω Χώρες (93 αγροκτήματα), το Βέλγιο (88 αγροκτήματα), το Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο (11 αγροκτήματα) και τη Γαλλία (66 εκμεταλλεύσεις εκτροφής προβάτων) (επικαιροποιήθηκε 7 Φεβρουαρίου 2012) <sup>(1)</sup>. Ο εν λόγω ιός είναι παρόμοιος με άλλους ιούς της ορολογικής ομάδας Simbu που έχουν ανιχνευθεί στην Αφρική, την Ασία, την Αυστραλία και στη Μέση Ανατολή, οι οποίοι είναι δυνατόν να προκαλέσουν ήπια νόσο σε ενήλικα και συγγενείς δυσπλασίες σε νεογέννητα ζώα ή απλώς υποκλινικές μολύνσεις. Η προέλευση του ιού αυτού δεν είναι γνωστή.

Η Επιτροπή συνεργάζεται στενά με τις αρχές των κρατών μελών, με εμπειρογνώμονες, την Ευρωπαϊκή Αρχή για την Ασφάλεια των Τροφίμων (EFSA) και το Ευρωπαϊκό Κέντρο Πρόληψης και Ελέγχου Νόσων (ECDC) με σκοπό να εξασφαλιστεί μια συντονισμένη και αναλογική αντιμετώπιση της παρούσας κατάστασης. Από τα διαθέσιμα στοιχεία προκύπτει ότι ο κίνδυνος που συνεπάγεται η εμφάνιση του εν λόγω ιού για την υγεία των ζώων είναι περιορισμένος. Επιπλέον, όπως αναφέρεται από το ECDC, δεν υπάρχουν ενδείξεις ότι μπορεί να προκαλέσει ασθένεια στον άνθρωπο ή να αποτελέσει κίνδυνο για την ασφάλεια των τροφίμων. Τα διαθέσιμα στοιχεία υποστηρίζουν τη δήλωση αυτή.

Δεδομένου ότι ο SBV (ιός Schmallenberg) μεταδίδεται μέσω εντόμων-φορέων, η αποτροπή της περαιτέρω εξάπλωσής του ενδέχεται να αποδειχθεί πολύ δύσκολη. Η Επιτροπή ζήτησε από την EFSA την παροχή βοήθειας και συμβουλών σχετικά με το ζήτημα αυτό, συμπεριλαμβανομένων πιθανών μελλοντικών σεναρίων, καθώς επίσης συνολική αξιολόγηση του αντικτύπου της εν λόγω μόλυνσης στην υγεία των ζώων.

Η Επιτροπή εκπόνησε «έγγραφο καθοδήγησης σχετικά με τις ενέργειες προτεραιότητας που πρέπει να αναληφθούν στην ΕΕ κατά τους επόμενους μήνες», το οποίο εγκρίθηκε από τα κράτη μέλη.

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή διερευνά επίσης τρόπους για τη χορήγηση χρηματοδοτικής συνδρομής στα κράτη μέλη με στόχο τη μελέτη του προβλήματος αυτού.

Τέλος, η Επιτροπή ενημερώνει τις τρίτες χώρες και θεωρεί ότι η λήψη μέτρων για τον περιορισμό των εμπορικών συναλλαγών όσον αφορά τις εξαγωγές της ΕΕ δεν δικαιολογείται και δεν συμμορφώνεται με τα διεθνή πρότυπα του ΔΓΕ.

Περισσότερες πληροφορίες διατίθενται στον δικτυακό τόπο της ΓΔ SANCO <sup>(2)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/schmallenberg\\_virus/docs/sv\\_statement\\_11012012\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/schmallenberg_virus/docs/sv_statement_11012012_en.pdf)

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/schmallenberg\\_virus/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/schmallenberg_virus/index_en.htm)

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000544/12  
alla Commissione**

**Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL), Kartika Tamara Liotard (GUE/NGL) e Sabine Wils (GUE/NGL)**

(25 gennaio 2012)

Oggetto: Il virus «Schmallenberg», salute pubblica e sicurezza alimentare

Il virus Schmallenberg, trasmesso da zanzare e mosche, è stato di recente accertato in ruminanti. A tutt'oggi è stato individuato in 20 allevamenti in Germania (in bovini e ovini), in 52 allevamenti in Olanda (in ovini e caprini) e in 14 in Belgio (in ovini).

Considerato che il Centro europeo di prevenzione e di controllo delle malattie (ECDC) ha dichiarato che «a questo stadio non è possibile escludere completamente che il virus possa trasmettersi anche agli esseri umani»:

1. Quali misure ha adottato la Commissione per affrontare questa malattia negli allevamenti in cui è già stata accertata, e più in generale per garantire una sorveglianza accurata e il monitoraggio della malattia?
2. Si sono nel frattempo manifestati nuovi casi in altri paesi? In caso di risposta affermativa, quali misure di sicurezza ha preso o propone di prendere, e in quali paesi, al fine di prevenire la diffusione del virus in altri allevamenti nei paesi interessati e in altri Stati membri?
3. Quali misure ha adottato per garantire che casi sospetti non entrino nella catena alimentare del bestiame e generalmente nella catena alimentare?
4. Quale è stato all'inizio il luogo di origine del virus, in che misura è possibile che sul luogo si sia prodotta infezione diretta tra animali e un'eventuale trasmissione del virus anche a esseri umani?
5. Ritiene la Commissione che in primavera potrà verificarsi un'epidemia del virus (a) con l'aumento della temperatura e (b) a causa delle numerose nascite da embrioni infetti in anticipo sul periodo? Quali misure sono state prese per contenere epidemia di questo tipo, nel caso si verificasse?

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000684/12  
alla Commissione**

**Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**

(30 gennaio 2012)

Oggetto: Il «virus Schmallenberg» — evoluzione e valutazione

Potrebbe la Commissione fornire informazioni sull'evoluzione della valutazione/monitoraggio effettuata sul «virus Schmallenberg» accertato in allevamenti di bovini in Germania, Paesi bassi e Belgio?

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001530/12  
alla Commissione**

**Mara Bizzotto (EFD)**

(9 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: Bovini, ovini e caprini: nuovo virus scoperto in Europa

Con un comunicato stampa diffuso all'inizio del mese di gennaio 2012 la Commissione europea ha messo in guardia gli Stati membri dal rischio di una possibile epizoozia tra i ruminanti che sarebbero in queste ore colpiti dal nuovo virus Schmallenberg. Scoperto nell'autunno scorso, trasmesso da zanzare e moscerini, il virus causa febbre, diminuzione consistente dei rendimenti di latte e anche malformazioni congenite tra i nuovi nati.

I dati ufficiali oggi disponibili riportano della scoperta di ovini, bovini e caprini affetti dal virus in Germania (21), Paesi Bassi (55) e Belgio (17), mentre i responsabili dei servizi veterinari nazionali in Francia, Lussemburgo e Regno Unito hanno già messo in allerta gli agricoltori che stanno, a loro volta, monitorando la situazione.

— A un mese dalla scoperta del virus, è la Commissione in grado di aggiornare circa gli sviluppi del fenomeno in termini di paesi colpiti e di numero di capi sino ad oggi coinvolti? Quali sono le misure in corso di adozione per contenere la diffusione del virus? Quali quelle previste per riparare e sostenere il settore dell'allevamento, fondamentale per l'economia di molti territori e regioni d'Europa, come il Veneto?

— Nel dicembre 2011 il Centro europeo di prevenzione e controllo delle malattie (ECDC) ha dichiarato «che è improbabile che questo virus possa causare malattie negli esseri umani, ma in questa fase ciò non può essere completamente escluso». È oggi la Commissione in grado di pronunciarsi con completezza circa l'esistenza o meno di potenziali effetti nocivi del virus per la salute umana?

### **Risposta congiunta data da John Dalli a nome della Commissione**

*(27 febbraio 2012)*

Il virus di Schmallenberg (SBV) è stato segnalato a partire dal novembre 2011 nei ruminanti in Germania (314 casi), nei Paesi Bassi (93 aziende agricole), in Belgio (88 aziende agricole), nel Regno Unito (11 aziende agricole) e in Francia (66 allevamenti di ovini), dati aggiornati al 7 febbraio 2012 <sup>(1)</sup>. Questo virus è simile ad altri virus del sierogruppo Simbu rilevati nei ruminanti in Africa, Asia, Australia e Medio Oriente che possono causare malattie lievi nei soggetti adulti e malformazioni congenite negli animali appena nati, o soltanto infezioni subcliniche. L'origine di tale virus è sconosciuta.

La Commissione sta lavorando a stretto contatto con le autorità degli Stati membri, gli esperti, l'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare (EFSA) e il Centro europeo per la prevenzione e il controllo delle malattie (ECDC) al fine di garantire una risposta coordinata e proporzionata alla situazione. In base alle informazioni disponibili si ritiene che il rischio per la salute degli animali sia limitato. Inoltre, come affermato dall'ECDC, non vi sono prove del fatto che tale virus possa provocare malattie nell'uomo o costituire una minaccia alla sicurezza alimentare. I dati attualmente disponibili confermano queste considerazioni.

Fermare l'ulteriore diffusione del virus potrebbe rivelarsi molto difficile perché la trasmissione avviene tramite insetti vettori. La Commissione ha chiesto all'EFSA di fornire assistenza e consulenza su questo punto, anche per delineare probabili scenari futuri nonché per una valutazione globale dell'impatto di tale infezione sulla salute animale.

La Commissione ha redatto un documento di orientamento sulle azioni prioritarie da intraprendere nell'UE nei prossimi mesi («Guidance Document on the Priority Actions to be undertaken in the EU in the Next Months») approvato dagli Stati membri.

La Commissione sta inoltre valutando le modalità di assistenza finanziaria agli Stati membri per lo studio del problema.

La Commissione tiene infine informati i paesi terzi, e ritiene non giustificata e non in linea con le norme internazionali dell'UIE l'adozione di restrizioni commerciali nei confronti delle esportazioni dell'UE.

Ulteriori informazioni sono disponibili sul sito web della DG SANCO <sup>(2)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/schmallenberg\\_virus/docs/sv\\_statement\\_11012012\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/schmallenberg_virus/docs/sv_statement_11012012_en.pdf)

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/schmallenberg\\_virus/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/schmallenberg_virus/index_en.htm)



(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000544/12  
aan de Commissie**

**Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL), Kartika Tamara Liotard (GUE/NGL) en Sabine Wils (GUE/NGL)**

(25 januari 2012)

*Betreeft:* Schmallenbergvirus, volksgezondheid en voedselveiligheid

Het Schmallenbergvirus, dat door muggen en vliegen wordt overgedragen, is recentelijk bij herkauwers aangetroffen. Tot op heden is het virus vastgesteld op 20 boerderijen in Duitsland (bij runderen en schapen), op 52 boerderijen in Nederland (bij schapen en geiten) en op 14 boerderijen in België (bij schapen).

Het Europees Centrum voor Ziektepreventie en -bestrijding (ECDC) heeft verklaard dat „in dit stadium het onmogelijk is om volledig uit te sluiten dat het virus ook de mens kan besmetten”, en daarom willen wij de Commissie het volgende vragen:

1. Welke maatregelen heeft de Commissie genomen om de ziekte te bestrijden op de boerderijen waar het virus reeds is vastgesteld en welke maatregelen voor streng toezicht op de ziekte en/of de opvolging ervan?
2. Zijn er intussen ook in andere landen gevallen opgespoord? In welke landen? En welke veiligheidsmaatregelen heeft de Commissie genomen of is ze van plan te nemen om de verspreiding naar andere boerderijen in de getroffen landen of in andere lidstaten tegen te gaan?
3. Welke maatregelen heeft de Commissie genomen om te beletten dat mogelijk besmette gevallen niet in de diervoeder- en voedingsketens terechtkomen?
4. Wat is de oorsprong van het virus? In hoeverre is directe besmetting tussen de dieren onderling mogelijk en in hoeverre is het betreffende virus overdraagbaar op de mens?
5. Is de Commissie van mening dat in het voorjaar, enerzijds door de temperatuurstijging en anderzijds omdat veel besmette embryo's dan geboren zullen worden, de ziekte zou kunnen opslaan? Welke maatregelen heeft ze genomen om iets dergelijks onder controle te houden?

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000684/12  
aan de Commissie**

**Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**

(30 januari 2012)

*Betreeft:* „Schmallenbergvirus” — Ontwikkeling en evaluatie

Kan de Commissie informatie geven over het verloop van de evaluatie/controlen van het Schmallenbergvirus, dat in veehouderijen in Duitsland, Nederland en België is aangetroffen?

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001530/12  
aan de Commissie**

**Mara Bizzotto (EFD)**

(9 februari 2012)

*Betreeft:* Nieuw virus onder rundvee, schapen en geiten in Europa

In een persbericht van begin januari 2012 heeft de Commissie de lidstaten gewaarschuwd voor het risico van een mogelijke dierziekten onder herkauwers, die nu blijkbaar worden getroffen door het nieuwe Schmallenbergvirus. Het virus, dat afgelopen najaar is ontdekt en wordt overgebracht door muggen en dazen, veroorzaakt koorts, een substantieel verminderde melkproductie en zelfs aangeboren misvormingen bij pasgeboren dieren.

Uit de nu beschikbare officiële gegevens blijkt dat schapen, runderen en geiten zijn besmet door het virus in Duitsland (21), Nederland (55) en België (17), en dat de nationale veterinaire diensten in Frankrijk, Luxemburg en het Verenigd Koninkrijk de boeren reeds hebben gewaarschuwd, die de situatie in het oog houden.

— Kan de Commissie, een maand na de ontdekking van het virus, actuele informatie geven over de ontwikkelingen, namelijk de getroffen landen en het aantal betrokken dieren tot dusver? Welke maatregelen worden er genomen om verspreiding van het virus in te perken? Welke maatregelen worden gepland voor herstel en ondersteuning van de veehouderij, die van vitaal belang is voor de economie van vele gebieden en regio's in Euro.a. zoals Veneto?

— In december 2011 heeft het Europees Centrum voor ziektepreventie en -bestrijding (ECDC) verklaard dat het onwaarschijnlijk is dat dit virus ziekte zal veroorzaken bij de mens, maar dat het in dit stadium niet kan worden uitgesloten. Is de Commissie nu in staat een gedetailleerde verklaring af te leggen over het al dan niet bestaan van mogelijke schadelijke effecten van het virus voor de menselijke gezondheid?

#### **Antwoord van de heer Dalli namens de Commissie**

*(27 februari 2012)*

Het Schmallenbergvirus (SBV) wordt sinds november 2011 aangetroffen bij herkauwers in Duitsland (314 gevallen), Nederland (93 bedrijven), België (88 bedrijven), het Verenigd Koninkrijk (11 bedrijven) en Frankrijk (66 schapenhouderijen) (stand per 7 februari 2012) <sup>(1)</sup>. Het virus lijkt op andere virussen van de Simbu-serogroep die worden aangetroffen bij herkauwers in Afrika, Azië, Australië en het Midden-Oosten, en die lichte ziekteverschijnselen bij volwassen dieren en aangeboren misvormingen bij jongen kunnen veroorzaken, dan wel slechts subklinische infecties. De oorsprong van het virus is niet bekend.

De Commissie zorgt in nauwe samenwerking met de autoriteiten van de lidstaten, deskundigen, de Europese Autoriteit voor voedselveiligheid (EFSA) en het Europees Centrum voor ziektepreventie en -bestrijding (ECDC) voor een gecoördineerde en evenredige reactie op deze situatie. De beschikbare gegevens lijken erop te wijzen dat dit virus slechts een beperkt gevaar oplevert voor de diergezondheid. Zoals het ECDC heeft verklaard, zijn er bovendien geen aanwijzingen dat het mensen ziek kan maken of gevaar kan opleveren voor de voedselveiligheid. Dit wordt gestaafd door de thans beschikbare gegevens.

Daar het Schmallenbergvirus wordt overgedragen door vectorinsecten, zal verdere verspreiding ervan wellicht zeer moeilijk te vermijden zijn. De Commissie heeft de EFSA verzocht om bijstand en advies ter zake, onder meer over aannemelijke toekomstscenario's, en een algehele beoordeling van de gevolgen van deze infectie voor de diergezondheid.

De Commissie heeft een leidraad betreffende de in de komende maanden in de EU uit te voeren prioritaire acties („Guidance Document on the Priority Actions to be undertaken in the EU in the Next Months”) opgesteld, die door de lidstaten is goedgekeurd.

De Commissie onderzoekt ook hoe zij de lidstaten financiële steun kan bieden voor de studie van deze problematiek.

Ten slotte houdt de Commissie derde landen op de hoogte, en meent zij dat handelsbeperkingen met betrekking tot de uitvoer van de EU niet gerechtvaardigd zijn en niet in overeenstemming zijn met de internationale normen van de OIE.

Nadere informatie is beschikbaar op de website van SANCO <sup>(2)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/schmallenberg\\_virus/docs/sv\\_statement\\_11012012\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/schmallenberg_virus/docs/sv_statement_11012012_en.pdf)

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/schmallenberg\\_virus/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/schmallenberg_virus/index_en.htm)

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000544/12**

**adresată Comisiei**

**Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL), Kartika Tamara Liotard (GUE/NGL) și Sabine Wils (GUE/NGL)**

(25 ianuarie 2012)

*Subiect:* Virusul „Schmallenberg”, sănătatea publică și siguranța alimentară

Virusul „Schmallenberg”, care este transmis de țânțari și muște, a fost descoperit de curând la rumegătoare. Până în prezent, acesta a fost descoperit în 20 de ferme din Germania (la bovine și ovine), în 52 de ferme din Olanda (la ovine și caprine) și în 14 ferme din Belgia (la ovine).

Având în vedere faptul că Centrul European de Prevenire și Control al Bolilor (ECDC) a declarat că, în această fază, nu se poate exclude complet posibilitatea ca acest virus să infecteze și oameni:

1. Ce măsuri a luat Comisia pentru a combate această boală la fermele unde a fost deja descoperită și, la nivel mai general, pentru a asigura o supraveghere și o monitorizare atentă a bolii?
2. Au apărut între timp și alte cazuri în alte țări? Dacă da, ce măsuri de siguranță a luat sau își propune să ia Comisia, și în ce țări, pentru a împiedica răspândirea virusului la alte ferme din țările afectate și în alte state membre?
3. Ce măsuri a luat Comisia pentru a se asigura că lanțurile de alimente de origine animală și lanțul alimentar în general nu sunt afectate de cazuri suspecte?
4. Care este locul de origine al virusului, în ce măsură este posibil ca animalele să se infecteze unele de la celelalte, iar acest virus să fie transmis și la oameni?
5. Consideră Comisia că, în primăvară, va apărea un focar al acestei boli (a) având în vedere faptul că temperatura va crește și (b) din cauza faptului că în acea perioadă se estimează că vor avea loc multe nașteri de animale provenind din embrioni infectați? Ce măsuri s-au luat pentru a izola un astfel de focar în cazul în care apare?

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000684/12**

**adresată Comisiei**

**Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**

(30 ianuarie 2012)

*Subiect:* Evoluția evaluării cu privire la „virusul Schmallenberg”

Comisia este rugată să prezinte informații referitoare la evoluția evaluării/monitorizării efectuate cu privire la „virusul Schmallenberg”, depistat în fermele de rumegătoare din Germania, Țările de Jos și Belgia.

**Răspuns comun dat de dl Dalli în numele Comisiei**

(27 februarie 2012)

Virusul Schmallenberg (*Schmallenberg virus* — SBV) a fost semnalat începând cu noiembrie 2011 la rumegătoare în Germania (314 cazuri), în Țările de Jos (93 de ferme), în Belgia (88 de ferme), în Regatul Unit (11 ferme) și în Franța (66 de ferme de oi) (actualizare 7 februarie 2012) <sup>(1)</sup>. Acest virus se aseamănă cu alte virusuri din serogrupul Simbu, prezente la rumegătoare din Africa, Asia, Australia și Orientul Mijlociu, virusuri care pot cauza îmbolnăviri ușoare la animalele adulte și malformații congenitale la animalele nou-născute sau doar infecții subclinice. Originea acestui virus este necunoscută.

Comisia lucrează în strânsă colaborare cu autoritățile din statele membre, cu experți, cu Autoritatea Europeană pentru Siguranța Alimentară (EFSA) și cu Centrul European de Prevenire și Control al Bolilor (ECDC), pentru a asigura o reacție coordonată și proporționată în această situație. Informațiile disponibile sugerează că riscul de afectare a sănătății animalelor de către acest virus este limitat. În plus, după cum precizează ECDC, nu există dovezi că poate cauza boli la oameni sau că poate amenința siguranța alimentelor. Informațiile disponibile în prezent sprijină această afirmație.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/schmallenberg\\_virus/docs/sv\\_statement\\_11012012\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/schmallenberg_virus/docs/sv_statement_11012012_en.pdf)

Dat fiind că SBV este transmis prin insecte, prevenirea continuării răspândirii sale se poate dovedi a fi foarte dificilă. Comisia a solicitat EFSA să ofere asistență și consiliere în această problemă, inclusiv cu privire la scenarii viitoare probabile, precum și la o evaluare generală a impactului acestei infecții asupra sănătății animalelor.

Comisia a elaborat un „Ghid privind acțiunile prioritare de desfășurat în UE în următoarele luni”, girat de statele membre.

De asemenea, Comisia explorează modalități de a oferi statelor membre asistență financiară pentru a studia această problemă.

În fine, Comisia transmite țărilor terțe informații actualizate și consideră că adoptarea de restricții comerciale pentru exporturile UE nu este justificată și nu este în acord cu standardele internaționale ale OIE.

Informații suplimentare sunt disponibile pe site-ul internet al SANCO <sup>(2)</sup>.

---

(2) [http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/schmallenberg\\_virus/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/schmallenberg_virus/index_en.htm)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000544/12  
to the Commission**

**Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL), Kartika Tamara Liotard (GUE/NGL) and Sabine Wils (GUE/NGL)**

(25 January 2012)

*Subject:* The 'Schmallenberg' virus, public health and food safety

The Schmallenberg virus, which is transmitted by mosquitoes and flies, has recently been detected in ruminants. To date, it has been detected on 20 farms in Germany (in cattle and sheep), on 52 farms in Holland (in sheep and goats) and 14 in Belgium (in sheep).

Given that the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) has declared 'that it is not possible at this stage to exclude completely that this virus may also infect humans':

1. What measures has the Commission taken to deal with this disease on the farms where it has already been detected, and more generally to ensure close supervision and monitoring of the disease?
2. Have new cases come to light in other countries in the meantime? If so, what safety measures has the Commission taken or does it propose to take, and in which countries, to prevent the virus spreading to other farms in the countries affected and to other Member States?
3. What measures has it taken to ensure that suspect occurrences do not affect livestock food chains and the food chain generally?
4. What is the initial place of origin of the virus, to what extent is it possible for there to be direct infection between animals and for this virus also to be transmitted to humans?
5. Does the Commission believe that there will be an outbreak of the disease in the spring (a) with the rise in temperature and (b) because large numbers of births from infected embryos anticipated over that period? What measures have been taken to contain such an outbreak should it occur?

**Question for written answer E-000684/12  
to the Commission**

**Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**

(30 January 2012)

*Subject:* 'Schmallenberg virus' — evolution and evaluation

Can the Commission provide information on the evolution of the evaluation/monitoring performed on the 'Schmallenberg virus' which has been found on cattle farms in Germany, the Netherlands and Belgium?

**Question for written answer E-001530/12  
to the Commission**

**Mara Bizzotto (EFD)**

(9 February 2012)

*Subject:* Cattle, sheep and goats: new virus discovered in Europe

In a press release issued in early January 2012, the Commission alerted Member States to the risk of a possible animal disease among ruminants, which are apparently now being struck by the new Schmallenberg virus. Discovered last autumn and transmitted by mosquitoes and gnats, the virus causes fever, a consistently decreased milk yield and even congenital deformities in neonates.

The official data now available show that sheep, cattle and goats have been found to have been affected by the virus in Germany (21), the Netherlands (55) and Belgium (17), while the heads of the national veterinary services in France, Luxembourg and the United Kingdom have already alerted farmers, who are monitoring the situation.

— One month on from the discovery of the virus, can the Commission provide an update regarding the progress of the phenomenon in terms of the countries affected and the number of animals involved up to now? What measures are being adopted to contain the spread of the virus? What measures are being planned to repair and support the livestock sector, which is vital for the economy of many territories and regions of Europe, such as the Veneto region?

— In December 2011, the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) stated that 'it is unlikely that this virus will cause disease in humans, but it cannot be excluded at this stage'. Is the Commission now in a position to give a detailed statement with regard to the existence or otherwise of potential harmful effects of the virus for human health?

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

*(27 February 2012)*

Schmallenberg virus (SBV) was reported starting from November 2011 in ruminants in Germany (314 cases), in the Netherlands (93 farms), in Belgium (88 farms), in the United Kingdom (11 farms) and in France (66 sheep farms) (updated 7 February 2012) <sup>(1)</sup>. This virus resembles other viruses of the Simbu serogroup found in ruminants in Africa, Asia, Australia and Middle East, that may cause mild disease in adults and congenital malformations in newborn animals or sub-clinical infections only. The origin of this virus is unknown.

The Commission is working in close contact with Member States' authorities, experts, the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) and the European Centre for Disease prevention and Control (ECDC) to ensure a coordinated and proportioned response to this event. Information available suggests that the risk posed by this virus to animal health is limited. In addition, as stated by the ECDC there is no evidence that it can cause illness to humans or pose a threat to food safety. Data currently available supports this statement.

Given that the SBV is transmitted by means of insect vectors, prevention of its further spread may prove to be very difficult. The Commission has asked EFSA to provide assistance and advice on this issue, including on likely future scenarios as well as an overall assessment of the impact of this infection on animal health.

The Commission has prepared a 'Guidance Document on the Priority Actions to be undertaken in the EU in the Next Months', endorsed by Member States.

The Commission is also exploring ways to provide financial assistance to Member States to study this problem.

Finally, the Commission is keeping third countries informed and considers that the adoption of trade restrictions vis-à-vis EU exports is not justified and not in line with OIE International Standards.

Further information is available on the SANCO website <sup>(2)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/schmallenberg\\_virus/docs/sv\\_statement\\_11012012\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/schmallenberg_virus/docs/sv_statement_11012012_en.pdf)

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/schmallenberg\\_virus/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/schmallenberg_virus/index_en.htm)

(Dansk udgave)

**Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-000655/12**  
**til Kommissionen**  
**Jens Rohde (ALDE)**  
(1. februar 2012)

Om: Import af forfalskede pesticider i EU

Større europæiske havne er i risikozonen for at modtage skibe fra Asien, som er lastet med forfalskede pesticider. Ifølge Europol er det især vintermånederne i januar og februar, som er højsæson for import af den illegale plantegift, der spredes på marker, hvor europæiske fødevarer dyrkes og derfor er til fare for miljøet, landmænd og forbrugere. Europol vurderer, at op mod en fjerdedel af solgte pesticider fra Baltikum er forfalskede. Det europæiske agentur oplyser endvidere, at organiserede kriminelle kan omsætte for op mod fem milliarder kroner årligt, fordi koordineringen og harmoniseringen blandt medlemslandene i EU er for mangelfuld.

Ifølge producentforeningen Dansk Planteværn er de forfalskede pesticider meget skadelige for afgrøderne og vandmiljøet, og det kan i sidste ende føre til, at forbrugeren bliver udsat for fare.

Er Kommissionen bekendt med ovenstående problemstilling? Hvilke initiativer påtænker Kommissionen i bekræftende fald?

**Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-001175/12**  
**til Kommissionen**  
**Dan Jørgensen (S&D)**  
(8. februar 2012)

Om: Import af ulovlige pesticider til EU

Europol har netop gjort opmærksom på, at de i den seneste tid har observeret en stigende ulovlig import af falske og ulovlige pesticider i EU. Denne ulovlige handel bliver organiseret af sofistikerede kriminelle netværk, der udnytter legale virksomheder til at kamuflere deres aktiviteter. Gevinsten forbundet med den ulovlige handel er, ifølge Europol, på flere milliarder årligt.

Disse ulovlige og falske pesticider er en alvorlig trussel mod Europas miljø, forbrugere, og landmænd. I værste fald skader de nemlig afgrøderne og vandmiljøet, skader forbrugernes sundhed, og gør landmændene alvorligt syge. Det er altså af allerstørste vigtighed, at vi får bremsset den ulovlige import af disse pesticider i Europa. Kommissionen bør derfor fremlægge en handlingsplan for, hvordan dette problem kan håndteres fremover.

Jeg ønsker derfor at stille følgende spørgsmål til Kommissionen:

1. Hvilken viden ligger Kommissionen inde med omkring denne ulovlige import af ulovlige og falske pesticider til Europa?
2. Hvilke skridt har Kommissionen taget for at begrænse den ulovlige import?
3. Hvilke skridt har Kommissionen tænkt sig at tage fremover for at begrænse den ulovlige import?

**Samlet svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af John Dalli**  
(14. marts 2012)

Kommissionen er bekymret over forfalskningen af plantebeskyttelsesmidler og de mulige negative konsekvenser for menneskers og miljøets sikkerhed samt for økonomien.

Der findes en række retlige instrumenter, som skal forhindre, at forfalskede produkter, herunder plantebeskyttelsesmidler, kommer ind og distribueres på markedet.

Forordning (EF) nr. 1107/2009 <sup>(1)</sup> fastsætter en række håndhævelsesbestemmelser, som kan bidrage til at dæmme op for denne praksis. Den indeholder også bestemmelser om den registrering, som brugere, producenter og distributører af plantebeskyttelsesmidler skal foretage, om medlemsstaternes kontrol med overholdelsen af forordningen og om et retsgrundlag for Kommissionens løbende overvågning af disse aktiviteter.

Forordning (EF) nr. 1383/2003 <sup>(2)</sup> giver medlemsstaternes toldadministrationer ret til at tilbageholde varer, der mistænkes for at krænke intellektuelle ejendomsrettigheder, og som bringes ind på EU's toldområde. Foranstaltninger, der træffes på grundlag af denne forordning, kræver, at indehaveren af de rettigheder, der angiveligt krænkes, indsender en ansøgning. Kommissionen er ved at forberede en revision af direktiv 2004/48/EF om håndhævelsen af intellektuelle ejendomsrettigheder i 2012. Kommissionen etablerede i 2009 det europæiske observationscenter for krænkelse af intellektuelle ejendomsrettigheder. Der forhandles for nærværende om en forordning, der skal overdrage centrets opgaver til Harmoniseringskontoret <sup>(3)</sup>.

Desuden overvejer Kommissionen supplerende mekanismer inden for rammerne af kontrollen ved de ydre grænser for at forhindre, at forfalskede plantebeskyttelsesmidler, som er ulovlige af andre grunde end krænkelse af intellektuelle ejendomsrettigheder, afsættes på markedet i EU.

Kommissionen råder ikke over tilstrækkelige data til at udtale sig om problemets omfang i medlemsstaterne eller om disses eventuelle mangler, for så vidt angår løsning af problemet.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> EUT L 309 af 24.11.2009, s. 1.

<sup>(2)</sup> EUT L 196 af 2.8.2003, s. 7-14.

<sup>(3)</sup> KOM(2011)0288 endelig.



(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000554/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Spyros Danellis (S&D)**  
(25 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Ανησυχητική αύξηση «πλαστών» φυτοφαρμάκων στην ΕΕ

Σύμφωνα με πρόσφατες δημοσιεύσεις, κακέκτυπες απομιμήσεις φυτοφαρμάκων και εντομοκτόνων, που ενδέχεται να περιέχουν απαγορευμένες χημικές ουσίες, διακινούνται και πωλούνται στην ΕΕ, θέτοντας σε κίνδυνο την υγεία των αγροτών και των καταναλωτών γεωργικών προϊόντων, το περιβάλλον και τους φυσικούς πόρους και τελικά την ίδια την ασφάλεια των γεωργικών προϊόντων. Το φαινόμενο φαίνεται να εξαπλώνεται με ταχείς ρυθμούς και να εμφανίζεται στο ¼ σχεδόν των συνολικών προμηθειών και πωλήσεων σε ορισμένα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή

1. Διαθέτει στοιχεία με τα κράτη μέλη, στα οποία το πρόβλημα είναι οξύμενο; Μπορεί να παρουσιάσει την κατανομή των κρουσμάτων που έχουν βεβαιωθεί ανά κράτος μέλος της Ένωσης;
2. Τι συμπεράσματα μπορούν να προκύψουν για την αδυναμία αντιμετώπισης του προβλήματος στα κράτη μέλη όπου αυτή παρουσιάζεται;
3. Προτίθεται να προβεί στη λήψη συντονισμένων μέτρων σε όλη την ΕΕ, ώστε να διασφαλισθεί η ασφάλεια της ευρωπαϊκής γεωργικής παραγωγής και η υγεία των πολιτών της ΕΕ;

**Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Dalli εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(14 Μαρτίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή ανησυχεί σχετικά με την παραποίηση φυτοπροστατευτικών προϊόντων (PPP) και σχετικά με τις πιθανές αρνητικές συνέπειες που ενδέχεται να έχουν στην ασφάλεια των ανθρώπων και του περιβάλλοντος καθώς και στην οικονομία.

Υπάρχουν διάφορα νομικά μέσα για την πρόληψη της εισόδου στην αγορά και της διάδοσης παραποιημένων προϊόντων, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των φυτοπροστατευτικών προϊόντων.

Ο κανονισμός (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1107/2009 <sup>(1)</sup> θεσπίζει διάφορες διατάξεις επιβολής οι οποίες μπορούν να βοηθήσουν να περιοριστεί αυτή η πρακτική. Επίσης προβλέπει την τήρηση μητρώου για τους χρήστες, τους παραγωγούς και την αλυσίδα διανομής των PPP, τους ελέγχους από τα κράτη μέλη σχετικά με τη συμμόρφωση στον κανονισμό και μια νομική βάση για την Επιτροπή ώστε να παρακολουθεί τακτικά τις δραστηριότητες αυτές.

Ο κανονισμός (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1383/2003 <sup>(2)</sup> επιτρέπει στις τελωνειακές υπηρεσίες των κρατών μελών να δεσμεύουν τα εμπορεύματα για τα οποία υπάρχουν υπόνοιες ότι παραβιάζουν ορισμένα δικαιώματα διανοητικής ιδιοκτησίας και τα οποία εισάγονται στο τελωνειακό έδαφος της ΕΕ. Η δράση που αναλήφθηκε με βάση τον εν λόγω κανονισμό απαιτεί αίτηση από τον κάτοχο των δικαιωμάτων τα οποία ενδεχομένως παραβιάζονται. Για το 2012, η Επιτροπή προετοιμάζει αναθεώρηση της οδηγίας 2004/48/ΕΚ σχετικά με την επιβολή των δικαιωμάτων διανοητικής ιδιοκτησίας. Το 2009, η Επιτροπή δημιούργησε το Ευρωπαϊκό Παρατηρητήριο για την παραβίαση των δικαιωμάτων διανοητικής ιδιοκτησίας. Πραγματοποιούνται διαπραγματεύσεις για την έκδοση κανονισμού σχετικά με τη μεταφορά των καθηκόντων του στο Γραφείο Εναρμόνισης στο πλαίσιο της Εσωτερικής Αγοράς (ΓΕΕΑ) <sup>(3)</sup>.

Επιπλέον, η Επιτροπή εξετάζει τη χρήση επιπρόσθετων μηχανισμών ελέγχου εντός των συνόρων για την πρόληψη της κυκλοφορίας στην αγορά της ΕΕ παραποιημένων φυτοπροστατευτικών προϊόντων τα οποία είναι παράνομα για λόγους άλλους από την παραβίαση των δικαιωμάτων διανοητικής ιδιοκτησίας.

Η Επιτροπή δεν κατέχει αρκετά στοιχεία για να σχολιάσει τη διάσταση του προβλήματος στα κράτη μέλη ή τις πιθανές ανεπάρκειες για την αντιμετώπισή του.

<sup>(1)</sup> ΕΕ L 309 της 24.11.2009, σ. 1.

<sup>(2)</sup> ΕΕ L 196 της 2.8.2003, σ. 7-14.

<sup>(3)</sup> COM(2011)288 τελικό.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000554/12  
to the Commission  
Spyros Danellis (S&D)  
(25 January 2012)**

*Subject:* A disturbing increase in 'counterfeit' pesticides in the EU

According to recently published information, shoddy imitation pesticides and insecticides that could contain banned chemical substances are in circulation and on sale in the EU, endangering the health of farmers and consumers of agricultural products, the environment, natural resources and, ultimately, the safety of farm products themselves. The phenomenon appears to be spreading rapidly and is affecting almost one-quarter of the total number of deliveries and sales in certain EU Member States.

1. Does the Commission have information concerning the Member States in which this problem is particularly acute? Can it give a breakdown by EU Member State of cases that have been confirmed?
2. What conclusions can be drawn from Member States' inability to deal with the problem where it arises?
3. Does it intend to proceed with implementation of coordinated measures throughout the EU so as to uphold the safety of European farm products and the health of EU citizens?

**Question for written answer E-000655/12  
to the Commission  
Jens Rohde (ALDE)  
(1 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Import of counterfeit pesticides into the EU

Major European ports are in danger of admitting ships from Asia with cargoes of counterfeit pesticides. According to Europol, the winter months of January and February are the peak period for the import of illegal herbicides, which are spread on fields where European food is grown, posing a danger to the environment, as well to farmers and consumers. Europol estimates that up to a quarter of pesticides originating from the Baltic States are counterfeit. Europol also notes that due to inadequate coordination and harmonisation between the Member States, organised criminals can reap annual profits of up to five billion DKK.

According to the Danish producers' organisation Danske Planteværn [Danish Crop Protection], counterfeit pesticides are extremely harmful to crops and the aquatic environment and can ultimately pose a threat to the consumer.

Is the Commission aware of this problem? If so, what steps is it considering taking?

**Question for written answer E-001175/12  
to the Commission  
Dan Jørgensen (S&D)  
(8 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Import of illegal pesticides into the EU

Europol has recently drawn attention to the increase in the illegal import of fake and illegal pesticides into the EU. This illegal trade is being organised by sophisticated criminal networks that use legal businesses to camouflage their activities. According to Europol, the profits from this illegal trade run to many billions per year.

These illegal and fake pesticides pose a serious threat to the European environment, its consumers and farmers. In the worst case, they damage crops and the aquatic environment, are harmful to consumers' health and can make farmers seriously ill. It is therefore of the utmost importance to stop the illegal import of these pesticides into Europe. The Commission should therefore draw up an action plan on how to deal with this problem in the future.

I would therefore like to ask the Commission the following questions:

1. What does the Commission know about the illegal import of illegal and fake pesticides into Europe?

2. What steps has the Commission taken to combat this illegal import?
3. What steps has the Commission considered taking in the future to combat this illegal import?

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

(14 March 2012)

The Commission is concerned about the counterfeiting of plant protection products (PPP) and possible negative consequences they may have on human and environmental safety and on the economy.

Several legal instruments exist to prevent the entry on the market and the distribution of counterfeited products, including PPP.

Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 <sup>(1)</sup> lays down several enforcement provisions which can help to contain this practice. It also provides for record keeping by users, producers and the distribution chain of PPP, for controls by Member States on compliance with the regulation and for a legal basis for the Commission to monitor these activities regularly.

Regulation (EC) No 1383/2003 <sup>(2)</sup> allows the Customs Administrations of the Member States to detain goods suspected of infringing intellectual property rights which are being brought into the EU customs territory. Action taken on the basis of this regulation requires an application by the holder of the rights allegedly infringed. For 2012, the Commission is preparing a revision of Directive 2004/48/EC on the enforcement of Intellectual Property rights. In 2009, the Commission put in place the European Observatory on Infringement of Intellectual Property Rights. A regulation is currently being negotiated to transfer its tasks to OHIM <sup>(3)</sup>.

Furthermore, the Commission is reflecting on additional mechanisms within external border controls to prevent that fake PPP which are illegal for reasons other than a breach of IPR are placed on the EU market.

The Commission does not possess enough data to comment on the dimension of the problem in Member States or on their possible shortcomings in tackling it.

—————

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 309, 24.11.2009, p. 1.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 196, 2.8.2003, p. 7-14.

<sup>(3)</sup> COM(2011) 288 final.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000593/12  
to the Commission  
Liam Aylward (ALDE)  
(26 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Amateur radio producers and the EMC Directive

In relation to the revision of Council Directive 89/336/EEC <sup>(1)</sup> concerning electromagnetic compatibility:

1. Could the Commission clarify its position with regard to the definition of electromagnetic disturbances concerning radio signalling?
2. Has the Commission made provision for amateur radio producers in formulating policy regarding this directive?
3. Has the Commission consulted organisations such as the International Telecommunication Union and the International Electrotechnical Committee with regard to the revision of this directive?
4. Could the Commission clarify its position concerning the need to revise the current EMC directive?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission  
(29 February 2012)**

1. The definition of electromagnetic disturbance is laid down in Article 2 of Directive 2004/108/EC on the harmonisation of the laws of the Member States relating to electromagnetic compatibility. The Commission proposal for a revision of this directive (COM(2011) 765 final) includes a minor change to the wording of this definition, resulting in a clearer formulation of the current definition without modifying its substance.

2-3. The proposal for a revision of Directive 2004/108/EC consists of an alignment of the directive to Decision 765/2008/EC (the 'New Legal Framework Decision'). The proposal maintains the current regulatory policy for products covered by the directive, and in particular does not change provisions for radio equipment used by radio amateurs. The alignment of this and 9 other directives to Decision 765/2008/EC was the subject of an extensive public consultation between 20.5.2010 and 15.10.2010.

4. The Commission considers that the alignment of Directive 2004/108/EC to Decision 765/2008/EC will substantially improve the legal framework of the internal market for all products within its scope. Following implementation of the revised directive, the Commission will consider whether further revision of the directive is necessary.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 139, 23.5.1989, p. 19.

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000609/12**  
**à Comissão**  
**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**  
(26 de janeiro de 2012)

*Assunto:* Novas vias de financiamento público para as empresas europeias

Tendo em conta que:

- O capital de risco é entendido como uma forma de financiar a atividade empresarial a longo prazo, sendo o reforço financeiro efetuado através de capitais próprias. Normalmente, considera-se a entrada de um novo sócio minoritário na estrutura da empresa que é responsável por acompanhar a atividade empresarial e o mercado de capitais;
- Os *business angels* são indivíduos que investem diretamente ou através de sociedades veículo, no capital de empresas com potencial de crescimento. Além da vertente financeira, os *business angels* transferem todo o seu conhecimento científico e técnico, valorizando o desenvolvimento de projetos empresariais;
- Segundo o documento aprovado no Conselho Económico e Social de Portugal intitulado «Compromisso para o Crescimento, Competitividade e Emprego», o Governo português pretende «Avaliar o défice de procura de fontes de financiamento além do crédito tradicional, incluindo o recurso ao mercado de capitais e a dinamização de redes de business angels»;
- Além disso, é entendimento de Portugal que é necessário reformar o capital de risco público, reorientando-o para empresas estratégicas que produzam bens e serviços transacionáveis ou operem na área do turismo para captar cada vez mais visitantes;
- Pretende-se apoiar empresas com potencial de inovação e de criação de emprego, assegurando o Estado as necessárias linhas de financiamento, como é o caso de empréstimos junto do Banco Europeu de Investimento (BEI) ou linhas de crédito;
- As empresas europeias possuem elevadas dificuldades para se financiarem nos mercados de capitais, não tendo suficiente liquidez de tesouraria para realizarem muitos projetos de investimento e apostarem sustentadamente em atividades de Investigação e Inovação.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Existe alguma empresa pública europeia de capital de risco vocacionada para apoiar novos projetos empresariais dinamizados por empresas de diversos Estados-Membros?
2. Além do financiamento concedido pelos Estados-Membros, existem outras vias de financiamento público europeu a que as empresas poderão recorrer para ultrapassarem as dificuldades de liquidez existentes?

**Resposta dada pelo Vice-Presidente Antonio Tajani em nome da Comissão**  
(2 de março de 2012)

A Comissão tem apoiado o desenvolvimento do mercado europeu de capital de risco através de políticas, medidas legislativas (como a recente proposta de criação de um passaporte europeu para gestores de fundos de capital de risco <sup>(1)</sup>) e instrumentos financeiros. No âmbito da vertente Empreendedorismo e Inovação (EIP) do Programa-Quadro para a Competitividade e Inovação (CIP, 2007-2013) <sup>(2)</sup>, a Comissão deu passos para resolver os problemas de financiamento das PME, designadamente no que respeita aos instrumentos de crédito e de participação com partilha

<sup>(1)</sup> Proposta da Comissão Europeia relativa a um regulamento sobre fundos de capital de risco europeus: [http://ec.europa.eu/internal\\_market/investment/venture\\_capital\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/investment/venture_capital_en.htm)

<sup>(2)</sup> Programa-Quadro para a Competitividade e a Inovação 2007-2013, 2007-2013: <http://ec.europa.eu/cip>

de risco pela Comissão e o Fundo Europeu de Investimento (FEI) <sup>(3)</sup>. Até finais de setembro de 2011, foram mobilizados mais de 5 mil milhões de euros de garantias e 1,9 mil milhões de euros de capital de risco, e mais de 155 mil PME tinham já beneficiado das intervenções do CIP. O FEI investiu em fundos de capital de risco em toda a Europa <sup>(4)</sup>, incluindo 13,2 milhões de euros no Fundo Albuquerque (Portugal) <sup>(5)</sup>.

A partir da experiência ganha com o CIP, a Comissão propôs instrumentos financeiros para o período de 2014-2020 no âmbito dos novos programas COSME <sup>(6)</sup> e Horizon 2020. Os instrumentos de participação de ambos os programas serão utilizados em estreita ligação com os investimentos em capital de risco do FEI, e através destes, para apoiar PME europeias com potencialidades de crescimento.

Acresce que os fundos estruturais também facilitam o acesso das PME ao financiamento no plano nacional e regional, por exemplo através da iniciativa Jeremie <sup>(7)</sup>. No período 2007-2013, os Estados-Membros já canalizaram 8,1 mil milhões de euros para instrumentos de financiamento destinados às PME. Em Portugal, estão operacionais vários instrumentos de financiamento para apoiar as PME através de capital de risco e de *business angels*.

Acresce que no período 2008-2011, o Banco Europeu de Investimento (BEI) concedeu cerca de 40 mil milhões de euros de empréstimos às PME, dos quais beneficiaram mais de 210 mil empresas.

---

<sup>(3)</sup> Para além do CIP, o FEI faz ainda investimentos de capital de risco utilizando fundos próprios e os recursos de outros mandatos como o Mandato de Capital de Risco do Banco Europeu de Investimento ou a *Portugal Venture Capital Initiative (PVCI)*. Em 2011, o total de investimentos de capital cometidos pelo FEI ascendeu a 1,1 mil milhões de euros. Este montante será investido em fundos, que atrairão igualmente outros co-investidores públicos e privados para então fazerem investimentos de capital em PME.

<sup>(4)</sup> Para uma lista dos investimentos de capital do CIP em toda a UE, consultar: <http://www.access2finance.eu/>

<sup>(5)</sup> Exemplo de uma PME apoiada pelo Fundo Albuquerque: [http://www.eif.org/what\\_we\\_do/equity/Case\\_studies/albuquerque\\_portugal.htm?lang=en](http://www.eif.org/what_we_do/equity/Case_studies/albuquerque_portugal.htm?lang=en)

<sup>(6)</sup> Programa Competitividade das Empresas e PME, 2014-2020: <http://ec.europa.eu/cip/cosme>

<sup>(7)</sup> Recursos Europeus Conjuntos para as Micro-empresas e as Médias Empresas (*Joint European Resources for Micro to Medium Enterprises*): [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/thefunds/instruments/jeremie\\_en.cfm](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/thefunds/instruments/jeremie_en.cfm)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000609/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**  
(26 January 2012)

*Subject:* New forms of public funding for European companies

Given that:

- venture capital is understood to be a way of funding business activity over the long term, under which funding is reinforced by means of appropriate capital, normally via the entry of a new minority partner into the company structure, to be responsible for monitoring business activity and the capital market;
- ‘business angels’ are individuals who invest directly or through intermediate companies in the capital of firms having potential for growth and, in addition to the financial component, transfer their entire scientific and technical knowledge, thereby adding value to the business projects concerned;
- according to a document adopted by the Economic and Social Council of Portugal entitled ‘Commitment to growth, competitiveness and employment’, the Portuguese Government intends to ‘assess the weak demand for financing sources other than traditional credit, including recourse to the capital market and promotion of “business angel” networks’;
- moreover, Portugal believes it is necessary to reform public venture capital, by redirecting such capital to strategic companies that produce marketable goods or services or operate within the tourism sector in order to attract more visitors;
- the intention is to fund companies with innovation and job creation potential, with the state ensuring the required lines of financing, as is the case with loans from the European Investment Bank (EIB) or credit lines;
- European companies have great difficulty in acquiring funding from the capital markets, since they do not have adequate cash liquidity to carry out many investment projects or to offer sustained support for research and innovation activities,

can the Commission state:

1. whether there exists a European public venture capital company designed to support new business projects promoted by companies in different Member States;
2. whether, apart from the financing granted by the Member States, there are other European public funding sources that companies can access in order to overcome existing liquidity problems?

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

The Commission has been supporting development of the European venture capital market with policies, legislative measures (such as the recent proposal for the creation of European passport for venture capital fund managers <sup>(1)</sup>) and financial instruments. Under the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme (CIP, 2007-2013) <sup>(2)</sup>, the Commission is addressing lack of SME finance through the Entrepreneurship and Innovation Programme (EIP): debt and equity instruments are being implemented on behalf of the Commission by the European Investment Fund (EIF) <sup>(3)</sup>. By the end of September 2011, more than EUR 5 billion of guarantees and EUR 1.9 billion of venture capital had been mobilised and over 1 55 000 SMEs had already benefited from CIP. The EIF has been investing in venture capital funds all over Europe <sup>(4)</sup>, including equity investment of EUR 13.2 million in Portuguese fund Albuquerque <sup>(5)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> European Commission proposal for a regulation on European Venture Capital Funds:  
[http://ec.europa.eu/internal\\_market/investment/venture\\_capital\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/investment/venture_capital_en.htm)

<sup>(2)</sup> Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme, 2007-2013: <http://ec.europa.eu/cip>.

<sup>(3)</sup> Apart from CIP, the EIF also invests into European venture capital funds from its own resources and from a number of other mandates such as the European Investment Bank's Risk Capital Mandate or the Portuguese PVCi mandate. In 2011, the total equity investments signed by the EIF amounted to EUR 1.1bn. This money will be invested in funds, which will also attract other private and public co-investors and then make equity investments into SMEs.

<sup>(4)</sup> For a list of CIP equity investments all over the EU, see: <http://www.access2finance.eu/>

<sup>(5)</sup> Example of a SME that got backed by the Albuquerque fund:  
[http://www.eif.org/what\\_we\\_do/equity/Case\\_studies/albuquerque\\_portugal.htm?lang=-en](http://www.eif.org/what_we_do/equity/Case_studies/albuquerque_portugal.htm?lang=-en).

Building on the CIP experience, the Commission proposed financial instruments for 2014-2020 in the new COSME <sup>(6)</sup> and Horizon 2020 programme. Equity facilities from both programmes will be implemented in close connection and through the EIF's investments in venture capital funds supporting European SMEs with growth potential.

Moreover, Structural funds also facilitate access to finance for SMEs at national and regional level, for example through the JEREMIE facility <sup>(7)</sup>. In the 2007-2013 period, Member States have so far allocated EUR 8.1 billion to financial instruments for SMEs. In Portugal, several financial instruments supporting SMEs through venture capital and business angels are under implementation.

Furthermore, in 2008-2011, the European Investment Bank provided EUR 40 billion of SME lending, which benefitted more than 210 000 SMEs.

---

<sup>(6)</sup> Programme for Competitiveness of Enterprises and SMEs, 2014-2020: <http://ec.europa.eu/cip/cosme>.

<sup>(7)</sup> Joint European Resources for Micro to Medium Enterprises: [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/the\\_funds/instruments/jeremie\\_en.cfm](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/the_funds/instruments/jeremie_en.cfm).



(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000612/12  
do Komisji**

**Artur Zasada (PPE)**

(26 stycznia 2012 r.)

*Przedmiot:* Pęknięcia na skrzydłach Airbusów A380

W ostatnim czasie na skrzydłach niektórych Airbusów A380 odkryto małe pęknięcia, o czym poinformowały linie lotnicze Qantas i Singapore Airlines. Informację tę potwierdził producent samolotów, zaznaczając jednocześnie, że usterka dotyczy niekrytycznego odcinka skrzydła pomiędzy złączeniem dwóch żeber w ograniczonej liczbie Airbusów A380. Producent opracował procedurę kontroli i naprawy pęknięć, które zostaną wykonane podczas rutynowych, zaplanowanych przeglądów resursowych.

Z interpretacją producenta nie zgodziło się australijskie Stowarzyszenie Licencjonowanych Inżynierów Lotnictwa. Wg australijskich inżynierów błędnym i niebezpiecznym jest wstrzymywanie się z naprawą do kolejnego zaplanowanego przeglądu.

1. Czy Komisja współpracuje z Europejską Agencją Bezpieczeństwa Lotniczego w tej sprawie?
2. Czy Komisja ma pewność, że poziomy diagnostyczne dla płatowców tego typu mieszczą się w zakresie dopuszczalnych zmian, a użytkowane przez europejskie linie Airbusy A380 są bezpieczne dla ich załóg i pasażerów?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wiceprzewodniczącego Siima Kallasa w imieniu Komisji**

(22 lutego 2012 r.)

Kwestie poruszane w zapytaniu Szanownego Pana Posła wiążą się bezpośrednio z uprawnieniami wykonawczymi EASA, tj. Europejskiej Agencji Bezpieczeństwa Lotniczego. Agencja ta jest ciałem niezależnym od Komisji na mocy rozporządzenia (WE) nr 216/2008<sup>(1)</sup>. W związku z powyższym satysfakcjonującej odpowiedzi na pytanie Szanownego Pana Posła może udzielić wyłącznie sama EASA.

Komisja wystąpiła zatem do EASA o udostępnienie informacji niezbędnych do jak najpilniejszego udzielenia takiej odpowiedzi. Komisja przekaże odpowiedź Agencji Szanownemu Panu Posłowi niezwłocznie po jej otrzymaniu.

<sup>(1)</sup> Dz.U. L 79 z 19.3.2008, s. 1-49.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000612/12  
to the Commission  
Artur Zasada (PPE)  
(26 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Cracks on the wings of Airbus A380 aircraft

Recently, Qantas and Singapore Airlines have reported the discovery of small cracks on the wings of some Airbus A380 aircraft. The aircraft manufacturer confirmed this information, at the same time pointing out that the fault relates to a non-critical section of the wing at the juncture of two ribs in a limited number of Airbus A380 aircraft. The manufacturer has developed a procedure for inspection and repair of the cracks which will be carried out during routine, scheduled maintenance.

The Australian Licensed Aircraft Engineers Association disagreed with the manufacturer's assessment, stating that it was wrong and dangerous to delay repairs until the next scheduled maintenance session.

1. Is the Commission cooperating with the European Aviation Safety Agency on this matter?
2. Is the Commission certain that the diagnostic levels for this type of airframe fall within the scope of permissible changes, and that the Airbus A380 aircraft that European airlines are using are safe for their crews and passengers?

**Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission  
(22 February 2012)**

The issues raised in the question of the Honourable Member relate directly to the executive competencies of the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA). This Agency is a body which is independent of the Commission, pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 216/2008 <sup>(1)</sup>. Accordingly, the sole liability for the answer remains with EASA.

The Commission has requested EASA to provide the elements of the reply to the Honourable Member's question as soon as possible. The Commission will send the Agency's reply to the Honourable Member as soon as received.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 79, 19.3.2008, p. 1-49.

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000613/12**  
**aan de Commissie**  
**Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE)**  
 (26 januari 2012)

*Betreft:* Richtlijn 2010/31/EU — Bijna energieneutrale nieuwe gebouwen tegen 2020

In artikel 9 van Richtlijn 2010/31/EU betreffende de energieprestatie van gebouwen, wordt bepaald dat alle nieuwbouwwoningen tegen eind 2020 bijna energieneutraal (BEN) moeten zijn. In een recent interview plaatst een gerenommeerd Prof.dr. Em. van de KULeuven serieuze vraagtekens bij deze doelstelling.

1. De Prof. waarschuwt ten eerste voor 3 mogelijke reboundeffecten van de BEN-doelstelling:
  - onderzoek wijst uit dat woningen met een hoger E-peil vaak beter scoren qua energieverbruik doordat gebruikers hun comforteisen naar omlaag stellen om hoge energiefacturen te compenseren.
  - Bij BEN-woningen zou dit reboundeffect zich in omgekeerde zin kunnen manifesteren.
  - De hoge prijs van dergelijke woningen zou ertoe leiden dat meer vrijstaande woningen in buitenwijken worden gebouwd wat nefast kan zijn op het vlak van efficiëntie, energieperformantie en ecologische belasting.
2. Verder noemt de Prof. de doelstelling ook asociaal omdat nieuwbouw hierdoor onbetaalbaar dreigt te worden en een privilege van de happy few. Want terwijl de terugverdieneffecten zich voo.a. op lange termijn situeren, moet de financiering van de woning toch bij aanvang rond zijn. Bovendien is het onzeker of de vaak zeer hoge investeringskosten om het E-peil verder omlaag te brengen nog voldoende meerwaarde opbrengen.
3. De Prof. noemt de doelstelling ook irrationeel. In mijn regio Vlaanderen verneem ik dat de uitvoerende sector momenteel de vraag niet kan bijhouden, dat er ook problemen zijn met materiaal aanvoer en dat hierdoor bvb. op het vlak van sociale huisvesting niet alle opdrachten kunnen worden besteed.
4. Tenslotte rijzen er ook tal van vragen ivm gezondheidsproblemen in passiefwoningen, voornamelijk uitgelokt door slechtwerkende ventilatiesystemen.

In die context graag volgende vragen aan de Commissie over elk van de bovenvermelde 4 punten:

- Is de Commissie op de hoogte van deze kritiek?
- Hoe e.a.ueert zij deze?
- Welke maatregelen neemt de Commissie, samen met de bevoegde overheden, om een antwoord te bieden op deze gevolgen?
- Overweegt de Commissie om op basis van deze kritiek, de doelstelling te herzien? Zo ja, op welke manier en wanneer? Zo neen, waarom niet?

**Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie**  
 (27 februari 2012)

De Commissie is niet op de hoogte van het interview waarnaar het geachte Parlementslid verwijst. Zonder duidelijk bewijsmateriaal kan de Commissie de stellingen van de professor emeritus niet naar behoren beoordelen.

Volgens de voorschriften van Richtlijn 2010/31/EU <sup>(1)</sup> betreffende de bijna energieneutrale nieuwe gebouwen mogen de lidstaten de doelstellingen eventueel niet toepassen in specifieke te rechtvaardigden gevallen waarin de kosten-batenanalyse over de economische levensduur van het betrokken gebouw negatief is.

Krachtens Richtlijn 2010/31/EU moeten de lidstaten bij het vaststellen van de minimumeisen voor de energieprestatie van gebouwen rekening houden met de gesteldheid van het binnenklimaat om eventuele negatieve effecten zoals onvoldoende ventilatie te voorkomen.

De Commissie overweegt niet de BEN-doelstelling te herzien.

<sup>(1)</sup> Richtlijn 2010/31/EU van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 19 mei 2010 betreffende de energieprestatie van gebouwen (herschikt), PB L 1 van 4.1.2003.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000613/12  
to the Commission**

**Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE)**

(26 January 2012)

*Subject:* Directive 2010/31/EU — nearly zero-energy new buildings by 2020

It is stipulated in Article 9 of Directive 2010/31/EU regarding the energy performance of buildings that all new buildings should be nearly zero-energy (NZE) by 2020. In a recent interview, a renowned emeritus professor from the Catholic University of Louvain cast serious doubt on this target.

1. The professor warns, first of all, of three possible rebound effects of the NZE target:
  - research indicates that homes with a higher energy consumption level often score better with regard to energy consumption because the users reduce their comfort requirements in order to offset high energy bills.
  - In NZE homes, this rebound effect may manifest itself in the opposite direction.
  - The high price of such homes would lead to the construction of more detached houses in suburbs, which could be detrimental in terms of efficiency, energy performance and environmental impact.
2. The professor also describes this target as antisocial because it may make new homes unaffordable and a privilege of the lucky few. Because while cost is recovered mainly in the long term, the home still needs to be paid for at the start. It is also not certain whether the often very high investment costs of pushing down the energy consumption level can yield sufficient added value.
3. The professor also describes the target as irrational. From what I hear in my region of Flanders, the supply is currently lagging behind the demand, there are also problems with material supply and because of that not all the commissions can be carried out in the field of social housing, for example.
4. And, finally, there are also many issues regarding health problems in passive houses, mainly triggered by malfunctioning ventilation systems.

In this context, I would like to put the following questions to the Commission on each of the above four points:

- Is the Commission aware of this criticism?
- How does it assess it?
- What measures is the Commission taking, together with the competent authorities, to counter these effects?
- Is the Commission considering the possibility of reviewing the target, based on this criticism? If so, how and when? If not, why not?

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

(27 February 2012)

The Commission is not aware of the interview referred to by the Honourable Member and, without any significant substantiating evidence, it is not in a position to properly assess the claims made by the Emeritus Professor.

The requirements of Directive 2010/31/EU <sup>(1)</sup> regarding nearly zero-energy buildings allow Member States to not apply the targets in specific and justifiable cases where the cost-benefit analysis over the economic lifecycle of the building in question is negative.

Directive 2010/31/EU requires Member States to take into account indoor climate conditions in order to avoid possible negative effects, such as inadequate ventilation, when establishing minimum energy performance requirements for buildings.

The Commission is not considering reviewing the NZEB target.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Directive 2010/31/EU of the Parliament and of the Council of 19 May 2010 on the energy performance of buildings (recast), OJ L 1, 4.1.2003.

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000812/12**  
**aan de Commissie**  
**Barry Madlener (NI)**  
(13 februari 2012)

*Betreft:* Griekse militaire aankopen voor miljarden euro's

1. Heeft de Commissie kennisgenomen van het bericht <sup>(1)</sup> dat Griekenland voor meer dan 10 miljard euro aan wapeninkopen wil doen?
2. Is het waar dat Griekenland voornemens is om, indien het opnieuw geld uit het noodfonds ontvangt, voor 4 miljard euro gevechtsvliegtuigen te kopen, voor nog eens 4 miljard euro fregatten te kopen, voor 2 miljard euro duikboten te kopen en voor 400 miljoen euro patrouilleboten te kopen?
3. Indien de berichtgeving waar is, deelt de Commissie dan de mening van de PVV dat het onaanvaardbaar is dat een land dat zo goed als failliet is en aan een geldinzuus ligt — ook van Nederland — voor meer dan 10 miljard euro aan wapeninkopen wil gaan doen? Zo neen, waarom niet?
4. Is de Commissie bereid een en ander te verifiëren en indien de berichtgeving klopt de Grieken daarop aan te spreken? Is de Commissie bereid de geldkraan aan Griekenland per direct dicht te draaien en te bevorderen dat Griekenland de eurozone zo spoedig mogelijk verlaat? Zo neen, waarom niet?

**Antwoord van de heer Rehn namens de Commissie**  
(12 maart 2012)

Het is de Commissie niet bekend dat de Griekse overheid van plan is om het genoemde militaire materieel voor de aangegeven bedragen te verwerven. Voorts stroken de in de vraag genoemde bedragen niet met de informatie die naar voren is gekomen tijdens het overleg over de bestedingsplannen voor de middellange termijn dat Griekenland en de Commissie, het IMF en de ECB in het kader van het economische aanpassingsprogramma hebben gevoerd. Volgens de informatie die toen is ontvangen, zou voor 0,7 à 1 miljard EUR per jaar aan militaire opdrachten worden geplaatst. Onlangs heeft Griekenland aangekondigd dat de defensie-uitgaven in 2012 niet 1 miljard EUR zullen bedragen, zoals eerder de bedoeling was, maar met 300 miljoen EUR worden verlaagd tot 700 miljoen EUR.

Losse wapenaankopen maken geen deel uit van de programmavooraanwaarden. Wel gelden voor uitgaven aan militair materieel en andere defensie-uitgaven en voor alle overige overheidsuitgaven die onder de primaire uitgaven vallen, sinds het begin van het programma in mei 2010 kwartaallimieten.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.zeit.de/2012/02/Ruestung-Griechenland>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000616/12  
to the Commission  
Nigel Farage (EFD)  
(26 January 2012)**

*Subject:* The purchase of German and French military hardware

Will the Commission comment on the purchase of German and French military hardware (submarines, jets, frigates etc) by the Greek authorities following the next tranche of the Greek bailout?

Are these arms purchases part of the conditions for the bailout, as widely reported? Do they amount to state aid from France and Germany to French and German manufacturers via the bailout mechanism and the Government of Greece?

Can the Commission comment on whether it feels that military spending is a suitable priority for the Greek Government, given the impact of the financial crisis on the Greek economy and society at large?

**Question for written answer E-000812/12  
to the Commission  
Barry Madlener (NI)  
(13 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Greek military purchases amounting to billions of euros

1. Has the Commission taken note of reports <sup>(1)</sup> that Greece is intending to spend more than EUR 10 billion on weapons purchases?
2. Is it true that, if it receives more money from the Emergency Fund, Greece plans to spend EUR 4 billion on fighter aircraft, EUR 4 billion on frigates, EUR 2 billion on submarines and EUR 400 million on patrol boats?
3. If this report is true, does the Commission share the view of the PVV that it is unacceptable that a country which is as good as bankrupt and which is on a financial drip — provided by the Netherlands, amongst other countries — should be planning to spend more than EUR 10 billion on weapons? If not, why not?
4. Is the Commission prepared to verify the facts of the case and, if the report is accurate, take this up with the Greeks? Is the Commission prepared to turn off the money supply to Greece immediately and to encourage Greece to leave the euro area as soon as possible? If not, why not?

**Joint answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission  
(12 March 2012)**

The Commission is not aware of any plans by the Greek authorities to acquire the abovementioned military equipment by the amounts indicated. Moreover, the amounts mentioned in the question are neither consistent with the information received during discussions of the medium-term spending plans between Greece and the Commission, IMF and ECB staff teams in the context of the Greek economic adjustment program. According to information received in this context, military procurement under armament programme is expected to vary between EUR 0.7-1 billion per year. Recently, Greece announced that the armament spending in 2012, previously planned to be EUR 1 billion was reduced by EUR 300 million to EUR 700 million.

No individual arms purchase is part of program conditionality. However, spending on military procurement and also other defence related spending, as any other government spending are part of primary expenditure, in relation to which there are quarterly ceilings as program conditionality since the beginning of the program in May 2010.

---

(1) <http://www.zeit.de/2012/02/Ruestung-Griechenland>

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000623/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Michail Tremopoulos (Verts/ALE)**  
 (27 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Κατασκευή φράγματος επί του ποταμού Αλιάκμονα, στο Ελάφιο Γρεβενών

Φράγμα ύψους 110 μ. για αρδευτικούς και υδροηλεκτρικούς (Υ/Η) σκοπούς σχεδιάζεται να κατασκευαστεί από τη ΔΕΗ επί του ποταμού Αλιάκμονα, στην περιοχή Ελάφιο Γρεβενών. Ο ταμιευτήρας που θα προκύψει θα έχει έκταση 39 km<sup>2</sup> και μήκος περί τα 40 km. Ταυτόχρονα, σημαντικό τμήμα του ποταμού Βενέτικου θα πλημμυρίσει (17 km). Ο ποταμός Γρεβενίτης θα κατακλυσθεί σχεδόν ολόκληρος, από την πόλη των Γρεβενών έως και τη συμβολή του με τον Αλιάκμονα. Ο σταθμός παραγωγής ενέργειας θα αποδίδει συνολική ισχύ 135 MW<sup>(1)</sup>. Για το έργο έχει ολοκληρωθεί η προμελέτη περιβαλλοντικών επιπτώσεων ενώ η μελέτη περιβαλλοντικών επιπτώσεων βρίσκεται στο στάδιο της ολοκλήρωσης. Θα κατακλυστούν τουλάχιστον 25 000 στρέμματα δασικών εκτάσεων, πάνω από 12 διαφορετικοί τύποι βλάστησης, νεολιθικοί οικισμοί υπό αρχαιολογική έρευνα, ο οικισμός της Αγάπης, 4 αρδευτικά δίκτυα, θα επηρεαστεί αρνητικά η πανίδα και ιδιαίτερα σπάνια θηλαστικά (αρκούδα, ζαρκάδι, αγριόγατα, βίδρα), ψάρια και πουλιά<sup>(2)</sup>. Επίσης, αναμένεται να κατακλυστούν φωλιές μαυροπελαργών και αποικίες ερωδιών<sup>(3)</sup>. Υπενθυμίζεται ότι δεν έχουν μελετηθεί οι συνδυαστικές επιπτώσεις που ενδέχεται να προκύψουν από τα δεκάδες άλλα τεχνητά έργα που επιβαρύνουν το ποτάμιο σύστημα του Αλιάκμονα<sup>(4)</sup> (5) και δεν έχει εκπονηθεί προσχέδιο Διαχείρισης Λεκάνης Απορροής.

Έχει η Επιτροπή ενημέρωση από τις ελληνικές αρχές για το συγκεκριμένο έργο; Συμφωνεί ότι αυτό παραβιάζει την ελληνική και ευρωπαϊκή νομοθεσία, ιδιαίτερα την Οδηγία 92/43/ΕΟΚ (άρθρο 10), καταστρέφοντας ενδιαιτήματα ειδών προτεραιότητας και τους ποτάμιους διαδρόμους επικοινωνίας τους; Τι μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει ώστε να μην καταστραφούν οι συγκεκριμένες περιοχές; Έχει ενημέρωση για το ενδεχόμενο ύπαρξης συνεχών τεχνητών λιμνών στον ποταμό Αλιάκμονα που θα δημιουργήσουν ανυπέβλητα εμπόδια στις μετακινήσεις των μεγάλων θηλαστικών; Τι μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει ώστε να αποφευχθεί ένα τέτοιο ενδεχόμενο;

**Απάντηση του κ. Ροτοζνίκ εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
 (12 Μαρτίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή δεν έχει ενημερωθεί από τις ελληνικές αρχές σχετικά με το υπόψη έργο. Αποτελεί ευθύνη των ελληνικών αρμόδιων αρχών να εξασφαλίσουν ότι για τον προγραμματισμό και την αδειοδότηση του υπόψη φράγματος έχει τηρηθεί η νομοθεσία της ΕΕ, ιδίως η οδηγία 92/43/ΕΟΚ για τα ενδιαιτήματα<sup>(6)</sup>, και έχουν επίσης ληφθεί υπόψη οι σωρευτικές επιπτώσεις από άλλα έργα υποδομής που επηρεάζουν το οικοσύστημα του ποταμού Αλιάκμονα. Με βάση τις πληροφορίες που διαβίβασε το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, η Επιτροπή θα διερευνήσει την υπόθεση με τις ελληνικές αρχές με σκοπό να επαληθεύσει αν τηρήθηκε η περιβαλλοντική νομοθεσία της ΕΕ.

(1) Το συγκεκριμένο φράγμα θεωρείται από τη ΔΕΗ ότι θα αυξήσει τη συμμετοχή των Ανανεώσιμων Πηγών Ενέργειας (ΑΠΕ) στο ενεργειακό ισοζύγιο της χώρας. Ωστόσο, σύμφωνα με την ελληνική νομοθεσία, δεν θεωρούνται ΑΠΕ οι Υ/Η σταθμοί που είναι μεγαλύτεροι των 15 MW.

(2) <http://www.callisto.gr/docs/aliakmon.pdf>

(3) Μπούσμπουρας Δ. (συντονιστής — υπεύθυνος σύνταξης) 2002. Ειδική Περιβαλλοντική Μελέτη ποταμού Βενέτικου. Ελληνική Ορνιθολογική Εταιρεία, Αναπτυξιακή Εταιρεία Ν. Γρεβενών.

(4) 4 μεγάλα φράγματα σε λειτουργία, 2 υπό κατασκευή, 1 υπό σχεδιασμό, πάνω από 20 Μικρά Υδροηλεκτρικά υπό σχεδιασμό. Έτσι, η μισή ροή του Αλιάκμονα πρόκειται να μετατραπεί σε δεξαμενή, δημιουργώντας τεράστια εμπόδια στις μετακινήσεις μεγάλων θηλαστικών.

(5) Επιστολή Αρκτούρου προς ΥΠΕΧΩΔΕ, με θέμα «Ανάγκη προστασίας του μέσου ρου του Αλιάκμονα και αποφυγή φραγμάτων», κα αρ. πρωτ. 72/17-03-2008.

(6) Οδηγία 92/43/ΕΟΚ του Συμβουλίου της 21ης Μαΐου 1992 για τη διατήρηση των φυσικών οικοτόπων καθώς και της άγριας πανίδας και χλωρίδας, ΕΕ L 206 της 22.7.1992.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000623/12  
to the Commission**

**Michail Tremopoulos (Verts/ALE)**

(27 January 2012)

*Subject:* Construction of a dam on the River Aliakmonas in the Elafi area, Grevena region

The construction of a 110 metre-high dam is planned for irrigation and hydroelectric purposes by DEI on the River Aliakmonas in the Elafi area, Grevena region. The reservoir created will cover an area of 39 km<sup>2</sup> and be around 40 km long. In addition, a substantial portion of the River Venetikos will be flooded (17 km). The River Grevenitis will be almost entirely flooded from the city of Grevena to its confluence with the Aliakmonas. The power station will generate a total of 135 MW <sup>(1)</sup>. A preliminary environmental impact assessment has been completed and the full environmental impact assessment is at the completion stage. At least 25 000 stremma of wooded area will be flooded, more than 12 different types of vegetation, Neolithic dwellings uncovered by archaeological research, the 'Agapi house', 4 irrigation networks, there will be negative impacts on fauna, especially mammals (bears, deer, wildcats and otters), fish and birds <sup>(2)</sup>. Likewise, nests of the black stork and colonies of herons <sup>(3)</sup> are expected to be flooded. It should be noted that the combined impacts which will be caused by the many artificial works to the Aliakmonas river system have not been studied <sup>(4)</sup> <sup>(5)</sup> and a plan to manage the river basin run-off has not been drawn up.

Has the Commission been informed by the Greek authorities about this project? Does it agree that the project violates Greek and European legislation, especially Directive 92/43/EEC (Article 10), destroying protected species' habitats and their river-based migration routes? What measures does it intend to take so that these areas are not destroyed? Has it been informed about the potential existence of permanent artificial lakes in the River Aliakmonas, which will create impassable obstacles to large mammals' migration? What measures does it intend to take to avoid this potential destruction?

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

(12 March 2012)

The Commission has not been informed by the Greek authorities about this project. It is the responsibility of Greek competent authorities to ensure that the planning and authorisation of the dam in question complies with EU legislation, in particular the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC <sup>(6)</sup>, taking also into account any cumulative impacts from other infrastructure projects affecting the River Aliakmon ecosystem. In light of the information supplied by the Honourable Member the Commission will investigate the case with the Greek authorities in order to verify whether the EU environmental legislation is complied with.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> DEI believes that the dam in question will increase the contribution of renewable energy sources to the country's energy balance. However, in accordance with Greek law, hydroelectric power stations larger than 15 MW are not included in this renewable energy plan.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.callisto.gr/docs/aliakmon.pdf>

<sup>(3)</sup> Bousbouras, D. (editor in chief) 2002. Special environmental study of the River Venetikos. Greek Ornithological Association, Prefecture of Grevena Development Agency.

<sup>(4)</sup> 4 large dams in operation, 2 under construction, 1 in planning, over 20 small hydroelectric schemes in planning. Thus, half the flow of the Aliakmonas will be stored in tanks, creating a huge impact on the movements of large mammals.

<sup>(5)</sup> Letter from Arcturos to the Ministry of the Environment, Regional Planning and Public Works on the need to protect the average flow rate of the River Aliakmonas and avoid dam construction, ref no 72/17-03-2008.

<sup>(6)</sup> Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora, OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.



(Dansk udgave)

**Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-000654/12**  
**til Kommissionen**  
**Anne E. Jensen (ALDE)**  
(30. januar 2012)

Om: Flypassagerers rettigheder (forordning (EF) nr. 261/2004)

Europa-Parlamentet vedtog i 2004 en forordning, som fastslår, at flypassagerer har visse rettigheder ved boardingafvisning, aflysning og lange forsinkelser (forordning (EF) nr. 261/2004).

Forordningen foreskriver, at EU's luftfartselskaber under visse omstændigheder er forpligtet til at yde kompensation m.m., hvis flyrejser aflyses, eller der er større forsinkelser.

Siden forordningen trådte i kraft har flypassagerer haft mulighed for at klage til deres respektive lands klageinstans (National Enforcement Body) med henblik på at få den kompensation, som de er berettiget til.

Ifølge mine oplysninger så viser det sig, at mange af de EU-borgere, som får medhold hos deres lands klageinstans, ikke får den kompensation, som de er berettiget til, fordi det enkelte flyselskab ignorerer henvendelsen fra den nationale klageinstans. Dermed står EU-borgeren i et limbo, idet man har fået ret hos det enkelte lands klageinstans, mens man er nødsaget til at anlægge et civilt søgsmål mod flyselskabet for at få den kompensation, som man er berettiget til i henhold til EU-forordningen.

1. Kan Kommissionen oplyse, hvor mange klagersager, hvor EU-borgeren har fået medhold, der er blevet afvist/ignoreret af de enkelte flyselskaber?
2. Kan Kommissionen oplyse, om den synes, at det er berettiget, at et EU-flyselskab ignorerer en afgørelse fra en national klageinstans (National Enforcement Body)?
3. Hvordan vil Kommissionen sikre, at EU-borgerne kan få den kompensation, som de er berettiget til, uden at de skal anlægge en langvarig og i øvrigt bekostelig retssag mod et givent flyselskab?

**Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Siim Kallas**  
(6. marts 2012)

1. Der foreligger ingen statistik vedrørende antallet af klager, der har fået medhold ved en national klageinstans og derefter er blevet afvist eller ignoreret af det involverede luftfartsselskab. Dog foreligger der oplysninger om sager, der er rejst af nationale klageinstanser med henblik på at sanktionere luftfartsselskaber, der ikke overholder forordning 261/2004. Kommissionen kan henvise det ærede medlem til Kommissionens arbejdsdokument <sup>(1)</sup> vedrørende dette spørgsmål.

2. Kommissionen mener ikke, at et luftfartsselskab bør ignorere en afgørelse fra en national klageinstans. Dog er det i sidste ende op til de nationale retsinstanser, om nødvendigt efter at have forelagt EU-Domstolen en anmodning om præjudiciel afgørelse, at afgøre, om et luftfartsselskab overholder forordning 261/2004 eller ej. Kommissionen efterprøver løbende, hvorvidt de nationale klageinstanser opfylder deres forpligtelser på korrekt vis, og giver sin mening til kende, når det skønnes hensigtsmæssigt.

3. Selvom den nationale klageinstans kan give passageren en velbegrunnet udtalelse om omstændighederne ved en konkret sag, er denne udtalelse ikke juridisk bindende i den forstand, at den ikke kan håndhæves uden en domstolsafgørelse. Under alle omstændigheder kan den dog fremføres som bevis ved en eventuel retssag. Medlemsstaterne kan sanktionere et luftfartsselskab for ikke at respektere forordning 261/2004. I forbindelse med forberedelserne til en revision af forordningen, ser Kommissionen på andre måder til at sikre, at passagerrettighederne respekteres fuldt ud.

Kommissionens lovgivningsforslag om alternative tvistbilæggelsesordninger og online tvistbilæggelsesordninger <sup>(2)</sup> har til hensigt at fremme hurtig, effektiv og billig adgang til løsning, inklusive onlineløsninger, af kontraktuelle tvister, så forbrugeren ikke er nødt til at gå rettens vej. Lovgivningen angående alternative tvistbilæggelsesordninger og

<sup>(1)</sup> Ledsagedokument til »Kommissionens meddelelse om anvendelsen og resultaterne af forordning (EF) nr. 261/2004 om fælles bestemmelser om kompensation og bistand til luftfartspassagerer ved boardingafvisning og ved aflysning eller lange forsinkelser — 2011«, særlig afsnit 3. ([http://ec.europa.eu/transport/passengers/doc/sec\\_2011\\_428\\_staff-working-paper.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/transport/passengers/doc/sec_2011_428_staff-working-paper.pdf)).

<sup>(2)</sup> Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) og Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) ([http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/redress\\_cons/adr\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/redress_cons/adr_en.htm)).

online tvistbilæggelsesordninger, som er blandt topprioriteringerne i forbindelse med relanceringen af det indre marked, vil gøre det muligt for alle EU-borgere at benytte sig af tvistbilæggelsesinstanser, der opfylder en række kvalitetskriterier, til at søge erstatning, også i forbindelse med problemer, der er opstået inden for områder, som er omfattet af forordning 261/2004.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000654/12  
to the Commission**

**Anne E. Jensen (ALDE)**

(30 January 2012)

*Subject:* Airline passengers' rights (Regulation (EC) No 261/2004)

In 2004, the European Parliament adopted a regulation establishing passengers' rights in the event of denied boarding, cancellation or long delays (Regulation (EC) No 261/2004).

The regulation states that, under certain circumstances, EU airlines are obliged to offer compensation etc. if flights are cancelled or if there are long delays.

Since the regulation came into force, air passengers have been able to lodge complaints with their respective countries' National Enforcement Bodies to gain the compensation to which they are entitled.

According to my information, it would appear that many EU citizens who have their claims upheld by their National Enforcement Body do not receive the compensation they are entitled to because the airline in question ignores the request by the National Enforcement Body. In such cases EU citizens are left in limbo since, although their complaint has been upheld by the national body, they are obliged to bring civil proceedings against the airline in order to receive the compensation they are entitled to under the EU Regulation.

1. Can the Commission state how many complaints in which an EU citizen's claim has been upheld have been rejected/ignored by the individual airline?
2. Does the Commission think it is justifiable for an EU airline to ignore a decision from a National Enforcement Body?
3. How will the Commission ensure that EU citizens can receive the compensation they are entitled to, without having to initiate long and costly legal proceedings against a particular airline?

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

(6 March 2012)

1. There are no statistics on the number of complaints upheld by a National Enforcement Body (NEB) and rejected or ignored by the airline concerned. However data do exist as regards cases engaged by NEBs for sanctioning airlines for failure to respect Regulation (EC) No 261/2004. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the Commission Staff Working Paper <sup>(1)</sup> on this issue.

2. The Commission does not think that an airline should ignore a decision from a NEB. However, it is ultimately for national courts, if necessary after requesting the interpretation of the European Court of Justice in the context of a prejudicial question, to decide on the non-compliance of an airline with Regulation (EC) No 261/2004. The Commission constantly verifies that the NEBs carry out their obligations properly and provides its views when appropriate.

3. Although the NEB can provide passengers with a well-founded opinion on the circumstances of their specific case, the NEB opinion on individual cases is not legally binding in the sense that it cannot be enforced without a court decision, where in any event it can be used as evidence. Member States can sanction airlines for failure to respect Regulation (EC) No 261/2004. In the preparation of the review of the regulation, the Commission is looking to other means in order to ensure full respect of passenger rights.

<sup>(1)</sup> Accompanying document to the communication on the operation and the results of Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 establishing common rules on compensation and assistance to passengers in the event of denied boarding and of cancellation or long delay of flights — 2011 and in particular Section 2 thereof ([http://ec.europa.eu/transport/passengers/doc/sec\\_2011\\_428\\_staff-working-paper.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/transport/passengers/doc/sec_2011_428_staff-working-paper.pdf)).

The Commission legislative proposals on ADR-ODR <sup>(?)</sup> intend to give access to quick, efficient and inexpensive means, including online, to resolve consumer contractual disputes without having to go to court. The ADR-ODR legislation, one of the key priorities for the re-launch of the single market, will enable any EU citizen to use dispute resolution entities complying with core quality requirements to seek redress in problems encountered also in the area covered by Regulation (EC) No 261/2004.

---

---

(?) Alternative Dispute Resolution and Online Dispute Resolution ([http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/redress\\_cons/adr\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/redress_cons/adr_en.htm)).

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000671/12**

**an die Kommission**

**Andreas Mölzer (NI)**

(30. Januar 2012)

*Betrifft:* Elektro-Autos — mangelnde Infrastruktur

Trotz ihres enormen Potenzials ist die Nachfrage nach Elektro-Autos noch gering. Anscheinend können auch starke Subventionen die Endverbraucher, die um Flexibilität und Alltagstauglichkeit besorgt sind, nicht zum Umstieg auf umweltfreundlichere Elektro-Autos bewegen. Hauptproblemfeld scheint nach wie vor die mangelnde Infrastruktur von Ladestationen zu sein. In diesem Zusammenhang laufen bereits Kooperationen mit Einkaufszentren, Restaurantketten, Parkgaragen etc.

1. Welche Projekte im Zusammenhang mit Elektro-Autos werden auf EU-Ebene gefördert?
2. Gibt es auf EU-Ebene Zahlen bezüglich des Einsatzes von Elektro-Autos und des Ausbaus der nötigen Infrastruktur an Stromtankstellen in den Mitgliedstaaten?
3. Gibt es Best-Practice-Vergleiche auf EU-Ebene und was ist in diesem Zusammenhang für die Zukunft geplant?

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

(24. Februar 2012)

Die Kommission verweist den Herrn Abgeordneten auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftlichen Anfragen E-8744/2011 und E-21/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

Die europäische Initiative für umweltfreundliche Kraftfahrzeuge ist eine der drei öffentlich-privaten Partnerschaften (PPP) im Rahmen des vom Kommissionspräsidenten am 26. November 2008 angekündigten europäischen Konjunkturprogramms. Eines der Ziele der Initiative ist die Förderung von Forschung und Entwicklung im Bereich der Technologien und Infrastrukturen für Elektrofahrzeuge. Informationen zu Projekten sind auf folgender Website zu finden: <http://www.green-cars-initiative.eu/projects>

Eine kürzlich vorgeschlagenen im Rahmen der europäischen Initiative für umweltfreundliche Kraftfahrzeuge veröffentlichte Aufforderung zur Einreichung von umfasst auch die Forschung zur Erhöhung der Kundenfreundlichkeit der Ladeinfrastrukturen durch die Entwicklung drahtloser Systeme. Diese Projekte werden sehr wahrscheinlich spätestens Ende 2012 gestartet.

---

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

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000671/12  
to the Commission  
Andreas Mölzer (NI)  
(30 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Electric cars — lack of infrastructure

In spite of their enormous potential, the demand for electric cars is still very low. It would seem that generous subsidies are still not enough to persuade end-users who are concerned about flexibility and suitability for daily use to switch to more environmentally-friendly electric cars. The main problem still appears to be the lack of infrastructure, in the form of charging stations. In that connection, joint schemes are already being implemented with shopping centres, restaurant chains, car parks, etc.

1. What projects involving electric cars are being promoted at EU level?
2. Are figures available at EU level concerning the use of electric cars and the development of the necessary infrastructure, in the form of charging stations, in the Member States?
3. Have best-practice comparisons been conducted at EU level and what measures are being planned for the future?

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

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Questions E-8744/2011 and E-21/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

The European Green Cars Initiative is one of the three Public Private Partnerships (PPP) of the European Economic Recovery Plan announced by the President of the Commission on the 26 November 2008. One of the objectives of the initiative is to support R & D on technologies and infrastructures for electric vehicles. Information on projects is available on the following website: <http://www.green-cars-initiative.eu/projects>

A recent call of the European Green Car Initiative includes research on improving the convenience of the charging infrastructure by developing wireless systems. These projects will most probably be launched by the end of 2012.

---

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

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000675/12  
to the Commission  
Jim Higgins (PPE)  
(30 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Water conservation

Could the Commission state what action it is taking to promote water conservation in the Member States?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission  
(5 March 2012)**

The aim of the Water Framework Directive <sup>(1)</sup> is to contribute to sustainable, balanced and equitable water use. The Commission is currently analysing the river basin management plans to see to which extent Member States have included, for instance, measures for water conservation. The result of the assessment will be published in the third implementation report, as part of the Blueprint to Safeguard Europe's Water Resources package, which will come forward at the end of 2012.

The Blueprint will also cover possibilities for water efficiency in the Member States.

A key element of the Blueprint is the review of the Water Scarcity and Droughts policy. The European Commission recognised the challenges posed by water scarcity and droughts in a communication <sup>(2)</sup>, which outlined the severity of the issue and presented a set of policy options focused on demand-side management to address water scarcity and drought across Europe and for promoting sustainable use and management of water.

The Water Scarcity and Droughts policy lays down a water hierarchy under which water demand management should come first, and alternative supply options — such as desalination plants — should only be considered once the potential for water savings and efficiency has been exhausted. Given the wide regional diversity of the problems with regard to water scarcity and drought, the water hierarchy is not a regulatory obligation, which allows for regional approaches to deal with these challenges in the most cost-effective way.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Directive 2000/60/EC of the Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2000 establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy, OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.

<sup>(2)</sup> COM(2007)414 final.

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000685/12**  
**adresată Comisiei**  
**Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**  
(30 ianuarie 2012)

*Subiect:* Producția mondială și stocul mondial de porumb, grâu și soia

Stresul hidric din Argentina și Brazilia generează îngrijorare cu privire la nivelul producției mondiale și stocul mondial de porumb, grâu și soia. Se estimează, de exemplu, că producția argentiniană de porumb va scădea, fiind cifrată la 25 de milioane de tone, cu 4 milioane de tone mai puțin decât era estimarea din luna anterioară.

Având în vedere gradul ridicat de dependență al Uniunii Europene de aceste mărfuri, Comisia este rugată să informeze Parlamentul cu privire la eventualele măsuri pe care le are în vedere pentru a reduce impactul creșterii prețurilor asupra sectorului creșterii animalelor din UE.

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

Ultimele estimări privind recolta europeană de cereale 2011/2012 se ridică la 283 de milioane de tone, ceea ce reprezintă cu 2% mai mult decât media ultimelor cinci campanii. Până în prezent nu au apărut probleme de disponibilitate a cerealelor în general, și a porumbului în special. Recolta de porumb din 2011/2012 este de aproximativ 66 de milioane de tone, grație recordurilor de productivitate înregistrate în mai multe țări mari producătoare. În ceea ce privește aprovizionarea din țări terțe, trebuie remarcat că o importantă sursă recentă se situează în Ucraina, care este în prezent al patrulea exportator mondial de porumb.

Referitor la soia, condițiile climatice defavorabile înregistrate recent în America de Sud au dus într-adevăr la reducerea perspectivelor de producție în 2011/2012 ale Argentinei și Braziliei. Recolta Argentinei a scăzut față de luna precedentă cu 1,5 milioane de tone, fiind estimată de către Consiliul Internațional al Cerealelor la 51 de milioane de tone. Totuși, față de campania precedentă, aceasta reprezintă o creștere de 2 milioane de tone, fiind a doua recoltă record. Pe de altă parte, recolta Braziliei a scăzut față de campania precedentă cu 3 milioane de tone, fiind estimată la 72 de milioane de tone. Aceste reduceri ale producției din Argentina și Brazilia nu reprezintă un pericol pentru necesarul de aprovizionare cu soia a pieței europene.

De altfel, pentru campania 2011/2012, Comisia a suspendat taxele vamale în cadrul contingentelor tarifare de grâu comun și de orz <sup>(1)</sup>, răspunzând astfel necesităților de aprovizionare cu costuri reduse ale sectorului creșterii animalelor. Mai mult, taxele vamale aplicabile importurilor de porumb sunt fixate la zero din august 2010.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Regulamentul (UE) nr. 633/2011 din 29 iunie 2011 (JO L 17, 30.6.2011, p.19) și Regulamentul (UE) nr. 1350/2011 din 20 decembrie 2011 (JO L 338, 21.12.2011, p. 27).



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000685/12  
to the Commission**

**Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**

(30 January 2012)

*Subject:* World production and world stocks of maize, wheat and soya

Water stress in Argentina and Brazil is raising concern over the levels of world production and world stocks of maize, wheat and soya. It is estimated, for example, that Argentinian maize production will fall to 25 million tonnes or 4 million less than last month's estimate.

Given the EU's high degree of dependence on these products, can the Commission inform Parliament concerning any measures it is considering to reduce the impact of higher prices on stockbreeding in the Union?

(Version française)

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

(22 février 2012)

Les dernières estimations relatives à la récolte céréalière européenne 2011/2012 se situent à 283 millions tonnes (Mio t), soit 2 % supérieur à la moyenne des cinq dernières campagnes. À l'heure actuelle, il n'y a pas de problème de disponibilité de céréales, notamment en ce qui concerne le maïs. En effet, la récolte de maïs 2011/2012 est proche de 66 Mio t, en raison de rendements record dans plusieurs pays producteurs importants. S'agissant de l'approvisionnement en provenance de pays tiers, il y également lieu de noter qu'une source récente et importante se situe en Ukraine, lequel est désormais le quatrième exportateur mondial de maïs.

S'agissant du soja, les récentes conditions climatiques défavorables en Amérique du Sud ont effectivement réduit les perspectives de production 2011/2012 en Argentine et au Brésil. La récolte argentine est estimée, par le Conseil International des Céréales, à 51 Mio t, en baisse de 1,5 Mio t par rapport au mois précédent: il s'agit toutefois d'une augmentation de 2 Mio t par rapport à la campagne précédente et de la deuxième récolte record. Quant à la récolte brésilienne, elle est estimée à 72 Mio t, soit une baisse de 3 Mio t par rapport à la campagne précédente. Ces révisions à la baisse des productions argentine et brésilienne ne mettent pas en péril le besoin d'approvisionnement du marché européen en soja.

Par ailleurs, la Commission a instauré, pour la campagne 2011/2012, une suspension des droits de douane à l'intérieur des contingents tarifaires de blé tendre et d'orge <sup>(1)</sup>, répondant ainsi au besoin d'approvisionnement du secteur de l'élevage à coût réduit. En outre, le droit de douane à l'importation applicable au maïs est nul depuis août 2010.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Règlements (EU) n° 633/2011, du 29 juin 2011, JO L 17 du 30.6.2011, p.19 et (EU) n° 1350/2011, du 20 décembre 2011, JO L 338 du 21.12.2011, p. 27).

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000690/12**

**a la Comisión**

**Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)**

(30 de enero de 2012)

*Asunto:* Uso de fondos comunitarios en actividades taurinas I

Estados como España y Portugal, donde los festejos taurinos son actividades legales, están empleando fondos procedentes de la Unión Europea para actuaciones relacionadas con el mundo taurino, como la rehabilitación de plazas de toros. Estas afirmaciones vienen precedidas de ejemplos en los últimos años, como el del Ayuntamiento de Pozoblanco (Córdoba) donde se emplearon 180 287,37 euros del programa Leader Plus para crear una visita audiovisual de la plaza de toros de la localidad, bajo el número de proyecto GDR-CO-05-1.3-167. Bajo la denominación «pequeñas mejoras» se encuentra el gasto de 25 975,11 euros de Proder en la plaza de toros propiedad del Ayuntamiento de Benamejí (Córdoba). En Bélmez, también en la provincia de Córdoba, se financió con cargo al Proder de Andalucía la rehabilitación de la plaza de toros con una aportación europea de 300 000 euros. En enero de 2011, el Ayuntamiento de Fuente del Maestre (Badajoz) anunció la reforma de su plaza de toros con cargo a los fondos Proder por un importe de 143 252 euros.

En este sentido, los ejemplos en Portugal también son conocidos, Estremoz remodelará su recinto taurino con 875 160 euros del programa FC-FEDER. Otras localidades invertirán fondos de los programas POLIS para rehabilitar también plazas de toros. En la *freguesía* (parroquia) de Santo António das Areias invirtieron cerca de 41 000 euros procedentes de Proder, y colocaron una placa conmemorativa de la inauguración de la remozada plaza taurina con logotipos comunitarios, en lo que demuestra ser una falta de respeto a la verdadera cohesión y solidaridad europeas.

— ¿Qué opinión le merece a la Comisión el uso de fondos de desarrollo regional y rural para rehabilitar un recinto donde se maltratan animales como actividad festiva?

— ¿Tiene constancia la Comisión del uso de este tipo de fondos para actuaciones en plazas de toros?

— ¿Dispone la Comisión de alguna medida o actuación para verificar el correcto y adecuado uso de los fondos que aporta la Unión Europea a los Estados miembros?

— ¿Considera correcta la Comisión la financiación de un espectáculo macabro que tan sólo es legal en tres de los 27 Estados miembros?

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000691/12**

**a la Comisión**

**Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)**

(30 de enero de 2012)

*Asunto:* Uso de fondos comunitarios en actividades taurinas II

El alcalde de la ciudad portuguesa de Estremoz anunció a finales de 2010 que su municipio iba a reformar la plaza de toros de la localidad, con una inversión de cerca de 2,5 millones de euros, cuya reapertura estaría prevista para el mes de abril de 2012. La reforma de este equipamiento, destinado a la celebración de festejos taurinos en una localidad de poco más de 7 000 habitantes, contará con la aportación de dinero de todos los europeos, pues desde Estremoz se ha incluido tal obra en el plan de Regeneración Urbana, que cuenta con el desembolso de fondos europeos por un valor aproximado de 875 000 euros correspondientes al programa FEDER, como se indica en el programa de presupuestos de la ciudad, sólo para esta rehabilitación, lo que supone un porcentaje importante del presupuesto total.

— Teniendo en cuenta que no es la primera ni la segunda ocasión que el grupo al que pertenezco, Verdes, Alianza Libre Europea, denuncia el uso de fondos comunitarios para rehabilitar recintos taurinos, ¿puede confirmar la Comisión si se están financiando con fondos comunitarios las instalaciones taurinas meramente destinadas al espectáculo?

— ¿Considera que deben financiarse las instalaciones taurinas con fondos europeos?

— ¿Tiene constancia la Comisión de otros usos de fondos europeos destinados a la ejecución de obras y proyectos relacionados con la tauromaquia en otros Estados miembros?

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000692/12**  
**a la Comisión**  
**Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)**  
(30 de enero de 2012)

*Asunto:* Uso de fondos comunitarios en actividades taurinas III

El empleo de fondos públicos para la celebración de festejos taurinos es una constante en aquellos países donde esta actividad todavía se mantiene. Sin embargo, también ciertos Estados miembros están utilizando fondos de toda índole provenientes de la Unión Europea para financiar desde las ganaderías hasta la rehabilitación de equipamientos dedicados a la tauromaquia.

En Muíños, una pequeña localidad de la provincia de Ourense (Galicia-España) ha aparecido un cartel promocional de fiestas con la inclusión de un festejo taurino donde también está presente un logotipo de la Unión Europea correspondiente al programa FEDER. El propio cartel menciona el proyecto aprobado a través del Poctep, que en total recibió más de 267 millones de euros de la Unión Europea, con cargo a FEDER.

En este sentido, resulta muy cuestionable que, en el mismo cartel en que se anuncia una actividad prohibida en la mayor parte de los Estados miembros, tenga presencia la imagen corporativa de la Unión Europea, que incluso ha podido subvencionar este espectáculo, ya que el programa aprobado y que menciona el cartel «0523\_Promercado\_1\_E» tiene un concepto muy extenso: desarrollar y valorizar productos endógenos, y un presupuesto total de 495 249,57 euros cuyo beneficiario ha sido el Inorde, un organismo de promoción económica de la provincia de Ourense.

— ¿Tiene constancia la Comisión de qué fondos de cooperación transfronteriza han ido a parar a la financiación de festejos taurinos?

— ¿Qué opinión merece a la Comisión la presencia de un logotipo comunitario en el mismo cartel que un festejo taurino?

— ¿Cree la Comisión que los fondos Feader y las convocatorias Poctep son correctamente empleados en la financiación de festejos taurinos? En cualquier caso, ¿se ajusta ello a las políticas de cohesión económica, social y territorial de la Unión Europea?

**Respuesta conjunta del Sr. Hahn en nombre de la Comisión**  
(12 de marzo de 2012)

Los proyectos financiados tanto por política de cohesión como por política de desarrollo rural deben cumplir con la legislación de la Unión y con la nacional. Los programas de la UE relacionados se ejecutan mediante gestión compartida. Es responsabilidad de los Estados Miembros seleccionar los proyectos que mejor contribuyan a los objetivos de estas políticas, garantizar el respeto de las normas y condiciones aplicables y mantener un registro de tales proyectos. La responsabilidad de la Comisión es garantizar el cumplimiento de la legislación de la UE; incluye, en particular, la realización de auditorías centradas en los sistemas de gestión y control establecidos por los Estados Miembros. Ambas políticas pueden apoyar la conservación del patrimonio cultural con el fin de hacer los lugares más atractivos para la inversión y pueden funcionar como motor de desarrollo socioeconómico.

Además, en el marco del artículo 167 del Tratado, el papel de la Comisión es el de contribuir al florecimiento de las culturas de los Estados miembros, dentro del respeto de su diversidad nacional y regional, poniendo de relieve al mismo tiempo el patrimonio cultural común. El principio de subsidiariedad puesto de relieve en el Tratado no otorga a la Comisión la autoridad de valorar lo que se incluye en el ámbito del patrimonio cultural dentro de los Estados Miembros. Este es un asunto que los Estados Miembros deciden por sí mismos.

En el caso de la localidad gallega mencionada en una de las preguntas, el FEDER no respaldó el festival taurino. La aparición del logotipo del FEDER fue un error a nivel local debido a la coincidencia con un evento simultáneo respaldado por el FEDER.

Por último, la Comisión remite a Su Señoría a la respuesta dada a la pregunta E-005684/2011.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000690/12  
to the Commission**

**Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)**

(30 January 2012)

*Subject:* Use of EU funds on bullfighting I

Countries such as Spain and Portugal, where bullfights are legal, are using EU funds for activities relating to bullfighting, such as the renovation of bullrings. There have been several examples of this over recent years, such as EUR 180 287.37 from the Leader+ programme being used by the local authority in Pozoblanco (Córdoba) to create an audiovisual tour of the town's bullring under project number GDR-CO-05-1.3-167. In Benamejí (Córdoba), EUR 25 975.11 from the Rural Development Programme (Proder) were spent on the local authority's bullring under the heading 'minor repairs'. The bullring in Bémez (Córdoba) was renovated with the help of EUR 300 000 in European funding from Proder Andalusia. In January 2011, the local authority in Fuente del Maestre (Badajoz) announced that its bullring would be renovated using Proder funding to the tune of EUR 143 252.

There are also examples of this happening in Portugal. Estremoz will be spending EUR 875 160 of ERDF cohesion funding to renovate its bullring. Other towns will be using POLIS programme funds to renovate bullrings. Around EUR 41 000 of Proder funding was used to renovate the bullring in Santo António das Areias. The plaque displayed to mark the inauguration of the renovated bullring has EU logos on it. This shows a lack of respect for true European cohesion and solidarity.

— What does the Commission think about regional and rural development funding being used to renovate facilities in which animals are mistreated for entertainment?

— Does the Commission have evidence of this kind of funding being spent on activities linked to bullrings?

— Are there any steps that the Commission can take to check that EU funds are being spent properly and appropriately in the Member States?

— Does the Commission consider it right to finance a macabre spectacle that is only legal in 3 of the 27 Member States?

**Question for written answer E-000691/12  
to the Commission**

**Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)**

(30 January 2012)

*Subject:* Use of EU funds on bullfighting II

In late 2010, the mayor of the Portuguese town of Estremoz announced that the town's bullring would be renovated, involving an investment of around EUR 2.5 million. It is scheduled to reopen in April 2012. The renovation of this bullring, situated in a town of little more than 7 000 people, will be paid for by everyone in Europe, since Estremoz has included the work in its town regeneration plan. According to the town's budget, that plan has received around EUR 875 000 of ERDF funding for the bullring renovation alone, representing a significant proportion of the overall budget.

— Given that this is far from the first occasion on which the Greens/EFA Group has reported that EU funds are being used to renovate bullrings, can the Commission confirm whether EU funding is being spent on facilities designed solely for the purpose of bullfighting events?

— Does the Commission think that bullfighting facilities should be financed with EU funds?

— Does the Commission have a record of other European funding being used to carry out building work and projects relating to bullfighting in other Member States?

**Question for written answer E-000692/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)**  
(30 January 2012)

*Subject:* Use of EU funds on bullfighting III

Spending public funds on bullfighting festivals is the norm in countries in which bullfighting still takes place. However, some Member States are also using all kinds of EU funding to finance everything from rearing the livestock involved to repairing the equipment used for bullfighting.

A poster has appeared in Muñíos, a village in the province of Ourense (Galicia, Spain), promoting festivals that include a bullfighting festival. The European Union's ERDF logo appears on the poster, which mentions a POCTEP-approved project that received more than EUR 267 million in European Union funding under the ERDF.

It is highly problematic that a poster advertising an activity that is banned in most Member States should bear the corporate image of the European Union. The EU may even have subsidised the event in question, because the programme mentioned on the poster, '0523\_PROMERCADO\_1\_E', covers a wide range of activities involving developing and promoting local products. The total budget for the programme was EUR 495 249.57, which went to Inorde, an organisation that promotes the economic development of the province of Ourense.

— Does the Commission have a record of the cross-border cooperation funding that has ultimately helped to finance bullfighting festivals?

— What does the Commission think about an EU logo appearing on the same poster as a bullfighting festival?

— Does the Commission believe that ERDF funding and POCTEP calls for proposals are being put to proper use where the financing of bullfighting festivals is concerned? Does this chime with the EU's policies on economic, social and territorial cohesion?

**Joint answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission**  
(12 March 2012)

Projects financed by both cohesion policy and rural development policy have to comply with applicable Union and national law. The related EU programmes are implemented under shared management. It is the responsibility of Member States to select the projects which may best contribute to the objectives of these policies, to ensure respect of the applicable rules and conditions and to keep a record of these projects. The Commission's responsibility is to ensure compliance with EU legislation; it includes, in particular, audits focused on the management and control systems established by Member States. Both policies can support the preservation of cultural heritage for making places more attractive to invest in and can work as a driver for socioeconomic development.

Moreover, within the framework of Article 167 of the Treaty, the Commission's role is to contribute to the flowering of the cultures of the Member States, while respecting their national and regional diversity and, at the same time, bringing common cultural heritage to the fore. The subsidiarity principle underlined in the Treaty does not give the Commission the authority to appraise what falls under the scope of cultural heritage within the EU Member States. This is a subject Member States decide upon themselves.

In the case of the Galician village mentioned in one of the questions, the ERDF did not support the bullfighting festival. The ERDF logo appearing on a poster was an error at local level due to a coincidence with a simultaneous event supported by the ERDF.

Finally, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-005684/2011.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000700/12  
to the Commission**

**Jim Higgins (PPE)**  
(30 January 2012)

*Subject:* Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on safety of offshore oil and gas prospection, exploration and production activities

Can the Commission indicate how it plans to ensure that the recommendations and conclusions contained in its new proposals for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on safety of offshore oil and gas prospection, exploration and production activities are carried out?

**Question for written answer E-000701/12  
to the Commission**

**Jim Higgins (PPE)**  
(30 January 2012)

*Subject:* Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on safety of offshore oil and gas prospection, exploration and production activities

Can the Commission indicate what penalties will be handed down to individuals or companies that do not comply with the new proposals regarding the regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on safety of offshore oil and gas prospection, exploration and production activities?

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

(7 March 2012)

The Commission's proposal referred to by the Honourable Member aims to establish a clear set of obligations on national administrations, regulators and the industry, covering different types of oil and gas activities undertaken offshore. While the responsibility for safety of operations remains with the industry, the proposal aims to create very strong national regulators who will be properly competent and endowed with resources to fulfil their supervisory duties effectively. In addition, the provisions on transparency will promote diligence and compliance by putting both industry and supervisory bodies under closer public scrutiny. The best regulatory practice will be further promoted by the provisions on cross-border collaboration and by the establishment of a new forum for cooperation between national regulators, stakeholders and the Commission (EU Offshore Authorities Group).

Moreover, in order to ensure compliance and to complement the supervisory duties of national authorities, Member States will be obliged to define penalties which should apply whenever transgressions are identified. The precise nature of the penalties will be left for Member States to determine, in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity.

---

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-006078/12**  
**adresată Comisiei**  
**Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**  
(19 iunie 2012)

*Subiect:* Contaminare cu OMG a orezului importat din India

Potrivit organizației non-guvernamentale GMWatch, Uniunea Europeană ar investiga un posibil caz de contaminare cu organisme modificate genetic (OMG) a orezului importat din India.

Comisia este rugată să informeze Parlamentul cu privire la această situație, precum și cu privire la măsurile pe care dorește să le pună în practică pentru a evita astfel de incidente viitoare, având în vedere că India este al doilea producător și exportator de orez din lume.

**Răspuns dat de dl Dallî în numele Comisiei**  
(9 august 2012)

La 5 ianuarie 2012, Franța a transmis Comisiei și celorlalte 26 de state membre o notificare prin intermediul RASFF <sup>(1)</sup> privind prezența de orez modificat genetic neautorizat în UE într-un lot de orez basmati importat din Pakistan și India.

Autoritățile franceze, care au obligația legală de a urmări depistarea și retragerea de pe piață a tuturor produselor contaminate, au efectuat o anchetă. Conform constatărilor anchetei, celelalte stocuri de orez basmati contaminat au fost retrase de pe piață, iar societatea importatoare a inițiat controale suplimentare ale importurilor ulterioare, ale căror rezultate au fost negative. De asemenea, ancheta a concluzionat că, din cauza amestecării loturilor la punctul de import, originea exactă a lotului contaminat nu poate fi stabilită cu certitudine.

Comisia a organizat o reuniune cu autoritățile indiene în ianuarie 2012, în cadrul căreia acestea au afirmat că pe teritoriul lor nu se cultivă orez modificat genetic și că nu sunt acordate permise pentru crearea de orez modificat genetic și studii pe teren. Această poziție a fost confirmată și printr-o scrisoare oficială din partea autorităților indiene, primită la 6 iulie 2012.

Alerta a fost inclusă pe ordinea de zi a tuturor ședințelor SCFCAH <sup>(2)</sup> începând din ianuarie 2012. Nu au existat alte alerte lansate de statele membre în legătură cu loturi de orez basmati contaminate cu orez modificat genetic neautorizat originar din India.

Comisia și statele membre vor continua să monitorizeze îndeaproape situația pentru a se asigura că organismele modificate genetic neautorizate nu intră în lanțul alimentar și furajer din UE.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Sistemul rapid de alertă pentru alimente și furaje.

<sup>(2)</sup> Comitetul permanent pentru lanțul alimentar și sănătatea animală.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006078/12  
to the Commission**

**Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**

(19 June 2012)

*Subject:* GMO contamination of rice imported from India

According to the GMWatch NGO, the European Union is investigating a possible case of contamination by genetically modified organisms (GMO) of rice imported from India.

Can the Commission provide Parliament with relevant details, indicating what measures it intends to take to prevent such a situation recurring in future, given that India is the world's second largest rice producer and exporter?

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

(9 August 2012)

On 5 January 2012 France notified the Commission and the 26 Member States via the RASFF <sup>(1)</sup> concerning the presence of GM rice not authorised in the EU in a consignment of basmati rice imported from Pakistan and India.

The French authorities, who are legally obliged to follow up in tracing and removing any contaminated product from the market, carried out an investigation. The results of this investigation were that remaining stocks of the contaminated basmati rice were removed from the market, and that the importing company instigated additional controls on subsequent imports, which were negative. The investigation also concluded that due to the mixing of lots at the point of import the exact origin of the contaminated lot could not be conclusively established.

The Commission held a meeting with the Indian authorities in January 2012, where they stated that no GM rice is cultivated on their territory, and that no permits are granted for GM rice development and field trials. This position was further confirmed in an official letter from the Indian authorities received on 6 July 2012.

The alert was put on the agenda of all meetings of the SCFCAH <sup>(2)</sup> since January 2012. No further alerts have been issued by any Member State concerning lots of basmati rice contaminated with non-authorised GM rice originating from India.

The Commission and Member States will continue to closely monitor the situation to ensure that non-authorised GMOs do not enter the food and feed chain in the EU.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed.

<sup>(2)</sup> Standing Committee on the food chain and animal health.



(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-006079/12**  
**adresată Comisiei**  
**Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**  
(19 iunie 2012)

*Subiect:* Regimul fiscal al subvențiilor agricole

Autoritățile române consideră că, în cazul societăților comerciale cu activitate în domeniul agriculturii, subvențiile agricole sunt venituri impozabile, fiind supuse impozitului pe profit și taxei pe valoarea adăugată; aplicarea acestui principiu este contestată de societățile comerciale, care consideră că sunt discriminate față de proprietarii persoane fizice, nesupuși impozitului.

Care este punctul de vedere oficial al Comisiei cu privire la această dispută?

**Răspuns dat de dl Ciolos în numele Comisiei**  
(13 august 2012)

În ceea ce privește impozitarea directă și în absența unor măsuri specifice de armonizare, statele membre dispun în continuare, în principiu, de libertatea de a-și concepe sistemele fiscale așa cum consideră că este cel mai bine, cu o singură condiție, aceea de a respecta normele generale prevăzute de tratate. Acest lucru este valabil și în cazul unui sistem în care subvențiile fac obiectul impozitării directe pentru unii contribuabili, iar pentru alții, nu. În condițiile în care legislația Uniunii Europene nu prevede norme specifice cu privire la tratamentul subvențiilor UE în contextul impozitării directe, simplul fapt că subvențiile sunt supuse impozitării directe nu contravine legislației UE.

Directiva TVA <sup>(1)</sup> oferă o definiție generală a termenului „persoană impozabilă” <sup>(2)</sup> — „orice persoană care, în mod independent, desfășoară în orice loc orice activitate economică” — nefăcând așadar distincție între persoanele fizice și cele juridice. Conceptul de „activitate economică” include și activitățile din agricultură.

Tratamentul subvențiilor în materie de TVA depinde de tipul subvenției. Dat fiind faptul că distinsul membru nu a precizat despre ce tip de subvenții este vorba, Comisia nu este în măsură să ofere un răspuns precis cu privire la acest aspect. Este, totuși, de reținut faptul că, în conformitate cu dispozițiile Directivei TVA <sup>(3)</sup>, așa cum au fost interpretate de Curtea de Justiție <sup>(4)</sup>, subvențiile pot fi supuse TVA în anumite condiții.

<sup>(1)</sup> Directiva 2006/112/CE a Consiliului din 28 noiembrie 2006 privind sistemul comun al taxei pe valoarea adăugată, JO L 347, 11.12.2006, p.1.

<sup>(2)</sup> Articolul 9 alineatul (1).

<sup>(3)</sup> Articolul 73.

<sup>(4)</sup> Hotărârea Curții din 22 noiembrie 2001 în Cauza C-184/00, Office des produits wallons, punctul 18.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006079/12  
to the Commission**

**Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**

(19 June 2012)

*Subject:* Taxation of farm subsidies

The Romanian authorities take the view that, with regard to businesses in the agricultural sector, farm subsidies are taxable, being subject to corporate tax and value added tax. This is being disputed by the businesses concerned, which argue that this constitutes discrimination against them since they are being treated less favourably than owners who are natural persons and exempt from tax.

What is the Commission's official view regarding this dispute?

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

(13 August 2012)

As regards direct taxation, and in the absence of specific harmonisation measures Member States remain in principle free to design their tax systems as they see fit, provided only that they comply with the general rules set out in the Treaties. The same would apply in regard to a system in which subsidies are subject to direct tax in regard to some taxpayers, but not in regard to others. Since there are no specific European Union rules on the treatment of EU subsidies for direct taxation purposes, the mere fact that subsidies are subject to direct taxation is not contrary to EC law.

The VAT Directive <sup>(1)</sup> offers a broad definition of the term 'taxable person' <sup>(2)</sup> as 'any person who, independently, carries out in any place any economic activity', thus not distinguishing between natural and legal persons. The concept of 'economic activity' encompasses agricultural activities.

The VAT treatment of subsidies depends on the type of subsidy. Given that the Honourable Member did not mention the type of subsidies concerned, the Commission is not in a position to provide a specific answer on this aspect. Note, however, that in accordance with the provisions of the VAT Directive <sup>(3)</sup> as interpreted by the Court of Justice <sup>(4)</sup>, subsidies can under certain conditions be subject to VAT.

---

<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> Article 9(1).

<sup>(3)</sup> Article 73.

<sup>(4)</sup> Judgment of the Court of 22 November 2001 in Case C-184/00, Office des produits wallons, paragraph 18.

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-006080/12**  
**adresată Comisiei**  
**Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**  
(19 iunie 2012)

*Subiect:* Excluderea copiilor de altă naționalitate decât cea italiană din grădinițele centrale

Organismul însărcinat cu administrarea regională a sistemului de învățământ din localitatea Borgomanero (Novara, Italia) intenționează să includă cetățenia pe primul loc al criteriilor de excludere a copiilor străini din grădinițele centrale; prin aceasta, copiii cetățenilor UE de altă origine decât cea italiană ar putea fi excluși de la participarea la educația de calitate, în zone aflate în proximitatea domiciliului.

Decizia propusă încalcă legislația italiană, care prevede că „minorii străini prezenți pe teritoriul național au dreptul la educație în forma și modurile prevăzute pentru cetățenii italieni” (Decretul prezidențial 394 din 1999).

Comisia este rugată să prezinte un punct de vedere oficial cu privire la conformitatea unei astfel de decizii cu legislația europeană împotriva discriminării.

**Răspuns dat de dna Vassiliou în numele Comisiei**  
(9 august 2012)

Comisia a primit deja mai multe plângeri cu privire la acest subiect și în prezent examinează conformitatea cu legislația UE a poziției respectivei autorități regionale responsabile pentru educație. În așteptarea rezultatului anchetei sale, Comisia amintește deocamdată că articolul 18 din Tratatul privind funcționarea Uniunii Europene interzice orice discriminare pe motiv de cetățenie sau naționalitate în domeniul de aplicare al tratatului. Întrucât condițiile de acces la educație intră în domeniul de aplicare al tratatului, se pot ridica îndoieli cu privire la compatibilitatea unei astfel de poziții cu legislația UE. În orice caz, Comisia va informa distinsul membru cu privire la rezultatul acestei anchete.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006080/12  
to the Commission**

**Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**

(19 June 2012)

*Subject:* Exclusion of non-Italian children from central kindergartens

The regional education authority responsible for Borgomanero (Novara, Italy) has announced its intention of making access to central kindergartens dependent on citizenship as the main criterion, thereby excluding non-Italian children. As a result, children of non-Italian EU citizens could be deprived of decent education in areas situated near their home.

The proposed decision infringes Italian law, which stipulates that 'foreign minors present on national territory are entitled to the same form of education and the same education arrangements as Italian nationals' (Presidential decree 394 of 1999).

Can the Commission make known its official position regarding the conformity of such a decision with EU anti-discrimination law?

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

(9 August 2012)

The Commission has already received several complaints on this matter and is currently investigating the conformity of the position of the said regional educational authority with EC law provisions. Pending the outcome of its investigation, the Commission would only recall at this point that Article 18 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union forbids any discrimination on grounds of nationality within the scope of the Treaty. Since the conditions of access to education fall within the scope of the Treaty, such a position may therefore raise doubts about its compatibility with EC law. In any case, the Commission will keep the Honourable Member informed of the outcome of its investigation.

---

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006082/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**María Eleni Koppa (S&D)**  
(19 Ιουνίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Υποστήριξη των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων των Παλαιστίνιων απεργών πείνας

Πριν καν συμπληρωθεί ένας μήνας από την υπογραφή της συμφωνίας ανάμεσα στις ισραηλινές σωφρονιστικές αρχές και τους Παλαιστίνιους απεργούς πείνας στις φυλακές του Ισραήλ με σκοπό τη λήξη της απεργίας, οι αρχές παραβίασαν τη συμφωνία πολλές φορές, με αποτέλεσμα την επανεμφάνιση απεργών πείνας στις τάξεις των κρατουμένων. Η συμφωνία, που είχε υπογραφεί υπό την επίβλεψη της διεθνούς κοινότητας στις αρχές Μαΐου έπειτα από τη μαζική απεργία πείνας χιλιάδων κρατουμένων, προέβλεπε τη λήξη της απεργίας με αντάλλαγμα τη βελτίωση των συνθηκών κράτησης, τη χορήγηση του δικαιώματος επισκέψεως στις οικογένειές τους (που δεν τους επιτραπήκαν επισκέψεις από το 2007) και την παύση της πρακτικής της διοικητικής κράτησης, μιας επίμαχης διάταξης που επιτρέπει τη φυλάκιση χωρίς απαγγελία κατηγορίας ή χωρίς δικαστική απόφαση για περίοδο έξι μηνών, ανανεώσιμη επ' αόριστον.

Στις 25.4.2012 το ζήτημα αυτό συζητήθηκε στην Επιτροπή Ανθρωπίνων Δικαιωμάτων του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου όπου υπήρξαν και καταγγελίες για βασανιστήρια εκ μέρους Ισραηλινών σωφρονιστικών υπαλλήλων. Παρότι, πράγματι, η υπογραφή της συμφωνίας ανάμεσα στους κρατούμενους και τις αρχές, ήταν ένα ελπιδοφόρο βήμα, δυστυχώς στην πράξη δεν έχει υπάρξει πρόοδος. Όπως καταγγέλλει η Διεθνής Αμνηστία, η διοικητική κράτηση παραμένει εν ενεργεία και τρεις κρατούμενοι ξανάρχισαν την απεργία πείνας, ενώ η κατάσταση της υγείας ενός από αυτούς — του ποδοσφαιριστή Mahmuut al-Sarsak — είναι πλέον κρίσιμη, καθώς δεν έτυχε της απαραίτητης ιατρικής υποστήριξης κατά τη διάρκεια της πολυήμερης απεργίας πείνας (Δ.τ. 15.6.2012).

Με δεδομένη τη στάση που οφείλει να τηρεί η ΕΕ απέναντι σε παραβιάσεις ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων, ιδίως όταν προέρχονται από εμπορικούς της εταίρους, όπως το Ισραήλ, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή: προτίθεται να θέσει επιτακτικά το ζήτημα στις ισραηλινές αρχές, προκειμένου να διασφαλισθεί η επιβίωση των απεργών πείνας και να θωρακιστεί η άσκηση των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων των Παλαιστίνιων κρατουμένων;

**Απάντηση της Υπατης Εκπροσώπου/Αντιπροέδρου Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(4 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Η ΥΕ/ΑΠ παρακολουθεί εκ του σύνεγγυς την εφαρμογή της συμφωνίας που επετεύχθη μεταξύ των σωφρονιστικών αρχών του Ισραήλ και των εκπροσώπων των παλαιστίνιων κρατουμένων. Στις 14 Μαΐου, η ΥΕ/ΑΠ απηύθυνε παραίτηση σε αμφότερα τα μέρη να συμμορφωθούν με τη συμφωνία και να εξασφαλίσουν την ταχεία εφαρμογή της.

Είναι πολύ νωρίς για να αξιολογηθούν οι μακροπρόθεσμες προοπτικές της συμφωνίας με την οποία δόθηκε τέλος στην ευρείας κλίμακας απεργία πείνας παλαιστίνιων κρατουμένων σε ισραηλινές φυλακές. Σημειώθηκε κάποια πρόοδος προς την κατεύθυνση της πλήρους εφαρμογής της συμφωνίας. Η πρακτική της απομόνωσης κρατουμένων περιορίσθηκε σημαντικά, και πραγματοποιούνται πλέον επισκέψεις συγγενών από τη λωρίδα της Γάζας. Η ΥΕ/ΑΠ εμμένει στην παραίτησή της προς αμφότερα τα μέρη να συμμορφωθούν με τις εκατέρωθεν υποχρεώσεις τους ώστε να εξασφαλιστεί η βελτίωση της ασφάλειας και των συνθηκών διαβίωσης στις ισραηλινές φυλακές.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006082/12  
to the Commission  
Maria Eleni Koppa (S&D)  
(19 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Upholding the human rights of Palestinian hunger strikers

Less than one month from the signature of an agreement between the Israeli prison authorities and Palestinian inmates with a view to ending a hunger strike by the latter, the Israeli authorities have repeatedly infringed the agreement, leading to resumption of the action. The agreement, which was signed under the supervision of the international community at the beginning of May following a massive hunger strike by thousands of inmates, sought to end the hunger strike in return for improved prison conditions, visiting rights for prisoners' families (who had not been allowed to visit since 2007) and an end to administrative detention, a controversial provision authorising imprisonment without charge or sentence for a six-month period renewable indefinitely.

On 25 April 2012, the matter was discussed in the European Parliament's Subcommittee on Human Rights, with allegations being made of torture by Israeli prison officers. While the signature of the agreement between the inmates and the authorities was in effect a promising development, it has unfortunately remained a dead letter. As pointed out by Amnesty International, the practice of administrative detention is continuing and three inmates have recommenced their hunger strike, the state of health of one of them — the footballer Mahmoud Sarsak — is now critical, since he did not receive the necessary medical attention during his long hunger strike (press release of 15 June 2012).

In view of the stance which ought to be taken by the EU in response to human rights infringements, particularly those committed by trading partners such as Israel, does the Commission intend to raise this matter with the Israeli authorities as a matter of urgency, with a view to ensuring the survival of the hunger strikers and upholding in practice the rights of Palestinian prison inmates?

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

The HR/VP has been following closely the implementation of the agreement reached between the Israeli prison authorities and representatives of Palestinian prisoners. On 14 May, the HR/VP urged both sides to abide by the agreement and ensure its speedy implementation.

It is too early to assess long term prospects for the agreement that ended the large scale hunger strike by Palestinian prisoners in Israeli prisons. Some Progress has been made towards the full implementation of the agreement. The practice of solitary confinement has been radically curtailed and family visits from Gaza are now taking place. The HR/VP continues to urge both sides to abide by their respective commitments to ensure improved security and living conditions in Israeli jails.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006083/12  
to the Commission  
David Martin (S&D)  
(19 June 2012)**

*Subject:* EU-Central Asia 'New Partnership' and human rights

It is five years since the EU adopted its Strategy for a New Partnership with Central Asia. This strategy is intended to step up EU support for human rights in the region. Since it is clear that this strategy has not been effective in improving human rights in the countries concerned, what changes to the strategy are being considered by the Commission?

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

The promotion of human rights and democratisation forms a key part of the EU's Central Asia Strategy. When the strategy was adopted by the European Council in 2007 the EU set out, as a key priority, to strengthen its engagement on human rights in the region and to establish structured human rights dialogues with all five countries (Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan). This was done and the EU is now engaged in regular in-depth dialogue with all five countries on human rights issues of concern. While we are still looking at ways of improving these dialogues they do provide useful venues for raising our concerns and identifying areas where the EU can share its expertise and assist in promoting reforms, including through technical assistance.

The EU is not limiting human rights discussions to these regular human rights dialogues. Our concerns about human rights developments are raised at all levels in our discussions, and the EU will continue to do so. The human rights situation in all five countries remains of serious concern.

The EU is committed to further develop relations and support political, social and economic reforms in the region and human rights continue to form an important part of its agenda. No other international actor is as actively and concretely engaged in human rights promotion in the region as the EU.

---

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-006084/12**  
**aan de Commissie**  
**Auke Zijlstra (NI)**  
(19 juni 2012)

*Betref:* Dierenbeulering in Egypte

Egypte is lid van de OIE: „World Organisation for Animal Health”. Doelstelling van deze organisatie is het wereldwijd bevorderen van dierenwelzijn. In Egypte is daar in de praktijk niets van te merken; in tegendeel zelfs. Op internet circuleert een filmpje, een compilatie van dierenbeulering in Egypte: koeien, schapen e.d. worden met ijzeren buizen doodgeslagen; andere worden levend aan hun poten opgetakeld waarna zij worden afgemaakt; verder worden de dieren met messen doodgestoken.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met de OIE, de doelstelling van deze organisatie <sup>(1)</sup>, het feit dat Egypte hier lid van is <sup>(2)</sup>, en de verschrikkelijke dierenbeulering in Egypte <sup>(3)</sup>?
2. Veroordeelt de Commissie de betreffende dierenbeulering die in het filmpje te zien is?
3. Hebben deze misstanden invloed op het buitenlandbeleid van de EU met Egypte? Zo ja, welke? Zo neen, waarom niet?

**Antwoord van de heer Dalli namens de Commissie**  
(17 augustus 2012)

1. De Commissie heeft van een organisatie voor dierenwelzijn een film over het slachten van dieren <sup>(4)</sup> ontvangen die zou zijn opgenomen in Egypte en andere derde landen.
2. In de film zijn handelingen te zien die krachtens de EU-wetgeving om hygiënische redenen en met het oog op het dierenwelzijn zijn verboden. De wijze waarop de dieren worden behandeld en geslacht is ook strijdig met de Animal Welfare Standards on the Slaughter of Animals <sup>(5)</sup> van de World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE).
3. De Commissie probeert voortdurend het dierenwelzijn internationaal te verbeteren. In de mededeling over de strategie van de Europese Unie voor de bescherming en het welzijn van dieren 2012-2015 <sup>(6)</sup> beklemtoont de Commissie dat het zaak is het dierenwelzijn in bilaterale handelsovereenkomsten op te nemen en het dierenwelzijn op multilateraal niveau te blijven verbeteren (vooral binnen de OIE en de Voedsel- en Landbouworganisatie van de Verenigde Naties).

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.oie.int/about-us/>.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.oie.int/about-us/our-members/member-countries/>.

<sup>(3)</sup> <http://action.ciwf.org.uk/ea-action/action?ea.client.id=119&ea.campaign.id=15211&ea.tracking.id=1174f49c>.

<sup>(4)</sup> <https://www.filesanywhere.com/fs/v.aspx?v=8a70638f616574bcaa69>.

<sup>(5)</sup> [http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=169&L=0&htmfile=chapitre\\_1.7.5.htm](http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=169&L=0&htmfile=chapitre_1.7.5.htm)

<sup>(6)</sup> COM(2012)6 definitief.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006084/12  
to the Commission**

**Auke Zijlstra (NI)**

(19 June 2012)

*Subject:* Cruelty to animals in Egypt

Egypt is a member of the OIE (World Organisation for Animal Health), whose aim is to promote animal welfare worldwide. In practice, one would not guess this fact from seeing what happens in Egypt itself; rather the contrary, indeed. A film clip is circulating on the Internet which presents a compilation of instances of cruelty to animals in Egypt: cows, sheep and other animals are beaten to death with iron pipes; others are strung up alive by their feet and then slaughtered; animals are also stabbed with knives.

1. Is the Commission aware of the OIE, the organisation's aim <sup>(1)</sup>, the fact that Egypt is a member of the organisation <sup>(2)</sup> and the appalling cruelty to animals which goes on in Egypt? <sup>(3)</sup>
2. Does the Commission condemn the cruelty to animals featured in the film clip?
3. Do these abuses influence the EU's foreign policy towards Egypt? If so, how? If not, why not?

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

(17 August 2012)

1. The Commission received from an animal welfare organisation a film <sup>(4)</sup> on the slaughter of animals allegedly taken in Egypt and other third countries.
2. The film shows acts that are prohibited under EC law, both for hygienic and animal welfare reasons. The conditions of handling and slaughter of animals are also contrary to the animal welfare standards on the slaughter of animals <sup>(5)</sup> of the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE).
3. The Commission is constantly working to promote animal welfare internationally. In its communication on the EU strategy for the protection and welfare of animals 2012-2015 <sup>(6)</sup>, the Commission emphasises the needs to continue to include animal welfare in bilateral trade agreements as well as to remain active in promoting animal welfare at a multilateral level, most particularly within the OIE and the Food Agriculture Organisation (FAO).

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.oie.int/about-us/>.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.oie.int/about-us/our-members/member-countries/>.

<sup>(3)</sup> <http://action.ciwf.org.uk/ea-action/action?ea.client.id=119&ea.campaign.id=15211&ea.tracking.id=1174f49c>.

<sup>(4)</sup> <https://www.filesanywhere.com/fs/v.aspx?v=8a70638f616574bcaa69>.

<sup>(5)</sup> [http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=169&L=0&htmlfile=chapitre\\_1.7.5.htm](http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=169&L=0&htmlfile=chapitre_1.7.5.htm)

<sup>(6)</sup> COM(2012)6 final.

(Dansk udgave)

**Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-006086/12**  
**til Kommissionen**  
**Anna Rosbach (ECR)**  
(20. juni 2012)

Om: Fangst af ål

Ålebestanden i Europa er stærkt truet og langt færre gydemodne ål når årligt ud i havet, end EU's handlingsplan foreskriver. Flere miljøorganisationer har opfordret Danmark og Sverige til et totalt stop for ålefiskeriet .

I forbindelse hermed bedes Kommissionen svare på følgende:

1. Hvad er situationen for ålebestanden generelt i Europa, og hvad er de regionale og nationale forskelle i, hvordan ålebestanden har det?
2. Hvilke yderligere tiltag har Kommissionen planer om for at redde den europæiske ål
3. I hvilke EU-lande fanges der stadig ål — og hvor mange fanges der i hvert land?
4. Hvis den nuværende udvikling fortsætter, hvordan mener Kommissionen da at situationen vil se ud for den europæiske ål om 10 år?
5. Hvad vil et 3-årigt midlertidigt totalt stop for ålefiskeriet i henholdsvis Danmark, Sverige og hele EU betyde for ålebestanden i Europa?
6. Hvorledes vurderer Kommissionen miljøorganisationernes opfordring til Danmark og Sverige?

**Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Maria Damanaki**  
(13. september 2012)

1. Den europæiske ålebestand, som er en enkelt bestand, betragtes generelt som værende i meget dårlig forfatning. Antallet af ungal, der vandrer op i floder og søer, har de seneste år ligget på mellem 1 og 5 % af den bestand, der eksisterede før 1980'erne.
2. Forordning (EF) nr. 1100/2007 <sup>(1)</sup> fastsætter et mål, der skal gøre det muligt for 40 % af biomassen af voksne ål at undslippe til deres gydesteder. Medlemsstaterne har gennem deres åleforvaltningsplaner gennemført adskillige foranstaltninger, både inden og uden for fiskeriområdet, for at nå dette mål. Forud for vedtagelsen er disse planer blevet vurderet af ICES <sup>(2)</sup> og Kommissionen. De fremskridt, der er sket i forbindelse med gennemførelse af forordningen, er ved at blive evalueret. På baggrund af konklusionen vil Kommissionen fremsætte et ændringsforslag for at sikre genopretning af bestanden. Den europæiske ål figurerer desuden på listen i bilag II til CITES <sup>(3)</sup>, som forbyder handel med ål ind i og ud af EU.
3. Kommissionen fremsender bilag <sup>(4)</sup> med en tabel over de efterspurgte informationer. Tabellen indeholder de oplysninger, som er fremsendt af medlemsstaterne inden for rammerne af CITES.
4. Ud fra tilgængelige videnskabelige informationer ville udviklingen i ålebestanden uden gennemførelsen af åleforordningen og indførelsen af CITES's handelsforbud kunne have ført til bestandens kollaps. Kommissionen er nu i færd med at undersøge resultaterne af gennemførelsen af forordningen og handelsforbuddet, før der kan afgives et bud på, hvordan bestandens situation vil være om 10 år.
5. De tilgængelige informationer gør det muligt for Kommissionen at vurdere effekten af et totalt fiskeriforbud af ål i en given medlemsstat eller område.
6. Et midlertidigt totalforbud mod ålefiskeri vil kunne have en positiv effekt på bestanden, men det vil være svært at måle denne effekt på grundlag af den nuværende videnskabelige viden.

<sup>(1)</sup> EUT L 248 af 22.9.2007, s. 17.

<sup>(2)</sup> Det Internationale Havundersøgelseråd.

<sup>(3)</sup> Konvention om international handel med udryddelsestruede vilde dyr og planter.

<sup>(4)</sup> Bilaget sendes direkte til det ærede medlem og Parlamentets sekretariat.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006086/12  
to the Commission  
Anna Rosbach (ECR)  
(20 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Eel fishing

Eel stocks in Europe are seriously endangered and far fewer mature eels are reaching the sea each year than prescribed in the EU Action Plan. A number of environmental organisations have called on Denmark and Sweden to impose a total ban on eel fishing.

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

1. What is the situation regarding eel stocks in general in Europe, and what regional and national differences are there in the state of eel stocks?
2. What further actions are planned by the Commission to save the European eel?
3. In which EU Member States are eels still being caught — and how many are caught in each country?
4. If the current trend continues, how does the Commission see the situation facing the European eel in 10 years time?
5. What will a temporary 3-year total ban on eel fishing in Denmark, Sweden and the EU as a whole respectively signify for eel stocks in Europe?
6. What does the Commission think of the environmental organisations' plea to Denmark and Sweden?

**Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission  
(13 September 2012)**

1. The stock of European eel, which is a single stock, is considered to be in very poor shape across the board. In recent years, recruitment of juvenile eel into rivers and lakes is fluctuating between 1% and 5% of pre-1980 levels.
2. Regulation (EC) No 1100/2007 <sup>(1)</sup> establishes a target that allows 40% of the biomass of adult eels to escape towards their spawning grounds. Various fishery and non-fishery-related measures have been implemented by the Member States via their eel management plans in order to achieve this target. The plans were assessed by ICES <sup>(2)</sup> and by the Commission prior to their adoption. The progress achieved via the implementation of the regulation is currently under evaluation. Based on its outcome, the Commission may propose an amendment in order to ensure the recovery of the stock. European eel is also listed in Annex II of CITES <sup>(3)</sup>, which prohibits its trade into and out of the EU.
3. The Commission is sending in annex <sup>(4)</sup> a table containing the information requested. It contains data submitted by the Member States within the CITES framework.
4. Based on the available scientific information, the trend in the eel stock prior to the implementation of the eel regulation and the CITES trade ban could have led to a collapse of the stock. The Commission is now examining the results of the implementation of the regulation and of the trade ban before making any estimations as to the state of the stock 10 years from now.
5. The information available does allow the Commission to estimate the effect of a total fishing ban on eel in any Member State or areas.
6. A temporary total ban on eel fishing could have a positive effect on the stock, but this effect would be difficult to quantify based on current scientific knowledge.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 248/17, 22.9.2007.

<sup>(2)</sup> International Council for the Exploration of the Seas.

<sup>(3)</sup> Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species.

<sup>(4)</sup> The annex is sent directly to the Honourable Member and to the Secretariat of Parliament.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006087/12  
an die Kommission  
Angelika Werthmann (NI)  
(20. Juni 2012)**

*Betrifft:* Verlassene Liegenschaften aufgrund der Krise

Auf Grund der anhaltenden Wirtschaftskrise und hohen Arbeitslosigkeit ist in den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika eine hohe Abwanderung aus den Gemeinden festzustellen. Daraus resultiert allerdings auch, dass Häuser, für welche die Unkosten nicht mehr bezahlt werden können, einfach hinterlassen werden, um die sich dann die einzelnen Gemeinden kümmern müssen.

Ist der Kommission eine ähnliche Situation in den von der Krise am härtesten betroffenen Ländern (wie Griechenland/Spanien) bekannt beziehungsweise gibt es Abschätzungen für eine solche Eventualität?

Wie sehen allfällige Vorgehensweisen für eine solche Eventualität aus? Gibt es bereits Pläne, es erst gar nicht so weit kommen zu lassen?

**Antwort von Herrn Andor im Namen der Kommission  
(3. August 2012)**

Viele EU-Regionen sind von der Bevölkerungsabwanderung betroffen, und diese Entwicklung wird sich voraussichtlich in den nächsten Jahrzehnten fortsetzen. Infolge der Krise ist die Abwanderungsbewegung zum Teil stärker geworden<sup>(1)</sup> und in einigen neuen Regionen, die zuvor stabil waren oder ein Bevölkerungswachstum verzeichneten, sanken die Bevölkerungszahlen durch Auswanderung<sup>(2)</sup>.

In Griechenland werden die Häuser trotz der zunehmenden Auswanderung im Zusammenhang mit der Krise zumeist nicht aufgegeben, hauptsächlich dank enger familiärer Bindungen; das griechische Recht gewährt Hausbesitzern einen gewissen Schutz im Falle von Schwierigkeiten mit Kreditrückzahlungen. In Lettland und Litauen konnte der Markt trotz massiver Bevölkerungsabwanderung die aufgegebenen oder unfertigen Immobilien wieder absorbieren. In Irland dagegen gibt es zahlreiche Immobilien, die in verschiedenen Stadien der Fertigstellung aufgegeben wurden und nun eine Belastung für die lokale Gemeinschaft darstellen.

Die Förderung von Beschäftigung und die Unterstützung der betroffenen Länder auf ihrem Weg aus der Krise sind unverzichtbar, damit Auswanderer zurückkehren und neue Häuser erwerben oder die bisherigen Immobilien wieder in Besitz nehmen können. Der ESF<sup>(3)</sup> unterstützt diese Bemühungen durch aktive Arbeitsmarktmaßnahmen. Die europäische Kohäsionspolitik insgesamt unterstützt die Mitgliedstaaten und Regionen durch Investitionen in intelligentes, nachhaltiges und inklusives Wachstum auf deren Hoheitsgebiet.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Einige Regionen in den baltischen Staaten.

<sup>(2)</sup> Irland, dann Griechenland und Spanien.

<sup>(3)</sup> Europäischer Sozialfonds.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006087/12  
to the Commission  
Angelika Werthmann (NI)  
(20 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Properties abandoned as a result of the crisis

Due to the continuing economic crisis and high unemployment, many people in the United States have moved out of the areas in which they used to live. A knock-on effect of this is that properties in which people can no longer afford to live are simply abandoned and the local authority has to look after them.

Is the Commission aware of a similar situation in the EU countries hardest hit by the crisis (such as Greece and Spain) and have any assessments been made of the likelihood of such a situation arising?

What would the procedures be for dealing with such an eventuality? Are there already plans to prevent the situation reaching this point?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission  
(3 August 2012)**

Population loss has been affecting many EU regions and is expected to continue for the next decades. As an effect of the crisis, some population loss has become faster <sup>(1)</sup> and the population in some new regions, previously stable or increasing, have undergone losses to emigration <sup>(2)</sup>.

In Greece, although emigration seems to have increased in the wake of the crisis, homes appear not to be abandoned, mainly thanks to close family ties; the Greek law grants some protection to home-owners with difficulties with loan repayment. In Latvia and Lithuania, in spite of massive depopulation, the market has been able to reabsorb abandoned or unfinished homes. In Ireland, there is indeed a significant number of homes abandoned at various stages of completion; these are a burden to their local communities.

Fostering employment and helping these countries out of the crisis is key to allow emigrants to return and enable them to afford to (re-)acquire homes. The ESF <sup>(3)</sup> supports this effort through active labour market measures. The European cohesion policy as a whole supports the Member States and regions with investments in smart, sustainable and inclusive growth in their territory.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Some regions in the Baltic States.  
<sup>(2)</sup> In Ireland, then Greece and Spain.  
<sup>(3)</sup> European Social Fund.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006088/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**  
(20. Juni 2012)

*Betrifft:* Erhöhung in der Rubrik 4

Es ist geplant, die Ausgaben im Bereich Außenbeziehungen von 5,7 auf 6,8 % des Gesamtfinanzrahmens zu erhöhen.

Wie lässt sich dies jedoch nun im Zuge der jüngsten — dramatischen — Entwicklung in der Europäischen Union (Spanien, Zypern brauchen die Hilfe des ESM, Italien „wackelt“) in der Tat verwirklichen, insbesondere vor dem Hintergrund u. a. der hohen Jugendarbeitslosigkeit in manchen Mitgliedstaaten der EU sowie der notwendigen verstärkten Investitionen in den Arbeitsmarkt im Allgemeinen?

**Antwort von Herrn Lewandowski im Namen der Kommission**  
(9. August 2012)

Im Vorschlag der Kommission für den nächsten mehrjährigen Finanzrahmen (MFR) ist vorgesehen, dass die jährlichen Gesamtausgaben für den Zeitraum 2014-2020 in realen Werten konstant auf dem Niveau von 2013 des derzeitigen MFR bleiben werden. Innerhalb dieses Gesamtrahmens schlägt die Kommission einen Haushalt vor, mit dem die Ausgaben zur Förderung eines intelligenten, nachhaltigen und integrativen Wachstums neu ausgerichtet und Maßnahmen finanziert werden sollen, die auf EU-Ebene wirtschaftlicher oder wirksamer durchgeführt werden können.

Die vorgeschlagene Aufstockung der Mittel für den Außenbereich im nächsten MFR spiegelt die im Vertrag von Lissabon festgelegten Ziele der Europäischen Union wider, das Amt des Hohen Vertreters, der gleichzeitig Vizepräsident der Kommission ist, und den Europäischen Auswärtigen Dienst (EAD) zur Unterstützung des Hohen Vertreters zu schaffen.

Die gegenwärtige Wirtschaftskrise verdeutlicht die Notwendigkeit engerer und intensiverer Beziehungen Europas zu seinen Partnern, denn sie haben einen wesentlichen Einfluss auf die finanziellen und wirtschaftlichen Aussichten Europas. Europa muss mehr denn je nach außen blicken und sich in der Welt einbringen. Europas Sicherheit und Wohlstand hängen davon ab, was jenseits seiner Grenzen geschieht, wie die jüngsten Entwicklungen im südlichen Mittelmeerraum aufzeigen.

Die vorgeschlagene Aufstockung ist außerdem notwendig, damit die EU ihre förmliche Zusage einhält, 0,7 % des BNE bis 2015 für die öffentliche Entwicklungshilfe bereitzustellen. Der Beitrag aus dem EU-Haushalt zu den gemeinsamen Anstrengungen der EU wird daher beibehalten, was einen entscheidenden Schritt zur Verwirklichung der Millennium-Entwicklungsziele darstellt.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006088/12  
to the Commission**

**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**

(20 June 2012)

*Subject:* Increase under heading 4

It is planned to increase expenditure in the area of external relations from 5.7% to 6.8% of the overall budget.

How can this in fact be achieved, however, in the wake of the latest, dramatic, developments in the European Union (Spain and Cyprus need ESM aid, Italy is teetering on the brink), especially in the light of such problems as the high youth unemployment rate in many EU Member States and the need for greater investment in the labour market in general?

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

(9 August 2012)

The Commission proposal for the next Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) means that overall annual spending over the period 2014-2020 will be stabilised at the 2013 level of the current MFF in real terms. Within this overall framework the Commission is proposing a budget to reorient spending in order to promote smart, sustainable and inclusive growth and to fund activities that can be done more economically or effectively at the EU level.

The proposed increase for external spending in the next MFF reflects the ambitions set out for the European Union in the Lisbon Treaty, which creates the post of High Representative who is also a Vice-President of the Commission, and establishes the European External Action Service (EEAS) to support the High Representative.

The present economic crisis underlines the need for Europe to have deeper and stronger relations with its partners, as they have a major impact on Europe's financial and economic prospects. Europe must more than ever look outwards and engage in the world. Our security and prosperity depend on what happens beyond our borders, which is illustrated by the recent developments in the Southern Mediterranean.

The proposed increase is also necessary in order to respect the EU's formal undertaking to commit 0.7% of gross national income by 2015 to Official Development Assistance (ODA). Thus it maintains the contribution of the EU budget to the common effort made by the EU as a whole, and makes a decisive step towards achieving the Millennium Development Goals.

---

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006089/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Georgios Papastamkos (PPE)**  
(20 Ιουνίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Small Business Act — Απεσταλμένος των Μικρομεσαίων Επιχειρήσεων

Βάσει της Ανακοίνωσης της Επιτροπής με τίτλο «Ανασκόπηση της πρωτοβουλίας “Small Business Act” για την Ευρώπη» (COM(2011)0078 τελικό), τα κράτη μέλη κλήθηκαν να ορίσουν εθνικό «απεσταλμένο των ΜμΕ».

Μπορεί να μου παραθέσει η Επιτροπή τον κατάλογο των ορισθέντων από τα κράτη μέλη ως απεσταλμένων για τις Μικρομεσαίες Επιχειρήσεις; Ποία η ιδιότητα των εν λόγω προσώπων; Πρόκειται για στελέχη της δημόσιας διοίκησης, εκπροσώπους επιχειρηματικών φορέων, εμπειρογνώμονες;

**Απάντηση του κ. Tajani εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(31 Ιουλίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει τον κ. βουλευτή στον διαδικτυακό τόπο του Δικτύου Απεσταλμένων για τις ΜΜΕ, ο οποίος περιέχει τα ονόματα όλων των εθνικών απεσταλμένων και, εφόσον υπάρχουν, των επίσημων αναπληρωτών τους: [http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/small-business-act/sme-envoy/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/small-business-act/sme-envoy/index_en.htm)

Όλοι οι αντιπρόσωποι για τις ΜΜΕ είναι κυβερνητικοί εκπρόσωποι και κατέχουν ανώτερες θέσεις στις εθνικές τους διοικήσεις. Ορισμένοι αντιπρόσωποι είναι μέλη κυβερνήσεων (υπουργοί, υφυπουργοί), άλλοι είναι ανώτεροι διοικητικοί υπάλληλοι. Η Επιτροπή θέλει να υπογραμμίσει ότι η αφοσίωση και η εμπειρογνομosύνη αυτών των υψηλού επιπέδου προσωπικοτήτων συνέβαλαν στη διαμόρφωση της πολιτικής για τις ΜΜΕ και στην προβολή της τόσο σε επίπεδο ΕΕ όσο και σε επίπεδο κρατών μελών. Η Επιτροπή αναμένει ότι θα συνεχιστεί η καλή συνεργασία με τα μέλη αυτού του δικτύου. Θέλει, επίσης, να επισημάνει ότι τις συνεδριάσεις παρακολουθούν και εκπρόσωποι επιχειρηματικών οργανώσεων της ΕΕ, όπως η UEAPME<sup>(1)</sup>, η Eurochambers και η BusinessEurope. Έτσι δίνεται η δυνατότητα άμεσης και ζωηρής ανταλλαγής απόψεων και αυξάνεται η αποτελεσματικότητα του δικτύου.

(<sup>1</sup>) Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση Βιοτεχνικών και Μικρομεσαίων Επιχειρήσεων.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006089/12  
to the Commission  
Georgios Papastamkos (PPE)  
(20 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Small Business Act SME Envoy

Following the communication from the Commission entitled 'Review of the Small Business Act for Europe' (COM(2011)0078 final), Member States were called on to designate an 'SME Envoy'.

Can the Commission provide a list of those designated by Member States as SME Envoy? What are the requisites for this post? Are those designated public servants, business representatives or experts?

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

The Commission would like to draw the attention of the Honourable Member to the website of the SME Envoy Network which contains the names of all national Envoys and, where applicable, their official deputies: [http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/small-business-act/sme-envoy/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/small-business-act/sme-envoy/index_en.htm).

All SME Envoys are governmental representatives and occupy a senior position in their national administration. Some Envoys are members of government (Ministers and State Secretaries), others are senior level administrators. The Commission would like to underline that the dedication and expertise of these high-level personalities has helped shaping the SME policy and make it more visible both at the EU level and in Member States. The Commission looks forward to continuing the good cooperation with the members of this network. It would like to point out that the meetings are also attended by a number of representatives from EU business organisations, such as UEAPME <sup>(1)</sup>, Eurochambers and BusinessEurope. This allows a very direct and lively exchange of views and increases the efficiency of the network.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> The European Association of Craft, Small and Medium-sized Enterprises.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006090/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**  
(20. Juni 2012)

*Betrifft:* Lungenkrebs durch Dieselabgase — Auswirkungen der Gesundheitskosten auf den EU-Haushalt

Laut einer von der Weltgesundheitsorganisation in Auftrag gegebenen Studie des Internationalen Krebsforschungszentrums (IARC) verursachen Dieselabgase Lungenkrebs und wirken sogar stärker krebserregend als Passivrauchen. Darüber hinaus bestehen Anhaltspunkte für einen Zusammenhang zwischen Dieselabgasen und Blasenkrebs. Dieselabgase werden nunmehr als Karzinogene der Gruppe 1 eingestuft.

1. Welche Gesamtauswirkungen auf den EU-Haushalt haben die Gesundheitskosten infolge von Lungenkrebs, der auf Dieselabgase zurückzuführen ist?
2. Wird die Kommission einen erneuten Vorschlag zur Besteuerung von CO<sub>2</sub>-Emissionen einbringen? Wenn ja: Wann wird diese Maßnahme eingeleitet werden? Wenn nicht, wird die Kommission gebeten, ihre Gründe, eine solche Maßnahme nicht zu ergreifen, ausführlich zu erläutern.

**Antwort von Herrn Dalli im Namen der Kommission**  
(14. August 2012)

Gesundheitskosten sind nicht Bestandteil des EU-Haushalts, sondern fallen in die Zuständigkeit der Mitgliedstaaten.

Im EU-Haushalt sind Gesundheitskosten nur indirekt durch die Krankenversicherung der EU-Bediensteten abgedeckt. Dazu zählen Kosten, die mit Lungenkrebs aufgrund von Dieselabgasen in Zusammenhang stehen können. Daher kann die Kommission die Frage nach den Gesamtauswirkungen auf den EU-Haushalt nicht beantworten. Der Kommission ist ferner keine Studie bekannt, die genaue statistische Angaben zu Fällen von ausschließlich durch Dieselabgase verursachtem Lungenkrebs oder eine anerkannte Methode zur Berechnung von Gesundheitskosten aufgrund von Lungenkrebs enthielte, der auf Dieselabgase zurückzuführen ist.

Am 13. April 2011 hat die Kommission einen Vorschlag zur Überarbeitung der Richtlinie (EG) Nr. 2003/96 des Rates <sup>(1)</sup> angenommen, nach dem eine Besteuerung von Energieerzeugnissen, die als Heiz- oder Kraftstoff verwendet werden, entsprechend ihrem CO<sub>2</sub>- und Energiegehalt vorgesehen ist. Dieser Vorschlag wird derzeit im Rat erörtert. Das Europäische Parlament verabschiedete am 18. April 2012 eine Stellungnahme zu dem Vorschlag.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> KOM(2011)169.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006090/12  
to the Commission  
Angelika Werthmann (NI)  
(20 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Diesel fumes causing lung cancer — the impact of health costs on the EU budget

According to a study by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) initiated by the World Health Organisation, diesel fumes cause lung cancer and are even more carcinogenic than second-hand cigarette smoke. There is also evidence linking diesel fumes to bladder cancer. Diesel fumes are now classified as group I carcinogens.

In light of the above:

1. What is the overall impact on the EU budget of the health costs associated with lung cancer caused by diesel fumes?
2. Is the Commission going to reintroduce a proposal to tax CO<sub>2</sub> emissions? If so, when will the next initiative be taken? If not, can the Commission give a detailed account of its reasons for not taking such an initiative?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission  
(14 August 2012)**

Healthcare costs do not fall under the EU budget, but are under the responsibility of Member States.

The EU budget only covers health costs indirectly, through the sickness insurance of EU employees. This includes costs that may be associated with lung cancer caused by diesel fumes. Therefore, the Commission is not able to answer the question on the overall impact on the EU budget. The Commission is also not aware of any study that would provide the exact statistics on lung cancer cases caused by diesel fumes alone, or any established methodology to calculate health costs of lung cancer caused by diesel fumes.

On 13 April 2011 the Commission adopted a proposal for revision of Council Directive (EC) No 2003/96<sup>(1)</sup> which envisages taxing energy products used as heating or motor fuel according to their CO<sub>2</sub>- and energy content. This proposal is still under discussion in the Council. The European Parliament adopted an opinion on the proposal on 18 April 2012.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2011) 169.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006091/12  
an die Kommission  
Angelika Werthmann (NI)  
(20. Juni 2012)**

*Betrifft:* Lungenkrebs durch Dieselabgase

Laut einer von der Weltgesundheitsorganisation in Auftrag gegebenen Studie des Internationalen Krebsforschungszentrums (IARC) verursachen Dieselabgase Lungenkrebs und wirken sogar stärker krebserregend als Passivrauchen. Darüber hinaus bestehen Anhaltspunkte für einen Zusammenhang zwischen Dieselabgasen und Blasenkrebs. Dieselabgase werden nunmehr als Karzinogene der Gruppe 1 eingestuft.

1. Ist der Kommission dieses Problem bekannt?
2. Welche Schritte gedenkt die Kommission angesichts dieser Ergebnisse zu unternehmen?
3. Kann die Kommission einen Überblick über die Lage in den Mitgliedstaaten geben?

**Antwort von Herrn Tajani im Namen der Kommission  
(10. August 2012)**

1.-2. Die Kommission verweist die Frau Abgeordnete hierzu auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-6147/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

Bei der Überprüfung der thematischen Strategie zur Luftverschmutzung werden zusätzliche Maßnahmen (auf nationaler oder möglicherweise auf EU-Ebene) zur Beschleunigung der stufenweisen Ausmusterung von Altfahrzeugen mit hohen Schadstoffemissionen in Erwägung gezogen.

3. Derzeit hat die Kommission einen guten Überblick über das Vorkommen der wichtigsten Schadstoffe in den Mitgliedstaaten, und insbesondere über Feinstaub, Stickoxide und Ozon, wohingegen zu einzelnen Kohlenwasserstoffen und PAK <sup>(2)</sup> weniger ausführliche Daten vorliegen. Die Europäische Umweltagentur legt jährlich Informationen zur Luftverschmutzung und der damit verbundenen Belastung/Gefährdung der EU-Bevölkerung vor <sup>(3)</sup>. Die Kommission analysiert derzeit die Entwicklungen bei der Luftverschmutzung und die daraus resultierenden Folgen für die Gesundheit der Bürgerinnen und Bürger der EU und wird gegebenenfalls im Rahmen der Überprüfung der Luftreinhaltepolitik 2013 entsprechende Maßnahmen vorschlagen.

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

<sup>(2)</sup> Polyzyklische aromatische Kohlenwasserstoffe.

<sup>(3)</sup> <http://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/air-quality-in-europe-2011>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006091/12  
to the Commission  
Angelika Werthmann (NI)  
(20 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Diesel fumes causing lung cancer

According to a study by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) initiated by the World Health Organisation, diesel fumes cause lung cancer and are even more carcinogenic than second-hand cigarette smoke. There is also evidence linking diesel fumes to bladder cancer. Diesel fumes are now classified as group I carcinogens.

1. Is the Commission aware of this problem?
2. What steps does the Commission intend to take in light of these results?
3. Can the Commission provide an overview of the situation in the Member States?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission  
(10 August 2012)**

1-2. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Question E-6147/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

In the review on the Thematic Strategy of Air Pollution further measures (at national or possibly EU level) to speed up the phasing out of old vehicles with high tailpipe emissions will be considered.

3. Presently, the Commission has a good overview of the occurrence in the Member States of the key pollutants and specifically for particulate matter, nitrogen oxides and ozone, whereas data are less complete for individual hydrocarbons and PAHs <sup>(2)</sup>. The European Environment Agency provides information annually on air pollution and the resulting exposure/risk to EU citizens <sup>(3)</sup>. The Commission is presently reviewing the trends in air pollution and health implications for EU citizens and will come forward with action as appropriate as part of the 2013 air policy review.

---

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

<sup>(2)</sup> Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons.

<sup>(3)</sup> <http://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/air-quality-in-europe-2011>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006092/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE)**

(20 June 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — EU citizens arrested in UAE

An increasing number of EU citizens are being given long prison sentences in the United Arab Emirates for bounced cheques which were written as security for business transactions and were never intended to be cashed. Those arrested can only be released upon repayment of their debts, which is difficult in custody, and suffer under harsh prison conditions in the meantime.

The imprisonment for non-payment of civil debts is banned under Protocol IV of the European Convention on Human Rights and Article 18 of the Arab Charter, which the UAE has signed.

Will the Vice-President/High Representative take up this issue with representatives from the United Arab Emirates to encourage them to change this practice?

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

(27 July 2012)

The Commission wishes to thank the Honourable Member for having brought this issue to its attention, which the EU will take up with the UAE authorities. This will supplement bilateral efforts being made by countries (including EU Member States) whose citizens are serving sentences in Emirati prisons because of these alleged offences.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006093/12  
to the Commission  
David Martin (S&D)  
(20 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Mahmoud Sarsak, Palestinian hunger striker

Mahmoud Sarsak is a young Palestinian footballer who has now been on hunger strike since 19 March 2012. He has been held in an Israeli jail for three years under an administrative detention order despite never having been formally charged or put on trial.

Can the Commission say what efforts are being made by the EU delegation to Israel in order to end Mr Sarsak's hunger strike and ensure that he is either freed or tried.

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

The EU has been closely monitoring Mr Al-Sarsak's detention, up to and including his release on 10 July 2012.

The EU has a long standing concern about the extensive and disproportionate use by Israel of administrative detention. All detainees have the right to be informed of the reasons for their detention and be subject to a fair trial without undue delay. The EU has frequently raised this issue in its dialogue with the Israeli authorities, most recently on 2 May.

---

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006094/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**  
(20. Juni 2012)

*Betrifft:* Mangelernährung in Europa

Aufgrund der Zunahme von Armut und Mangelernährung, die in einer Reihe von Mitgliedstaaten infolge der Wirtschaftskrise zu verzeichnen ist, stellen Frauen eine besonders schutzbedürftige Gruppe dar.

1. Sollten nach Auffassung der Kommission die Mittel aus dem Europäischen Sozialfonds gegenüber dem vorhergehenden Finanzrahmen erhöht werden, um dem Bedarf an Nahrungsmittelhilfe gerecht zu werden?
2. Was kann die Kommission tun, um die Ernährungsversorgung in allen Arten von Einrichtungen im Gesundheits- und Pflegebereich, wie Krankenhäusern und Pflegeheimen, zu verbessern?
3. Welche Auswirkungen wird Mangelernährung, wenn sie mit erhöhter Morbidität, einer längeren Verweildauer im Krankenhaus und höheren Kosten für das Gesundheitswesen verbunden ist, für den EU-Haushalt wie auch unter sozialen Gesichtspunkten haben?
4. Welche Gesundheits- und Ernährungsstrategien beabsichtigt die Kommission zu verwirklichen, um Unter- und Mangelernährung vorzubeugen?

**Antwort von Herrn Dalli im Namen der Kommission**  
(23. August 2012)

- 1) Die Kommission hat in ihrem Vorschlag für den nächsten mehrjährigen Finanzrahmen <sup>(1)</sup> die Schaffung eines neuen Instruments zur Unterstützung bedürftiger Bürgerinnen und Bürger in der Union vorgesehen, das mit 2,5 Mrd. EUR unter der Rubrik 1 (Intelligentes und integratives Wachstum) ausgestattet werden soll. Dieser Vorschlag wurde in dem Verordnungsvorschlag zur Kohäsionspolitik aufgegriffen <sup>(2)</sup>.
- 2) Die Mitgliedstaaten sind für die Leistungen des Gesundheitswesens und der Langzeitpflege zuständig. Die Kommission ist nicht befugt, in die Ernährung in Pflegeeinrichtungen einzugreifen.
- 3) Da für das Gesundheitswesen die Mitgliedstaaten zuständig sind, gehen durch Mangelernährung eventuell verursachte Kosten zu Lasten der nationalen Haushalte, für die die jeweiligen nationalen Behörden verantwortlich sind.
- 4) Die im Weißbuch „Ernährung, Übergewicht, Adipositas“ <sup>(3)</sup> entworfene Strategie für Europa leistet einen Beitrag zur Senkung der Risiken, die mit schlechter Ernährung und mangelnder körperlicher Aktivität zusammenhängen <sup>(4)</sup>. Die Kommission setzt sich zudem durch die Förderung der Entwicklung und des Austauschs beispielhafter Praktiken zwischen den EU-Mitgliedstaaten für die Gleichbehandlung in Gesundheitsfragen ein <sup>(5)</sup>, z. B. mit Projekten, die aus dem Gesundheitsprogramm und dem 7. Forschungsrahmenprogramm finanziert werden. Schließlich fördert die Kommission im Rahmen der Europäischen Innovationspartnerschaft „Aktivität und Gesundheit im Alter“ <sup>(6)</sup> konkrete Maßnahmen von Stakeholdern zur Bekämpfung von Gebrechlichkeit und Mangelernährung.

<sup>(1)</sup> KOM(2011)500 endg. vom 29.6.2011.

<sup>(2)</sup> KOM(2011)615 endg./2 vom 14.3.2012.

<sup>(3)</sup> KOM(2007)279 endg. vom 30.5.2007.

<sup>(4)</sup> Zwischenbericht hier: [http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition\\_physical\\_activity/docs/implementation\\_report\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/docs/implementation_report_en.pdf).

<sup>(5)</sup> Mitteilung „Solidarität im Gesundheitswesen: Abbau gesundheitlicher Ungleichheit in der EU“, KOM(2009)567 endg. vom 20.10.2009.

<sup>(6)</sup> KOM(2012)83 endg. vom 29.2.2012.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006094/12  
to the Commission**

**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**

(20 June 2012)

*Subject:* Malnutrition in Europe

The increase in poverty and malnutrition in a number of Member States as a result of the economic crisis has meant that women are a particularly vulnerable group.

1. In the Commission's view, should appropriations from the European Social Fund be increased relative to the previous financial framework in order to meet food support needs?
2. What can the Commission do to improve nutritional care in all types of care facility, such as hospitals and care homes?
3. If malnutrition is associated with increased morbidity, prolonged hospital stays and higher healthcare costs, what impact will this have on the EU budget, and what will its impact be in social terms?
4. What health and nutrition strategies does the Commission intend to implement with a view to preventing undernourishment and malnutrition?

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

(23 August 2012)

1. The Commission has foreseen — in its proposal for the next multi-annual financial framework <sup>(1)</sup> — the creation of a new instrument to assist deprived citizens of the Union with a budget of EUR2.5 billion under heading 1 (Smart and inclusive growth). This has been taken up in the legislative proposal for cohesion policy <sup>(2)</sup>.
2. Member States are responsible for the delivery of health and long-term care. The Commission does not have the competence to intervene on nutritional care in care facilities.
3. As healthcare is delivered in the Member States, potential costs caused by malnutrition affect national budgets which are the responsibility of national authorities.
4. The strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity-related health issues <sup>(3)</sup> contributes to reducing the risks associated with poor nutrition and limited physical activity <sup>(4)</sup>. The Commission also takes action to address health inequalities <sup>(5)</sup> by facilitating the development and exchange of good practice among EU countries, i.e. through projects funded under the Health Programme and the 7th Research Framework Programme. Furthermore, the Commission is facilitating implementation of concrete actions by stakeholders on frailty and malnutrition under the European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing <sup>(6)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2011) 500 final, 29.6.2011.

<sup>(2)</sup> COM(2011) 615 final/2, 14.3.2012.

<sup>(3)</sup> COM(2007) 279 final.

<sup>(4)</sup> Mid term report at [http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition\\_physical\\_activity/docs/implementation\\_report\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/docs/implementation_report_en.pdf)

<sup>(5)</sup> Communication 'Solidarity in Health: Reducing Health Inequalities in the EU' COM(2009) 567 final.

<sup>(6)</sup> KOM(2012)83 final 29.2.2012.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006096/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**  
(20. Juni 2012)

*Betrifft:* Sexualisierung von Mädchen

Journalisten, Kinderrechtsorganisationen, Eltern und Psychologen argumentieren, dass die Sexualisierung von Mädchen ein zunehmendes und umfassendes Problem ist und eine Gefahr für Mädchen darstellt.

1. Welche Auswirkungen haben Medieninhalte nach Ansicht der Kommission auf Kinder?
2. Kann die Kommission sich dazu äußern, wie sich die Sexualisierung von Mädchen und Frauen ihrer Ansicht nach auf das Wohlergehen von Mädchen auswirkt?
3. Hat die Kommission die vielfältigen Fragen und Probleme im Zusammenhang mit auf Kinder ausgerichteter Werbung geprüft?
4. Welche negativen Auswirkungen hat es nach Auffassung der Kommission, wenn Kinder und Jugendliche Gewalt verherrlichenden interaktiven Medien ausgesetzt sind?
5. Wie lauten die Empfehlungen der Kommission in Bezug auf Forschung, Praxis, Bildung und Ausbildung, Politik und Sensibilisierung der Öffentlichkeit in diesem Bereich?

**Antwort von Frau Kroes im Namen der Kommission**  
(2. August 2012)

Wie bereits in dem Bericht der Kommission zum „Schutz der Kinder in der digitalen Welt“ hervorgehoben, bringt ein verändertes Medienverhalten von Kindern Probleme in Bezug auf deren Schutz mit sich. Für Eltern ist es häufig schwierig, Ratschläge im Zusammenhang mit neuen Technologien zu geben, mit denen sie sich zumeist weniger gut auskennen als ihre Kinder <sup>(1)</sup>.

Der Kommission sind Berichte bekannt, aus denen hervorgeht, dass sich die Hypersexualisierung von Kindern (von der sowohl Mädchen als auch Jungen betroffen sind) negativ auf deren psychische Entwicklung auswirken kann, dass sie eine Bedrohung für die Gleichstellung der Geschlechter beinhaltet, da geschlechtsbezogene Stereotype verstärkt werden, und dass sie potenziell auf unterschiedliche Weise negative Folgen zeitigen kann (schlechtes Bild vom eigenen Körper, Essstörungen, bis hin zu sexueller Gewalt und sexuellem Missbrauch).

Entsprechend der Richtlinie über audiovisuelle Mediendienste <sup>(2)</sup> ist die Ausstrahlung von Programmen (z. B. pornografischen Inhalts), die die Entwicklung von Kindern „ernsthaft beeinträchtigen könnten“, verboten. Audiovisuelle Inhalte auf Abruf, die die Entwicklung von Kindern ernsthaft beeinträchtigen könnten, dürfen nur so bereitgestellt werden, dass Kinder sie normalerweise nicht hören oder sehen. Die Richtlinie enthält auch Vorschriften für die Werbung, insbesondere gilt, dass „audiovisuelle Kommunikation [...] nicht zur körperlichen oder seelischen Beeinträchtigung Minderjähriger führen“ darf.

Im Mai 2012 verabschiedete die Kommission die Mitteilung „Europäische Strategie für ein besseres Internet für Kinder“ <sup>(3)</sup>, die einen Plan enthält, wie Kindern die digitalen Fähigkeiten und Instrumente vermittelt werden sollen (u. a. Medienkompetenz, Instrumente für die Meldung schädlicher Inhalte), die sie benötigen, um das digitale Umfeld sicher nutzen zu können.

Schließlich könnten 2013 im Rahmen des Programms Daphne konkrete Projekte kofinanziert werden, die auf einen Wandel der Einstellungen und des Verhaltens im Zusammenhang mit der Frage der Sexualisierung abzielen und der Gewaltanwendung gegen Kinder, Jugendliche und Frauen vorbeugen sollen. Im Rahmen des Vorschlags für die Fazilität „Connecting Europe“ sollen die Safer-Internet-Zentren unterstützt werden, deren Tätigkeiten auch Informationskampagnen zum Thema Sexualisierung umfassen könnten.

<sup>(1)</sup> KOM(2011)556 endg., siehe: [http://ec.europa.eu/avpolicy/reg/minors/rec/2011\\_report/index\\_de.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/avpolicy/reg/minors/rec/2011_report/index_de.htm)

<sup>(2)</sup> Siehe Richtlinie 2010/13/EU zur Koordinierung bestimmter Rechts- und Verwaltungsvorschriften der Mitgliedstaaten über die Bereitstellung audiovisueller Mediendienste (Richtlinie über audiovisuelle Mediendienste) vom 10. März 2010.

<sup>(3)</sup> KOM(2012)196 endg., siehe: [http://ec.europa.eu/information\\_society/activities/sip/policy/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/sip/policy/index_en.htm)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006096/12  
to the Commission**

**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**

(20 June 2012)

*Subject:* Sexualisation of girls

Journalists, child advocacy organisations, parents and psychologists argue that the sexualisation of girls is an increasing and wide-ranging problem that is harmful to girls.

1. In the Commission's view, what is the impact of media content on children?
2. Could the Commission give its view on how the sexualisation of girls and women may influence girls' well-being?
3. Has the Commission examined the broad issues raised by advertising aimed at children?
4. In the Commission's view, what negative impact does exposure to violent interactive media have on children and young people?
5. What are the Commission's recommendations as regards research, practice, education and training, policy and public awareness in this area?

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

(2 August 2012)

As highlighted in the Commission Report 'Protecting Children in the Digital World', changes in children's use of media bring some challenges regarding their protection. Parents often find it difficult advising in relation to new technologies that are usually less known to them than to their children <sup>(1)</sup>.

The Commission is aware of reports indicating that hypersexualisation of children might have a negative psychological impact on the development of children; that hypersexualisation concerns both girls and boys; that it is a threat to gender equality as it accentuates gender stereotypes and that there are several potential negative impacts ranging from poor body image and eating disorders through to sexual violence and abuse.

According to the Audiovisual Media Services Directive <sup>(2)</sup>, broadcasts (e.g. pornography) which 'might seriously impair' the development of children are prohibited. On-demand audiovisual content which 'might seriously impair' the development of children may only be made available in such a way that children will not normally hear or see it. The directive also sets out rules on advertising, notably 'audiovisual commercial communications shall not cause physical or moral detriment to minors'.

In May 2012 the Commission adopted the communication for a 'Strategy for a Better Internet for Children' <sup>(3)</sup> establishing a plan to give children the digital skills and tools (e.g. media literacy, harmful content reporting tools) they need to safely benefit from the digital world.

Finally, in 2013, the Daphne programme may co-finance specific practical projects that aim to bring about attitudinal and behavioural change in the context of sexualisation, in order to prevent violence against children, young people and women. The Connecting Europe Facility proposal envisages supporting the Safer Internet Centres, activities of which could include sexualisation-related awareness campaigns.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> COM/2011/0556 final, see [http://ec.europa.eu/avpolicy/reg/minors/rec/2011\\_report/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/avpolicy/reg/minors/rec/2011_report/index_en.htm)

<sup>(2)</sup> See Directive 2010/13/EU on the coordination of certain provisions laid down by law, regulation or administrative action in Member States concerning the provision of audiovisual media services (Audiovisual Media Services Directive), 10 March 2010.

<sup>(3)</sup> COM/2012/0196 final, see [http://ec.europa.eu/information\\_society/activities/sip/policy/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/sip/policy/index_en.htm)

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006097/12**  
**an den Rat**  
**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**  
(20. Juni 2012)

*Betrifft:* Mutterschaftsurlaub in Europa

Derzeit unterscheiden sich die Regelungen über den Mutterschaftsurlaub in der Europäischen Union erheblich. Bulgarien sieht mit 45 Wochen den längsten bezahlten Urlaub vor. Deutschland und Malta sind inzwischen die einzigen beiden Länder, die für junge Mütter den geltenden EU-Mindesturlaub von 14 Wochen vorsehen.

Einige Regierungen haben davor gewarnt, dass der vorgeschlagene 20wöchige voll bezahlte Urlaub die Steuerzahler noch mehr belasten wird. Kritik kam auch aus Unternehmerkreisen, denen zufolge mehr Mutterschaftsurlaub die Gleichstellung der Geschlechter am Arbeitsplatz gefährden könnte.

— Würde Zypern, das im zweiten Halbjahr 2012 den Ratsvorsitz innehat, angesichts der aus der derzeitigen Finanzkrise resultierenden Sparmaßnahmen die Möglichkeit einer schrittweisen Umsetzung der revidierten Richtlinie 92/85/EWG prüfen, wie vom Parlament vorgeschlagen?

**Antwort**  
(18. September 2012)

Das Europäische Parlament hat seine Stellungnahme im Oktober 2010 abgegeben; seither konnte die erforderliche qualifizierte Mehrheit im Rat nicht erzielt werden. Die Gespräche wurden fortgeführt, aber der Rat ist bisher nicht in der Lage, deren Ergebnis oder Länge vorherzusagen.

Im Dezember 2011 nahm der Rat einen Sachstandsbericht des Vorsitzes zur Kenntnis, der den aktuellen Stand der Beratungen darlegt<sup>(1)</sup>. Seitdem wurden keine weiteren Fortschritte gemacht und eine mögliche schrittweise Umsetzung der überarbeiteten Richtlinie wurde nicht speziell erörtert.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> 17029/11.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006097/12  
to the Council  
Angelika Werthmann (NI)  
(20 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Maternity leave in Europe

Currently, policy on maternity leave varies widely across the European Union. Bulgaria offers the longest paid leave at 45 weeks. Germany and Malta are meanwhile the only two countries that offer new mothers the current EU minimum of 14 weeks.

Some governments have warned that the proposed 20-week fully paid leave will further burden taxpayers. Criticism has also come from business leaders who say increased maternity leave could endanger gender equality in the workplace.

— In view of the austerity measures stemming from the current financial crisis, would Cyprus, which holds the Council Presidency in the second half of 2012, consider the possibility of gradual implementation of the revised Directive 92/85/EEC, as proposed by Parliament?

**Reply  
(18 September 2012)**

After the European Parliament adopted its Opinion in October 2010, the requisite qualified majority could not be reached within the Council. Discussions have continued, but the Council is not in a position to anticipate at this stage their outcome or duration.

In December 2011, the Council took note of a Progress Report by the Presidency setting out the state of play <sup>(1)</sup>. Since then, no further progress has been achieved and no specific discussion on possible gradual implementation of the revised Directive has taken place.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> 17029/11.

(Svensk version)

**Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-006098/12  
till kommissionen (Vice-ordföranden / Höga representanten)  
Alf Svensson (PPE)  
(20 juni 2012)**

*Angående:* VP/HR – Prioritera demokrati och mänskliga rättigheter i förbindelserna mellan EU och Kuba

EU håller som bäst på att utarbeta ett bilateralt avtal med Kuba. Så vitt jag vet följer parlamentet processen med stort intresse. För EU innebär processen ett viktigt tillfälle att uppmuntra Kuba att frige alla politiska fångar, införa mänskliga rättigheter och anordna fria och rättvisa demokratiska val.

År 2010 antog kommissionen det första landstrategidokumentet för Kuba. Ett preliminärt anslag på 20 miljoner euro öronmärktes för Kuba för perioden 2011-2013 i EU:s finansieringsinstrument för utvecklingssamarbete. I strategidokumentet fastställdes tre viktiga områden: 1) Livsmedelstrygghet. 2) Miljö och anpassning till klimatförändringarna. 3) Utbyte av sakkunniga, utbildning och undersökningar.

Demokrati och mänskliga rättigheter gavs inte högsta prioritet i strategidokumentet. Det är viktigt att klargöra hur EU-biståndet till Kuba kommer att vara inriktat på att förbättra demokrati och mänskliga rättigheter under nästa budgetperiod.

Jag undrar därför:

1. Varför ges inte insatser för demokrati och mänskliga rättigheter högsta prioritet i det nuvarande strategidokumentet?
2. Vad ämnar vice ordföranden/den höga representanten göra för att ge demokrati och mänskliga rättigheter högsta prioritet i det framtida strategidokumentet och i de kommande bilaterala förhandlingarna om avtalet?

**Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-006099/12  
till kommissionen  
Alf Svensson (PPE)  
(20 juni 2012)**

*Angående:* Prioritera demokrati och mänskliga rättigheter i förbindelserna mellan EU och Kuba

EU håller som bäst på att utarbeta ett bilateralt avtal med Kuba. Så vitt jag vet följer parlamentet processen med stort intresse. För EU innebär processen ett viktigt tillfälle att uppmuntra Kuba att frige alla politiska fångar, införa mänskliga rättigheter och anordna fria och rättvisa demokratiska val.

År 2010 antog kommissionen det första landstrategidokumentet för Kuba. Ett preliminärt anslag på 20 miljoner euro öronmärktes för Kuba för perioden 2011-2013 i EU:s finansieringsinstrument för utvecklingssamarbete. I strategidokumentet fastställdes tre viktiga områden: 1) Livsmedelstrygghet. 2) Miljö och anpassning till klimatförändringarna. 3) Utbyte av sakkunniga, utbildning och undersökningar.

Demokrati och mänsklig rättigheter gavs inte högsta prioritet i strategidokumentet. Det är viktigt att klargöra hur EU-biståndet till Kuba kommer att vara inriktat på att förbättra demokrati och mänskliga rättigheter under nästa budgetperiod.

Jag undrar därför:

1. Varför ges inte insatser för demokrati och mänskliga rättigheter högsta prioritet i det nuvarande strategidokumentet?
2. Vad ämnar kommissionen göra för att ge demokrati och mänskliga rättigheter högsta prioritet i det framtida strategidokumentet och i de kommande bilaterala förhandlingarna om avtalet?

**Samlat svar från den höga representanten/vice ordförande Catherine Ashton på kommissionens vägnar**  
(27 juli 2012)

Demokrati och mänskliga rättigheter står i centrum vid EU:s förbindelser med alla länder, även med Kuba. EU har vid flera tillfällen påpekat vikten av att de kubanska myndigheterna gör fortsatta framsteg när det gäller full respekt för alla de politiska och medborgerliga rättigheterna, inklusive yttrande- och mötesfriheten. Dessa frågor behandlas och kommer att fortsätta behandlas inom ramen för den politiska dialogen mellan EU och Kuba, och i kontakterna på alla nivåer med de kubanska myndigheterna både i Bryssel och i Havanna.

EU står fast vid sitt stöd för medborgerliga och politiska rättigheter i Kuba och arbetar just nu mot detta mål genom politisk dialog. Detta diskuterades med Europaparlamentet då man antog landstrategidokumentet för 2011-2013, vilket tar upp viktiga frågor för de kubanska medborgarna och stödjer den pågående reformprocessen inom jordbrukssektorn.

Rådet har inte fattat något beslut om att inleda förhandlingar för ett bilateralt avtal med Kuba. Vid utrikesrådet i oktober 2010 inleddes en diskussion om framtiden för förbindelserna mellan EU och Kuba. Arbetet med dessa frågor pågår. I bilaterala avtal mellan EU och tredjeländer finns alltid klausuler om väsentliga delar som gäller de mänskliga rättigheterna och rättsstatsprincipen.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006098/12**  
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**  
**Alf Svensson (PPE)**  
(20 June 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Making democracy and human rights a priority in EU-Cuba relations

The EU is about to formulate a bilateral agreement with Cuba. The Parliament, as far as I understand, is following this process with great interest. The process is a great opportunity for the EU to encourage Cuba to release all political prisoners, introduce human rights and hold free and fair democratic elections.

In 2010, the Commission adopted the first Country Strategy Paper for Cuba. An indicative allocation of EUR 20 million was earmarked for Cuba for the period 2011-2013 under the EU Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI). Three priority sectors were identified for this Strategy Paper: (1) Food security; (2) Environment and adaptation to climate change; (3) Expertise exchanges, training and studies.

Democracy and human rights were not included as top priorities in this strategy paper. There is a great need for clarification on how European aid to Cuba over the next budget period will be targeted at improving democracy and human rights.

My questions are therefore:

1. Why are efforts for democracy and human rights not among the top priorities in the current strategy paper?
2. What steps does the VP/HR aim to take in order to make democracy and human rights top priorities in future strategy papers and in the upcoming bilateral agreement negotiations?

**Question for written answer E-006099/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Alf Svensson (PPE)**  
(20 June 2012)

*Subject:* Making democracy and human rights a priority in EU-Cuba relations

The EU is about to formulate a bilateral agreement with Cuba. The Parliament, as far as I understand, is following this process with great interest. The process is a great opportunity for the EU to encourage Cuba to release all political prisoners, introduce human rights and hold free and fair democratic elections.

In 2010, the Commission adopted the first Country Strategy Paper for Cuba. An indicative allocation of EUR 20 million was earmarked for Cuba for the period 2011-2013 under the EU Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI). Three priority sectors were identified for this Strategy Paper: (1) Food security; (2) Environment and adaptation to climate change; (3) Expertise exchanges, training and studies.

Democracy and human rights were not included as top priorities in this strategy paper. There is a great need for clarification on how European aid to Cuba over the next budget period will be targeted at improving democracy and human rights.

My questions are therefore:

1. Why are efforts for democracy and human rights not among the top priorities in the current strategy paper?
2. What steps does the Commission aim to take in order to make democracy and human rights top priorities in future strategy papers and in the upcoming bilateral agreement negotiations?



**Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**  
(27 July 2012)

Democracy and human rights are at the centre of EU relations with all countries, including Cuba. The EU has reiterated on several occasions the importance of the Cuban authorities continuing to make progress towards full respect of all political and civil rights, including freedom of expression and assembly. These questions are and will continue to be addressed in the context of the EU-Cuba political dialogue and in contacts at all levels with the Cuban authorities both in Brussels and in Havana.

The EU is firmly committed to supporting civil and political rights in Cuba, pursuing this goal at this specific moment through political dialogue. This was discussed with the EP on the occasion of the adoption of the 2011-2013 Country Strategy Paper which addresses important priorities for Cuban citizens and supports the ongoing reform process in the agriculture sector.

There has been no decision by the Council to launch negotiations for a bilateral agreement with Cuba. The FAC of October 2010 has launched a reflection on the future of EU-Cuba relations. This work is ongoing. In any case bilateral agreements between the EU and third countries include essential elements clauses on human rights and the rule of law.

---

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-006100/12**  
**adresată Comisiei**  
**Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)**  
(20 iunie 2012)

*Subiect:* Acțiunea Uniunii Europene în domeniul sănătății mintale a copiilor

În ceea ce privește acțiunea Uniunii Europene în domeniul sănătății mintale a copiilor, într-un document de informare din 2008, intitulat „Sănătatea mintală în UE: date, cifre și activități-cheie”, elaborat de DG Sănătate și Consumatori, se afirmă că „nu s-a introdus niciun instrument statistic la nivel comunitar pentru a se monitoriza sănătatea mintală la nivelul acestei grupe de vârstă, deși există diverse date, la nivelul statelor, care provin din alte surse”.

A realizat Comisia o analiză comparativă a datelor de orice tip referitoare la sănătatea mintală a copiilor la nivelul Uniunii Europene ulterior publicării acestui document de informare?

Consideră Comisia că UE, prin acțiunea sa în acest domeniu, a abordat în mod corespunzător problematica sănătății mintale a copiilor până în prezent?

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

Documentul de informare „Sănătatea mintală în UE: date, cifre și activități-cheie” din 2008 a fost pregătit de o echipă de autori în cadrul proiectului „Servicii de secretariat pentru grupul de lucru al Comisiei Europene pentru sănătate mintală (MH SUPPORT)”, care a fost cofinanțat din Programul UE în domeniul sănătății.

În urma publicării acestui document de informare în 2008, Comisia a publicat în 2009 un Eurobarometru Flash 246 „Părerile părinților în legătură cu sănătatea mentală a copiilor lor”. În 2011, au fost publicate datele primei anchete europene de sănătate prin intermediul interviului (EHIS) <sup>(1)</sup> (din 2008), inclusiv datele privind aspectele de sănătate mintală pentru grupa de vârstă 15-24 de ani. Datele privind factorii determinanți ai sănătății mintale a tinerilor au fost colectate într-un modul ad hoc <sup>(2)</sup> din Statisticile UE (EU-SILC) referitoare la venit și la condițiile de viață. În plus, Eurostat colectează în mod regulat date privind cauzele de deces în rândul copiilor și al tinerilor, printre care automutilarea intenționată (suicid) <sup>(3)</sup>. Un grup de lucru al Eurostat se ocupă de statisticile privind tulburările mentale și comportamentale specifice pentru toate categoriile de vârstă, printre care încercările de suicid, pentru colectarea periodică a datelor privind morbiditatea în funcție de diagnostic.

În cele din urmă, copiii și tinerii reprezintă un grup-țintă important pentru activitățile din cadrul Pactului european pentru sănătate mintală și bunăstare. În cadrul programului de lucru pentru 2012 al programului UE în domeniul sănătății s-a făcut apel la o acțiune comună privind sănătatea mintală și bunăstarea care să vizeze sănătatea mintală a copiilor și a tinerilor.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=hlth\\_ehis\\_st1&lang=en](http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=hlth_ehis_st1&lang=en).

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/income\\_social\\_inclusion\\_living\\_conditions/data/ad\\_hoc\\_modules](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/income_social_inclusion_living_conditions/data/ad_hoc_modules) (Material deprivation, 2009).

<sup>(3)</sup> [http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=hlth\\_cd\\_anr&lang=en](http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=hlth_cd_anr&lang=en).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006100/12  
to the Commission**

**Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)**

(20 June 2012)

*Subject:* EU action in the field of child mental health

With regard to EU action in the field of child mental health, a 2008 background paper entitled 'Mental Health in the EU: Key facts, figures and activities', prepared by DG Health and Consumers, states that 'no statistical instrument is yet in place at Community level to monitor mental health in this age group although multiple state data are provided from other sources'.

Has the Commission collated any data relating to child mental health at EU level subsequent to the publication of this background paper?

Does the Commission consider that EU action has adequately addressed the issue of child mental health so far?

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

(3 August 2012)

The Background paper 'Mental Health in the EU: key facts, figures and activities' from 2008 was prepared by a team of authors under the project 'Secretariat Support for European Commission Mental Health Working Party (MH SUPPORT)', which had received co-funding from the EU-Health Programme.

Subsequent to the publication of this background paper in 2008, the Commission published in 2009 a Flash Eurobarometer 246 'Parents' views on the mental health of their child'. In 2011, the data (2008) from the first wave of the European Health Interview Survey (EHIS) <sup>(1)</sup> were published, including data on mental health aspects for the 15-24 years age group. Data on determinants of young people's mental health were collected in an ad hoc module <sup>(2)</sup> of the EU-SILC survey on incomes and living conditions. In addition, Eurostat collects on a routine basis data on causes of death in children and young people, including intentional self-harm (suicide) <sup>(3)</sup>. Statistics on specific mental and behavioural disorders for all age groups, including suicidal attempts, are addressed by a Eurostat Task Force for developing a regular data collection on diagnosis-specific morbidity statistics.

Finally, children and young people are an important target group of the work under the European Pact for Mental Health and Well-being. A Joint Action on Mental Health and Well-being has been invited under the 2012 work plan of the EU-Health Programme and is expected to address children and young people's mental health.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=hlth\\_ehis\\_st1&lang=en](http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=hlth_ehis_st1&lang=en).

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/income\\_social\\_inclusion\\_living\\_conditions/data/ad\\_hoc\\_modules](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/income_social_inclusion_living_conditions/data/ad_hoc_modules) (Material deprivation, 2009).

<sup>(3)</sup> [http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=hlth\\_cd\\_anr&lang=en](http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=hlth_cd_anr&lang=en).

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006101/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Niki Tzavela (EFD)**  
(20 Ιουνίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Μέτρα για την ελληνική καπνοβιομηχανία

Όπως όλοι γνωρίζουν, η Ελλάδα αντιμετωπίζει μείζονα οικονομική κρίση, που έχει αναγκάσει πολλές μικρομεσαίες επιχειρήσεις να κλείσουν, με αποτέλεσμα την αύξηση της ανεργίας.

Νέα μέτρα για τη μείωση του καπνίσματος πρόκειται να τεθούν σε εφαρμογή. Μεταξύ αυτών είναι και το μέτρο να καταστούν όλα τα πακέτα πανομοιότυπα, με μεγάλα σήματα τα οποία προειδοποιούν τους καταναλωτές για τους κινδύνους που έχει το κάπνισμα στην υγεία. Ωστόσο, σύμφωνα με φόβους που εκφράζει το Εμπορικό και Βιομηχανικό Επιμελητήριο Ελλάδος, οι αλλαγές αυτές θα μειώσουν την τιμή των τσιγάρων, οδηγώντας σε αύξηση της κατανάλωσης. Χειρότερα ακόμη, υπάρχει ο φόβος ότι οι νέοι θα επιλέξουν να καπνίζουν φθηνότερα τσιγάρα χαμηλότερης ποιότητας. Εφιστάται επίσης η προσοχή στην απώλεια σημαντικών φορολογικών εσόδων.

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τις ανωτέρω παρενέργειες, θεωρεί η Επιτροπή ότι είναι τώρα η κατάλληλη στιγμή να τεθούν σε εφαρμογή νέα μέτρα για την καπνοβιομηχανία στην Ελλάδα.

**Απάντηση του κ. Dalli εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(26 Ιουλίου 2012)

Στο πλαίσιο της αναθεώρησης της οδηγίας περί προϊόντων καπνού 2001/37/ΕΚ<sup>(1)</sup>, η Επιτροπή εξετάζει την τυχόν εισαγωγή νέων απαιτήσεων για τη σήμανση και τη συσκευασία των προϊόντων καπνού. Οι οικονομικές, κοινωνικές και σχετικά με την υγεία συνέπειες των διάφορων δυνατών μέτρων αναλύονται προσεκτικά πριν από τη λήψη οιασδήποτε απόφασης στον εν λόγω τομέα. Η Επιτροπή προβλέπει να υποβάλει πρόταση τροποποίησης της οδηγίας πριν από τα τέλη του 2012.

(<sup>1</sup>) EE L 194 της 18.7.2001.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006101/12  
to the Commission  
Niki Tzavela (EFD)  
(20 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Measures in the Greek smoking industry

As everybody knows, Greece is facing a major economic crisis that has forced many small and medium-sized companies to shut down, resulting in increased unemployment.

New measures to reduce smoking are to be implemented. Among them is a measure to make all packages identical, with large labels warning consumers of the health hazards of smoking. However, according to fears expressed by the Greek Chamber of Commerce and Industry, such alterations will push down the price of cigarettes, leading to increased consumption. More seriously, it is feared that younger people will choose to smoke cheaper cigarettes of poorer quality. Attention is also drawn to the loss of significant tax revenue.

With the aforementioned side effects in mind, does the Commission think that now is the appropriate time to put in place new measures on the smoking industry in Greece?

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

In the context of the revision of the Tobacco Products Directive 2001/37/EC <sup>(1)</sup>, the Commission is considering the possible introduction of new labelling and packaging requirements for tobacco products. The economic, social and health impacts of different possible measures are being carefully analysed before any decision is taken on this matter. The Commission envisages presenting a proposal to revise the directive before the end of 2012.

---

(1) OJ L 194, 18.7.2001.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006102/12**

**al Consejo**

**Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)**

(20 de junio de 2012)

*Asunto:* Gobierno español y rescate

Considerando los anuncios del Gobierno español de pedir un préstamo vía la línea del FEEF/MEDE para recapitalizar sus instituciones financieras. Considerando los anuncios de Eurostat <sup>(1)</sup> de que esto comportaría un incremento de la deuda pública y del déficit público.

¿Tiene el Consejo conocimiento sobre los plazos que pretende seguir el Gobierno español para solicitar la ayuda?

¿Tendrá en cuenta esta nueva situación a la hora de aprobar las recomendaciones específicas sobre el Plan Nacional de Reformas 2012 y el Plan de Estabilidad 2012-2015 de España considerando este nuevo panorama? ¿No cree indispensable establecer un nuevo calendario para sus objetivos?

¿Considera posible reabrir negociaciones sobre el MEDE para habilitar una línea de la recapitalización directa de entidades financieras? ¿Cree que la *super-seigniority* del MEDE comportará mayores costes para la refinanciación de la deuda pública española? ¿Considera posible la eliminación de esta característica?

Estas medidas deberían comportar una mayor regulación y control europeo del sistema financiero. ¿Cree que las propuestas presentadas por la Comisión sobre regulación bancaria <sup>(2)</sup> satisfacen esta necesidad? ¿O simplemente mantienen la lógica de que cada Estado es responsable de su sistema financiero?

**Respuesta**

(8 de octubre de 2012)

España ha estado sujeta al procedimiento de déficit excesivo desde abril de 2009, cuando el Consejo declaró la existencia de un déficit excesivo en España <sup>(3)</sup> y formuló una Recomendación en la que solicitó que el déficit se corrigiera para 2012.

El 10 de julio de 2012, el Consejo formuló una Recomendación revisada <sup>(4)</sup> en la que fijó en 2014 el plazo para que España situara su déficit por debajo del 3 % del PIB. Los objetivos de déficit establecidos en la Recomendación son el 6,3 % del PIB en 2012, el 4,5 % del PIB en 2013 y el 2,8 % del PIB en 2014.

El 6 de junio de 2012, la Comisión adoptó una propuesta legislativa <sup>(5)</sup> destinada al rescate y la resolución de entidades bancarias. En el marco propuesto se establecen las medidas y las competencias necesarias para asegurar que las crisis bancarias en toda la UE se gestionan de forma que se evite la inestabilidad financiera y se minimicen los costes para el contribuyente. En la actualidad el Consejo está analizando los pormenores de la propuesta de la Comisión y aún no ha establecido su posición.

España solicitó formalmente el 25 de junio de 2012 a sus socios de la zona del euro ayuda financiera para sus bancos por un importe de 100 mil millones de euros.

Según la declaración de la Cumbre de la Zona del Euro de 29 de junio de 2012, cuando se establezca un mecanismo único y efectivo de supervisión, en el que participe el BCE, para los bancos de la zona del euro, el Mecanismo Europeo de Estabilidad (MEDE) podría, tras la adopción de una decisión regular, tener la posibilidad de recapitalizar directamente los bancos. Los Jefes de Estado o de Gobierno de la zona del Euro también decidieron que cuando el MEDE conceda a España préstamos no adquirirá la condición de acreedor preferente.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/government\\_finance\\_statistics/documents/Note\\_on\\_statistical\\_implications\\_of\\_summits-updated-12\\_A.pdf](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/government_finance_statistics/documents/Note_on_statistical_implications_of_summits-updated-12_A.pdf)

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/12/416&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>

<sup>(3)</sup> DO L 135 de 30.5.2009, p. 25.

<sup>(4)</sup> Documento 12171/12.

<sup>(5)</sup> Propuesta de Directiva del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo por la que se establece un marco para el rescate y la resolución de entidades de crédito y empresas de inversión, y por la que se modifican las Directivas 77/91/CEE y 82/891/CE del Consejo, las Directivas 2001/24/CE, 2002/47/CE, 2004/25/CE, 2005/56/CE, 2007/36/CE y 2011/35/CE y el Reglamento (UE) n° 1093/2010 (11066/12).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006102/12  
to the Council**

**Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)**

(20 June 2012)

*Subject:* Spanish Government and bail-out

The Spanish Government has said that it intends to request a loan via the EFSF/ESM to recapitalise its financial institutions. According to Eurostat <sup>(1)</sup>, this will lead to an increase in public debt and deficit.

Is the Council aware of the timetable which the Spanish Government intends to follow in order to request this aid?

Will it take the this new situation into account when it comes to approving specific recommendations on Spain's National Reform Plan for 2012 and its Stability Plan for 2012-2015? Does it not consider it necessary to draw up a new calendar for its objectives?

Does the Council see a possibility of reopening ESM negotiations to establish a line for the direct recapitalisation of financial bodies? Does it consider that ESM super seniority will increase the cost of financing Spain's public debt? Does it see a way to eliminate this feature?

These measures should lead to increased European control and regulation of the financial system. Does the Council believe that the Commission's proposals on bank regulation <sup>(2)</sup> meet this need? Or do they simply maintain the idea that each State is responsible for its own financial system?

**Reply**

(8 October 2012)

Spain has been subject to an excessive deficit procedure (EDP) since April 2009, when the Council decided on the existence of an excessive government deficit in Spain <sup>(3)</sup> and issued a recommendation calling for the deficit to be corrected by 2012.

On 10 July 2012, the Council issued a revised Recommendation <sup>(4)</sup> setting 2014 as the new deadline for bringing Spain's deficit below 3% of GDP. The recommendation establishes headline deficit targets of 6.3% of GDP for 2012, 4.5% of GDP for 2013 and 2.8% of GDP for 2014.

On 6 June 2012, the Commission adopted a legislative proposal <sup>(5)</sup> for bank recovery and resolution. The proposed framework sets out the necessary steps and powers to ensure that bank failures across the EU are managed in a way which avoids financial instability and minimises costs for taxpayers. The Council is currently analysing the details of the Commission proposal and has not yet established its position.

Spain formally requested from its euro area partners financial assistance of up to EUR 100 billion for its banks on 25 June 2012.

According to the euro area summit statement of 29 June 2012, once an effective single supervisory mechanism for banks in the euro area is established, involving the European Central Bank, the European Stability Mechanism (ESM) could, following a regular decision, have the possibility to recapitalise banks directly. Euro area Heads of State or Government also decided that once the ESM provides loans to Spain, these will not gain seniority status.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/government\\_finance\\_statistics/documents/Note\\_on\\_statistical\\_implications\\_of\\_summits-updated-12\\_A.pdf](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/government_finance_statistics/documents/Note_on_statistical_implications_of_summits-updated-12_A.pdf)

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/12/416&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ L 135, 30.5.2009, p. 25.

<sup>(4)</sup> 12171/12.

<sup>(5)</sup> Proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a framework for the recovery and resolution of credit institutions and investment firms and amending Council Directives 77/91/EEC and 82/891/EC, Directives 2001/24/EC, 2002/47/EC, 2004/25/EC, 2005/56/EC, 2007/36/EC and 2011/35/EC and Regulation (EU) No 1093/2010 (11066/12).

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006104/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**  
(20 Ιουνίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Αίτηση πρόσθετης χρηματοδότησης για το κέντρο φιλοξενίας παράνομων μεταναστών στην Αμυγδαλέζα (περιοχή Αττικής)

Η Ελλάδα, στο πλαίσιο του αναθεωρημένου ετήσιου προγράμματος του 2010 για το ΤΕΕ, απέστειλε τον Μάρτιο του 2012 αίτηση στην Επιτροπή για παροχή πρόσθετης χρηματοδότησης για το κέντρο φιλοξενίας παράνομων μεταναστών στην Αμυγδαλέζα (περιοχή Αττικής).

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

- Αξιολόγησε θετικά την επιλεξιμότητα της συγκεκριμένης αίτησης; Ποια είναι η τελική απόφαση της σχετικά με τη χρηματοδότηση του συγκεκριμένου έργου;

**Απάντηση της κας Malmström εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(30 Αυγούστου 2012)

Η δημιουργία (πρώτο στάδιο) του κέντρου φιλοξενίας Αμυγδαλέζα έγινε δεκτή για χρηματοδότηση βάσει του αναθεωρημένου ετήσιου προγράμματος 2010 στο πλαίσιο του Ταμείου Επιστροφής, υπό την προϋπόθεση ότι το έργο θα υλοποιηθεί σε πλήρη συμμόρφωση με τη νομοθεσία της ΕΕ, ιδίως δε με την οδηγία περί επιστροφής και το κεκτημένο στον τομέα του ασύλου.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006104/12  
to the Commission  
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)  
(20 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Request for additional funding for the Amygdaleza detention centre for illegal immigrants (Attica)

In March 2012, Greece Commission sent a request to the Commission under the 2010 revised EBF annual programme seeking additional funding for the Amygdaleza detention centre (Attica), which was built to accommodate illegal immigrants.

Did the Commission regard this request as admissible? What was its final decision regarding funding for the centre?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission  
(30 August 2012)**

The establishment (first stage) of the Amygdaleza detention centre was accepted for funding under the revised 2010 Annual Programme under the Return Fund, provided that the project will be implemented in full compliance with the EC law, in particular the Return Directive and *asylum acquis*.

---

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006106/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**  
(20 Ιουνίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Όργανο ρευστότητας ύψους 500 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ για νέους και ΜΜΕ στην Ελλάδα

Στο πλαίσιο της προσπάθειας για την αντιμετώπιση της νεανικής ανεργίας στην Ελλάδα και για την στήριξη των μικρομεσαίων επιχειρήσεων (ΜΜΕ), ξεκίνησαν νέες στοχευμένες δράσεις για νέους και ΜΜΕ, συμπεριλαμβανομένου ενός νέου οργάνου ρευστότητας ύψους 500 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ (με εγγύηση του ΕΤΠΑ για τα δάνεια της ΕΤΕπ στις ΜΜΕ στην Ελλάδα) που υπογράφηκε στις 23 Μαρτίου 2012.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Καθώς έχει παρέλθει χρονικό διάστημα άνω των 3 μηνών από την έναρξη του συγκεκριμένου προγράμματος, παρατηρεί η Επιτροπή πως υπάρχει ενδιαφέρον από τις ελληνικές ΜΜΕ για την αξιοποίηση των δανείων που προσφέρονται από το νέο αυτό όργανο ρευστότητας;
2. Είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει η Επιτροπή για το ποσοστό αξιοποίησης των χρημάτων από ΜΜΕ και νέους μέχρι σήμερα;

**Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(3 Αυγούστου 2012)

1. Καθώς η συμφωνία με τους ενδιάμεσους χρηματοπιστωτικούς φορείς βρίσκεται υπό διαπραγμάτευση, δεν διατίθενται πληροφορίες στο στάδιο αυτό σχετικά με το επίπεδο του ενδιαφέροντος που εκφράστηκε από τις ΜΜΕ για το νέο μηχανισμό εγγυήσεων.

2. Επιχορήγηση 4,3 δισεκατομμυρίων ευρώ περίπου που συγχρηματοδοτήθηκε από τα διαρθρωτικά ταμεία εγκρίθηκε με σκοπό να υποστηριχθούν πάνω από 70 000 επιχειρήσεις. Έχουν συσταθεί μέσα χρηματοδοτικής τεχνικής τα οποία διαθέτουν 700 εκατομμύρια ευρώ περίπου από κεφάλαια της ΕΕ και των εθνικών δημόσιων ταμείων για τη βελτίωση της πρόσβασης των ΜΜΕ στη χρηματοδότηση. Από το 2010 και μετά, η ΕΤΕπ υπέγραψε δάνεια ύψους 4 δισεκατομμυρίων ευρώ στην Ελλάδα, όμως οι εγκρίσεις και οι υπογραφές μειώθηκαν ενώ το 2012 οι εκταμιεύσεις μειώθηκαν επίσης. Για να ενισχυθεί η δανειοδότηση από την ΕΤΕπ προς την Ελλάδα, συστάθηκε ταμείο εγγύησης ύψους 500 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ, καθώς τα διαρθρωτικά ταμεία διευκολύνουν την ΕΤΕπ να παράσχει στις ελληνικές τράπεζες δάνειο ύψους 1 δισεκατομμυρίου ευρώ για τις ΜΜΕ, του οποίου η πρώτη δόση των 500 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ εγκρίθηκε τον Ιούνιο από το διοικητικό συμβούλιο της ΕΤΕπ. Επιπλέον, δάνεια συνολικού ύψους 440 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ εγκρίθηκαν/υπογράφηκαν κατά το διάστημα 2011-12 υπό κρατική εγγύηση, όμως για την εκταμίευση αναμένεται η εκπλήρωση ορισμένων προϋποθέσεων από τις ελληνικές αρχές. Κατά συνέπεια, οι ελληνικές ΜΜΕ θα μπορούσαν να επωφεληθούν από δάνεια ύψους 1,4 δισεκατομμυρίου ευρώ εντός των προσεχών 30 μηνών.

Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει τον κ. βουλευτή στην απάντησή της στην ερώτηση E-000627/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>. Η καινοτόμος ενέργεια για την προώθηση της επιχειρηματικότητας την οποία υποστηρίζει το ΕΤΠΑ σημείωσε σχετική επιτυχία: δόθηκε επιχορήγηση 30 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ· υπεβλήθησαν προτάσεις αντικειμένου 117 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ· εγκρίθηκαν 439 επιχειρηματικά σχέδια που αντιστοιχούν σε 37 εκατομμύρια ευρώ. Οι συνέργειες μεταξύ των ταμείων θα πρέπει να διευρυνθούν περαιτέρω για τη λήψη και άλλων μέτρων, π.χ. επιχειρηματικότητα των γυναικών με στόχο τις γυναίκες ηλικίας 18-55 ετών: επιχορήγηση ΕΤΠΑ 30,8 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ· εγκρίθηκε ποσό ύψους 30,6 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ· απορροφήθηκε ποσό 6,3 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ· πραγματοποιήθηκαν δράσεις του ΕΚΤ, π.χ. επιδότηση επιχειρήσεων για την πρόσληψη άνεργων πτυχιούχων τριτοβάθμιας εκπαίδευσης έως και 35 ετών, με επιχορήγηση ύψους 68 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ.

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

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006106/12  
to the Commission**

**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**

(20 June 2012)

*Subject:* EUR 500 m liquidity instrument for young people and SMEs in Greece

In a bid to deal with youth unemployment in Greece and assist small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), new targeted measures for young people and SMEs have been launched, including a new EUR 500 m liquidity instrument (with ERDF guarantees for EIB loans to SMEs in Greece) which was signed on 23 March 2012.

1. Given that over three months have now elapsed from the launching of the programme, can the Commission say whether Greek SMEs have evinced any interest in loans under the new liquidity instrument?
2. Can it indicate the level of take-up of funding by SMEs and young people to date?

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

(3 August 2012)

1. As agreement with financial intermediaries is under negotiation, information is not available at this stage on the level of interest expressed by SMEs for the new guarantee mechanism.
2. About EUR 4.3 billion of grants co-financed by Structural Funds have been approved to support over 70 000 enterprises. Financial engineering instruments have been set up with around EUR 700 million of EU and national public funds to improve SME access to finance. Since 2010, the EIB has signed EUR 4 billion worth of loans in Greece but approvals and signatures have decreased while in 2012 disbursement has declined. In order to strengthen EIB lending in Greece, a EUR 500 million guarantee fund was created with Structural Funds facilitating EIB lending of EUR 1 billion to Greek Banks for SMEs, with the first tranche of EUR 500 million approved in June by EIB's board. In addition, loans totalling EUR 440 million were approved/ signed in 2011-12 under sovereign guarantee but await disbursement, pending fulfilment of certain conditions by the Greek authorities. Thus, Greek SMEs could benefit from EUR 1.4 billion of loans in the next 30 months.

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its reply to Question E-000627/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>. The ERDF-promoted Innovative Entrepreneurship has been relatively successful: allocation EUR 30 million, proposals received EUR 117 million; 439 business plans approved corresponding to EUR 37 million. Synergies between funds should be exploited further for other measures e.g. Women's Entrepreneurship targeting women aged 18-55: ERDF allocation EUR 30.8 million; approved EUR 30.6 million; absorbed EUR 6.3 million; ESF actions e.g. subsidisation of enterprises for the recruitment of unemployed University graduates of up to 35 years of age, with an allocation of EUR 68 million.

---

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

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006107/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**  
(20 Ιουνίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Έκθεση του οργανισμού «Διεθνής Διαφάνεια» (Transparency International)

Με έκθεση του οργανισμού Διεθνής Διαφάνεια (Transparency International) που δόθηκε στην δημοσιότητα στις Βρυξέλλες, την Τετάρτη 06.06.2012, υπογραμμίζεται ότι η διαφθορά στην Ευρώπη και ιδιαίτερα στις χώρες της Μεσογείου, απειλεί να αποδυναμώσει περαιτέρω τις ευάλωτες οικονομίες που αγωνίζονται να αντιμετωπίσουν την κρίση χρέους. Στην έκθεση σημειώνεται εξάλλου ότι σε πολλές περιπτώσεις οι δημόσιοι λειτουργοί δεν ελέγχονται για τις ενέργειές τους.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

- Διαθέτει το σύνολο των κρατών μελών της ΕΕ ρυθμιστικό πλαίσιο για τις δραστηριότητες των ομάδων άσκησης πίεσης (lobbies); Εκτιμά η Επιτροπή πως θα πρέπει να αναληφθούν περαιτέρω πρωτοβουλίες από την ίδια και τα κράτη μέλη στον τομέα αυτό;

**Απάντηση του κ. Barroso εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(9 Αυγούστου 2012)

Οι Συνθήκες δεν παρέχουν στα θεσμικά όργανα της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης καμία αρμοδιότητα όσον αφορά τη ρύθμιση από τα κράτη μέλη των ομάδων άσκησης πίεσης. Η Επιτροπή δεν προτίθεται, ως εκ τούτου, να προβλέψει ουδεμία πρωτοβουλία που αποσκοπεί στη διατύπωση προδιαγραφών σε αυτόν τον τομέα. Όσον αφορά το πλαίσιο που παρέχεται σε επίπεδο Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης από τη διοργανική της συμφωνία με το Κοινοβούλιο, καθώς και τις κοινές τους πρωτοβουλίες σε αυτόν τον τομέα, η Επιτροπή υπενθυμίζει ότι η συμφωνία αυτή προβλέπει ότι το κοινό μητρώο θα αποτελέσει αντικείμενο επανεξέτασης εντός δύο ετών από τη θέση του σε λειτουργία. Οποιοδήποτε ενδεχόμενο μέτρο για τη βελτίωση της λειτουργίας αυτού του μητρώου θα πρέπει να εξεταστεί από αμφότερα τα όργανα στο πλαίσιο αυτής της διαδικασίας που αναμένεται να πραγματοποιηθεί το 2013.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006107/12  
to the Commission  
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)  
(20 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Report by Transparency International

The report by Transparency International published in Brussels on Wednesday, 6 June 2012, indicates that corruption in Europe — particularly in Mediterranean countries — is threatening to further undermine economies currently in the throes of a debt crisis and refers to many cases of failure to monitor the activities of public officials.

In view of this:

Can the Commission say whether lobbies are governed by framework regulatory provisions in all EU Member States? Does it consider that further initiatives by the Commission itself and the Member States in this area will be necessary?

**Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission  
(9 August 2012)**

The Treaties do not confer any powers on the European Union concerning the regulation of lobbies by the Member States. The Commission therefore has no plans for any initiative to draw up rules for them. Concerning the interinstitutional agreement with Parliament at European level and joint initiatives, the Commission recalls that this agreement provides that the common register will be subject to review no later than two years following its entry into operation. Should any measure be envisaged to improve the functioning of this register, it will have to be considered by both institutions within this process due to take place in 2013.

---

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006108/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**  
(20 Ιουνίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Διασαφηνίσεις από την Ελλάδα για την δημιουργία κέντρων υποδοχής και φιλοξενίας παράνομων μεταναστών

Με απάντηση της σε προηγούμενο ερώτημά μου (E-003504/2012), η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή με ενημέρωσε πως εξακολουθεί να εξετάζει το εύρος των προτάσεων της Ελλάδας για τον σχεδιασμό, την κατασκευή και ανακατασκευή κέντρων υποδοχής και φιλοξενίας παράνομων μεταναστών και αναμένει επιπλέον διασαφηνίσεις από την Ελλάδα.

Είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει κυρίως ως προς ποια σημεία του ελληνικού σχεδιασμού η Επιτροπή ζήτησε διευκρινίσεις και αν η Ελλάδα μέχρι σήμερα έχει ανταποκριθεί στο σχετικό αίτημα;

**Απάντηση της κας Malmström εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(18 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Όσον αφορά τα έργα υποδομών που πρότεινε η Ελλάδα στο σχέδιο του ετήσιου προγράμματος του 2012 για το Ταμείο Εξωτερικών Συνόρων, η Επιτροπή ζήτησε πρόσθετες διευκρινίσεις σχετικά με τις χρηματοοικονομικές πτυχές, τα χρονοδιαγράμματα και τις διαδικασίες σύναψης των συμβάσεων. Μέχρι σήμερα, η Ελλάδα δεν έχει υποβάλει αναθεωρημένο πρόγραμμα το οποίο να λαμβάνει υπόψη τα αιτήματα αυτά.

Όσον αφορά το κέντρο της Αμυγδαλέζας (το οποίο αναφέρθηκε στην απάντηση που δόθηκε στη γραπτή ερώτηση E-3504/2012), η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος στην απάντηση που έδωσε στη γραπτή ερώτηση E-6104/2012<sup>(1)</sup>.

---

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

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006108/12  
to the Commission  
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)  
(20 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Information from Greece concerning reception centres and facilities for illegal immigrants

In reply to my previous question (E-003504/2012), the Commission indicated that it was continuing to examine the scope of proposals by Greece regarding the planning, construction and conversion of reception centres and facilities for illegal immigrants and was awaiting further information from Greece.

To which main areas of the Greek project did the Commission queries principally relate and has Greece replied?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission  
(18 September 2012)**

Regarding the infrastructure projects proposed by Greece in the draft 2012 annual programme for External Borders Fund, the Commission requested additional clarification on financial aspects, timeframes and procurement procedures. So far, Greece has not submitted a revised programme addressing these requests.

Regarding the Amygdaleza centre (which was mentioned in the reply to Written Question E-3504/2012), the Commission draws the attention of the Honourable Member to the reply to Written Question E-6104/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

---

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

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006109/12**  
**alla Commissione**  
**Mario Mauro (PPE)**  
(20 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Convenzione sui lavoratori domestici

La Convenzione sui lavoratori domestici stabilisce le norme sul lavoro ratificate dall'Organizzazione internazionale del lavoro nel giugno 2011 che tutelano i lavoratori domestici. I principali diritti stabiliti dalla proposta sono il diritto al riposo quotidiano e settimanale (24 ore), il diritto a percepire un salario minimo e il diritto a scegliere il proprio luogo di residenza.

Quasi un anno dopo, l'Uruguay è stato il primo paese a ratificare la Convenzione sui lavoratori domestici che non può entrare in vigore fino alla ratifica da parte di almeno due paesi. Le Filippine sono pronte a diventare il secondo paese che ratificherà la proposta e altri paesi, tra cui Belgio, Benin e Mauritius, hanno promesso di fare altrettanto.

In base alle informazioni divulgate dall'Organizzazione internazionale del lavoro, i lavoratori domestici rappresentano il più ampio segmento dei circa 14,2 milioni di persone nel mondo che sono vittime del lavoro forzato a fini di sfruttamento economico. Oltre il 50 % dei paesi del mondo attualmente non dispone di leggi che limitano l'orario di lavoro per i lavoratori domestici, che spesso porta a giornate di 16 ore per molte donne e ragazze. La loro situazione può facilmente passare inosservata, poiché spesso esse sono nascoste in residenze private dove alcune diventano le vittime senza voce di abusi fisici e sessuali.

Human Rights Watch ha pubblicato un articolo che plaude agli sforzi profusi finora e che auspica la ratifica della Convenzione da parte di un numero maggiore di paesi.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione comunicare:

1. qual è la situazione attuale dei lavoratori domestici negli Stati membri dell'UE;
2. se gli Stati membri saranno incoraggiati a esaminare e ratificare la Convenzione sui lavoratori domestici?

**Risposta di Laszlo Andor a nome della Commissione**  
(14 agosto 2012)

La situazione dei lavoratori domestici e le problematiche legate alla loro occupazione e alle loro condizioni di lavoro nell'Unione europea sono affrontate dalla Commissione nel suo pacchetto occupazione «Verso una ripresa fonte di occupazione» dell'aprile 2012 nell'ambito del quale la Commissione consulta le parti interessate sulle potenzialità di posti di lavoro qualitativamente validi in relazione ai servizi per la persona e la famiglia <sup>(1)</sup>.

In una prospettiva globale la Commissione concorda quanto alla necessità di affrontare la situazione dei lavoratori domestici, che spesso appartengono a gruppi vulnerabili o hanno un rapporto di lavoro informale, e ritiene che l'attuazione della Convenzione n. 189 del 2011 sulle lavoratrici e i lavoratori domestici contribuirà a migliorare le loro condizioni di lavoro.

L'Unione europea promuove standard occupazionali a livello internazionale facendo leva su vari strumenti, sia attraverso le sue politiche interne che con le sue relazioni estere. In particolare essa facilita, incoraggia e sostiene la ratifica e l'attuazione delle convenzioni che l'OIL ha classificato quali aggiornate <sup>(2)</sup>.

Nel contesto della strategia contro la tratta di esseri umani <sup>(3)</sup>, la Commissione sollecita inoltre gli Stati membri a ratificare tutti i pertinenti strumenti, accordi e obblighi giuridici su scala internazionale che renderanno la lotta contro la tratta di esseri umani più efficace, coordinata e coerente, compresa quindi anche la Convenzione sui lavoratori domestici.

<sup>(1)</sup> Exploiting the employment potential of the personal and household services SWD (2012) 95, documento che accompagna la comunicazione «Verso una ripresa fonte di occupazione», COM(2012)173 del 18.04.2012.

<sup>(2)</sup> Promuovere la possibilità di un lavoro dignitoso per tutti — contributo dell'Unione alla realizzazione dell'agenda per il lavoro dignitoso nel mondo, COM(2006)249 del 24.5.2006, e conclusioni del Consiglio dell'1.12.2006 su un lavoro dignitoso per tutti.

<sup>(3)</sup> La strategia dell'UE per l'eradicazione della tratta degli esseri umani 2012-2016, COM(2012)286 del 19.06.2012.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006109/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Mario Mauro (PPE)**  
(20 June 2012)

*Subject:* Convention on Domestic Workers

The Convention on Domestic Workers set labour standards protecting domestic workers that were ratified by the International Labour Organisation in June 2011. The main rights set forth by the proposal are the right to daily and weekly rest (at least 24 consecutive hours), the right to be paid a set minimum wage, and the right to choose whether to reside in the household or not.

Nearly a year later, Uruguay became the first country to ratify the convention, which cannot go into effect until it has been ratified by at least two countries. The Philippines are poised to be the second to ratify the proposal, and other countries including Belgium, Benin and Mauritius have promised to do likewise.

According to information released by the International Labour Organisation, domestic workers make up the largest segment of the nearly 14.2 million people around the world who are victims of forced labour for economic exploitation. Over 50% of the world's countries currently do not have laws limiting labour hours for domestic workers, commonly resulting in 16-hour days for many women and girls. Their plight can easily go undetected, as they may be hidden away in private residences, where some then become voiceless victims of physical and sexual abuse.

Human Rights Watch has published an article praising the efforts made thus far and encouraging more countries to ratify the convention.

1. What is the current situation of domestic workers in the EU Member States?
2. Should Member States be encouraged to examine and ratify the Convention on Domestic Workers?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission**  
(14 August 2012)

The situation of domestic workers and the challenges of their employment and working conditions in the European Union are addressed by the Commission in its employment package 'Towards a job-rich recovery' of April 2012 whereby the Commission is consulting stakeholders on the potential for quality jobs in personal and household services <sup>(1)</sup>.

In a global perspective, the Commission agrees on the need to address the situation of domestic workers, who often belong to vulnerable groups or are in informal employment, and considers that the implementation of the Domestic Workers Convention, 2011 (No 189) will contribute to improving their working conditions.

The European Union promotes international labour standards through various means, both in its internal policies and in its external relations. In particular, it facilitates, encourages and supports the ratification and implementation of the Conventions that have been classified by the ILO as up to date <sup>(2)</sup>.

In the context of the strategy against trafficking in Human Beings <sup>(3)</sup>, the Commission furthermore urges Member States to ratify all relevant international instruments, agreements and legal obligations which will make the work against such trafficking more effective, coordinated and coherent, including the Domestic Workers Convention.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Exploiting the employment potential of the personal and household services SWD (2012) 95 accompanying Towards a job-rich recovery COM(2012)173, 18.4.2012.

<sup>(2)</sup> Promoting decent work for all- the EU contribution to the implementation of the decent work agenda in the world, COM(2006)249, 24.5.2006, and Council conclusions on Decent work for all of 1.12.2006.

<sup>(3)</sup> EU strategy towards the eradication of trafficking in Human Beings 2012-2016, COM(2012)286, 19.6.2012.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-006110/12  
do Komisji**

**Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)**

(20 czerwca 2012 r.)

*Przedmiot:* Represje władz kolonii wobec białoruskiego więźnia politycznego

Aleś Bialacki, białoruski obrońca praw człowieka, szef Centrum Obrony Praw Człowieka „Viasna”, który obecnie odbywa karę 4,5 r. kolonii karnej o zaostrzonym rygorze, jest prześladowany przez władze kolonii. Tak wynika z listów, jakie szef „Viasny” skierował do Walancina Stefanowicza. W ciągu ostatniego półrocza otrzymał on trzy nagany – za nieregularne obuwie, przebywanie w miejscu pracy bez odpowiedniej naszywki oraz spanie w miejscu pracy.

Jak podkreślają działacze praw człowieka, celem działań dyrekcji kolonii jest nadanie Bialackiemu statusu „więźnia złośliwie naruszającego reżim kolonii”, by pozbawić go prawa do amnestii. Pragnę przypomnieć, że to nie pierwszy przypadek represji i prześladowań więźniów politycznych przez władze kolonii. W ostatnim czasie Mykoła Statkiewicz i Mykoła Autuchowicz zostali skazani na surowsze warunki odbywania kary, a Mykoła Dziadok został przeniesiony do izolatki.

W związku z tym zwracam się z zapytaniem, czy Komisja posiada informacje na temat przypadków prześladowań białoruskich więźniów politycznych w koloniach karnych i ma zamiar podjąć interwencję w tej sprawie?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Štefana Fülego w imieniu Komisji**

(22 sierpnia 2012 r.)

Komisja jest poinformowana o kolejnych doniesieniach dotyczących niedopuszczalnych warunków, w jakich przebywają więźniowie polityczni w koloniach karnych na Białorusi.

UE wielokrotnie, zarówno w kontaktach dwustronnych z władzami białoruskimi, jak i poprzez publiczne oświadczenia, podkreślała swoje obawy dotyczące doniesień o niehumanitarnym i poniżającym traktowaniu więźniów politycznych na Białorusi. UE przypominała władzom białoruskim o ich zobowiązaniach wynikających z prawa międzynarodowego do traktowania więźniów zgodnie z międzynarodowymi normami praw człowieka.

UE nie ma dostępu do białoruskich więzień, aby monitorować warunki przetrzymywania więźniów. Delegatura UE w Mińsku wielokrotnie zwracała się o prawo do odwiedzenia więźniów politycznych w miejscu ich przetrzymywania, ale jak dotąd bezskutecznie. Pozostaje ona jednak w bliskim kontakcie z członkami rodzin więźniów politycznych.

Komisja i Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca będą nadal uważnie śledzić sytuację więźniów politycznych i ich traktowanie na Białorusi oraz podejmować wysiłki na rzecz ich uwolnienia i rehabilitacji.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006110/12  
to the Commission**

**Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)**

(20 June 2012)

*Subject:* Repressive measures against Belarusian political prisoner by prison authorities

Ales Bialiatski, the Belarusian human rights activist and head of the Viasna Human Rights Centre, who is currently serving a four-and-a-half-year term in a maximum security prison, is being persecuted by the prison authorities, according to letters sent to Valentin Stefanovich. In the last six months he has received three reprimands — for irregular footwear, not having the correct stripes at the workplace, and sleeping at the workplace.

Human rights activists point out that the purpose of these reprimands issued by the prison authorities is to give Bialiatski the status of 'prisoner maliciously disrupting the prison regime', in order to deprive him of the right to an amnesty. This is not the first instance of repression and persecution of political prisoners by prison authorities. Mikalai Statkevich and Mikalai Autukhovich were recently sentenced to harsh conditions, and Mikalai Dzyadok was placed in solitary confinement.

Does the Commission have any information about the persecution of Belarusian political prisoners and does it intend to take any action in the matter?

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

(22 August 2012)

The Commission is aware of continued reports regarding the unacceptable conditions to which political prisoners are subjected in Belarus detention facilities.

The EU has repeatedly, both in bilateral contacts with Belarusian authorities and through public statements, highlighted its concerns about reports of inhumane and degrading treatment of prisoners in Belarus. The EU has reminded the Belarusian authorities of their obligations under international law to treat prisoners according to international human rights standards.

The EU has no access to Belarusian prisons to monitor the conditions of imprisonment. The EU Delegation in Minsk has, on numerous occasions, requested to visit political prisoners at their place of detention, so far to no avail. The EU Delegation in Minsk remains however in close contact with family members of the political prisoners.

The Commission and the HR/VP will continue to closely follow the situation of political prisoners and their treatment in Belarus and spare no efforts to obtain their release and rehabilitation.

---

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006111/12  
a la Comisión**

**Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)**

(20 de junio de 2012)

*Asunto:* Caudal ecológico del río Ebro

El 25 de abril de 2012 la Confederación Hidrográfica del Ebro (CHE) presentó la propuesta del Plan Hidrológico de la cuenca del Ebro en la reunión de constitución del Consejo del Agua de la demarcación. La propuesta, que se encuentra actualmente en fase de exposición pública, fija entre otras cosas los caudales ecológicos para la cuenca del Ebro. La CHE, junto con la Agencia Catalana del Agua (ACA), realizó en el 2008 una propuesta de caudales de mantenimiento, caudales regeneradores para situaciones de avenidas y caudales de continuidad en situación de sequía para el río Segre y afluentes catalanes del Ebro. Sin embargo, la propuesta actual de caudales ecológicos del Plan Hidrológico Nacional (PHN) no tiene nada que ver con el citado informe. Nos encontramos ante una propuesta que atenta contra la Directiva marco sobre el agua, proponiendo unos caudales ecológicos claramente insuficientes, que priman el mercadeo de aguas por encima del bienestar del ecosistema fluvial, máxime en el caso del Delta, que es un sistema muy frágil, bajo el peligro de la regresión y subsidencia, erosión costera y salinización.

1. ¿Considera la Comisión que la nueva propuesta de caudales ecológicos en el marco del PHN de la cuenca del Ebro es acorde con los criterios e indicadores ecológicos establecidos en la Directiva marco sobre el agua?
2. ¿Considera la Comisión que la propuesta del 2008 de la CHE y el ACA sobre caudales de mantenimiento, caudales regeneradores para situaciones de avenidas y caudales de continuidad en situación de sequía para el río Segre y afluentes catalanes del Ebro es acorde con los criterios e indicadores ecológicos establecidos en la Directiva marco sobre el agua?
3. ¿Considera la Comisión que es aceptable que la propuesta de nuevos caudales no se base en la propuesta del 2008 de la CHE y el ACA sobre caudales de mantenimiento, caudales regeneradores para situaciones de avenidas y caudales de continuidad en situación de sequía para el río Segre y afluentes catalanes del Ebro?
4. ¿Dispone la Comisión de los estudios técnicos de base utilizados para establecer el régimen de caudales ecológicos?

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

(31 de julio de 2012)

La Comisión tiene conocimiento de la consulta pública que está teniendo lugar sobre la propuesta de Plan Hidrológico de la cuenca del Ebro y ha afirmado reiteradamente la importancia de establecer un caudal ecológico adecuado a fin de alcanzar los objetivos medioambientales de la Directiva Marco sobre el Agua (DMA) <sup>(1)</sup>.

La información relativa a los caudales ecológicos debe reflejarse en los planes hidrológicos de cuenca, que presentan los Estados miembros de conformidad con la DMA. Sin embargo, la Comisión ha tenido que iniciar un procedimiento de infracción contra España (asunto 2010/2083) por no haber adoptado ni notificado a la Comisión sus planes hidrológicos de cuenca.

La Comisión evaluará el contenido de los planes hidrológicos de cuenca de España, y los documentos relacionados, tan pronto como sean adoptados y le sean notificados, y tomará todas las medidas necesarias partiendo de esa evaluación.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Directiva 2000/60/CE, DO L 327 de 22.12.2000.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006111/12  
to the Commission**

**Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)**

(20 June 2012)

*Subject:* Ecological volume of the Ebro River

On 25 April 2012, the Ebro Hydrographic Confederation (CHE) presented its draft hydrological plan for the Ebro basin at the constituent meeting of the Water Council for the area in question. The proposal, which is currently at the public consultation stage, sets, among other things, the ecological volume for the Ebro basin. In 2008, the CHE and the Catalan Water Agency (ACA) drew up proposed management volumes, regenerating volumes for spate conditions and continuity volumes for drought conditions for the Segre River and Catalan tributaries of the Ebro. However, the ecological volumes now being proposed by the National Hydrological Plan (PHN) bear no resemblance to this report. The current proposal violates the terms of the Water Framework Directive, by proposing clearly inadequate ecological volumes which prioritise the commercial use of water over the wellbeing of the river ecosystem, which in the case of the Ebro River is an extremely fragile one, threatened by decline and subsidence, coastal erosion and salinity.

1. Does the Commission consider that the new ecological volumes proposed within the framework of the hydrological plan for the Ebro basin meets the environmental indicators and criteria established by the Water Framework Directive?
2. Does the Commission consider that the 2008 proposal by the CHE and ACA concerning management volumes, regenerating volumes for spate conditions and continuity volumes for drought conditions for the Segre River and Catalan tributaries of the Ebro meets the environmental indicators and criteria established by the Water Framework Directive?
3. Does the Commission consider it acceptable that the proposed new volumes are not based on the 2008 proposal by the CHE and ACA concerning management volumes, regenerating volumes for spate conditions and continuity volumes for drought conditions for the Segre River and Catalan tributaries of the Ebro?
4. Does the Commission have access to the technical studies on which the proposed system of ecological volumes was based?

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

(31 July 2012)

The Commission is aware of the ongoing public consultation on the Ebro draft river basin management plan and has repeatedly stated the importance of setting an appropriate ecological flow to reach the environmental objectives of the Water Framework Directive (WFD) <sup>(1)</sup>.

Information related to ecological flows would normally be reflected in the River Basin Management Plans (RBMPs) submitted by Member States in line with the WFD. However, the Commission has had to open an infringement procedure against Spain (Case 2010/2083) for failing to adopt and report its RBMPs.

The Commission will assess the contents of Spain's RBMPs and any other supporting document available as soon as they are adopted and reported to the Commission. The Commission will then take all necessary measures on the basis of this assessment.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Directive 2000/60/EC, OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006113/12**  
**à la Commission**  
**Christine De Veyrac (PPE)**  
(20 juin 2012)

*Objet:* Sous-utilisation des fonds européens en Grèce

Dans sa communication sur «la croissance pour la Grèce», publiée le 18 avril 2012, la Commission mentionnait l'utilisation des fonds européens, notamment des fonds structurels, comme l'une des principales contributions de l'Union en vue du redressement économique de ce pays.

Le document mettait cependant en évidence dans le même temps la faible utilisation des ressources allouées par l'Union européenne: moins de la moitié des 21 milliards d'euros destinés à la Grèce sur la période 2007-2013, au titre des fonds structurels, ont en effet été dépensés.

Alors que d'autres pays sont confrontés à des difficultés économiques réelles, qui mettent aussi en danger la stabilité de la zone euro, la non-utilisation d'une partie des ressources disponibles ne saurait être compatible avec la gestion saine, efficace et optimale des fonds publics, qui s'impose désormais pour les budgets européens comme nationaux.

L'État grec ne saurait par ailleurs se priver d'engager les politiques nécessaires pour retrouver le chemin de la croissance. L'appui aux PME, à travers les cofinancements européens et les crédits accordés grâce au nouveau fonds européen de garantie, apparaît en ce sens primordial, pour rétablir le dynamisme et la compétitivité de l'économie grecque.

1. Outre les dysfonctionnements administratifs et l'incertitude économique, la Commission peut-elle expliquer les facteurs qui expliqueraient la «sous-utilisation» des fonds européens en Grèce? La situation est-elle comparable dans les autres pays européens (en valeur absolue et relative)?
2. L'état d'avancement des 181 projets prioritaires grecs qui doivent être financés par ces fonds européens permet-il de penser qu'ils seront réalisés au terme du cadre financier actuel?
3. L'incertitude qui pèse sur la situation politique du pays peut-elle ralentir ou remettre en cause ces projets?
4. Quelles mesures la Commission envisage-t-elle de prendre dans le cas où ces fonds ne seraient pas utilisés par la Grèce?

**Réponse donnée par M. Hahn au nom de la Commission**  
(8 août 2012)

1. En ce qui concerne l'absorption des fonds européens, la Grèce fait mieux que la moyenne de l'UE-27: en juillet 2012, elle avait utilisé 41,1 % de l'ensemble des Fonds structurels, contre 38,38 % pour l'UE-27. Néanmoins, la mise en œuvre des fonds européens a été entravée par un système de gestion du cadre de référence stratégique national (CRSN) lourd et compliqué, qui affaiblit la planification stratégique initiale et conduit à des investissements non ciblés et un suivi inefficace. Le cadre juridique au sens large (à savoir les législations relatives à l'environnement, aux expropriations et aux marchés publics) a également provoqué des retards. Des dispositions destinées les unes à simplifier, les autres à renforcer le système de gestion du CRSN sont en cours d'examen. Enfin, le manque de liquidités dans le système bancaire et la réticence des banques à accorder des garanties ont eu une incidence considérable sur la mise en œuvre des fonds européens en Grèce.

2-3. En date du mois de juillet 2012, 15 des 181 projets prioritaires ont déjà été menés à bien. Les autorités grecques ont mis au point un vaste outil en ligne ([www.anaptyxi.gov.gr](http://www.anaptyxi.gov.gr)) qui permettra de suivre les progrès accomplis concernant les projets restants. Tous les projets devraient être achevés pour la fin de l'année 2015. La Commission collabore étroitement avec le gouvernement grec pour remédier aux principaux goulets d'étranglement — tels que les lenteurs bureaucratiques et les retards contractuels — dans la mise en œuvre des projets prioritaires et pour veiller à leur progression constante.

4. Au vu des montants encore disponibles au titre de l'ensemble des priorités des Fonds structurels, les efforts se concentrent sur l'accélération de la mise en œuvre des programmes. En outre, les fonds européens existants, en particulier les financements dans le cadre du Fonds social européen (FSE), seront utilisés pour répondre aux objectifs de l'initiative en faveur des jeunes.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006113/12  
to the Commission**

**Christine De Veyrac (PPE)**

(20 June 2012)

*Subject:* Under-utilisation of European funding in Greece

In its communication on 'growth for Greece' published on 18 April 2012, the Commission refers to the utilisation of European funding, in particular the structural funds, as being one of the main EU contributions to efforts to achieve economic recovery in Greece.

At the same time, the document refers to the under-utilisation of EU resources, less than half of the EUR 21 billion in structural fund appropriations earmarked for Greece for the period 2007-2013 having been spent.

While other countries are facing genuine economic difficulties which are also threatening the stability of the euro area, failure to use all available resources cannot be regarded as compatible with sound, effective and optimal management of public funding, which is now necessary in respect of to both European and national budgets.

Moreover, Greece must not neglect to implement the necessary policies if it is to effect a return to growth. In this connection, support for SMEs in the form of European co-funding and loans under the new European Guarantee Funds are essential to restore the dynamism and competitiveness of the Greek economy.

1. Aside from administrative shortcomings and economic uncertainty, can the Commission give the reasons for the under-utilisation of European funding in Greece? Does a similar situation exist in other European countries (in absolute or relative terms)?
2. Does the state of advancement of the 181 priority projects in Greece receiving European funding indicate that they are likely to be completed within the current financial framework?
3. Could the uncertainty affecting the political situation in the country slow down or compromise the projects?
4. What measures are being envisaged by the Commission if the funding is not utilised by Greece?

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

(8 August 2012)

1. In terms of absorption, Greece performs above the EU-27 average; for all Structural Funds, GR 41.1% vs. EU-27 38.38% in July 2012. Nevertheless, the implementation of EU funds has been hindered by a heavy and complicated National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF) management system weakening the initial strategic planning and leading to non-targeted investments and inefficient monitoring. Delays have also been caused by the broader legal framework (i.e. environmental legislation, expropriations, public procurement). Provisions for simplification are under discussion as well as for strengthening the NSRF management system. Finally, the lack of liquidity in the banking system and the reluctance of banks to issue guarantees have severely impacted the implementation of EU funds in Greece.

2-3. As of July 2012, 15 of the 181 priority projects have already been completed. The Greek authorities have developed a comprehensive web-tool that will be used to monitor the progress of the remaining projects: [www.anaptyxi.gov.gr](http://www.anaptyxi.gov.gr). All projects are scheduled to be completed by end-2015. The Commission is working closely with the Greek Government to tackle critical bottlenecks in the implementation of the priority projects such as bureaucratic and contractual delays and ensure continued progress.

4. Given the amounts still available under all Structural Fund priorities, efforts are being concentrated on accelerating the implementation of the programmes. In addition, existing EU funds notably allocations within the European Social Fund (ESF), will be used to meet the objectives of the youth initiative.

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006114/12**

**alla Commissione**  
**Mario Borghezio (EFD)**  
*(20 giugno 2012)*

Oggetto: Grecia e Goldman Sachs

Determinata a favorire l'ingresso della Grecia nell'euro nel 2002, la Goldman Sachs fornì ad Atene la consulenza finanziaria necessaria anche a fronte di bilanci pubblici poi rivelatisi falsificati. Per questo motivo e anche per le linee di credito erogate allo Stato greco, la banca d'affari Goldman Sachs è stata profumatamente retribuita.

Questo fa pensare che Goldman Sachs si sia trovata in una situazione privilegiata di possesso di informazioni sul rischio dell'euro connesso al pericolo che la Grecia andasse in default.

La Commissione ha valutato se Goldman Sachs abbia utilizzato queste informazioni privilegiate per speculare a scapito dell'euro o trarre profitti di mercato in maniera scorretta?

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

*(6 settembre 2012)*

Per quanto attiene alla consulenza finanziaria fornita da Goldman Sachs ad Atene, la Commissione è a conoscenza soltanto di operazioni su derivati effettuate tra l'Agenzia greca del debito e Goldman Sachs. Per maggiori informazioni in materia, l'onorevole parlamentare può far riferimento ad una relazione di Eurostat sulle visite metodologiche in Grecia, che è consultabile sul seguente sito: [http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/government\\_finance\\_statistics/documents/Greece%20-%202010%20methodological%20visits%20report.pdf](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/government_finance_statistics/documents/Greece%20-%202010%20methodological%20visits%20report.pdf)

Quanto alla possibilità che Goldman Sachs abbia utilizzato informazioni privilegiate per speculare contro l'euro nell'ambito delle operazioni di cui sopra, la Commissione non dispone di informazioni riguardanti presunte attività speculative.

---



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006114/12  
to the Commission  
Mario Borghezio (EFD)  
(20 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Greece and Goldman Sachs

Determined to facilitate the entry of Greece into the euro in 2002, the investment bank Goldman Sachs provided Athens with the financial advice it needed, even in the face of government accounts that later turned out to be false. For this, and also for the credit lines granted to the Greek Government, Goldman Sachs was paid handsomely.

This suggests that Goldman Sachs was in a privileged position in having information on the risks relating to the euro, in connection with the risk that Greece could default.

Has the Commission considered whether Goldman Sachs might have used this inside information to speculate against the euro or profit improperly from the market?

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

Concerning financial advice provided by Goldman Sachs to Athens, the Commission is only aware of transactions in derivatives between the Greek debt agency and Goldman Sachs. For more information on this, the Honourable Member is referred to a report by Eurostat on the methodological visits to Greece, which is available at: [http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/government\\_finance\\_statistics/documents/Greece%20-%202010%20methodological%20visits%20report.pdf](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/government_finance_statistics/documents/Greece%20-%202010%20methodological%20visits%20report.pdf).

Concerning whether Goldman Sachs might have used inside information to speculate against the euro in the context of the above transactions, the Commission has no information concerning possible speculative activities.

---

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-006115/12**  
**aan de Commissie**  
**Barry Madlener (NI)**  
(20 juni 2012)

*Betref:* Werkloosheid naar recordhoogte

De werkloosheid in Nederland loopt op naar recordhoogte: 500 000 werklozen.

Ondertussen gaat de arbeidsmigratie vanuit Midden- en Oost-Europa naar Nederland gewoon door. Maar de Midden- en Oost-Europeanen komen dikwijls niet om te werken; velen houden zich bezig met criminele activiteiten.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met de berichten „Werkloosheid naar hoogste niveau in 15 jaar” <sup>(1)</sup> en „Politie verdenkt Roemenen van 127 inbraken” <sup>(2)</sup>?
2. Is de Commissie ervan op de hoogte dat de werkloosheidscijfers in Nederland geflatteerd zijn, dus dat de werkloosheid in werkelijkheid nog hoger is?
3. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat zowel de hoog oplopende werkloosheid als de criminele activiteiten van Midden- en Oost-Europeanen redenen zijn om de Nederlandse arbeidsmarkt te sluiten, zeker voor personen uit Midden- en Oost-Europa? Zo nee, waarom niet?

**Antwoord van de heer Andor namens de Commissie**  
(3 augustus 2012)

1. Ja, de Commissie is op de hoogte van de door het geachte Parlementslid genoemde berichten.
2. Eurostat publiceert geharmoniseerde werkloosheidspercentages die zijn gebaseerd op de door de Internationale Arbeidsorganisatie aanbevolen definitie en berekend aan de hand van geharmoniseerde gegevens (EU-arbeidskrachtenenquête). Volgens de recentste Eurostat-cijfers (mei 2012) bedraagt het werkloosheidspercentage in Nederland 5,1 %; dit is het op een na laagste percentage voor de lidstaten en het ligt beduidend lager dan het EU-gemiddelde (10,3 %).
3. Het grondrecht van vrij verkeer mag niet worden beperkt, behalve voor een beperkte, niet-verlengbare periode in het kader van de overgangsregelingen die de lidstaten <sup>(3)</sup> in staat stellen de toegang tot hun arbeidsmarkt te beperken voor werknemers uit lidstaten die onlangs tot de EU zijn toegetreden. Deze overgangsregelingen vormen uiteraard een voorbereidende fase die de lidstaten in staat stelt zich geleidelijk voor te bereiden op de volledige toepassing van de EU-wetgeving inzake vrij verkeer van werknemers.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://www.telegraaf.nl/overgeld/arbeid/12385915/\\_Werkloosheid\\_naar\\_hoogste\\_niveau\\_in\\_15\\_jaar\\_.html](http://www.telegraaf.nl/overgeld/arbeid/12385915/_Werkloosheid_naar_hoogste_niveau_in_15_jaar_.html)

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://www.telegraaf.nl/binnenland/12386083/\\_Mannen\\_pleegden\\_127\\_inbraken\\_.html](http://www.telegraaf.nl/binnenland/12386083/_Mannen_pleegden_127_inbraken_.html)

<sup>(3)</sup> Nederland, bijvoorbeeld, blijft de toegang tot zijn arbeidsmarkt beperken voor Bulgaarse en Roemeense werknemers in het kader van EU-bepalingen die dat uiterlijk tot 31 december 2013 mogelijk maken.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006115/12  
to the Commission  
Barry Madlener (NI)  
(20 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Record high unemployment

Labour migration from Central and Eastern Europe to the Netherlands is simply continuing at present. But in many cases, Central and Eastern Europeans come not to work but to commit crimes.

1. Is the Commission aware of the reports 'Werkloosheid naar hoogste niveau in 15 jaar' [Unemployment at its highest level in 15 years] <sup>(1)</sup> and 'Politie verdenkt Roemenen van 127 inbraken' [Police suspect Romanians of 127 burglaries] <sup>(2)</sup>?
2. Is the Commission aware that the unemployment figures in the Netherlands are actually distorted, the true situation being even worse than it appears?
3. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that both high unemployment and the criminal activities of Central and Eastern Europeans are reasons to close the Dutch labour market, particularly to people from Central and Eastern Europe? If not, why not?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission  
(3 August 2012)**

1. Yes, the Commission is aware of the reports that the Honourable Member refers to.
2. Eurostat produces harmonised unemployment rates based on the definition recommended by the International Labour Organisation and measured using a source of harmonised data (the EU labour force survey). According to the latest Eurostat figures (May 2012), the unemployment rate in the Netherlands is 5.1%, which is the second lowest rate for the Member States and significantly below the EU average (10.3%).
3. Restrictions cannot be placed on workers' fundamental freedom of movement, except for a limited, non-extendable period under the transitional arrangements allowing the Member States <sup>(3)</sup> to restrict access to their labour markets by workers from Member States that acceded the EU recently. These transitional arrangements are by the very nature a preparatory phase, allowing Member States to prepare gradually for the full application of EC law on free movement of workers.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://www.telegraaf.nl/overgeld/arbeid/12385915/\\_Werkloosheid\\_naar\\_hoogste\\_niveau\\_in\\_15\\_jaar\\_.html](http://www.telegraaf.nl/overgeld/arbeid/12385915/_Werkloosheid_naar_hoogste_niveau_in_15_jaar_.html)

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://www.telegraaf.nl/binnenland/12386083/\\_Mannen\\_pleegden\\_127\\_inbraken\\_.html](http://www.telegraaf.nl/binnenland/12386083/_Mannen_pleegden_127_inbraken_.html)

<sup>(3)</sup> For instance, the Netherlands continues to restrict access to its labour market by Bulgarian and Romanian workers under EU provisions which allow it to do so until 31 December 2013 at the latest.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-006116/12  
do Komisji**

**Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)**

(20 czerwca 2012 r.)

**Przedmiot:** Zapobieganie zapaleniu płuc i biegunce u dzieci poniżej piątego roku życia w Afryce i Azji

W ostatnio opublikowanym sprawozdaniu UNICEF stwierdza, że zapalenie płuc i biegunka to najbardziej śmiertelne choroby wśród najuboższych dzieci na świecie. Te dwie choroby są głównymi zabójcami dzieci poniżej piątego roku życia, powodując 29 % zgonów na całym świecie (ponad dwa miliony zgonów każdego roku). 90 % tych zgonów ma miejsce w Afryce Subsaharyjskiej i w Azji Południowej.

Zapalenie płuc i biegunka są ściśle związane z ubóstwem w otoczeniu domowym, niedożywieniem i brakiem dostępu do podstawowych świadczeń; można im łatwo zapobiegać poprzez optymalne praktyki karmienia piersią, właściwe odżywianie, szczepienia, mycie rąk mydłem, dostęp do bezpiecznej wody pitnej, do podstawowych urządzeń sanitarnych itd. UNICEF podkreśla możliwość zmniejszenia różnic pod względem wskaźnika przeżywalności dzieci między ubogimi a bardziej zasobnymi krajami przez zwiększenie zaangażowania, uwagi i środków finansowych na podstawową opiekę zdrowotną i pomoc żywnościową. Ma to również na celu przyspieszenie postępu w osiągnięciu milenijnych celów rozwoju.

1. Czy Komisja zamierza wspierać plany działań UNICEF, aby kontrolować zachorowania na biegunkę i zapalenie płuc na kontynentach afrykańskim i azjatyckim?
2. Czy Komisja planuje nawiązać współpracę z UNICEF lub, zamiast tego, czy zamierza rozwiązać tę kwestię niezależnie od tej organizacji? Jeśli Komisja wybierze drugą opcję, jakie środki planuje zastosować, aby zapewnić stosowanie najlepszych praktyk i aby jednocześnie uniknąć pokrywania się jej działań z działaniami UNICEF?

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

(6 sierpnia 2012 r.)

Zapalenie płuc i biegunka mają istotny wpływ na wskaźniki zachorowalności i śmiertelności, a działania prowadzone w związku z tym przez UNICEF są uznawane przez Komisję. Podejście Unii Europejskiej polega na wspieraniu krajów w ich kompleksowych strategiach i planach dotyczących zdrowia oraz powiązanych strategiach i planach sektorowych, które odnoszą się również do tych chorób. Kraje same określają swoje priorytety i wybierają partnerów wykonawczych. UE dostosowuje swoje poparcie do ich krajowych planów na rzecz zdrowia zgodnie z zasadami skuteczności pomocy.

Komisja utrzymuje regularne kontakty i interakcje zarówno na poziomie centralnym, jak i krajowym, a w zależności od konkretnej sytuacji w kraju UNICEF może działać jako agencja wdrażająca. UE uzupełnia swoje podejście wspierając sojusz GAVI<sup>(1)</sup>, który zapewnia pomoc dla państw w zakresie dostarczanych przez UNICEF szczepionek przeciwko zapaleniu płuc i biegunce.

<sup>(1)</sup> Globalnego Sojuszu na rzecz Szczepionek i Szczepień.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006116/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)**  
(20 June 2012)

*Subject:* Prevention against pneumonia and diarrhoea for children under the age of 5 in Africa and Asia

In its most recently published report, Unicef states that pneumonia and diarrhoea are the two deadliest diseases for the world's poorest children. The two diseases are the leading killers for children under 5 years old, resulting in 29% of deaths worldwide (more than two million deaths each year). 90% of those deaths occur in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia.

Pneumonia and diarrhoea are closely associated with poor home environments, undernutrition and lack of access to essential services; they can be easily prevented through optimal breastfeeding practices, adequate nutrition, vaccinations, hand-washing with soap, access to safe drinking water, basic sanitation etc. Unicef underlines the opportunity to narrow the child survival gap between the poorest and better-off countries by increasing commitment, attention and funding for basic public health and nutrition interventions. This is also aimed at accelerating progress towards the Millennium Development Goals.

1. Does the Commission intend to support Unicef's action plans to control diarrhoea and pneumonia on the African and Asian continents?
2. Does the Commission plan to establish cooperation with Unicef or, instead, to tackle the issue separately from that organisation? If it chooses the second option, what measures does the Commission plan to use in order to ensure that best practice is used and, at the same time, to avoid overlapping with the activities of Unicef?

**Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission**  
(6 August 2012)

Pneumonia and diarrhoea have a major impact in terms of morbidity and mortality, and the related work of Unicef is acknowledged by the Commission. The European Union approach is to support countries in their comprehensive health and inter-related sector strategies and plans that also address these diseases. The countries themselves determine what their priorities are and choose their preferred implementation partners. The EU, in line with aid effectiveness principles, aligns its support to their National Health Plan.

The Commission has regular contacts and interaction at headquarters and at country level, and, depending on the specific country situation, Unicef may act as an implementing agency. The EU complements its approach in supporting the GAVI Alliance<sup>(1)</sup> which provides support to countries for vaccinations against pneumonia and diarrhoea, supplied through Unicef.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunisation.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-006120/12  
do Komisji**

**Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)**

(20 czerwca 2012 r.)

*Przedmiot:* Stan więziennictwa na Białorusi

Prawa człowieka na Białorusi są nagminnie łamane. W ostatnim czasie coraz częściej docierają informacje o bardzo złych warunkach, które panują w białoruskich więzieniach. Więźniowie często poddawani są torturom i nieludzkiemu traktowaniu. Przechowywani są w zimnych przeludnionych celach, bez wentylacji i dostępu do światła dziennego. W pomieszczeniach brakuje dopływu ciepłej wody, przy tym więźniowie mogą korzystać z prysznicza tylko raz na tydzień. Nie ma również wydzielonego osobnego miejsca na toalety. Współwięźniowie śpią razem na drewnianych ławkach bez pościeli. Nie mogą również wyjść z celi na spacer.

W związku z tym zwracam się z zapytaniem:

1. Czy Komisja monitoruje stan więziennictwa na Białorusi?
2. Czy zostały podjęte próby reagowania na niehumanitarne traktowanie więźniów na Białorusi?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Štefana Fülego w imieniu Komisji**

(27 lipca 2012 r.)

1. UE nie ma dostępu do białoruskich więzień, aby monitorować warunki przetrzymywania więźniów. Delegatura UE w Mińsku wielokrotnie, bezskutecznie wnioskowała o prawo do odwiedzenia więźniów politycznych w miejscu zatrzymania.
2. UE wielokrotnie, zarówno w kontaktach dwustronnych z władzami białoruskimi oraz poprzez publiczne oświadczenia, podkreślała swoje obawy w odniesieniu do sprawozdań dotyczących nieludzkiego i poniżającego traktowania więźniów politycznych na Białorusi. Na przykład we wnioskach Rady do Spraw Zagranicznych z dnia 23 marca 2012 r. wyrażono głębokie zaniepokojenie doniesieniami o torturach i nieludzkich warunkach przetrzymywania więźniów politycznych. Rada przypominała władzom białoruskim, że na mocy prawa międzynarodowego są one zobowiązane do tego, by zapewnić przestrzeganie zakazu tortur oraz okrutnego, nieludzkiego i poniżającego traktowania oraz że władze są odpowiedzialne za weryfikowanie doniesień na ten temat.

UE będzie nadal uważnie śledzić rozwój sytuacji na Białorusi, w tym w zakresie ochrony praw człowieka i podstawowych wolności.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006120/12  
to the Commission  
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)  
(20 June 2012)**

*Subject:* State of the prison system in Belarus

Human rights in Belarus are repeatedly violated. Recently we have heard increasing reports of terrible conditions in Belarusian prisons. Prisoners are often subjected to torture and inhumane treatment. They are kept in cold, overcrowded cells without ventilation or daylight. Shortages of hot water mean that prisoners are only able to shower once a week. Toilet areas are not separated or private, and cellmates sleep together on wooden bunks with no bedding. They are not allowed to leave their cells to go for a walk.

Given this situation, I should like to ask the following questions:

1. Is the Commission monitoring the state of the prison system in Belarus?
2. Have any attempts been made to respond to the inhumane treatment of prisoners in Belarus?

**Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission  
(27 July 2012)**

1. The EU has no access to Belarusian prisons in order to monitor the conditions of imprisonment. The EU Delegation in Minsk has on numerous occasions requested to visit political prisoners at their place of detention, to no avail.
2. The EU has repeatedly, both in bilateral contacts with Belarusian authorities and through public statements, highlighted its concerns as regards reports of inhumane and degrading treatment of prisoners in Belarus. For example, the 23 March 2012 conclusions of the Foreign Affairs Council expressed deep concern over reports of torture and inhumane prison conditions of political prisoners. The Council also reminded the Belarusian authorities of their obligation under international law to ensure the respect of the prohibition of torture and cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment, and of their responsibility to investigate reports thereof.

The EU will continue to closely follow domestic developments in Belarus, including issues of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-006121/12  
to the Commission  
Ashley Fox (ECR)  
(20 June 2012)**

*Subject:* High-speed broadband

Local authorities across the South West of England are investing in high-speed broadband in an effort to boost economic growth in the region. Sadly, the process has stalled due to unreasonable demands by the Commission. The already considerable delay is threatening the entire feasibility of the project and may lead to its cancellation. The Commissioner talks a lot about the need for growth, and yet his own departments' actions are threatening schemes that are key to this economic revival.

Will the Commissioner please answer the following questions:

1. Why is the Commission insisting on open access to the proposed new network when existing UK OfCom regulations already require passive access? By insisting on open access the Commission is threatening the entire project.
2. Why does the Commission believe that a fourth-generation — or LTS fixed — wireless system will not provide superfast broadband?
3. Will the Commissioner give assurances that these unreasonable demands will be withdrawn so that this much-needed scheme can go ahead?

**Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission  
(23 July 2012)**

The Commission strongly supports efforts, such as those undertaken in the South West of England, to achieve the EU 2020 targets in high speed and very high speed broadband.

The requirements for open access established in the context of the current EU State aid guidelines on broadband networks represent a guarantee for open competition for all potential suppliers of Internet services. The Commission is currently assessing the state aid notification for the UK BDUK scheme which it expects to complete shortly. This assessment includes looking into whether the remedies foreseen within it are sufficient to meet the criteria of the EU state aid guidelines or whether further access obligations are necessary to ensure effective open access at all network levels as required in the context of a publicly funded infrastructure.

The Commission fully recognises the role that wireless technologies can play in the provision of high speed broadband services, particularly in rural areas with lower population density. The use of such wireless technologies in the access network would obviously require the existence of a strong high speed backhaul in order to sustain the expected quality of high speed broadband services (e.g. upload and download speeds, different levels of contention rates, etc).

---



(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006123/12  
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**

**Fiorello Provera (EFD)**

(20 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Trattamento dei detenuti libici

Il 18 giugno 2012 Human Rights Watch (HRW) ha dichiarato che i casi di tortura in Libia continuano a rappresentare un serio problema. Almeno 7 000 persone sono attualmente detenute in seguito al conflitto dello scorso anno che ha rovesciato il colonnello Gheddafi, stando a quanto dichiarato da funzionari delle Nazioni Unite e del governo libico. In tutto il paese le milizie detengono 4 000 di questi prigionieri, mentre gli altri si trovano in strutture gestite dal governo. Molti miliziani detengono segretamente alcune persone.

I prigionieri sono presumibilmente detenuti per aver commesso crimini gravi, prima e dopo il conflitto, mentre molti altri sono detenuti per aver combattuto con le forze favorevoli a Gheddafi o a causa delle proprie affiliazioni familiari, tribali o politiche. In base alla Costituzione libica, il fatto di aver combattuto a favore di Gheddafi non costituisce reato. Possono essere perseguiti solo coloro che hanno commesso reati quali omicidi, torture, violenze sessuali o altri crimini. HRW riferisce che alcuni comandanti della milizia rifiutano di consegnare i detenuti, perché credono che il governo di transizione non assicurerà efficacemente la giustizia, e che alcuni prigionieri sono utilizzati come merce di scambio. Inoltre, destano particolare preoccupazione le torture perpetrate nelle strutture detentive controllate dalla milizia. HRW ha riferito in merito ad almeno una decina di casi. Le relazioni di alcuni gruppi mediatici come la BBC riferiscono che nei centri detentivi presso la città di Misurata le donne sono state violentate e sottoposte a torture.

Pochi detenuti sono stati formalmente accusati e molti non conoscono il motivo della propria detenzione. Stando a quanto riferito dalla polizia giudiziaria, sono state pronunciate condanne solo nei confronti di 194 persone detenute durante o in seguito al conflitto. Esercitando maggiori poteri rispetto all'esercito e alla polizia, le milizie locali hanno impedito la ricostruzione del sistema giudiziario del paese. Alcune relazioni riferiscono che polizia, pubblici ministeri e giudici sono stati minacciati da soggetti legati alle milizie. Si contano inoltre numerosi omicidi di natura politica. Un pubblico ministero ha riferito a Human Rights Watch che alcuni soggetti sono sospettati di questi crimini, ma che non è possibile arrestarli.

1. Quali azioni ha intrapreso il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante per risolvere la questione del trattamento dei detenuti libici con il Consiglio nazionale di transizione del paese?
2. Qual è la posizione del Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante rispetto al significativo ruolo delle milizie in Libia, ritenute responsabili di ostacolare il processo di ricostruzione del sistema giudiziario del paese?
3. Qual è il ruolo dell'UE nel migliorare il sistema giuridico della Libia e, in particolare, quale sostegno pratico può offrire l'Unione nel tutelare le autorità locali minacciate dai miliziani?
4. Quali misure è pronto il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante ad adottare per indagare sui casi di abusi perpetrati nei confronti di donne e bambini prigionieri nei centri detentivi libici?

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

(9 agosto 2012)

L'AR/VP è preoccupata per le informazioni relative alle violazioni dei diritti umani in Libia, tra cui il maltrattamento da parte delle milizie dei prigionieri appartenenti a gruppi vulnerabili. Il 31 gennaio 2012 l'AR/VP ha chiesto il pieno rispetto dei diritti dei detenuti in Libia e ha invitato le autorità ad accelerare il trasferimento sotto il loro controllo di tutti i luoghi detentivi, nonché di indagare sulle presunte violazioni dei diritti dei detenuti. Il governo libico ha risposto positivamente a tali inviti e ha dichiarato che l'attuazione di misure volte a trasferire alle autorità il controllo delle strutture detentive era in corso. Ciononostante, l'UE continua regolarmente a sollevare la questione con le autorità e a seguirne da vicino gli sviluppi.

L'UE ha fornito aiuti di emergenza alle popolazioni bisognose di protezione in seguito al conflitto e sosterrà le autorità nei loro sforzi intesi a garantire il rispetto dei diritti umani, i valori democratici e lo Stato di diritto. Inoltre, essa fornisce sostegno alle vittime di tortura e di traumi violenti in Libia e promuove un quadro giuridico e politico nazionale per contrastare la tortura e altre forme di maltrattamento.

Per quanto riguarda la riforma generale intesa a rafforzare il rispetto dello Stato di diritto, la riforma del settore della sicurezza e il sostegno allo scioglimento delle milizie mediante la creazione di occupazione alternativa, l'UE ha sviluppato un dialogo con le autorità in merito a tali questioni, ha fornito sostegno a breve termine e prevede un sostegno più significativo in futuro con il nuovo governo.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006123/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Fiorello Provera (EFD)**

(20 June 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — The treatment of Libyan detainees

On 18 June 2012, Human Rights Watch (HRW) warned that incidents of torture in Libya remain a serious problem. At least 7000 people are currently in detention following last year's conflict which toppled Colonel Gaddafi. This is according to the United Nations and Libyan Government officials. Four thousand of those individuals are being held by militias across the country, while the rest are in facilities run by the government. Many militias are holding individuals in secret.

The detainees are allegedly being held for having committed serious crimes, before and after the conflict, yet many are in detention because they fought with pro-Gaddafi forces, or because of their family, tribal or political affiliations. According to the Libyan Constitution, it is not a crime to have fought for Gaddafi. Only individuals who committed unlawful killings, torture, sexual violence or other crimes may be prosecuted. HRW reports that some militia commanders are refusing to hand over detainees because they believe that the transitional government will not deliver justice effectively, and some detainees are being used as bargaining chips. What is more, torture inside militia-controlled detention facilities is a major concern. At least a dozen cases have been reported by HRW. There are reports from media groups such as the BBC which state that women have been raped and subjected to torture in detention centres near the city of Misrata.

Few of the detainees have been formally charged, and many do not know why they are still in detention. According to the judicial police, only 194 people detained during or after the conflict have been sentenced. Since local militias wield more power than the army and police, they have hampered the rebuilding of the country's justice system. There are reports that police, prosecutors and judges have been threatened by individuals linked to militias. In addition, there have also been numerous politically motivated murders. One prosecutor told Human Rights Watch that: 'We have suspects for these killings, but we don't have the power to arrest them'.

1. What steps has the Vice-President/High Representative taken to address the issue of the treatment of Libyan detainees with the country's Transitional National Council?
2. What is the position of the Vice-President/High Representative regarding the significant role played in Libya by militias, which are believed to be hampering the process of rebuilding the country's justice system?
3. What role is the EU playing in improving Libya's legal system and, in particular, what practical support can it offer in protecting judicial authorities who are threatened by militia groups?
4. What steps is the Vice-President/High Representative prepared to take to investigate cases of abuse of women and children who are being held in detention centres across Libya?

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

(9 August 2012)

The HR/VP is concerned about reports from Libya of human rights violations, including the ill-treatment of detainees belonging to vulnerable groups by militias. On 31 January 2012 the HR/VP called for full respect of the rights of detainees in Libya and for the authorities to accelerate the process of bringing all places of detention under their control and to investigate allegations of violations of detainees' rights. The Libyan Government reacted positively to these calls and stated that it is in the process of implementing measures aiming at transferring the control of detention facilities to the authorities. Nonetheless the EU continues to raise these issues regularly with the authorities and is following developments closely.

The EU has provided emergency assistance to people in need of protection as a result of the conflict and will support the authorities in their efforts to ensure respect for human rights, democratic values and the rule of law. Moreover, it is currently supporting victims of torture and of violent trauma in Libya and is advocating for a national legal and policy framework that addresses torture and other forms of ill-treatment.

As regards wider reform designed to strengthen respect for the rule of law, reform the security sector and support the disbanding of the militias through the creating of alternative employment, the EU has developed a dialogue with the authorities on these issues and has provided some short-term support and envisages more substantial support in the future moments with the new government.

---

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-006124/12**

**aan de Commissie**

**Auke Zijlstra (NI)**

(20 juni 2012)

*Betref:* Nauwere samenwerking EU-Turkije op het gebied van energie

1. Is het de Commissie bekend dat de commissaris voor energie en de Turkse ministers Bagis en Yildiz vorige week in Stuttgart een verklaring hebben afgegeven over intensivering van de relaties met Turkije met betrekking tot energie?
2. Kan de Commissie bevestigen dat daarbij door de commissaris is gezegd dat Turkije en de EU, met betrekking tot energie, dezelfde strategische uitdagingen kennen en dezelfde doelen nastreven?
3. Hoe ziet de Commissie deze intensivering van de relaties tussen de EU en Turkije in het licht van de bezetting door Turkse troepen van het noorden van de EU-lidstaat Cyprus?
4. Wat is de positie van de Commissie ten aanzien van de claims van zowel de EU-lidstaat Cyprus als Turkije op de onlangs aangetoonde olievoorraden in het oosten van de Middellandse Zee?
5. Hoe ziet de Commissie bovengenoemde verklaring in het licht van het sluimerende conflict tussen de EU-lidstaat Cyprus en Turkije over de onlangs aangetoonde olievoorraden in het oosten van de Middellandse Zee?
6. Houdt de verklaring van de commissaris voor Energie, dat de Commissie de strategische doelen van Turkije steunt, ook in dat de Commissie de Turkse aanspraken op de olievoorraden in het oosten van de Middellandse Zee steunt?

**Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie**

(1 augustus 2012)

De leden van de Commissie die verantwoordelijk zijn voor Energie respectievelijk Uitbreiding en Europees Nabuurschapsbeleid, en de Turkse ministers Yildiz en Bağış hebben op 14 juni 2012 in Stuttgart overeenstemming bereikt over een plan voor nauwere samenwerking op energiegebied. Die samenwerking is in het wederzijdse belang van de EU en Turkije, die te maken hebben met een groot aantal gemeenschappelijke uitdagingen bij hun streven om een duurzame energievoorziening en concurrerende energiemarkten tot stand te brengen. Deze nauwere samenwerking op energiegebied maakt deel uit van de „positieve agenda” voor Turkije, een initiatief dat op 9 december 2011 door de Europese Raad is goedgekeurd.

De nauwere samenwerking op energiegebied is niet van invloed op de positie van de EU ten aanzien van de soevereine rechten van de lidstaten van de EU. Deze omvatten onder meer het aangaan van bilaterale overeenkomsten, en de exploratie en exploitatie van hun natuurlijke hulpbronnen in overeenstemming met het acquis van de EU en het internationale recht, waaronder het Zeerechtverdrag van de Verenigde Naties — zoals duidelijk is uitgesproken door de Europese Raad van december 2011.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006124/12  
to the Commission  
Auke Zijlstra (NI)  
(20 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Closer cooperation between the EU and Turkey in the field of energy

1. Is the Commission aware that, last week in Stuttgart, the Commissioner for Energy and the Turkish ministers Bagis and Yildiz issued a statement on stepping up relations with Turkey with regard to energy?
2. Can the Commission confirm that, on that occasion, the Commissioner said that, in relation to energy, Turkey and the EU faced the same strategic challenges and were pursuing the same goals?
3. How does the Commission view this stepping-up of relations between the EU and Turkey in the light of the occupation of the north of EU Member State Cyprus by Turkish troops?
4. What is the Commission's position with regard to the claims of both the EU Member State Cyprus and Turkey to the recently discovered oil deposits in the eastern Mediterranean?
5. How does the Commission view the aforementioned statement in the light of the dormant conflict between the EU Member State Cyprus and Turkey over the oil deposits recently shown to exist in the eastern Mediterranean?
6. In stating that the Commission supported Turkey's strategic objectives, was the Commissioner for Energy also implying that the Commission supports Turkey's claims to the oil deposits in the eastern Mediterranean?

**Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission  
(1 August 2012)**

The Members of the Commission responsible for Energy and for Enlargement and European Neighbourhood Policy and Turkish Ministers Yildiz and Bagis agreed on 14 June 2012 in Stuttgart on an outline for enhanced energy cooperation. Such cooperation is in the mutual interest of the EU and Turkey, which have many challenges in common in their endeavours to secure sustainable energy supplies and to ensure competitive energy markets. This enhanced energy cooperation is part of the 'positive agenda' for Turkey, an initiative which was endorsed by the European Council of 9 December 2011.

The enhanced energy cooperation does not affect the EU's position with regard to the sovereign rights of EU Member States. These include, *inter alia*, entering into bilateral agreements, and exploring and exploiting their natural resources in accordance with the EU *acquis* and international law, including the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea — as clearly stated by the European Council of December 2011.

---

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-006125/12**  
**aan de Commissie**  
**Auke Zijlstra (NI)**  
(20 juni 2012)

*Betreft:* Turkije rekent op visumvrij reizen door EU

Turkije rekent erop dat de 80 miljoen Turken binnen enkele jaren zonder visum vrij door de EU kunnen reizen.

Om van visumplicht vrijgesteld te worden, heeft de EU in het verleden aan Turkije de voorwaarde gesteld dat het een oplossing moet vinden voor de stroom illegalen van Turkije naar de EU; Turkije zelf heeft gezegd dat de EU daartoe „de eerste stap” zou moeten zetten.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht „Turkey hopes for EU visa breakthrough this week” <sup>(1)</sup>?
2. Welke zekerheid heeft de Commissie gekregen dat Turkije — in het kader van de vele illegalen die via dit land de EU binnenkomen — nu wél zijn grenzen deugdelijk beschermt? Welke verbeteringen/hervormingen heeft Turkije in dezen doorgevoerd, en welke resultaten heeft dat reeds gehad?
3. Is Turkije voornemens alle illegalen die via dit land de EU zijn binnengekomen terug te nemen? Zo neen, welke consequenties verbindt de Commissie hieraan? Welke zekerheid heeft de Commissie in dezen van Turkije gekregen?
4. Turkish Airlines vliegt vaker naar en van Mogadishu dan voorheen; daarmee is Turkije een luchtbrug geworden voor Somaliërs die de EU willen binnenkomen <sup>(2)</sup>. Heeft Turkije reeds een oplossing voor dit probleem gevonden? Zo ja, welk? Zo neen, welke consequenties verbindt de Commissie hieraan?
5. Is de Commissie ervan op de hoogte uit welke andere derde landen, naast Somalië, personen via Turkije (illegaal) de EU binnenkomen, zoals uit Marokko en andere Noord-Afrikaanse landen? Heeft Turkije reeds een oplossing voor dit probleem gevonden? Zo ja, welk? Zo neen, welke consequenties verbindt de Commissie hieraan?

**Antwoord van mevrouw Malmström namens de Commissie**  
(6 augustus 2012)

Het is de Commissie bekend dat Turkije rekent op een visumvrije regeling voor zijn burgers. De Raad heeft in zijn conclusies van 21 juni 2012 de Commissie verzocht maatregelen te nemen met het oog op visumliberalisering voor Turkije als gradueel perspectief voor de lange termijn, parallel met de ondertekening van de overnameovereenkomst door Turkije.

Turkije heeft in 2006 een nationaal actieplan voor de ontwikkeling van geïntegreerd grensbeheer opgesteld. Dit actieplan voorziet in een aantal hervormingen en maatregelen voor capaciteitsopbouw om de kwaliteit van het grensbeheer in Turkije te verbeteren. De vorderingen die Turkije met de uitvoering van het actieplan maakt, worden door de Commissie nauwgezet in het oog gehouden.

Op 21 juni 2012 heeft de Commissie de onderhandelingen over een overnameovereenkomst met Turkije met succes afgerond. De presentatie door de EU van een routekaart voor visumliberalisering is voor de Turkse autoriteiten een voorwaarde voor ondertekening van deze overeenkomst.

De Commissie heeft in het kader van de dialoog met de Turkse autoriteiten al gewezen op bepaalde normen en praktijken in Turkije die het voor personen die er alleen op uit zijn illegaal over de buitengrens van de EU te komen, gemakkelijker maken om het Turkse grondgebied te betreden. De Commissie zal in samenwerking met Frontex nauwgezet in het oog houden op welke wijze de Turkse autoriteiten dit probleem oplossen.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://euobserver.com/15/116678>.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.elsevier.nl/web/Nieuws/Politiek/332644/Leers-vreest-toestroom-Somalische-vluchtelingen.htm>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006125/12  
to the Commission  
Auke Zijlstra (NI)  
(20 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Turkey's anticipation of visa-free travel within the EU

Turkey expects that within a few years from now the 80 million Turks will be able to travel freely within the EU without visas.

In order for the visa requirement to be dropped, the EU has in the past made it a precondition that Turkey should find a solution to the stream of illegal migrants entering the EU from its territory; Turkey itself has said that the EU must take 'the first step' to this end.

1. Is the Commission aware of the report 'Turkey hopes for EU visa breakthrough this week' <sup>(1)</sup>?
2. In view of the large numbers of illegal migrants entering the EU via Turkey, what assurances has the Commission received that Turkey is now after all protecting its borders properly? What improvements/reforms has Turkey implemented in this regard, and what results has this already had?
3. Does Turkey intend to take back all illegal migrants who have entered the EU via its territory? If not, what action will the Commission take? What assurances has the Commission received from Turkey in this regard?
4. Turkish Airlines is flying to and from Mogadishu more frequently than before, making Turkey an air bridge for Somalis wishing to enter the EU <sup>(2)</sup>. Has Turkey already found a solution to this problem? If so, what? If not, how will the Commission respond?
5. Does the Commission know from which other third countries besides Somalia people enter the EU illegally via Turkey, for example Morocco and other North African countries? Has Turkey already found a solution to this problem? If so, what? If not, how will the Commission respond?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission  
(6 August 2012)**

The Commission is aware of the expectations of Turkey to obtain a visa-free regime for its citizens. On 21 June 2012 the Council adopted conclusions inviting the Commission to take steps towards visa liberalisation for Turkey as a gradual and long-term perspective, in parallel with the signature of the readmission agreement by Turkey.

In 2006, Turkey adopted a 'National Action Plan towards the development of the Integrated Border Management', under which several reforms and capacity building measures are foreseen which allow to improve the quality of border management in Turkey. The Commission closely monitors the progress made by Turkey in implementing that Action Plan.

On 21 June 2012, the Commission successfully concluded the negotiation of the EU-Turkey readmission agreement. The Turkish authorities are conditioning their signature of this agreement on the presentation by the EU of a Roadmap on visa liberalisation.

In the framework of its dialogue with the Turkish authorities, the Commission has already drawn the attention of the latter to the fact that some norms and practices in Turkey are facilitating the entry into the Turkish territory of persons whose only intention is to irregularly cross the external border of the EU. The Commission, in coordination with Frontex, will closely monitor in which manner Turkish authorities will address this problem.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://euobserver.com/15/116678>.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.elsevier.nl/web/Nieuws/Politiek/332644/Leers-vreest-toestroom-Somalische-vluchtelingen.htm>



(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006127/12**

**alla Commissione**

**Mario Borghezio (EFD)**

(20 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Traffico d'armi in Europa proveniente dai Balcani e intervento dell'UE

Kalashnikov, revolver 357 magnum, pistole mitragliatrici Skorpion, pistole 9mm, fucili d'assalto. Durante le operazioni anti-droga e contro la criminalità organizzata le polizie di tutta Europa stanno sequestrando più armi che mai. La sezione balistica della Prefettura di Polizia di Parigi custodisce 4 500 armi da fuoco confiscate negli ultimi dieci anni e si stima che in Francia le armi illegali attualmente in circolazione siano 30-40 mila, con dati in crescita per le armi da guerra. Vengono utilizzate nel traffico di droga, nelle guerre tra gang e per il controllo del territorio.

Secondo i dati della polizia parigina, la maggior parte sono di fabbricazione ex-jugoslava e, a differenza del traffico di stupefacenti, vengono introdotte in Europa con consegne di piccoli quantitativi: 4 o 5 armi per volta, per un valore di 2 500/3 000 Euro a pezzo. Si ritiene che in Bosnia, su 4 milioni di abitanti, siano ancora 400 000 le armi detenute illegalmente dai civili.

In una località segreta di Sarajevo una banda di trafficanti offre kalashnikov al costo di 400 euro (che cinque anni fa costavano solo 50 euro), un lanciarazzi per 500 euro, mentre le granate si vendono a 50 euro al pezzo, 20 euro con lo sconto quantità. Sono due le rotte del traffico di armi destinato all'Europa occidentale: la prima, a nord, passa per Croazia, Slovenia, Austria e Germania e si effettua a bordo di camion, di auto di lusso o del mezzo più sicuro: i bus autostradali.

La strada meridionale transita invece per Montenegro e Albania per approdare in Italia via mare, sulle stesse rotte utilizzate dalla mafia albanese per il traffico di droga e di clandestini, con natanti che viaggiano ad una velocità equivalente a 50km/h. L'Albania stessa è un arsenale di armi da guerra: furono derubate dalle basi militari e di polizia assaltate durante la rivolta del 1997. Si stima che attualmente sul territorio albanese si trovino ancora 600 000 AK47 di produzione russa o cinese, detenuti illegalmente.

La Commissione come intende per intervenire nei confronti degli Stati balcanici candidati all'UE per smantellare il traffico d'armi che minaccia tutta l'Europa?

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

(16 agosto 2012)

L'UE sostiene costantemente il rafforzamento delle capacità delle agenzie di contrasto in tutti i paesi dei Balcani occidentali al fine di arginare i traffici illegali transfrontalieri. Le attività di sviluppo delle capacità sono attuate attraverso progetti regionali e per paese finanziati nell'ambito dell'assistenza dello strumento di preadesione. Iniziative più specifiche di breve termine sono state anche finanziate nel contesto dello strumento di assistenza tecnica e scambio di informazioni.

La Commissione continua a monitorare, anche in collaborazione con esperti degli Stati membri, la coerenza e la sostenibilità delle riforme per quanto concerne la gestione delle frontiere. Periodicamente si effettuano valutazioni nel quadro di meccanismo di controllo per il periodo successivo alla liberalizzazione dei visti; la sicurezza delle frontiere e i documenti d'identità erano parte integrante delle tabelle di marcia per la liberalizzazione dei visti.

La Commissione è impegnata anche a rafforzare le capacità dei sistemi giudiziari nazionali nel contesto del rafforzamento della cooperazione giudiziaria regionale, elemento essenziale anche per affrontare efficacemente aspetti quali la criminalità organizzata transnazionale e la corruzione. Tali sforzi sono in linea con il nuovo approccio al capitolo 23 «Diritti giudiziari e fondamentali» e al capitolo 24 «Giustizia, libertà e sicurezza», approvato dal Consiglio nel dicembre 2011 al fine di dare impulso alle riforme per il consolidamento dello Stato di diritto nel contesto del processo di adesione.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006127/12  
to the Commission  
Mario Borghezio (EFD)  
(20 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Trafficking in Europe of arms from the Balkans and need for EU action

Kalashnikov rifles, 357 magnum revolvers, Skorpion machine pistols, 9mm pistols, assault rifles ... During operations to combat drugs and organised crime, police forces across Europe have been seizing more weapons than ever. The ballistic department of the Paris Police Prefecture is currently holding 4 500 firearms that have been confiscated over the past 10 years and it is estimated that in France there are 30 000-40 000 illegal weapons currently in circulation, with the number of weapons of war on the rise. They are being used in drug trafficking and gang wars for control of the territory.

According to the Paris police, most of these weapons are made in the former Yugoslavia and, unlike drug trafficking, arrive in the EU by deliveries of small quantities of four or five weapons at a time, for a value of EUR 2 500/3 000 per piece. In Bosnia, it is estimated that, in a population of four million, there are still 400 000 weapons being illegally held by civilians.

In a secret location in Sarajevo a band of traffickers is offering Kalashnikovs at a cost of EUR 400 (five years ago they cost only EUR 50), a rocket launcher for EUR 500 and grenades for EUR 50 per piece, which becomes EUR 20 after the discount for buying in bulk. There are two routes for smuggling the weapons to Western Europe: the first, to the north, passes through Croatia, Slovenia, Austria and Germany; the weapons are hidden in lorries, luxury cars or — the safest vehicle of all — long-distance coaches.

The southern route is via Montenegro and Albania, reaching Italy by sea on the same routes used by the Albanian mafia for trafficking drugs and illegal immigrants, with boats travelling at a speed of 50km/h. Albania itself is an arsenal of weapons of war, which were stolen from military and police bases that were attacked during the 1997 revolt. It is estimated that 600 000 Russian or Chinese AK47s are currently still being held illegally in Albania.

What action does the Commission intend to take in respect of the Balkan states which are candidates for EU accession, to put an end to the arms trafficking that is threatening all of Europe?

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

The EU continuously supports the reinforcement of the capacities of the law enforcement agencies throughout Western Balkans Countries in tackling illegal trafficking across borders. Capacity-building activities are implemented through both regional and country-tailored projects, which have been financed under the Instrument for Pre-Accession assistance. Short-term and more focused initiatives have also been financed under the Technical Assistance and Information Exchange instrument.

The Commission, also in cooperation with experts from the Member States, continues to monitor the consistency and sustainability of reforms in the area of border management. Assessments are periodically carried out in the framework of the Post-Visa Liberalisation Monitoring Mechanism; security of borders and ID documents were an integral part of the visa liberalisation roadmaps.

The Commission is also engaging on strengthening the capacities of the national judicial systems, along with the reinforcement of regional judicial cooperation, which is also a crucial aspect to tackle effectively transnational organised crime and corruption. These efforts are in line with the new approach to Chapter 23 'Judiciary and fundamental rights' and Chapter 24 'Justice, freedom and security', endorsed by the Council in December 2011 with a view to frontload the reforms in the area of rule of law within the accession process.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006128/12  
alla Commissione**

**Mario Borghezio (EFD)**

(20 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: La Balkan route minaccia per gli Stati membri. L'UE intervenga

L'immigrazione clandestina che, attraverso i Balcani, arriva in Europa segue la cosiddetta Balkan route (tragitto illegale che passa dall'Afghanistan all'Iran e dalla Turchia alla Grecia), ovvero lo stesso percorso che fa la droga prodotta in Afghanistan e in Iran e che transita fino in Europa. Dopo di che risale i Balcani ed entra nell'Unione Europea. I soggetti che gestiscono i traffici si sono formati in Albania. Anche il traffico di cocaina, che arrivava finora da Spagna e Portogallo (via Sud America), o dall'Olanda, si è spostato nei Balcani.

La mafia serba ha stretto un'alleanza col Fronte armato rivoluzionario della Colombia (FARC), e con due cartelli di narcos messicani. Nonostante le smentite di Al Qaeda, nei Balcani il narcotraffico è stato gestito anche da gruppi di islamisti radicali.

Intanto la Croazia è diventata la sede di arrivo di molti immigrati clandestini asiatici e africani. Negli ultimi anni gli arrivi di somali, afgani e turchi intercettati è cresciuto enormemente. Il passaggio dei clandestini avviene attraverso la contea serba di Vukovar-Srijem, parte della «Balkan route» delle droghe.

Quando il 1° luglio 2013 la Croazia diventerà un nuovo Stato membro dell'UE, la questione si porrà in maniera ancora più seria e coinvolgerà tutta l'Unione europea.

1. La Commissione come intende affrontare questa situazione?
2. La Commissione è a conoscenza di questo stato di cose? E come intende intervenire nei confronti degli Stati potenzialmente candidati all'Unione Europea?

**Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione**

(13 agosto 2012)

La cosiddetta «rotta dei Balcani» rimane una delle principali vie di accesso dell'eroina nell'Unione europea, cui vanno affiancandosi di recente nuove rotte. La Commissione sostiene l'impegno degli Stati membri per intercettare il traffico di stupefacenti e aiuta i paesi dei Balcani occidentali ad affrontare più efficacemente il problema della droga riducendo tanto la domanda quanto l'offerta.

L'Unione europea intrattiene dialoghi politici annuali su questo tema con i paesi dei Balcani occidentali, con i quali ha concordato un piano d'azione contro la droga che scade nel 2013. Il problema della droga è anche al centro del processo di stabilizzazione e di associazione con i paesi dei Balcani occidentali. Attraverso lo strumento di preadesione, la Commissione, in cooperazione con gli Stati membri, sostiene azioni regionali nei Balcani occidentali e in Turchia mirate a sviluppare, tra l'altro, le loro capacità di indagine penale e i sistemi transfrontalieri di raccolta di informazioni e intelligence.

Per quanto riguarda l'immigrazione irregolare nei paesi dei Balcani occidentali, in particolare in Croazia, relazioni annuali della Commissione esaminano periodicamente i progressi compiuti verso la creazione di un quadro giuridico coerente e nell'attuare le politiche. Missioni di esperti alle frontiere croate valutano sistematicamente l'azione delle autorità nazionali in risposta alle migrazioni irregolari e alla criminalità transfrontaliera. Ad ottobre saranno pubblicate le nuove relazioni sui progressi compiuti dai paesi dei Balcani occidentali, compresa la relazione di valutazione globale della Croazia.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006128/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Mario Borghezio (EFD)**  
(20 June 2012)

*Subject:* The Balkan route a threat to Member States — the EU should take action

Illegal immigrants reaching the EU follow the so-called Balkan route (the illegal route from Afghanistan to Iran and from Turkey to Greece). This is the same route taken by the drugs produced in Afghanistan and Iran which, through the Balkans, ultimately reach the EU. Those running the trafficking operations have been trained in Albania. Even cocaine trafficking, which hitherto had been through Spain and Portugal (via South America) or the Netherlands, has moved to the Balkans.

The Serbian mafia has forged an alliance with the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) and two Mexican drug cartels. Despite Al Qaeda's denials, drug trafficking operations in the Balkans have also been run by groups of radical Islamists.

Meanwhile, Croatia has become a point of arrival for many illegal Asian or African immigrants. In recent years, the number of intercepted arrivals of Somalis, Afghans and Turks has risen hugely. The illegal immigrants are transported through the Serbian county of Vukovar-Srijem, which is part of the Balkan drug route.

When Croatia joins the EU on 1 July 2013 the issue will become even more serious and will involve the entire European Union.

1. How does the Commission intend to address this situation?
2. Is it aware of this state of affairs? And what action will it take in respect of countries that are potential EU candidates?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission**  
(13 August 2012)

The so-called Balkan Route remains one of the primary routes to smuggle heroin into the EU, and new routes are emerging. The Commission supports Member States' drug interception efforts and provides support to the countries in the western Balkans to enable them to address the drugs issue more effectively by reducing both the supply of and the demand for drugs.

The EU holds annual political dialogues on drugs with the western Balkans countries, and the EU and Western Balkans have an action plan on drugs which will expire in 2013. The drugs problem is also addressed in the framework of the Stabilisation and Association Process involving Western Balkans countries. Through the Instrument of Pre-Accession, the Commission supports, in cooperation with the Member States, regional actions in the western Balkans and Turkey with the aim of developing *inter alia* their criminal investigation capacities and cross-border information and intelligence collection systems.

As regards the illegal immigration in countries of the western Balkans and Croatia in particular, the Commission is regularly assessing the progress made as regards the establishment of a coherent legal framework and implementation of policies within the annual Progress Reports. Experts' missions have regularly been conducted at the Croatian borders to assess the response of national authorities to illegal migrations and trans-border crimes. The next Progress Reports for each of the countries in the western Balkans, including the Comprehensive Monitoring Report for Croatia, will be issued in October this year.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006129/12  
alla Commissione**

**Roberta Angelilli (PPE)**

(20 giugno 2012)

**Oggetto:** Possibili finanziamenti comunitari per il progetto delle aziende Gendiag e CEGAT volto a sviluppare un nuovo tipo di screening genetico per le malattie cardiovascolari

La morte cardiaca improvvisa (MCI) è una delle più comuni cause di morte nei paesi occidentali, interessando circa 800 000 persone ogni anno, anche giovani che non hanno mai accusato alcun sintomo (dal 5 % al 15 % dei casi).

Anche se le anomalie strutturali cardiovascolari spiegano la maggior parte dei casi di morte cardiaca improvvisa, la causa della morte rimane inspiegabile dopo l'autopsia dal 10 % al 30 % dei casi.

Alcuni di questi decessi potrebbero derivare da una malattia genetica che, in assenza di una diagnosi non approfondita, potrebbe comportare importanti implicazioni per i familiari, i quali potrebbero ignorare a loro volta eventuali malattie ed essere potenzialmente a rischio di MCI.

A tale proposito il test genetico può fornire una buona diagnosi e consentire l'adozione di eventuali strategie di prevenzione per i familiari delle vittime di MCI.

L'azienda Gendiag (PMI con esperienza nello sviluppo di pannelli genetici in campo cardiovascolare) in stretta collaborazione con CEGAT (PMI con esperienza in genetica e in tecnologie high-throughput sequencing) propone di sviluppare un nuovo tipo di screening genetico volto a rilevare la presenza di una possibile malattia cardiovascolare e per identificare successivamente se i familiari dei pazienti sono a loro volta ad alto rischio di MCI.

Nel caso sia stata identificata una variazione genetica positiva, questo progetto offre esami medici e/o una terapia salvavita profilattica.

Ciò premesso, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. se il suddetto progetto può beneficiare di finanziamenti europei?
2. qual è il quadro generale della situazione?

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

(31 luglio 2012)

La Commissione è consapevole dell'impatto della morte cardiaca improvvisa (MCI) e dell'importanza di uno *screening* precoce su base familiare per elaborare strategie preventive e fornire un monitoraggio più preciso della malattia.

Anche se attualmente non è finanziata la ricerca in materia di screening genetico per la MCI, il Settimo programma quadro di ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico (7° PQ, 2007-2013) destina 5,8 milioni di euro al sostegno della ricerca sui determinanti genetici e sui potenziali metodi di screening per le malattie cardiovascolari in generale, mediante i progetti INHERITANCE <sup>(1)</sup> e BIG-HEART <sup>(2)</sup>.

Inoltre, il progetto EuTrigTreat <sup>(3)</sup> (12 milioni di euro), intende chiarire i meccanismi molecolari e ambientali che soggiacciono alle aritmie cardiache fatali, una delle cause principali di MCI.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.inheritanceproject.eu/>.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.big-heart.eu/>.

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

Le domande di ricerca collaborativa presentate in risposta a inviti annuali a presentare proposte <sup>(4)</sup> nell'ambito del 7° PQ sono selezionate attraverso una procedura di valutazione inter pares, considerando l'eccellenza scientifica come criterio preponderante, in modo da finanziare le migliori candidature.

Ulteriori opportunità di ricerca collaborativa sulla morte cardiaca improvvisa sono contenute nel programma di lavoro «Salute» 2013 <sup>(5)</sup> del 7° PQ, che è stato ufficialmente pubblicato il 9 luglio 2012.

---

<sup>(4)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/fp7\\_documentation](http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/fp7_documentation).

<sup>(5)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portalplus/static/docs/calls/fp7/common/32745-annex\\_4\\_to\\_the\\_decision\\_health\\_wp2013-18\\_june\\_for\\_egreff\\_e\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portalplus/static/docs/calls/fp7/common/32745-annex_4_to_the_decision_health_wp2013-18_june_for_egreff_e_en.pdf)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006129/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Roberta Angelilli (PPE)**  
(20 June 2012)

*Subject:* Possible EU funding for the Gendiag and CEGAT project to develop a new type of genetic screening for cardiovascular diseases

Sudden cardiac death (SCD) is one of the most common causes of death in Western countries, affecting about 800 000 people every year, even young people who have never had any symptoms (and who account for 5-15% of all cases).

Although most of the cases of sudden cardiac death can be explained by structural cardiovascular abnormalities, in 10-30% of cases the cause of death remains unexplained after autopsy.

Some of these deaths could be the result of a genetic disease which, unless a thorough diagnosis is made, could have major implications for family members, who, in turn, could be unaware of any disease they might have and could potentially be at risk of SCD.

In this regard, genetic testing can provide a sound diagnosis and can enable prevention strategies to be put in place for the families of SCD victims.

The company *Gendiag* (an SME with experience in the development of genetic panels in the cardiovascular field), in close cooperation with *CEGAT* (an SME with experience in genetics and high-throughput sequencing technologies) is planning to develop a new type of genetic testing to detect the possible presence of cardiovascular disease and to subsequently identify whether a patient's family members might be at high risk of SCD.

Should a positive genetic variation be identified, this project will provide medical testing and/or life-saving prophylactic therapy.

Can the Commission therefore:

1. say whether this project might be able to receive EU funding;
2. give an overview of the situation?

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

The Commission is aware of the impact of sudden cardiac death (SCD) and the importance of developing early family screening to devise preventive strategies and provide a more accurate monitoring of the disease.

Although research on genetic screening for SCD is not currently supported, the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013) is devoting EUR 5,8 million to support research on the genetic determinants and potential screening approaches for cardiovascular diseases at large through the Inheritance <sup>(1)</sup> and BIG-HEART <sup>(2)</sup> projects.

In addition, the EuTrigTreat <sup>(3)</sup> (EUR 12 million) project intends to elucidate the molecular and environmental mechanisms underlying life-threatening cardiac arrhythmias, one of the major causes of SCD.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.inheritanceproject.eu/>.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.big-heart.eu/>.

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

Collaborative research applications submitted to annual calls for proposals <sup>(4)</sup> within FP7 are selected through a peer-review's evaluation procedure with scientific excellence as the overriding criterion and financial support awarded to the best applications.

Further opportunities for collaborative research on cardiac sudden death may be found in the FP7 2013 Health Research Work Programme <sup>(5)</sup>, which was officially published in 9 July 2012.

---

<sup>(4)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/fp7\\_documentation](http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/fp7_documentation).

<sup>(5)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portalplus/static/docs/calls/fp7/common/32745-annex\\_4\\_to\\_the\\_decision\\_health\\_wp2013-18\\_june\\_for\\_egreffe\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portalplus/static/docs/calls/fp7/common/32745-annex_4_to_the_decision_health_wp2013-18_june_for_egreffe_en.pdf)



(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006130/12  
alla Commissione**

**Roberta Angelilli (PPE)**

(20 giugno 2012)

**Oggetto:** Utilizzo da parte dei 27 Stati membri dei finanziamenti comunitari previsti nella Programmazione finanziaria 2007-2013

Nell'ambito della Programmazione finanziaria dell'Unione europea per il periodo 2007-2013 sono stati adottati numerosi programmi operativi a sostegno della politica di coesione, per un budget complessivo di 347 miliardi di euro per rendere l'Europa non solo solidale ma anche più innovativa, dinamica e competitiva.

Sulla base del regolamento sui fondi strutturali, ogni singolo Stato membro ha elaborato un Quadro di riferimento strategico nazionale, sottoposto all'approvazione della Commissione, all'interno del quale vengono sviluppati gli obiettivi e le priorità della programmazione pluriennale.

Tale documento, prodotto con il contributo delle amministrazioni centrali e locali, assicura la sinergia delle politiche nazionali con gli «Orientamenti strategici in materia di coesione».

Premesso che la Programmazione è in fase di scadenza, può la Commissione:

1. fornire un bilancio generale dell'utilizzo dei finanziamenti?
2. far sapere se esiste o se verrà pubblicato uno studio dettagliato sull'utilizzo di tali fondi da parte di ciascuno Stato membro?
3. evidenziare quali sono state le migliori pratiche risultanti dal loro utilizzo?

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

(3 agosto 2012)

Gli articoli 29 e 30 del regolamento del Consiglio (CE) n. 1083/2006 forniscono la base giuridica per la presentazione di relazioni sull'attuazione dei programmi relativi alla politica di coesione per gli anni 2007-2013. Le relazioni strategiche della Commissione per il 2010 e il 2013 si basano sulle 27 relazioni strategiche nazionali. Esse evidenziano inoltre le buone pratiche. Le relazioni strategiche nazionali costituiscono uno strumento fondamentale per monitorare l'adempimento degli impegni strategici assunti dagli Stati membri allo scopo di conseguire gli obiettivi di alto livello dell'UE tramite la politica di coesione. Le ultime relazioni strategiche nazionali, contenenti aggiornamenti dei progressi compiuti nell'attuazione ed esempi di buone pratiche, dovrebbero essere pubblicate dagli Stati membri alla fine di quest'anno. Ulteriori analisi dei risultati della politica di coesione figurano nelle relazioni della rete di valutazione della Direzione generale della politica regionale, pubblicate sul suo sito web, nonché nelle valutazioni nazionali.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006130/12  
to the Commission  
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)  
(20 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Use by the 27 Member States of EU funding under the 2007-2013 Financial Perspective

In connection with EU financial programming for 2007-2013, numerous operational programmes were adopted in support of cohesion policy, for a total budget of EUR 347 billion, to make Europe not only cohesive but also more innovative, dynamic and competitive.

In accordance with the Structural Funds regulations, each Member State has drawn up a National Strategic Reference Framework that is subject to the approval of the Commission; within that framework the objectives and priorities of multiannual programming are developed.

This text, produced with the contribution of central and local government departments, ensures that national policies are in keeping with the 'Strategic Guidelines on Cohesion'.

Given that the programming is about to expire, can the Commission:

1. provide a general review of how the funds have been used;
2. say whether there are any detailed studies on the use of these funds by each Member State, or whether any such study will be published;
3. highlight the best practices resulting from use of the funds?

**Answer given by M. Hahn on behalf of the Commission  
(3 August 2012)**

Articles 29 and 30 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 provide the legal basis for reporting on the implementation of the cohesion policy programmes 2007-13. The Commission's strategic reports in 2010 and 2013 are based on the 27 national strategic reports. They also highlight good practice. The national strategic reports are a key tool to monitor the implementation of the strategic commitments of the Member States to deliver high level EU objectives through cohesion policy. The latest national strategic reports with an update on progress of implementation and examples of good practice are foreseen to be delivered by Member States at the end of this year. Further analysis on the achievements of cohesion policy can be found in reports of Directorate-General of Regional Policy's evaluation network which are published on its website as well as in national evaluations.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006131/12**

**alla Commissione**  
**Roberta Angelilli (PPE)**  
(20 giugno 2012)

**Oggetto:** Ulteriori informazioni in merito alla risposta della Commissione E-004127/2012 circa la rete d'informazione Europe direct

Con la risposta E-004217/2012 del 30.5.2012 concernente la rete d'informazione Europe direct, la Commissione ha dichiarato che «una valutazione intermedia sulle prestazioni generali degli EDIC completata nel gennaio di quest'anno indica che i cittadini sono estremamente soddisfatti dei servizi degli EDIC e si sentono meglio informati sulle questioni attinenti all'UE grazie al loro operato».

Consultando i siti di alcuni Centri, risulta però una disparità in termini di quantità e qualità delle informazioni pubblicate. Alcuni di questi siti sono aggiornati, prevedono eventi, bandi in corso ed informazioni utili, altri invece sono carenti su ogni profilo.

Premesso ciò può la Commissione far sapere:

1. in che modo e in base a quali criteri vengono valutati i Centri d'informazione Europe Direct?
2. poiché nella risposta si dice che i cittadini sono «estremamente soddisfatti», è possibile sapere con quali strumenti di rilevamento dati è stato possibile esprimere tale giudizio?
3. se e in che modo viene monitorata la spesa della sovvenzione destinata ad ogni singolo centro?

**Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione**

(1° agosto 2012)

La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole deputata alla relazione di valutazione intermedia dell'attuale generazione di centri d'informazione Europe Direct (EDIC) <sup>(1)</sup>.

Un'indagine online condotta tra gli utilizzatori dei servizi forniti dalla rete EDIC è stata condotta in diversi Stati membri per valutare l'efficacia, l'utilità e la visibilità degli EDIC dal punto di vista dei cittadini. La metodologia valutativa è illustrata in dettaglio nella parte 2<sup>a</sup> della relazione summenzionata.

La Commissione segue lo stato delle spese attraverso la valutazione dei piani d'azione annuali presentati dalle strutture ospitanti. Il sistema di sovvenzioni applicato per l'attuale generazione degli EDIC si basa su un approccio forfettario. Ciascun beneficiario seleziona, nell'ambito del piano d'azione, moduli di attività cui si applicano criteri diversi. Ciascun modulo corrisponde a un certo importo.

Inoltre, ciascun centro presenta una relazione mensile delle sue attività. Alla fine di ogni anno le strutture ospitanti presentano una relazione finale sull'attuazione del piano d'azione. L'importo finale della sovvenzione è calcolato sulla base del tasso d'esecuzione di ciascun modulo.

Infine, gli EDIC sono anche assoggettati ai controlli del servizio di audit interno.

La Commissione desidera informare l'onorevole deputata dell'attuale invito a presentare proposte per la nuova generazione di EDIC 2013-2017 indetto il 25 giugno 2012 <sup>(2)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://www.cc.cec/dgintranet/comm/documents/who\\_does\\_what/directorate\\_c/unit\\_c3/europe\\_direct\\_network/edic\\_mid-term\\_evaluation\\_final\\_report\\_v27\\_01\\_2012.pdf](http://www.cc.cec/dgintranet/comm/documents/who_does_what/directorate_c/unit_c3/europe_direct_network/edic_mid-term_evaluation_final_report_v27_01_2012.pdf)

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/contracts-and-grants/grants/years/2012\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/contracts-and-grants/grants/years/2012_en.htm)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006131/12  
to the Commission  
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)  
(20 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Further information about the Commission's answer to Written Question E-004127/2012 about the Europe Direct information network

In its reply of 30 May 2012 to Written Question E-004217/2012 on the Europe Direct information network, the Commission stated that 'a mid-term evaluation of the overall performance of EDICs completed in January this year indicates that citizens are very satisfied with the EDICs services and feel better informed about EU affairs thanks to their work'.

However, consultation of the websites of some of the centres reveals a disparity in terms of the quantity and quality of information published. Some of these sites are updated, with lists of events, ongoing calls for tender or calls for proposals, and other useful information, while others are lacking from every point of view.

Can the Commission therefore answer the following questions:

1. How, and based on what criteria, are the Europe Direct Information Centres evaluated?
2. Since its reply states that people are 'very satisfied', could it say what data collection tools were used to reach such a judgment?
3. Is the expenditure for the grants given to each individual centre monitored, and if so, how?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission  
(1 August 2012)**

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to the mid-term evaluation report of the current generation of European Direct Information Centres (EDICs) <sup>(1)</sup>.

An online survey among the users of the EDIC network services was carried out in a number of Member States in order to assess the effectiveness, usefulness and visibility of EDICs from the citizens' point of view. The evaluation methodology is explained in detail in Part 2 of the abovementioned report.

The Commission monitors expenditures through the evaluation of the annual action plans submitted by the host structures. The grant system of the current generation of EDICs is based on a lump sum approach. Each beneficiary selects within the action plan modules of activities to which different criteria apply. Each module corresponds to a certain amount.

In addition, each centre presents a monthly report of its activities. At the end of each year, the host structures present a final report on the implementation of the action plan. The final amount of the grant is calculated on the basis of the rate of execution of each module.

Finally, EDICs are also subject to controls by the internal audit service.

The Commission wishes to inform the Honourable Member of the ongoing call for proposals for the new generation of EDICs 2013-2017 launched on 25 June 2012 <sup>(2)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://www.cc.cec/dgintranet/comm/documents/who\\_does\\_what/directorate\\_c/unit\\_c3/europe\\_direct\\_network/edic\\_mid-term\\_evaluation\\_final\\_report\\_v27\\_01\\_2012.pdf](http://www.cc.cec/dgintranet/comm/documents/who_does_what/directorate_c/unit_c3/europe_direct_network/edic_mid-term_evaluation_final_report_v27_01_2012.pdf)

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/contracts-and-grants/grants/years/2012\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/contracts-and-grants/grants/years/2012_en.htm)

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-006133/12  
a la Comisión**

**Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)**

(21 de junio de 2012)

**Asunto:** Fumigaciones ilegales desde el aire y salud pública (muerte de abejas)

Hace pocas semanas se anunciaba la realización de fumigaciones en aéreas masivas de Cascade, producto cuyo principio activo es el flufenoxuron, para hacer frente a la plaga de *gonipterus scutellatus* (gorgullo) que afecta a unas 100 000 hectáreas de eucaliptos en Galicia y para lo que se utilizarían 50 000 litros de flufenoxuron diluido. Sin embargo, el Reglamento (UE) n° 942/2011, de 22 de septiembre de 2011, establece su prohibición, a más tardar, el 31 de diciembre de 2011, aunque autoriza a los Estados miembros períodos de gracia en los términos del artículo 46 del Reglamento (CE) n° 1107/2009 «para la eliminación, almacenamiento, comercialización y utilización de las existencias» en el supuesto de que «las razones de la retirada, modificación o no renovación de la autorización no estén relacionadas con la protección de la salud humana o animal.»

Existen numerosos estudios que desaconsejan la utilización de estos productos neurotóxicos por sus graves consecuencias para la flora, la fauna e incluso para la salud de las personas. En particular, se relaciona con la desaparición de grandes cantidades de abejas en Galicia, en ciertas zonas el 80 % de la población apícola, poniéndolas en riesgo de extinción en esta región. Las abejas son responsables de polinizar los cultivos agrícolas, pudiendo producir el colapso de la agricultura (según la FAO el 80 % de las flores y el 84 % de las plantas cultivadas son polinizadas por las abejas y el 76 % de la alimentación humana depende de su presencia). El propio Einstein advirtió que la supervivencia de la especie humana dependía de ellas. Aparte, la fumigación aérea provoca que hasta un 60 % de los agrotóxicos dispersados caigan fuera de su objetivo y se expandan a kilómetros de distancia afectando a espacios naturales, agua potable y cultivos e, incluso, especies animales como los artrópodos. Hay también constancia de intoxicación por flufenoxuron en seres humanos, siendo clasificado por el Comité de Evaluación de Riesgos como sustancia potencialmente nociva para los niños alimentados con leche materna y como sustancia peligrosa para el medio ambiente acuático.

Además de las fumigaciones previstas, la venta de cuatro marcas cuyo principio activo es el flufenoxuron está autorizada aún en España ¿Podría aclarar la Comisión si el período de gracia previsto en España es conforme con el artículo 46 del Reglamento (CE) n° 1107/2009 dados sus riesgos para la salud pública y el medio ambiente? ¿Es conforme al derecho comunitario la fumigación aérea con flufenoxuron cuando existen otros medios para hacer frente a la plaga? ¿Dispone la Comisión de los mapas de las fumigaciones aéreas y tiene la seguridad de que no van a afectar a espacios naturales protegidos? ¿Qué medidas urgentes puede poner en práctica la Comisión a fin de evitar los graves daños que podrían provocar las fumigaciones aéreas masivas con flufenoxuron?

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

(23 de julio de 2012)

En el artículo 9 de la Directiva 2009/128/CE, por la que se establece el marco de la actuación comunitaria para conseguir un uso sostenible de los plaguicidas <sup>(1)</sup>, se prohíben las pulverizaciones aéreas, excepto en casos especiales que podrán autorizar los Estados miembros si se cumplen unas condiciones muy estrictas.

Entre estas condiciones se encuentra que no existan alternativas viables y que los plaguicidas utilizados deben haber sido aprobados explícitamente para pulverización aérea por el Estado miembro de que se trate, previa evaluación específica de los riesgos que suponga la pulverización aérea.

El plazo para la transposición de la Directiva concluía el 26 de noviembre de 2011. España solamente la había transpuesto en parte en esa fecha. Por consiguiente, la Comisión envió el 23 de marzo de 2012 una carta de emplazamiento a España como primer paso del procedimiento de infracción.

Además de notificar la transposición de la Directiva, los Estados miembros no tienen la obligación de comunicar a la Comisión información más detallada en relación con la prohibición de las pulverizaciones aéreas.

En lo que se refiere a las cuestiones específicas relacionadas con el uso de la sustancia activa flufenoxuron, la Comisión remite a Su Señoría a su respuesta a la pregunta escrita E-004548/2012 <sup>(2)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> DO L 309 de 24.11.2009.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp>

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-006133/12  
to the Commission**

**Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)**

(21 June 2012)

*Subject:* Illegal aerial pesticide spraying and public health (death of bees)

A few weeks ago it was announced that extensive fumigation is to be carried out in Galicia with Cascade, a product whose active principle is flufenoxuron, in order to combat infestation by *gonipterus scutellatus* (eucalyptus snout beetle) in 100 000 hectares of eucalyptus plantation.. The fumigation calls for 50 000 litres of dilute flufenoxuron. Under Regulation (EU) No 942/2011 of 22 September 2011, this chemical has been banned by 31 December 2011 at the latest, although Member States are allowed a grace period under the terms of Article 46 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 'for the disposal, storage, placing on the market and use of existing stocks' where 'the reasons for withdrawal, amendment or non-renewal of the authorisation are not related to the protection of human and animal health'.

Numerous studies show the use of this neurotoxin to be inadvisable due to its harmful impact on plant and animal life, as well as on human health. It is particularly linked with the disappearance of large numbers of bees in Galicia, in some areas amounting to 80% of bee colonies, raising the threat of their extinction in this region. As bees are responsible for pollinating agricultural crops, this could lead to the collapse of agriculture (according to the FAO, 80% of cultivated plants are pollinated by bees and 76% of human food depends on their presence). Einstein himself warned that the survival of the human species depends on bees. Furthermore, aerial pesticide spraying results in up to 60% of the agrottoxins dispersed falling outside their target area over a distance of several kilometres, affecting natural areas, drinking water, crops and even animal species such as arthropods. There have also been cases of flufenoxuron poisoning in humans. It is classified as a substance which is potentially harmful to breast-feeding babies and dangerous to the aquatic environment.

In addition to this proposed fumigation, four pesticide brands containing flufenoxuron as their active ingredient are still authorised for sale in Spain. Can the Commission clarify whether the grace period applied in Spain complies with the terms of Article 46 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009, given the risk to public health and the environment? Does aerial pesticide spraying with flufenoxuron comply with Community law, when there are other ways in which the abovementioned pest can be combated? Does the Commission have maps of the areas being aerially sprayed and can it be sure that no protected natural spaces will be affected? What urgent measures can the Commission apply, in order to prevent serious damage being caused by widespread aerial pesticide spraying with flufenoxuron?

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

(23 July 2012)

Article 9 of Directive 2009/128/EC establishing a framework for Community action to achieve the sustainable use of pesticides <sup>(1)</sup>, provides for the ban of aerial spraying, with exception for derogations which may be granted by Member States under very restricted conditions.

Among the conditions, there must be no viable alternatives and the pesticides used must be explicitly approved for aerial spraying by the Member State following a specific assessment addressing risks from aerial spraying.

The directive had to be transposed by 26 November 2011. By this date Spain had partially transposed it. Consequently, the Commission on 23 March 2012 has sent a letter of formal notice to Spain as a first step of the infringement procedure.

Apart from notifying the transposition of the directive, Member States have no obligation to inform the Commission about further details concerning the prohibition of aerial spraying.

For the specific questions related to the use of the active substance flufenoxuron, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-004548/2012 <sup>(2)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 309, 24.11.2009.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp>.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-006134/12  
alla Commissione**

**Antonio Cancian (PPE)**

(21 giugno 2012)

**Oggetto:** Terremoti nel nord-est dell'Italia: quali Fondi alle imprese per il pronto rilancio del territorio

Dal 20 maggio ad oggi, il nord-est dell'Italia è afflitto da continui terremoti che stanno provocando ingenti danni a cose e persone, mettendo a rischio tutto il comparto produttivo della zona, dal settore agroalimentare a quello industriale, caratterizzato in particolar modo dalla biomedicina.

Le province maggiormente colpite sono cinque tra i distretti industriali i più importanti e rappresentativi dell'Italia. L'insieme di questi centri che si estendono nelle province emiliane di Modena, Parma, Bologna, Piacenza e Reggio Emilia, ma anche in Lombardia e Veneto, comprende 6500 aziende grandi e piccole, 260 mila addetti ed una quota export media del 65 %. Una delle città maggiormente colpite è Mirandola, la quale rischia di non garantire più il servizio di produzione di attrezzature per dialisi, cardiocirurgia e trasfusione e di prodotti plastici (usa e getta) e le cui aziende garantiscono forniture di flebo e siringhe a tutta Europa.

Al momento, le stime dei danni materiali alle sole aziende ammontano circa 500 milioni di euro.

Considerando la ripetitività e la gravità di questi eventi sismici, s'interroga la Commissione per sapere se:

1. il Fondo di solidarietà dell'Unione europea, istituito per esprimere l'immediata solidarietà alle popolazioni colpite da gravi calamità naturali, può intervenire per aiutare prontamente e far ripartire la produzione nelle aree interessate?
2. oltre al fondo sopra citato, esistono altri fondi attivabili per questi eventi che sconvolgono l'economia di un intero paese, in particolare per aiutare la ripresa e la crescita delle aziende biomediche ed per risarcire i danni industriali?

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

(25 luglio 2012)

1. Il Fondo di solidarietà dell'UE può intervenire solo a seguito di una domanda d'aiuto del paese in questione; la Commissione non può mobilitare il Fondo di propria iniziativa. La Commissione collabora strettamente con le autorità italiane a livello nazionale e regionale e prevede che queste presentino domanda entro il 29 luglio, data alla quale scade il termine previsto di 10 settimane. L'effettiva concessione di un aiuto ed il suo importo dipenderanno dall'esito dato alla domanda e saranno subordinati all'approvazione da parte del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio dell'aiuto proposto dalla Commissione. In ogni caso, gli aiuti del Fondo di solidarietà possono essere utilizzati anche per coprire il costo delle operazioni di emergenza effettuate dalle autorità pubbliche. I danni assicurabili, compresi quelli subiti dalle imprese, non possono essere risarciti.

2. Nell'ambito del Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale, sono stati riassegnati alla ricostruzione 10 milioni di euro dal programma per l'Emilia Romagna. Qualora l'autorità di gestione di tale programma dovesse chiedere un trasferimento di fondi all'interno del programma stesso per potenziare il sostegno alle PMI, la Commissione non avrebbe nulla da obiettare.

Inoltre la Banca europea per gli investimenti sta esaminando un eventuale prestito di 200 milioni di euro per finanziare progetti ammissibili di ricostruzione o di sicurezza nei settori pubblico e privato, danneggiati dal recente terremoto. La banca sosterrà la ricostruzione delle infrastrutture pubbliche e il ripristino di gran parte dell'infrastruttura industriale ed agricola nelle province della regione. Ciò dovrebbe contribuire a limitare un'eventuale delocalizzazione industriale e ad agevolare la rapida ripresa delle attività.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-006134/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Antonio Cancian (PPE)**  
(21 June 2012)

*Subject:* Earthquakes in north-eastern Italy — what funds are available to firms to help them resume business as soon as possible?

Since 20 May, north-eastern Italy has been plagued by constant earthquakes that are causing extensive damage to property and people, jeopardising the entire productive sector in the area, from agri-food to industry, and particularly biomedicine.

The most seriously affected provinces are five of the most important and representative industrial areas of Italy. These areas, in the Emilia-Romagna provinces of Modena, Parma, Bologna, Piacenza and Reggio Emilia, but also in Lombardy and Veneto, taken together, include 6500 large and small companies and 260 000 employees, with an average export share of 65%. One of the worst affected towns is Mirandola, which might no longer be able to carry on providing its service manufacturing equipment for dialysis, heart surgery and blood transfusions, in addition to disposable plastic products (companies in this town provide drips and syringes to the whole of Europe).

Material damage to the companies alone is currently being estimated at around EUR 500 million.

Given the repetitive nature and seriousness of these earthquakes, can the Commission say whether:

1. the European Union Solidarity Fund, established in order to express immediate solidarity with people affected by serious natural disasters, can act promptly to help production to resume in the affected areas;
2. in addition to the abovementioned fund, there are any other funds that can be activated for such events that disrupt the economy of an entire country, in particular to help biomedical companies to recover and resume growth, and to compensate for the damage done to industry?

**Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission**  
(25 July 2012)

1. The EU Solidarity Fund may intervene only following an application for aid from the country concerned; the Commission may not activate the Fund upon its own initiative. The Commission is cooperating closely with the Italian authorities at national and regional level and is expecting them to present an application before the expiry of the 10 week deadline on 29 July. Whether, and what amount of, aid can be granted will depend on the assessment of the application and of the approval by the Parliament and the Council of any aid proposed by the Commission. In any event, Solidarity Fund aid may only be used to help cover the cost of emergency operations undertaken by the public authorities. Insurable damage, including damage to businesses, may not be compensated.

2. Within the framework of the European Regional Development Fund, EUR 10 million in the Emilia Romagna programme has been reallocated for reconstruction purposes. If the managing authority of the Emilia Romagna programme were to ask for a transfer of funds within the programme to reinforce support to SMEs, the Commission would be open to such a reprogramming.

Moreover a loan of EUR 200 million is currently under appraisal by the European Investment Bank, to finance eligible size reconstruction or safety projects in the public and private sectors, impacted by the recent earthquakes. The Bank will support the reconstruction of public infrastructure and the rebuilding of much of the industrial sector and agriculture infrastructure in the Emilia Romagna provinces. This would contribute to reducing possible industrial relocation and facilitating a quick restart of their activities.

---



(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006135/12**  
**a la Comisión**  
**Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)**  
(21 de junio de 2012)

*Asunto:* Tensiones en el mercado lechero y diferencias de precios en origen y al consumo

Según datos del FEGA de España y del LTO de Holanda los precios de la leche en origen varían desde los 41,6 euros por litro en Italia hasta los 29,5 en Bélgica dentro de la Unión Europea. En Galicia, la principal comunidad productora de leche en España, se han situado en 29,9 euros litro el pasado mes de abril.

Algunas organizaciones agrarias han señalado que la presión sobre el mercado lechero está aumentando considerablemente, a consecuencia del incremento de costes de producción y de un volumen de producción más elevado que la demanda, y recuerdan la crisis de 2009.

Un reciente estudio del sindicato gallego Unión Agrarias señalaba que multinacionales de la distribución colocaban en el mercado francés al consumo marcas blancas al doble de precio que lo hacían en España.

— ¿Dispone la Comisión de informaciones sobre precios de la leche en origen y al consumo?

— ¿Tiene previsto divulgar regularmente información transparente sobre la evolución de los precios al origen y al consumo desglosada por países y principales distribuidores?

— ¿Estima que las diferencias de precios en origen están justificadas u obedecen a distorsiones del mercado?

— ¿Comparte el diagnóstico sobre el incremento de presiones en el sector?

— ¿Ha constatado la existencia de las diferencias de precio al consumo tan grandes por parte de las mismas distribuidoras? En caso afirmativo, ¿se corresponde esta situación con un correcto funcionamiento del mercado interior y de las reglas de la competencia?

— ¿Va a adoptar alguna nueva iniciativa al respecto?

**Respuesta del Sr. Ciolos en nombre de la Comisión**  
(2 de agosto de 2012)

La Comisión recibe de los Estados miembros notificaciones de los precios de la leche en origen cada mes y las hace públicas en una página web <sup>(1)</sup>. Con respecto a los precios pagados por los consumidores, la DG ESTAT ha creado, en el marco del Foro de Alto Nivel sobre la Mejora del Funcionamiento de la Cadena Alimentaria <sup>(2)</sup>, un Instrumento Europeo de Control de Precios para el seguimiento de los precios de los productores a los consumidores <sup>(3)</sup>. Los índices de precios se desglosan por Estado miembro.

La Unión Europea ha optado por una orientación en función del mercado en su Política Agrícola Común, la cual prevé que los precios los fije el mercado en un nivel en el que se dé un equilibrio entre la oferta y la demanda. Nada impide que se alcance este equilibrio en un determinado nivel en una región y en uno distinto en otra. No existe contradicción alguna entre este hecho y la normas en materia de competencia ni el correcto funcionamiento del mercado único.

Los precios de los productos lácteos fueron muy altos en 2010 y en 2011. Desde mediados de 2011, se ha invertido la tendencia y existe una presión a la baja en el mercado. Esto está en consonancia con la pauta estacional de la producción y los precios lácteos, aunque esta tendencia se ve reforzada por el aumento de la producción de leche de las principales regiones suministradores de leche del mundo. La información del mercado reciente indica una tendencia a la estabilización o incluso ligeramente al alza.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://circa.europa.eu/Public/irc/agri/lait/home>.

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/food/competitiveness/forum\\_food/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/food/competitiveness/forum_food/index_en.htm)

<sup>(3)</sup> [http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/hicp/methodology/prices\\_data\\_for\\_market\\_monitoring](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/hicp/methodology/prices_data_for_market_monitoring).

Además, el Foro de Alto Nivel sobre la Mejora del Funcionamiento de la Cadena Alimentaria apoya el objetivo de la Comisión de mejorar las relaciones entre las empresas. Varios representantes de la cadena alimentaria han propuesto recientemente un marco para la aplicación de una serie de principios de mejores prácticas que una amplia gama de partes interesadas acordó en noviembre de 2011 <sup>(\*)</sup>. Antes del final de su mandato en diciembre de 2012, se espera que el Foro presente recomendaciones dirigidas a hacer frente a las prácticas comerciales desleales en la cadena alimentaria.

---

---

(\*) [http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/food/files/competitiveness/good\\_practices\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/food/files/competitiveness/good_practices_en.pdf)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006135/12  
to the Commission**

**Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)**

(21 June 2012)

*Subject:* Milk market under pressure and differences in point-of-origin and point-of-sale pricing

According to data released by the Spanish Agricultural Guarantee Fund and the Dutch Federation of Agriculture and Horticulture, milk prices at point of origin vary across the EU from EUR 41.6/litre in Italy down to EUR 29.5/litre in Belgium. In April 2012, point-of-origin milk prices in Galicia, Spain's main milk producing region, were at EUR 29.9/litre.

Recalling the crisis of 2009, a number of farming organisations have pointed out that pressure on the milk market has been increasing considerably, owing to the rise in production costs and the fact that output has exceeded demand.

A recent study by a Galician trade union, *Unións Agrarias*, found that multinational distribution companies were selling own-brand products on the French consumer market at double the price of the same products in Spain.

— Does the Commission have information on milk prices at point of origin and point of sale?

— Does it intend to release transparent information on a regular basis about trends in point of origin and point of sale prices, broken down by country and main distributor?

— Does it believe that the differences between prices at point of sale are justified or that they are caused by market distortion?

— Does it agree with the assessment that there is increasing pressure on the sector?

— Is it aware that retailers are charging very different prices for the same product at different points of sale? If so, is this in line with the proper functioning of the internal market and competition rules?

— Is the Commission planning to adopt any new initiatives in response to this matter?

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

(2 August 2012)

The Commission receives farm gate milk price notifications from Member States every month and publishes them on a website <sup>(1)</sup>. With regard to prices paid by consumers, DG ESTAT has developed in the framework of the High Level Forum for a Better Functioning Food Supply Chain <sup>(2)</sup>, a Food Price Monitoring Tool to follow prices from producers to consumers <sup>(3)</sup>. Price indices are broken down per Member State.

The European Union has opted for market orientation in its Common Agricultural Policy. This provides for prices to be set by the market at a level where there is a balance between supply and demand. Nothing prevents that this balance is found at a certain level in a region and at a different level in another one. There is no contradiction between this fact and competition rules as well as with the proper functioning of the single market.

Dairy product prices were particularly high in 2010 and 2011. Since the middle of 2011, the trend has reversed and there is a downward pressure on the market. This is in line with the seasonal pattern of milk production and prices, but is reinforced by increased milk production in the main milk supplying regions of the world. Recent market information points in the direction of a stabilisation or even a slightly higher trend.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://circa.europa.eu/Public/irc/agri/lait/home>.

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/food/competitiveness/forum\\_food/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/food/competitiveness/forum_food/index_en.htm)

<sup>(3)</sup> [http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/hicp/methodology/prices\\_data\\_for\\_market\\_monitoring](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/hicp/methodology/prices_data_for_market_monitoring).

Furthermore, the High Level Forum for a Better Functioning Food Supply Chain supports the Commission's objective to improve business-to-business relationships. Several representatives of the food chain have recently proposed a framework for the implementation of a set of Principles of Good Practice agreed in November 2011 by a broad range of stakeholders <sup>(\*)</sup>. Before the end of its mandate in December 2012, the Forum is expected to put forward recommendations to tackle unfair trading practices in the food supply chain.

---

---

<sup>(\*)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/food/files/competitiveness/good\\_practices\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/food/files/competitiveness/good_practices_en.pdf)

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006136/12  
a la Comisión**

**Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)**

(21 de junio de 2012)

Asunto: Pregunta complementaria a E-003896/2012

Como llamaba la atención a la Comisión en la pregunta E-003896/2012, en los presupuestos del Estado para el año 2012, el Gobierno español ha decidido invertir 1 217 000 000 de euros en la construcción de una línea de alta velocidad hacia Galicia <sup>(1)</sup>. El modelo de alta velocidad español tiene pérdidas generalizadas (su gestor, ADIF cuenta con unas pérdidas por valor de 8 745 000 000 de euros) y diversos estudios han puesto en cuestión la viabilidad económica de ciertas inversiones ferroviarias si no se cumplen unos determinados requisitos <sup>(2)</sup>.

En su respuesta a dicha pregunta se afirma «la Comisión coincide con Su Señoría en que las prioridades fundamentales para lograr el crecimiento mediante las infraestructuras de transporte en España están vinculadas a la realización de corredores interoperables y a la interconexión de nodos y modos en estos corredores.» La ausencia de inversión de los 8 000 000 de euros necesarios para conectar el puerto de Barcelona a la red ferroviaria podría suponer que la empresa inversora decida retirar su inversión por valor de 453 000 000 de euros. Las nuevas instalaciones tendrían una superficie total de 100 hectáreas, entre las que destaca una línea de atraque de 1,5 kilómetros, que acogería la mayor terminal semiautomatizada de contenedores del sur de Europa <sup>(3)</sup>.

A la luz de lo anterior,

¿Cuál es la opinión de la Comisión sobre el hecho que los Presupuestos prevean una inversión por valor por más de 1 000 000 millones de euros en un nuevo tren de alta velocidad mientras esta infraestructura que cuesta sólo 8 millones se encuentra parada?

¿No considera la Comisión que esta línea de 1,5 kilómetros es coherente con los criterios del core network de los TEN-T y necesaria para la conexión del puerto de Barcelona al futuro corredor mediterráneo de mercancía?

¿No cree la Comisión que una vez más, un análisis coste-beneficio de los proyectos podría ayudar a escoger los más relevantes y con valor añadido en este período de grave crisis económica?

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

(27 de julio de 2012)

La Comisión presta una gran atención a la mejora de la accesibilidad del puerto de Barcelona. Se está trabajando en la actualidad en muchos proyectos para mejorar su conexión ferroviaria. El profesor Carlo Secchi, coordinador europeo, ha visitado hace poco el puerto de Barcelona para evaluar los proyectos en curso y su situación. Barcelona es el único puerto de la Península Ibérica con acceso al ferrocarril de ancho UIC, además del ibérico y métrico, y ya están en marcha operaciones ferroviarias internacionales.

Además de la prometedoras puesta en marcha de estas operaciones, la Comisión sabe que la nueva terminal de aguas profundas que se está construyendo solo podrá explotarse plenamente después de la finalización de la conexión ferroviaria directa, por lo que está supervisando el proyecto.

En el marco de la revisión de las RTE-T, Barcelona se ha incluido en la lista de puertos principales de la RTE-T y, por lo tanto, su conexión con el corredor mediterráneo pertenece a la red principal. En consecuencia, se le aplican normas de obligado cumplimiento.

El análisis de coste y beneficio es un instrumento de evaluación ya aprobado por la Comisión y se aplica obligatoriamente a cada proyecto para el que se solicite cofinanciación de los Fondos Estructurales y del Fondo de Cohesión o del BEI. La evaluación de los beneficios socioeconómicos y medioambientales de los proyectos también se tiene en cuenta para asignar los fondos de la partida presupuestaria de la RTE-T.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.economista.es/empresas-finanzas/noticias/3885260/04/12/Pastor-Blinda-el-AVE-gallego-de-cara-a-las-autonomicas.html>

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.ub.edu/graap/bel.htm>

<sup>(3)</sup> <http://www.elconfidencial.com/espana/2012/06/19/una-gigantesca-inversion-china-en-barcelona-peligra-por-ocho-millones-100298/>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006136/12  
to the Commission**

**Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)**

(21 June 2012)

*Subject:* Follow-on question from E-003896/2012

In Question E-003896/2012 to the Commission, I pointed out that the Spanish Government has decided to invest EUR 1.217 billion of its 2012 national budget in the construction of a high-speed rail line to Galicia <sup>(1)</sup>. Spain's high-speed rail system runs at an overall loss (the company responsible for managing it, ADIF, has suffered losses of EUR 8.745 billion) and several studies have questioned the economic viability of certain railway investments if specific requirements are not met <sup>(2)</sup>.

In its answer, the Commission said that it 'agrees with the Honourable Member that the key priorities to deliver growth through transport infrastructure in Spain are related to the deployment of interoperable corridors, as well as to the interconnection of nodes and modes along these corridors'. However, the EUR 8 million needed to connect the port of Barcelona to the rail network has not been made available and could cause the investor to withdraw its planned EUR 453 million investment. The new installations would have a total surface area of 100 hectares to accommodate the largest semi-automated container terminal in southern Europe <sup>(3)</sup>, and would include a 1.5 km-long rail spur.

Bearing in mind that more than EUR 1 billion has been set aside in Spain's national budget to invest in a new high-speed rail line, what is the Commission's view on the fact that for lack of a mere EUR 8 million, building work on the new infrastructure in Barcelona cannot get underway?

Does the Commission agree that the 1.5 km rail spur is consistent with the criteria of the TEN-T core network and necessary for connecting the port of Barcelona to the future Mediterranean goods corridor?

Does it agree that, yet again, an additional cost-benefit analysis of projects could help to determine which would be most appropriate and beneficial during this period of serious economic crisis?

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

(27 July 2012)

The Commission pays great attention to the enhancement of Port of Barcelona's accessibility. Currently many projects are being developed to improve its railway connection. Recently the European Coordinator, Prof. Carlo Secchi, has visited the port of Barcelona to ascertain the ongoing projects and their status. Barcelona is the only Iberian port with access to railway in UIC gauge (as well as in Iberian and Metric gauge), and international railway operations are already in place.

Besides the promising start-up of such operations, the Commission is aware that the new deep-sea terminal which is currently being built can develop its full potential only once the direct railway connection will be finalised, and is therefore monitoring the project.

In the framework of the TEN-T revision, Barcelona has been included in the list of TEN-T Core Ports and therefore its connections to the Mediterranean corridor belong to the Core Network as well. Accordingly, they have mandatory standards to comply with.

A Cost-Benefit Analysis is an assessment tool already endorsed by the Commission — it applies mandatorily to every project for which co-funding by the Structural Funds and the Cohesion Fund, or co-financing by the EIB is sought. The assessment of environmental and socioeconomic benefits is appraised for projects to attribute funding from the TEN-T budget line as well.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.economista.es/empresas-finanzas/noticias/3885260/04/12/Pastor-Blinda-el-AVE-gallego-de-cara-a-las-autonomicas.html>

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.ub.edu/graap/bel.htm>

<sup>(3)</sup> <http://www.elconfidencial.com/espana/2012/06/19/una-gigantesca-inversion-china-en-barcelona-peligra-por-ocho-millones-100298/>.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006137/12  
a la Comisión**

**Esther Herranz García (PPE)**

(21 de junio de 2012)

*Asunto:* Plagas en los cítricos provenientes de Sudáfrica y Brasil

En el año 2011 se ha detectado un aumento de las enfermedades y plagas en los cítricos provenientes de Sudáfrica y Brasil. En el caso de Sudáfrica, se ha pasado de 16 casos detectados en el año 2010 a un total de 46 en el año 2011 (30 detecciones de *guignardia citricarpa* y 7 de *cryptophlebia leucotreta*). Asimismo se ha puesto de manifiesto el incumplimiento, por parte de este país, de la legislación europea en materia de sanidad vegetal. Por su parte los cítricos provenientes de Brasil adolecen del mismo problema y los casos detectados han aumentado de 5 en el 2010 a 50 en el 2011, de los que 42 correspondían a la *guignardia citricarpa*.

1. ¿Que medidas tomará la Comisión para impedir la proliferación de esas plagas en los cítricos europeos?
2. ¿Autorizará la Comisión el uso excepcional de productos fitosanitarios en la Unión Europea para contrarrestar los efectos de esas enfermedades?
3. ¿Qué medidas y controles se aplicarán a estos países con el fin de que cumplan la normativa europea?

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

(28 de agosto de 2012)

En la Directiva 2000/29/CE del Consejo <sup>(1)</sup> se regulan los cítricos, cuya importación de terceros países está sujeta a requisitos especiales, entre los que cabe citar unas medidas concretas contra la introducción en la UE de *Guignardia citricarpa* y su propagación.

*Cryptophlebia leucotreta* no es un organismo nocivo sujeto a restricciones en la UE. Si un Estado miembro considera que este organismo nocivo presenta un peligro inminente, debe notificarlo a la Comisión y, en caso necesario, tomar medidas nacionales temporales para evitar su introducción y propagación en el país antes de que la Comisión y los Estados miembros estudien la situación.

Desde 2004, se aplican medidas de emergencia provisionales respecto a determinados cítricos originarios de Brasil, a los que se aplican requisitos más estrictos en relación con *Guignardia citricarpa* (Decisión 2004/416/CE de la Comisión <sup>(2)</sup>). Además, la Comisión ha realizado recientemente controles (en 2011) en Brasil y Sudáfrica relacionados con la exportación de cítricos.

La Comisión ha manifestado a Brasil y Sudáfrica su preocupación por el elevado número de partidas de cítricos interceptadas en 2011 y les ha pedido que tomen medidas adicionales para garantizar que los cítricos exportados a la UE cumplen los requisitos de importación correspondientes.

La Comisión seguirá de cerca la situación durante la campaña de importación actual y estudiará la conveniencia de adoptar medidas adicionales si la situación no mejora.

Cuando sea necesario, se aplicarán las disposiciones del artículo 53 del Reglamento (CE) n° 1107/2009, en el que se establecen las condiciones para una autorización temporal de uso de productos fitosanitarios por una situación de emergencia en materia fitosanitaria.

<sup>(1)</sup> DO L 169 de 10.7.2000, p. 1.

<sup>(2)</sup> DO L 151 de 30.4.2004, p. 76.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006137/12  
to the Commission**

**Esther Herranz García (PPE)**

(21 June 2012)

*Subject:* Pests affecting citrus fruits from South Africa and Brazil

In 2011, an increase was detected in the number of cases of citrus fruits imported from South Africa and Brazil being diseased and pest-infested. In the case of South Africa, the number of cases detected rose from 16 in 2010 to 46 in 2011 (30 of which concerned the *guignardia citricarpa* pathogen, and another seven the *cryptophlebia leucotreta* or false codling moth). The increase demonstrates that South Africa has been breaching European legislation on plant health. Citrus fruits imported from Brazil are also affected by the same problem, with the number of detected cases rising from 5 in 2010 to 50 in 2011 (42 of which were caused by *guignardia citricarpa*).

1. What measures will the Commission take to prevent these pests spreading to citrus fruits in the EU?
2. Will the Commission authorise the exceptional use of phytosanitary products in the EU to counteract the effects of these plant diseases?
3. What measures and checks will be implemented with regard to South Africa and Brazil to ensure that they comply with European legislation?

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

(28 August 2012)

Citrus fruit is a regulated commodity in Council Directive 2000/29/EC<sup>(1)</sup> with special requirements for the imports from third countries, including specific measures against the introduction into, and spread within, the EU of *Guignardia citricarpa*.

*Cryptophlebia leucotreta* is not a regulated harmful organism in the EU. If a Member State considers that this harmful organism poses an imminent danger, it shall notify the Commission and, if necessary, take temporary national measures to prevent its introduction and spread before Commission and Member States examine the situation.

Since 2004, temporary emergency measures are in place in respect of certain citrus fruit originating in Brazil with stricter requirement against *Guignardia citricarpa* (Commission Decision 2004/416/EC<sup>(2)</sup>). In addition, the Commission has carried out recent audits (2011) in Brazil and South Africa related to the export of citrus fruit.

The Commission has communicated to Brazil and South Africa its concerns regarding the high number of interceptions of citrus fruit in 2011 and requested to take additional measures to ensure that citrus fruit exported to the EU complies with the relevant import requirements.

The Commission will closely monitor the situation during the current import season and will consider taking additional measures if the situation does not improve.

When necessary the provisions of Article 53 of Regulation 1107/2009 stipulating the conditions for temporary authorisation of plant protection products to be used for emergency situation in plant protection would be applicable.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 169, 10.7.2000, p. 1.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 151, 30.4.2004, p. 76.



(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006138/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)**  
(21. Juni 2012)

*Betrifft:* Mögliche Verschwendung von EU-Geldern für Geländer an einem Radweg bei der E 261 in Polen

Die Europastraße 261 verbindet Wrocław und Poznań in Polen. Von Wrocław bis Trebnica wird die Straße größtenteils von einem Radweg gesäumt, der teilweise mit einem rot-weißen Geländer ausgestattet ist. Zwischen Wysoki Kościół und Gmina Wisznia Mała wird der Radweg größtenteils sogar beidseitig von Geländern begleitet. Am 6. September 2007 billigte die Kommission für den Zeitraum 2007-2013 ein regionales operationelles Programm für die Woiwodschaft Niederschlesien in Polen mit dem Titel „operationelles Programm für die Woiwodschaft Niederschlesien für den Zeitraum 2007-2013“, mit einem Gesamtetat von rund 1,56 Mrd. EUR.

1. Welche Standards für Geh- und Radwege werden bei regionalen operationellen Programmen wie dem in Niederschlesien angewandt?
2. In welcher Höhe wurden Gelder des „operationellen Programms für die Woiwodschaft Niederschlesien für den Zeitraum 2007-2013“ oder anderer EU-subventionierter Infrastrukturprojekte für den Ausbau der E 261, des Radwegs und des Radweggeländers ausgegeben?
3. Aus welchem Grund wurde der Radweg mit Geländern versehen?

**Antwort von Herrn Hahn im Namen der Kommission**  
(14. August 2012)

Laut Auskunft der polnischen Behörden werden die Abschnitte der Europastraße 261 (polnische Nationalstraße DK 5) zwischen Breslau (Wrocław) und Trzebnica sowie zwischen Wysoki Kościół und Gmina Wisznia Mała weder aus den Europäischen Strukturfonds bzw. dem Kohäsionsfonds noch aus dem regionalen operationellen Programm für die Woiwodschaft Niederschlesien noch aus dem operationellen Programm für Infrastruktur und Umwelt kofinanziert.

Gemäß den Informationen des Ministeriums für regionale Entwicklung hat Polen eine Kofinanzierung der Modernisierung der E 261 aus EU-Mitteln erst für die nächste Phase eingeplant (Ausbau zur Schnellstraße S5). Die Verhandlungen zwischen der Europäischen Kommission und Polen für die Programme im Programmplanungszeitraum 2014-2020 müssen erst noch eingeleitet werden.

Das regionale Programm für die Woiwodschaft Niederschlesien enthält keine besonderen Vorschriften für Radwege. Die Infrastruktur muss den einschlägigen EU-Vorschriften wie auch den nationalen Vorschriften entsprechen. Die Anforderungen an Radwege sind in der polnischen Straßenverkehrsordnung geregelt.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006138/12  
to the Commission  
Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Possible waste of EU funds on railings for a cycle path along the E261 in Poland

European route 261 links Wrocław and Poznań in Poland. A cycle path runs along almost the entire length of the route from Wrocław to Trzebnica and a red and white railing has been built along part of that cycle path. Indeed, for most of the length of the cycle path between Wysoki Kosciol and Gmina Wisznia Mała there are railings on both sides. On 6 September 2007, the Commission approved a regional operational programme for the Lower Silesia Province of Poland for the period 2007-2013 (Operational programme 2007-2013: Lower Silesia) with a total budget of around EUR 1.56 billion.

1. What standards are laid down for footpaths and cycle paths in regional operational programmes such as the one for Lower Silesia?
2. How much funding from the 'Operational programme 2007-2013: Lower Silesia' or from other EU-subsidised infrastructure programmes has been spent on the construction of the E261, the cycle path and the cycle-path railings?
3. Why is the cycle path equipped with railings?

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

According to the information provided by the Polish authorities the parts of E 261 road (Polish national road DK 5) Wrocław — Trzebnica and Wysoki Kosciół — Gmina Wisznia Mała are not co-financed by the European Structural Funds and/or Cohesion Fund, nor from the regional programme 'Dolnośląskie' or from the programme Infrastructure and Environment.

According to the information provided by the Ministry of Regional Development the EU co-financing for the modernisation of the E261 road is included only in plans from Poland for the next period (upgrade to express road S5). The negotiations between the Commission and Poland for the programmes for the 2014-2020 period still have to start.

The regional programme 'Dolnośląskie' does not include specific requirements for bicycle paths. The constructed infrastructure must comply with relevant EU rules as well with national rules. The requirements for the bicycle paths are set by the Polish Road Code.

---

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006139/12  
an den Rat**

**Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Renate Sommer (PPE), Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE)  
und Philippe Boulland (PPE)**  
(21. Juni 2012)

**Betrifft:** Nichtanerkennung des EU-Ratsvorsitzes und das Einfrieren der Beziehungen mit der EU von offizieller türkischer Seite für das kommende Halbjahr

Die türkische Tageszeitung „Sabah“<sup>(1)</sup> veröffentlichte am 8. Juni 2012 Äußerungen der türkischen Minister für auswärtige Angelegenheiten bzw. für europäische Angelegenheiten, in denen sie unter anderem ankündigten, dass „keines der Ministerien oder anderen Institutionen der Republik Türkei mit dem EU-Ratsvorsitz in Zusammenhang mit Tätigkeiten des griechisch-zyprischen Ratsvorsitzes in Kontakt stehen werde“. Die Äußerungen wurden bei einem gemeinsamen Pressetermin im Rahmen des Dritten Treffens des politischen Dialogs auf Ministeriebene zwischen der EU und der Türkei gemacht, an dem die Hohe Vertreterin der EU für Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik sowie das für Erweiterung zuständige Kommissionsmitglied teilnahmen.

Die Aussagen dienten als Bestätigung eines Rundschreibens des Büros des türkischen Ministerpräsidenten an alle Ministerien, Verwaltungsdienststellen und Diplomaten seiner Regierung mit der Anweisung, an keinen EU-Sitzungen teilzunehmen, bei denen der zyprische EU-Ratsvorsitz den Vorsitz führt oder an denen er teilnimmt. Das Rundschreiben wurde vom zyprischen Regierungssprecher als eine Provokation und Beleidigung der EU und ihrer Organe kritisiert.

Hinzu kommt, dass auf der 69. Sitzung des Gemischten Parlamentarischen Ausschusses (GPA) EU-Türkei am 13. Juni 2012 in Straßburg, bei der das für Erweiterung zuständige Kommissionsmitglied und der türkische Minister für europäische Angelegenheiten zugegen waren, sich sowohl der türkische Minister als auch der Kovorsitzende des GPA (ein Mitglied der türkischen Nationalversammlung) beharrlich weigerten, Fragen mehrerer MdEP, so auch des stellvertretenden Vorsitzenden des GPA, in Bezug auf die Einladung bzw. Anwesenheit eines Vertreters des zyprischen EU-Ratsvorsitzes zur bzw. bei der 70. Sitzung des GPA und seine damit verbundene Anerkennung zu beantworten.

1. Wie sieht die Reaktion des Rates auf die öffentlichen Äußerungen der beiden Minister und das Rundschreiben des Büros des türkischen Ministerpräsidenten aus?
2. Welche konkreten Maßnahmen hat der Rat diesbezüglich ergriffen? Hat er der türkischen Regierung eine Protestnote übermittelt? Falls ja, wie hat die Türkei darauf reagiert?
3. Kann die EU und ihre Organe (einschließlich der Ausschüsse und anderer Gremien) gemäß den Verträgen eine solche Praxis (d. h. die Forderung, dass ein Vertreter des wechselnden EU-Ratsvorsitzes offiziellen EU-Treffen fernbleibt) eines beitragswilligen oder eines anderen an EU-Verfahren beteiligten Staates direkt, indirekt, stillschweigend oder ausdrücklich akzeptieren?

**Antwort**

(18. September 2012)

Die Abgeordneten werden auf die Antwort des Rates auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-007295/2011 verwiesen.

Diese Frage wird von der Union regelmäßig in den verschiedenen geeigneten Foren für den Dialog zwischen der EU und der Türkei angesprochen, zuletzt auf der Tagung des Assoziationsrates EU-Türkei am 22. Juni 2012 in Brüssel.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://english.sabah.com.tr/National/2012/06/08/we-will-not-recognize-southern-cyprus-eu-term-presidency>.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006139/12**

**προς το Συμβούλιο**

**Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Renate Sommer (PPE), Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE)  
και Philippe Boulland (PPE)**

(21 Ιουνίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Η επίσημη πρακτική της Τουρκίας να μην αναγνωρίζει την Προεδρία του Συμβουλίου της ΕΕ και το πάγωμα των σχέσεων της με την ΕΕ κατά το προσεχές εξάμηνο

Στις 8 Ιουνίου η τουρκική εφημερίδα Σαμπάχ<sup>(1)</sup> δημοσίευσε δηλώσεις του Υπουργού Εξωτερικών και του Υπουργού Ευρωπαϊκών Υποθέσεων, στις οποίες μεταξύ άλλων αναφέρθηκε ότι «κανένα υπουργείο ούτε θεσμικό όργανο της Τουρκικής Δημοκρατίας δεν θα έρθει σε επαφή με την Προεδρία της ΕΕ σε οποιαδήποτε δραστηριότητα συνδέεται με την ελληνοκυπριακή Προεδρία». Αυτές οι δηλώσεις έγιναν σε κοινή συνέντευξη Τύπου στο πλαίσιο της τρίτης συνεδρίασης πολιτικού διαλόγου Τουρκίας-ΕΕ, στην οποία παρευρίσκονταν η Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος Εξωτερικών Υποθέσεων και Πολιτικής Ασφαλείας καθώς και ο αρμόδιος για τη διεύρυνση Επίτροπος.

Αυτές οι δηλώσεις ήρθαν να επιβεβαιώσουν την εγκύκλιο από το Γραφείο του Τούρκου Πρωθυπουργού προς όλους τους υπουργούς, τις διοικητικές υπηρεσίες και τους διπλωμάτες της κυβέρνησής του, η οποία επιτάσσει να μην παρευρεθούν σε καμία συνεδρίαση της ΕΕ όπου προεδρεύει ή/και παρευρίσκεται η Κυπριακή Προεδρία του Συμβουλίου της ΕΕ. Αυτή η εγκύκλιος επικριθηκε από τον Κύπριο κυβερνητικό εκπρόσωπο ως προκλητική και προσβλητική για την ΕΕ και τα θεσμικά της όργανα.

Επιπλέον, κατά την 69η συνεδρίαση της Μικτής Κοινοβουλευτικής Επιτροπής (ΜΚΕ) ΕΕ-Τουρκίας, η οποία πραγματοποιήθηκε στις 13 Ιουνίου στο Στρασβούργο, όπου ήταν παρόντες ο αρμόδιος για τη διεύρυνση Επίτροπος και ο Τούρκος Υπουργός Εξωτερικών, τόσο ο Τούρκος Υπουργός όσο και ο συμπροεδρεύων της ΜΚΕ, ο οποίος είναι μέλος της Τουρκικής Εθνοσυνέλευσης, απέφευγαν συστηματικά να απαντήσουν στις ερωτήσεις διαφόρων βουλευτών του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, συμπεριλαμβανομένου του αντιπροέδρου της ΜΚΕ, σχετικά με την πρόσκληση, παρουσία και επομένως την αναγνώριση εκπροσώπου της κυπριακής Προεδρίας της ΕΕ στην 70ή συνεδρίαση της ΜΚΕ.

1. Ποια είναι η απάντηση του Συμβουλίου στις δημόσιες δηλώσεις των δύο υπουργών και στην εγκύκλιο από το Γραφείο του Τούρκου Πρωθυπουργού;
2. Σε ποια συγκεκριμένη ενέργεια έχει προβεί το Συμβούλιο επ' αυτού; Έχει προβεί σε διάβημα προς την τουρκική κυβέρνηση; Αν ναι, πώς αντέδρασε η τουρκική κυβέρνηση;
3. Έχοντας υπόψη τις Συνθήκες, μπορούν η ΕΕ και τα θεσμικά της όργανα (συμπεριλαμβανομένων των επιτροπών και άλλων οργάνων) να δέχονται, άμεσα ή έμμεσα, σιωπηρά ή ρητά, τέτοια πρακτική (δηλαδή το αίτημα να μην είναι παρών εκπρόσωπος της εκ περιτροπής Προεδρίας του Συμβουλίου της ΕΕ σε επίσημες συνεδριάσεις της ΕΕ) εκ μέρους υποψήφιου για ένταξη κράτους ή οποιουδήποτε κράτους συμμετέχει στις διαδικασίες της ΕΕ;

**Απάντηση**

(18 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Οι αξιότιμοι βουλευτές παραπέμπονται στην απάντηση που έδωσε το Συμβούλιο στη γραπτή ερώτηση E-007295/2011.

Το συγκεκριμένο θέμα θίγεται συστηματικά από την Ένωση στα διάφορα βήματα διαλόγου μεταξύ της ΕΕ και της Τουρκίας, και πλέον πρόσφατα κατά τη σύνοδο του Συμβουλίου Σύνδεσης ΕΕ-Τουρκίας που πραγματοποιήθηκε τις 22 Ιουνίου 2012 στις Βρυξέλλες.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://english.sabah.com.tr/National/2012/06/08/we-will-not-recognize-southern-cyprus-eu-term-presidency>.

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006139/12  
au Conseil**

**Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Renate Sommer (PPE), Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE)  
et Philippe Boulland (PPE)**  
(21 juin 2012)

*Objet:* Turquie: refus de reconnaître officiellement la présidence du Conseil de l'UE et gel des relations avec l'UE durant le deuxième semestre

Le 8 juin 2012, le quotidien turc Sabah <sup>(1)</sup> a publié les déclarations des ministres turcs des affaires étrangères et des affaires européennes dans lesquelles ils déclarent, entre autres, que «[...] aucun ministère, aucune institution de la République turque ne sera en contact avec la présidence européenne dans quelque activité que ce soit où la présidence chypriote grecque serait partie prenante». Ces déclarations ont été faites au cours d'une conférence de presse commune organisée dans le cadre de la troisième réunion de dialogue politique au niveau ministériel entre la Turquie et l'UE, à laquelle participaient la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante de l'Union pour les affaires étrangères et la politique de sécurité et le commissaire européen chargé de l'élargissement.

Les déclarations servaient à confirmer la teneur d'une circulaire envoyée par le bureau du Premier ministre turc à tous les ministères, services administratifs et diplomates du gouvernement turc leur donnant instruction de n'assister à aucune session présidée par la présidence chypriote de l'UE, ou à laquelle elle serait partie prenante. Le porte-parole du gouvernement chypriote a critiqué la circulaire, estimant qu'elle constitue une provocation et une insulte à l'égard de l'Union européenne et de ses institutions.

De plus, lors de la 69<sup>e</sup> réunion de la commission parlementaire mixte (CPM) Turquie-UE qui s'est tenue à Strasbourg le 13 juin 2012, à laquelle assistaient le commissaire à l'élargissement et le ministre turc des affaires européennes, tant le ministre turc que le coprésident de la CPM, lui-même député à l'Assemblée nationale turque, ont systématiquement fait l'impasse sur les questions posées par plusieurs députés du Parlement européen, y compris le vice-président de la CPM, concernant l'invitation, la présence et, partant, la reconnaissance d'un représentant de la présidence chypriote de l'UE à la 70<sup>e</sup> réunion de la CPM.

1. Comment le Conseil réagit-il face aux déclarations publiques des deux ministres et à la circulaire émise par le bureau du premier ministre turc?
2. Quelle action le Conseil a-t-il menée à cet égard? A-t-il entamé une démarche auprès du gouvernement turc? Dans l'affirmative, quelle a été la réponse de la Turquie?
3. S'agissant des traités, l'UE et ses institutions (y compris ses comités et autres organes) peuvent-elles accepter, directement ou indirectement, implicitement ou explicitement, de telles pratiques (notamment, le fait de refuser la présence, aux réunions officielles de l'UE, d'un représentant de la présidence tournante du Conseil de l'Union européenne) de la part d'un pays candidat à l'adhésion ou de tout autre pays concerné par les procédures de l'Union?

**Réponse**  
(18 septembre 2012)

L'Honorable Parlementaire est prié de se référer à la réponse donnée par le Conseil à la question écrite E-007295/2011.

L'Union aborde systématiquement cette question dans les diverses enceintes de dialogue entre l'UE et la Turquie; cela a encore été le cas lors de la réunion du Conseil d'association UE-Turquie, tenue à Bruxelles le 22 juin 2012.

---

(1) <http://english.sabah.com.tr/National/2012/06/08/we-will-not-recognize-southern-cyprus-eu-term-presidency>.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006139/12  
al Consiglio**

**Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Renate Sommer (PPE), Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE) e  
Philippe Boulland (PPE)**  
(21 giugno 2012)

**Oggetto:** Il non riconoscimento ufficiale turco della Presidenza del Consiglio dell'UE e il congelamento delle relazioni con l'UE nel prossimo semestre

L'8 giugno 2012, il quotidiano turco Sabah <sup>(1)</sup> ha pubblicato le dichiarazioni dei ministri turchi degli Affari esteri e degli Affari europei in cui affermano, tra l'altro, che «nessun ministro della Repubblica turca né alcuna istituzione intratterranno rapporti con la Presidenza dell'UE in merito a qualsiasi attività connessa alla Presidenza greco-cipriota». Le dichiarazioni sono state rese nel corso di una conferenza stampa congiunta nel quadro della terza riunione ministeriale di dialogo politico tra la Turchia e l'UE, alla presenza dell'Alto Rappresentante per gli affari esteri e la politica di sicurezza dell'UE e il Commissario responsabile per l'allargamento.

Le dichiarazioni erano finalizzate a confermare una circolare indirizzata dall'ufficio del primo ministro turco a tutti i ministeri, ai servizi amministrativi e agli organi diplomatici del suo governo con l'istruzione di non partecipare a nessuna riunione dell'UE presieduta e/o presenziata dalla presidenza cipriota del Consiglio dell'UE. La circolare è stata criticata dal portavoce del governo cipriota come provocatoria e ingiuriosa nei confronti dell'UE e delle sue istituzioni.

Inoltre, in occasione della 69ª riunione della commissione parlamentare mista (CPM) UE-Turchia, tenutasi a Strasburgo il 13 giugno 2012, dove erano presenti il Commissario per l'allargamento e il ministro turco per gli Affari europei, sia il ministro turco che il co-presidente della CPM, che è un deputato dell'Assemblea nazionale turca, hanno evitato sistematicamente di rispondere alle domande di diversi deputati del PE, anche del Vicepresidente della CPM, relative all'invito, alla presenza e dunque al riconoscimento in occasione della 70ª riunione del CPM di un rappresentante della Presidenza cipriota dell'UE.

1. Qual è la reazione del Consiglio alle dichiarazioni pubbliche dei due ministri e alla circolare dell'ufficio del primo ministro turco?
2. Quali misure concrete ha preso il Consiglio a questo riguardo? Ha avviato una protesta diplomatica nei confronti del governo turco? In caso affermativo, qual è la risposta turca?
3. Visti i trattati, possono l'UE e le sue istituzioni (compresi i comitati e gli altri organi) accettare, direttamente o indirettamente, tale pratica (ovvero la richiesta che un rappresentante della presidenza di turno del Consiglio dell'UE non sia presente nelle riunioni ufficiali dell'UE) da parte di un paese candidato o di qualsiasi Stato interessato dalle procedure dell'UE?

**Risposta**  
(18 settembre 2012)

Si rimanda l'onorevole parlamentare alla risposta del Consiglio all'interrogazione scritta E-007295/2011.

La questione è sistematicamente sollevata dall'Unione nei vari adeguati consessi di dialogo tra l'UE e la Turchia, da ultimo in occasione della sessione del consiglio di associazione UE-Turchia tenutasi a Bruxelles il 22 giugno 2012.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://english.sabah.com.tr/National/2012/06/08/we-will-not-recognize-southern-cyprus-eu-term-presidency>.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-006139/12  
do Rady**

**Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Renate Sommer (PPE), Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE)  
oraz Philippe Boulland (PPE)**  
(21 czerwca 2012 r.)

*Przedmiot:* Oficjalne nieuznanie przez Turcję prezydencji Rady UE i zamrożenie stosunków z UE przez następny okres prezydencji

W dniu 8 czerwca 2012 r. turecki dziennik Sabah<sup>(1)</sup> opublikował oświadczenia tureckich ministrów spraw zagranicznych i spraw europejskich, w których oznajmili oni m.in., że „żadne ministerstwo ani żadna instytucja Republiki Tureckiej nie będzie utrzymywać kontaktów z prezydenturą UE w czasie jej sprawowania przez grecką część Cypru”. Oświadczenia wydano podczas wspólnej konferencji prasowej w ramach trzeciego spotkania w sprawie dialogu politycznego między Turcją i UE na szczelbu ministerialnym z udziałem wysokiej przedstawiciel UE do spraw zagranicznych i polityki bezpieczeństwa oraz komisarza ds. rozszerzenia.

Oświadczenia stanowiły potwierdzenie pisma obiegowego wysłanego przez gabinet tureckiego premiera do wszystkich ministerstw, jednostek administracyjnych i dyplomatów tureckiego rządu, w którym poinstruowano ich, by nie uczestniczyli w żadnym ze spotkań UE pod przewodnictwem lub z udziałem cypryjskiej prezydencji Rady UE. Pismo to skrytykował rzecznik rządu cypryjskiego, nazywając je prowokacyjnym i obelżywym dla UE i jej instytucji.

Ponadto w czasie 69. posiedzenia wspólnej komisji parlamentarnej UE-Turcja w Strasburgu w dniu 13 czerwca 2012 r. z udziałem komisarza ds. rozszerzenia oraz tureckiego ministra spraw zagranicznych zarówno turecki minister, jak i współprzewodniczący wspólnej komisji parlamentarnej, będący też członkiem tureckiego Zgromadzenia Narodowego, systematycznie unikali odpowiedzi na pytania szeregu posłów do PE, w tym Wiceprzewodniczącego wspólnej komisji parlamentarnej, dotyczące zaproszenia, obecności i tym samym uznania przedstawiciela cypryjskiej prezydencji Rady UE podczas 70. posiedzenia tej komisji.

1. Jaka jest reakcja Rady na ww. publiczne oświadczenia dwóch ministrów i pismo obiegowe gabinetu tureckiego premiera?
2. Jakie konkretnie działania podjęła Rada w związku z zaistniałą sytuacją? Czy Rada wystosowała démarche do rządu tureckiego? A jeżeli tak, to jaka była odpowiedź strony tureckiej?
3. Mając na uwadze Traktaty, czy UE i jej instytucje (w tym komitety i inne organy) akceptują – bezpośrednio lub pośrednio, w sposób dorozumiany lub wprost – taką praktykę, tj. wniosek kraju kandydującego lub jakiegokolwiek innego państwa uczestniczącego w procedurach UE o to, by przedstawiciel rotacyjnej prezydencji Rady UE nie uczestniczył w oficjalnych spotkaniach na szczelbu unijnym?

**Odpowiedź**  
(18 września 2012 r.)

Zwracamy uwagę Panów Posłów i Pań Posłanek na odpowiedź udzieloną przez Radę na pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi na piśmie nr E-007295/2011.

Kwestia ta jest regularnie poruszana przez Unię na różnych odpowiednich forach dialogu między UE a Turcją, ostatnio podczas posiedzenia Rady Stowarzyszenia UE-Turcja w Brukseli w dniu 22 czerwca 2012 r.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://english.sabah.com.tr/National/2012/06/08/we-will-not-recognize-southern-cyprus-eu-term-presidency>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006139/12  
to the Council**

**Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Renate Sommer (PPE), Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE)  
and Philippe Boulland (PPE)**  
(21 June 2012)

*Subject:* Official Turkish non-recognition of the Presidency of the EU Council and the freezing of relations with the EU during next semester

On 8 June 2012, the Turkish daily Sabah <sup>(1)</sup> published statements by the Turkish Ministers of Foreign Affairs and European Affairs in which they, *inter alia*, declared that 'none of the Turkish Republic's ministries or any institutions will be in contact with the EU Presidency in any of the activities related to the Greek Cypriot Presidency'. The statements were made during a joint press meeting in the framework of the Third Ministerial Turkey-EU Political Dialogue Meeting attended by the EU High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and the Commissioner for Enlargement.

The statements served to confirm a circular note issued by the office of the Turkish Prime Minister to all ministries, administrative services and diplomats of his Government instructing them not to attend any EU session chaired and/or attended by the Cypriot Presidency of the EU Council. The circular note was criticised by the spokesman of the Cypriot Government as provocative and insulting to the EU and its institutions.

Moreover, during the 69th Meeting of the Joint Parliamentary Committee (JPC) EU-Turkey in Strasbourg on 13 June 2012, where the Commissioner for Enlargement and the Turkish Minister of European Affairs were present, both the Turkish Minister and the co-chairman of the JPC, who is a member of the Turkish National Assembly, systematically avoided answering questions from several MEPs, including the Vice-Chairman of the JPC, concerning the invitation, presence and thus recognition of a representative of the Cyprus EU Presidency at the 70th meeting of the JPC.

1. What is the Council's reaction to the public statements of the two ministers and to the circular note from the Turkish Prime Minister's office?
2. What concrete action has the Council taken in this regard? Has it lodged a *démarche* with the Turkish Government? If so, what was the Turkish response?
3. Having regard to the treaties, can the EU and its institutions (including committees and other organs) accept, directly or indirectly, implicitly or explicitly, such a practice (i.e., the request that a representative of the rotating Presidency of the EU Council not be present in official EU meetings) by a candidate country or by any state involved in the EU procedures?

**Reply**  
(18 September 2012)

The Honourable Member is referred to the Council's reply to Written Question E-007295/2011.

This matter is systematically raised by the Union in the various appropriate fora for dialogue between the EU and Turkey, most recently during the EU-Turkey Association Council meeting in Brussels on 22 June 2012.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://english.sabah.com.tr/National/2012/06/08/we-will-not-recognise-southern-cyprus-eu-term-presidency>.



(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-006142/12  
do Komisji**

**Paweł Zalewski (PPE)**

(21 czerwca 2012 r.)

*Przedmiot:* Ułatwienia wizowe dla obywateli Ukrainy

Umowa między Ukrainą a UE zmieniająca umowę między obiema stronami w sprawie ułatwień wizowych została paraflowana w dniu 16 lutego 2012 r. Rząd Ukrainy twierdzi, że zakończył procedury niezbędne do podpisania zmienionej umowy.

Minister spraw zagranicznych Ukrainy Konstantyn Gryszczenko oświadczył, iż jest gotów podpisać zmienioną umowę podczas swojej wizyty w Brukseli w dniach 23-24 lipca 2012 r., kiedy to będzie uczestniczył w czwartym posiedzeniu ministrów spraw zagranicznych państw Partnerstwa Wschodniego. Jednak wydaje się, że Komisja nie popiera aktywnie podpisania umowy przy tej okazji.

Ułatwienia wizowe są ważną kwestią dla wielu Ukraińców z różnych grup: przedsiębiorców, organizacji pozarządowych i organizacji społeczeństwa obywatelskiego. W niedalekiej przeszłości byliśmy świadkami szeregu przypadków, w których obywatelom Ukrainy utrudniano wjazd do UE. Byłbym bardzo zadowolony, gdyby Komisja przyspieszyła proces finalizowania umowy, aby uniknąć sytuacji, w której ten stan rzeczy będzie się przedłużał w przyszłości.

Stąd moje pytanie do Komisji: Na kiedy zaplanowano sfinalizowanie umowy oraz jakie obecne (lub wcześniejsze) przeszkody spowodowały bieżące opóźnienie?

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

(17 sierpnia 2012 r.)

Komisja przywiązuje dużą wagę do dalszego wspierania procesu ułatwiania kontaktów międzyludzkich pomiędzy obywatelami UE i Ukrainy. W tym celu dnia 5 lipca 2012 r. Komisja przyjęła wnioski dotyczące decyzji Rady w sprawie podpisania i zawarcia umowy pomiędzy Unią Europejską a Ukrainą zmieniającej umowę pomiędzy Wspólnotą Europejską a Ukrainą o ułatwieniach w wydawaniu wiz oraz przekazała je do Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady. Dnia 23 lipca Rada przyjęła decyzję dotyczącą podpisania umowy. Tego samego dnia wspomniana umowa została podpisana przez obie strony. Komisja popiera niezwłoczne zakończenie procedury w celu zawarcia przedmiotowej umowy, które spoczywa obecnie w rękach Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady. Jej zakończenie stanowiłoby pozytywny znak dla obywateli ukraińskich, zwłaszcza w obliczu obecnej trudnej sytuacji politycznej. Umowa przewiduje w szczególności nowe udogodnienia, między innymi dla przedstawicieli organizacji społeczeństwa obywatelskiego, młodych osób uczestniczących w wydarzeniach proponowanych przez organizacje nienastawione na zysk oraz dla studentów i dziennikarzy, którzy zamierzają podróżować do strefy Schengen.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006142/12  
to the Commission  
Paweł Zalewski (PPE)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Visa facilitation for Ukrainian citizens

An agreement between Ukraine and the EU amending the visa facilitation agreement between Ukraine and the EU was initialled on 16 February 2012. The Government of Ukraine claims to have completed the procedures required for signature of the amended agreement.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine, Kostyantyn Gryshchenko, has declared his readiness to sign this agreement during his visit to Brussels on 23-24 July 2012 to attend the Fourth Eastern Partnership (EaP) Foreign Ministers' meeting. Nonetheless, it seems the Commission is not actively supporting the signing of the agreement on this occasion.

Visa facilitation is an important issue for many Ukrainians from a variety of organisations: companies, NGOs, and civil society organisations. In the recent past, we have witnessed a number of cases where Ukrainian travellers were impeded in their attempts to enter the EU. In order to avoid this situation continuing in future, I would greatly welcome the Commission speeding up the process of finalising the agreement.

Therefore, I would like to ask the Commission: what is the planned timeframe to do so and what are (or have been) the obstacles which constitute the reason for the current delay?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission  
(17 August 2012)**

The Commission attaches great importance to further promoting the facilitation of people-to-people contacts between the citizens of the EU and Ukraine. To this end, on 5 July 2012, the Commission, adopted the proposals for Council decisions on the signature and the conclusion of the Agreement between the European Union and Ukraine amending the Agreement between the European Community and Ukraine on the facilitation of the issuance of visas and transmitted them to the European Parliament and the Council. On 23 July, the Council adopted the decision on the signature of this Agreement. On that same day, this Agreement was signed by both Parties. The Commission supports a swift finalisation of the procedure for the conclusion of this Agreement, which is now in the hands of the European Parliament and of the Council, as a positive signal to the ordinary Ukrainian citizens particularly in the difficult current political circumstances. The Agreement foresees notably new facilitations for, amongst others, representatives of civil society organisations, young persons participating in events organised by non-profit organisations, students and journalists, who want to travel to the Schengen area.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006144/12  
alla Commissione  
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)  
(21 giugno 2012)**

Oggetto: Monaco tibetano morto nelle carceri cinesi

Un monaco tibetano è morto nelle carceri cinesi, in seguito alle torture subite dagli agenti di polizia. Il religioso buddista era rinchiuso in una prigione della contea di Nyagrong, prefettura di Kardze, una delle Prefetture autonome del Tibet nella provincia cinese del Sichuan. Era accusato di aver appeso poster inneggianti all'indipendenza del Tibet nella contea di Kardze e per questo era stato arrestato in attesa di processo.

In questi mesi, Pechino ha aumentato la sua stretta contro il popolo tibetano, che secondo gli esperti sta subendo una vera e propria colonizzazione. Le restrizioni cinesi comprendono il divieto di insegnare la lingua e la religione tibetana e l'imposizione di politiche di sviluppo inappropriate, tutte a favore dell'etnia han. Dall'inizio del 2012, sono 35 i tibetani che si sono dati fuoco per criticare la dittatura di Pechino e chiedere il ritorno del Dalai Lama in Tibet. Il leader spirituale tibetano ha sempre sottolineato di «non incoraggiare» queste forme estreme di ribellione, ma ha elogiato «l'audacia» di quanti compiono l'estremo gesto, frutto del «genocidio culturale» che è in atto in Tibet. Pechino risponde attaccando il Dalai Lama, colpevole di sostenere «terroristi, criminali o malati mentali».

Può la Commissione far sapere:

1. Se il VP/HR è al corrente di questa vicenda?
2. Quali azioni ha intrapreso e quali intende intraprendere il VP/HR negli ultimi mesi al fine di porre fine alle violenze che continuano a verificarsi nel paese a danno dei tibetani?

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

L'UE è al corrente della notizia della morte in carcere, a fine maggio, di un monaco di 32 anni di nome Karwang: è stato selvaggiamente torturato e percosso per obbligarlo a confessare di aver affisso dei manifesti inneggianti all'indipendenza tibetana sui muri di un palazzo governativo cinese nella contea di Xinlong (Nyagrong, in tibetano), nella prefettura autonoma tibetana di Ganzi (Kardze), nel Sichuan. L'UE solleva costantemente con le autorità cinesi i casi individuali di tibetani soggetti ad arresti arbitrari o a rischio di tortura.

L'UE è preoccupata dal deteriorarsi della situazione dei diritti umani in Tibet negli ultimi anni, confermata da questo caso e dalla tragica serie di persone che si sono autoimmolate dal marzo 2011.

L'UE coglie l'occasione di visite e dialoghi ad alto livello per esprimere alle autorità cinesi la propria inquietudine sul Tibet. Recentemente, la trentunesima sessione del dialogo sui diritti umani UE-Cina, tenutasi a Bruxelles il 29 maggio 2012, ha offerto all'UE l'opportunità di un intenso scambio di vedute con le autorità cinesi sulle questioni che destano preoccupazione, tra queste il Tibet. L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente della Commissione europea ha manifestato l'inquietudine dell'UE nel discorso sul Tibet che ha tenuto al Parlamento europeo il 12 giugno 2012. L'UE ha dato voce alle proprie preoccupazioni sul Tibet anche nelle ultime due sessioni del Consiglio dei diritti dell'uomo in marzo e giugno.

Ha esortato le autorità cinesi ad affrontare le cause profonde del malcontento della popolazione tibetana e a garantire il rispetto dei loro diritti umani e ha inoltre insistito presso le autorità cinesi affinché diano prova di moderazione e permettano a diplomatici e giornalisti stranieri di accedere liberamente a tutte le zone autonome tibetane. L'UE ha anche esortato le autorità cinesi a dar seguito al dialogo con gli inviati del Dalai Lama, la cui ultima riunione risale all'inizio del 2010, in modo da contribuire ad una soluzione duratura.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006144/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)**

(21 June 2012)

*Subject:* Tibetan monk dies in Chinese prison

A Tibetan Buddhist monk has died in a Chinese prison after being tortured by police. He was being held in a prison in Nyagrong county in the prefecture of Kardze, one of the Tibetan Autonomous Prefectures in the Chinese province of Sichuan. He had been arrested on a charge of putting up posters in Kardze calling for Tibetan independence and was awaiting trial.

In recent months Beijing has been tightening its grip on the Tibetan people, who are now, according to experts, undergoing what can only be described as colonisation. The restrictions introduced by the Chinese authorities include a ban on teaching the Tibetan language and religion and the imposition of inappropriate development policies to the exclusive benefit of the Han Chinese community. Since early 2012, 35 Tibetans have set themselves on fire as a way of protesting against the Beijing dictatorship and calling for the Dalai Lama's return to Tibet. The Tibetan spiritual leader has always stressed that these extreme kinds of rebellion are 'not to be encouraged', but has praised the 'bravery' of those who make the ultimate sacrifice in response to the current 'cultural genocide' in Tibet. Beijing has in turn accused the Dalai Lama of supporting 'terrorists, criminals and the mentally ill'.

1. Is the VP/HR aware of this incident?
2. What steps has the VP/HR taken in recent months and what steps does she intend to take in order to put an end to the violent repression of the Tibetan people?

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

(10 August 2012)

The EU is aware of reports that a 32-year-old monk named Karwang died in detention in late May after being severely tortured and beaten to force him to confess to having put up posters calling for Tibetan independence on the walls of a Chinese government building in Xinlong (in Tibetan, Nyagrong) county in Sichuan's Ganzi (Kardze) Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture. The EU repeatedly raises individual cases of Tibetans who are subject to arbitrary arrest or at risk of torture with the Chinese authorities.

The EU is concerned by the deterioration of the Human Rights situation in Tibet witnessed over the last years, as illustrated by this case as well as the tragic wave of self immolations since March 2011.

The EU takes the opportunity of high-level visits and dialogues to express its concerns on Tibet with the Chinese authorities. Lately, the 31st session of the EU-China Human Rights dialogue which took place in Brussels on 29 May 2012 provided the EU with the opportunity to have an extensive exchange of views on issues of concerns, including Tibet, with the Chinese authorities. The High Representative/Vice-President of the European Commission expressed the EU's concern in her speech on Tibet to the European Parliament on 12 June 2012. The EU also raised its concern on Tibet at the last two sessions of the Human Rights Council in March and in June.

The EU called upon the Chinese authorities to address the root causes of the dissatisfaction of Tibetan people and to ensure that their human rights are respected. The EU also urged the Chinese authorities to exercise restraint and to allow unrestricted access by foreign diplomats and journalists to all Tibetan autonomous areas. The EU also urged the Chinese authorities to follow up on the dialogue with the Envoys of the Dalai Lama since the last session took place in early 2010 in order to contribute to a durable solution.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006146/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)**

(21 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Allerta energy drink

In Francia, l'Agenzia nazionale per la sicurezza sanitaria e alimentare ipotizza due morti sospette collegate al consumo «anomalo» di bibite energizzanti. Gli elementi sono emersi attraverso il sistema di nutri-sorveglianza messo a punto nel 2009 per raccogliere le segnalazioni dei consumatori su energy drink e informazioni su piante medicinali o esotiche presenti in alimenti arricchiti e integratori, ma non comprese nelle liste della farmaco-vigilanza.

Recentemente è stato rilevato un incremento delle segnalazioni di effetti collaterali da parte di chi miscela le bevande energizzanti con i superalcolici. Secondo l'Agenzia quando le bibite vengono abbinate a un'attività sportiva intensa, oppure sono mescolate con alcolici, potrebbero avere un effetto sul rischio cardiovascolare o portare a una diminuzione della percezione degli effetti correlati all'alcol. Il problema maggiore quindi è dato dal mix energy-drink e alcol perché la caffeina riduce il senso di ubriachezza e l'individuo può non accorgersi di avere superato i suoi limiti in senso negativo. Il rischio è una perdita di consapevolezza delle proprie azioni, con la possibilità di mettersi alla guida in condizioni precarie. Inoltre, ogni lattina di 250 ml contiene circa nove zollette di zucchero. Si tratta di una quantità non certo trascurabile se la bibita è assunta da giovani con problemi di sovrappeso e obesità.

Alla luce di quanto precede, si interroga la Commissione per sapere:

1. Se è a conoscenza delle indagini dell'Agenzia francese per la sicurezza sanitaria e alimentare?
2. Se l'EFSA ha in precedenza svolto indagini su energy-drink e, in caso di risposta negativa, se dopo i casi riscontrati in Francia, non intende intervenire sulla questione?

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

(21 agosto 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza del lavoro attualmente in corso presso ANSES <sup>(1)</sup> sugli «energy drinks».

Quanto alla seconda domanda, la Commissione rimanda l'onorevole parlamentare alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-005939/2012 <sup>(2)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Agenzia francese per la sicurezza sanitaria dell'alimentazione, dell'ambiente e del lavoro.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006146/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)**

(21 June 2012)

*Subject:* Energy drink warning

The French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health and Safety (ANSES) has linked two deaths in France to the 'anomalous' consumption of energy drinks. The details have emerged through the work of the nutritional surveillance system set up in 2009 to compile reports from energy drink consumers and information on medicinal or exotic plants which are used as ingredients in enriched and fortified foods, but which are not included on pharmacovigilance watchlists.

Recently there has been an increase in the number of reports of side effects suffered by people who mix energy drinks with spirits. According to ANSES, when consumed during intense sporting activity or mixed with alcohol these drinks could increase the risk of a heart attack or lead to a reduction in the perceived effects of alcohol. The most serious problems arise, therefore, when energy drinks are mixed with alcohol, because the caffeine they contain reduces the feeling of drunkenness and individuals can no longer gauge whether they have exceeded their personal limits. The danger is that they are then no longer in control of their own actions, possibly even when at the wheel of a vehicle. Moreover, every 250 ml can of energy drink contains the equivalent of about nine cubes of sugar, a considerable amount if consumed by young people suffering from problems linked to their being overweight or obese.

1. Is the Commission aware of these studies conducted by ANSES?
2. Has the European Food Safety Agency carried out any research into energy drinks? If not, does the Commission intend to take action on this matter in the light of the cases which have come to light in France?

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

(21 August 2012)

The Commission is aware of the work being carried out by ANSES <sup>(1)</sup> on 'energy drinks'.

With regard to the second question, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-005939/2012 <sup>(2)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> The French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health and Safety.  
<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN>.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006149/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)**

(21 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Malagrotta, tumori in aumento per i residenti

Tumore della laringe e della vescica, problemi circolatori per le donne e malattie dell'apparato respiratorio per gli uomini: sono queste le patologie legate, secondo il rapporto basato sugli 85mila residenti nella zona di Malagrotta (Roma), alla presenza di ben tre impianti nella predetta area: inceneritore, discarica e raffineria. Sia per quanto riguarda la mortalità sia soprattutto per le ospedalizzazioni, sono stati riscontrati alcuni eccessi di rischio degni di nota. I malati accertati in zona sono almeno un centinaio e tutti di tumore o con problemi tiroidei e cardiovascolari.

A rendere la situazione particolarmente pericolosa sarebbe stato il contatto tra la discarica più grande d'Europa — 240 ettari ormai stracolmi — e la falda acquifera sottostante. A rilevare il dato è stata un'altra perizia elaborata nei mesi scorsi che, dopo aver fatto prelievi in sessantuno differenti punti della zona, riscontrava come venivano continuamente superati i limiti alla presenza di sostanze pericolose come ferro, manganese e nichel, mentre in alcuni prelievi l'arsenico e il benzene oltrepassavano addirittura di 30 volte i limiti di legge. In alcuni casi, la quantità di arsenico sarebbe arrivata addirittura a 200 volte oltre il quantitativo previsto dalla legge.

Tante sono state finora le denunce dei residenti che da anni chiedono un intervento alle istituzioni inermi.

Poiché i problemi sanitari non conoscono frontiere e tale concetto è la stessa Unione a ribadirlo, può la Commissione far sapere, alla luce di quanto precede:

1. se è a conoscenza di quanto denunciato dai residenti di Malagrotta;
2. come intende intervenire al fine di tutelare la salute delle persone;
3. se la discarica in questione è in possesso dei requisiti operativi e tecnici per i rifiuti e le discariche previsti nella normativa europea?

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

(31 luglio 2012)

Attualmente la Commissione procede all'istruzione del procedimento di infrazione 2011/4021, relativo al funzionamento della discarica di Malagrotta, contestato per il fatto che alcuni rifiuti scaricati nell'impianto non subiscono un pretrattamento adeguato, in violazione dell'articolo 6 della direttiva 1999/31/CE relativa alle discariche di rifiuti <sup>(1)</sup>. La Commissione non dispone di elementi di prova determinanti che collegherebbero l'inquinamento delle acque sotterranee dell'area di Malagrotta al funzionamento della discarica.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> GUL 182 del 16.7.1999.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006149/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)**

(21 June 2012)

*Subject:* Increased incidence of tumours among Malagrotta residents

A number of medical conditions — including cardiovascular disease and tumours of the larynx and bladder, in the case of women, and respiratory disease, in the case of men — are linked, according to a report on the health of the 85 000 residents of the Malagrotta district of Rome, to three major facilities sited there: an incinerator, a waste tip and a refinery. There is a significantly increased risk in relation to some pathologies, both in terms of mortality and hospitalisation rates. At least a hundred patients from the area are reported to be suffering from tumours, thyroid conditions or cardiovascular disease.

It appears that the situation has become particularly dangerous because the biggest waste tip in Europe — which covers 240 hectares, and is now full to overflowing — is polluting the underlying water table, as revealed by another report drawn up some months ago. Samples taken at 61 different points in the area showed that the limit values for dangerous substances such as iron, manganese and nickel were constantly being exceeded, while the amount of arsenic and benzene detected in some samples was 30 times higher than the legal limit. In some cases, in fact, the amount of arsenic found was 200 higher than the maximum level set by law.

Residents have been complaining about this situation for years to the authorities, which seem powerless to intervene.

Given that health problems transcend frontiers, as the European Union itself stresses, and in view of the situation outlined above,

1. Is the Commission aware of the situation denounced by the residents of Malagrotta?
2. What action does the Commission intend to take to protect public health?
3. Can the Commission state whether the waste tip in question meets the operational and technical requirements imposed by the European legislation on waste and waste disposal facilities?

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

(31 July 2012)

Currently, the Commission is conducting the infringement procedure 2011/4021, challenging the operation of the Malagrotta landfill on the ground that some of the waste landfilled does not undergo an adequate pre-treatment, in breach of Article 6 of the Landfill Directive 1999/31/EC<sup>(1)</sup>. The Commission is not in possession of conclusive evidence which would link the pollution of the groundwaters in the Malagrotta district with the operation of the landfill.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 182, 16.7.1999.



*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006150/12  
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)  
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)**

*(21 giugno 2012)*

**Oggetto:** VP/HR — Militare italiano morto in Kosovo

Un militare italiano della KFOR, la Forza NATO di stanza in Kosovo, è morto in un incidente avvenuto in una base del contingente nel nord del Paese. A confermarlo è stato un rappresentante del contingente italiano.

L'incidente è avvenuto nella base italiana a Novo Selo, fra i villaggi di Zupc e Caber, non lontano da Kosovska Mitrovica. All'interno del campo è stato sentito un colpo d'arma da fuoco e il soldato è stato trovato privo di vita con il fucile vicino. Stando alla fonte, dal fucile sarebbe partito accidentalmente un colpo, mentre il militare era impegnato nella pulizia dello stesso. Sull'episodio sono comunque in corso indagini da parte dei responsabili militari.

Il militare era tra i 550 soldati italiani che sono attualmente impegnati nell'operazione di pace delle forze Nato in Kosovo, a cui partecipano 31 Paesi con 5 500 soldati. Il contingente nazionale è schierato a Pristina, Belo Polje, Decane e Dakovica. L'Italia è alla guida del Multinational Battle Group West, di cui fanno parte anche militari di Slovenia e Austria.

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

1. se è a conoscenza della vicenda;
2. se può fornire maggiori informazioni;
3. quali immediate azioni intende disporre per accertare, nell'ambito delle sue competenze, le cause della morte e le eventuali responsabilità?

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

*(10 agosto 2012)*

L'Alta Rappresentante è informata della morte del soldato della NATO, per la quale esprime profondo cordoglio. Il Servizio europeo per l'azione esterna (SEAE) non è però in grado di fornire ulteriori informazioni sulle circostanze di questo tragico evento e invita l'onorevole parlamentare a rivolgere il quesito ai nostri colleghi della NATO.

Tra NATO e EULEX vi è un'eccellente cooperazione sul campo. L'UE è pronta a fornire qualsiasi assistenza la NATO richiedesse in connessione con il terribile evento menzionato.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006150/12**  
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**  
**Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)**  
(21 June 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Death of an Italian soldier in Kosovo

An Italian soldier serving with KFOR, the NATO force stationed in Kosovo, has died as a result of an incident at a NATO base in the north of Kosovo. The death has been confirmed by a representative of the Italian contingent.

The incident occurred at the Italian base in Novo Selo, between the villages of Zupc and Caber, not far from Kosovska Mitrovica. A gunshot was heard at the camp, and the soldier was found dead, with his gun nearby. According to the source, the gun had been fired accidentally while the soldier was cleaning it. The military authorities are, however, investigating the incident.

The soldier was one of the 550 Italian troops currently serving in the NATO force's peace-keeping operation in Kosovo, which involves 31 countries and 5 500 troops. The Italian contingent is based in Pristina, Belo Polje, Decane and Dakovica. Italy has the command of the Multinational Battle Group West, which also comprises soldiers from Slovenia and Austria.

In the light of the foregoing:

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of this incident?
2. Can the Vice-President/High Representative provide any further information about it?
3. What immediate action does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to take, within the limits of her remit, to ascertain the cause of this soldier's death and where responsibility may lie?

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

The HR/VP has been informed of the death of the NATO soldier, which she deeply deplores. The EEAS is however not in a position to offer any further information on the circumstances of this tragic event and invites the Honorable Member of the European Parliament to address his inquiry to our NATO colleagues.

In the field, NATO and EULEX enjoy an excellent cooperation. Any assistance NATO might require in connection with the above terrible event, the EU will certainly endeavour to provide.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006152/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)**

(21 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Naufragio lungo le coste salentine, sette dispersi nordafricani

Dovrebbero essere sei i migranti dispersi nel canale d'Otranto dopo che la loro piccola imbarcazione — a bordo altre quattro persone tratte in salvo — è naufragata a sei miglia dalla punta del Salento, tra Santa Maria di Leuca e Torre Vado. Questo è l'ultimo dato fornito dalle forze dell'ordine dopo gli interrogatori dei superstiti. Sul posto sono intervenuti mezzi aero-navali, cinque imbarcazioni e due aerei in tutto, che stanno battendo palmo a palmo una vasta zona di mare (circa 200 miglia quadrate) antistante la costa ionica salentina, nella speranza di recuperare le altre persone che, secondo i racconti dei sopravvissuti, si trovavano a bordo del motoscafo.

L'allarme è scattato intorno alle 6.30 ed è partito da una barca a vela che navigava nella zona. Quattro uomini sono stati trovati in acqua: due libici, un afgano e un tunisino, tutti neppure trentenni. Due di loro sono stati tratti in salvo da un peschereccio che, intorno alle sette, navigava nella zona tra Leuca e Torre Vado. Un altro clandestino è stato recuperato da una motovedetta nel porto di Gallipoli, appena il mezzo ha raggiunto la zona del naufragio, mentre, per trovare il quarto uomo, è stata necessaria un'altra ora di ricerche. Le persone tratte in salvo presentavano un principio di assideramento, per cui dopo essere state trasportate nel porto di Leuca sono state condotte all'ospedale di Tricase per gli accertamenti di rito. Dopo le cure saranno trasferiti a Otranto per le procedure di identificazione.

L'Unione europea vanta una lunga tradizione di accoglienza delle persone provenienti da altri paesi alla ricerca di un lavoro o in fuga da guerre e persecuzioni perseguendo quei diritti umani che l'Europa considera universali e indivisibili.

Alla luce di quanto precede, si interroga la Commissione per sapere se:

1. è a conoscenza di quanto accaduto nelle acque territoriali italiane?
2. e come intende intervenire affinché non si ripetano situazioni simili?

**Risposta data da Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione**

(17 agosto 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza degli eventi citati dall'onorevole parlamentare.

A tale proposito, attira la sua attenzione sulla risposta data all'interrogazione scritta E-03726/2012 <sup>(1)</sup> e lo informa che l'operazione Hermes è ricominciata il 1° luglio 2012.

---

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

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006152/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)**

(21 June 2012)

*Subject:* Shipwreck off the Salento coast — seven North Africans missing

Seven migrants are thought to be missing in the Strait of Otranto after their small boat sank six miles off the tip of the Salento peninsula, between Santa Maria di Leuca and Torre Vado. The other four people on board the boat were rescued. This is the latest information released by police following their questioning of the survivors. Five ships and two aircraft have been deployed to the area; inch by inch they are scouring an area of sea (roughly 200 square miles) off the Ionian coast of the Salento in the hope of rescuing the other people, who, according to the survivors, were also on board the vessel when it sank.

A sailing boat in the vicinity at the time raised the alarm at around 6.30. Four men were found in the water: two Libyans, one Afghan and one Tunisian, all of them aged under 30. Two of them were rescued by a fishing boat present in the area between Leuca and Torre Vado at around 7.00. Another illegal immigrant was rescued by a patrol vessel from Gallipoli as soon it reached the site of the shipwreck, while it took another hour of searching before the fourth man was found. Those rescued were showing early signs of hypothermia and after being transported back to land they were taken straight from the port of Leuca to Tricase hospital for a check-up. After treatment they will be transferred to Otranto for identification.

The EU boasts a long tradition of welcoming people from other countries who are seeking work or fleeing war and persecution. In so doing it upholds the human rights which Europe regards as universal and indivisible.

1. Is the Commission aware of this incident in Italian waters?
2. What action does it plan to take to prevent any repeat?

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

(17 August 2012)

The Commission is aware of the incidents mentioned by the Member of Parliament.

In this respect, it would like to refer him to its reply to Written Question E-003726/2012 <sup>(1)</sup> and inform him that Operation Hermes resumed on 1 July 2012.

---

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

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006154/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)**

(21 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Plastica biodegradabile in pochi giorni

Un'azienda di Minerbio, in provincia di Bologna, è la prima produttrice al mondo di plastica «pulita». L'impresa ha acquistato il primo brevetto per realizzare una plastica totalmente biodegradabile utilizzando la melassa. Un mondo senza l'inquinante plastica al petrolio sembra sempre più vicino.

Trovata sul web una promettente ricerca negli Stati Uniti, i due soci hanno investito i propri risparmi acquistando il brevetto americano per 250 mila euro e poi altri brevetti. Ora la loro azienda in Emilia Romagna è la prima a produrre il PHA, una molecola utilizzata anche per produrre policarbonati, le strutture chimiche alla base della plastica dura. Si tratta di affamare e poi far ingrassare dei batteri. In poche ore quel grasso diventa la polvere con cui è prodotta la plastica. Il prodotto finito è biodegradabile in terra, acqua dolce e acqua di mare. In dieci giorni, i granuli della plastica così prodotta, si dissolvono in acqua senza alcun residuo.

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

1. Se è a conoscenza del brevetto per la realizzazione di plastica «pulita»?
2. Se ci sono ricerche, finanziate dal programma LIFE, circa la produzione di plastica biodegradabile?

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

(1° agosto 2012)

La Commissione ringrazia l'onorevole parlamentare per queste interessanti informazioni concernenti un brevetto per la produzione di una plastica che si dissolve in acqua in 10 giorni senza residui. La Commissione non era a conoscenza di tale brevetto e gradirebbe ricevere informazioni tecniche più esaustive da cui poter trarre conclusioni relative all'impatto ambientale di questo tipo di plastica.

Dalla banca dati dei progetti del programma LIFE della Commissione risulta che 27 progetti ENV riguardano le materie plastiche e, alcuni di essi, plastiche di tipo innovativo <sup>(1)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/life/project/Projects/index.cfm>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006154/12  
to the Commission  
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Plastic that decomposes in a few days

A company in Minerbio, in Bologna province, has become the first in the world to produce 'clean' plastic. The company has acquired the first patent to manufacture fully biodegradable plastic using molasses. It seems that a world free of petroleum-based polluting plastic has come closer than ever.

The two partners in the firm came across some promising research in the United States on the Internet. They used their own savings to acquire first the American patent for EUR 250 000 and then other patents. Now their company in Emilia Romagna has become the first to produce PHA, a molecule also used in the production of polycarbonates, the chemical structure on which hard plastic is based. The process involves starving and then fattening up bacteria. In a few hours, the fat becomes dust from which the plastic is produced. The end product decomposes in earth, freshwater and saltwater. Granules of plastic produced in this way dissolve in water in 10 days without leaving any residue.

1. Does the Commission know about the patent to manufacture 'clean' plastic?
2. Is the LIFE programming funding any research into the production of biodegradable plastic?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission  
(1 August 2012)**

The Commission thanks the Honourable Member for this interesting piece of information about a patent for the production of plastic that dissolves in water within 10 days without leaving any residues. The Commission was not aware of such a patent and would appreciate to receive more comprehensive technical information from which conclusions towards the environmental impact of such plastic could be drawn.

The Commission's LIFE programming project database shows that 27 ENV projects have dealt with plastics, some of them innovative types of plastic <sup>(1)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/life/project/Projects/index.cfm>.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006155/12**  
**alla Commissione**  
**Mara Bizzotto (EFD)**  
(21 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Attuazione della direttiva 2009/48/CE

La direttiva 2009/48/CE sulla sicurezza dei giocattoli è stata recepita dall'Italia col D.Lgs n. 54, 11 aprile 2011. Tale direttiva prevede che, affinché i giocattoli possano essere immessi nel mercato europeo, debbano rispettare i Requisiti Essenziali di Sicurezza (RES). Lo scopo del provvedimento è quello di creare regole comuni per il mercato interno aggiornate in materia di sicurezza dei giocattoli che vantano specifiche criticità fisico-chimiche: infiammabilità, tipologie di vernici, igiene, che devono essere ridotte e monitorate in base all'evoluzione tecnologica degli stessi. La direttiva intende facilitare la vendita di giocattoli fra Stati membri, nell'interesse dei consumatori, degli operatori economici e delle autorità di vigilanza del mercato.

— Ad un anno e mezzo dalla data ultima di recepimento della direttiva, può la Commissione indicare se essa sia stata implementata completamente negli Stati membri?

— Come valuta la Commissione gli effetti della direttiva sul mercato, in particolare riguardo alla concorrenza?

— Reputa la Commissione che ci sia la possibilità che alcuni paesi abbiano recepito la direttiva in modo tale da inficiare le regole del mercato comune a danno di altri Stati membri?

**Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione**  
(31 luglio 2012)

La direttiva 2009/48/CE, parzialmente applicabile in tutti gli Stati membri a partire dal 20 luglio 2011, prevede un periodo transitorio più lungo per i requisiti di sicurezza relativi a sostanze chimiche. Pertanto, essa sarà pienamente applicabile solo a partire dal 20 luglio 2013.

La direttiva prevede l'obbligo per gli Stati membri di presentare una relazione sulla sua attuazione entro il 20 luglio 2014 e, successivamente, ogni cinque anni. Dopo aver ricevuto tali relazioni la Commissione sarà in grado di valutare meglio l'efficacia della direttiva. Inoltre, la Commissione prevede di avviare uno studio sulla competitività del settore dei giocattoli all'interno dell'UE i cui risultati dovrebbero essere disponibili nel primo semestre del 2013.

Quanto all'avanzamento del recepimento della direttiva, tutti gli Stati membri hanno comunicato le relative disposizioni nazionali di attuazione. La Commissione sta monitorando attentamente la situazione e prenderà prontamente provvedimenti nei confronti degli Stati membri interessati qualora la direttiva non sia applicata correttamente.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006155/12  
to the Commission  
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Implementation of Directive 2009/48/EC

Directive 2009/48/EC on the safety of toys was transposed into Italian law through Legislative Decree No 54 of 11 April 2011. The directive provides that toys must comply with essential safety requirements before being introduced onto the EU market. The directive aims to establish up-to-date common rules on toy safety for the internal market which cover certain specific and critical physical and chemical properties: flammability, paint typologies, hygiene. These must be reduced and monitored in line with the technological development of toys. The directive seeks to facilitate the sale of toys between Member States, in the interests of the consumer, economic operators and market supervisory authorities.

— One and a half years after the last country transposed this directive, can the Commission confirm whether it has been fully implemented in the Member States?

— What is the Commission's assessment of the effect the directive has had on the market, particularly with regard to competition?

— Does the Commission think that some countries may have transposed the directive in such a way that it nullifies common market rules to the detriment of other Member States?

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

Directive 2009/48/EC, partially applicable in all Member States since 20 July 2011, contains a longer transitional period for the safety requirements related to chemical substances. Thus, it will be fully applicable only from 20 July 2013.

The directive foresees the obligation for Member States to submit a report on its implementation by 20 July 2014, and every five years thereafter. Once these reports are received, the Commission will be able to better assess the effectiveness of the directive. In addition, the Commission plans to undertake a study on the competitiveness of the toy sector in the EU, the results of which are expected to be available in the first half of 2013.

As regards the status of the directive's transposition, all Member States have notified the relevant national implementing provisions. The Commission is closely monitoring the situation and will take prompt action towards the Member State(s) concerned in case the directive is not correctly applied.

---



(Versione italiana)

### Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006156/12

alla Commissione

Mara Bizzotto (EFD)

(21 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Creazione di Zone franche a fisco e burocrazia zero per agevolare l'economia dei territori di Emilia Romagna, Lombardia e Veneto

La grave emergenza umana, sociale ed economica, che ha colpito Emilia Romagna, Veneto e Lombardia, richiede la massima solidarietà di tutti i livelli di governo: locale, regionale ma anche comunitario.

Considerato l'esito del sopralluogo aereo che lo scorso 3 giugno ha permesso al Commissario europeo per le politiche regionali, Johannes Hahn, di constatare l'effettiva situazione e i danni provocati dal sisma alle zone interessate; posto che la creazione di zone a fisco e burocrazia zero rappresenterebbe un ulteriore possibile regime d'aiuto limitato, circoscritto, proporzionale alle dimensioni dei soggetti beneficiari e compatibile con i limiti imposti dalle regole sulla concorrenza (ex articoli 107 e 108 del TFUE) fondamentali per rimettere in moto il tessuto produttivo e l'economia di queste aeree:

- la Commissione ha intenzione di sostenere l'eventuale richiesta da parte dello Stato italiano di attribuire alle aeree alluvionate lo status di zona franca a fisco e burocrazia zero?
- Di fronte all'eccezionalità degli eventi sismici che si registrano quotidianamente in queste aree e alla conseguente impossibilità di stabilire i danni totali provocati da questa catastrofe entro le 10 settimane previste dall'articolo 4 del regolamento (CE) n. 2012/2002 che istituisce il Fondo di solidarietà dell'Unione europea, è possibile ipotizzare una deroga alla normale procedura di attivazione del Fondo?

### Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione

(7 agosto 2012)

1. La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta P-005880/12 <sup>(1)</sup>. Alla zona di libero scambio si applicano inoltre le disposizioni dell'articolo 107, paragrafo 3, lettera a) del Trattato, nell'interpretazione datane dagli Orientamenti sugli aiuti di stato a finalità regionale per il periodo 2007-2013 («Orientamenti» <sup>(2)</sup>): l'unico caso in cui l'aiuto al funzionamento può essere compatibile con il mercato interno è quello in cui sia concesso in un'area ammessa a beneficiare degli aiuti regionali ai sensi della deroga di cui all'articolo 107, paragrafo 3, lettera a), del TFUE. Le regioni interessate non rientrano però tra quelle contemplate dall'articolo 107, paragrafo 3, lettera a), del TFUE.

In ogni caso le norme sugli aiuti pubblici consentono di prestare sostegno alle zone colpite servendosi di altri strumenti, come ad esempio gli aiuti alle PMI e gli aiuti «de minimis» <sup>(3)</sup> che possono sostenere la ricostruzione dell'area integrando i provvedimenti per rimediare ai danni.

Se ed in quanto le zone di libero scambio offrono un livello ridotto di tassazione effettiva delle imprese entro i limiti dell'aiuto «de minimis», o di aiuti che potrebbero essere approvati nel quadro di una deroga agli aiuti di Stato, si dovranno osservare le condizioni stabilite dal Codice di condotta per la tassazione delle imprese: Assenza di favoritismi nei confronti degli investitori stranieri, nessun privilegio per i servizi finanziari, trasparenza nella procedura di domanda.

2. Il regolamento del Consiglio (CE) n. 2012/2002 non consente di derogare al termine di dieci settimane per la presentazione delle domande. La Commissione sta fornendo indicazioni alle autorità italiane per redigere la domanda di accesso al Fondo di solidarietà. Le autorità italiane non hanno segnalato difficoltà nel completare la domanda in tempo utile. Sulla base dell'esperienza passata, si ritiene che 10 settimane siano sufficienti per redigere una domanda. La Commissione è ciononostante disposta a prendere in considerazione informazioni supplementari trasmesse successivamente alla presentazione della domanda, anche se ciò significa che i pagamenti potrebbero subire ritardi.

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

<sup>(2)</sup> GU C 54 del 4.3.2006, pag. 13.

<sup>(3)</sup> Regolamento (CE) n. 1998/2006 della Commissione del 15 dicembre 2006, relativo all'applicazione degli articoli 87 e 88 del Trattato agli aiuti d'importanza minore (de minimis) (GU L 379 del 28.12.2006).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006156/12  
to the Commission  
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Establishment of free trade zones with zero tax and bureaucracy to help the economy of the Emilia Romagna, Lombardy and Veneto regions

The major emergency that has hit Emilia Romagna, Veneto and Lombardy, and its human, social and economic repercussions, calls for the greatest possible solidarity by government at all levels — local and regional, and also at EU level.

On 3 June 2012, the Commissioner for Regional Policy, Johannes Hahn, flew over the areas affected and was able to see for himself the true situation and the damage caused by the earthquake. A scheme whereby areas free of tax and bureaucracy are established has the potential to be a further way of providing aid that is limited, circumscribed and in proportion to the size of the beneficiaries. This would comply with the restrictions laid down by the rules on competition (see Articles 107 and 108 TFEU) which are crucial to getting the productive fabric and economy underway again in these areas.

— Would the Commission back a request by the Italian Government for the flooded areas to be granted the status of free trade zones exempt from tax and bureaucracy?

— In view of the exceptional nature of the earthquakes being recorded daily in these areas, making it impossible to establish the full extent of the damages they have caused and are causing within the 10 week period stipulated in Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 2012/2002 establishing the European Union Solidarity Fund, could a derogation to the normal procedure for activating the Fund be considered?

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

1. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question P-005880/12 <sup>(1)</sup>. Furthermore, the free trade zone falls under the provisions of Article 107(3)(a) of the Treaty, as interpreted by the Guidelines on national regional aid for 2007-13 (RAG <sup>(2)</sup>): the only case when operating aid could be compatible with the internal market is when it is granted in an area eligible for regional aid pursuant to Article 107(3)(a) TFEU derogation. The regions concerned, however, do not have Article 107(3)(a) TFEU status.

However, the applicable state aid rules do allow support for the affected areas by other means, e.g. aid for SMEs and *de minimis* <sup>(3)</sup> aid that can support the reconstruction of the area by complementing the measures to make good the damage.

To the extent that free trade zones provide for a reduced effective level of business tax limited to *de minimis* aid or which could be approved under a state aid derogation, the conditions set by the Code of Conduct for business taxation will need to be observed: not solely targeting foreign investors, no privileges for financial services and a transparent application process.

2. Council Regulation EC (No) 2012/2002 does not allow derogating from the 10 week deadline for submitting applications. The Commission is providing guidance to the Italian authorities for the preparation of the Solidarity Fund application. The Italian authorities have not reported difficulties in completing the application on time. From past experience it can be said that 10 weeks are sufficient to establish an application. The Commission is however prepared to take into consideration additional information submitted after the official application has been lodged, even if this means that the payment might be delayed.

---

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

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ C 54, 4.3.2006, p. 13.

<sup>(3)</sup> Commission Regulation (EC) No 1998/2006 of 15 December 2006 on the application of Articles 87 and 88 of the Treaty to *de minimis* aid (OJ L 379, 28.12.2006).

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006157/12**  
**alla Commissione**  
**Mara Bizzotto (EFD)**  
(21 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Norme armonizzate

La direttiva 2009/48/CE sulla sicurezza dei giocattoli prevede che, per essere messi in vendita nel mercato comunitario, debbano essere conformi ai RES (requisiti essenziali di sicurezza) disposti dall'articolo 10 e dall'Allegato II.

I RES hanno carattere di obbligatorietà per il fabbricante, ma non contengono indicazioni specifiche sulle tecniche di progettazione e costruzione dei prodotti, le quali sono disciplinate dalle «norme armonizzate» redatte dal Comitato europeo di normazione, che fissano le modalità tecniche di attuazione dei RES.

È facoltà dei produttori scegliere come rispettare i RES. Se utilizzano le norme armonizzate ottengono automaticamente la presunzione di conformità. Se invece scelgono strade alternative debbono dimostrare che i propri prodotti rispettano i criteri di conformità.

— Ritiene la Commissione che abbia senso mantenere il sistema di adesione volontaria alle norme armonizzate quando sia essa sia la direttiva hanno lo scopo di fornire un riferimento fondamentale per progettare e produrre beni sicuri e ambientalmente compatibili su tutto il mercato Europeo?

— Dispone essa di dati relativi alla percentuale delle imprese, in Italia e negli altri Stati membri, nell'ambito della produzione dei giocattoli che si conformano alle norme armonizzate?

— Reputa infine sufficienti e efficaci i controlli attualmente in essere sui giocattoli immessi sul mercato soprattutto per le aziende che non si conformano alle norme armonizzate?

**Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione**  
(23 luglio 2012)

La Commissione ritiene che la direttiva 2009/48/CE<sup>(1)</sup> affronti in modo adeguato la questione della sicurezza dei giocattoli, secondo il metodo del «nuovo approccio», e che garantisca un livello di sicurezza elevato, armonizzando i requisiti essenziali di sicurezza che i giocattoli devono soddisfare per poter circolare liberamente all'interno della UE.

Le norme armonizzate hanno uno scopo diverso: integrano la direttiva definendo le specifiche tecniche dei giocattoli che rispondono ai requisiti essenziali di sicurezza e fornendo ai produttori uno strumento che permette loro di dimostrare la conformità a tali requisiti essenziali. Le norme armonizzate sono sviluppate da esperti del settore, offrono un alto grado di flessibilità e possono facilmente adattarsi ai cambiamenti dovuti all'innovazione o a nuovi rischi.

La Commissione non dispone di dati precisi sul tipo di procedure di valutazione della conformità scelto dai fabbricanti. Tuttavia, le informazioni disponibili provenienti dall'industria e dalle autorità di vigilanza del mercato indicano che l'applicazione delle norme armonizzate (che conferiscono presunzione di conformità con tutti i requisiti di sicurezza) è la procedura di valutazione di conformità preferita e maggiormente adoperata nel settore dei giocattoli.

Quanto alle attività di vigilanza del mercato nel settore dei giocattoli, la Commissione è fermamente convinta che controlli efficaci, anche da parte delle autorità doganali alla frontiera esterna dell'UE prima dell'importazione, siano essenziali per garantire il livello di protezione stabilito dalla direttiva. Nel 2011 il 21 % di tutti i prodotti pericolosi notificati attraverso RAPEX<sup>(2)</sup> era costituito da giocattoli. Tale percentuale è leggermente inferiore al 28 % registrato nel 2009 e al 25 % del 2010. La Commissione invita gli Stati membri a proseguire gli sforzi in questo campo.

<sup>(1)</sup> G.U. L 170 del 30.6.2009, L 170 pag. 1.

<sup>(2)</sup> Rapid alert system for non food dangerous products (sistema di allarme rapido per i prodotti non alimentari pericolosi).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006157/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Mara Bizzotto (EFD)**  
(21 June 2012)

*Subject:* Harmonised standards

Directive 2009/48/EC on the safety of toys stipulates that, in order to be placed on the EU market, toys should comply with the essential safety requirements (ESR) laid down in Article 10 and Annex II.

The ESR are mandatory for manufacturers, but do not contain specific guidance on product design and construction techniques. These are governed by the 'harmonised standards' drawn up by the European Committee for Standardisation, which lay down the technical arrangements for implementing the ESR.

It is up to manufacturers to decide how to comply with the ESR. If they use the harmonised standards, they automatically obtain 'presumption of conformity'. If, instead, they choose alternative routes, they have to demonstrate that their products meet the conformity criteria.

— Does the Commission believe that it makes sense to retain the system of voluntary adherence to harmonised standards when both they and the directive have the aim of providing a fundamental reference framework for designing and producing safe and environmentally compatible goods throughout the EU market?

— Does it have any data regarding the percentage of toy manufacturing firms in Italy and in the other Member States which comply with the harmonised standards?

— Lastly, does it consider the checks currently in place on the toys placed on the market to be sufficient and effective, especially with regard to those companies that do not comply with the harmonised standards?

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

The Commission considers that directive 2009/48/EC <sup>(1)</sup> appropriately addresses the safety of toys, according to the New Approach regulatory technique. It establishes the high level of safety which children must benefit from when playing with toys, by harmonising the essential safety requirements that toys must meet in order to enjoy free movement within the EU.

Harmonised standards have a different aim. They support and complement the directive, by defining the technical specifications of toys meeting the essential safety requirements and by providing manufacturers with a tool to demonstrate compliance with these essential requirements. They are developed by expert stakeholders in the field, offer a high degree of flexibility and can easily adapt to changes due to innovation or new risks.

The Commission does not have precise data on the type of conformity assessment procedures chosen by manufacturers. However, available information from industry and market surveillance authorities shows that applying harmonised standards (giving presumption of conformity with all relevant safety requirements) is the preferred and most widely used conformity assessment procedure in the toy sector.

As for market surveillance activities in the toy sector, the Commission strongly believes that effective enforcement through adequate checks, including by Customs at the EU external border prior to importation, is essential to ensure that children fully benefit from the level of protection established by the directive. In 2011, amongst all the dangerous products notified under RAPEX <sup>(2)</sup>, 21% were toys. This number slightly decreased compared to the 28% recorded in 2009 and the 25% recorded in 2010. The Commission calls on Member States to continue their efforts in this area.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 170, 30.6.2009, p. 1.

<sup>(2)</sup> Rapid alert system for non-food dangerous products.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006158/12**

**alla Commissione**

**Mara Bizzotto (EFD)**

(21 giugno 2012)

**Oggetto:** Politiche sleali di concorrenza finanziaria cinese a discapito delle imprese europee nella penetrazione dei mercati internazionali

Le imprese italiane ed europee sono sempre più penalizzate dall'aggressiva e sregolata politica di concorrenza finanziaria che la Cina sta implementando in Africa penalizzandone la presenza e la competitività in questo importante mercato. «Assafrica e Mediterraneo», l'Associazione per lo sviluppo delle imprese italiane in Africa, Mediterraneo e Medio Oriente, facente capo a Confindustria, ha redatto un dossier dove illustra chiaramente la strategia cinese per realizzare un vero e proprio monopolio economico nel continente africano a discapito delle imprese europee. Come noto, i paesi membri dell'OCSE sono tenuti al rispetto del cosiddetto «Accordo di consensus» definito nel 1978 come un accordo informale (Gentlemen's Agreement) sulle Linee Diretrici in Materia di Credito all'Esportazione, che regola sia gli «Aiuti Pubblici allo Sviluppo» (APS), ovvero contributi finalizzati ad una crescita economica sostenibile a lungo termine (il 25 % dei quali hanno carattere di liberalità con interessi inferiori al 10 % e il restante 75 % a tassi di mercato), che i crediti all'Export.

La Cina invece può farsi liberamente strada nei mercati internazionali seguendo un sistema di donazioni decise direttamente dal dipartimento del ministero del commercio, che concede prestiti a tasso zero erogati attraverso un istituto di credito pubblico, avvantaggiando di fatto le proprie società nei paesi che ne usufruiscono. L'aggressione cinese ai mercati internazionali si basa inoltre su discutibili pratiche di scambio tra infrastrutture e forniture di materie prime, fatto documentato in Angola nel 2004 e poi replicato in altri paesi del continente.

— La Commissione è a conoscenza di questa situazione?

— Non ritiene la Commissione che sia venuto il momento di assumere una posizione forte rispetto alle politiche economiche cinesi che si mostrano da anni insofferenti alle regole del mercato comune, al rispetto dei diritti dell'uomo e dell'ambiente?

— Come intende la Commissione supportare gli Stati membri e le loro imprese nei confronti della Cina?

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

(6 agosto 2012)

Nel corso degli ultimi anni l'Unione europea, rappresentata dalla Commissione europea in quanto firmataria dell'accordo OCSE sui crediti all'esportazione che beneficiano di sostegno pubblico, ha esortato in diverse occasioni, alla pari di altri membri dell'OCSE, la Cina ad uniformarsi alla regolamentazione in tema di crediti all'esportazione. La Cina ha purtroppo sempre rifiutato di assumere impegni sulla scorta della regolamentazione attuale. Essa ha tuttavia recentemente aderito all'iniziativa di costituire un nuovo gruppo internazionale dei principali offerenti di crediti all'esportazione, al quale si affiderà il compito di elaborare linee guida internazionali sui crediti all'esportazione, così da arrivare ad un nuovo accordo entro il 2014. La Commissione sostiene pienamente questo processo multilaterale, mirato a garantire nel lungo periodo la parità completa di condizioni in fatto di crediti all'esportazione tra i membri dell'OCSE, la Cina e altri operatori economici emergenti.

In merito alla reazione dell'Unione alle politiche economiche della Cina, la Commissione solleva regolarmente con le controparti cinesi la questione dei problemi attinenti al commercio. Tali contestazioni sono avanzate a tutti i livelli. Per citare il caso più recente, gli ostacoli frapposti dalla Cina al commercio sono stati contestati dal Commissario responsabile del commercio in sede di Comitato congiunto UE-Cina il 31 maggio 2012.

Nel perseguire una politica di ferma difesa degli interessi europei ogni qualvolta siano soggetti a discriminazione sleale la Commissione si avvale di tutti gli strumenti a sua disposizione, compresi quelli di difesa commerciale e l'impiego della procedura OMC per la risoluzione delle controversie. La Commissione ha recentemente aperto nuovi contenziosi al riguardo.

In particolare per quanto riguarda le prassi cinesi relative ai crediti all'esportazione è fondamentale ottenere informazioni precise. È quindi della massima importanza, per redigere le contestazioni, ottenere informazioni e cooperazione da parte delle imprese dell'Unione e delle altre parti interessate.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006158/12  
to the Commission  
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Penetration of international markets by EU companies damaged by unfair Chinese financial competition policies

Italian and European firms are increasingly being hit by China's aggressive and unregulated policy on financial competition in Africa, which is threatening their presence and competitiveness in what is a major market. 'Assafrica e Mediterraneo', the Association to develop Italian business in Africa, the Mediterranean and the Middle East, part of Confindustria, has drawn up a file clearly explaining China's strategy for achieving a genuine economic monopoly in the African continent, to the detriment of European firms. As is known, OECD member countries are bound to respect the terms of the 1978 Consensus Agreement. This is an informal gentlemen's agreement on guidelines for export credits, which governs both state aid for development through subsidies for long-term sustainable economic growth (25% at low interest rates of less than 10%, with the remaining 75% at market rate), and export credits.

China however, can forge freely ahead in the international markets. It has a system whereby subsidies are decided directly by the department at the Ministry of Trade that grants interest-free loans paid out through a publicly owned credit institution, thereby putting its own companies at an advantage in the recipient countries. Chinese aggression in international markets is, moreover, based on the controversial practice of exchanging infrastructure for raw materials, a fact documented in Angola in 2004 and since replicated in other countries on the continent.

— Is the Commission aware of this situation?

— Does the Commission not feel that the time has come to take a strong stand in regard to China's economic policies, which have for years disregarded common market rules, human rights and the environment?

— How will the Commission support Member States and their firms against China?

**Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission  
(6 August 2012)**

Throughout the last few years, the European Union — represented by the European Commission as Participant to the OECD Arrangement on Officially Supported Export Credits — and other OECD Members have on many occasions called on China to join the international disciplines on export credits. Unfortunately, China has always refused to engage on the basis of current disciplines. However, China has recently joined an initiative to set up a new international group of major export credit providers, to work on international guidelines on export credits with a view to the adoption of a new agreement by 2014. The Commission is fully supporting this multilateral process, which has the objective of ensuring in the long run a full level playing field on export credits among OECD Members, China and other emerging economic players.

As regards the EU response to Chinese economic policies, the Commission raises regularly trade problems with its Chinese counterparts. This takes place at all levels. Most recently Chinese trade impediments were raised by The Member of the Commission responsible for TRADE at the EU-China Joint Committee on 31 May 2012.

In pursuing a policy of firmly defending European interests wherever they are unfairly threatened, the Commission uses all tools that it has available, including trade defence and using the WTO dispute settlement procedure. It has recently launched new cases in this respect.

In particular with regard to Chinese export credit practices, it is important to obtain precise information. Therefore inputs and cooperation from EU business and other stakeholders are very important in building cases.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006159/12**  
**alla Commissione**  
**Mara Bizzotto (EFD)**  
(21 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Sequestri in Italia di giocattoli non conformi «Made in China»

Nell'ambito di un'operazione della Guardia di finanza denominata «True Toy» sono stati posti sotto sequestro, in un magazzino di Padova di proprietà di un importatore cinese, 420 000 giocattoli non conformi alla normativa e quindi ritenuti pericolosi. Le indagini hanno portato gli inquirenti a ricollegare lo stesso soggetto alla titolarità di altri magazzini in Toscana, dove risultavano stoccati 3 700 000 giocattoli, posti anch'essi sotto sequestro, tutti «Made in China».

Come noto, a norma dell'articolo 5 del decreto legge n. 54, dell'11 aprile 2011, (attuativo della direttiva 2009/48/CE sulla sicurezza dei giocattoli) l'importatore è tenuto ad etichettare i giocattoli e a certificarne la conformità con gli standard di sicurezza europei prima di immetterli sul mercato. Nel caso di specie si sono riscontrate macroscopiche violazioni relative alla fase di certificazione da parte dell'importatore, che marchiava come conformi prodotti che tali non erano.

Questo sequestro non è che l'ultimo in linea temporale. Milioni di articoli fuori norma, potenzialmente pericolosi per la salute umana, vengono ogni anno posti sotto sequestro in Italia e altrettanti purtroppo sfuggono ai controlli e finiscono sul mercato:

- La Commissione è a conoscenza di questa situazione?
- Considerata la quantità di prodotti che violano le normative UE, volute espressamente al fine di salvaguardare la salute dei cittadini e la stabilità interna del mercato e considerando che essi provengono soprattutto dalla Cina, che cosa intende fare la Commissione per porre un freno a tali pratiche e supportare i singoli Stati membri nella lotta a questa pericolosa invasione?
- Questi prodotti risultano appetibili ai consumatori a causa dei prezzi bassi rispetto agli omologhi prodotti «Made in EU» i quali, per rispettare le normative di sicurezza hanno costi ovviamente maggiori; come intende agire la Commissione per sostenere le imprese italiane ed europee e tutelare i consumatori contro l'aggressiva politica di export cinese?
- La Commissione ritiene sufficienti gli attuali controlli posti in essere alle dogane sia italiane sia degli altri Stati membri per contrastare l'ingresso di questi giocattoli non prodotti secondo gli standard europei?

**Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione**  
(8 agosto 2012)

La Commissione è consapevole dei problemi presentati dai giocattoli fabbricati in Cina. Conformemente all'ultima relazione annuale sul funzionamento del sistema RAPEX <sup>(1)</sup>, il 54 % dei prodotti pericolosi notificati nel 2011 proviene dalla Cina (Hong Kong compresa). Tale cifra è leggermente inferiore al 60 % registrato nel 2009 e al 58 % del 2010.

Per migliorare l'ottemperanza dei fabbricanti cinesi alla legislazione vigente dell'UE sulla sicurezza dei giocattoli è in corso da diversi anni una cooperazione efficace con le autorità cinesi. Tale cooperazione comporta uno scambio regolare d'informazioni sui requisiti di sicurezza e sugli standard applicabili tra esperti europei e cinesi di sicurezza dei prodotti, lo scambio d'informazioni sui giocattoli non sicuri di origine cinese reperiti sul mercato dell'UE, l'organizzazione di attività mirate di sensibilizzazione all'indirizzo dei fabbricanti in Cina nonché la formazione di funzionari del governo cinese che intervengono nei controlli obbligatori preventivi effettuati dalla Cina sulle esportazioni.

<sup>(1)</sup> Sistema di scambio rapido di informazioni sui pericoli connessi con l'uso di prodotti di consumo.

La legislazione UE sulla sicurezza dei giocattoli si applica agli operatori economici dell'UE e a quelli di paesi terzi. Tutti i giocattoli immessi sul mercato dell'UE devono ottemperare alle stesse regole di sicurezza, indipendentemente dalla loro origine o dal loro prezzo, al fine di tutelare la sicurezza dei bambini. Il modo più efficace per evitare l'immissione sul mercato dell'UE di giocattoli pericolosi importati consiste nell'eseguire controlli adeguati alle frontiere. Per agevolare i compiti delle dogane in proposito si sono sviluppate di recente linee guida per i controlli all'importazione in relazione alla sicurezza dei prodotti, compresi i giocattoli. Si è inoltre intensificata la cooperazione tra le autorità preposte alla sorveglianza del mercato e le dogane. La Commissione assicura inoltre un approccio coordinato tra le autorità preposte alla sorveglianza del mercato per il tramite del gruppo di esperti nel campo della cooperazione amministrativa sulla sicurezza dei giocattoli.

---



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006159/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Mara Bizzotto (EFD)**  
(21 June 2012)

*Subject:* Seizures in Italy of toys 'Made in China' which are in breach of safety regulations

As part of the 'True Toy' operation carried out by Italy's Guardia di Finanza police force, a total of 420 000 toys were seized from a warehouse in Padua owned by a Chinese importer on the grounds that they do not meet safety standards and are therefore dangerous. Further inquiries led the investigators to link the same importer to the ownership of other warehouses in Tuscany, where 3 700 000 toys, all of them made in China, were being stored. These toys were also seized.

Under the terms of Article 5 of Legislative Decree No 54 of 11 April 2011 (implementing Directive 2009/48/EC on the safety of toys) the importer is responsible for labelling toys and certifying that they meet European safety standards before placing them on the market. In this specific case, the importer had committed serious breaches of the rules during the certification stage by incorrectly marking products as complying with safety standards.

These raids are only the latest in a long series. Every year, Italy seizes millions of items which are in breach of safety regulations and which pose a potential threat to public health. Unfortunately, just as many slip through the net and end up on the market.

— Is the Commission aware of the situation?

— Given the number of toys found to be in breach of EU safety standards, which are designed to protect public health and ensure market stability, and given that these toys come mainly from China, how does the Commission intend to put a stop to these practices and to support individual Member States in the fight against this influx of dangerous products?

— These products are attractive to consumers because they are cheaper than their 'Made in the EU' counterparts, which necessarily cost more given the work needed to make them comply with safety standards. What will the Commission do to support Italian and European businesses and protect consumers against the effects of China's aggressive export policy?

— Does the Commission regard the customs checks carried out in Italy and the other Member States as sufficient to prevent products which do not comply with European standards from entering the EU?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission**  
(8 August 2012)

The Commission is aware of the challenges posed by toys manufactured in China. According to the last Annual report on the functioning of RAPEX <sup>(1)</sup>, 54% of the dangerous products notified in 2011 originate from China (Hong Kong included). This number is slightly lower than the 60% recorded in 2009 and the 58% recorded in 2010.

To improve Chinese manufacturers' compliance with applicable EU toy safety legislation, effective cooperation has been in place for several years with the Chinese authorities. Such cooperation involves a regular exchange of information about applicable safety requirements and standards between European and Chinese product safety experts, exchange of information on unsafe Chinese origin toys found on the EU market, the organisation of targeted outreach activities for manufacturers in China as well as training of Chinese government officials active in preventive enforcement as part of China's mandatory export controls.

The EU toy safety legislation applies equally to EU and non-EU economic operators. All toys placed on the EU market have to comply with the same safety rules, regardless of their origin or price, in order to protect children's safety. The most effective way to avoid the placing on the EU market of dangerous imported toys is to perform adequate checks at the border. To facilitate Customs tasks in this regard, Guidelines for import controls in the area of product safety, including for toys, have recently been developed. Furthermore, close cooperation between market surveillance and customs authorities is taking place. Additionally, the Commission ensures a coordinated approach amongst market surveillance authorities via the Toy Safety Administrative Cooperation Expert group.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Rapid alert system for non-food dangerous products.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006160/12**  
**alla Commissione**  
**Mario Borghezio (EFD)**  
(21 giugno 2012)

**Oggetto:** Intervento dell'UE sulla persecuzione dei monaci tibetani

Recentemente un monaco tibetano è morto nelle carceri cinesi in seguito alle torture subite dagli agenti di polizia. Il religioso buddista era rinchiuso in una prigione della contea di Nyagrong, prefettura di Kardze, una delle Prefetture autonome del Tibet nella provincia cinese del Sichuan. Karwang era accusato di aver appeso poster inneggianti all'indipendenza del Tibet nella contea di Kardze, e secondo fonti di Tibetan Centre for Human Rights and Democracy (Tchrd), era stato rinchiuso in attesa di processo.

Nonostante le numerose proteste e i continui appelli di organizzazioni e paesi stranieri, la polizia cinese continua a arrestare e sequestrare chiunque manifesti dissenso. In questi mesi, Pechino ha aumentato la sua stretta contro il popolo tibetano, che sta subendo una vera e propria colonizzazione. Le restrizioni cinesi comprendono il divieto di insegnare la lingua e la religione tibetana, l'imposizione di politiche di sviluppo inappropriate, tutte a favore dell'etnia han, e attacchi continui e di diverso tipo all'élite culturale e intellettuale del Tibet.

Per questo decine di giovani tibetani, monaci e laici, hanno scelto l'autoimmolazione come gesto estremo di protesta. Dall'inizio del 2012 sono 35 i tibetani che si sono dati fuoco per criticare la dittatura di Pechino e chiedere il ritorno del Dalai Lama in Tibet.

Sempre attenta e pronta alla salvaguardia dei diritti delle minoranze, intende la Commissione prendere posizione riguardo all'intollerabile persecuzione dei monaci buddisti in Tibet? Se sì, in che misura?

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

L'UE segue da vicino la situazione dei diritti umani nelle regioni popolate da minoranze e in altre parti della Cina. A tal riguardo, è molto preoccupata per il deterioramento della situazione che si registra in Tibet negli ultimi anni, come dimostrato dalla tragica serie di autoimmolazioni iniziata nel 2009.

In occasione delle visite ad alto livello e dei dialoghi con la Cina l'UE manifesta puntualmente la sua inquietudine per la situazione nelle regioni abitate da minoranze, come il Tibet. Recentemente, il tema dei diritti delle minoranze e altri argomenti erano al centro dell'ultima sessione del dialogo UE-Cina sui diritti dell'uomo, tenutasi a Bruxelles il 29 maggio 2012.

L'UE ha invitato le autorità cinesi ad affrontare le cause che sono alla base dell'insoddisfazione del popolo tibetano e a garantire il rispetto dei suoi diritti umani. L'UE ha inoltre esortato la Cina ad agire con maggiore moderazione e a concedere ai diplomatici e giornalisti stranieri un accesso senza restrizioni a tutte le regioni autonome del Tibet. A seguito dell'annuncio, all'inizio di quest'anno, dell'intenzione di distaccare in via permanente funzionari di governo o di partito presso i monasteri, l'UE ha chiesto perché fosse necessario che lo Stato esercitasse un controllo così rigoroso sulle attività di culto, imponendo restrizioni sulla mobilità dei monaci tra i monasteri e fissando contingenti sul numero massimo di monaci autorizzati a risiedere in tali strutture. L'UE ha altresì invitato le autorità cinesi a dare seguito al dialogo con gli emissari del Dalai Lama da quanto ha avuto luogo l'ultimo incontro all'inizio del 2010 per contribuire a una soluzione duratura.

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha espresso la preoccupazione dell'UE nel suo discorso sul Tibet al Parlamento europeo il 12 giugno 2012. L'UE ha inoltre manifestato i suoi timori per il Tibet in occasione delle ultime due sessioni del Consiglio per i diritti dell'uomo a marzo e giugno.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006160/12  
to the Commission**

**Mario Borghezio (EFD)**

(21 June 2012)

*Subject:* EU response to the persecution of Tibetan monks

A Tibetan Buddhist monk died recently in a Chinese prison after having been tortured in police custody. He was being detained in a prison in the county of Nyagrong, in Kardze, a Tibetan autonomous prefecture in the Chinese province of Sichuan. Karwang was accused of having put up posters in the county of Kardze calling for an independent Tibet and, according to the Tibetan Centre for Human Rights and Democracy, was on remand awaiting trial.

Despite numerous protests and continuous appeals by foreign countries and organisations, the Chinese police continue to arrest and detain anyone who expresses dissent. In recent months, Beijing has further tightened its control over the Tibetan people, which is being subjected to out-and-out colonisation. The restrictive action taken by China include banning the teaching of the Tibetan language and religion, imposing inappropriate development policies designed to benefit the Han Chinese population, and continually attacking, in various ways, Tibet's cultural and intellectual elite.

As a result of these actions, dozens of young Tibetans, both monks and lay people, have chosen self-immolation as an extreme act of protest. Since the beginning of 2012, 35 Tibetans have set fire to themselves to protest against the dictatorship in Beijing and call for the return of the Dalai Lama to Tibet.

Since the Commission always pays close attention to, and is ready to defend, the rights of minorities, does it intend to take a stand on the intolerable persecution of Buddhist monks in Tibet? If so, how?

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

(8 August 2012)

The EU follows closely the human rights situation in minorities-populated areas as it does also in other parts of China. In this regard, the EU is deeply concerned by the deterioration of the situation in Tibet witnessed in recent years, as illustrated by the tragic wave of self immolations since 2009.

The EU takes the opportunity of high-level visits and dialogues with China to express its concerns on the situation in minorities-populated areas such as Tibet. Lately, the rights of minorities, as well as other issues, were discussed at the last session of the EU-China Human Rights dialogue which took place in Brussels on 29 May 2012.

The EU called upon the Chinese authorities to address the root causes of the dissatisfaction of Tibetan people and to ensure that their human rights are respected. The EU also urged the Chinese authorities to exercise restraint and to allow unrestricted access by foreign diplomats and journalists to all Tibetan autonomous areas. Following the announcement earlier this year that government or party officials will be stationed in monasteries permanently, the EU asked why is it necessary for the State to impose such detailed control over religious activities and to impose restrictions on movements of monks between monasteries and to set quotas for the maximum number of monks who may reside at a monastery. The EU also urged the Chinese authorities to follow up on the dialogue with the Envoys of the Dalai Lama since the last session took place in early 2010 in order to contribute to a durable solution.

The High Representative/Vice-President expressed the EU's concern in her speech on Tibet to the European Parliament on 12 June 2012. The EU also raised its concern on Tibet at the last two sessions of the Human Rights Council in March and in June.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006161/12**  
**alla Commissione**  
**Sergio Berlato (PPE)**  
(21 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Violazione dell'applicazione della raccomandazione C(2007)2551 del 13 giugno 2007

Il 13 giugno 2007, la Commissione europea ha rivolto agli Stati membri la raccomandazione C(2007)2551 sulla protezione di specie della flora e della fauna selvatiche mediante il controllo del loro commercio. Questa raccomandazione prevede che gli Stati membri debbano adottare provvedimenti adeguati per garantire che per le infrazioni commesse siano irrogate sanzioni (a norma dell'articolo 16 del regolamento (CE) n. 338/97) adeguate alla natura e alla gravità delle stesse onde combattere il commercio illegale.

L'Italia, nonostante le numerose segnalazioni, continua ad ignorare la raccomandazione di cui sopra, imponendo delle sanzioni pecuniarie. Si consideri, inoltre, che il rilascio di certificati CITES per animali comunemente allevati in cattività e regolarmente marcati secondo le disposizioni comunitarie — animali di allegato A, in particolare, si fa riferimento al Testuto Terrestri e ad alcune specie di pappagalli — avviene con ritardi di oltre 12-18 mesi.

Tutto ciò premesso, si interroga la Commissione per sapere se è a conoscenza:

1. del fatto che in Italia le sanzioni previste dalla legge n. 152 del 1992, i cui importi vanno da 3 098,00 a 9 296,00 euro, si applicano perfino agli errori amministrativi del registro (di cui 3 098,00 euro per qualsiasi errore di questo tipo), in violazione delle norme vigenti e, in particolare, della raccomandazione di cui in oggetto ai considerando 5 e 6?
2. dei problemi interni della Commissione scientifica CITES italiana, istituita nel 1993 per applicare la Convenzione di Washington, problemi che creano dei ritardi di oltre 12-18 mesi nei rilasci dei certificati degli animali figuranti nell'allegato A della stessa, nati in cattività e regolarmente marcati?

**Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione**  
(24 luglio 2012)

La raccomandazione della Commissione del 13 giugno 2007 che individua una serie di azioni per l'esecuzione del regolamento (CE) n. 338/97 del Consiglio, relativo alla protezione di specie della flora e della fauna selvatiche mediante il controllo del loro commercio <sup>(1)</sup>, fornisce degli orientamenti in merito alle misure che gli Stati membri dovrebbero attuare al fine di rafforzare le loro azioni di lotta contro il commercio illegale di flora e fauna selvatiche.

Spetta tuttavia ancora agli Stati membri adottare misure e azioni idonee a garantire una corretta attuazione della CITES, incluse sanzioni di tipo pecuniario. La Commissione ritiene che gli elementi forniti dall'onorevole parlamentare non siano sufficienti per concludere che la legislazione interna dell'Italia costituirebbe una violazione del diritto dell'UE.

Per quanto concerne i ritardi nel rilascio dei certificati, la Commissione riferirà alle autorità italiane del settore CITES le preoccupazioni espresse dall'onorevole parlamentare.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> GUL 159 del 20.6.2007, pag. 45.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006161/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Sergio Berlato (PPE)**  
(21 June 2012)

*Subject:* Breach in the enforcement of Recommendation C(2007) 2551 of 13 June 2007

On 13 June 2007 the Commission issued Recommendation C(2007) 2551, addressed to the Member States, on the protection of species of wild fauna and flora by regulating trade therein. The recommendation states that to combat this illegal trade Member States must ensure that sanctions are imposed for infringements, in accordance with Article 16 of Regulation (EC) No 338/97, that are appropriate to their nature and gravity.

Despite numerous warnings, Italy continues to impose financial penalties, thereby disregarding this recommendation. Furthermore, CITES certificates for animals commonly bred in captivity and properly marked in line with Community regulations — Annex A species, with particular reference to the land tortoise and some species of parrot — are issued more than 12 to 18 months late.

1. Is the Commission aware that the penalties laid down in Italy's 1992 Law No 152, to wit fines of between EUR 3 098 and EUR 9 296, are even applied to administrative registration errors (EUR 3 098 for any such error), which is in breach of current regulations, and of Recitals 5 and 6 of the aforementioned recommendation in particular?
2. Furthermore, is the Commission aware of the internal problems within Italy's CITES Scientific Committee — set up in 1993 to enforce the Washington Convention — which are causing delays of more than 12 to 18 months in issuing certificates for Annex A animals that have been born in captivity and are properly marked?

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

The Commission recommendation of 13 June 2007 identifying a set of actions for the enforcement of Council Regulation (EC) No 338/97 on the protection of species of wild fauna and flora by regulating trade therein <sup>(1)</sup> provides guidance as to the measures that Member States should implement to enhance their efforts to combat illegal trade in wild life products.

However, it is still up to the Member States to establish appropriate measures and actions to ensure a proper implementation of CITES, including sanctions like fines. The elements provided by the Honourable Member are not sufficient for the Commission to conclude that the domestic legislation in Italy would constitute a breach against EC law.

With reference to the delays affecting the issuing of certificates, the Commission will convey to the Italian CITES Authorities the concerns raised by the Honourable Member.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 159, 20.6.2007.

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-006163/12  
aan de Raad**

**Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI) en Lucas Hartong (NI)**

(21 juni 2012)

*Betref:* Absorptiepercentages EU spoorprojecten

Op 21 juni 2012 kwam Reuters met een speciaal verslag betreffende de absorptiegraden van de Europese spoorprojecten ondergebracht onder het Cohesiefonds. In dit verslag meldt het dat de Commissie in de programmaperiode van 2007-2013 een bedrag heeft gereserveerd van EUR 14,9 miljard. Momenteel ligt het absorptiepercentage van deze gelden met het bedrag van EUR 1,65 miljard aan opgevraagde fondsen op ongeveer 11 %.

In dat kader heeft de PVV de volgende vragen die zij graag puntsgewijs, kort en krachtig beantwoord zou zien:

1. Is de Raad met de PVV van mening dat aan het eind van de huidige programmaperiode, de overgebleven fondsen naar rato moeten terugvloeien naar de nationale begrotingen en niet naar de middelen van de EU? Zo nee, waarom niet?
2. Als blijkt dat aan het eind van de programmaperiode het gereserveerde budget niet is opgevraagd, is de Raad het dan met de PVV eens dat voor de volgende programmaperiode een overeenkomstig bedrag ter grootte van het restbudget kan worden gekort op spoorprojecten en daarmee dus op het Cohesiefonds kan worden bezuinigd? Zo nee, waarom niet?
3. Is de Raad het met de PVV eens dat dergelijk lage absorptiepercentages getuigen van desinteresse van de lidstaten en dat het zogenaamde TEN-T project een complete flop blijkt te zijn? Zo nee, waarom niet?
4. Is de Raad met de PVV van mening dat de resterende miljarden die naar verwachting zullen overblijven bij het aflopen van de huidige programmaperiode, een prima start zijn om tenminste 100 miljard te bezuinigen op het MFK 2014-2020, waar inmiddels tien lidstaten, waaronder Nederland, om hebben gevraagd? Zo nee, waarom niet?

**Antwoord**

(18 september 2012)

In Verordening (EG, Euratom) nr. 1605/2002 van de Raad van 25 juni 2002 houdende het Financieel Reglement van toepassing op de algemene begroting van de Europese Gemeenschappen <sup>(1)</sup> en Verordening (EG) nr. 1083/2006 van de Raad van 11 juli 2006 houdende algemene bepalingen inzake het Europees Fonds voor Regionale Ontwikkeling, het Europees Sociaal Fonds en het Cohesiefonds <sup>(2)</sup> zijn de voor vrijmakingen geldende regels vastgelegd. Vrijgemaakte kredieten kunnen uiteindelijk ten goede komen aan de nationale begrotingen, aangezien er geen toekomstige betalingskredieten nodig zijn. Krachtens bovengenoemde verordeningen is het aan de Europese Commissie vrijmakingen te verrichten die onder de uitvoering van het TEN-T-programma vallen.

Aangezien de TEN-T-programmeringsperiode nog loopt en de totale absorptiepercentages pas aan het einde van die periode kunnen worden berekend, kan de Raad geen conclusies trekken betreffende de doeltreffendheid van het programma in dit opzicht.

De onderhandelingen over het meerjarig financieel kader 2014-2020 zijn nog gaande, en de Raad heeft nog geen akkoord bereikt over de begrotingscijfers daarvoor.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> PBL 248 van 16.9.2002, blz. 1.  
<sup>(2)</sup> PBL 210 van 31.7.2006, blz. 25.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006163/12  
to the Council  
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI) and Lucas Hartong (NI)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Absorption rates of EU rail projects

On 21 June 2012, Reuters issued a special report on the absorption rates of European rail projects financed by the Cohesion Fund. It indicated that in the programming period 2007-2013 the Commission had reserved EUR 14.9 billion. At present the absorption rate of these funds is approximately 11% (EUR 1.65 billion having been used).

The PVV would appreciate receiving concise, to-the-point and itemised answers to each of the following questions:

1. Does the Council agree with the PVV that at the end of the current programming period the remaining funds should be returned to the national budgets on a pro rata basis, rather than to the EU budget? If not, why not?
2. If it becomes apparent at the end of the programming period that the reserved budget has not been called up, does the Council agree with the PVV that in the next programming period an amount corresponding to the residual budget can be deducted from the rail project budget, making it possible to save money on the Cohesion Fund? If not, why not?
3. Does the Council agree with the PVV that such low absorption rates bear witness to a lack of interest on the part of the Member States and that the so-called TEN-T project has turned out to be a complete flop? If not, why not?
4. Does the Council agree with the PVV that the remaining billions which are expected to be left at the end of the current programming period would make an excellent starting point enabling at least EUR 100 billion to be cut from the Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-2020, which is something that 10 Member States, including the Netherlands, have already called for? If not, why not?

**Reply  
(18 September 2012)**

Council Regulation (EC, Euratom) No 1605/2002 of 25 June 2002 on the Financial Regulation applicable to the general budget of the European Communities <sup>(1)</sup> and Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 of 11 July 2006 laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund <sup>(2)</sup> provide for the rules applicable to decommitments. Decommited funds may ultimately benefit the national budgets, as no future payment appropriations will be required. Pursuant to the above-mentioned Regulations, it is for the European Commission to proceed to decommitments falling within the implementation of the TEN-T programme.

Since the TEN-T programming period is still running and its overall absorption rates can only be calculated at the end of that period, the Council is not in a position to draw conclusions as to the effectiveness of the programme in this respect.

The negotiations on the Multi-annual Financial Framework 2014-2020 are still underway, and the Council has not yet reached an agreement on budgetary figures for it.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 248, 16.9.2002, p. 1.  
<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 210, 31.7.2006, p. 25.

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-006164/12  
aan de Commissie**

**Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI) en Lucas Hartong (NI)**

(21 juni 2012)

*Betref:* Absorptiepercentages EU spoorprojecten

Op 21 juni 2012 kwam Reuters met een speciaal verslag betreffende de absorptiegraden van de Europese spoorprojecten ondergebracht onder het Cohesiefonds. In dit verslag meldt het dat de Commissie in de programmaperiode van 2007-2013 een bedrag heeft gereserveerd van EUR 14,9 miljard. Momenteel ligt het absorptiepercentage van deze gelden met het bedrag van EUR 1,65 miljard aan opgevraagde fondsen, op ongeveer 11 %.

In dat kader heeft de PVV de volgende vragen die zij graag puntsgewijs, kort en krachtig beantwoord zou zien:

1. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat aan het eind van de huidige programmaperiode, de overgebleven fondsen naar rato moeten terugvloeien naar de nationale begrotingen en niet naar de middelen van de EU? Zo nee, waarom niet?
2. Als blijkt dat aan het eind van de programmaperiode het gereserveerde budget niet is opgevraagd, is de Commissie het dan met de PVV eens dat voor de volgende programmaperiode een overeenkomstig bedrag ter grootte van het restbudget kan worden gekort op spoorprojecten en daarmee dus op het Cohesiefonds kan worden bezuinigd? Zo nee, waarom niet?
3. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat dergelijk lage absorptiepercentages getuigen van desinteresse van de lidstaten en dat het zogenaamde TEN-T project een complete flop blijkt te zijn? Zo nee, waarom niet?

**Antwoord van de heer Hahn namens de Commissie**

(27 juli 2012)

1. In overeenstemming met de operationele voorschriften van het cohesiebeleid voor de periode 2007-2013 worden alle financiële middelen die, na verloop van twee jaar nadat deze in de EU-begroting werden vastgelegd, door de lidstaten niet voor specifieke projecten zijn besteed, voor de programma's in kwestie automatisch geannuleerd. Voor dergelijke geannuleerde middelen zijn later geen betalingskredieten nodig en de lidstaten behouden bijgevolg de financiële middelen die anders voor betalingskredieten nodig zouden zijn.
2. De Commissie is het niet met dit standpunt eens. Steunmaatregelen ter verbetering van de spoorverbindingen in heel Europa blijven in het toekomstige cohesiebeleid een prioriteit, en het verminderen van de toewijzing voor spoorwegen belemmert de verdere ontwikkeling van een duurzaam vervoersnet.
3. De Commissie is het niet met dit standpunt eens. In de huidige periode is 24 miljard EUR van de totale middelen van het cohesiebeleid aan spoorwegen toegewezen, met inbegrip van TEN-T-spoorwegen en rollend spoorwagematerieel. Uit het jaarlijks verslag over de uitvoering van 2011 blijkt dat 14 miljard EUR (60 %) aan specifieke projecten is toegewezen. Dit is een aanzienlijke stijging ten opzichte van 20 % in 2009 en 50 % in 2010. De vroegere trage absorptie was veeleer te wijten aan de technische complexiteit van spoorwegprojecten en het gebrek aan administratieve capaciteit, met name bij de spoorwegadministratie in de nieuwe lidstaten, dan aan een gebrek aan belangstelling. In sommige gevallen zijn dus institutionele hervormingen noodzakelijk. De voorgestelde ex-antevoorwaarden voor de programmeringsperiode 2014-2020 moeten bijdragen tot de verbetering van de situatie. Overheidsinvesteringen in spoorweginfrastructuur, en zodoende in klimaatvriendelijk vervoer, zullen ook in de toekomst hard nodig zijn om de in de EU 2020-strategie vastgelegde klimaatdoelstellingen te halen.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006164/12  
to the Commission  
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI) and Lucas Hartong (NI)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Absorption rates of EU rail projects

On 21 June 2012, Reuters issued a special report on the absorption rates of European rail projects financed by the Cohesion Fund. It indicated that in the programming period 2007-2013 the Commission had reserved EUR 14.9 billion. At present the absorption rate of these funds is approximately 11% (EUR 1.65 billion having been used).

The PVV would appreciate receiving concise, to-the-point and itemised answers to each of the following questions:

1. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that at the end of the current programming period the remaining funds should be returned to the national budgets on a pro rata basis, rather than to the EU budget? If not, why not?
2. If it becomes apparent at the end of the programming period that the reserved budget has not been called up, does the Commission agree with the PVV that in the next programming period an amount corresponding to the residual budget can be deducted from the rail project budget, making it possible to save money on the Cohesion Fund? If not, why not?
3. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that such low absorption rates bear witness to a lack of interest on the part of the Member States and that the so-called TEN-T project has turned out to be a complete flop? If not, why not?

**Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission  
(27 July 2012)**

1. In conformity with cohesion policy operating rules for the 2007-13 period, any funding which has not been spent on specific projects by Member States by the end of two years after the funding has been committed in the EU budget is automatically decommitted from the programmes concerned. Such decommitted funds will not require future payment credits, and as a result, the funding that would have been required for payment credits is retained by the Member States.
  2. The Commission does not share this analysis. Support for improving rail connections across Europe will remain a priority under future cohesion policy, and reducing allocations to railways will hinder the EU's continued development of a sustainable transport network.
  3. The Commission does not share this analysis. In the current period, EUR 24 billion of the total cohesion policy funds has been allocated to railways including TEN-T-railways and also Mobile Rail Assets. The 2011 Annual Implementation Report shows that EUR 14 billion (60%) has been allocated to specific projects. This is a sharp increase from 20% in 2009 and 50% in 2010. Reasons for the previously slow uptake were the technical complexity of railway projects and the lack of administrative capacity, especially in railway authorities in newer Member States, rather than a lack of interest. Thus in some cases, institutional reforms would be needed. The proposed *ex-ante* conditionalities for the 2014-2020 programming period aim to help to improve the situation. Public investments in railway infrastructure and thus in climate friendly transport will also in the future be very much needed in order to reach the EU2020 climate change targets.
-

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-006165/12  
do Komisji**

**Jacek Włosowicz (EFD) oraz Tadeusz Cymański (EFD)**

(21 czerwca 2012 r.)

**Przedmiot:** Zapytanie w sprawie projektowania i realizacji budowy ekranów akustycznych na terenie miasta i gminy Końskie oraz gminy Radoszyce

W ostatnim czasie przy projektowaniu i realizacji nowych inwestycji infrastrukturalnych w Polsce można zauważyć częste sprzeciwów mieszkańców czy przedsiębiorców występujących przeciw budowie ekranów akustycznych. Porównując dopuszczalne normy hałasu w Polsce i zestawiając je z normami w innych krajach Unii Europejskiej wyraźnie widać, iż niektóre z państw ustanowiły normy dopuszczalnego hałasu większe niż te, które aktualnie obowiązują w Polsce. Porównując dla przykładu wartości norm hałasu obowiązujące w Polsce i w Niemczech można zauważyć, że ten zamożniejszy od Polski kraj ustanowił mniej restrykcyjne dopuszczalne poziomy hałasu.

Dodatkowo mieszkańcy Wincentowa (powiat konecki, województwo świętokrzyskie) poinformowali mnie na piśmie o szeregu nieprawidłowości dotyczących procesu konsultacyjnego inwestycji dotyczących budowy ekranów akustycznych w ciągu drogi wojewódzkiej nr 728 obwodnicy centrum miasta Końskie od km 84+001 do km 88+256 oraz rozbudowie drogi wojewódzkiej nr 728 od km 88+256 do km 99+855 na terenie miasta i gminy Końskie oraz gminy Radoszyce. <sup>(1)</sup>

Wobec tego pragnę zapytać:

1. Jakie są działania Komisji w zakresie kontroli racjonalności środków przeznaczanych na budowę ekranów akustycznych w Polsce?
2. Czy Komisja ma wiedzę w zakresie właściwego prowadzenia procesów konsultacyjnych z mieszkańcami dotyczących inwestycji związanych z projektowaniem i budowaniem ekranów akustycznych w Polsce?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Janeza Potočnika w imieniu Komisji**

(16 sierpnia 2012 r.)

W ramach polityki spójności, która podlega zasadom zarządzania dzielonego, Komisja sprawdza, czy duże projekty współfinansowane ze środków funduszy UE spełniają wymagania określone w dyrektywach w sprawie ocen oddziaływania na środowisko (ang. Environmental Impact Assessment – EIA) w czasie budowy, jak i w trakcie eksploatacji dróg. Może to obejmować budowę ekranów akustycznych, które mają na celu zmniejszenie poziomu hałasu w otoczeniu. Państwa członkowskie odpowiadają za zapewnienie stosownych środków ochrony przed hałasem w zależności od natężenia ruchu drogowego oraz wynikających z niego poziomów hałasu (zob. poniżej). W oparciu o analizę kosztów i korzyści państwa członkowskie są również odpowiedzialne za wybór projektów najważniejszych pod względem technicznym, ekonomicznym i prawnym, zapewniając jednocześnie największe korzyści społeczno-gospodarcze. Należy zauważyć, że środki finansowe UE przeznaczają się głównie na budowę autostrad i dróg ekspresowych, a nie pomniejszych dróg regionalnych.

Europejska dyrektywa w sprawie poziomu hałasu w środowisku 2002/49/WE <sup>(2)</sup> nakłada na państwa członkowskie wymóg przyjęcia planów działania odnośnie dróg o natężeniu ruchu wynoszącym ponad 6 milionów pojazdów rocznie. Plany te wymagają konsultacji z lokalnymi mieszkańcami. Problemy na drodze wojewódzkiej nr 728 nie zostały zgłoszone przez odpowiednie władze krajowe prawdopodobnie dlatego, że panujące na niej natężenie ruchu znajduje się poniżej progu ustalonego w dyrektywie.

W związku z tym Komisja odsyła Szanownego Pana Posła do właściwych władz krajowych w celu uzyskania stosownych informacji dotyczących środków prawnych oraz procedur służących egzekwowaniu prawa krajowego w zakresie hałasu w środowisku.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://tygodnik.net.pl/index.php/konskie-informacje/2149-nie-chcemy-mieszkac-w-blaszanym-gettcie>.

<sup>(2)</sup> Dz.U. L 189 z 18.7.2002.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006165/12  
to the Commission  
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD) and Tadeusz Cymański (EFD)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Planning and construction of noise barriers in Końskie and Radoszyce municipalities

The planning and implementation of new infrastructure investments in Poland has recently given rise to frequent opposition from local inhabitants and businesses, in particular to the construction of noise barriers. Comparing the noise limits in Poland with the standards in other EU countries, it is clear that the acceptable noise levels in some countries are higher than those currently in force in Poland. For example, Germany, a more prosperous country than Poland, has established acceptable noise levels that are less restrictive than in Poland.

Residents of Wincentów (in the Końskie district of Świętokrzyskie province) have written to inform me of a number of irregularities concerning the consultation process for the project to build noise barriers along provincial road 728, the Końskie bypass, from km 84+001 to km 88+256, and the extension of provincial road 728 from km 88+256 to km 99+855 in Końskie and Radoszyce municipalities <sup>(1)</sup>.

I would therefore like to ask the following questions:

1. What action does the Commission take to check the rationality of funds allocated for the construction of noise barriers in Poland?
2. Does the Commission know how consultation processes for the planning and construction of noise barriers in Poland should be conducted with local residents?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission  
(16 August 2012)**

In Cohesion policy, which is under shared management, the Commission verifies that major projects co-financed from EU funds comply with the directives on environmental impact assessments (EIA) during the construction and during the functioning of the roads. This may include the construction of noise barriers, with a view to reducing the impact of noise levels to the surroundings. Member States are responsible for ensuring that proportional arrangements are made for noise protection depending on the traffic density and subsequent noise levels (see paragraphs below). Based on a cost-benefit analysis, Member States are also responsible for selecting the most appropriate projects with respect to technical, economic and regulatory aspects, while providing for the highest socioeconomic advantages. It is noted that EU funding is mostly focused on motorways and express ways rather than on smaller provincial roads.

The European Environmental Noise Directive 2002/49/EC <sup>(2)</sup> require Member States to adopt action plans for roads where traffic amounts to more than 6 million vehicles per year. Local residents must be consulted on these action plans. However, the provincial road 728 was not reported by competent national authorities, presumably because traffic is below the threshold set by the directive.

Therefore, the Commission refers the Honourable Member to the national competent authorities which may provide adequate information as regards their legal means and procedures to enforce the national law on environmental noise.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://tygodnik.net.pl/index.php/konskie-informacje/2149-nie-chcemy-mieszkac-w-blaszanym-gettcie>.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 189, 18.7.2002.

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006166/12**

**à Comissão**

**Diogo Feio (PPE)**

(21 de junho de 2012)

*Assunto:* Europa 2020: Recomendações por país — Alemanha

A Comissão Europeia, nas palavras do seu presidente, lançou o mais importante pacote de propostas económicas do presente ano depois de ter feito um exame rigoroso à «saúde» orçamental e económica de cada um dos 27 Estados-Membros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que resultados destaca em relação à Alemanha?
2. Que principais desafios impendem sobre o país no tocante à estabilização económica e orçamental, ao crescimento e ao emprego?
3. Considera que a Alemanha se encontra no bom caminho para cumprir os objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020?
4. Que medidas deve este país tomar para os atingir?

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006167/12**

**à Comissão**

**Diogo Feio (PPE)**

(21 de junho de 2012)

*Assunto:* Europa 2020: Recomendações por país — Áustria

A Comissão Europeia, nas palavras do seu presidente, lançou o mais importante pacote de propostas económicas do presente ano depois de ter feito um exame rigoroso à «saúde» orçamental e económica de cada um dos 27 Estados-Membros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que resultados destaca em relação à Áustria?
2. Que principais desafios impendem sobre o país no tocante à estabilização económica e orçamental, ao crescimento e ao emprego?
3. Considera que a Áustria se encontra no bom caminho para cumprir os objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020?
4. Que medidas deve este país tomar para os atingir?

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006168/12**

**à Comissão**

**Diogo Feio (PPE)**

(21 de junho de 2012)

*Assunto:* Europa 2020: Recomendações por país — Bélgica

A Comissão Europeia, nas palavras do seu presidente, lançou o mais importante pacote de propostas económicas do presente ano depois de ter feito um exame rigoroso à «saúde» orçamental e económica de cada um dos 27 Estados-Membros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que resultados destaca em relação à Bélgica?
2. Que principais desafios impendem sobre o país no tocante à estabilização económica e orçamental, ao crescimento e ao emprego?
3. Considera que a Bélgica se encontra no bom caminho para cumprir os objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020?
4. Que medidas deve este país tomar para os atingir?

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006169/12**

**à Comissão**

**Diogo Feio (PPE)**

*(21 de junho de 2012)*

*Assunto:* Europa 2020: Recomendações por país — Bulgária

A Comissão Europeia, nas palavras do seu presidente, lançou o mais importante pacote de propostas económicas do presente ano depois de ter feito um exame rigoroso à «saúde» orçamental e económica de cada um dos 27 Estados-Membros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que resultados destaca em relação à Bulgária?
2. Que principais desafios impendem sobre o país no tocante à estabilização económica e orçamental, ao crescimento e ao emprego?
3. Considera que a Bulgária se encontra no bom caminho para cumprir os objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020?
4. Que medidas deve este país tomar para os atingir?

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006170/12**

**à Comissão**

**Diogo Feio (PPE)**

*(21 de junho de 2012)*

*Assunto:* Europa 2020: Recomendações por país — Chipre

A Comissão Europeia, nas palavras do seu presidente, lançou o mais importante pacote de propostas económicas do presente ano depois de ter feito um exame rigoroso à «saúde» orçamental e económica de cada um dos 27 Estados-Membros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que resultados destaca em relação a Chipre?
2. Que principais desafios impendem sobre o país no tocante à estabilização económica e orçamental, ao crescimento e ao emprego?
3. Considera que Chipre se encontra no bom caminho para cumprir os objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020?
4. Que medidas deve este país tomar para os atingir?

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006171/12**  
**à Comissão**  
**Diogo Feio (PPE)**  
(21 de junho de 2012)

*Assunto:* Europa 2020: Recomendações por país — Dinamarca

A Comissão Europeia, nas palavras do seu presidente, lançou o mais importante pacote de propostas económicas do presente ano depois de ter feito um exame rigoroso à «saúde» orçamental e económica de cada um dos 27 Estados-Membros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que resultados destaca em relação à Dinamarca?
2. Que principais desafios impendem sobre o país no tocante à estabilização económica e orçamental, ao crescimento e ao emprego?
3. Considera que a Dinamarca se encontra no bom caminho para cumprir os objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020?
4. Que medidas deve este país tomar para os atingir?

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006172/12**  
**à Comissão**  
**Diogo Feio (PPE)**  
(21 de junho de 2012)

*Assunto:* Europa 2020: Recomendações por país — Eslováquia

A Comissão Europeia, nas palavras do seu presidente, lançou o mais importante pacote de propostas económicas do presente ano depois de ter feito um exame rigoroso à «saúde» orçamental e económica de cada um dos 27 Estados-Membros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que resultados destaca em relação à Eslováquia?
2. Que principais desafios impendem sobre o país no tocante à estabilização económica e orçamental, ao crescimento e ao emprego?
3. Considera que a Eslováquia se encontra no bom caminho para cumprir os objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020?
4. Que medidas deve este país tomar para os atingir?

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006173/12**  
**à Comissão**  
**Diogo Feio (PPE)**  
(21 de junho de 2012)

*Assunto:* Europa 2020: Recomendações por país — Eslovénia

A Comissão Europeia, nas palavras do seu presidente, lançou o mais importante pacote de propostas económicas do presente ano depois de ter feito um exame rigoroso à «saúde» orçamental e económica de cada um dos 27 Estados-Membros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que resultados destaca em relação à Eslovénia?
2. Que principais desafios impendem sobre o país no tocante à estabilização económica e orçamental, ao crescimento e ao emprego?
3. Considera que a Eslovénia se encontra no bom caminho para cumprir os objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020?
4. Que medidas deve este país tomar para os atingir?

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006174/12**

à Comissão

**Diogo Feio (PPE)***(21 de junho de 2012)*

*Assunto:* Europa 2020: Recomendações por país — Espanha

A Comissão Europeia, nas palavras do seu presidente, lançou o mais importante pacote de propostas económicas do presente ano depois de ter feito um exame rigoroso à «saúde» orçamental e económica de cada um dos 27 Estados-Membros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que resultados destaca em relação à Espanha?
2. Que principais desafios impendem sobre o país no tocante à estabilização económica e orçamental, ao crescimento e ao emprego?
3. Considera que a Espanha se encontra no bom caminho para cumprir os objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020?
4. Que medidas deve este país tomar para os atingir?

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006175/12**

à Comissão

**Diogo Feio (PPE)***(21 de junho de 2012)*

*Assunto:* Europa 2020: Recomendações por país — Estónia

A Comissão Europeia, nas palavras do seu presidente, lançou o mais importante pacote de propostas económicas do presente ano depois de ter feito um exame rigoroso à «saúde» orçamental e económica de cada um dos 27 Estados-Membros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que resultados destaca em relação à Estónia?
2. Que principais desafios impendem sobre o país no tocante à estabilização económica e orçamental, ao crescimento e ao emprego?
3. Considera que a Estónia se encontra no bom caminho para cumprir os objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020?
4. Que medidas deve este país tomar para os atingir?

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006176/12**

à Comissão

**Diogo Feio (PPE)***(21 de junho de 2012)*

*Assunto:* Europa 2020: Recomendações por país — Finlândia

A Comissão Europeia, nas palavras do seu presidente, lançou o mais importante pacote de propostas económicas do presente ano depois de ter feito um exame rigoroso à «saúde» orçamental e económica de cada um dos 27 Estados-Membros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que resultados destaca em relação à Finlândia?
2. Que principais desafios impendem sobre o país no tocante à estabilização económica e orçamental, ao crescimento e ao emprego?
3. Considera que a Finlândia se encontra no bom caminho para cumprir os objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020?
4. Que medidas deve este país tomar para os atingir?

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006177/12**

à Comissão

**Diogo Feio (PPE)***(21 de Junho de 2012)*

*Assunto:* Europa 2020: Recomendações por país — França

A Comissão Europeia, nas palavras do seu presidente, lançou o mais importante pacote de propostas económicas do presente ano depois de ter feito um exame rigoroso à «saúde» orçamental e económica de cada um dos 27 Estados-Membros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que resultados destaca em relação à França?
2. Que principais desafios impendem sobre o país no tocante à estabilização económica e orçamental, ao crescimento e ao emprego?
3. Considera que a França se encontra no bom caminho para cumprir os objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020?
4. Que medidas deve este país tomar para os atingir?

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006178/12**

à Comissão

**Diogo Feio (PPE)***(21 de Junho de 2012)*

*Assunto:* Europa 2020: Recomendações por país — Grécia

A Comissão Europeia, nas palavras do seu presidente, lançou o mais importante pacote de propostas económicas do presente ano depois de ter feito um exame rigoroso à «saúde» orçamental e económica de cada um dos 27 Estados-Membros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que resultados destaca em relação à Grécia?
2. Que principais desafios impendem sobre o país no tocante à estabilização económica e orçamental, ao crescimento e ao emprego?
3. Considera que a Grécia se encontra no bom caminho para cumprir os objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020?
4. Que medidas deve este país tomar para os atingir?

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006180/12**

à Comissão

**Diogo Feio (PPE)***(21 de Junho de 2012)*

*Assunto:* Europa 2020: Recomendações por país — Irlanda

A Comissão Europeia, nas palavras do seu presidente, lançou o mais importante pacote de propostas económicas do presente ano depois de ter feito um exame rigoroso à «saúde» orçamental e económica de cada um dos 27 Estados-Membros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que resultados destaca em relação à Irlanda?
2. Que principais desafios impendem sobre o país no tocante à estabilização económica e orçamental, ao crescimento e ao emprego?
3. Considera que a Irlanda se encontra no bom caminho para cumprir os objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020?
4. Que medidas deve este país tomar para os atingir?



**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006181/12**

à Comissão

**Diogo Feio (PPE)***(21 de Junho de 2012)*

*Assunto:* Europa 2020: Recomendações por país — Itália

A Comissão Europeia, nas palavras do seu presidente, lançou o mais importante pacote de propostas económicas do presente ano depois de ter feito um exame rigoroso à «saúde» orçamental e económica de cada um dos 27 Estados-Membros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que resultados destaca em relação à Itália?
2. Que principais desafios impendem sobre o país no tocante à estabilização económica e orçamental, ao crescimento e ao emprego?
3. Considera que a Itália se encontra no bom caminho para cumprir os objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020?
4. Que medidas deve este país tomar para os atingir?

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006182/12**

à Comissão

**Diogo Feio (PPE)***(21 de Junho de 2012)*

*Assunto:* Europa 2020: Recomendações por país — Letónia

A Comissão Europeia, nas palavras do seu presidente, lançou o mais importante pacote de propostas económicas do presente ano depois de ter feito um exame rigoroso à «saúde» orçamental e económica de cada um dos 27 Estados-Membros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que resultados destaca em relação à Letónia?
2. Que principais desafios impendem sobre o país no tocante à estabilização económica e orçamental, ao crescimento e ao emprego?
3. Considera que a Letónia se encontra no bom caminho para cumprir os objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020?
4. Que medidas deve este país tomar para os atingir?

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006183/12**

à Comissão

**Diogo Feio (PPE)***(21 de Junho de 2012)*

*Assunto:* Europa 2020: Recomendações por país — Lituânia

A Comissão Europeia, nas palavras do seu presidente, lançou o mais importante pacote de propostas económicas do presente ano depois de ter feito um exame rigoroso à «saúde» orçamental e económica de cada um dos 27 Estados-Membros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que resultados destaca em relação à Lituânia?
2. Que principais desafios impendem sobre o país no tocante à estabilização económica e orçamental, ao crescimento e ao emprego?
3. Considera que a Lituânia se encontra no bom caminho para cumprir os objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020?
4. Que medidas deve este país tomar para os atingir?

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006184/12**  
**à Comissão**  
**Diogo Feio (PPE)**  
(21 de Junho de 2012)

*Assunto:* Europa 2020: Recomendações por país — Luxemburgo

A Comissão Europeia, nas palavras do seu presidente, lançou o mais importante pacote de propostas económicas do presente ano depois de ter feito um exame rigoroso à «saúde» orçamental e económica de cada um dos 27 Estados-Membros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que resultados destaca em relação ao Luxemburgo?
2. Que principais desafios impendem sobre o país no tocante à estabilização económica e orçamental, ao crescimento e ao emprego?
3. Considera que o Luxemburgo se encontra no bom caminho para cumprir os objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020?
4. Que medidas deve este país tomar para os atingir?

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006185/12**  
**à Comissão**  
**Diogo Feio (PPE)**  
(21 de Junho de 2012)

*Assunto:* Europa 2020: Recomendações por país — Malta

A Comissão Europeia, nas palavras do seu presidente, lançou o mais importante pacote de propostas económicas do presente ano depois de ter feito um exame rigoroso à «saúde» orçamental e económica de cada um dos 27 Estados-Membros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que resultados destaca em relação a Malta?
2. Que principais desafios impendem sobre o país no tocante à estabilização económica e orçamental, ao crescimento e ao emprego?
3. Considera que Malta se encontra no bom caminho para cumprir os objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020?
4. Que medidas deve este país tomar para os atingir?

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006186/12**  
**à Comissão**  
**Diogo Feio (PPE)**  
(21 de Junho de 2012)

*Assunto:* Europa 2020: Recomendações por país — Países Baixos

A Comissão Europeia, nas palavras do seu presidente, lançou o mais importante pacote de propostas económicas do presente ano depois de ter feito um exame rigoroso à «saúde» orçamental e económica de cada um dos 27 Estados-Membros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que resultados destaca em relação aos Países Baixos?
2. Que principais desafios impendem sobre o país no tocante à estabilização económica e orçamental, ao crescimento e ao emprego?
3. Considera que os Países Baixos se encontram no bom caminho para cumprir os objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020?

4. Que medidas deve este país tomar para os atingir?

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006187/12**

**à Comissão**

**Diogo Feio (PPE)**

*(21 de Junho de 2012)*

*Assunto:* Europa 2020: Recomendações por país — Polónia

A Comissão Europeia, nas palavras do seu presidente, lançou o mais importante pacote de propostas económicas do presente ano depois de ter feito um exame rigoroso à «saúde» orçamental e económica de cada um dos 27 Estados-Membros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que resultados destaca em relação à Polónia?
2. Que principais desafios impendem sobre o país no tocante à estabilização económica e orçamental, ao crescimento e ao emprego?
3. Considera que a Polónia se encontra no bom caminho para cumprir os objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020?
4. Que medidas deve este país tomar para os atingir?

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006188/12**

**à Comissão**

**Diogo Feio (PPE)**

*(21 de Junho de 2012)*

*Assunto:* Europa 2020: Recomendações por país — Portugal

A Comissão Europeia, nas palavras do seu presidente, lançou o mais importante pacote de propostas económicas do presente ano depois de ter feito um exame rigoroso à «saúde» orçamental e económica de cada um dos 27 Estados-Membros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que resultados destaca em relação a Portugal?
2. Que principais desafios impendem sobre o país no tocante à estabilização económica e orçamental, ao crescimento e ao emprego?
3. Considera que Portugal se encontra no bom caminho para cumprir os objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020?
4. Que medidas deve este país tomar para os atingir?

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006189/12**

**à Comissão**

**Diogo Feio (PPE)**

*(21 de Junho de 2012)*

*Assunto:* Europa 2020: Recomendações por país — República Checa

A Comissão Europeia, nas palavras do seu presidente, lançou o mais importante pacote de propostas económicas do presente ano depois de ter feito um exame rigoroso à «saúde» orçamental e económica de cada um dos 27 Estados-Membros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que resultados destaca em relação à República Checa?
2. Que principais desafios impendem sobre o país no tocante à estabilização económica e orçamental, ao crescimento e ao emprego?

3. Considera que a República Checa se encontra no bom caminho para cumprir os objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020?
4. Que medidas deve este país tomar para os atingir?

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006190/12**  
**à Comissão**  
**Diogo Feio (PPE)**  
(21 de Junho de 2012)

*Assunto:* Europa 2020: Recomendações por país — Roménia

A Comissão Europeia, nas palavras do seu presidente, lançou o mais importante pacote de propostas económicas do presente ano depois de ter feito um exame rigoroso à «saúde» orçamental e económica de cada um dos 27 Estados-Membros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que resultados destaca em relação à Roménia?
2. Que principais desafios impendem sobre o país no tocante à estabilização económica e orçamental, ao crescimento e ao emprego?
3. Considera que a Roménia se encontra no bom caminho para cumprir os objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020?
4. Que medidas deve este país tomar para os atingir?

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006191/12**  
**à Comissão**  
**Diogo Feio (PPE)**  
(21 de Junho de 2012)

*Assunto:* Europa 2020: Recomendações por país — Suécia

A Comissão Europeia, nas palavras do seu presidente, lançou o mais importante pacote de propostas económicas do presente ano depois de ter feito um exame rigoroso à «saúde» orçamental e económica de cada um dos 27 Estados-Membros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que resultados destaca em relação à Suécia?
2. Que principais desafios impendem sobre o país no tocante à estabilização económica e orçamental, ao crescimento e ao emprego?
3. Considera que a Suécia se encontra no bom caminho para cumprir os objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020?
4. Que medidas deve este país tomar para os atingir?

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006192/12**  
**à Comissão**  
**Diogo Feio (PPE)**  
(21 de Junho de 2012)

*Assunto:* Europa 2020: Recomendações por país — Reino Unido

A Comissão Europeia, nas palavras do seu presidente, lançou o mais importante pacote de propostas económicas do presente ano depois de ter feito um exame rigoroso à «saúde» orçamental e económica de cada um dos 27 Estados-Membros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que resultados destaca em relação ao Reino Unido?

2. Que principais desafios impendem sobre o país no tocante à estabilização económica e orçamental, ao crescimento e ao emprego?
3. Considera que o Reino Unido se encontra no bom caminho para cumprir os objetivos da Estratégia Europa 2020?
4. Que medidas deve este país tomar para os atingir?

**Resposta conjunta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão**

*(3 de agosto de 2012)*

Em resposta à pergunta sobre a apreciação da Comissão relativamente ao desempenho de todos os Estados-Membros, no âmbito do Semestre Europeu e da estratégia «Europa 2020», em especial no que se refere à aplicação das recomendações específicas para cada país e à necessidade de novas medidas, a Comissão gostaria de remeter o Senhor Deputado para os documentos relativos a cada Estado-Membro, que contêm as informações requeridas, de forma completa e sucinta.

Os documentos relevantes são o documento de trabalho dos serviços da Comissão e a sua recomendação para as recomendações específicas para cada país apresentada em 30 de maio de 2012 no contexto da vigilância integrada no quadro do Semestre Europeu. O Conselho adotou as recomendações específicas para cada país a 10 de julho de 2012. ([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))

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-006166/12  
to the Commission  
Diogo Feio (PPE)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Germany

The Commission has, in the words of its President, launched this year's most important package of economic proposals, after having carried out a rigorous economic and budgetary health check on each of the 27 Member States.

1. What are the Commission's findings in relation to Germany?
2. What are the main challenges facing Germany in terms of economic and budgetary stabilisation, growth and employment?
3. Does the Commission consider that Germany is on track towards meeting the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy?
4. What measures should Germany adopt in order to attain these objectives?

**Question for written answer E-006167/12  
to the Commission  
Diogo Feio (PPE)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Austria

The Commission has, in the words of its President, launched this year's most important package of economic proposals, after having carried out a rigorous economic and budgetary health check on each of the 27 Member States.

1. What are the Commission's findings in relation to Austria?
2. What are the main challenges facing Austria in terms of economic and budgetary stabilisation, growth and employment?
3. Does the Commission consider that Austria is on track towards meeting the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy?
4. What measures should Austria adopt in order to attain these objectives?

**Question for written answer E-006168/12  
to the Commission  
Diogo Feio (PPE)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Belgium

The Commission has, in the words of its President, launched this year's most important package of economic proposals, after having carried out a rigorous economic and budgetary health check on each of the 27 Member States.

1. What are the Commission's findings in relation to Belgium?
2. What are the main challenges facing Belgium in terms of economic and budgetary stabilisation, growth and employment?
3. Does the Commission consider that Belgium is on track towards meeting the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy?
4. What measures should Belgium adopt in order to attain these objectives?

**Question for written answer E-006169/12  
to the Commission  
Diogo Feio (PPE)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Bulgaria

The Commission has, in the words of its President, launched this year's most important package of economic proposals, after having carried out a rigorous economic and budgetary health check on each of the 27 Member States.

1. What are the Commission's findings in relation to Bulgaria?
2. What are the main challenges facing Bulgaria in terms of economic and budgetary stabilisation, growth and employment?
3. Does the Commission consider that Bulgaria is on track towards meeting the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy?
4. What measures should Bulgaria adopt in order to attain these objectives?

**Question for written answer E-006170/12  
to the Commission  
Diogo Feio (PPE)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Cyprus

The Commission has, in the words of its President, launched this year's most important package of economic proposals, after having carried out a rigorous economic and budgetary health check on each of the 27 Member States.

1. What are the Commission's findings in relation to Cyprus?
2. What are the main challenges facing Cyprus in terms of economic and budgetary stabilisation, growth and employment?
3. Does the Commission consider that Cyprus is on track towards meeting the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy?
4. What measures should Cyprus adopt in order to attain these objectives?

**Question for written answer E-006171/12  
to the Commission  
Diogo Feio (PPE)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Denmark

The Commission has, in the words of its President, launched this year's most important package of economic proposals, after having carried out a rigorous economic and budgetary health check on each of the 27 Member States.

1. What are the Commission's findings in relation to Denmark?
2. What are the main challenges facing Denmark in terms of economic and budgetary stabilisation, growth and employment?
3. Does the Commission consider that Denmark is on track towards meeting the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy?
4. What measures should Denmark adopt in order to attain these objectives?

**Question for written answer E-006172/12  
to the Commission  
Diogo Feio (PPE)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Slovakia

The Commission has, in the words of its President, launched this year's most important package of economic proposals, after having carried out a rigorous economic and budgetary health check on each of the 27 Member States.

1. What are the Commission's findings in relation to Slovakia?
2. What are the main challenges facing Slovakia in terms of economic and budgetary stabilisation, growth and employment?
3. Does the Commission consider that Slovakia is on track towards meeting the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy?
4. What measures should Slovakia adopt in order to attain these objectives?

**Question for written answer E-006173/12  
to the Commission  
Diogo Feio (PPE)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Slovenia

The Commission has, in the words of its President, launched this year's most important package of economic proposals, after having carried out a rigorous economic and budgetary health check on each of the 27 Member States.

1. What are the Commission's findings in relation to Slovenia?
2. What are the main challenges facing Slovenia in terms of economic and budgetary stabilisation, growth and employment?
3. Does the Commission consider that Slovenia is on track towards meeting the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy?
4. What measures should Slovenia adopt in order to attain these objectives?

**Question for written answer E-006174/12  
to the Commission  
Diogo Feio (PPE)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Spain

The Commission has, in the words of its President, launched this year's most important package of economic proposals, after having carried out a rigorous economic and budgetary health check on each of the 27 Member States.

1. What are the Commission's findings in relation to Spain?
2. What are the main challenges facing Spain in terms of economic and budgetary stabilisation, growth and employment?
3. Does the Commission consider that Spain is on track towards meeting the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy?
4. What measures should Spain adopt in order to attain these objectives?



**Question for written answer E-006175/12  
to the Commission  
Diogo Feio (PPE)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Estonia

The Commission has, in the words of its President, launched this year's most important package of economic proposals, after having carried out a rigorous economic and budgetary health check on each of the 27 Member States.

1. What are the Commission's findings in relation to Estonia?
2. What are the main challenges facing Estonia in terms of economic and budgetary stabilisation, growth and employment?
3. Does the Commission consider that Estonia is on track towards meeting the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy?
4. What measures should Estonia adopt in order to attain these objectives?

**Question for written answer E-006176/12  
to the Commission  
Diogo Feio (PPE)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Finland

The Commission has, in the words of its President, launched this year's most important package of economic proposals, after having carried out a rigorous economic and budgetary health check on each of the 27 Member States.

1. What are the Commission's findings in relation to Finland?
2. What are the main challenges facing Finland in terms of economic and budgetary stabilisation, growth and employment?
3. Does the Commission consider that Finland is on track towards meeting the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy?
4. What measures should Finland adopt in order to attain these objectives?

**Question for written answer E-006177/12  
to the Commission  
Diogo Feio (PPE)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — France

The Commission has, in the words of its President, launched this year's most important package of economic proposals, after having carried out a rigorous economic and budgetary health check on each of the 27 Member States.

1. What are the Commission's findings in relation to France?
2. What are the main challenges facing France in terms of economic and budgetary stabilisation, growth and employment?
3. Does the Commission consider that France is on track towards meeting the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy?
4. What measures should France adopt in order to attain these objectives?

**Question for written answer E-006178/12  
to the Commission  
Diogo Feio (PPE)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Greece

The Commission has, in the words of its President, launched this year's most important package of economic proposals, after having carried out a rigorous economic and budgetary health check on each of the 27 Member States.

1. What are the Commission's findings in relation to Greece?
2. What are the main challenges facing Greece in terms of economic and budgetary stabilisation, growth and employment?
3. Does the Commission consider that Greece is on track towards meeting the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy?
4. What measures should Greece adopt in order to attain these objectives?

**Question for written answer E-006180/12  
to the Commission  
Diogo Feio (PPE)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Ireland

The Commission has, in the words of its President, launched this year's most important package of economic proposals, after having carried out a rigorous economic and budgetary health check on each of the 27 Member States.

1. What are the Commission's findings in relation to Ireland?
2. What are the main challenges facing Ireland in terms of economic and budgetary stabilisation, growth and employment?
3. Does the Commission consider that Ireland is on track towards meeting the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy?
4. What measures should Ireland adopt in order to attain these objectives?

**Question for written answer E-006181/12  
to the Commission  
Diogo Feio (PPE)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Italy

The Commission has, in the words of its President, launched this year's most important package of economic proposals, after having carried out a rigorous economic and budgetary health check on each of the 27 Member States.

1. What are the Commission's findings in relation to Italy?
2. What are the main challenges facing Italy in terms of economic and budgetary stabilisation, growth and employment?
3. Does the Commission consider that Italy is on track towards meeting the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy?
4. What measures should Italy adopt in order to attain these objectives?

**Question for written answer E-006182/12  
to the Commission  
Diogo Feio (PPE)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Latvia

The Commission has, in the words of its President, launched this year's most important package of economic proposals, after having carried out a rigorous economic and budgetary health check on each of the 27 Member States.

1. What are the Commission's findings in relation to Latvia?
2. What are the main challenges facing Latvia in terms of economic and budgetary stabilisation, growth and employment?
3. Does the Commission consider that Latvia is on track towards meeting the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy?
4. What measures should Latvia adopt in order to attain these objectives?

**Question for written answer E-006183/12  
to the Commission  
Diogo Feio (PPE)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Lithuania

The Commission has, in the words of its President, launched this year's most important package of economic proposals, after having carried out a rigorous economic and budgetary health check on each of the 27 Member States.

1. What are the Commission's findings in relation to Lithuania?
2. What are the main challenges facing Lithuania in terms of economic and budgetary stabilisation, growth and employment?
3. Does the Commission consider that Lithuania is on track towards meeting the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy?
4. What measures should Lithuania adopt in order to attain these objectives?

**Question for written answer E-006184/12  
to the Commission  
Diogo Feio (PPE)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Luxembourg

The Commission has, in the words of its President, launched this year's most important package of economic proposals, after having carried out a rigorous economic and budgetary health check on each of the 27 Member States.

1. What are the Commission's findings in relation to Luxembourg?
2. What are the main challenges facing Luxembourg in terms of economic and budgetary stabilisation, growth and employment?
3. Does the Commission consider that Luxembourg is on track towards meeting the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy?
4. What measures should Luxembourg adopt in order to attain these objectives?

**Question for written answer E-006185/12  
to the Commission  
Diogo Feio (PPE)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Malta

The Commission has, in the words of its President, launched this year's most important package of economic proposals, after having carried out a rigorous economic and budgetary health check on each of the 27 Member States.

1. What are the Commission's findings in relation to Malta?
2. What are the main challenges facing Malta in terms of economic and budgetary stabilisation, growth and employment?
3. Does the Commission consider that Malta is on track towards meeting the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy?
4. What measures should Malta adopt in order to attain these objectives?

**Question for written answer E-006186/12  
to the Commission  
Diogo Feio (PPE)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — the Netherlands

The Commission has, in the words of its President, launched this year's most important package of economic proposals, after having carried out a rigorous economic and budgetary health check on each of the 27 Member States.

1. What are the Commission's findings in relation to the Netherlands?
2. What are the main challenges facing the Netherlands in terms of economic and budgetary stabilisation, growth and employment?
3. Does the Commission consider that the Netherlands is on track towards meeting the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy?
4. What measures should the Netherlands adopt in order to attain these objectives?

**Question for written answer E-006187/12  
to the Commission  
Diogo Feio (PPE)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Poland

The Commission has, in the words of its President, launched this year's most important package of economic proposals, after having carried out a rigorous economic and budgetary health check on each of the 27 Member States.

1. What are the Commission's findings in relation to Poland?
2. What are the main challenges facing Poland in terms of economic and budgetary stabilisation, growth and employment?
3. Does the Commission consider that Poland is on track towards meeting the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy?
4. What measures should Poland adopt in order to attain these objectives?

**Question for written answer E-006188/12  
to the Commission  
Diogo Feio (PPE)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Portugal

The Commission has, in the words of its President, launched this year's most important package of economic proposals, after having carried out a rigorous economic and budgetary health check on each of the 27 Member States.

1. What are the Commission's findings in relation to Portugal?
2. What are the main challenges facing Portugal in terms of economic and budgetary stabilisation, growth and employment?
3. Does the Commission consider that Portugal is on track towards meeting the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy?
4. What measures should Portugal adopt in order to attain these objectives?

**Question for written answer E-006189/12  
to the Commission  
Diogo Feio (PPE)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Czech Republic

The Commission has, in the words of its President, launched this year's most important package of economic proposals, after having carried out a rigorous economic and budgetary health check on each of the 27 Member States.

1. What are the Commission's findings in relation to the Czech Republic?
2. What are the main challenges facing the Czech Republic in terms of economic and budgetary stabilisation, growth and employment?
3. Does the Commission consider that the Czech Republic is on track towards meeting the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy?
4. What measures should the Czech Republic adopt in order to attain these objectives?

**Question for written answer E-006190/12  
to the Commission  
Diogo Feio (PPE)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Romania

The Commission has, in the words of its President, launched this year's most important package of economic proposals, after having carried out a rigorous economic and budgetary health check on each of the 27 Member States.

1. What are the Commission's findings in relation to Romania?
2. What are the main challenges facing Romania in terms of economic and budgetary stabilisation, growth and employment?
3. Does the Commission consider that Romania is on track towards meeting the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy?
4. What measures should Romania adopt in order to attain these objectives?

**Question for written answer E-006191/12  
to the Commission  
Diogo Feio (PPE)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — Sweden

The Commission has, in the words of its President, launched this year's most important package of economic proposals, after having carried out a rigorous economic and budgetary health check on each of the 27 Member States.

1. What are the Commission's findings in relation to Sweden?
2. What are the main challenges facing Sweden in terms of economic and budgetary stabilisation, growth and employment?
3. Does the Commission consider that Sweden is on track towards meeting the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy?
4. What measures should Sweden adopt in order to attain these objectives?

**Question for written answer E-006192/12  
to the Commission  
Diogo Feio (PPE)  
(21 June 2012)**

*Subject:* Europe 2020: country-specific recommendations — United Kingdom

The Commission has, in the words of its President, launched this year's most important package of economic proposals, after having carried out a rigorous economic and budgetary health check on each of the 27 Member States.

1. What are the Commission's findings in relation to the United Kingdom?
2. What are the main challenges facing the United Kingdom in terms of economic and budgetary stabilisation, growth and employment?
3. Does the Commission consider that the United Kingdom is on track towards meeting the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy?
4. What measures should the United Kingdom adopt in order to attain these objectives?

**Joint answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission  
(3 August 2012)**

In response to the question on the Commission's assessment of all Member States' performances in the context of the European Semester and the Europe 2020 strategy, in particular with regard to the implementation of country-specific recommendations and need for further measures, the Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member of Parliament to the documents relating to each Member State, which contain comprehensively and succinctly the information sought.

The relevant documents are the Commission Staff Working Document and its recommendation for country-specific recommendations presented on 30 May 2012 in the context of integrated surveillance under the European Semester. The Council adopted the country-specific recommendations on 10 July 2012:

[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)

---