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 247 E/01)

Treść **Strona**

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003249/12
a la Comisión
Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE)
(27 de marzo de 2012)

Asunto: Indicación geográfica «gofio» de Canarias

El Gobierno canario acaba de conceder la protección de la indicación geográfica «gofio canario», que se encuentra a la espera de su aprobación por parte de la Comisión Europea. El gofio es un producto típico de esta región y responde a unos requisitos específicos de elaboración.

— ¿Podría informar la Comisión de la fase en la que se encuentra el trámite de aprobación de esa nueva Indicación Geográfica Protegida (IGP)?

— ¿Tendría este producto derecho a recibir algún apoyo financiero de la PAC en calidad de IGP?

Respuesta del Sr. Cioloş en nombre de la Comisión
(14 de mayo de 2012)

La Comisión recibió el 24 de enero de 2012 la solicitud de registro de la denominación «gofio canario» como Indicación Geográfica Protegida (IGP).

La Comisión está examinando actualmente la solicitud a fin de evaluar si cumple los requisitos establecidos en el Reglamento (CE) n° 510/2006 ([1]).

La política de promoción ([2]) y el programa de desarrollo rural de Canarias de 2007-2013 contemplan la posibilidad de prestar una ayuda financiera para las indicaciones geográficas registradas.

([1]) Reglamento (CE) n° 510/2006 del Consejo, de 20 de marzo de 2006, sobre la protección de las indicaciones geográficas y de las denominaciones de origen de los productos agrícolas y alimenticios, DO L 93 de 31.3.2006, p. 12.

([2]) Reglamento (CE) n° 3/2008 del Consejo, de 17 de diciembre de 2007, sobre acciones de información y de promoción de los productos agrícolas en el mercado interior y en terceros países, DO L 3 de 5.1.2008, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003249/12
to the Commission
Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE)
(27 March 2012)

Subject: Geographical indication of 'gofio' from the Canary Islands

The Canary Islands Government has recently granted protected geographical indication status to 'Gofio Canario', pending approval by the European Commission. Gofio is a typical product from this region, meeting specific production requirements.

— Can the Commission report on the current stage of the approval process for this new Protected Geographical Indication (PGI)?

— Would this product, as a PGI, be entitled to receive any financial support from the CAP?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(14 May 2012)

The application for registration of the designation 'Gofio Canario' as Protected Geographical Indication (PGI) was received by the Commission on 24 January 2012.

The application is currently under scrutiny by the Commission to assess whether it fulfils the requirements of Regulation (EC) No 510/2006 ([1]).

The possibility to receive financial support for registered geographical indications is foreseen in the promotion policy ([2]) and the Rural Development Programme of Canarias 2007-2013.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 510/2006 of 20 March 2006 on the protection of geographical indications and designations of origin for agricultural products and foodstuffs, OJ L 93, 31.3.2006, p. 12.

([2]) Council Regulation (EC) No 3/2008 of 17 December 2007 on information provision and promotion measures for agricultural products on the internal market and in third countries, OJ L 3, 5.1.2008, p. 1.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003254/12
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL), Sabine Wils (GUE/NGL), Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL), Sabine Lösing (GUE/NGL), Paul Murphy (GUE/NGL), Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL) y Gabriele Zimmer (GUE/NGL)
(27 de marzo de 2012)

Asunto: VP/HR — Brutalidad y represión ejercidas por el Gobierno de Piñera contra los habitantes de Aysén en Chile

La región de Aysén, situada en el norte de la Patagonia chilena, ha sido testigo el mes pasado de un proceso ejemplar de movilización social. Organizaciones sindicales, populares y medio ambientales, unidas en la Mesa social por Aysén han organizado una petición generalizada compuesta de diez puntos en la que se exige al Gobierno que encuentre soluciones a los problemas de aislamiento geográfico, elevado coste de vida, graves carencias en sanidad y educación, reducción drástica de los recursos naturales y marcada desigualdad socioeconómica de la región.

Estas demandas y las acciones de la Mesa social por Aysén cuentan con un respaldo casi unánime en la región, como constatan las manifestaciones y las marchas multitudinarias de las últimas semanas.

Siguiendo con la política de represión y sanción empleada contra las protestas de los habitantes de la región de Magallanes y el movimiento estudiantil que tuvieron lugar el año pasado, el Gobierno de Sebastián Piñera ha desplazado a la zona un amplio contingente de cuerpos especiales de la policía (el cuerpo represivo de élite de la policía militarizada chilena). El resultado es un recrudecimiento de la violencia y las prácticas abusivas de la policía, que se ha saldado con un gran número de activistas heridos. Al comienzo de la semana, el Gobierno invocó la ley de seguridad del Estado, un acto legislativo represivo heredado de la dictadura de Pinochet, para intimidar a los manifestantes y desarticular el movimiento.

Ayer, 22 de marzo de 2012, un nuevo contingente de la policía enviado a la zona realizó maniobras que sugerían un estado de guerra, dirigidas a las ciudades de Puerto Aysén y Coihaique. Son muchas las denuncias de palizas y de uso indiscriminado de armas de fuego por parte de la policía, así como de civiles heridos por perdigones y balines.

Estas acciones del Gobierno y la policía contravienen los convenios internacionales para la protección de los derechos humanos firmados por Chile y están poniendo en peligro los derechos humanos de la población de Aysén.

Habida cuenta del acuerdo de asociación entre la UE y Chile y, en especial de su segundo artículo, que obliga a ambas partes a respetar los derechos humanos y los principios democráticos básicos en sus relaciones exteriores e interiores,

— ¿se ha puesto en contacto la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante con el Gobierno de Chile, o tiene intención de hacerlo, para condenar de manera oficial estas acciones en nombre de la UE y subrayar la necesidad urgente de poner fin a esta represión brutal e intimidación de los ciudadanos y de pedir que se abra una investigación independiente?

Respuesta de la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta Sra. Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(8 de junio de 2012)

La Unión Europea ha seguido de cerca el proceso de movilización social en la región de Aysén, en el sur de Chile, que ha sido coordinado por el Movimiento Social por la Región de Aysén (MSPRA) y que se inició a comienzos de febrero de 2012. Como tal vez sepa Su Señoría, a raíz de las conversaciones entre las autoridades chilenas y el MSPRA, las partes firmaron un acuerdo el 23 de marzo de 2012 en el que se recogían compromisos en materia de salud, educación, empleo, conectividad, infraestructura y subsidios de combustible y leña para los habitantes de Aysén. También se acordó un calendario de ejecución de los mismos.

La Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta observa que el Instituto Nacional de los Derechos Humanos (INDH) de Chile ha publicado los informes de dos misiones de observación independientes que llevó a cabo a petición del MSPRA, del 22 al 25 de febrero y del 13 al 17 de marzo de 2012 respectivamente. El INDH, recordando que la obligación de los Estados de mantener el orden público no debe ir en detrimento de su obligación de respetar y garantizar los derechos humanos, ha expresado su preocupación por la actuación de las Fuerzas Especiales de Carabineros y ha remitido oportunas observaciones a las autoridades chilenas competentes. A raíz de la intervención del INDH, el Ministerio de Interior ha retirado los cargos presentados con arreglo a la Ley de Seguridad del Estado contra 22 manifestantes, decisión que ha sido bien acogida por el MSPRA.

Se ha encontrado una solución negociada y han cesado las protestas. Teniendo en cuenta el papel efectivo del INDH en la investigación de las supuestas violaciones de los derechos humanos y en su intervención frente a las autoridades, la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta no tiene previsto contactar al Gobierno chileno.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003254/12
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin / Hohe Vertreterin)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL), Sabine Wils (GUE/NGL), Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL), Sabine Lösing (GUE/NGL), Paul Murphy (GUE/NGL), Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL) und Gabriele Zimmer (GUE/NGL)
(27. März 2012)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Gewalt und Unterdrückung gegenüber den Einwohnern von Aysén durch die Piñera-Regierung in Chile

In der Region Aysén, die sich im Norden Patagoniens in Chile befindet, gab es im vergangenen Monat eine noch nie da gewesene soziale Mobilisierung. Die zum Bündnis „Mesa Social" von Aysén zusammengeschlossenen Gewerkschaften, Basisorganisationen und Umweltgruppen haben einen allgemeinen Zehn-Punkte-Katalog aufgestellt, in dem sie die Regierung aufrufen, Lösungen für die Probleme der geografischen Isolation, die hohen Lebenshaltungskosten, die unzulängliche Gesundheits— und Bildungsversorgung, den Abbau natürlicher Ressourcen und die schwerwiegenden sozioökonomischen Ungleichheiten in der Region zu finden.

Diese Forderungen und die Maßnahmen des „Mesa Social" von Aysén finden nahezu einstimmige Unterstützung in der Region, wie auch die Massenkundgebungen und Demonstrationen der letzten Wochen gezeigt haben.

Die Regierung von Sebastián Piñera setzte ihre Politik der Unterdrückung und Kriminalisierung, die gegen die Proteste der Einwohner der Magellanregion und die Studentenbewegung im vergangenen Jahr angewandt wurde, nun fort und stellte in dem Gebiet ein großes Sonderpolizeikontingent (repressiver Flügel der Eliteeinheit der chilenischen Militärpolizei) auf. Dies führte zu einem Aufflammen der Gewalt und missbräuchlichem Verhalten der Polizei, wobei zahlreiche Demonstranten verletzt wurden. Anfang dieser Woche berief sich die Regierung auf das Gesetz über die Staatssicherheit, eine Rechtsvorschrift mit repressivem Charakter aus den Zeiten der Pinochet-Diktatur, um die Protestierenden einzuschüchtern und die Bewegung im Keim zu ersticken.

Gestern, am 22. März 2012, führte ein neues Polizeikontingent, das in das Gebiet entsendet wurde, spezielle Manöver durch, die einen Kriegszustand hervorrufen sollten und auf die Städte Puerto Aysén und Coyhaique abzielten. Es liegen zahlreiche Berichte über das gewaltsame Vorgehen und die willkürliche Verwendung von Feuerwaffen durch die Polizei sowie über Zivilisten vor, die durch Schüsse verwundet wurden.

Diese Maßnahmen der Regierung und der Polizei verstoßen gegen die internationalen Menschenrechtskonventionen, die von Chile unterzeichnet wurden, und stellen eine Gefährdung der Menschenrechte der Einwohner von Aysén dar.

Unter Berücksichtigung des EU-Chile-Assoziationsabkommens, insbesondere des darin enthaltenen zweiten Artikels, wonach beide Parteien zur Einhaltung der Menschenrechte und der grundlegenden demokratischen Grundsätze in ihrer Außen— und Innenpolitik verpflichtet sind, ergeht folgende Frage:

— Hat die Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin die chilenische Regierung kontaktiert oder beabsichtigt sie, diese zu kontaktieren, um im Namen der EU diese Maßnahmen formal zu verurteilen und um auf die dringende Notwendigkeit zu verweisen, dieser brutalen Unterdrückung und Einschüchterung der Zivilbevölkerung ein Ende zu setzen und die Einleitung einer unabhängigen Untersuchung zu fordern?

Antwort von Frau Catherine Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(8. Juni 2012)

Die Europäische Union hat die soziale Mobilisierung in der Region Aysén im Süden Chiles, die von der Sozialen Bewegung für die Region Aysén (MSPRA) koordiniert worden ist und Anfang Februar 2012 begonnen hat, aufmerksam verfolgt. Wie den Damen und Herren Abgeordneten vermutlich bekannt ist, haben die chilenische Regierung und die MSPRA am 23. März 2012 im Anschluss an Gespräche ein Abkommen unterzeichnet, das Verpflichtungen in Bezug auf Gesundheit, Bildung, Beschäftigung, Verkehrsanbindung, Infrastruktur sowie Treibstoff — und Brennholzsubventionen für die Bewohner von Aysén enthält; zudem haben sie einen Zeitplan für die Umsetzung vereinbart.

Die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin stellt fest, dass das Nationale Institut für Menschenrechte in Chile (INDH) Berichte von zwei unabhängigen Beobachtungsmissionen veröffentlicht hat, die es auf Ersuchen der MSPRA vom 22. bis zum 25. Februar bzw. vom 13. bis zum 17. März 2012 in Aysén durchführte. Das INDH erinnerte daran, dass die Verpflichtung der Staaten, die öffentliche Ordnung aufrechtzuerhalten, nicht schwerer wiegt als ihre Verpflichtung, die Menschenrechte zu achten und zu garantieren. Es äußerte sich besorgt über das Vorgehen der

Spezialkräfte der Militärpolizei (Fuerzas Especiales de Carabineros) und richtete einschlägige Empfehlungen an die zuständigen chilenischen Behörden. Nach dieser Intervention des INDH ließ das Innenministerium die Anklagen fallen, die nach dem Gesetz über die Staatssicherheit gegen 22 Demonstranten erhoben worden waren. Die MSPRA begrüßte diese Entscheidung.

Da eine Verhandlungslösung gefunden worden ist, die Proteste aufgehört haben und das Nationale Institut für Menschenrechte bei der Untersuchung von mutmaßlichen Menschenrechtsverletzungen eine wirksame Rolle gespielt und sich erfolgreich bei den Behörden eingeschaltet hat, beabsichtigt die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin nicht, die chilenische Regierung in dieser Angelegenheit zu kontaktieren.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003254/12
προς την Επιτροπή (Αντιπρόεδρος/Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL), Sabine Wils (GUE/NGL), Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL), Sabine Lösing (GUE/NGL), Paul Murphy (GUE/NGL), Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL) και Gabriele Zimmer (GUE/NGL)
(27 Μαρτίου 2012)

Θέμα: VP/HR — Πράξεις βιαιότητας και καταστολής κατά των κατοίκων της Aysen από την κυβέρνηση Piñera στη Χιλή

Τον τελευταίο μήνα, η περιοχή Aysen στη βόρεια Παταγονία της Χιλής δίνει ένα αξιοσημείωτο δείγμα κοινωνικών κινητοποιήσεων. Συνδικάτα, πολιτικές οργανώσεις και περιβαλλοντικές ομάδες, συνασπισμένα στο Κοινωνικό Μέτωπο της Aysen, έχουν υποβάλει ένα συλλογικό αίτημα με δέκα σημεία με το οποίο καλούν την κυβέρνηση να βρει λύσεις για τα προβλήματα της γεωγραφικής απομόνωσης, του υψηλού κόστους ζωής, των σοβαρών ανεπαρκειών στους τομείς της υγείας και της παιδείας, της εξάντλησης των φυσικών πόρων και των σοβαρών κοινωνικοοικονομικών ανισοτήτων στην περιοχή.

Τα εν λόγω αιτήματα και οι δράσεις του Κοινωνικού Μετώπου της Aysen τυγχάνουν της σχεδόν ομόφωνης στήριξης των κατοίκων της περιοχής, όπως επιβεβαιώνεται από τις μαζικές πορείες και διαδηλώσεις κατά τις τελευταίες εβδομάδες.

Εμμένοντας στην κατασταλτική πολιτική και στην πολιτική ποινικοποίησης ως απάντηση στις διαδηλώσεις των κατοίκων της περιοχής Magallanes και στο φοιτητικό κίνημα του περασμένου έτους, η κυβέρνηση του Sebastián Piñera εγκατέστησε στην περιοχή μεγάλο σώμα των ειδικών αστυνομικών δυνάμεων (επίλεκτο κατασταλτικό σώμα της στρατικοποιημένης αστυνομίας της Χιλής). Το γεγονός αυτό είχε ως αποτέλεσμα την έξαρση της βίας και των καταχρηστικών πρακτικών εκ μέρους των αστυνομικών δυνάμεων καθώς και πολλούς τραυματίες μεταξύ των κινητοποιημένων διαδηλωτών. Νωρίτερα αυτήν την εβδομάδα, η κυβέρνηση επικαλέστηκε τον Νόμο Εσωτερικής Ασφάλειας του Κράτους, νομοθεσία με κατασταλτικό χαρακτήρα, κληροδότημα της δικτατορίας του Pinochet, έτσι ώστε να εκφοβίσει τους διαδηλωτές και να αποδυναμώσει το κίνημα.

Χτες, 22 Μαρτίου 2012, μια νέα αστυνομική ομάδα που κατέφθασε στην περιοχή προέβη σε χειρισμούς που υποδήλωναν εμπόλεμη κατάσταση και είχαν ως στόχο τις πόλεις Puerto Aysen και Coyhaique. Έχουν γίνει πολλές αναφορές για χτυπήματα και αδιάκριτη χρήση πυροβόλων από την αστυνομία καθώς και για τραυματισμούς αμάχων από σκάγια και σφαίρες.

Οι ανωτέρω δράσεις της κυβέρνησης και της αστυνομίας παραβιάζουν τις διεθνείς συμβάσεις για τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα που έχει υπογράψει η Χιλή και θέτουν σε κίνδυνο τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα των κατοίκων της Aysen.

Λαμβανομένης υπόψη της συμφωνίας σύνδεσης ΕΕ-Χιλής και κυρίως του δεύτερου άρθρου της, βάσει του οποίου και τα δύο συμβαλλόμενα μέρη υποχρεούνται να σέβονται τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα και τις βασικές δημοκρατικές αρχές στο πλαίσιο των εξωτερικών και εσωτερικών τους υποθέσεων,

— Ερωτάται η Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος/Αντιπρόεδρος της Επιτροπής εάν έχει έρθει σε επαφή με την κυβέρνηση της Χιλής ή εάν σκοπεύει να το πράξει, προκειμένου να καταδικάσει επισήμως τις εν λόγω ενέργειες εκ μέρους της ΕΕ, να τονίσει την επείγουσα ανάγκη να δοθεί τέλος στην βίαιη καταστολή και στον απάνθρωπο εκφοβισμό των πολιτών, και να ζητήσει την εκκίνηση ανεξάρτητης έρευνας.

Απάντηση της Ύπατης Εκπροσώπου/Αντιπροέδρου Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(8 Ιουνίου 2012)

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση παρακολουθεί στενά τη διαδικασία κοινωνικής κινητοποίησης που συντονίζεται από το κοινωνικό κίνημα για την περιφέρεια Aysén (ΚΚΠΑ), στην περιφέρεια Aysén της νότιας Χιλής, διαδικασία η οποία ξεκίνησε στις αρχές Φεβρουαρίου 2012. Όπως ίσως γνωρίζουν τα αξιότιμα μέλη, μετά τις διαβουλεύσεις μεταξύ των αρχών της Χιλής και του ΚΚΠΑ, τα μέρη υπέγραψαν συμφωνία στις 23 Μαρτίου 2012 που περιλάμβανε δεσμεύσεις σχετικά με την υγεία, την παιδεία, τη συγκοινωνιακή σύνδεση, τις υποδομές και τις επιδοτήσεις υγρών καυσίμων και καυσόξυλων για τους κατοίκους της Aysén, και έχει συμφωνηθεί χρονοδιάγραμμα για την εφαρμογή των δεσμεύσεων αυτών.

Η Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος/Αντιπρόεδρος (ΥΕ/ΑΠ) σημειώνει ότι το εθνικό ινστιτούτο για τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα (ΕΙΑΔ) της Χιλής εξέδωσε εκθέσεις σχετικά με δύο ανεξάρτητες αποστολές παρακολούθησης τις οποίες πραγματοποίησε στην Aysén μετά από αίτημα του ΚΚΠΑ στις 22-25 Φεβρουαρίου και στις 13-17 Μαρτίου αντίστοιχα. Το ΕΙΑΔ, υπενθυμίζοντας ότι η υποχρέωση των κρατών να διατηρούν τη δημόσια τάξη δεν υπερτερεί της υποχρέωσης τους να σέβονται και να εξασφαλίζουν τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα, εξέφρασε την ανησυχία του σχετικά με τη συμπεριφορά των ειδικών δυνάμεων της στρατιωτικοποιημένης αστυνομίας (Fuerzas Especiales de Carabineros) και έκανε σχετικές συστάσεις στις αρμόδιες αρχές της Χιλής. Μετά από την παρέμβαση του ΕΙΑΔ, το Υπουργείο Εσωτερικών απέσυρε τις κατηγορίες που είχε αναγγείλει βάσει του νόμου Εσωτερικής Ασφάλειας εναντίον 22 διαδηλωτών, απόφαση που επιδοκιμάστηκε από το ΚΚΠΑ.

Καθότι βρέθηκε λύση μέσω διαπραγματεύσεων και οι διαδηλώσεις σταμάτησαν, και έχοντας υπόψη τον αποτελεσματικό ρόλο του εθνικού ινστιτούτου για τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα στην έρευνα των εικαζόμενων παραβιάσεων των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων και στην διεξαγωγή των σχετικών παρεμβάσεων με τις αρχές, η ΥΕ/ΑΠ δεν σκοπεύει να επικοινωνήσει με τη χιλιανή κυβέρνηση σχετικά με το ζήτημα αυτό.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003254/12
à la Commission (Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL), Sabine Wils (GUE/NGL), Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL), Sabine Lösing (GUE/NGL), Paul Murphy (GUE/NGL), Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL) et Gabriele Zimmer (GUE/NGL)
(27 mars 2012)

Objet: VP/HR — Brutalité et répression perpétrées contre les habitants d'Aysén, au Chili, par le gouvernement Piñera

Ce dernier mois, la région d'Aysén, dans le nord de la Patagonie chilienne, a connu une mobilisation sociale exemplaire. Des syndicats, des organisations de base et des groupes de défense de l'environnement, rassemblés au sein du Front social d'Aysén, ont lancé une pétition générale en dix points, demandant au gouvernement de trouver des solutions aux problèmes de l'isolation géographique, du coût élevé de la vie, des graves lacunes en matière de santé et d'éducation, de l'appauvrissement des ressources naturelles et de la forte inégalité socio-économique dans la région.

Ces demandes et actions du Front social d'Aysén bénéficient d'un soutien presque généralisé dans la région, comme le confirment les marches et manifestations de masse de ces dernières semaines.

Poursuivant la politique de répression et de criminalisation des protestations des habitants de la région de Magallanes et du mouvement des étudiants qui ont eu lieu l'année dernière, le gouvernement de Sebastián Piñera a déployé dans la région un grand contingent du corps spécial de police (l'aile répressive de la police militarisée Chili). Cela entraîné un regain de violence et donné lieu à des pratiques abusives de la police; de nombreux militants ont été blessés. Cette semaine, le gouvernement a invoqué la loi sur la sécurité de l'État, un acte législatif répressif hérité de la dictature de Pinochet, afin d'intimider les protestants et de démanteler le mouvement.

Hier, le 22 mars 2012, un nouveau contingent de police envoyé dans la région a entrepris des manœuvres impliquant un état de guerre, ciblant les villes de Puerto Aysén et de Coyhaique. On signale de nombreuses bagarres, le recours à tort et à travers aux armes à feu par la police et des civils blessés par des chevrotines et des balles de plomb.

Ces agissements du gouvernement et de la police sont contraires aux conventions internationales sur les Droits de l'homme signées par le Chili et menacent les Droits de l'homme des habitants d'Aysén.

Compte tenu de l'accord d'association UE-Chili, et en particulier de son article 2, qui oblige les deux parties à respecter les Droits de l'homme et les principes démocratiques fondamentaux dans leurs politiques internes et internationales,

— la Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante a-t-elle pris contact avec le gouvernement chilien, ou entend-elle le faire, afin de condamner formellement ces actes au nom de l'UE, d'insister sur la nécessité de mettre d'urgence un terme à cette répression brutale et à cette intimidation des citoyens et de demander l'ouverture d'une enquête indépendante?

Réponse donnée par Mme Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission
(8 juin 2012)

L'Union européenne a observé de près le processus de mobilisation sociale dans la région d'Aysén au sud du Chili, qui a été coordonné par le mouvement social pour la région d'Aysen (MSPRA) et a commencé début février 2012. Ainsi que les Honorables Membres le savent peut-être, suite aux discussions entre les autorités chiliennes et le MSPRA, les parties ont signé un accord le 23 mars 2012 qui comportait des engagements en matière de santé, d'éducation, d'emploi, de connectivité, d'infrastructure et des subventions pour l'achat de combustibles et de bois de chauffage en faveur des habitants d'Aysén et un calendrier a été décidé pour leur mise en œuvre.

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante (VP/HP) note que l'Institut national des Droits de l'homme (INDH) du Chili a publié des rapports sur la région d'Aysén, rédigés au terme de deux missions d'observation indépendantes effectuées, respectivement du 22 au 25 février et du 13 au 17 mars 2012, à la demande du MSPRA. Rappelant que l'obligation des États de maintenir l'ordre public ne les dispense pas de leur obligation de garantir le respect des Droits de l'homme, l'INDH a exprimé son inquiétude concernant le comportement des forces spéciales ainsi que de la police militarisée (Fuerzas Especiales de Carabineros) et a formulé des recommandations appropriées à l'adresse des autorités chiliennes compétentes. Suite à l'intervention de l'INDH, le ministère de l'intérieur a abandonné les charges contre 22 manifestants retenues en vertu de la loi sur la sécurité de l'État, une décision saluée par le MSPRA.

Étant donné qu'une solution négociée a été trouvée et que les manifestations ont cessé et considérant le rôle efficace joué par l'Institut national des Droits de l'homme dans les enquêtes sur des violations alléguées des Droits de l'homme et les actions appropriées menées auprès des autorités, la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante ne prévoit pas de prendre contact avec le gouvernement chilien sur cette question.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003254/12
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente / Alta Representante)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL), Sabine Wils (GUE/NGL), Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL), Sabine Lösing (GUE/NGL), Paul Murphy (GUE/NGL), Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL) e Gabriele Zimmer (GUE/NGL)
(27 de Março de 2012)

Assunto: VP/HR — Brutalidade e repressão cometidas pelo Governo de Piñera contra os habitantes de Aysen, no Chile

A região de Aysen, situada no norte da Patagónia, no Chile, assistiu, no mês passado, a um processo exemplar de mobilização social. Sindicatos, organizações populares e grupos ambientalistas, reunidos na Frente Social de Aysen, apresentaram uma petição conjunta de dez pontos, exigindo ao Governo que encontrasse soluções para os problemas do isolamento geográfico, custo de vida elevado, carências substanciais na saúde e educação, delapidação dos recursos naturais e graves desigualdades socioeconómicas na região.

Estas exigências e as ações da Frente Social de Aysen contam com um apoio praticamente unânime na região, como mostram as marchas e manifestações de massa das últimas semanas.

Prosseguindo a política de repressão e criminalização levada a cabo contra os protestos dos habitantes da região de Magalhães e o movimento estudantil no ano passado, o Governo de Sebastián Piñera instalou na zona um vasto contingente do Corpo Especial de Polícia (a ala repressiva de elite da polícia militarizada do Chile). O resultado é uma nova vaga de violência e ações autoritárias por parte da polícia, com grande número de militantes feridos. Ainda esta semana, o Governo invocou a Lei de Segurança do Estado, um instrumento jurídico repressivo herdado da ditadura de Pinochet, para intimidar os manifestantes e desmantelar o movimento.

Ontem, 22 de março de 2012, um novo contingente policial enviado para a região iniciou manobras que incluem o estado de sítio e visa as cidades de Puerto Aysen e Coyhaique. Há numerosos relatos de espancamentos e uso indiscriminado de armas de fogo pela polícia, com civis feridos por disparos de pistolas de pressão de ar e caçadeiras.

Estas ações do Governo e da polícia violam as convenções internacionais dos direitos humanos assinadas pelo Chile e estão a pôr em perigo os direitos humanos da população de Aysen.

Tendo em conta o Acordo de Associação UE-Chile, em especial o seu artigo 2.°, que obriga ambas as partes ao respeito dos direitos humanos e de princípios democráticos básicos nos seus assuntos externos e internos,

— A Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante já contactou ou tenciona contactar o Governo chileno para manifestar a condenação formal destas ações por parte da UE e sublinhar a necessidade urgente de pôr fim a esta repressão e intimidação brutais dos cidadãos e ordenar a abertura de um inquérito independente?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(8 de Junho de 2012)

A União Europeia tem acompanhado de perto o processo da mobilização social na região de Aysén, no sul do Chile, que começou no início de fevereiro de 2012, e tem sido coordenado pelo Movimento Social pela Região de Aysén (MSPRA). Como os Senhores Deputados devem saber, na sequência das conversações entre as autoridades chilenas e o MSPRA, as partes assinaram um acordo em 23 de março de 2012 contendo compromissos em matéria de saúde, educação, emprego, conectividade, infraestruturas e subsídios para a compra de combustível e lenha para os habitantes de Aysén. Foi igualmente aprovado um calendário para a execução dos compromissos.

A Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente (AR/VP) recorda que o Instituto Nacional dos Direitos Humanos (INDH) do Chile publicou os relatórios das duas missões de observação independentes realizadas em Aysén a pedido do MSPRA, de 22 a 25 de fevereiro e de 13 a 17 de março de 2012, respetivamente. Recordando que a obrigação dos Estados de manter a ordem pública não dispensa a sua obrigação de garantir o respeito pelos direitos humanos, o INDH exprimiu preocupação com o comportamento das forças especiais da polícia militarizada (*Fuerzas Especiales de Carabineros*) e apresentou recomendações oportunas às autoridades chilenas competentes. Após a intervenção do INDH, o Ministério da Administração Interna retirou as acusações formuladas contra 22 manifestantes ao abrigo da Lei de Segurança do Estado, decisão que foi bem acolhida pelo MSPRA.

Atendendo a que foi encontrada uma solução negociada e que cessaram os protestos e tendo em conta o papel ativo do Instituto Nacional dos Direitos Humanos na investigação de alegadas violações dos direitos humanos e na sua intervenção junto das autoridades, a AR/VP não tenciona contactar o Governo chileno sobre esta questão.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003254/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL), Sabine Wils (GUE/NGL), Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL), Sabine Lösing (GUE/NGL), Paul Murphy (GUE/NGL), Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL) and Gabriele Zimmer (GUE/NGL)
(27 March 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Brutality and repression perpetrated against the inhabitants of Aysen by the Piñera government in Chile

The region of Aysen, located in northern Patagonia in Chile, has seen, over the last month, an exemplary process of social mobilisation. Trade unions, grassroots organisations and environmental groups, coming together in the Social Front of Aysen, have mounted an across-the-board ten-point petition, calling on the government to find solutions to the problems of geographical isolation, the high cost of living, serious shortcomings in health and education, depletion of natural resources and severe socioeconomic inequality in the region.

These demands and the actions of the Social Front of Aysen are meeting with virtually unanimous support in the region, as confirmed in the mass marches and demonstrations of recent weeks.

Continuing with the policy of repression and criminalisation used against the protests by the inhabitants of the Magallanes region and the student movement that took place last year, the government of Sebastián Piñera has installed in the area a large contingent of the special police corps (the elite repressive wing of Chile's militarised police). The result is an upsurge in violence and abusive practices by the police, with large numbers of militants being injured. Earlier this week, the government invoked the Law on State Security, a repressive piece of legislation inherited from the Pinochet dictatorship, in order to intimidate the protesters and dismantle the movement.

Yesterday 22 March 2012, a new police contingent sent to the area undertook manoeuvres implying a state of war, targeted on the cities of Puerto Aysen and Coyhaique. There are numerous reports of beatings and indiscriminate use of firearms by the police, and of civilians being wounded by buckshot and pellets.

These actions by the government and the police are in breach of the international human rights conventions signed by Chile and are jeopardising the human rights of the people of Aysen.

Taking into account the EU-Chile Association Agreement, and especially its second article, which obliges both parties to respect human rights and basic democratic principles in their foreign and internal affairs,

— Has the Vice-President/High Representative contacted the Chilean government, or does she intend to contact it, in order to make a formal condemnation of these actions on the EU's part and to stress the need, as a matter of urgency, to put an end to this brutal repression and intimidation of citizens and call for an independent inquiry to be opened?

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

The European Union has followed closely the process of social mobilisation in Chile's southern Aysén region, that has been coordinated by the Social Movement for the Aysén Region (MSPRA) and began in early February 2012. As the Honourable Members may know, following talks between the Chilean authorities and the MSPRA, the parties signed an agreement on 23 March 2012 containing commitments relating to health, education, employment, connectivity, infrastructure and fuel and firewood subsidies for the inhabitants of Aysén; and a timetable has been agreed for their implementation.

The High Representative/Vice-President (HR/VP) notes that Chile's National Institute for Human Rights (INDH) has published reports of two independent observation missions which it undertook in Aysén at the request of the MSPRA, from 22 to 25 February and 13 to 17 March 2012 respectively. The INDH, recalling that the obligation of states to maintain public order does not outweigh their obligation to respect and guarantee human rights, has expressed concern about the behaviour of the special forces of the militarised police (Fuerzas Especiales de Carabineros) and made relevant recommendations to the respective Chilean authorities. Following the intervention of the INDH, the Ministry of the Interior has dropped charges brought under the Law on State Security against 22 protestors, a decision which was welcomed by the MSPRA.

As a negotiated solution has been found and the protests have ceased, and having regard to the effective role of the National Institute for Human Rights in investigating alleged human rights abuses and making relevant interventions with the authorities, the HR/VP has no plans to contact the Chilean government about this matter.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-003264/12
Komisijai
Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D)
(2012 m. kovo 27 d.)

Tema: Pasiūlymas dėl Europos Parlamento ir Tarybos reglamento, kuriuo sukuriama Sąjungos programa „Erasmus visiems“

Praėjusių metų pabaigoje Europos Komisija pateikė pasiūlymą dėl Europos Parlamento ir Tarybos reglamento, kuriuo sukuriama Sąjungos švietimo, mokymo, jaunimo ir sporto programa „Erasmus visiems“.

Ar Komisija mano, kad programoje, kuria siūloma jungti švietimo, mokymo, jaunimo ir sporto sritis, bus skiriama pakankamai dėmesio jaunimo problemoms ir jaunimo bei jaunimo organizacijų veiklai ir ar bus užtikrintas šių problemų sprendimas ir šios veiklos finansavimas?

Ar Komisija taip pat mano, jog bus užtikrinta socialinė jaunų žmonių, turinčių mažiau galimybių, įtrauktis, neformalaus mokymosi galimybės jaunimui, jaunų žmonių aktyvaus pilietiškumo ugdymas, kas buvo akcentuojama įgyvendinant ES programą „Veiklus jaunimas“ (2007-2013)?

Jei taip, tai kokiomis formomis ir kokiu būdu?

A. Vassiliou atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2012 m. birželio 1 d.)

Atsižvelgdama į 2014-2020 m. daugiametės finansinės programos gaires, kuriose pabrėžta, kad būtina racionalizuoti ir supaprastinti Sąjungos finansinę paramą ([1]), Komisija pasiūlė priimti vieną programą, kuri jungia šiuo metu pagal Mokymosi visą gyvenimą programą, programą „Veiklus jaunimas“ ir tarptautinio bendradarbiavimo aukštojo mokslo srityje programas remiamą veiklą.

Komisija įsitikinusi, kad programoje „Erasmus visiems“, kaip ir dabartinėje programoje „Veiklus jaunimas“, bus skirta pakankamai dėmesio jaunimo problemoms ir tinkamai sprendžiami su šios srities specialistų ir jaunimo organizacijų veikla susiję uždaviniai. Programos pasiūlymas tiesiogiai susietas su 2009 m. pabaigoje priimta 2010-2018 m. Europos bendradarbiavimo jaunimo reikalų srityje sistema. Be to, Komisijos pasiūlyme su jaunimu susijusiai veiklai numatytas metinis biudžeto asignavimas yra didesnis už dabartinės programos „Veiklus jaunimas“ metinį biudžetą.

Reglamento pasiūlymo 17 straipsnio 2 dalyje ir 5 straipsnyje aiškiai nurodyta, kad mažiau galimybių turintys jaunuoliai turi būti skatinami dalyvauti programoje, ir nurodyti kiti tikslai – remti neformalųjį mokymąsi ir aktyvų jaunimo dalyvavimą visuomenės gyvenime.

Programos tikslams įgyvendinti bus imamasi įvairių veiksmų. Pagrindiniais veiksmais bus siekiama toliau tęsti veiksmingiausią pagal programą „Veiklus jaunimas“ remtą veiklą (ypač jaunimo mainus, Europos savanorių tarnybą, specialistų mokymą ir jaunimo organizacijų tinklų kūrimą).

([1]) 2011 m. birželio 29 d. Komisijos komunikatas COM(2011) 500 galutinis.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003264/12
to the Commission
Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D)
(27 March 2012)

Subject: Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the Erasmus for All programme

At the end of last year, the European Commission presented a proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the Union programme for education, training, youth and sport entitled Erasmus for All.

Does the Commission believe that the programme, which proposes linking education, training, youth and sport, will pay sufficient attention to young people's issues and youth organisation activity, and that it will guarantee that these issues will be addressed and this activity funded?

Does the Commission also believe that the programme will guarantee the inclusion of young people with fewer opportunities, non-formal learning opportunities for young people and the teaching of active citizenship to young people, as stressed in the implementation of the EU Youth in Action programme (2007-2013)?

If so, in what forms and by what means?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Vassiliou au nom de la Commission
(1^er^ juin 2012)

Conformément aux orientations retenues pour le cadre financier pluriannuel 2014-2020 qui mettent l'accent sur la rationalisation et simplification des interventions financières de l'Union ([1]), la Commission a proposé un programme unique, intégrant les activités aujourd'hui soutenues par les programmes Éducation et formation tout au long de la vie et Jeunesse en Action et des programmes de coopération internationale dans le domaine de l'enseignement supérieur.

La Commission est convaincue qu'Erasmus pour tous permettra, comme l'actuel programme Jeunesse en Action, de répondre de manière appropriée aux questions de jeunesse et à l'activité des professionnels et des organisations qui œuvrent dans le domaine de la jeunesse. La proposition de programme établit un lien direct avec le Cadre pour la coopération européenne dans le domaine de la jeunesse (2010-2018) adopté fin 2009. D'autre part, la proposition de la Commission envisage une allocation budgétaire annuelle pour les activités de jeunesse supérieure aux budgets annuels de l'actuel programme Jeunesse en Action.

Les articles 17.2 et 5 de la proposition de règlement se réfèrent explicitement à l'accès au programme des jeunes ayant moins d'opportunités et aux objectifs de soutenir l'apprentissage non formel et la participation active des jeunes à la société.

Les objectifs du programme seront servis par diverses actions dont les principales reconduiront les activités les plus efficaces de Jeunesse en Action (notamment les échanges de jeunes, le Service volontaire européen et les actions de formation et de mise en réseau des animateurs et des organisations de jeunesse).

([1]) Communication de la Commission du 29 juin 2011, COM(2011)500 final.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-003265/12
a Bizottság számára
Gáll-Pelcz Ildikó (PPE)
(2012. március 27.)

Tárgy: Az Unió nyelvhasználatra vonatkozó szabályainak megsértése, különös tekintettel a fordításokra

Az európai harmonizált szabványok kialakítása angol, német és francia nyelven történik. A jelenleg hatályban lévő, az európai szabványosítás finanszírozásáról szóló 1673/2006/EK európai parlamenti és tanácsi határozat (5) preambulumbekezdése rögzíti: biztosítani kell, hogy a kis- és középvállalkozások alkalmazni tudják az európai szabványokat. Azért, hogy a kkv-k teljes mértékben ki tudják használni a harmonizált európai szabványok adta előnyöket és könnyen alkalmazni tudják azokat, fokozottan segíteni kell az európai harmonizált szabványok nemzeti nyelven történő hozzáférését. Azonban számos esetben a nemzeti nyelvekre történő fordítás rendkívül lassú, s mindezeken felül az uniós finanszírozási keretből a fordításokra elkülönített pénzekhez való hozzáférés korlátozott.

Hasonló probléma jelenik meg a REACH rendelet alkalmazása kapcsán. A regisztrációk túlnyomó többsége – az előzetes várakozásoknak megfelelően – 2013-ban illetve 2018-ban lesz esedékes. A REACH és az azt kiegészítő CLP értelmezését több ezer oldalas – állandóan változó – útmutatók segítik. Ezek csak nagy késéssel érhetők el számos hivatalos nyelven. Az ECHA honlapján a kérdések és az azokra adott válaszok szintén segítik az értelmezést, de ezek is csak angol nyelven érhetőek el. A kis- és középvállalkozások többségénél nincs arra lehetőség, hogy ezekre a feladatokra önálló stábokat állítsanak fel, akik folyamatosan nyomon követik az angol nyelvű háttéranyagokat.

A „hivatalos nyelvek" közötti megkülönböztetés ellentétes az Unió alapértékeivel, ugyanakkor sajnálatos tény, hogy a „nagy nyelvek" számára előnyös nyelvi hierarchia alakult ki a jogszabályokban, közleményekben és végül az uniós szabadalom során használt nyelvpolitikában.

A „Szerződések őreként" tervezi-e a Bizottság olyan egységes intézkedések meghozatalát, melyek értelmében az EU valamennyi hivatalos nyelvére vonatkozó egyenértékűség elvét ténylegesen alkalmazzák, biztosítva ezáltal az összes uniós nyelv számára az egyenlő és megkülönböztetés-mentes „hivatalos nyelv" státuszát? A ráruházott hatáskörök alapján a fordításokat illetően milyen további intézkedéseket szándékozik hozni a Bizottság e tekintetben?

José Manuel Barroso válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2012. május 30.)

A Bizottság – a költségvetési hatóság biztosította források erejéig – továbbra is elkötelezett a jelenlegi többnyelvűség és a hivatalos nyelvek egyenlősége mellett ([1]), és minden tőle telhetőt megtesz az egyenlőség tiszteletben tartására és alkalmazására.

Az európai harmonizált szabványokkal kapcsolatban a Bizottság tisztában van azzal, mekkora nehézséget jelent az angol, a francia és a német nyelvet nem beszélő felhasználóknak az európai harmonizált szabványok elérhetősége, illetve lefordítása, különösen a kkv-k esetében.

Az európai harmonizált szabványok közzététele, valamint az angol, a francia és a német nyelvtől eltérő nyelvekre történő lefordítása az egyes tagállamok nemzeti szabványügyi testületeinek hatáskörébe tartozik. Az európai harmonizált szabványok nemzeti nyelvekre történő lefordítását tehát legjobban a tagállamok tudják támogatni, például úgy, hogy elegendő forrást bocsátanak a nemzeti szabványügyi testületek rendelkezésére.

A REACH alkalmazásával kapcsolatban az ECHA törekszik a kkv-knak és a nyilvánosságnak szánt dokumentumok (például útmutatók, kézikönyvek, sajtóközlemények) 22 hivatalos európai uniós nyelven történő biztosítására. Ennek keretében eddig több mint 7000 oldalt fordíttatott le. A szövegek fordítását az Európai Unió Szerveinek Fordítóközpontja végzi ([2]). A Bizottság továbbra is minél több útmutató dokumentum és eszköz lefordíttatására biztatja az ECHA-t, különösen azon dokumentumokat szem előtt tartva, amelyek a kkv-k számára fontosak. Az ECHA igyekszik ennek eleget tenni.

Az ECHA 2011 decemberében indította el új honlapját, amelyen szintén egyre több oldal olvasható az említett nyelveken.

([1]) A hivatalos nyelvek egyenlőségét az Európai Gazdasági Közösség által használt nyelvek meghatározásáról szóló 1/1958 tanácsi rendelet (HL L 17., 1958.10.6., a legutóbb az 1791/2006/EK rendelettel [HL 363., 2006.12.20.] módosított rendelet) mondja ki.

([2]) A vegyi anyagok regisztrálásáról, értékeléséről, engedélyezéséről és korlátozásáról (REACH), az Európai Vegyianyag-ügynökség létrehozásáról, az 1999/45/EK irányelv módosításáról, valamint a 793/93/EGK tanácsi rendelet, az 1488/94/EK bizottsági rendelet, a 76/769/EGK tanácsi irányelv, a 91/155/EGK, a 93/67/EGK, a 93/105/EK és a 2000/21/EK bizottsági irányelv hatályon kívül helyezéséről szóló, 2006. december 18-i 1907/2006/EK európai parlamenti és tanácsi rendelet 104. cikkének (2) bekezdése (HL L 396., 2006.12.30.).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003265/12
to the Commission
Ildikó Gáll-Pelcz (PPE)
(27 March 2012)

Subject: The infringement of Union rules on language use, with particular reference to translations

The development of European harmonised standards is carried out in English, German and French. Recital 5 of Decision No 1673/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the financing of European standardisation, currently in force, states: 'it is necessary to ensure that small and medium-sized enterprises (…) are able to apply European standards'. In order to allow small and medium-sized enterprises to take advantage of the harmonised European standards and apply them with ease, access to the European harmonised standards in national languages should be facilitated. However, in many cases their translation into the national languages is extremely slow, and access to the funds designated for translations from the EU financial framework is restricted.

A similar problem is faced with respect to the application of the REACH Regulation. According to preliminary expectations, the vast majority of registrations will be due in 2013 and in 2018. The interpretation of REACH and its supplement, the CLP, is assisted by several thousand ever-changing pages of guides. These are available only with a significant delay in several official languages. Their interpretation is also helped by the questions and answers published on the ECHA website; however, these are also available only in English. The majority of small and medium-sized enterprises do not have the means to assign independent staff to continuously follow the English-language background materials.

Any discrimination among 'official languages' violates the basic values of the Union, and it is regrettable that a linguistic hierarchy has developed in favour of the 'big languages' in the field of legislation and communications and in the linguistic policy pursued in relation to European Union patents.

As the 'guardian of the Treaties', is the Commission planning to introduce uniform measures to ensure that the principle of equality among all official languages of the EU will genuinely be applied, thus guaranteeing the equal status, without discrimination, of each Union language as an 'official language'? Based on the powers bestowed upon the Commission with regard to translations, what further measures does it intend to take in this regard?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2012)

The Commission remains committed to the current multi-language regime and the equality of all official languages ([1]) within the resources allocated by the budgetary authority and makes every effort to respect and apply it.

With regards to the European harmonised standards, the Commission is aware of the difficulties that the users may face in terms of the availability of European harmonised standards in languages other than English, French and German, as well as a particular need for translations amongst SMEs.

The publication and translation of the European harmonised standards in languages other than English, French and German is in the competence of the national standardisation bodies of the Member States. The Member States can thus best support the translations of European harmonised standards in their national languages, e.g. by providing sufficient resources to their national standardisation bodies.

Concerning the application of REACH, ECHA follows the practice of providing in 22 official EU languages those documents aimed at SMEs and the general public (i.a. guidances, manuals, press releases) and more than 7 000 pages have been translated. The translations are provided by the Translation Centre of the bodies of the European Union ([2]). The Commission is encouraging ECHA to translate more of the guidance documents and tools, in particular those important for SMEs and they continue working on this.

ECHA's new website, launched in December 2011, also provides an increasing volume of web-pages in these languages.

([1]) As laid down in Regulation No 1/1958 of the Council determining the languages to be used by the European Economic Community, OJ L 17, 6.10.1958, as last amended by Regulation (EC) No 1791/2006, OJ L 363, 20.12.2006.

([2]) Article 104(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 of the Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 concerning the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH), establishing a European Chemicals Agency, amending Directive 1999/45/EC and repealing Council Regulation (EEC) No 793/93 and Commission Regulation (EC) No 1488/94 as well as Council Directive 76/769/EEC and Commission Directives 91/155/EEC, 93/67/EEC, 93/105/EC and 2000/21/EC, OJ L 396, 30.12.2006.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003267/12
aan de Commissie (Vicevoorzitter — Hoge Vertegenwoordiger)
Barry Madlener (NI)
(27 maart 2012)

Betreft: VP/HR — EU gaat piraten aan land bestrijden

De Europese Unie gaat ook piraten op de kust van Somalië bestrijden. De Europese antipiraterijmissie Atalanta bij de Hoorn van Afrika wordt uitgebreid. Dat zijn de ministers van Defensie van de Europese Unie donderdag overeengekomen.

Het is de bedoeling dat met gerichte operaties acties of plannen van de piraten worden verstoord. Vanuit de lucht of vanaf zee zou bijvoorbeeld een brandstof- of munitiedepot kunnen worden beschoten. Verder worden korte operaties van mariniers op een smalle kuststrook mogelijk ([1]).

1. Kan de VP/HR aangeven hoe het mandaat er uitziet voor eventuele Nederlandse militairen die in Somalië worden ingezet onder Atalanta?

2. Kan de VP/HR instaan voor de veiligheid van de Nederlandse strijdkrachten en op welke manier kunnen de Nederlandse strijdkrachten rekenen op adequate (militaire) steun?

3. Kan de VP/HR aangeven of Nederlandse militairen worden uitgerust om gevechtshandelingen te verrichten en onder welk recht vallen Nederlandse militairen die in vijandige handen vallen?

4. Kan de VP/HR aangeven waarom er nog steeds veel schepen onbeschermd ten prooi vallen aan piraterij?

5. Kan de VP/HR aangeven waar de gevangengenomen piraten worden berecht?

6. Kan de VP/HR aangeven wat de kosten zijn van deze EU-missie en wat Nederland daaraan bijdraagt? Op welke wijze worden deze kosten gefinancierd?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(17 juli 2012)

In het besluit van de Raad wordt het operatiegebied als volgt uitgebreid:

„Het operatiegebied van de hiertoe ingezette troepenmacht bestaat uit de kustgebieden en de binnenwateren van Somalië, en uit de maritieme gebieden voor de kust van Somalië en van de buurlanden binnen de regio van de Indische Oceaan, […]" ([2]).

De deelnemende Nederlandse strijdkrachten maken een volwaardig deel uit van de operatie EUNAVFOR Atalanta, die in overeenstemming met het (geheime) operatieplan wordt uitgevoerd. Momenteel nemen er geen Nederlandse oorlogsschepen deel aan de operatie.

De uitrusting van de Nederlandse strijdkrachten is een nationale verantwoordelijkheid, conform de opgave van behoeften van de operationeel commandant.

De EU heeft met de Republiek Somalië een overeenkomst inzake de status van de troepen ([3]) gesloten, waarin vrij verkeer en immuniteit tegen aanhouding of vrijheidsbeneming voor de EUNAVFOR-troepen in Somalië worden gegarandeerd. De beveiliging van schepen blijft de verantwoordelijkheid van de vlagstaat, de reders en de kapiteins. De gehele internationale gemeenschap draagt echter bij aan de bestrijding van piraterij; in het bijzonder de EU-lidstaten die deelnemen aan Atalanta werken hiervoor samen en beveiligen alle schepen die onder buitenlandse vlag varen in het kader van zowel de algemene beginselen van het Verdrag van de Verenigde Naties inzake het recht van de zee (UNCLOS) als relevante resoluties van de VN-veiligheidsraad. Tot op heden hebben echter niet alle schepen de nodige maatregelen genomen om zich doeltreffend tegen piraterij te beschermen. EUNAVFOR werkt nauw samen met vertegenwoordigers van de scheepvaartwereld en de IOM voor het bevorderen van beste beheerspraktijken.

([1]) Bron: http://www.telegraaf.nl/buitenland/11766260/__EU__piraten_aan_land_bestrijden__.html
([2]) PB L 89 van 27.3.2012, blz. 69.
([3]) PB L 10 van 15.1.2009, blz. 29.

Overeenkomstig artikel 105 van het UNCLOS en de relevante resoluties van de VN-veiligheidsraad, kunnen alle belanghebbende staten — zoals vlag-, haven- en kuststaten, staten waarvan slachtoffers en daders van piraterij en gewapende zeeroverij de nationaliteit bezitten, of andere staten met rechtsmacht — voorts nog steeds aanspraak maken op jurisdictie. Artikel 105 geldt onverminderd de toekomstige oprichting van Somalische rechtbanken die jurisdictie uitoefenen conform de toepasselijke internationale wetgeving inzake mensenrechten.

De EU heeft overdrachtsovereenkomsten gesloten met de Seychellen en Mauritius en legt de laatste hand aan een overdrachtsovereenkomst met Tanzania. De overdrachtsovereenkomst met Kenia kan worden gebruikt op basis van een ad-hocbesluit van de Keniaanse regering.

Overeenkomstig artikel 41 van het Verdrag betreffende de Europese Unie komen uitgaven die voortvloeien uit operaties die gevolgen hebben op militair of defensiegebied ten laste van de lidstaten (met uitzondering van Denemarken) volgens de bruto nationaal product-verdeelsleutel. De „gemeenschappelijke kosten" voor de operatie Atalanta bedroegen respectievelijk:

— 8,8 miljoen EUR (2010);

— 7,720 miljoen EUR (2011);

— 8 miljoen EUR (voorlopige begroting 2012).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003267/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Barry Madlener (NI)
(27 March 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — The EU is going to combat pirates on land

The European Union will also combat pirates on the Somali coast. The European anti-pirate mission, Operation Atalanta at the Horn of Africa, will be expanded. The European Union Defence Ministers agreed upon these actions on Thursday.

The intention is to disrupt pirate actions or plans with targeted operations. For example, a fuel or ammunition depot could be bombarded from the air or by sea. In addition, rapid marine operations on a narrow coastline are possible ([1]).

1. Can the VP/HR indicate what the mandate says about Dutch soldiers possibly being deployed in Somalia under Atalanta?

2. Can the VP/HR guarantee the safety of the Dutch armed forces and to what extent can the Dutch armed forces count on adequate (military) support?

3. Can the VP/HR indicate whether Dutch soldiers will be equipped to execute military operations and which law will be applicable to Dutch soldiers when captured by enemies?

4. Can the VP/HR indicate why there are still many unprotected ships falling prey to piracy?

5. Can the VP/HR indicate where the captured pirates will be brought to trial?

6. Can the VP/HR indicate the costs of this EU mission and the amount being contributed by the Netherlands? How are these costs being financed?

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

The Council decision extends the area of operation as follows:

'The area of operations of the forces deployed to that end shall consist of the Somali coastal territory and internal waters, and the maritime areas off the coasts of Somalia and neighbouring countries within the region of the Indian Ocean, …' ([2]).

The participating Dutch forces are an integral part of Operation EUNAVFOR Atalanta which is conducted in accordance with the (classified) Operations Plan. There are currently no Dutch warships active in the operation.

The equipment of Dutch forces is a national responsibility in accordance with the statement of requirements of the Operation Commander.

The EU has concluded a Status of Forces agreement with the Somali Republic ([3]) which foresees freedom of movement and immunity from arrest or detention for EUNAVFOR forces in Somalia.

The protection of ships remains a responsibility of the Flag State, shipowners and shipmasters. However, the international community as a whole contributes to the fight against piracy, and in particular EU Member States participating to Atalanta cooperate to the fight against piracy protecting all foreign flagged ships in the framework of both Unclos general principles and pertinent UNSCRs. To date however, not all ships take the required measures to effectively protect them of piracy. EUNAVFOR is working closely with representatives of the shipping community and IOM to promote Best Management Practices.

Furthermore, in accordance with Article 105 of the Unclos and the relevant UNSCRs it is still possible for all interested States — such as flag, port, and coastal States, States of the nationality of victims, and perpetrators of piracy and armed robbery, or other States with relevant jurisdiction — to claim jurisdiction. The previsions of Article 105

([1]) *Source:* http://www.telegraaf.nl/buitenland/11766260/__EU__piraten_aan_land_bestrijden__.html
([2]) OJ L 89, 27.3.2012, p. 70.
([3]) OJ L 10, 15.1.2009, p. 41.

are to be considered without prejudice to the future establishment of Somali Courts exercising jurisdiction consistent with applicable international human rights law.

The EU signed transfer agreements with the Seychelles and Mauritius; a further transfer agreement is being finalised with Tanzania. The transfer agreement with Kenya can be used on the basis of ad-hoc decision making by the Kenyan government.

Pursuant to Article 41 of the Treaty on EU, expenditure arising from operations with military or defence implications are charged to the Member States (with the exception of Denmark) in accordance with the gross national product scale. The 'Common costs' of Operation Atalanta were respectively:

— EUR 8.8 million (2010);

— EUR 7.720 million (2011);

— EUR 8 million (2012 provisional budget).

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003290/12
à la Commission
Frédérique Ries (ALDE)
(27 mars 2012)

Objet: Autorisation de mise sur le marché de l'Union européenne de la stévia comme additif alimentaire

En novembre 2011, la Commission européenne publiait au Journal officiel de l'Union européenne le règlement (UE) nº 1131/2011 autorisant l'usage des glycosides de stéviol comme édulcorants, issus d'une plante sud-américaine: la stévia.

Elle reconnaissait implicitement à travers cette autorisation de mise sur le marché, effective en début d'année 2012, l'innocuité de ces édulcorants naturels, dont le pouvoir sucrant est considéré jusqu'à 300 fois plus élevé que celui du sucre ordinaire, rejoignant ainsi l'avis positif remis en avril 2010 par l'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments.

Cette reconnaissance, même tardive, laisse augurer une diversification de l'offre, notamment dans les boissons «light», mais aussi dans une large gamme de produits, dont des yaourts, des céréales, des sodas, des confiseries, des chocolats et des édulcorants de table. Elle pourrait également satisfaire la demande croissante des consommateurs européens, nombreux à se tourner vers les produits dits de «santé naturelle».

La Commission peut-elle dresser un premier état des lieux de la commercialisation de la stévia sur le marché de l'Union depuis l'entrée en application du règlement (UE) nº 1131/2011?

Peut-elle confirmer que le règlement (UE) nº 1131/2011 n'est pas restrictif et qu'il ne limite pas l'application de la stévia aux édulcorants de table (sous forme de sucrettes) et aux boissons aromatisées édulcorées au détriment d'autres applications, par exemple dans le domaine de la boulangerie-pâtisserie?

La Commission estime-t-elle également que, si l'on est en droit de se féliciter de la mise sur le marché d'un édulcorant naturel commercialisé en toute sécurité depuis près de 50 ans au Japon et en Amérique du Sud, il est important de rester vigilant face au risque d'appropriation de cette substance, et des possibles brevets sur les stéviosides, par les «géants» du secteur de l'agroalimentaire?

Réponse donnée par M. Dalli au nom de la Commission
(2 mai 2012)

Dans son avis relatif aux glycosides de stéviol, l'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments (EFSA) a conclu que leur utilisation en tant qu'édulcorant ne présentait globalement pas de danger. Compte tenu des utilisations proposées, tant pour les adultes que pour les enfants, l'EFSA a toutefois également estimé que les grands consommateurs de cet édulcorant risquaient d'en dépasser la dose journalière acceptable (de 4 mg/kg de poids corporel, exprimée en équivalents stéviols). La Commission a par conséquent prié les demandeurs d'autorisation de revoir les utilisations envisagées, afin de parvenir à un niveau d'utilisation sans danger.

Sur la base des niveaux d'utilisation révisés proposés par les demandeurs d'autorisation et d'un nouvel avis rendu par l'EFSA, la Commission a adopté le règlement (UE) n° 1131/2011 ([1]) du 9 novembre 2011, qui autorise l'utilisation des glycosides de stéviol en tant qu'édulcorant. L'utilisation des glycosides de stéviol est désormais permise à des doses à la fois sans danger et fonctionnelles, en tant qu'édulcorant, dans 31 catégories d'aliments.

À ce jour, la Commission ne dispose pas d'informations quant à la façon dont les glycosides de stéviol sont commercialisés dans l'UE depuis l'adoption du règlement.

Leur autorisation dans les produits de boulangerie fine n'a pas été envisagée, car aucune demande ne portait sur leur utilisation dans cette catégorie d'aliments.

Comme tous les autres additifs alimentaires, les glycosides de stéviol respectant les spécifications fixées par le règlement (UE) n° 231/2012 ([2]) peuvent être commercialisés librement et utilisés par tous les producteurs de denrées alimentaires, dans le respect de la législation de l'UE.

([1]) JO L 295 du 12.11.2011.
([2]) JO L 83 du 22.3.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003290/12
to the Commission
Frédérique Ries (ALDE)
(27 March 2012)

Subject: Authorisation for stevia to be made available as a food additive on the EU market

In November 2011, the Commission published in the *Official Journal of the European Union* Commission Regulation (EU) No 1131/2011 authorising the use of steviol glycosides, derived from the South American stevia plant, as sweeteners.

By authorising their placement on the market, with effect from the beginning of 2012, the Commission implicitly recognised that these natural sweeteners, considered to be up to 300 times as sweet as ordinary sugar, were harmless, a view that was in line with the positive opinion issued by the European Food Safety Authority in April 2010.

Although late in coming, this recognition holds out the prospect of product diversification, in particular of 'light' drinks, but also of a wide range of other products, including yoghurts, cereals, fizzy drinks, confectionery, chocolate and table top sweeteners. It could also meet increasing demand from European consumers, many of whom are switching to 'naturally healthy' products.

Could the Commission provide an initial assessment regarding the way in which stevia has been marketed on the EU market over the period since Commission Regulation (EU) No 1131/2011 came into effect?

Can it confirm that Commission Regulation (EU) No 1131/2011 is not restrictive and that it does not limit the use of stevia to table top sweeteners (in the form of artificial sweetener tablets) and sweetened flavoured drinks at the expense of other possible uses, for example in cakes and other bakery items?

Although allowing a natural sweetener that has been safely marketed in Japan and South America for nearly 50 years to be sold on the EU market is a welcome step, does the Commission also recognise the importance of preventing this substance and any patents awarded for steviosides from being monopolised by the 'giants' of the food industry?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(2 May 2012)

The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) concluded in its opinion on steviol glycosides that in general the use of steviol glycosides as sweetener is safe. However, EFSA also concluded that with the proposed uses, both in adults and children, it is likely that the Acceptable Daily Intake (4 mg/kg body weight expressed as steviol glycosides) could be exceeded for high level consumers. The Commission therefore requested the applicants to reconsider these uses in order to arrive at a safe level of use.

Taking into account the revised uses proposed by the applicant and additional advice of EFSA, the Commission adopted Regulation (EU) No 1131/2011 ([1]) on 9 November 2011 authorising the use of steviol glycosides as a sweetener. The use of steviol glycosides is now authorised at levels that are safe and at the same time functional as sweetener in 31 different food categories.

The Commission does not presently dispose of information regarding the way in which steviol glycosides have been marketed in the EU since the adoption of the regulation.

The authorisation of steviol glycosides in fine bakery ware was not considered as none of the applicants requested an authorisation for use of the sweetener in that food category.

As for all other food additives steviol glycosides that comply with the specifications laid down in Regulation (EU) No 231/2012 ([2]), can be freely marketed and used in accordance with the EU legislation by all food producers.

([1]) OJ L 295, 12.11.2011.
([2]) OJ L 83, 22.03.2012.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003322/12
aan de Commissie
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(28 maart 2012)

Betreft: Ryanair

De luchtvaartorganisatie Ryanair is in België actief op de luchthaven van Charleroi en stelt Belgische piloten tewerk. Hoewel België de uitvalsbasis is voor de piloten, zijn ze officieel ingeschreven in Ierland, waar zich de hoofdzetel van het bedrijf bevindt. Hierbij ontstaat een situatie waarbij Belgische piloten die door Ryanair tewerkgesteld worden in België onder het Ierse belastingsregime vallen en dus minder duur zijn dan Belgische piloten die door andere luchtvaartmaatschappijen in België worden tewerkgesteld. Zo kost een piloot met hetzelfde brutoloon aan Ryanair veel minder dan aan bijvoorbeeld Brussels Airlines en toch krijgt een piloot die in België ingeschreven is minder loon uitbetaald dan zijn collega die in Ierland ingeschreven is.

Deze situatie wijkt af van de algemene regel dat je beroepsinkomen belast wordt in het land waar je werkt. Hierdoor ontstaat een situatie die de arbeidsmarkt voor piloten in België geheel ontwricht. Ook in andere lidstaten — onder meer in Frankrijk, Spanje en Italië — werden hieromtrent reeds klachten geformuleerd (o.a. middels parlementaire vraag P-8653/2010).

1. Kan de Commissie een overzicht geven van de klachten die zij over deze problematiek reeds heeft ontvangen vanuit de lidstaten?

2. Zijn deze praktijken verenigbaar met de doelstellingen in het EU Verdrag?

3. Oordeelt de Commissie dat de praktijken van Ryanair in overeenstemming zijn met de Europese regelgeving, en meer bepaald met Verordening (EG) nr. 593/2008 over het recht dat van toepassing is op contractuele verplichtingen en de uitspraak van het Europees Hof van Justitie in de zaak Koelzsch (C-29/10) hierover en Verordening (EG) nr. 1899/2006 inzake de harmonisatie van technische voorschriften en administratieve procedures op het gebied van de burgerluchtvaart?

Antwoord van de heer Andor namens de Commissie
(28 juni 2012)

1. Behalve een vraag om inlichtingen over het salaris van de stewardessen en niet van de piloten, heeft de Commissie daarover geen enkele klacht ontvangen.

2. Over het algemeen is de inkomstenbelasting in de EU niet geharmoniseerd, zodat de nationale systemen van de lidstaten van elkaar kunnen verschillen zonder daarom in strijd te zijn met de EU-wetgeving. Ook de verdeling van de heffingsbevoegdheid tussen de lidstaten is niet gereguleerd op EU-niveau, maar wordt in plaats daarvan geregeld bij tussen de lidstaten gesloten verdragen ter voorkoming van dubbele belasting. De EU kan alleen optreden tegen discriminatie door een lidstaat bij de uitoefening van de hem verleende heffingsbevoegdheid.

3. De door Ryanair toegepaste praktijken bij de indienstneming van vliegtuigbemanningsleden, zoals beschreven door de geachte afgevaardigde, zijn niet in strijd met Verordening (EG) nr. 1899/2006 ([1]), die alleen de veiligheidsaspecten van luchtvaartactiviteiten en de veiligheidsvoorschriften voor de luchtvaart reguleert. De regels betreffende de vaststelling van het op verbintenissen uit overeenkomst toepasselijke recht zijn vastgelegd in Verordening (EG) nr. 593/2008 ([2]). Overeenkomstig artikel 8 van deze verordening wordt een individuele arbeidsovereenkomst beheerst door het recht dat de partijen hebben gekozen. Deze keuze mag er evenwel niet toe leiden dat de werknemer de bescherming verliest die hij geniet op grond van bepalingen waarvan niet bij overeenkomst mag worden afgeweken op grond van het recht van het land waar of, bij gebreke daarvan, van waaruit de werknemer gewoonlijk zijn arbeid verricht.

In 2010 heeft de Commissie voorgesteld Verordening (EG) nr. 883/2004 ([3]) betreffende de coördinatie van de socialezekerheidsstelsels te wijzigen om de wetgeving met betrekking tot de „thuisbasis" aan te passen aan

([1]) Verordening (EG) nr. 1899/2006 van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 12 december 2006 houdende wijziging van Verordening (EEG) nr. 3922/91 van de Raad inzake de harmonisatie van technische voorschriften en administratieve procedures op het gebied van de burgerluchtvaart, PB L 377 van 27.12.2006.

([2]) Verordening (EG) nr. 593/2008 van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 17 juni 2008 inzake het recht dat van toepassing is op verbintenissen uit overeenkomst (Rome I), PB L 309 van 24.11.2009.

([3]) Verordening (EG) nr. 883/2004 van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 29 april 2004 betreffende de coördinatie van de socialezekerheidsstelsels, PB L 166 van 30.4.2004.

Verordening (EG) nr. 1899/2006. Het voorstel is onlangs door de Raad en het Europees Parlement goedgekeurd en zal medio 2012 in werking treden. Alle bemanningsleden die voor Ryanair werken en hun thuisbasis in Charleroi hebben, zullen dan ook onder de Belgische socialezekerheidswetgeving vallen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003322/12
to the Commission
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(28 March 2012)

Subject: Ryanair

The airline company Ryanair is active in Belgium at Charleroi Airport and employs Belgian pilots. Although Belgium is the operating base for the pilots, they are officially registered in Ireland, where the company headquarters are located. This fact creates a situation in which Belgian pilots employed by Ryanair in Belgium fall under the Irish tax regime and, therefore, are less expensive than Belgian pilots who are employed by other airline companies in Belgium. So a pilot with the same gross salary costs much less to Ryanair than to, for example, Brussels Airlines, and yet a pilot who is registered in Belgium receives a lower salary than a colleague who is registered in Ireland.

This situation deviates from the general rule that your income is taxed in the country where you work. Consequently, a situation arises that completely disrupts the labour market for pilots in Belgium. Complaints of the same nature have also already been drawn up in other Member States — including in France, Spain and Italy (among others, through parliamentary Question P-8653/2010).

1. Can the Commission provide an overview of the complaints that have already been received from Member States on this issue?

2. Are these practices compatible with the objectives in the EU Treaty?

3. Does the Commission find that Ryanair's practices are in agreement with the European rules, and, more specifically, with Regulation (EC) No 593/2008 on the law applicable to contractual obligations and the decision by the European Court of Justice in the Koelzsch case (C-29/10) about this issue, and Regulation (EC) No 1899/2006 on the harmonisation of technical requirements and administrative procedures in the field of civil aviation?

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

1. With the exception of a request for information concerning flight attendants' salaries rather than pilots' salaries, the Commission has not received any complaints on this issue.

2. Income taxation is generally not harmonised in the EU, so that Member States' national systems can differ from each other, without this being contrary to EC law. Also, the division of taxing rights between Member States is not regulated at EU level, but is governed by double taxation conventions between Member States instead. The EU could only intervene against discriminations operated by one or the other Member State in the exercise of the taxing rights allocated to it. .

3. Ryanair's practice of flight crew employment as described by the Honourable Member is not contrary to Regulation (EC) No 1899/2006 ([1]), which only regulates safety aspects of airline operations and aviation safety requirements. The rules governing the law applicable to contractual obligations are laid down in Regulation (EC) No 593/2008 ([2]). According to Article 8 of this regulation, an individual employment contract is governed by the law chosen by the parties. Such a choice of law may not, however, have the result of depriving the employee of the protection afforded to him by provisions that cannot be derogated from by agreement under the law of the country in which or, failing that, from which the employee habitually carries out his work.

In 2010 the Commission proposed to amend Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 ([3]) on the coordination of social security systems in order to align the legislation applicable to the 'home base' on Regulation (EC) No 1899/2006. The proposal was adopted by the Council and EP recently and will be applicable by summer 2012. All aircrew members who work for Ryanair and have their home base in Charleroi will therefore be subject to Belgian social security legislation.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1899/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006 amending Council Regulation (EEC) No 3922/91 on the harmonisation of technical requirements and administrative procedures in the field of civil aviation, OJ L 377, 27.12.2006.
([2]) Regulation (EC) No 593/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 June 2008 on the law applicable to contractual obligations (Rome I), OJ L 309, 24.11.2009.
([3]) Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the coordination of social security systems OJ L 166, 30.4.2004.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003323/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(28 de Março de 2012)

Assunto: Valor alocado às 11 Regiões Ultraperiféricas e de baixa densidade populacional no âmbito da dotação específica da Política de Coesão 2014/2020

— A proposta da Comissão Europeia de Regulamento do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativa ao estabelecimento do Fundo Europeu de Desenvolvimento Regional (FEDER) e ao objetivo de Investimento no Crescimento e no Emprego (COM(2011)614 final) para a Política de Coesão entre 2014 e 2020, refere que existem grandes disparidades entre os países da União Europeia em termos de desenvolvimento, produtividade e emprego, sendo evidente a necessidade de tomar as necessárias medidas programáticas;

— No período compreendido entre 2014 e 2020, as Regiões Ultraperiféricas e as Regiões menos povoadas possuem uma dotação adicional específica de 926 milhões de euros, equivalente a uma diminuição de 47 % das verbas atribuídas no anterior período de programação a preços de 2011;

— Segundo a resposta (E-009784/2011) do Comissário Europeu da Política Regional, Johannes Hahn, as regiões NUTS-2 elegíveis para a referida dotação específica são: Canárias (Espanha), Guadalupe, Martinica, Guiana Francesa, Ilha da Reunião (França), Região Autónoma dos Açores e Região Autónoma da Madeira (Portugal), Itä-Suomi, Pohjois-Suomi (Finlândia), Mellersta Norrland e Övre Norrland (Suécia);

— Na mesma resposta, foi referido que a distribuição da dotação específica se fará proporcionalmente em função da população, sendo o montante per capita 20 euros/habitante/ano;

— Em março de 2012, o Eurostat apresentou o índice do PIB per capita referente ao ano de 2009, sendo possível aferir que as 7 Regiões Ultraperiféricas ficaram 0,8 % mais ricas que a média europeia registada entre 2007 e 2009, enquanto as 4 Regiões de baixa densidade populacional empobreceram mais de 4 % no mesmo período de tempo;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Qual o valor que cada região recebeu da dotação específica no anterior período de programação?

2. Não considera que as taxas de execução são condicionadas pela elevada taxa de cofinanciamento (50 %) que é exigida às regiões?

3. Qual o valor da população das 11 regiões que será elegível para a alocação dos 926 milhões de euros e quanto irá receber cada uma no período 2014/2020?

4. Face ao empobrecimento verificado nas 11 regiões e à redução drástica do orçamento para 2014/2020, está disponível para rever as verbas consagradas na dotação específica adicional?

Resposta dada por Mr Hahn em nome da Comissão
(8 de Maio de 2012)

1. Em conformidade com o anexo II, ponto 20, do Regulamento (CE) n.º 1083/2006, as regiões ultraperiféricas e as regiões setentrionais escassamente povoadas receberam financiamentos suplementares cujos montantes são os seguintes (em euros, a preços de 2004)

Canarias: 434 492 233
Guadeloupe: 106 738 527
Martinique: 95 176 486
Guyane: 42 871 269
Réunion: 182 622 623
Região Autónoma dos Açores: 58 206 001
Região Autónoma da Madeira: 58 848 251
Itä-Suomi: 164 835 524
Pohjois-Suomi: 153 552 511
Mellersta Norrland and Övre Norrland: 215 598 656

2. As baixas taxas de execução devem-se sobretudo ao arranque moroso dos programas do período de 2007 a 2013. No entanto, nas regiões escassamente povoadas de Mellersta Norrland e Övre Norrland, na Suécia, as taxas de execução são muito elevadas (de 100 % para projetos no terreno, até janeiro de 2012).

3. A totalidade da população das 11 regiões será elegível para efeitos do financiamento suplementar proposto. A Comissão propôs a repartição proporcional das verbas suplementares, em função da população total destas regiões.

4. No contexto das negociações relativas ao quadro financeiro plurianual para 2014/2020, a Comissão não irá perder de vista esta questão e procurará chegar a resultados equitativos para todas as regiões, incluindo as regiões ultraperiféricas e as regiões setentrionais escassamente povoadas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003323/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(28 March 2012)

Subject: Sum allocated to the outermost and sparsely populated regions from the specific funding package for cohesion policy 2014-2020

— The European Commission proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on specific provisions concerning the European Regional Development Fund and the Investment for growth and jobs goal (COM(2011) 0614 final) for cohesion policy between 2014 and 2020 mentions that there are major disparities between the countries of the European Union in terms of development, productivity and employment, and there is a clear need to take the necessary programme measures.

— In the period between 2014 and 2020, the outermost and sparsely populated regions have a specific additional allocation of EUR 926 million, which equates, at 2011 prices, to a 47 % decrease from the funding allocated in the previous programming period.

— According to answer E-009784/2011 from the European Commissioner for Regional Policy, Johannes Hahn, the NUTS-2 regions eligible for the aforementioned specific allocation are: the Canary Islands (Spain); Guadeloupe, Martinique and French Guiana (France); the Autonomous Region of the Azores and the Autonomous Region of Madeira (Portugal); Itä-Suomi and Pohjois-Suomi (Finland); and Mellersta Norrland and Övre Norrland (Sweden).

— In the same answer, mention was made that these specific funds will be allocated proportionally, according to population, to the value of EUR 20 per inhabitant per year.

— In March 2012, Eurostat published the index of gross domestic product per capita for 2009. This showed that the seven outermost regions were 0.8 % richer than the European average recorded between 2007 and 2009, while the four sparsely populated regions became more than 4 % poorer over the same period.

Can the Commission answer the following:

1. What sum did each region receive from the specific funding allocation in the previous programming period?

2. Does it not believe that the implementation rates are conditioned by the high co-financing rate required from the regions?

3. How much of the population in the 11 regions will be eligible for allocation of the EUR 926 million and what amount will each receive in the period 2014-2020?

4. In light of the impoverishment in the 11 regions and the drastic cuts in the budget for 2014-2020, is it prepared to review the funds allocated in the specific additional allocation?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(8 May 2012)

1. In accordance with Annex II, § 20 of Council Regulation (EC) 1083/2006, the outermost regions and the sparsely populated northern regions received the following amounts (EUR, in 2004 prices) as additional funding:

Canarias: 434 492 233
Guadeloupe: 106 738 527
Martinique: 95 176 486
Guyane: 42 871 269
Réunion: 182 622 623
Região Autónoma dos Açores: 58 206 001
Região Autónoma da Madeira: 58 848 251
Itä-Suomi: 164 835 524
Pohjois-Suomi: 153 552 511
Mellersta Norrland and Övre Norrland: 215 598 656

2. Low implementation rates have mainly been due to a slow start of the programmes of the 2007-2013 period. However, in the sparsely populated regions of Mellersta Norrland and Övre Norrland in Sweden implementation rates are very high (100 % allocated to projects on the ground by January 2012).

3. The entire population of the 11 regions will be eligible for the proposed additional allocation. The Commission has proposed to distribute the additional funding pro-rata according to the total population of these regions.

4. In the context of the negotiations on the multi-annual financial framework 2014-20 the Commission will keep this aspect under consideration and will try to find equitable outcomes for all regions, including the outermost regions and the sparsely populated northern regions.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003602/12
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(4 april 2012)

Betreft: Eisen ten aanzien van dierentuinen

Richtlijn 1999/22/EG van de Raad van de Europese Unie van 29 maart 1999 betreffende het houden van wilde dieren in dierentuinen (dierentuinrichtlijn) borduurt voort op Verordening 338/97/EG. Op grond van de richtlijn moeten dierentuinen vijf instandhoudingsmaatregelen uitvoeren. Eén van deze vereisten is dat dierentuinen moeten deelnemen aan onderzoek ten behoeve van het behoud van de diersoorten, en/of aan opleiding in relevante vaardigheden gericht op het behoud en/of fokken van dieren in gevangenschap, herstel van de populatie of het herintroduceren van soorten in hun natuurlijke omgeving.

Dit vereiste brengt hoge kosten met zich mee voor de dierentuinen en geeft aanleiding tot de volgende vragen aan de Commissie:

1a. Draagt het onderzoek en onderwijs naar verwachting bij aan de doelen die de Commissie zich heeft gesteld met betrekking tot het behoud van biodiversiteit?

1b. Is het genoemde vereiste effectief?

2a. Is de Commissie zich bewust van de kosten die dit vereiste in Richtlijn 1999/22/EG met zich meebrengt voor dierentuinen?

2b. Is het vereiste efficiënt?

3. Welke voorziening heeft de Commissie getroffen als tegemoetkoming aan de dierentuinen voor de onderzoeks- en onderwijskosten die zij moeten maken om aan het vereiste te kunnen voldoen?

4. Zijn er dierentuinen die via de Commissie een vergoeding hebben ontvangen om aan één of meer van de instandhoudingsmaatregelen te voldoen?

5. Indien de Commissie geen voorzieningen heeft getroffen ter tegemoetkoming aan dierentuinen, op welke wijze voorziet de Commissie dat deze kosten door de dierentuinen kunnen worden opgebracht?

Antwoord van de heer Potočnik namens de Commissie
(25 mei 2012)

Hoewel de grootste inspanningen voor de instandhouding en het duurzame gebruik van de biodiversiteit, zowel in Europa als mondiaal, op maatregelen „in situ" moeten zijn gericht, is ook voor instandhoudingsmaatregelen „ex situ" een rol weggelegd. In dat verband wordt met Richtlijn 1999/22/EG van de Raad betreffende het houden van wilde dieren in dierentuinen ([1]) beoogd de bescherming en de instandhouding van wilde diersoorten te bevorderen door de rol van dierentuinen bij de instandhouding van de biodiversiteit te versterken.

In de richtlijn is niet voorzien in EU-medefinanciering van maatregelen om de doelstellingen van de richtlijn te halen, ook niet met betrekking tot onderzoek en opleiding. De Commissie beschikt niet over een kostenraming voor de onderzoeksvereisten en beschouwt het evenmin als haar taak een tegemoetkoming in de kosten die worden gemaakt ter nakoming van de verplichtingen uit hoofde van de richtlijn te verstrekken. Het is de verantwoordelijkheid van de bevoegde autoriteiten in de lidstaten om ervoor te zorgen dat de bepalingen van de richtlijn worden toegepast.

De Commissie blijft ijveren voor de tenuitvoerlegging van de dierentuinenrichtlijn en zal in 2012 een studie laten uitvoeren die is bedoeld om richtsnoeren te ontwikkelen ter bevordering van het delen van ervaring en goede praktijken met het oog op de tenuitvoerlegging van de dierentuinenrichtlijn. Zij houdt zich ook bezig met opleiding voor overheidsambtenaren en betrokken beroepsbeoefenaars, met name dierenartsen en bestuurders van dierentuinen, alsook leden van niet-gouvernementele organisaties die werkzaam zijn op dit gebied.

In de LIFE+-verordening ([2]) is voorzien in EU-medefinanciering voor biodiversiteit, met inbegrip van medefinanciering voor instandhoudingsmaatregelen ex situ. Dierentuinen komen in aanmerking om dergelijke financiering aan te vragen overeenkomstig de doelstelling en de regels van LIFE+.

([1]) PB L 94 van 9.4.1999.
([2]) PB L 149 van 9.6.2007.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003602/12
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(4 April 2012)

Subject: Requirements regarding zoos

Directive 1999/22/EC from the Council of the European Union of 29 March 1999 regarding the keeping of wild animals in zoos (Zoo Directive) elaborates on Regulation 338/97/EC. Based on the directive, zoos must implement five conservation measures. One of these requirements is that zoos must participate in research benefiting the preservation of animal species, and/or training in relevant skills focusing on the preservation and/or breeding of animals in captivity, restoration of the population or the reintroduction of species into their natural environment.

This requirement entails high costs for zoos and gives rise to the following questions to the Commission:

1a. Does the research and training contribute as expected to the goals that the Commission has set for itself regarding the preservation of biodiversity?

1b. Is the stated requirement effective?

2a. Is the Commission aware of the costs for zoos that the research requirement in Directive 1999/22/EC entails?

2b. Is the requirement efficient?

3. What provision has the Commission made by way of compensation to zoos for the research and training costs that they must incur in order to be able to meet the requirement?

4. Are there zoos that have received compensation via the Commission in order to comply with one or more of the conservation measures?

5. If the Commission has not made any provisions by way of compensation to zoos, how does the Commission anticipate that these costs will be able to be covered by the zoos?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(25 May 2012)

Whereas the greatest efforts for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity need to focus on *in situ* measures, both in Europe and globally, there is also a role for *ex situ* conservation and in this context Council Directive 1999/22/EC relating to the keeping of wild animals in zoos ([1]) aims to promote wild animal species protection and conservation by strengthening the role of zoos in the conservation of biodiversity.

The directive does not foresee EU co-financing of measures to achieve the objectives of the directive, including in relation to research and training. The Commission does not have any estimate of costs for research requirements nor does it consider that it has a role to play in compensation for fulfilment of the obligations of the directive. It is the responsibility of the relevant authorities in the Member States to ensure that the provisions of the directive are applied.

The Commission continues to support implementation of the Zoos Directive and will be launching a study in 2012 aimed at developing guidance to help promote the sharing of experience and of good practice for the implementation of the Zoos Directive. It is also engaged in training for government officials and relevant practitioners, particularly veterinarians and managers of Zoological gardens as well as members of non-governmental organisations operating in the field.

EU co-financing for biodiversity, including in relation to ex-situ conservation measures, is possible under the LIFE+ Regulation ([2]) and Zoos are eligible to apply for such funding in accordance with the objective and rules governing this programme.

([1]) OJ L 94, 9.4.1999.
([2]) OJ L 149, 9.6.2007.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003603/12
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(4 april 2012)

Betreft: Carbon footprint van biobrandstof

Op 29 maart jongsleden is een „breakfast meeting" gehouden over „Carbon emissions from bioenergy" onder voorzitterschap van Linda McAvan MEP (S&D). Tijdens deze bijeenkomst werd door verschillende onderzoekers aangetoond dat de CO_2-uitstoot als gevolg van het aanwenden van biomassa voor energie, groter is dan de CO_2-uitstoot als gevolg van het aanwenden van fossiele energiedragers voor energie.

Op deze bijeenkomst was ook het hoofd van de administratieve eenheid in DG Energie van de Europese Commissie aanwezig. Deze gaf tijdens de bijeenkomst aan dat, ondanks deze hogere CO_2-uitstoot door het gebruik van biomassa voor de opwekking van energie, de Europese Commissie het gebruik van bio-energie blijft voorstaan.

1. Deelt de Commissie dit standpunt van het hoofd van de administratieve eenheid in DG Energie van de Europese Commissie.?

2. Zo ja, hoe moet ik in dat licht de Energy Roadmap 2050 begrijpen?

In de Energy Roadmap 2050 staat dat het doel van de EU is om de uitstoot van broeikasgassen in 2050 met 80-95 % terug te dringen. Ook staat daarin dat de elektriciteitsproductie in 2050 vrij van broeikasgassen moet zijn. Deze doelen stroken mijns inziens niet met het voorstaan van het gebruik van biomassa als energiedrager, zoals het hoofd van de administratieve eenheid propageert.

3. Zo neen, wat is het standpunt van de Commissie over het gebruik van biomassa als energiedrager met betrekking tot de hoge uitstoot van CO_2 bij het aanwenden van die biomassa als brandstof?

Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie
(30 mei 2012)

De Commissie analyseert momenteel de bestaande wetenschappelijke studies betreffende de biogene koolstofemissies van biomassa, die niet allemaal tot dezelfde conclusies komen aangezien het resultaat afhangt van talrijke factoren (soorten, teeltrotatie, opbrengst).

In het Stappenplan Energie 2050 ([1]) wordt aangegeven dat het gebruik van biomassa aanzienlijk zal moeten toenemen om de broeikasgasemissies met 80-95 % te kunnen verminderen. De Commissie is van mening dat biomassa een belangrijke bijdrage zal leveren tot het koolstofarm maken van de energiesector en buigt zich momenteel over de behoefte aan aanvullende duurzaamheidseisen met betrekking tot vaste biomassa.

([1]) COM(2011) 885 definitief.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003603/12
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(4 April 2012)

Subject: Carbon footprint left by biofuels

At a breakfast meeting held on 29 March 2012 to discuss carbon emissions from bioenergy chaired by Linda McAvan, MEP (S&D), a number of researchers pointed out that biomass power generation produced higher CO_2 emission levels than energy from fossil fuels.

A Head of Unit from the Commission's Directorate-General for Energy also present at the meeting indicated that the Commission was continuing to advocate the use of biomass as an energy source, notwithstanding the higher CO_2 emission levels resulting.

1. Does the Commission in fact concur with what was said by the Head of Unit from its Directorate-General for Energy?

2. If so, what interpretation must be placed in this context on the 2050 Energy Roadmap, which states that the EU objective is to achieve an 80-95 % reduction in greenhouse gas emissions or even the total elimination thereof with regard to electricity generation by 2050, given that these objectives would appear to be at variance with the use of biomass to generate energy as advocated by the Head of Unit?

3. If not, what are the Commission's views regarding biomass power generation, given the high resulting CO_2 emission levels?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2012)

The Commission is currently analysing the scientific studies carried out on biogenic carbon emissions from biomass which do not all lead to the same conclusions since the outcomes depend on many factors (species, rotation pattern, yield).

The Energy Roadmap 2050 ([1]) points out that biomass use will need to grow significantly to reduce emissions by 80-95%. The Commission is of the opinion that biomass will make a major contribution to decarbonisation of the energy sector and is currently considering if there is a need to introduce additional sustainability requirements for solid biomass.

([1]) COM(2011) 885 final.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003604/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(4 Απριλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Διάβρωση ακτών στη Βόρεια Πελοπόννησο

Στη βόρεια ακτή της Πελοποννήσου εμφανίζεται, εδώ και πολλά χρόνια, το φαινόμενο της διάβρωσης των ακτών και της ανόδου της στάθμης της θάλασσας. Πιο συγκεκριμένα, στην περιοχή Δερβένι Κορινθίας, στις 29.2.2012, παρατηρήθηκε γενικευμένη διάβρωση της παράλιας ζώνης, λόγω υποχώρησης του βυθού της παραλίας (έως και 30 μέτρα), καταστρέφοντας δεκάδες οικίες και επιχειρήσεις.

Η συγκεκριμένη περιοχή εμφανίζεται, τόσο στην Πανευρωπαϊκή Έκθεση για τη διάβρωση των ακτών (Μάιος 2004 — Eurosion: Coastal Erosion. Evaluation of the need for Action, Part II, Maps and Statistics, σελ. 12), όσο και στη βάση δεδομένων του Ευρωπαϊκού Οργανισμού Περιβάλλοντος για τις παράκτιες περιοχές (European coastal lowlands most vulnerable to sea level rise), ως ιδιαίτερα ευάλωτη, όσον αφορά τις επιπτώσεις της διάβρωσης των ακτών και της ανόδου του επιπέδου της θάλασσας.

Με δεδομένο το πρόβλημα στη συγκεκριμένη περιοχή, καθώς επίσης και του γεγονότος ότι το 31,6 % των ελληνικών ακτών και το 50 % των ακτών της Πελοποννήσου αντιμετωπίζουν προβλήματα διάβρωσης των ακτών (βλ. Έκθεση Eurosion), ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Ποιες είναι οι δυνατότητες αξιοποίησης ευρωπαϊκών ταμείων για τη χρηματοδότηση συγκεκριμένων δράσεων, προκειμένου να αντιμετωπιστεί αυτό το φαινόμενο;

2. Γνωρίζει η Επιτροπή ποιες είναι οι καλύτερες πρακτικές για την αντιμετώπιση τέτοιων προβλημάτων, που έχουν εφαρμοστεί σε χώρες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης ή και αλλού;

Απάντηση του κ. Potočnik εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(6 Ιουνίου 2012)

1. Οι εργασίες για την καταπολέμηση της διάβρωσης των ακτών θα μπορούσαν να χρηματοδοτηθούν από το Εθνικό Στρατηγικό Πλαίσιο Αναφοράς, είτε στο πλαίσιο του Επιχειρησιακού Προγράμματος για το Περιβάλλον είτε στο πλαίσιο του σχετικού Περιφερειακού Επιχειρησιακού Προγράμματος, υπό τον όρο ότι θα πληρούν τα καθορισμένα κριτήρια επιλεξιμότητας. Εναπόκειται όμως στις ελληνικές αρχές να προτείνουν, να προετοιμάζουν και να εκτελούν τέτοια έργα.

2. Πληροφορίες σχετικά με τις καλλίτερες πρακτικές για την αντιμετώπιση προβλημάτων διάβρωσης των ακτών περιλαμβάνονται στους ακόλουθους ιστότοπους:

http://ec.europa.eu/ourcoast/index.cfm?menuID=3 και http://www.eurosion.org

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003604/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(4 April 2012)

Subject: Coastal erosion in the Northern Peloponnese

The northern coastline of the Peloponnese has been afflicted by erosion and sea level rise for many years. More specifically, in the region of Derveni, Corinthia, on 29 February 2012, generalised erosion of the coastal zone was observed on account of seabed subsidence (up to 30 m) along the coastline, destroying dozens of houses and business premises.

In both the Pan-European Report on Coastal Erosion (May 2004 — Eurosion: Coastal Erosion — Evaluation of the need for Action, Part II, Maps and Statistics, p. 12) and the European Environment Agency database on European coastal lowlands most vulnerable to sea level rise, the area in question is characterised as particularly vulnerable, on account of the effects of coastal erosion and rising sea levels.

Given the problem that exists in this area, along with the fact that 31.6% of the Greek coastline and 50% of the Peloponnese coastline are facing problems of coastal erosion (see Eurosion report) can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. What are the possibilities of utilising European funds for financing specific actions to deal with this problem?

2. Does the Commission know what are the best practices for dealing with such problems which have been adopted in EU countries and/or elsewhere?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2012)

1. Coastal works to combat erosion could be co-financed through the National Strategic Reference Framework, either under the Operational Programme for the Environment or the relevant Regional Operational Programme, provided that they meet the established eligibility criteria. However, it is up to the Greek authorities to propose, prepare and carry out such projects.

2. Information on best practices for dealing with coastal erosion problems can be found at the following websites:
http://ec.europa.eu/ourcoast/index.cfm?menuID=3
http://www.eurosion.org

(English version)

Question for written answer P-003623/12
to the Commission
Catherine Stihler (S&D)
(10 April 2012)

Subject: Crane safety

In February 2012 a fatal accident inquiry in Scotland found that the fatal car crash in 2008 caused by hydraulic fluid that had leaked from a crane should, as a matter of urgency, prompt the UK Government to introduce legislation to make it a legal requirement for cranes to have an MOT test.

Given that oil spillages from cranes are commonplace as a result of poor maintenance, will the Commission consider introducing legislation to prevent any more tragic accidents of this nature happening in the EU in the future?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(16 May 2012)

1. Periodic technical inspections of road vehicles are subject to the provisions of Directive 2009/40/EC ([1]). The categories of vehicles subject to these provisions set out in Annex I currently do not include mobile cranes. However, according to Article 5, Member States are free to introduce more stringent provisions and, in particular, to extend the periodic test requirement to other categories of vehicles. Consequently, the directive does not prevent the UK from submitting mobile cranes to periodic roadworthiness tests.

The Commission is planning a revision of the European roadworthiness legislation. This modification would have the effect of including mobile cranes.

The items to be compulsorily tested during the roadworthiness test are set out in Annex II. Concerning the risk of leaks of hydraulic fluid, it may be noted that Commission Directive 2010/48/EU ([2]) introduced into Annex II the requirement to test for any excessive fluid leak likely to harm the environment or to pose a safety risk to other road users.

2. Cranes are also subject to the national provisions implementing Directive 2009/104/EC ([3]). According to Article 4 of that directive, the employer shall take the measures necessary to ensure that work equipment is subject to adequate maintenance throughout its working life.

According to Article 5, work equipment exposed to conditions causing deterioration liable to result in dangerous situations shall be subject to periodic inspections and, where appropriate, testing by competent persons.

It is for the Member States to determine which categories of work equipment are subject to such periodic inspections, the content and frequency of the inspections and by whom they may be carried out.

([1]) Directive 2009/40/EC of the Parliament and of the Council of 6 May 2009 on roadworthiness tests for motor vehicles and their trailers (Recast), OJ L 141, 6.6.2009.

([2]) Commission Directive 2010/48/EU of 5 July 2010 adapting to technical progress Directive 2009/40/EC of the Parliament and of the Council on roadworthiness tests for motor vehicles and their trailers, OJ L 173, 8.7.2010.

([3]) Directive 2009/104/EC of the Parliament and of the Council of 16 September 2009 concerning the minimum safety and health requirements for the use of work equipment by workers at work (second individual Directive within the meaning of Article 16(1) of Directive 89/391/EEC), OJ L 260, 3.10.2009.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-003627/12
a la Comisión
Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE)
(10 de abril de 2012)

Asunto: Repsol — Argentina

Las autoridades argentinas, tras una campaña injustificada de hostigamiento y amenazas de nacionalización, han retirado licencias a la petrolera Repsol-YPF en cinco provincias argentinas y amenazan con hacer lo mismo en otras tres provincias. Esta retirada carece de justificación alguna y supone un precedente peligroso para la seguridad jurídica de las empresas europeas en Argentina.

Se acusa a la petrolera de no cumplir con sus obligaciones de inversión y producción. Sin embargo, el volumen de inversión de YPF desde 2006, en Argentina, ha sido superior a los resultados con un record de inversión en 2011, a pesar de los conflictos gremiales en el sur del país que afectaron significativamente a su producción. Por ejemplo, en Chubut se ha registrado un aumento ininterrumpido en las inversiones desde 2009 que ascendieron hasta 350 millones de dólares en 2011, lo que supone un incremento del 236 % en ese periodo. Además, el índice de incorporación de reservas de YPF fue superior a la media de otras compañías, tanto en petróleo (144 %) como en gas (100 %), y presenta un ratio de producción/reservas en petróleo y gas natural superior al resto de compañías. Por otra parte YPF es una de las petroleras más innovadoras en Argentina y se ha convertido en la compañía pionera en descubrir y desarrollar un *shale oil play* en el yacimiento de Vaca Muerta.

La UE debe exigir firmemente a nuestros socios comerciales el respeto de la seguridad jurídica de las inversiones de las empresas europeas.

¿Qué acciones emprenderá la Comisión Europea para asegurar que se respeten los derechos de la petrolera europea y se garantice la seguridad jurídica de las inversiones de las empresas europeas en Argentina?

Respuesta del Sr. De Gucht en nombre de la Comisión
(15 de mayo de 2012)

La Comisión coincide con Su Señoría en que la acción emprendida por el Gobierno argentino envía una señal muy negativa a los inversores internacionales, que buscan la estabilidad y la previsibilidad para sus inversiones, y puede perjudicar gravemente el entorno empresarial en Argentina. La medida crea inseguridad jurídica no sólo para la empresa española Repsol, sino también para otras empresas europeas en Argentina.

La Comisión ha instado al Gobierno de Argentina a garantizar el cumplimiento de sus compromisos internacionales en materia de tratamiento y protección de las inversiones procedentes de un Estado miembro de la Unión Europea.

El Presidente de la Comisión trasladó claramente esta opinión a la Presidenta de Argentina el 6 de abril de 2012, a través de un mensaje enviado a través de la Delegación de la UE en Argentina. El 17 de abril de 2012, la Alta Representante/Vicepresidenta hizo una declaración en el Parlamento, insistiendo en que la decisión argentina era motivo de profunda preocupación.

El 19 de abril de 2012, el Comisario responsable de Comercio envió una carta a su homólogo argentino, reiterando las graves inquietudes de la UE sobre esta cuestión, expresadas previamente por el Presidente de la Comisión.

Debido al clima creado por la expropiación, la Comisión y la Alta Representante/Vicepresidenta decidió aplazar la Comisión Mixta UE-Argentina prevista para los días 19 y 20 de abril de 2012.

La Comisión está analizando la medida argentina y analizando todas las opciones con el fin de determinar, en colaboración con las autoridades españolas, las futuras acciones.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-003627/12
to the Commission
Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE)
(10 April 2012)

Subject: Repsol — Argentina

The Argentine authorities, after an unwarranted campaign of harassment and threats of nationalisation, have withdrawn licences from the Repsol-YPF oil company in five Argentine provinces and are threatening to do the same in three other provinces. This withdrawal has no justification whatsoever and sets a dangerous precedent for the legal certainty of European companies in Argentina.

The oil company is accused of failing to meet its investment and production obligations. However, YPF's investment in Argentina since 2006 has been higher than its income, with record investment in 2011 despite labour conflicts in the south of the country that significantly affected production. For example, in Chubut, investment had steadily increased since 2009 to reach USD 350 million in 2011, which represents an increase of 236 % over this period. Furthermore, YPF's rate of capitalisation of reserves was higher than the average for other companies both in oil (144 %) and gas (100 %), showing a higher production-reserves ratio in oil and natural gas than these other companies. YPF is also one of the most innovative oil companies in Argentina, becoming the pioneer in discovering and developing a shale oil play in the Vaca Muerta field.

The EU should demand firmly of its trading partners that they respect the legal certainty of investments by European companies.

What action will the European Commission take to ensure respect for the rights of the European oil industry and to ensure legal certainty for investments by European companies in Argentina?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(15 May 2012)

The Commission concurs with the Honourable Member's view that this action by the Argentine Government sends a very negative signal to international investors, who seek stability and predictability for their investments, and that it could seriously harm the business environment in Argentina. The measure creates legal insecurity not only for the Spanish company Repsol but also for other European firms in Argentina.

The Commission has urged the Government of Argentina to ensure compliance with its international commitments on the treatment and protection of investments originating from a Member State of the European Union.

The President of the Commission clearly conveyed this to the President of Argentina on 6 April 2012, through a message delivered via the EU Delegation in Argentina. On 17 April 2012, the High Representative/Vice-President made a statement at Parliament, reaffirming that the Argentine decision was cause for grave concern.

On 19 April 2012, the Commissioner responsible for Trade sent a letter to his Argentine counterpart, reiterating the serious concerns the EU has on this matter, as expressed beforehand by the President of the Commission.

Due to the climate created by the expropriation, the Commission and the High Representative/Vice-President decided to postpone the EU-Argentina Joint Committee foreseen for 19-20 April 2012.

The Commission is analysing the Argentine measure and exploring all options in order to determine, in liaison with the Spanish authorities, the next steps.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003633/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(10 Απριλίου 2012)

Θέμα: ΧΥΤΑ Μαυροράχης — φυσικές πηγές μεταλλικού νερού

Σε προηγούμενη ερώτησή μου (E-011586/2011) σχετικά με πρόβλημα στον βιολογικό καθαρισμό του ΧΥΤΑ Μαυροράχης, η Επιτροπή είχε απαντήσει «κατόπιν αιτήσεως της Επιτροπής, οι αρμόδιες ελληνικές αρχές διαβίβασαν τις ακόλουθες πληροφορίες σε σχέση με τον ΧΥΤΑ Μαυροράχης: δεν έχουν αναφερθεί προβλήματα στη λειτουργία του σταθμού επεξεργασίας στραγγισμάτων του ΧΥΤΑ Μαυροράχης. Η σχεδόν συνεχής ροή του νερού οφείλεται στις φυσικές πηγές μεταλλικού νερού της περιοχής, που προέρχονται από γεωλογικούς σχηματισμούς. Η χημική ανάλυση δείχνει ότι το νερό είναι εμπλουτισμένο σε σίδηρο και ενώσεις του θείου, γεγονός που δικαιολογεί το "κατακίτρινο ρεύμα που εκπέμπει την χαρακτηριστική οσμή των χημικών ουσιών"».

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— οι φυσικές πηγές στις οποίες αναφέρονται οι ελληνικές αρχές, πηγάζουν ή διέρχονται μέσα από το χώρο του ΧΥΤΑ; Η Μελέτη Περιβαλλοντικών Επιπτώσεων (ΜΠΕ) βάσει της οποίας αδειοδοτήθηκε το έργο, περιέγραφε την ύπαρξη τέτοιων πηγών; Προέβλεπε τη λήψη των απαραίτητων μέτρων, βάσει της κοινοτικής και ελληνικής νομοθεσίας, για την οριοθέτηση και την προστασία των υδάτων; Θα ήταν ποτέ δυνατόν να δοθεί άδεια λειτουργίας σε ΧΥΤΑ χωροθετημένο πάνω ή δίπλα σε φυσικές πηγές μεταλλικού νερού; Τι σκοπεύει να πράξει η Επιτροπή σε σχέση με τα παραπάνω; Ποια αρμόδια υπηρεσία διαβίβασε αυτή την πληροφορία στην Επιτροπή;

Απάντηση του κ. Potocnik εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(20 Ιουνίου 2012)

Η οδηγία περί υγειονομικής ταφής των αποβλήτων ([1]) δεν περιλαμβάνει ειδικές απαιτήσεις για την τοποθεσία του χώρου υγειονομικής ταφής, ούτε εξειδικεύει ότι η άδεια δεν πρέπει να χορηγείται σε χώρο υγειονομικής ταφής (ΧΥΤΑ) που βρίσκεται κοντά σε φυσικές πηγές μεταλλικού νερού. Αντιθέτως, η οδηγία αναφέρει ότι μπορεί να δοθεί άδεια για ΧΥΤΑ μόνον εάν τα χαρακτηριστικά του τόπου όσον αφορά ορισμένες απαιτήσεις που απαριθμούνται στην οδηγία, ή τα διορθωτικά μέτρα που πρέπει να ληφθούν, καταδεικνύουν ότι ο ΧΥΤΑ δεν συνεπάγεται σοβαρό κίνδυνο για το περιβάλλον. Η επιλογή του ΧΥΤΑ, η αξιολόγηση των κινδύνων και η απόφαση έγκρισής του εμπίπτουν στον τομέα ευθύνης των αρμοδίων αρχών του κράτους μέλους.

Οι πληροφορίες που ζητά το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου περιλαμβάνονται στην εκτίμηση περιβαλλοντικών επιπτώσεων του έργου, η οποία αποτελεί δημόσιο έγγραφο. Ως εκ τούτου, η Επιτροπή συνιστά στο Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου να ανατρέξει στο εν λόγω έγγραφο για την απόκτηση του οποίου πρέπει να επικοινωνήσει με τις αρμόδιες τοπικές αρχές.

Η Ενδιάμεση Διαχειριστική Αρχή Κεντρικής Μακεδονίας διαβίβασε στην Επιτροπή τις πληροφορίες στις οποίες αναφέρεται η απάντηση στην προηγούμενη ερώτηση (E-011586/2011).

([1]) ΕΕ L 182 της 16.7.1999.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003633/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(10 April 2012)

Subject: Mavrorachi landfill — natural mineral springs

The Commission stated in reply to a previous question (E-011586/2011) of mine, on the problem of biological purification of the Mavrorachi landfill, that 'upon the Commission's request, the competent Greek authorities provided the following information in relation to the operation and expansion of the Mavrorachi landfill: 1. no problems have been reported in the operation of the Leachate Treatment Plant of Mavrorachi landfill. The near constant flow of water is due to natural spring water in the area, caused by geological formations. Chemical analysis presents that the water is enriched with iron and sulphur compounds which justifies the "completely yellow stream giving off the characteristic odour of chemicals".'

Would the Commission answer the following:

— Do the natural springs referred to by the Greek authorities originate in or flow through the landfill site? Does the environmental impact assessment (EIA) on the basis of which the project was approved describe the existence of such springs? Did it provide for the implementation of necessary measures, on the basis of Community and Greek legislation, for the delimitation and protection of the waters? Would it ever be possible for a licence to be granted to a landfill situated on or adjacent to natural mineral springs? What does the Commission intend to do in relation to all the above? Which competent authority communicated this information to the Commission?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2012)

The Landfill Directive ([1]) does not include specific requirements for the location of a landfill, nor does it specify that a licence should not be granted to a landfill located nearby natural mineral springs. Instead, the directive states that a landfill can only be authorised if the characteristics of the site with respect to a number of requirements listed in the directive, or the corrective measures to be taken, indicate that the landfill does not pose a serious environmental risk. The selection of the landfill location, evaluation of risks and the decision to authorise a landfill lay in the area of responsibility of the Member State's competent authorities.

The information requested by the Honourable Member is included in the Environmental Impact Assessment of the project which is a public document. Therefore, the Commission would suggest to the Honourable Member to consult this document for which he should contact the competent local authority.

The Intermediate Managing Authority of Central Macedonia communicated to the Commission the information referred to in reply to the previous question (E-011586/2011).

([1]) OJ L 182, 16.7.1999.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003640/12
aan de Commissie
Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE)
(10 april 2012)

Betreft: Btw — Beperking recht op aftrek — Roerende bedrijfsmiddelen

Artikel 168bis van de Richtlijn 2006/112/EG, ingevoegd bij artikel 1, 12 van de Richtlijn 2009/162/EU van de Raad van 22 december 2009 tot wijziging van enkele bepalingen van Richtlijn 2006/112/EG betreffende het gemeenschappelijk stelsel van belasting over de toegevoegde waarde, beperkt het recht op aftrek van onroerende goederen die deel uitmaken van het vermogen van het bedrijf van een belastingplichtige en die zowel voor de activiteiten van het bedrijf als voor zijn privégebruik of meer algemeen voor andere dan bedrijfsdoeleinden worden gebruikt.

De lidstaten hebben de keuze om de nieuwe beperking van het recht op aftrek uit te breiden tot andere goederen dan onroerende goederen.

1. Hoeveel en welke lidstaten hebben gebruik gemaakt van de keuze voorzien in artikel 168 bis, 2 Richtlijn 2006/112/EG?

2. Indien een lidstaat het recht op aftrek beperkt van roerende goederen, die zowel voor bedrijfsdoeleinden als voor privégebruik of meer algemeen voor andere dan bedrijfsdoeleinden worden aangewend, hoe dient het tijdelijk bijkomend gebruik voor:

a) andere dan bedrijfsdoeleinden te worden gecorrigeerd of dient dit niet langer te worden gecorrigeerd?

b) bedrijfsdoeleinden te worden gecorrigeerd of kan dit niet langer worden gecorrigeerd?

3. Wordt de gelijkheid tussen belastingplichtigen met betrekking tot voor ander dan bedrijfsdoeleinden aangewende roerende goederen niet beter gewaarborgd door het gebruik gelijk te stellen met een dienst onder bezwarende titel (cf. art. 26, 1, a) Richtlijn 2006/112/EG) in plaats van het recht op aftrek te beperken?

4. Indien de ongelijkheid tussen belastingplichtigen met betrekking tot roerende bedrijfsmiddelen, „zij het op een minder significante en minder uniforme wijze, zich voordoet" (cf. overweging 11 Richtlijn 2009/162/EG), schendt een lidstaat dan het proportionaliteitsbeginsel door het recht op aftrek te beperken voor alle roerende bedrijfsmiddelen?

5. Om welke redenen werd artikel 168 bis, 2, Richtlijn 2006/112/EG ingevoerd?

Antwoord van de heer Šemeta namens de Commissie
(5 juni 2012)

Lid 2 van artikel 168 bis van de btw-richtlijn ([1]) betreffende roerende goederen is ingevoegd bij Richtlijn 2009/162/EG van de Raad. Dit lid was niet opgenomen in het voorstel van de Commissie ([2]), waarin oorspronkelijk was bepaald dat — uitsluitend voor onroerende goederen — veranderingen in de verhouding tussen het gebruik voor bedrijfsdoeleinden en voor andere dan bedrijfsdoeleinden, na een eerste opsplitsing, in aanmerking zouden worden genomen zoals dat gebeurt bij herzieningen in het kader van de regeling voor investeringsgoederen (onder de voorwaarden van de artikelen 187, 188, 190 en 192).

Artikel 168 bis is evenwel geen beperking van het recht op aftrek als zodanig, maar strekt ertoe het algemene beginsel te ondersteunen dat btw op goederen en diensten slechts in aanmerking komt voor aftrek voor zover de ontvanger ervan deze zelf weer aanwendt voor belaste prestaties.

In het verleden volstond zelfs een minimaal belast gebruik om de voorbelasting volledig en onmiddellijk te mogen aftrekken. Doordat het privégebruik krachtens artikel 26, lid 1, onder a), pas later in de heffing werd betrokken, ontstonden er cashflowvoordelen, met name voor goederen met een lange economische levensduur zoals onroerende goederen, maar leidde dit ook tot ongelijkheid tussen onder meer niet-belastingplichtigen en belastingplichtigen die handelen als particulier.

([1]) Richtlijn 2006/112/EG van de Raad van 28 november 2006 betreffende het gemeenschappelijke stelsel van belasting over de toegevoegde waarde (PB L 347 van 11.12.2006, blz. 1).
([2]) COM(2007) 677 definitief.

Volgens de nieuwe regels zal een belast gebruik voor bedrijfsdoeleinden van bijvoorbeeld 70 % leiden tot een initiële aftrek van 70 % van de voorbelasting. Wijzigingen in de verhouding tussen het gebruik voor bedrijfsdoeleinden en voor andere dan bedrijfsdoeleinden die zich voordoen nadat het recht op aftrek voor de eerste keer is uitgeoefend, moeten in aanmerking worden genomen overeenkomstig de bestaande beginselen betreffende de herziening van de aftrek, die in de artikelen 184 tot en met 192 zijn vastgesteld.

Uit de vragen kan worden afgeleid dat er een zekere bezorgdheid bestaat, maar toch gelooft de Commissie niet — ofschoon het inderdaad zo is dat de lidstaten nu de vrijheid hebben om alle soorten bedrijfsmiddelen onder deze regeling te brengen — dat deze regels inbreuk maken op de gelijkheid of de evenredigheid.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003640/12
to the Commission
Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE)
(10 April 2012)

Subject: VAT — restrictions on the right of deduction — movable business assets

Article 168a of Directive 2006/112/EC, added to Article 1(12) of Council Directive 2009/162/EU of 22 December 2009 amending various provisions of Directive 2006/112/EC on the common system of value added tax, restricts the right of deduction in the case of immovable property forming part of the business assets of a taxable person and used both for the purposes of the taxable person's business and private use or, more generally, for purposes other than those of business.

Member States may choose to extend the new restriction on the right of rebate to goods other than immovable property.

1. How many and which Member States have used the option provided for in Article 168(a2) of Directive 2006/112/EC?

2. If a Member State restricts the right of deduction in respect of movable property which is used both for the purposes of the taxable person's business and for private use or, more generally, for purposes other than those of business, how should the additional temporary use be corrected for:

(a) purposes other than those of business, or should this no longer be corrected?

(b) business purposes, or can this no longer be corrected?

3. Would the equality between taxable persons with respect to movable goods used for purposes other than business not be better guaranteed by treating this use as being identical to a supply of services for consideration (see Article 26(1a) Directive 2006/112/EC) instead of restricting the right of deduction?

4. If the inequality arises between taxable persons with respect to movable business assets, 'though in a less significant and less uniform manner' (see recital 11 of Directive 2009/162/EU), will a Member State then be violating the principle of proportionality by restricting the right of deduction for all movable business assets?

5. On what grounds was Article 168(a2) Directive 2006/112/EC introduced?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2012)

The second paragraph of Art. 168a of the VAT Directive ([1]) on movable goods was introduced by Council Directive 2009/162/EC. It was not included in the Commission proposal ([2]) that aimed, for immovable property only, to take, after an initial apportionment, business/non-business fluctuations into account in the same way as capital goods scheme adjustments (under the conditions of Art. 187, 188, 190 and 192).

However, Art. 168a is not a restriction of the right of deduction as such but aims to reinforce the overall principle that VAT on goods and services is only deductible in so far as these purchases are used for the purposes of taxed output transactions.

In the past, even a minimal taxed use was sufficient to allow a full and immediate deduction of the input VAT. The subsequent taxation of the private use under Art. 26(1)(a) created cash-flow benefits, in particular in relation to assets with a long economic life such as immovable property and resulted in inequity between, *inter alia*, non-taxable persons and taxable persons acting in their capacity as private person.

Under the new rules, a taxed business use of e.g. 70 % will result in an upfront deduction of 70 % of the input VAT. Subsequent changes in the business/non-business use after the initial exercise of the right of deduction have to be taken into account in accordance with the existing principles on adjustment of deductions as set out in Art. 184 to 192.

([1]) Council Directive 2006/112/EC of 28/11/ 2006 on the common system of value added tax (OJ L 347, 11.12.2006, p.1).
([2]) COM(2007) 677 final.

The questions seem to reflect certain concerns but, and although it is true that Member States now dispose of the freedom to include all types of business assets, the Commission is not of the opinion that these rules would lead to a breach of equality or proportionality.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003645/12
aan de Commissie
Luca. Hartong (NI)
(11 april 2012)

Betreft: Begroting 2012: budgetlijn 15 05 55; Jeugd in actie

In de begroting van de Commissie (2012/70/EU), begrotinglijn 15 05 55 is voor ruim EUR 139 miljoen aan vastleggingkredieten en EUR 123 miljoen aan betalingskredieten gereserveerd voor het project „Jeugd in actie".

In de toelichting worden verscheidene doelstellingen uiteengezet, waaronder de ontwikkeling van het Europees burgerschap, het versterken van solidariteitsbesef en inspelen op speciale behoeften van jongeren in landen van het EU nabuurschapsbeleid.

Europees Burgerschap

1. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat het nutteloos is om geld van de belastingbetaler te verkwisten aan de ontwikkeling van zogenaamd Europees burgerschap? Zo nee, waarom niet?

2. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat burgerschap enkel op het niveau van soevereine landen kan worden gezien en daarnaast niet aan personen kan worden opgelegd door de EU? Zo nee, waarom niet.

3. Is de Commissie bereid om alle budgetten die „het bevorderen van Europees burgerschap" in hun doelstelling hebben staan voor het jaar 2013 te annuleren en deze budgetten terug te geven aan de betalende lidstaten? Zo nee, waarom niet?

Solidariteitsbesef

4. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat „het versterken van het solidariteitsbesef" een streven is dat niet meetbaar is en dan dus ook niet gecontroleerd kan worden of belastinggeld doelmatig wordt besteed?

5. Hoe wordt de doeltreffendheid en doelmatigheid van projecten met dergelijke vage doelstellingen gemeten en aangetoond?

Antwoord van mevrouw Vassiliou namens de Commissie
(19 juni 2012)

De doelstellingen die in de toelichting bij begrotingsonderdeel 15 05 55 zijn vermeld, zijn de doelstellingen van de acties in het kader van Besluit nr. 1719/2006/EG van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 15 november 2006 tot vaststelling van het programma „Jeugd in actie" ([1]). Twee van de algemene doelstellingen van dat programma zijn de bevordering van actief burgerschap van jongeren in het algemeen en van hun Europees burgerschap in het bijzonder, en de ontwikkeling van de solidariteit en de bevordering van de verdraagzaamheid onder jongeren, vooral met het oog op de versterking van de sociale samenhang van de Europese Unie.

Met name rekening houdend met de tussentijdse evaluatie van het programma, en onder meer met de evaluatieverslagen die op nationaal niveau zijn opgesteld, alsook met de navraag bij de deelnemers naar de effecten van het programma, is de Commissie van oordeel dat „Jeugd in actie" bijdraagt tot de realisatie van bovengenoemde doelstellingen. In dat verband merkt de Commissie op dat het begrip „Europees burgerschap" wordt genoemd in artikel 9 van het Verdrag betreffende de Europese Unie. In deze omstandigheden heeft de Commissie niet het voornemen de uitvoering van een door de wetgever aangenomen programma op de helling te zetten.

De Commissie is het er niet mee eens dat het onmogelijk zou zijn te meten of een bepaalde actie heeft bijgedragen tot de ontwikkeling van de solidariteitszin. Haar oordeel over de doeltreffendheid en doelmatigheid van het programma „Jeugd in actie" berust met name op de tussentijdse evaluatie, die beschikbaar is op http://ec.europa.eu/youth/focus/youth-in-action-monitoring-survey_en.htm.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:327:0030:0044:NL:PDF.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003645/12
to the Commission
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(11 April 2012)

Subject: 2012 budget: budget line 15 05 55 — Youth in Action

In the Commission's budget (2012/70/EU), budget line 15 05 55 earmarks over EUR 139 million for commitment appropriations and EUR 123 million for payment appropriations for the 'Youth in Action' project.

Various aims are set out in the remarks, including developing [young people's] European citizenship, reinforcing [their] sense of solidarity and addressing the special needs of youth in the European neighbourhood policy countries.

European citizenship:

1. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that it is pointless to waste taxpayers' money on developing of so-called European citizenship? If not, why not?

2. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that citizenship can only be seen in the context of sovereign countries and, what is more, cannot be imposed on people by the EU? If not, why not?

3. Is the Commission prepared to annul all budgets which have the 'promotion of European citizenship' as one of their aims and to return those budgets to the paying Member States by 2013? If not, why not?

Sense of solidarity:

4. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that 'reinforcing a sense of solidarity' is an aspiration that cannot be measured and therefore it is impossible to monitor whether taxpayers' money will be spent efficiently?

5. How is the effectiveness and efficiency of projects with such vague aims measured and demonstrated?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Vassiliou au nom de la Commission
(19 juin 2012)

Les objectifs repris dans les commentaires budgétaires de la ligne 15 05 55 sont ceux des actions couvertes par la Décision n° 1719/2006/EC du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 15 novembre 2006 ([1]) établissant le programme Jeunese en Action, dont deux des objectifs généraux consistent, d'une part, à promouvoir la citoyenneté active des jeunes, en général, et leur citoyenneté européenne en particulier, d'autre part, à développer la solidarité et promouvoir la tolérance entre les jeunes, notamment en vue de renforcer la cohésion sociale dans l'Union.

Tenant compte, notamment, de l'évaluation intermédiaire du programme, y compris des rapports d'évaluation établis au niveau national, et d'enquêtes d'impact menées auprès de participants au programme, la Commission considère que Jeunesse en Action contribue à l'atteinte des objectifs qui lui ont été assignés. Dans ce contexte, elle note que le concept de citoyenneté européenne est visé à l'article 9 du Traité sur l'Union européenne. Dans de telles conditions elle n'envisage pas de remettre en question l'exécution d'un programme adopté par le législateur.

La Commission ne partage pas l'avis qu'il ne serait pas possible de mesurer si une action donnée aide à développer le sens de la solidarité. Son jugement quant à l'éfficacité et à l'efficience du programme Jeunesse en Action repose notamment sur l'évaluation intermédiaire disponible à l'adresse suivante: (http://ec.europa.eu/youth/focus/youth-in-action-monitoring-survey_en.htm).

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:327:0030:0044:FR:PDF

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003648/12
an die Kommission
Albert Deß (PPE)
(11. April 2012)

Betrifft: Die Umsetzung der Fauna-Flora-Habitat-Richtlinie (FFH): Bestimmungen und Ausnahmen

Die Richtlinie 92/43 EWG des Rates vom 21. Mai 1992 zur Erhaltung der natürlichen Lebensräume sowie der wildlebenden Tiere und Pflanzen (FFH-Richtlinie) hat zum Ziel, wildlebende Arten, deren Lebensräume und die europaweite Vernetzung dieser Lebensräume zu sichern und zu schützen. In den verschiedenen Anhängen der FFH-Richtlinie ist genau aufgeführt, welche Gebiete und welche Arten geschützt werden sollen.

Eine Firma aus meinem Wahlkreis möchte in der Gemeinde ein Bauland erschließen. Von den circa 5 500 m^2 der geplanten Baufläche liegen jedoch 1 500 m^2 im FFH- und Vogelschutzgebiet. Im vorliegenden Fall handelt es sich um eine landwirtschaftlich bewirtschaftete Wiese, welche direkt an der Ortsgrenze und einer belebten Kreisstraße liegt. Außerdem wäre die Gemeinde bereit, das Gebiet in eine andere Richtung auszuweiten.

Oben genannte 1 500 m^2 sind nicht Teil des Landschaftsschutzgebietes und liegen auch nicht brach, werden hingegen drei bis viermal pro Jahr gemäht und gedüngt. Eine Niederlassung von Lebewesen wildlebender Art ist somit unwahrscheinlich.

Wie kann man bei diesem Fall unbürokratisch vorgehen, um dieses Projekt zu verwirklichen?

Sind bei der Umsetzung der FFH-Richtlinie in den Mitgliedstaaten bestimmte Ausnahmen festgelegt, um eine räumliche Kohärenz zwischen Schutzgebieten und Wohn- und Baugebieten zu erreichen?

Ist es dementsprechend möglich, ein FFH-Gebiet zu verschieben, zu erweitern oder zu verkleinern?

Antwort von Herrn Potočnik im Namen der Kommission
(6. Juni 2012)

Pläne oder Projekte, die sich möglicherweise negativ auf ein Natura-2000-Gebiet auswirken, unterliegen den Verfahrensgarantien gemäß Artikel 6 Absätze 3 und 4 der Richtlinie 92/43/EWG des Rates vom 21. Mai 1992 zur Erhaltung der natürlichen Lebensräume sowie der wildlebenden Tiere und Pflanzen ([1]). Wenn die Pläne oder Projekte nicht unmittelbar mit der Verwaltung des Natura-2000-Gebietes in Verbindung stehen oder hierfür nicht notwendig sind, jedoch das Gebiet erheblich beeinträchtigen könnten, dann müssen sie einer Prüfung auf Verträglichkeit mit den für dieses Gebiet festgelegten Erhaltungszielen unterzogen werden. Die jeweiligen zuständigen Behörden in einem Mitgliedstaat sind dafür verantwortlich, dass diese Bestimmungen im Rahmen jedes Vorhabens, das in Betracht gezogen wird und das ein solches Natura-2000-Gebiet beeinträchtigen könnte, in vollem Umfang eingehalten werden. Wenn eine angemessene Prüfung zu dem Ergebnis führt, dass das Natura-2000-Gebiet beeinträchtigt werden wird, darf der Plan oder das Projekt nur fortgesetzt werden, wenn keine Alternativlösung vorhanden ist, ein überwiegendes öffentliches Interesse besteht und Ausgleichsmaßnahmen ergriffen werden, um jedweden Verlust bzw. jedwede Veränderung in dem Gebiet zu kompensieren.

Die Kommission hat eine Reihe von Leitfäden zu diesem Thema entwickelt, die auf der Website der Kommission zu finden sind: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/guidance_en.htm

---

([1]) ABl. L 206 vom 22.7.1992.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003648/12
to the Commission
Albert Deß (PPE)
(11 April 2012)

Subject: Implementation of the Fauna-Flora and Habitat Directive (FFH): provisions and derogations

The objective of Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora (FFH Directive) is to secure and protect wild species of fauna and flora, their habitats and the Europe-wide network of such habitats. The various Annexes of the FFH Directive provide a precise list of which areas and species are to be protected.

A business in my constituency is looking to develop a site within the local authority area. However, 1 500 m^2 of the approximately 5 500 m^2 planned site is located within the FFH and wild bird conservation area. In this case, the area is a farmed meadow located right on the edge of the local authority and on a busy country road. In addition, the local authority would be willing to expand the area in a different direction.

The aforementioned 1 500 m^2 are not part of the conservation area and are not left to lie fallow, but are mown and fertilised three or four times each year. Colonisation by wild species is therefore unlikely.

How can we proceed in this case with a minimum of red tape, so as to implement this project?

Are particular derogations defined for the implementation of the FFH Directive in the Member States in order to ensure spatial coherence between protected areas and residential/ developed areas?

Accordingly, is it possible to move, extend or reduce an FFH area?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2012)

Any plan or project that may have potential negative impacts on a Natura 2000 site, is subject to the procedural safeguards given in Article 6(3) and (4) of Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora ([1]). If the plan or project is not connected with or necessary for the management of the Natura 2000 site, but likely to have a significant effect upon it, then it must be subject to an appropriate assessment of its implications for the site in view of the site's conservation objectives. It is the responsibility of the relevant competent authorities in a Member State to ensure that these provisions are fully respected in the context of any contemplated development that may affect the integrity of this Natura 2000 site. If it is concluded from an appropriate assessment that the integrity of the Natura 2000 site will be affected, then the plan or project may only proceed, in the absence of alternative solutions, if it is of overriding public interest and with the provision of compensatory measures to offset any loss or change to the site.

The Commission has developed a range of guidance documents on that matter, which can be found on the Commission website: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/guidance_en.htm

([1]) OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003668/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Chrysoula Paliadeli (S&D)
(11 Απριλίου 2012)

Θέμα: U-Multirank (πολυδιάστατο παγκόσμιο σύστημα κατάταξης των πανεπιστημίων)

Το 2009, η Επιτροπή ανακοίνωσε την προώθηση ερευνητικής μελέτης που στόχευε στην ανάπτυξη ενός πολυδιάστατου παγκόσμιου συστήματος κατάταξης των πανεπιστημίων. Η Επιτροπή επεσήμανε τα τρία κύρια χαρακτηριστικά του εν λόγω νέου εργαλείου κατάταξης: τον πολυδιάστατο χαρακτήρα, τη διαφάνεια και τον παγκόσμιο προσανατολισμό του. Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τη μακρά παράδοση της ΕΕ στην τριτοβάθμια εκπαίδευση και έρευνα και την πολυμορφία όσον αφορά τα προφίλ των πανεπιστημίων και των ανώτατων ερευνητικών ιδρυμάτων, ζητείται από την Επιτροπή να απαντήσει στα ακόλουθα ερωτήματα.

1. Τι είδους μέτρα σκοπεύει να λάβει για να διασφαλίσει ότι τα ιδρύματα τριτοβάθμιας εκπαίδευσης της ΕΕ θα καταλάβουν τις υψηλότερες θέσεις στο σύστημα κατάταξης;

2. Σύμφωνα με την αρχή αριθ. 2 των Αρχών του Βερολίνου, η κατάταξη των ιδρυμάτων τριτοβάθμιας εκπαίδευσης του U-Multirank βασίζεται σε ομοιογενείς δείκτες επιδόσεων που λαμβάνουν υπόψη την πολυμορφία όσον αφορά τα προφίλ των πανεπιστημίων. Ωστόσο, είναι αναπόφευκτη η κατάταξη τόσο των δημόσιων όσο και των ιδιωτικών ιδρυμάτων, τοποθετώντας τα ιδιωτικά ιδρύματα σε υψηλότερες θέσεις από τα δημόσια. Με ποιον τρόπο σκοπεύουν τα ενδιαφερόμενα μέρη του U-Multirank να αντιμετωπίσουν αυτό το είδος διαφοροποίησης από μεθοδολογικής άποψης και να βοηθήσουν να διασφαλισθεί ότι τα δημόσια ιδρύματα θα καταλάβουν και αυτά με τη σειρά τους τις υψηλότερες θέσεις στην κατάταξη;

3. Δεδομένου ότι ο ιδιωτικός τομέας φαίνεται να αποτελεί σημαντική πηγή χρηματοδότησης για την υλοποίηση του U-Multirank, τι είδους μέτρα πρέπει να ληφθούν εκ μέρους της Επιτροπής ούτως ώστε να διασφαλισθεί η ποιότητα, η διαφάνεια και η ανεξαρτησία του εν λόγω συστήματος κατάταξης, προστατεύοντάς το έτσι από κάθε είδους ιδιωτικά συμφέροντα;

Απάντηση της κας Βασιλείου εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(31 Μαΐου 2012)

Ένα από τα πλεονεκτήματα της ευρωπαϊκής τριτοβάθμιας εκπαίδευσης είναι ακριβώς η πολυμορφία. Όπως αναφέρεται στην ατζέντα της Επιτροπής για τον εκσυγχρονισμό της τριτοβάθμιας εκπαίδευσης ([1]) η Ευρώπη χρειάζεται μια μεγάλη ποικιλία ιδρυμάτων τριτοβάθμιας εκπαίδευσης, από τα οποία το καθένα πρέπει να επιδιώκει την αριστεία σύμφωνα με τις αποστολές του και τις στρατηγικές προτεραιότητές του. Η κύρια αρμοδιότητα για την επίτευξη αριστείας ανήκει στα κράτη μέλη και στα ίδια τα εκπαιδευτικά ιδρύματα. Ο ρόλος της Επιτροπής είναι να υποστηρίζει τα ιδρύματα τριτοβάθμιας εκπαίδευσης, μεταξύ άλλων με την παροχή εργαλείων που τους επιτρέπουν να αξιολογούν τις επιδόσεις τους, και γενικότερα να υποστηρίζει τα κράτη μέλη μέσω των ενεργειών που αναφέρονται στην ανωτέρω ατζέντα για τον εκσυγχρονισμό της τριτοβάθμιας εκπαίδευσης.

Όσον αφορά την πιθανότητα προτίμησης ιδιωτικών εκπαιδευτικών ιδρυμάτων, ένα από τα βασικά πλεονεκτήματα του νέου συστήματος κατάταξης είναι η δυνατότητα σύγκρισης «μεταξύ ομοίων». Τόσο τα δημόσια όσο και τα ιδιωτικά εκπαιδευτικά ιδρύματα πρέπει να επιδιώκουν την αριστεία σε ό, τι αφορά τις δικές τους προτεραιότητες· δεν είναι ούτε έργο ούτε στόχος της Επιτροπής να διασφαλίζει ότι είτε τα δημόσια είτε τα ιδιωτικά ιδρύματα επιτυγχάνουν τις ύψιστες θέσεις στην κατάταξη, αλλά ότι οι επιδόσεις του συνόλου καθίστανται πιο διαφανείς.

Η Επιτροπή συμφωνεί ότι είναι σημαντικό να διασφαλίζεται η ποιότητα, η διαφάνεια και η ανεξαρτησία του συστήματος κατάταξης και να προστατεύεται αυτό από κάθε είδους ιδιωτικά συμφέροντα. Αυτός είναι ο λόγος για τον οποίο η κατάταξη θα πραγματοποιηθεί από ανεξάρτητο φορέα υπό την εποπτεία συμβουλευτικής επιτροπής η οποία θα αποτελείται από τα ενδιαφερόμενα μέρη και την Επιτροπή ώστε να διασφαλιστούν τα ανωτέρω. Τα πρώτα αποτελέσματα θα δημοσιευθούν στα τέλη του 2013, μέσω ενός σχεδίου που χρηματοδοτείται από την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή.

([1]) COM(2011)567 τελικό.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003668/12
to the Commission
Chrysoula Paliadeli (S&D)
(11 April 2012)

Subject: U-Multirank (multi-dimensional global university ranking)

In 2009 the Commission announced that it was promoting a research study aimed at developing a multi-dimensional global university ranking. The Commission pointed out the three main characteristics of this new ranking tool: its multi-dimensional nature, its transparency and its global orientation. Taking into consideration the EU's long tradition in higher education and research and the variety in the profiles of universities and higher research institutions, the Commission is asked to answer the questions set out below.

1. What kinds of measures will it take in order to ensure that the EU's higher education institutions rise to the highest positions in the ranking system?

2. In accordance with Principle 2 of the Berlin Principles, U-Multirank's classification of higher education institutions is based on homogeneous performance indicators which take into account the variety in universities' profiles. However, the classification of both public and private institutions is unavoidable, putting private institutions in higher positions than public institutions. How do U-Multirank's stakeholders intend to deal with this kind of differentiation in methodological terms and help ensure that public institutions also reach the highest positions in the ranking?

3. Given that the private sector seems to represent a significant source of funding for the implementation of U-Multirank, what kinds of measures should be taken on the Commission's behalf in order to ensure the quality, transparency and independence of this ranking system, thereby protecting it from any kind of private interest?

Answer given by Mrs Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(31 May 2012)

One of the strengths of European higher education is its diversity. As stated in the Commission's Modernisation Agenda for Higher Education ([1]) Europe needs a wide diversity of higher education institutions and each must pursue excellence in line with its missions and strategic priorities. The main responsibility for achieving excellence rests with Member States and education institutions themselves. The Commission's role is to support higher education institutions, including by providing tools which enable them to assess their performance and more generally to support the Member States via the actions presented in the above Modernisation Agenda.

With regard to a possible favouring of private institutions, one of the main benefits of the new ranking system is the possibility to compare 'like with like'. Public and private institutions must pursue excellence in terms of their own priorities; it is neither a Commission task nor a Commission goal to ensure that either public or private institutions reach the highest positions in the ranking, but rather that the performance of all should become more transparent.

The Commission agrees that is it important to ensure the quality, transparency and independence of the ranking system and to protect it from any private interest. That is why the ranking will be run by an independent body, overseen by an advisory board consisting of relevant stakeholders and the Commission to ensure this. First results will be published end 2013, via a project funded by the European Commission.

([1]) COM(2011) 567 final.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-003680/12
do Komisji
Tomasz Piotr Poręba (ECR)
(11 kwietnia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Elektrownie wiatrowe w Polsce

Powstające ostatnio licznie farmy wiatrowe wzbudzają coraz więcej kontrowersji. Również w Polsce w ostatnich latach zakłada się coraz więcej farm wiatrowych. Jednak brak przepisów prawnych regulujących odległości sytuowania elektrowni wiatrowych od zabudowań i gospodarstw domowych powoduje, że farmy wiatrowe rozwijają się w sposób niekontrolowany i pozbawiony zasad lokalizacyjnych. Budowanie farm wiatrowych w Polsce wiąże się często z nadużyciami, łamaniem prawa, brakiem poszanowania krajobrazu, środowiska i obywateli. Społeczność lokalna, mimo gwarancji ustawodawcy, nie uczestniczy w procesie oceny oddziaływania danego przedsięwzięcia na środowisko i okolicznych mieszkańców. Właściciele posesji sąsiadujących z działkami atrakcyjnymi dla inwestorów podpisują z nimi umowy monopolistyczne, ułatwiając im tym samym otwarcie procedury administracyjnej. Samorządy ulegają presji inwestorów i pokusie łatwych wpływów do budżetu nawet kosztem strategii rozwoju lokalnego, a co najgorsze, często bez znajomości wyników badań potencjalnego oddziaływania przedsięwzięcia.

— Czy wg Komisji państwa członkowskie zobowiązane są do przestrzegania zgodności procesu inwestycyjnego budowy farm wiatrowych z regulacjami UE? Jeśli tak, to z którymi regulacjami?

— Czy Komisja wydała wykaz szczegółowych regulacji i warunków koniecznych, jakie powinny zostać spełnione w trakcie całego procesu przygotowania, realizacji i eksploatacji farm wiatrowych w państwach UE?

— Jakie wg Komisji są szczegółowe regulacje dotyczące lokalizacji i funkcjonowania farm/elektrowni wiatrakowych w państwach UE?

— Jakie wg Komisji są minimalne standardy zapewniające bezpieczne funkcjonowanie farm wiatrowych dla środowiska i społeczności lokalnych?

— Jaka powinna być minimalna odległość farmy (przy założeniu, że wiatrak będzie posiadał wysokość 150 m) od zabudowań mieszkalnych?

— Czy Komisja przeprowadziła badania szkodliwego działania farm wiatrowych na zdrowie człowieka?

— Jak Komisja zamierza zapewnić przestrzeganie przez państwa członkowskie w procesie rozwoju energii wiatrowej standardów zapewniających poszanowanie środowiska i obywateli?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Janeza Potočnika w imieniu Komisji

(25 maja 2012 r.)

Plany i projekty dotyczące farm wiatrowych podlegają odpowiednio przepisom dyrektywy w sprawie strategicznej oceny oddziaływania na środowisko (SEA ([1])) oraz dyrektywy w sprawie oceny oddziaływania na środowisko (EIA ([2])). Farmy wiatrowe są wymienione w załączniku II do dyrektywy EIA, co oznacza, że w niektórych przypadkach wymagana jest pełna ocena oddziaływania na środowisko. Jeżeli przeprowadzana jest EIA, należy ocenić między innymi wpływ projektu na ludzi, faunę, florę i krajobraz. Podstawowym elementem procedury oceny oddziaływania na środowisko jest konsultacja społeczna.

Ponadto farmy wiatrowe, które mogą mieć negatywne oddziaływanie na obszary Natura 2000, muszą być poddawane odpowiedniej ocenie z uwzględnieniem celów w zakresie ochrony danego obszaru zgodnie z art. 6 dyrektywy siedliskowej ([3]). Aby usprawnić proces przeprowadzania odpowiednich ocen w odniesieniu do energii wiatrowej, Komisja wydała w 2011 r. specjalne wytyczne na temat stosowania przepisów UE w dziedzinie ochrony środowiska do farm wiatrowych ([4]).

([1]) Dyrektywa 2001/42/WE Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady z dnia 27 czerwca 2001 r. w sprawie oceny wpływu niektórych planów i programów na środowisko, Dz.U. L 197 z 21.7.2001.
([2]) Dyrektywa Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady 2011/92/UE z dnia 13 grudnia 2011 r. w sprawie oceny skutków wywieranych przez niektóre przedsięwzięcia publiczne i prywatne na środowisko, Dz.U. L 26 z 26.1.2012.
([3]) Dyrektywa Rady 92/43/EWG z dnia 21 maja 1992 r. w sprawie ochrony siedlisk przyrodniczych oraz dzikiej fauny i flory, Dz.U. L 206 z 22.7.1992.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/Wind_farms.pdf

Komisja nie określiła minimalnych norm dotyczących wpływu farm wiatrowych na środowisko, ponieważ każdy projekt musi być oceniony z osobna. Jeśli chodzi o obszary Natura 2000, odpowiednia ocena stanowi kluczowe narzędzie służące do określenia wpływu danego projektu na chronioną faunę i florę oraz do wskazania koniecznych środków zaradczych mających ograniczyć potencjalne negatywne skutki.

Komisja nie ma informacji o żadnych badaniach poświęconych wpływowi farm wiatrowych na ludzkie zdrowie.

Zapewnienie odpowiedniego stosowania przepisów UE w zakresie ochrony środowiska jest obowiązkiem właściwych organów w poszczególnych państwach członkowskich. Jeżeli istnieją niezbite dowody, że przepisy nie są stosowane, Komisja podejmie działania prawne w celu zapewnienia zgodności z prawem UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-003680/12
to the Commission
Tomasz Piotr Poręba (ECR)
(11 April 2012)

Subject: Wind farms in Poland

The wind farms that have been sprouting up in great numbers recently are causing increasing controversy. In recent years, a growing number of wind farms have also been established in Poland. However, the lack of legal regulations on the distance of wind farms from buildings and households allows wind farms to develop in an uncontrolled way, devoid of rules on location. Constructing wind farms in Poland often involves abuses, breaking the law and a lack of respect for the landscape, environment and citizens. Despite the legislator's guarantee, local communities are not involved in the process of assessing the impact of a given undertaking on the environment and on local residents. Owners of estates that adjoin lots of interest to investors conclude anti-competitive agreements with them that facilitate the initiation of administrative procedures for the investors. Local authorities come under pressure from investors and are tempted by easy budgetary revenue, even at the cost of local development strategy. However, the worst is that this often happens without the knowledge of any test results regarding the potential impact of the undertaking.

— Does the Commission believe that the Member States should be obliged to ensure that the investment process of constructing wind farms complies with EU regulations? If so, with which precise regulations?

— Has the Commission issued a list of specific regulations and necessary requirements to be met throughout the process of preparing, realising and operating wind farms in the EU Member States?

— In the Commission's view, what are the specific regulations that apply to the location and the functioning of wind farms in the EU Member States?

— In the Commission's view, what are the minimal standards necessary to ensure the safe functioning of wind farms for the environment and local communities?

— What should be a farm's minimum distance (given that the wind turbine will be 150m high) from residential developments?

— Has the Commission carried out studies on wind farms' negative impact on human health?

— How does the Commission intend to ensure that Member States in the process of developing wind energy comply with the standards for ensuring respect for citizens and the environment?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(25 May 2012)

Wind farm plans and projects are subject to the provisions of the directives on Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA ([1])) and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA ([2])) respectively. Wind farms are listed in Annex II of the EIA Directive which means that in certain cases a full impact assessment is required. If an EIA is carried out it has to assess, amongst others things, the effects of a project on human beings, fauna, flora, and landscape. Consultation with the public is a key feature of environmental assessment procedures.

In addition, wind farms likely to have an adverse effect on a Natura 2000 site must be subject to an appropriate assessment in light of the site's conservation objectives, according to Article 6 of the Habitats Directive ([3]). To facilitate the process of appropriate assessments in the context of wind energy, the Commission issued a specific guidance document on application of EU nature legislation to wind farms ([4]) in 2011.

([1]) Directive 2001/42/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 June 2001 on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment, OJ L 197, 21.7.2001.
([2]) Directive 2011/92/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment, OJ L 26, 28.1.2012.
([3]) 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.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/Wind_farms.pdf

The Commission has not issued minimum standards with regard to wind farms and environment as each project has to be assessed on a case-by-case basis. With regard to Natura 2000 areas the appropriate assessment is the key tool to assess the project's impact on protected fauna and flora and to identify the requisite mitigation measures to reduce potential negative effects.

The Commission is not aware of any work specifically on the impact of wind farms on human health.

It is the responsibility of the competent authorities in each Member State to ensure that the provisions of the EU environmental legislation are correctly implemented. If there is a clear evidence of failure the Commission will take legal action to ensure compliance with EC law.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003684/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(11 Απριλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Αποτελεσματικότητα των ευρωπαϊκών δικτύων για την αντιμετώπιση της φαρμακοδιέγερσης στον αθλητισμό

Στο πλαίσιο της προπαρασκευαστικής δράσης της ΕΕ για τον αθλητισμό 2010, προβλέφθηκαν μέτρα ενθάρρυνσης για την καταπολέμηση της φαρμακοδιέγερσης και, για αυτό τον λόγο, χρηματοδοτήθηκαν τρία σχέδια σχετικά με τα ευρωπαϊκά δίκτυα που διήρκεσαν έως τον Μάρτιο του 2012.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Ποια τα αποτελέσματα και ο απολογισμός των τριών σχεδίων-δικτύων για την καταπολέμηση της φαρμακοδιέγερσης στον αθλητισμό;

— Συμμετείχαν όλα τα κράτη μέλη στις συγκεκριμένες δράσεις; Ποια η περίπτωση της Ελλάδας;

— Με βάση τα πρακτικά συμπεράσματα που προκύπτουν από τις παραπάνω δράσεις, αναμένεται η Επιτροπή να αναλάβει νέα πρωτοβουλία στον συγκεκριμένο τομέα;

Απάντηση της κας Βασιλείου εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(11 Ιουνίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή, στην απάντησή της στην ερώτηση E-003166/2012 ([1]) παρείχε αναλυτικά στοιχεία σχετικά με τα τρία σχέδια στα οποία αναφέρεται η παρούσα ερώτηση, συμπεριλαμβανομένων όλων των εταίρων και των κρατών μελών στα οποία βρίσκεται η έδρα τους. Υπογράφηκαν συμφωνίες επιχορήγησης στην αρχή μιας διαδικασίας επιλογής που διοργανώθηκε στο πλαίσιο πρόσκλησης υποβολής προτάσεων ανοικτής προς όλα τα κράτη μέλη. Όλα τα ενδιαφερόμενα μέρη παροτρύνθηκαν να συμμετάσχουν. Σε κανένα από τα τρία αυτά επιτυχή δίκτυα δεν συμμετείχε κάποια οργάνωση που να εδρεύει στην Ελλάδα.

Τα αποτελέσματα των εν λόγω σχεδίων, που συγχρηματοδοτούνται μέσω προπαρασκευαστικών δράσεων στον τομέα του αθλητισμού, θα δημοσιοποιηθούν από τις επικεφαλής οργανώσεις. Η Επιτροπή υπολογίζει να λάβει όλες τις τελικές εκθέσεις έως τον Σεπτέμβριο του 2012. Τα σχέδια μέχρι στιγμής έχουν καταδείξει τη σημασία των δικτύων πολλαπλών εταίρων — που περιλαμβάνουν αθλητικές οργανώσεις, αλλά δεν περιορίζονται μόνο σ' αυτές — και τα οποία ανοίγουν νέους δρόμους στην ανάπτυξη νέων προσεγγίσεων για την πρόληψη της φαρμακοδιέγερσης.

Σε σχέση με την καταπολέμηση της φαρμακοδιέγερσης, η Επιτροπή ανέλαβε πολλές και διάφορες πρωτοβουλίες μετά την έναρξη ισχύος της συνθήκης της Λισαβόνας, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των προτάσεων που διατύπωσε στην ανακοίνωσή της «Ανάπτυξη της ευρωπαϊκής διάστασης του αθλητισμού». Τέτοιου είδους πρωτοβουλίες περιλαμβάνουν, εκτός από την ανάπτυξη μέτρων για την παροχή κινήτρων, πολιτική συνεργασία με τα κράτη μέλη στο πλαίσιο του Συμβουλίου και της ομάδας εμπειρογνωμόνων της ΕΕ για την καταπολέμηση της φαρμακοδιέγερσης· την προετοιμασία και την υποβολή στον Παγκόσμιο Οργανισμό κατά της Φαρμακοδιέγερσης συνεισφοράς της ΕΕ όσον αφορά την αναθεώρηση του παγκόσμιου κώδικα για την καταπολέμηση της φαρμακοδιέγερσης, και την τακτική συνεργασία με το Συμβούλιο της Ευρώπης. Τέλος, η Επιτροπή συμπεριέλαβε ειδικό κεφάλαιο για τον αθλητισμό στην πρότασή της για ένα πρόγραμμα για την εκπαίδευση, την κατάρτιση, τη νεολαία και τον αθλητισμό «Erasmus για όλους» για την περίοδο 2014-2020.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003684/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(11 April 2012)

Subject: Effectiveness of EU networks in the fight against doping in sport

As part of the EU's preparatory action in the field of sport in 2010, measures were introduced to encourage the fight against doping and three projects related to EU networks were funded for this purpose, which lasted until March 2012.

The Commission is asked:

— What are the results and the reports of the three projects/networks to combat doping in sport?

— Did all Member States take part in these actions? What about Greece?

— On the basis of the practical conclusions of the above actions, does the Commission expect to take any new initiatives in this sector?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2012)

Details on the three projects referred to in this question, including all partners and the Member States where they are based, were provided by the Commission in its reply to Written Question E-003166/2012 ([1]). Grant agreements were signed at the outset of a selection procedure organised as part of an open call for proposals which was open to all Member States. All relevant stakeholders were encouraged to participate. No organisations based in Greece formed part of any of the three successful project networks.

The results of these projects, co-financed via Preparatory Actions in the field of Sport, will be disseminated by the leading organisations. The Commission expects to receive all the final reports by September 2012. The projects have thus far demonstrated the relevance of multi-actor networks — including but not limited to sports organisations — pioneering the development of new approaches to doping prevention.

In relation to the fight against doping, the Commission has taken many different initiatives following the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, including the proposals put forward in its communication 'Developing the European Dimension in Sport'. Apart from the development of incentive measures, such initiatives include political cooperation with Member States in the Council and in the EU Expert Group on Anti-Doping; the preparation and submission to the World Anti-Doping Agency of an EU contribution to the revision of the World Anti-Doping Code; and regular cooperation with the Council of Europe. Finally, the Commission included a Sport Chapter in its proposal for an 'Erasmus for All' Programme for Education, Training, Youth and Sport covering the years 2014-2020.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003690/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(11 de abril de 2012)

Asunto: Modificación de la propuesta de Reglamento de verificación y acreditación de verificadores de informes de emisión de gases de efecto invernadero I

En referencia a la propuesta de Reglamento relativo a la verificación de los informes de emisión de gases de efecto invernadero y de informe de datos sobre toneladas-kilómetro y a la acreditación de los verificadores de conformidad con la Directiva 2003/87/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo. La propuesta de Reglamento de verificación y acreditación, se justifica, entre otros, por los motivos siguientes:

— para garantizar que la verificación de los informes sea realizada por verificadores que tengan la competencia técnica necesaria y para llevar a cabo la tarea de verificación de forma independiente e imparcial,

— por la necesidad de armonizar las normas de acreditación,

— para aprovechar la sinergia del marco general de acreditación establecido por el Reglamento 765/2008, de 9 de julio,

— para aprovechar las sinergias entre el Reglamento 1221/2009, de 25 de noviembre (EMAS) y la propuesta de este Reglamento de verificación y acreditación Kyoto.

Analizando estas motivaciones y tomando como referencia los Reglamentos 765/2008 y 1221/2009, que reafirman uno de los principios del Tratado constitutivo de la Unión Europea de no interferir en la distribución de funciones en el sí de los Estados miembros, queremos trasladar a la Comisión las preguntas siguientes en relación a la propuesta de Reglamento:

1. ¿Por qué se introduce la nomenclatura certificación de verificadores en lugar de utilizar el término autorización como en el Reglamento 1221/2009?

2. ¿Por qué sólo prevé que una Administración pública nacional pueda certificar verificadores individuales si el Reglamento 1221/2009 también le permite autorizar verificadores empresas, si el objetivo final es el mismo?

Respuesta de la Sra. Hedegaard en nombre de la Comisión
(5 de junio de 2012)

En virtud del Reglamento (CE) n° 1221/2009 ([1]), el término «autorización» se refiere al registro de verificadores medioambientales y, en consonancia con el artículo 5 del Reglamento (CE) n° 765/2008 ([2]), constituye una alternativa a la acreditación de verificadores. Estos verificadores medioambientales autorizados pueden ser personas físicas o jurídicas. El proyecto de Reglamento de la Comisión relativo a la verificación de los informes de emisiones de gases de efecto invernadero y de los informes de datos sobre toneladas-kilómetro y a la acreditación de los verificadores de conformidad con la Directiva 2003/87/CE ([3]) en lo sucesivo denominado el proyecto de Reglamento de la Comisión) introduce disposiciones relacionadas exclusivamente con los verificadores que son personas físicas a fin de abordar las situaciones diversas existentes en los Estados miembros. Así pues, los dos instrumentos legislativos tratan de dos situaciones diferentes. El proyecto de Reglamento de la Comisión introduce la expresión «certificación de los verificadores» para subrayar esta diferencia y evitar posibles malentendidos.

Con arreglo al Reglamento (CE) n° 765/2008, el organismo nacional de acreditación es «el único organismo de un Estado miembro con potestad pública para llevar a cabo acreditaciones» y no debe tener fines lucrativos. Además, el reconocimiento mutuo de los verificadores es un elemento fundamental del proyecto de Reglamento de la Comisión. Para garantizar la realización plena y efectiva del reconocimiento mutuo de todos los verificadores, se introduce un sistema de certificación de los verificadores que ofrece las mismas garantías que el aplicable a la acreditación de verificadores. A tal fin, el proyecto de Reglamento de la Comisión exige que el Estado miembro que decida hacer uso

([1]) Reglamento (CE) n° 1221/2009 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 25 de noviembre de 2009, por el que se permite que las organizaciones se adhieran con carácter voluntario a un sistema comunitario de gestión y auditoría medioambientales (EMAS) (DO L 342 de 22.12.2009).

([2]) Reglamento (CE) n° 765/2008 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo de 9 de julio de 2008 por el que se establecen los requisitos de acreditación y vigilancia del mercado relativos a la comercialización de los productos y por el que se deroga el Reglamento (CEE) n° 339/93 (DO L 218 de 13.8.2008).

([3]) Directiva 2003/87/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 13 de octubre de 2003, por la que se establece un régimen para el comercio de derechos de emisión de gases de efecto invernadero en la Comunidad (DO L 275 de 25.10.2003).

de la opción de certificación designe a una autoridad nacional y que presente todas las pruebas suplementarias necesarias a la Comisión y a los demás Estados miembros como prueba de que esa autoridad nacional cumple los mismos requisitos que un organismo nacional de acreditación.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003690/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(11 April 2012)

Subject: Amendment to the proposal for a regulation on verification and accreditation of verifiers of greenhouse gas emission reports (I)

The grounds for the proposal for a regulation on verification of greenhouse gas emission reports and tonne-kilometre reports and the accreditation of verifiers pursuant to Directive 2003/87/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council include the following:

— to ensure that verification of reports is carried out by verifiers that have the required technical competence to perform the verification task in an independent and impartial manner;

— the need to harmonise accreditation standards;

— in order to make use of the synergy of the overall accreditation framework established by Regulation (EC) No 765/2008 of 9 July 2008;

— in order to make use of the synergies between Regulation (EC) No 1221/2009 of 25 November 2009 (EMAS) and the provisions of this proposal for a regulation regarding Kyoto verification and accreditation.

Analysing these reasons, and with reference to Regulations (EC) Nos 765/2008 and 1221/2009, which reaffirm one of the principles of the Treaty establishing the European Union of not interfering in the distribution of functions within Member States, we would like to ask the Commission the following questions regarding the proposal for a regulation:

1. Why is the term 'certification of verifiers' introduced, instead of using the term 'licensing' as in Regulation (EC) No 1221/2009?

2. Why does it lay down that only a national public authority is empowered to certify individual verifiers, while Regulation (EC) No 1221/2009 also allows enterprises to license verifiers if the end goal is the same?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2012)

Under Regulation (EC) No 1221/2009([1]) the term 'licensing' refers to the registration of environmental verifiers and, in line with Article 5 of Regulation (EC) No 765/2008,([2]) is an alternative to the accreditation of verifiers. These licensed environmental verifiers can be either legal or natural persons. The draft Commission Regulation on the verification of greenhouse gas emission reports and tonne-kilometre reports and the accreditation of verifiers pursuant to Directive 2003/87/EC([3]) thereafter: the draft Commission Regulation) introduces provisions dealing exclusively with verifiers that are natural persons in order to address the variety of situations that exist in the Member States. Thus the two legislative instruments deal with two distinctly different situations. The draft Commission Regulation introduces the term 'certification of verifiers' to underline this difference and avoid any potential misunderstanding.

According to Regulation (EC) No 765/2008, a national accreditation body 'shall mean the sole body in a Member State that performs accreditation with authority derived from the State' and it shall operate on a not-for-profit basis. Furthermore, mutual recognition of verifiers is a key element of the draft Commission Regulation. To ensure the full and effective realisation of the mutual recognition of all verifiers, it introduces a system for the certification of verifiers that provides the same guarantees as the one applicable to the accreditation of verifiers. To that end, the draft Commission Regulation requires that the Member State, which chooses to make use of the certification option, appoints a national authority and supplies all supplementary evidence necessary to the Commission and the other Member States as proof that that national authority fulfills the same requirements as a national accreditation body.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1221/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November2009 on the voluntary participation by organisations in a Community eco-management and audit scheme (EMAS), OJ L 342, 22.12.2009.

([2]) Regulation (EC) No 765/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 9 July 2008 setting out the requirements for accreditation and market surveillance relating to the marketing of products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 339/93, OJ L 218, 13.8.2008.

([3]) Directive 2003/87/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 October 2003 establishing a scheme for greenhouse gas emission allowance trading within the Community, OJ L 275, 25.10.2003.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003692/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(11 de abril de 2012)

Asunto: Modificación de la propuesta de Reglamento de verificación y acreditación de verificadores de informes de emisión de gases de efecto invernadero III

En referencia a la propuesta de Reglamento relativo a la verificación de los informes de emisión de gases de efecto invernadero y de informe de datos sobre toneladas-kilómetro y a la acreditación de los verificadores de conformidad con la Directiva 2003/87/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo. La propuesta de Reglamento de verificación y acreditación, se justifica, entre otros, por los motivos siguientes:

— para garantizar que la verificación de los informes sea realizada por verificadores que tengan la competencia técnica necesaria y para llevar a cabo la tarea de verificación de forma independiente e imparcial,

— por la necesidad de armonizar las normas de acreditación,

— para aprovechar la sinergia del marco general de acreditación establecido por el Reglamento 765/2008, de 9 de julio,

— para aprovechar las sinergias entre el Reglamento 1221/2009, de 25 de noviembre (EMAS) y la propuesta de este Reglamento de verificación y acreditación Kyoto.

Analizando estas motivaciones y tomando como referencia los Reglamentos 765/2008 y 1221/2009, que reafirman uno de los principios del Tratado constitutivo de la Unión Europea de no interferir en la distribución de funciones en el sí de los Estados miembros, queremos trasladar a la Comisión las preguntas siguientes en relación a la propuesta de Reglamento:

1. ¿Qué capacidad de control puede ejercer la Administración regional competente sobre los verificadores?

2. ¿En caso de una verificación incorrecta, quién asumirá las consecuencias que se deriven?

Respuesta de la Sra. Hedegaard en nombre de la Comisión
(5 de junio de 2012)

Si por autoridades regionales pertinentes se entiende una autoridad competente designada por un Estado miembro con arreglo a la Directiva 2003/87/CE ([1]), la respuesta a la pregunta es afirmativa en el marco del proyecto de Reglamento de la Comisión relativo a la verificación de los informes de emisiones de gases de efecto invernadero y de los informes de datos sobre toneladas-kilómetro y a la acreditación de los verificadores de conformidad con la Directiva 2003/87/CE (en lo sucesivo denominado el proyecto de Reglamento de la Comisión).

El proyecto de Reglamento de la Comisión tiene por objeto establecer un procedimiento detallado y de alta calidad para la verificación de los informes de emisiones de gases de efecto invernadero y de los informes sobre toneladas-kilómetro presentados por un titular o un operador de aeronaves. Este proceso de verificación supone, en especial, la notificación correcta y eficaz de las emisiones de gases de efecto invernadero, las competencias técnicas de los verificadores y la mejora permanente de los procesos internos por parte de los verificadores, sobre todo en lo que respecta a su independencia e imparcialidad. El proyecto de Reglamento de la Comisión aborda la fiabilidad de la verificación para los usuarios y recuerda que el proceso de verificación de los informes de emisiones debe ser un medio eficaz y fidedigno en apoyo de la garantía de calidad y los procedimientos de control de la calidad. Además, de conformidad con la Directiva 2003/87/CE, el verificador debe aplicar un planteamiento basado en el riesgo a fin de llegar a un dictamen de verificación que ofrezca garantías razonables de que las emisiones totales no contienen ninguna inexactitud importante o de que las toneladas-kilómetro no presentan errores, así como de que el informe puede ser comprobado como satisfactorio. De producirse verificaciones incorrectas, la cuestión de la responsabilidad debe evaluarse caso por caso.

([1]) Directiva 2003/87/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 13 de octubre de 2003, por la que se establece un régimen para el comercio de derechos de emisión de gases de efecto invernadero en la Comunidad (DO L 275 de 25.10.2003).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003692/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(11 April 2012)

Subject: Amendment to the proposal for a regulation on verification and accreditation of verifiers of greenhouse gas emission reports (III)

The grounds given for the proposal for a regulation on verification of greenhouse gas emission reports and tonne-kilometre reports and the accreditation of verifiers pursuant to Directive 2003/87/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council include the following:

— to ensure that verification of reports is carried out by verifiers that have the required technical competence to perform the verification task in an independent and impartial manner;

— the need to harmonise accreditation standards;

— in order to make use of the synergy of the overall accreditation framework established by Regulation (EC) No 765/2008 of 9 July 2008;

— in order to make use of the synergies between Regulation (EC) No 1221/2009 of 25 November 2009 (EMAS) and the provisions in this proposal for a regulation regarding Kyoto verification and accreditation.

Analysing these reasons, and with reference to Regulations (EC) Nos 765/2008 and 1221/2009, which reaffirm one of the principles of the Treaty establishing the European Union of not interfering in the distribution of functions within Member States, we would like to ask the Commission the following questions regarding the proposal for a regulation:

1. To what extent is the relevant regional authority empowered to monitor verifiers?

2. In case of an incorrect verification, who assumes the responsibility for consequences?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2012)

If by relevant regional authority it is meant a competent authority appointed by a Member State on the basis of Directive 2003/87/EC ([1]), the answer to the question is positive within the context of the draft Commission Regulation on the verification of greenhouse gas emission reports and tonne-kilometre reports and the accreditation of verifiers pursuant to Directive 2003/87/EC (hereafter: the draft Commission Regulation).

The draft Commission Regulation aims to set up a detailed and high-quality process for the verification of greenhouse gas emission reports and tonne-kilometre reports submitted by an operator or aircraft operator. That verification process involves, notably, the correct and effective reporting of greenhouse gas emissions; the technical skills of the verifiers; the continuous improvement of internal processes by verifiers, notably as for their independence and impartiality. The draft Commission Regulation addresses the reliability of verification for users and recalls that the process of verifying emission reports shall be an effective and reliable tool in support of quality assurance and quality control procedures. Furthermore, in accordance with Directive 2003/87/EC the verifier shall apply a risk-based approach with the aim of reaching a verification opinion providing reasonable assurance that the total emissions or tonne-kilometres are not materially misstated and that the report can be verified as satisfactory. In the event of an incorrect verification, the question of responsibility should be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

([1]) Directive 2003/87/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 October 2003 establishing a scheme for greenhouse gas emission allowance trading within the Community, OJ L 275, 25.10.2003.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003715/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(12 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Progetto «Bici al posto delle pillole»

A Strasburgo l'amministrazione comunale ha deciso di finanziare un progetto per la prescrizione di ore di pedalate a chi ne può trarre beneficio per la salute. La ricetta medica che prescrive le passeggiate in bicicletta permetterà ai cittadini di usufruire delle bici che il municipio gestisce da diverso tempo tramite un sistema (Vel'hop) che consente a chiunque di utilizzarle in città pagando un piccolo affitto.

Il progetto partirà solo con 50 medici volontari, generici e cardiologi. Se l'esperienza, che durerà un anno, avrà successo diventerà definitiva nel 2014. A quel punto tutti i medici potranno prescrivere la bicicletta o altre attività «dolci» nei parchi e nelle aree attrezzate del Comune.

Alla luce dei fatti sopraesposti, può la Commissione per sapere se è a conoscenza del progetto «Bici al posto delle pillole» dell'amministrazione comunale di Strasburgo?

Considerando le finalità ecologiche, educative e mediche del progetto, intende dedicare adeguati finanziamenti a progetti che puntano alla sensibilizzazione del trasporto sostenibile soprattutto se può giovare, come nel caso delle biciclette, alla salute dei cittadini?

Tale iniziativa potrebbe rientrare tra quelle finanziate con i progetti pilota dell'Unione europea?

Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(20 giugno 2012)

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

La Commissione promuove attivamente la buona salute e gli stili di vita sani; i progetti in tale ambito rientrano nel campo di applicazione del programma Salute 2008-2013 ([1]). I singoli progetti però, per essere selezionati, devono corrispondere a tutti i criteri descritti nei piani di lavoro adottati annualmente dalla Commissione ed essere selezionati per la loro qualità ad opera di valutatori esterni nell'ambito di un concorso. Il programma di lavoro 2013 sarà adottato alla fine del 2012.

Il finanziamento di progetti pilota è possibile se questi rientrano in un elenco di progetti pilota approvato dal Parlamento europeo nel contesto della procedura annuale di bilancio.

I progetti di sensibilizzazione sui trasporti sostenibili potrebbero potenzialmente ottenere anch'essi un cofinanziamento dal programma LIFE+ a condizione che soddisfino i requisiti di tale programma ([2]). La Commissione ha indetto un bando di gara per una campagna triennale di sensibilizzazione su scala europea in tema di mobilità urbana sostenibile per supportare la Settimana europea della mobilità. I lavori relativi alla campagna sono iniziati nel gennaio 2012.

([1]) Decisione n. 1350/2007 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, GU L 301 del 20.11.2007.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/life/funding/lifeplus.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003715/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(12 April 2012)

Subject: 'Bikes, not pills' project

The city administration in Strasbourg has decided to fund a project that prescribes hours of cycling to those who may derive health benefits from it. The medical prescription of bicycle rides will enable citizens to make use of the bikes the city has managed for some time via the Vel'hop system, which enables anybody to use them in the city for a small hire charge.

The project will begin with just 50 volunteer doctors, general practitioners and cardiologists. If the year-long experiment is successful, the project will become permanent in 2014. From then, all doctors will be able to prescribe bicycle riding or other 'gentle' activities in parks and designated spaces in the city.

In view of the above, can the Commission state whether it is aware of the 'Bikes, not pills' project of the Strasbourg city administration?

Considering the environmental, educational and medical aims of the project, does it intend to dedicate appropriate funding to projects that focus on raising awareness of sustainable transport, particularly if it can benefit the health of citizens, as in the case of bicycles?

Could such an initiative be among those funded by European Union pilot projects?

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

The Commission is not aware of the project referred to by the Honourable Member.

The Commission is keen to promote good health and healthy living and projects in this area fall under the scope of the Health Programme 2008-2013 ([1]). For individual projects to be selected for funding, however, they need to fulfill all the criteria described in the work plans adopted each year by the Commission and selected in terms of quality by external evaluators in a competitive process. The 2013 work programme will be adopted by the end of 2012.

The funding of pilot projects is possible if included on a list of pilot projects approved by the Parliament as part of the annual budgetary procedure.

Projects focusing on raising awareness of sustainable transport could potentially also obtain co-funding from the LIFE+ programme, provided they also satisfy the requirements of this programme ([2]). The Commission launched a tender for a 3 year Europe-wide awareness-raising campaign on sustainable urban mobility to support the European Mobility Week. The work on the campaign started in January 2012.

([1]) Decision No 1350/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council OJ L 301, 20.11.2007.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/life/funding/lifeplus.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003718/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(12 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Shopping on line e pagamenti sicuri

Raddoppiare il valore del commercio elettronico europeo entro il 2015 in sedici mosse. Questo è l'ambizioso obiettivo che si è dato il commissario europeo Neelie Kroes, rinforzandolo con un dato che ne afferma tutta l'importanza: per ogni posto di lavoro che si perde a causa del paradigma digitale se ne creano 2,6 e questo dimostra la rilevanza del tema ai fini dello sviluppo e dell'occupazione.

Lo shopping on line è un mercato in continua crescita, nonostante in Italia sia ancora relegato a un ruolo di nicchia. E mentre l'e-commerce decolla in tutto il mondo, con cifre quasi record raggiunte durante il periodo natalizio, l'Europa inizia a preoccuparsi della concorrenza. Il leader del settore sembra essere diventato la Cina, con 315 miliardi di dollari in transazioni, ed entro il 2015 pare che gli acquisti via Internet possano eguagliare, se non superare, quelli effettuati fisicamente in negozio.

La concorrenza del sistema economico cinese ha preso di mira il mercato europeo, con iniziative sempre più localizzate e intense, e punta a superare nel 2015 lo stesso mercato on line americano.

In merito a quanto esposto, può la Commissione chiarire:

1. come intende tutelare il consumatore in merito a pagamenti sicuri, ivi comprese la logistica delle spedizioni e garanzie che il prodotto acquistato corrisponda al prodotto pubblicizzato su Internet;

2. come intende equilibrare il mercato delle vendite on line in un'economia che rischia di andare ad appannaggio esclusivo dell'Asia.

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(21 giugno 2012)

La Commissione ritiene che il commercio elettronico e i servizi in linea siano una fonte importante di crescita e d'occupazione: nella comunicazione dell'11 gennaio 2012 ha pertanto definito una strategia di sviluppo del commercio elettronico transfrontaliero mediante il rafforzamento della fiducia dei cittadini e delle imprese.

1. I consumatori europei godono dei diritti previsti dalle direttive 99/44/CE ([1]), 97/7/CE ([2]), 93/13/CE ([3]), 2005/29/CE ([4]) e, in futuro, dalla direttiva 2011/83/UE, compreso il diritto di recesso da un contratto concluso in linea. Peraltro la direttiva sui servizi di pagamento ([5]) contiene disposizioni sul diritto di rimborso in caso di addebiti non autorizzati, eccessiva fatturazione o esecuzione non corretta ([6]).

La Commissione è consapevole dell'importanza di migliorare la consegna e la disponibilità dei sistemi di pagamento. Nell'aprile 2012 si è conclusa una consultazione pubblica sui pagamenti tramite carte, internet e telefono mobile: ([7]) la Commissione renderà pubbliche le conclusioni entro la fine di luglio 2012. Nell'autunno 2012 sarà avviata una nuova consultazione pubblica volta a determinare le misure che consentano un migliore servizio di ritiro e consegna dei pacchi.

2. La Commissione intende permettere alle PMI di accedere più facilmente alle attività in linea e ottimizzarne le prestazioni in termini di crescita e creazione di posti di lavoro: è uno dei modi per garantire la più ampia vitalità del tessuto economico europeo nel quadro della concorrenza mondiale e per conseguire l'obiettivo di raddoppiare le vendite in linea nel comparto delle vendite al dettaglio entro il 2015.

([1]) Direttiva 99/44/CE su taluni aspetti della vendita e delle garanzie dei beni di consumo: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:1999:171:0012:0016:IT:PDF.
([2]) Direttiva 97/7/CE riguardante la protezione dei consumatori in materia di contratti a distanza: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:1997:144:0019:0027:IT:PDF.
([3]) Direttiva 93/13/CEE concernente le clausole abusive nei contratti stipulati con i consumatori: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:1993:095:0029:0034:IT:PDF.
([4]) Direttiva 2005/29/CE relativa alle pratiche commerciali sleali: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2005:149:0022:0039:IT:PDF.
([5]) Direttiva 2007/64/CE: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:319:0001:01:IT:HTML.
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/payments/docs/framework/psd_consumers/psd_it.pdf
([7]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0941:FIN:IT:PDF.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003718/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(12 April 2012)

Subject: Online shopping and secure payments

To double the value of European e-commerce by 2015 in 16 steps: this is the ambitious target set by European Commissioner Neelie Kroes, reinforcing it with a statistic that shows how important it is: for every job lost to the digital paradigm, 2.6 jobs are created, which demonstrates how relevant the subject is for development and employment.

Online shopping is a continually growing market, although in Italy it is still relegated to a niche role. And while e-commerce is taking off around the world, with near record numbers reached during the Christmas period, Europe has begun to worry about the competition. China seems to have become the leader in this sector, with USD 315 billion earned in transactions, and by 2015 it appears that Internet shopping may equal, if not exceed, in-shop purchases.

Competition from the Chinese economic system has targeted the market in Europe with increasingly localised and intense initiatives and in 2015 it aims to overtake the US online market.

In view of the above, can the Commission explain:

1. How it intends to protect consumers with regard to the security of payments, including shipping logistics and guarantees that the purchased product matches the product advertised on the Internet;

2. How it intends to counterbalance the online sales market in an economy which is likely to become the exclusive preserve of Asia.

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission
(21 juin 2012)

La Commission considère que le commerce électronique et les services en ligne constituent une source majeure de croissance et d'emplois. Elle a donc défini dans sa Communication du 11 janvier 2012 une stratégie pour le développement du commerce électronique transfrontalier, par le renforcement de la confiance des citoyens et des entreprises.

1. Les consommateurs européens jouissent des droits prévus par les directives 99/44/CE ([1]), 97/7/CE ([2]), 93/13/CEE ([3]), 2005/29/CE ([4]) et, dans le futur, la directive 2011/83/UE y compris d'un droit de se rétracter d'un contrat conclu en ligne. Par ailleurs la directive sur les services de paiements ([5]) contient des mesures sur le droit au remboursement en cas de prélèvements non-autorisés, de surfacturation ou de traitement erroné ([6]).

La Commission est consciente de l'importance d'améliorer la livraison et la disponibilité de systèmes de paiements. Une consultation publique sur les paiements par carte, par internet et par téléphone mobile ([7]) s'est achevée en avril 2012. La Commission rendra publiques ses conclusions d'ici la fin du mois de juillet 2012. À l'automne 2012 une nouvelle consultation publique visant à déterminer les mesures permettant un meilleur acheminement des colis sera lancée.

2. La Commission vise à permettre aux PME d'accéder plus facilement aux activités en ligne et d'optimiser leur performance en termes de croissance et d'emplois. C'est un des moyens d'assurer la plus grande vitalité du tissu économique européen dans le cadre d'une concurrence mondiale et d'atteindre l'objectif du doublement des ventes en ligne dans les ventes de détail d'ici 2015.

([1]) Directive 99/44/CE sur certains aspects de la vente et des garanties des biens de consommation: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:1999:171:0012:0016:FR:PDF
([2]) Directive 97/7/CE concernant la protection des consommateurs en matière de contrats à distance: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:1997:144:0019:0027:FR:PDF
([3]) Directive 93/13/CEE concernant les clauses abusives dans les contrats conclus avec les consommateurs: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:1993:095:0029:0034:FR:PDF
([4]) Directive 2005/29/CE sur les pratiques commerciales déloyales: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2005:149:0022:0039:FR:PDF
([5]) Directive 2007/64/CE: http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:319:0001:01:FR:HTML
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/payments/docs/framework/psd_consumers/psd_fr.pdf
([7]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0941:FIN:FR:PDF

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003720/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(12 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Erasmus per giovani imprenditori

La crisi che si protrae oramai dal 2008 sta mettendo in ginocchio molte imprese. Ora l'allarme è che l'Italia, così come molti altri Stati membri, possa perdere un'intera generazione di imprenditori.

Questo accade perché il contesto imprenditoriale si è fatto via via più competitivo e la difficile congiuntura economica sta mettendo in ginocchio anche le realtà produttive più consolidate, scoraggiando non poco i giovani che hanno un'idea di business ma non la forza, finanziaria e non, per realizzarla.

Molti giovani imprenditori poi, nel momento in cui costituiscono un'impresa, non possiedono un'adeguata esperienza nella gestione aziendale e mancano di competenze cruciali per la buona riuscita del loro progetto imprenditoriale. Tali lacune, unite al fatto che il più delle volte l'impresa che nasce opera solo a livello nazionale, ne limitano notevolmente la crescita.

La Commissione europea, per risolvere il problema, ha creato il programma «Erasmus per giovani imprenditori»; l'idea è di aiutare l'imprenditore ad acquisire importanti competenze e ad estendere la propria attività a livello europeo.

1. In merito a quanto esposto, può la Commissione far sapere quanti giovani hanno potuto usufruire del programma «Erasmus per giovani imprenditori» dalla sua nascita?

2. Può indicare quali sono i principali obiettivi del programma «Erasmus per giovani imprenditori»? Può eventualmente indicare quali e quanti sono i risultati per le PMI europee gestite da giovani che hanno potuto usufruire dall'idea?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(11 giugno 2012)

Il programma «Erasmus per giovani imprenditori» e operativo dall'aprile 2009. A tutt'oggi più di 3 500 imprenditori hanno un profilo convalidato nella base dati del programma e sono stati organizzati più di 1 070 soggiorni.

Gli obiettivi generali del programma sono, da un lato, il potenziamento dello spirito imprenditoriale e delle competenze manageriali dei giovani imprenditori che si trovano a contatto con un «imprenditore ospitante» di esperienza collaudata e, dall'altro, il rafforzamento della competitività e l'internazionalizzazione delle piccole e medie imprese partecipanti.

Stando alle risposte ai questionari compilati dai partecipanti alla fine di ciascuno scambio, il programma consente di sviluppare il progetto professionale o l'attività commerciale sia dei nuovi imprenditori che degli imprenditori ospitanti; l'89 % dei «nuovi imprenditori» ritiene che la partecipazione al programma abbia contribuito a realizzare la loro ambizione di creare una propria impresa. Il programma offre inoltre ai partecipanti la possibilità di meglio esplorare le opportunità offerte dal mercato comune ampliando la loro rete di contatti o approfondendo le loro conoscenze dei mercati esteri.

Una valutazione intermedia dell'azione preparatoria — realizzata peraltro ad uno stadio precoce dell'azione e quindi fondata su dati limitati — fornisce del pari proiezioni interessanti in termini di creazione di posti di lavoro. 10 000 scambi potrebbero determinare la creazione di 5 000-6 000 posti di lavoro. Questa valutazione è disponibile su internet al seguente indirizzo: http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/evaluation/eye_final_report_en.pdf.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003720/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(12 April 2012)

Subject: Erasmus for Young Entrepreneurs

The crisis that has been dragging on since 2008 is bringing many companies to their knees. The danger is that Italy, like many other Member States, could lose an entire generation of entrepreneurs.

This is happening because the business world is becoming increasingly competitive and the difficult economic situation is even reducing the more established areas of industry, thereby discouraging many young people with business ideas, but not the strength, financial or otherwise, to realise them.

Furthermore, when setting up a company, many young entrepreneurs lack sufficient experience of business administration and the crucial skills needed to make their project a success. These shortcomings, together with the fact that the companies created mostly only operate at national level, considerably limit their growth.

To resolve the problem, the European Commission has created the Erasmus for Young Entrepreneurs programme, to help entrepreneurs to gain important skills and expand their activities at European level.

1. In view of the above, can the Commission say how many young people have been able to take advantage of this programme since its inception?

2. Can it also state the main objectives of the Erasmus for Young Entrepreneurs programme? Is it possible to indicate the nature and quantity of the results achieved by European SMEs managed by young people who have been able to make good use of the idea?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Tajani au nom de la Commission
(11 juin 2012)

Le programme «Erasmus pour jeunes entrepreneurs» est opérationnel depuis avril 2009. À ce jour, plus de 3 500 entrepreneurs ont un profil validé dans la base de données du programme et plus de 1 070 séjours ont été organisés.

Les objectifs généraux du programme sont, d'une part, l'amélioration de l'esprit d'entreprise et des compétences managériales des jeunes entrepreneurs mis en contact avec un «entrepreneur d'accueil» expérimenté et, d'autre part le renforcement de la compétitivité et l'internationalisation des Petites et Moyennes Entreprises participantes.

D'après les réponses aux questionnaires remplis par les participants à la fin de chaque échange, le programme permet de développer le projet professionnel ou l'activité commerciale tant des nouveaux entrepreneurs que des entrepreneurs d'accueil; 89 % des «nouveaux entrepreneurs» estiment que leur participation au programme a contribué à leur ambition de créer leur propre entreprise. Le programme donne également aux participants la possibilité de mieux explorer les opportunités offertes par le marché commun en élargissant leur réseau de contacts ou en approfondissant leurs connaissances de marchés étrangers.

Une évaluation intermédiaire de l'action préparatoire — bien que réalisée à un stade précoce de l'action et par conséquent fondée sur des données limitées — fournit également des projections intéressantes en termes de création d'emplois. Ainsi, 10 000 échanges pourraient donner lieu à la création de 5 000 à 6 000 emplois. Cette évaluation est disponible sur internet à l'adresse suivante:
http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/evaluation/eye_final_report_en.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003722/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(12 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Possibili fondi per l'Associazione Polje

L'Associazione Consortile Polje di Molfetta nasce dall'azione sinergica di sei associazioni presenti sul territorio: Archeoclub, Ictíus, Legambiente, Pro Loco, Terrae e Wwf.

Dal 2007 è soggetto gestore del Pulo su incarico dalla Provincia di Bari, ente proprietario del bene, e opera per la valorizzazione del sito, garantendone una fruibilità rispettosa dell'ambiente e delle testimonianze storico-archeologiche. Il Pulo di Molfetta è una caratteristica dolina da crollo di origine carsica, dove ha vissuto l'uomo del Neolitico tra il VI e l'VIII secolo.

Il Pulo di Molfetta non è interessante solo dal punto di vista storico-archeologico e della sua natura geologica, ma anche — cosa non di minore importanza — per le sue valenze naturalistiche che rendono questo sito, dalle dimensioni non molto estese, importantissimo sotto il profilo della biodiversità sia faunistica che botanica. L'Associazione Polje si occupa ogni anno, all'interno della dolina, oltre che dell'organizzazione di visite guidate, anche di manifestazioni culturali, come spettacoli teatrali e concerti.

Alla luce dei fatti sopraesposti, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. È a conoscenza delle attività e dei progetti svolti dall'Associazione Consortile Polje?

2. Considerate le finalità culturali, storiche e archeologiche dell'Associazione, può il Consorzio Polje usufruire di fondi europei per le proprie attività?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(7 giugno 2012)

1. La Commissione non è a conoscenza delle attività e dei progetti trattati dall'Associazione consortile Polje.

2. Si rinvia l'onorevole deputato alla risposta che la Commissione ha dato all'interrogazione scritta E-3298/2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp?language=fr.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003722/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(12 April 2012)

Subject: Possible funding for the Polje Consortium Association

The Polje Consortium Association in Molfetta is the result of collaborative work between six associations operating in this area: Archeoclub, Ictius, Legambiente, Pro Loco, Terrae and WWF.

Since 2007 it has been entrusted with responsibility for managing the *Pulo* by the Province of Bari, the organisation that owns the site, and is working to enhance its value, ensuring that it is used in a manner that is respectful to the environment and its historic and archaeological heritage. The *Pulo* in Molfetta is a typical sinkhole, caused by a karstic collapse, in which humans lived in the Neolithic age between the 7th and 8th centuries.

The *Pulo* in Molfetta is interesting not only from an archaeological and geological point of view but also — and no less importantly — for its natural value, which makes this relatively small site extremely important in terms of biodiversity both for its flora and fauna. Every year, the Polje Consortium Association organises guided tours and cultural initiatives in the sinkhole, including theatrical performances and concerts.

In view of the above, could the Commission reply to the following questions:

1. Is it aware of the activities and projects carried out by the Polje Consortium Association?

2. Given the cultural, historic and archaeological objectives of the association, could the Polje Consortium benefit from European funding for its activities?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Hahn au nom de la Commission
(7 juin 2012)

1. La Commission n'a pas connaissance des activités et des projets traités par l'Association Consortile Polje.

2. L'Honorable Parlementaire voudra bien se reporter à la réponse que la Commission a donnée à sa question écrite E-3298/2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp?language=fr

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003733/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(12 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Ricerca e innovazione in Europa

In questo momento storico l'innovazione rappresenta una strategia fondamentale per avviare le economie mature verso la ripresa e per lasciarsi definitivamente alle spalle il difficile momento di crisi che incide negativamente sugli investimenti e sulla competitività.

Nella stessa «Strategia Europa 2020» l'asse prioritario «crescita intelligente» promuove la conoscenza e l'innovazione come motori della nostra futura crescita e chiede di mantenere monitorato il parametro inerente alla spesa in Ricerca & Sviluppo (R&S) in rapporto al PIL.

L'Unione europea sta avanzando a poco a poco verso la propria meta, ovvero investire il 3 % del PIL in R&S: nel 2009 la spesa in R&S dell'Unione raggiunge il 2 % mantenendosi ancora a distanza dai maggiori concorrenti mondiali (Stati Uniti e Giappone), ma nello stesso anno sono stati 23 gli Stati membri a riuscire a mantenere o ad accrescere la propria spesa in R&S.

In Italia nel 2009 è stato destinato all'attività di ricerca l'1,26 % del PIL, valore che porta la nostra nazione sempre più vicina all'obiettivo nazionale fissato per il 2020, pari all'1,53 %. La distanza dal target tende quindi a ridursi per l'Italia, arrivata a soltanto 0,3 punti percentuali al di sotto della soglia.

Tutto ciò premesso, s'interroga la Commissione per sapere:

1. Dal momento che l'Unione europea richiede un investimento complessivo del 3 % del PIL in R&S, ma non specifica il target per ogni Stato membro, può la Commissione fornire un quadro degli investimenti in R&S nei diversi Stati membri?

2. È in possesso la Commissione di dati in base ai quali si possa evincere in quali settori gli Stati membri hanno più tendenza a investire?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(11 giugno 2012)

1. Nel 2010 ogni Stato membro dell'UE, ad eccezione del Regno Unito, della Grecia e della Repubblica ceca ([1]) ha fissato il proprio obiettivo da raggiungere entro il 2020 in materia di investimenti di R&S in relazione al PIL («l'intensità di R&S»). La Commissione ha dialogato con ciascuno Stato membro fornendo elementi di analisi concreti che permettono di stabilire una fascia per la fissazione di un obiettivo che sia al tempo stesso ambizioso e realista, tenendo conto in particolare della situazione iniziale, della sua recente evoluzione e della composizione settoriale della sua economia. I dati dell'ultimo valore conosciuto dell'intensità R&S di ciascuno Stato membro e l'obiettivo fissato da ciascuno Stato sono riportati nella tabella in allegato ([2]).

2. La Commissione incentiva l'elaborazione di strategie nazionali di ricerca e di innovazione che precisino orientamenti tematici chiari e ben individuati. La prossima programmazione dei fondi strutturali, che darà ampio spazio agli investimenti per la ricerca e l'innovazione, sarà strettamente connessa alle strategie regionali di specializzazione intelligente (smart specialisation strategies) che dovranno essere elaborate dalle regioni nei prossimi mesi. La Commissione rende pubblici *sistematicamente* gli studi e le analisi che essa stessa commissiona o produce e che possono rendere più consapevoli tali scelte; ciò è avvenuto ad esempio nella relazione 2011 sulla competitività dell'Unione dell'innovazione ([3]) che contiene profili per paese ([4]) ed elementi destinati a facilitare le scelte di specializzazione ([5]). La ripartizione delle spese private di R&S per settori economici in ciascuno Stato membro viene indicata anch'essa nella tabella in allegato.

([1]) La Repubblica ceca ha fissato soltanto un obiettivo per l'intensità pubblica di ricerca.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/index_en.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/innovation-union/index_en.cfm?section=competitiveness-report&year=2011.
([4]) Sezione II.
([5]) Pagine I 432-I 452.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003733/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(12 April 2012)

Subject: Research and innovation in Europe

At this historic moment, innovation is a fundamental strategy for driving mature economies towards recovery so that they may finally emerge from the difficult crisis which has had a negative impact on investments and competition.

The Europe 2020 strategy, whose main aim of 'intelligent growth' is to promote knowledge and innovation as the engines of our future growth, calls for continued monitoring of the parameters regarding the cost of Research and Development (R & D) relative to GDP.

The European Union is slowly moving towards its goal, namely to invest 3 % of GDP in R & D. In 2009, R & D expenditure in the EU reached 2 %, still lagging behind its main global competitors (the United States and Japan) although, in the same year, 23 Member States managed to maintain or increase their R & D spending.

In Italy, in 2009, 1.26 % of GDP was spent on research, bringing our country ever closer to the 1.53 % target set for 2020. The distance from the target is therefore tending to decrease in Italy, which is now just 0.3 percentage points below the threshold.

In view of the above, we ask the Commission to let us know:

1. Since the EU is calling for a total investment of 3 % of GDP in R & D but does not specify the target for each Member State, can the Commission provide a picture of the R & D investments in the different Member States?

2. Does the Commission have data concerning which sectors attract most investment from Member States?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Geoghegan-Quinn au nom de la Commission
(11 juin 2012)

1. En 2010, chaque État membre de l'UE, à l'exception du Royaume-Uni, de la Grèce et de la République Tchèque ([1]) a fixé lui-même sa cible à atteindre d'ici 2020 en matière d'investissements en R&D rapporté au PIB («l'intensité de R&D»). La Commission a dialogué avec chaque État membre en fournissant des éléments d'analyse factuels permettant de déterminer une fourchette pour la fixation d'un objectif qui soit à la fois ambitieux et réaliste compte tenu notamment de sa situation de départ, de son évolution récente et de la composition sectorielle de son économie. La dernière valeur connue de l'intensité R&D de chaque État membre ainsi que l'objectif fixé par celui-ci sont donnés dans le tableau en annexe ([2]), ([3]).

2. La Commission encourage l'élaboration de stratégies nationales de recherche et d'innovation précisant des orientations thématiques claires et bien identifiées. La prochaine programmation des fonds structurels, qui fera une large place aux investissements en recherche et innovation, sera étroitement liée aux stratégies régionales de spécialisation intelligente (smart specialisation strategies) qui devront être élaborées par les régions dans les mois qui viennent. La Commission rend systématiquement publiques les études et analyses qu'elle commande ou produit elle-même et qui sont susceptibles d'informer ces choix, comme par exemple le rapport 2011 de la compétitivité de l'Union de l'innovation ([4]) qui comporte des profils par pays ([5]) et des éléments destinés à faciliter les choix de spécialisation ([6]). La répartition des dépenses privées de R&D par secteurs économiques dans chaque État membre est également fournie dans le tableau en annexe.

([1]) La République Tchèque a fixé un objectif pour l'intensité publique de recherche uniquement.
([2]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/europe_2020_indicators/headline_indicators
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/index_en.htm
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/innovation-union/index_en.cfm?section=competitiveness-report&year=2011
([5]) Section II.
([6]) Pages I 432 à I 452.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-003742/12
komissiolle
Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE)
(12. huhtikuuta 2012)

Aihe: Pakkausten täyttöaste

Direktiivi 94/62/EY pakkauksista ja pakkausjätteistä säätää toimista, joilla pyritään vähentämään pakkausjätteiden tuotantoa ja lisäämään niiden kierrätystä. Kyseinen direktiivi velvoittaa jäsenvaltiot mm. ottamaan käyttöön palautus-, keruu- ja hyödyntämisjärjestelmiä hyödyntämis- ja kierrätystavoitteiden saavuttamiseksi.

Direktiivi ei kuitenkaan käsittele elintarvikkeiden kuluttajapakkausten täyttöastetta eli sitä, miten paljon pakkauksessa saa olla tyhjää tilaa.

Vähittäiskaupassa myytävissä monissa elintarvikkeissa huomattava osa pakkauksesta on tyhjää tilaa, mikä lisää sekä pakkausjätettä että tuotteen kuljetuskustannuksia. Lisäksi se johtaa harhaan kuluttajaa, joka usein valitsee kahdesta tuotteesta sen, jolla on isompi pakkaus riippumatta siitä, onko pakkausten sisällön määrässä eroa.

Jos kuluttajapakkausten minimitäyttöaste olisi määritelty EU-lainsäädännössä, valmistajilla ei olisi syytä tuhlata resursseja tekemällä ylisuuria pakkauksia, ja kuluttajankin olisi helpompi verrata pakkausten sisältämän tavaran määrää. Tämä tukisi EU:n resurssitehokkuustavoitteiden saavuttamista. Komissio toteaakin viime vuonna julkaisemassaan Etenemissuunnitelmassa kohti resurssitehokasta Eurooppaa, että jäsenvaltiot ja komissio arvioivat vuodesta 2012 lähtien toimia, joilla optimoidaan pakkausten resurssitehokkuus.

Aikooko komissio tässä tai muussa yhteydessä harkita toimia, joilla kuluttajapakkausten täyttöasteita parannetaan?

Janez Potočnikin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(30. toukokuuta 2012)

Pakkauksista ja pakkausjätteistä annetussa direktiivissä 94/62/EY säädetään useista keskeisistä vaatimuksista, jotka koskevat pakkausten saattamista markkinoille. Yksi näistä vaatimuksista on se, että pakkauksen paino ja koko on rajoitettava mahdollisimman pieniksi siten, että samalla varmistetaan vaadittava turvallisuuden, hygienian ja hyväksyttävyyden taso sekä pakatun tuotteen että kuluttajan kannalta.

Komissio ei tällä hetkellä aio ehdottaa uusia toimenpiteitä pakkausten täyttöasteen nostamiseksi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003742/12
to the Commission
Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE)
(12 April 2012)

Subject: Degree of filling of consumer packaging

Directive 94/62/EC on packaging and packaging waste introduced measures intended to reduce the output of packing waste and to promote recycling of such waste. This directive requires Member States to implement return, collection and recovery systems in order to achieve recovery and recycling objectives.

However, the directive does not address the degree to which consumer food packaging is filled. That is, there is no regulation concerning the amount of empty space that such packaging may contain.

Many food products on sale in retail outlets are packaged in such a way that a considerable proportion of the packaging is empty space, which increases packaging waste and the logistical costs of the product. Furthermore, it misleads consumers, who often choose a larger product, regardless of whether there is a difference in the amount of content within the packaging.

If EU legislation defined a minimum degree of filling for consumer packaging, producers would have no reason to waste resources on manufacturing oversized packaging and it would be easier for consumers to compare the amount of product contained within the packaging. This would facilitate the achievement of the EU's resource efficiency objectives. Indeed, the Commission stated in its Roadmap to a Resource Efficient Europe, which was published last year, that the Member States and the Commission intended to investigate measures for optimising the resource efficiency of packaging from 2012 onwards.

Does the Commission intend to consider measures, in this or in any other regard, by which the degree of filling of consumer packaging could be increased?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2012)

Directive 94/62/EC on packaging and packaging waste provides for a set of essential requirements for placing packaging on the market. One of these requirements is that packaging weight and volume must be reduced to the minimum necessary for safety, hygiene and consumer acceptance of the packaged product.

The Commission does not currently have the intention to propose further measures to increase the degree of filing of packaging.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-003743/12
alla Commissione
Debora Serracchiani (S&D)
(12 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Itinerario culturale di Santiago de Compostela

Il 21 agosto 2010 Giulio Recusani, un ragazzo italiano, è morto annegato presso la *Playa de Mar de Fora*, a Finisterre, ultima tappa del pellegrinaggio di Santiago de Compostela, in Spagna. Dalle testimonianze dei presenti è emerso che, prima di inabissarsi, il ragazzo ha nuotato per un'ora e che i soccorsi sono arrivati solo quando ormai era troppo tardi.

Il 112 era stato immediatamente allertato e ad oggi non è chiaro se e quando sia stata effettuata la chiamata di «Mayday relay» alle imbarcazioni di pesca della zona attraverso l'apposito canale 16 UHF o gli altri sistemi previsti.

A quanto pare il percorso è conosciuto per altri incidenti e decessi avvenuti in passato e causati dalla mancanza di segnalazione dei punti che, per la mutevolezza delle condizioni atmosferiche e delle correnti, risultano pericolosi. I genitori della vittima hanno oltretutto dovuto affrontare le difficoltà legate alle procedure per il rimpatrio della salma e sono stati costretti a ritornare in Spagna per l'esame del DNA a pochi giorni dal rientro in Italia. Il risultato dell'esame del DNA è stato reso noto a distanza di dieci giorni e solo dopo circa tre settimane la salma è stata finalmente rimpatriata.

— Considerando che le sue competenze in relazione agli atti e alle omissioni degli Stati membri sono limitate alla vigilanza sull'applicazione del diritto dell'Unione sotto il controllo della Corte di giustizia dell'UE (articolo 17 paragrafo 1 del TUE), quali misure ha adottato o intende adottare la Commissione per migliorare la cooperazione tra Stati membri in materia di rafforzamento della fiducia e di riconoscimento reciproco nel settore del trasferimento delle salme da uno Stato membro all'altro?

— Considerando che quello di Santiago de Compostela è uno dei più importanti itinerari culturali europei, intende la Commissione adottare misure di prevenzione degli incidenti e, se del caso, verificare che i sistemi di soccorso siano ovunque efficaci e sempre attivi?

Risposta data da Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(23 maggio 2012)

La Commissione invita l'onorevole parlamentare a prendere conoscenza della risposta da essa data alle interrogazioni scritte E-000338/2012, E-0010619/2010, E-002731/2010, E-001264/2008.

Il trasferimento del corpo di defunti in Europa è oggetto dell'accordo del Consiglio d'Europa del 1973, inteso a semplificare le formalità amministrative per il trasporto delle spoglie delle persone defunte tra le parti contraenti. Nella sua comunicazione per un'efficace tutela consolare nei paesi terzi: il contributo dell'Unione europea — Piano d'azione 2007-2009, la Commissione ha raccomandato agli Stati membri che non sono ancora parti dell'accordo di aderire quanto prima a questo strumento. Attualmente 17 Stati membri sono firmatari dell'accordo. La Spagna ha firmato l'accordo nel 1989 e la ratifica e l'entrata in vigore dell'accordo hanno avuto luogo nel 1992. L'Italia deve ancora firmare detto accordo.

La Commissione non prevede di proporre prossimamente misure specifiche in materia.

La Commissione promuove attivamente il numero unico di emergenza europeo 112 che garantisce l'accesso ai servizi di emergenza. Fin dall'adozione della decisione del Consiglio ([1]), la Commissione ha seguito l'applicazione della normativa UE sul 112 da parte degli Stati membri. L'attuale quadro normativo ([2]), entrato in vigore il 25 maggio 2011, ha rafforzato le disposizioni sull'accesso al 112 in particolare per le persone che viaggiano nell'Unione europea. La Commissione pubblica ogni anno la relazione sull'attuazione del 112 ([3]), che fornisce un quadro generale dell'attuazione dell'accesso al numero 112 negli Stati membri.

([1]) Decisione 91/396/CEE del Consiglio, del 29 luglio 1991, sull'introduzione di un numero unico europeo per chiamate di emergenza.
([2]) Direttiva 2002/22/CE relativa al servizio universale, modificata dalla direttiva 2009/136 sui diritti dei cittadini; anche il regolamento 544/2009 relativo al roaming prevede disposizioni concernenti le informazioni sul 112.
([3]) La relazione può essere consultata su un apposito sito web: www.112.eu.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-003743/12
to the Commission
Debora Serracchiani (S&D)
(12 April 2012)

Subject: Santiago de Compostela cultural trail

On 21 August 2010, Giulio Recusani, a young Italian man, drowned at the *Playa de Mar de Fora*, in Finisterre, on the last section of the Santiago de Compostela pilgrimage trail, in Spain. Witness statements revealed that the young man had been swimming for an hour before drowning and that the rescue services arrived too late.

The emergency services had been alerted immediately and it is not yet clear if and when the 'Mayday relay' call had been made to the fishing boats in the area via the special UHF-16 channel or the other systems provided.

It appears that the route is known for other accidents and deaths that have occurred there in the past as a result of a failure to signpost areas that are dangerous due to changeable weather conditions and currents. The victim's parents also had to deal with the difficulties connected with repatriating the body and were forced to return to Spain for the DNA test a few days after returning to Italy. The DNA test result was released 10 days later and only after around three weeks was the body finally repatriated.

— Considering that its competences relating to the acts and omissions of Member States are limited to overseeing the application of EC law under the control of the European Court of Justice (Article 17, Paragraph 1 of the TEU), what measures has the Commission adopted, or does it intend to adopt, in order to improve cooperation between Member States with a view to increasing confidence and strengthening mutual recognition when transferring corpses between one Member State and another?

— Considering that the Santiago de Compostela route is one of the most important cultural trails in Europe, does the Commission intend to adopt accident prevention measures and, if so, verify that rescue systems are effective everywhere and always active?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(23 May 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to the written questions E-000338/2012, E-0010619/2010, E-002731/2010, E-001264/2008.

The transfer of corpses in Europe is subject to the 1973 Council of Europe Agreement, which is designed to simplify the administrative formalities for transferring remains between the contracting parties. In its communication on effective consular protection in third countries: the contribution of the European Union — Action Plan 2007-2009, the Commission recommended the Member States, that are not yet parties to the agreement, to accede to this instrument as soon as possible. Currently 17 Member States are the signatories of the Agreement. Spain has signed the agreement in 1989 and ratification and entry into force of the agreement took place in 1992. Italy has not signed the agreement so far.

The Commission does not plan to propose any specific measures on this subject in the immediate future.

The Commission actively promotes the single European emergency number 112 which ensures access to emergency services. Since the adoption of Council decision ([1]) the Commission has monitored the implementation of the EC law on 112 by Member States. The current regulatory framework ([2]) which entered into force on 25 May 2011 reinforced the requirements relating to access to 112 in particular for people travelling in the European Union. The Commission is publishing every year the 112 implementation report ([3]) which provides an overview of the implementation of the access to the 112 number in the Member States.

([1]) 91/396/EEC of 29 July 1991 on the introduction of a single European emergency call number.
([2]) Universal Service Directive 2002/22/EC as amended by Directive 2009/136/EC; the Roaming Regulation 544/2009 also includes requirements relating to the information on 112.
([3]) The report can be consulted on a dedicated website: www.112.eu

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003751/12
to the Commission
Marta Andreasen (EFD)
(12 April 2012)

Subject: Follow-up to Question E-010609/11 on psychological harassment — Part 1

The Commission's answer to my questions on harassment revealed certain interesting data. For instance, the Council is the only institution in which cases of harassment were admitted to have taken place during the last five years, and only 28 out of 61 'Article 24' complaints led to an administrative investigation by the Commission. Even more interesting, though, is what cannot be found in the answers. I therefore have to ask these follow-up questions to points 1, 2, 3 and 4 of E-010609/11:

1. Can the Commission explain why it does not carry out and periodically publish surveys to establish the percentage of staff members who have at some time felt morally (psychologically) harassed, with a breakdown by Directorate-General and service, since this could be a useful indicator for measuring both mismanagement and the success rate of the Commission's policy on harassment? Will the Commission's DG HR undertake and publish such a survey, whilst encouraging a high participation rate?

2. The Commission replied that between 2006 and 2010 'in no case, actual harassment was found'. However, the Mediator's annual reports from 2008 to 2010 show 386 complaints of harassment. Has the Commission ever in fact found a single case of moral harassment? If so, how many cases has it found? If not, it would appear to believe that moral harassment simply cannot exist within the Commission. We may also be forced to draw the conclusion that its policy to combat moral harassment is of no use, since it is apparently unable to detect such a phenomenon.

3. The Commission answered that although 'in no case, actual harassment was found', 'in some cases the behaviour complained about was considered as inappropriate behaviour'. The Commission decision of 26 April 2006 on the European Commission policy on protecting the dignity of the person and preventing psychological harassment and sexual harassment does not explain the difference between harassment and inappropriate behaviour. What is the practical difference between moral harassment and inappropriate behaviour?

4. Out of the 28 administrative investigations mentioned above, can the Commission publish the number of cases in which the behaviour complained about was considered to be inappropriate behaviour? What were the actual consequences for the perpetrators and victims (e.g. sanctions or transfers to other departments or DGs)?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2012)

1. Since the Commission has a comprehensive anti-harassment policy in place, it does not deem it justified to carry out surveys on this specific area of HR policy. To the best of the Commission's knowledge, other institutions do not carry out such detailed surveys.

2. The total amount of 386 cases refers to relational problems as a whole. Support and assistance is provided in all cases of relational problems, be they harassment or not.

3. According to the Staff Regulations, psychological harassment occurs when four conditions are cumulatively met ([1]). Behaviour that does not meet these four criteria may still constitute a form of inappropriate behaviour under Article 12, which may be the case when, for example, only one incident is proven to the required legal standard.

4. Out of 28 administrative investigations opened between 2006 and 2010 for allegations of psychological harassment, 15 cases were closed without follow-up. In five cases, a sanction for inappropriate conduct was taken. Three cases were transmitted to other competent services for follow-up measures. Five investigations have not yet led to a final decision by the Appointing Authority.

([1]) See Article 12a of the Staff Regulations of officials of the European Communities and the provisions of the Conditions of employment of other servants of the European Communities.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003814/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(13 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Corea, lancio di satellite

La Corea del Nord il 16 aprile festeggerà il «Giorno del Sole», ovvero il centesimo anniversario della nascita del presidente Kim Il Sung, nonno dell'attuale leader del Paese. Per l'occasione si terrà un lancio balistico descritto dai media coreani come il lancio di un satellite per le osservazioni meteorologiche.

All'evento sono stati invitati diversi giornalisti stranieri, ma nemmeno loro, accolti nella stazione satellitare di Soahe, sono in grado di indicare con precisione di cosa esattamente si tratti: la tecnologia (militare) utilizzata è la stessa, che sia per prevedere il tempo o per agganciare al missile una testata nucleare.

Alla luce di quanto citato, si interroga l'Alto Rappresentante per sapere:

1. se è informata sulla vicenda, e quali altre informazioni sa fornire in merito, in particolare se si tratta di esperimenti che anticipano futuri test nucleari,

2. quali sono le attività diplomatiche intraprese dall'Unione europea nella Corea del Nord.

Risposta congiunta di Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(25 giugno 2012)

Con il tentativo di lanciare un «satellite» il 13 aprile 2012 la Repubblica popolare democratica di Corea (RPDC) ha chiaramente violato i propri obblighi internazionali e in particolare quelli stabiliti dalle risoluzioni del Consiglio di sicurezza delle Nazioni Unite n. 1718 e 1874.

Il 17 marzo 2012, subito dopo l'annuncio della RPDC del piano per il lancio del «satellite», l'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton ha esortato la Corea del Nord, tramite una dichiarazione formale del suo portavoce, ad astenersi dal lancio previsto, dichiarando che ciò avrebbe costituito una violazione degli obblighi internazionali del paese. Il 13 aprile 2012, il giorno stesso dell'esecuzione del lancio, l'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha espresso con una dichiarazione formale la sua profonda preoccupazione per le ripercussioni pericolose e destabilizzanti dell'accaduto e ha esortato la Corea del Nord ad astenersi da qualsiasi azione che possa incrementare ulteriormente le tensioni a livello regionale. L'AR/VP ha inoltre precisato che l'UE conferma la sua disponibilità a continuare la collaborazione con i partner internazionali al fine di a contribuire alla ricerca di una pace duratura e di stabilità per la penisola coreana. Il 16 aprile 2012, il Consiglio di sicurezza delle Nazioni Unite ha approvato ulteriori designazioni di gruppi e soggetti della RPDC da sottoporre a misure restrittive in base alle risoluzioni in materia, cosa avvenuta il 2 maggio 2012. Queste ulteriori designazioni sono già incluse nella lista delle designazioni autonome dell'UE.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003766/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(12 de abril de 2012)

Assunto: Lançamento de foguetão norte-coreano

A Coreia do Norte planeia lançar um foguetão para afirmar a autoridade de Kim Jon-Un.

Considerada como uma provocação aos países vizinhos, apesar da miséria em que vivem milhões de norte-coreanos, o próximo Secretário-Geral do Partido dos Trabalhadores da Coreia do Norte espera marcar, assim, o advento de um Estado poderoso e próspero.

Vários peritos têm já sublinhado a hipótese de ocorrerem falhas neste lançamento e de, em vez de cair sobre o Mar Amarelo e sobre o Pacífico, poder ocorrer um desvio de rota, com todas as consequências daí decorrentes.

Pergunto à Comissão:

— Como avalia a atitude norte-coreana?

— Quais as ações empreendidas para demover o regime norte-coreano relativamente ao aludido lançamento?

Resposta conjunta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(25 de junho de 2012)

A tentativa da República Popular Democrática da Coreia (RPDC) de lançar um «satélite», em 13 de abril de 2012, constituiu uma clara violação das suas obrigações internacionais, em especial as resoluções do Conselho de Segurança das Nações Unidas 1718 e 1874.

Em 17 de março de 2012, imediatamente após o anúncio da RPDC do seu plano de levar por diante o lançamento de um «satélite», a Alta Representante da UE para os Negócios Estrangeiros e Vice-Presidente da Comissão, Catherine Ashton, apelou à RPDC, através de uma declaração formal emitida pelo seu porta-voz, para que renunciasse ao plano de lançamento, recordando que, se o fizesse, estaria a violar as suas obrigações internacionais. Em 13 de abril de 2012, no mesmo dia em que o lançamento teve lugar, Catherine Ashton exprimiu, numa declaração formal, a sua profunda preocupação com o perigo e o efeito desestabilizador do lançamento e exortou a RPDC a abster-se de qualquer ato suscetível de agravar as tensões regionais. Deixou ainda bem claro que a UE continua disposta a colaborar com os seus parceiros internacionais a fim de contribuir para uma paz e estabilidade duradouras na Península coreana. Em 16 de abril de 2012, o Conselho de Segurança das Nações Unidas decidiu acrescentar novos artigos e entidades à lista de restrições impostas à RPDC, nos termos das Resoluções pertinentes. Tal foi feito em 2 de maio de 2012. Estas designações adicionais já estão incluídas na lista de designações autónomas da UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003766/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(12 April 2012)

Subject: North Korean rocket launch

North Korea is planning to launch a rocket to assert the authority of Kim Jong-un.

Although the launch is considered a provocation to its neighbouring countries, and despite the poverty in which millions of North Koreans live, the next General Secretary of the Workers' Party of North Korea hopes to mark the advent of a prosperous and powerful state in this way.

Various experts have already stressed the possibility that the launch will fail and that, instead of falling into the Yellow Sea or the Pacific, the rocket may change course, with all the resulting consequences.

Would the Commission answer the following:

— How does it view North Korea's attitude?

— What actions have been taken to deter the North Korean regime from this launch?

Question for written answer E-003814/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(13 April 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Korea satellite launch

On 16 April 2012, North Korea will celebrate the 'Day of the Sun' or the hundredth anniversary of the birth of President Kim Il Sung, the grandfather of the country's current leader. The occasion will be marked by a ballistic launch, described by the Korean media as the launch of a satellite for meteorological observations.

Several foreign journalists have been invited to the event and welcomed at the Soahe satellite station, but not even they are able to pinpoint exactly what it is: The (military) technology used is the same both for predicting the weather and attaching a nuclear warhead to the missile.

In view of the above, can the High Representative state:

1. Whether she is informed of the matter and what other information she can provide, particularly on whether these are experiments that foreshadow future nuclear tests?

2. What diplomatic activities are being undertaken by the EU in North Korea?

Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(25 June 2012)

The attempt made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) to launch a 'satellite' on 13 April 2012 was done in clear violation of the DPRK's international obligations as set out in particular under UN Security Council Resolutions 1718 and 1874.

On 17 March 2012, immediately after the DPRK's announcement of its plan to carry out the 'satellite' launch the High Representative of the EU Foreign Affairs and Vice-President of the Commission, Catherine Ashton, called, through a formal Statement by her Spokesperson, upon the DPRK to refrain from the planned launch and stated that it would create a breach of the DPRK's international obligations. On 13 April 2012, the same day the launch was executed, she expressed, in a formal statement, her deep concern about the dangerous and destabilising effect of the launch and urged the DPRK to refrain from any action that could further increase regional tensions. She also made it clear that the EU remains ready to continue working with international partners with a view to contributing to the pursuit of lasting peace and stability on the Korean peninsula. On 16 April 2012 the UN Security Council agreed to designate additional DPRK groups and items for restrictions under the relevant Resolutions. This was done on 2 May 2012. These additional designations are already included in the list of EU autonomous designations.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003775/12
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(12 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Macellazioni rituali e benessere degli animali

Lo scorso anno, in Olanda, è stato approvato un provvedimento, presentato da governo e opposizione insieme, che vieta la macellazione delle carni adoperando tecniche rituali che escludono l'uso di anestetici o di sistemi che stordiscono l'animale. Un bando simile esiste già da tempo in altri paesi europei come la Svezia o l'Austria mentre in altri Stati, come l'Italia, esistono normative che tollerano la macellazione rituale. La legge, presentata da uno schieramento trasversale, ha acceso il dibattito tra i difensori dei diritti degli animali e i difensori della libertà religiosa.

La Commissione:

1. Tenuto conto del protocollo allegato al trattato CE sulla protezione e il benessere degli animali, considerando la necessità di rispettare i riti religiosi e le tradizioni culturali, non ritiene che comunque la macellazione debba avvenire previo stordimento dell'animale? Non ritiene altresì che la non applicazione del protocollo, oltre a non rispettare i diritti degli animali, porti a un inasprimento delle differenze tra i vari paesi e le diverse culture?

2. Ritiene che la ricerca Dialrel abbia prodotto risultati positivi in ordine al prevalere o meno degli interessi degli animali nella macellazione?

3. Non ritiene che sia necessaria una normativa applicabile in tutti gli Stati dell'Unione che omologhi i provvedimenti in materia di macellazione rituale?

4. È a conoscenza delle conseguenze sulla salute delle persone che utilizzano carni di animali sottoposti a enormi scariche di adrenalina?

Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(11 giugno 2012)

1. La Commissione ritiene che le disposizioni UE in tema di protezione degli animali al momento della macellazione o dell'abbattimento ([1])che concede deroghe allo stordimento in caso di macellazione religiosa rispetta sia il benessere animale conformemente all'articolo 13 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea sia la libertà di religione sancita dall'articolo 10 della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'UE.

2. Il progetto di ricerca DIALREL ha contribuito a realizzare progressi nel campo della macellazione rituale, in particolare istituendo un dialogo tra le parti interessate. La Commissione ha diffuso questi risultati agli Stati membri.

3. Considerato il margine di discrezione lasciato agli Stati membri in questo ambito ([2]) la Commissione ritiene che sulla base della legislazione vigente sia difficile imporre agli Stati membri l'applicazione di pratiche ottimali. La Commissione prevede però di presentare nel 2014 linee guida per l'attuazione del regolamento (CE) n. 1099/2009 in cui potrebbe inserire raccomandazioni in merito alla deroga allo stordimento.

4. Lo stress registrato dagli animali poco prima o durante la macellazione può produrre una qualità anomala delle carni con conseguente riduzione della conservabilità, ma non si ripercuote sulla sicurezza della carne.

([1]) Direttiva 93/119/CEE (GU L 340 del 31.12.1993) e, a decorrere dall'1.1.2013, regolamento (CE) n. 1099/2009 (GU L 303 del 18.11.2009).
([2]) In particolare alla luce della formulazione del considerando 18 del regolamento (CE) n. 1099/2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003775/12
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(12 April 2012)

Subject: Ritual slaughter and animal welfare

Last year in the Netherlands, a measure was adopted, tabled by both the government and the opposition, which bans the slaughter of animals using ritual methods that exclude the use of anaesthetics or stunning systems. A similar ban has also been in force for some time in other European countries, such as Sweden and Austria, whereas in other Member States, such as Italy, the law tolerates ritual slaughter. The law, tabled by a cross-party group, has ignited the debate between the defenders of animal rights and the defenders of religious freedom.

1. Considering the protocol annexed to the EC treaty on the protection and welfare of animals, and taking into account the need to respect religious rites and cultural traditions, does the Commission not believe that animals should nevertheless be stunned prior to slaughter? Does it also not believe that failing to implement the protocol, in addition to failing to respect the rights of animals, leads to an exacerbation of the differences between the various countries and different cultures?

2. Does it believe that the Dialrel research has produced positive results with regard to allowing the interests of animals to prevail when slaughtered?

3. Does it not believe that legislation is required which applies in all the Member States of the EU and which approves measures concerning ritual slaughter?

4. Is it aware of the health consequences for people who consume meat from animals that have been exposed to enormous rushes of adrenaline?

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

1. The Commission considers that the EU provisions on the protection of animals at the time of slaughter or killing ([1])which grant derogation from stunning in case of religious slaughter respect both animal welfare in accordance with Article 13 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU and the freedom of religion enshrined in Article 10 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU.

2. The DIALREL research project has contributed to make progress in the field of ritual slaughter in particular by establishing a dialogue between stakeholders. The Commission has publicised these results to the Member States.

3. Given the amount of discretion left to the Member States in this area ([2]) the Commission is of the opinion that the application of best practices could hardly be imposed on the Member States on the grounds of the existing legislation. The Commission however plans to present in 2014 guidelines for the implementation of Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 where it could include recommendations on the derogation from stunning.

4. Stress experienced by animals shortly before or during slaughter may result in abnormal meat quality with associated reduced shelf life, but does not affect the safety of the meat.

([1]) Directive 93/119/EEC (OJ L 340, 31.12.1993) and as from 1.1.2013 Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 (OJ L 303, 18.11.2009).
([2]) In particular in the light of the wording of Recital 18 of Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003776/12
aan de Commissie
Esther de Lange (PPE)
(12 april 2012)

Betreft: Mogelijke schadelijke gevolgen van e chemische verbinding 4-methylimidazole in de procedure van voedsel en dranken

Frisdrankproducenten Coca-Cola en Pepsi gebruiken karamel om hun frisdranken te kleuren. Bij de productie van de als kleurstof toegevoegde karamel zou de chemische verbinding 4-methylimidazole (4-MEI) ontstaan. Na onderzoek door het Amerikaanse Center for Science in the Public Interest (CSPI) blijkt dat deze stof bij toediening op muizen en ratten carcinogeen is. Op grond van dit onderzoek heeft de staat Californië een wet ingesteld die Coca-Cola en Pepsi zou verplichten een gezondheidswaarschuwing op de blikjes te zetten. Coca-Cola en Pepsi hebben als gevolg hiervan het recept voor hun frisdranken aangepast door de hoeveelheid 4-MEI te verlagen.

In tegenstelling tot het CSPI heeft het ANS-panel van EFSA in maart 2011 karamelkleurstoffen als niet-genotoxisch en niet-carcinogeen beoordeeld. Het panel lette bij de beoordeling ook specifiek op uit de productie van deze karamelkleurstoffen voortkomende bijproducten, zoals 4-MEI in E150c en E1590d. Toen werd aangeraden om de niveaus van deze bijproducten zo laag te houden als technologisch mogelijk.

1. Overweegt de Commissie om nader onderzoek te doen naar de mogelijke schadelijke gevolgen van de chemische verbinding 4-methylimidazole in de productie van voedsel en dranken?

2. Is de Commissie van mening dat Coca-Cola en Pepsi naar aanleiding van het advies van EFSA ook in Europa de hoeveelheid 4-MEI in hun frisdranken moeten verlagen? Zo nee, waarom niet?

Antwoord van de heer Dalli namens de Commissie
(19 juni 2012)

De Commissie verwijst het geachte Parlementslid naar haar antwoord op schriftelijke vraag E-002847/2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=NL.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003776/12
to the Commission
Esther de Lange (PPE)
(12 April 2012)

Subject: Possible damaging effects of chemical compound 4-methylimidazole which forms during the production of food and beverages

Soft drinks producers Coca-Cola and Pepsi use caramel to add colour to their soft drinks. During production of the caramel colouring, the chemical compound 4-methylimidazole (4-MEI) is said to form. A study conducted by the US Center for Science in the Public Interest (CSPI) has shown that this substance causes cancer in mice and rats. On the basis of this study, the State of California has introduced a law which obliges Coca-Cola and Pepsi to place a health warning on their cans. As a result of this, Coca-Cola and Pepsi have changed the recipe of their soft drinks by lowering the quantity of 4-MEI.

Unlike the CSPI, the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) Panel on Food Additives and Nutrient Sources assessed caramel colourings in March 2011 as neither genotoxic nor carcinogenic. The panel paid particular attention during the assessment to the by-products which form during the production of these caramel colourings, such as 4-MEI in E150c and E1590d. It was recommended then that the levels of these by-products should be kept as low as technologically feasible.

1. Is the Commission contemplating conducting more detailed research into the possible damaging effects of the chemical compound 4-methylimidazole formed during the production of food and drinks?

2. Does the Commission believe that Coca-Cola and Pepsi should follow the EFSA's recommendation and lower the quantity of 4-MEI in their soft drinks in Europe too? If not, why not?

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

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-002847/2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003779/12
aan de Commissie
Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE)
(12 april 2012)

Betreft: Richtlijn 2005/60/EG — sancties op niet-naleving meldingsplicht aan FIE en verbod op betaling in contanten voor bedragen van meer dan EUR 15 000

Overeenkomstig artikel 39, lid 1, van Richtlijn 2005/60/EG van 26 oktober 2005 dienen de lidstaten erop toe te zien dat de personen die onder deze richtlijn vallen aansprakelijk kunnen worden gesteld voor inbreuken op de ter uitvoering van deze richtlijn vastgestelde nationale bepalingen. De sancties moeten doeltreffend, evenredig en afschrikkend zijn. Overweging 48 van deze richtlijn verduidelijkt dat „geen enkele bepaling van deze richtlijn mag worden uitgelegd of uitgevoerd op een wijze die strijdig is met het Europees Verdrag tot bescherming van de rechten van de mens en de fundamentele vrijheden".

1. Indien een lidstaat aan handelaren een verbod op betaling in contanten voor bedragen van meer dan EUR 15 000 oplegt in plaats van de handelaren aan een identificatieverplichting en meldingsplicht te onderwerpen, dient in overeenstemming met deze richtlijn dan een strafrechtelijke sanctie in de zin van artikel 6 EVRM voor niet-naleving van dit verbod te worden opgelegd aan de handelaar en/of de medecontractant?

2. Indien een lidstaat aan handelaren zowel een verbod op betaling in contanten voor bedragen van meer dan EUR 15 000 oplegt als een meldingsplicht aan de financiële inlichtingeneenheid (FIE), dient in overeenstemming met deze richtlijn dan een strafrechtelijke sanctie in de zin van artikel 6 EVRM.

a) voor niet-naleving van het verbod op betaling in contanten te worden opgelegd aan:

— de medecontractant

— de handelaar, die dit verbod tevens moet melden aan de FIE waardoor hij aangifte doet van een strafrechtelijk misdrijf gepleegd door hemzelf en zijn medecontractant, waardoor de handelaar zichzelf incrimineert?

— de handelaar, in zoverre hij de meldingsplicht niet naleeft?

b) voor niet-naleving van de meldingsplicht te worden opgelegd aan de handelaar?

3. Geldt hetzelfde antwoord indien een lidstaat een lagere drempel dan 15 000 euro aanneemt?

Antwoord van de heer Barnier namens de Commissie
(1 juni 2012)

Artikel 39 van Richtlijn 2005/60/EG (de „derde antiwitwasrichtlijn") verplicht de lidstaten ervoor te zorgen dat natuurlijke en rechtspersonen die onder deze richtlijn vallen aansprakelijk kunnen worden gesteld voor inbreuken op nationale wetgeving ter uitvoering van de EU-regels. De sancties moeten „doeltreffend, evenredig en afschrikkend" zijn.

De derde antiwitwasrichtlijn stelt een minimumharmonisatieniveau vast, hetgeen betekent dat de lidstaten op nationaal niveau striktere regels mogen opleggen, zoals het opleggen van strafrechtelijke sancties wegens niet-toepassing van de nationale regels ter uitvoering van de richtlijn, of het verbod op contante betalingen boven een bepaalde drempel, die kleiner mag zijn dan 15 000 EUR. De bevoegdheid van de lidstaten om strafrechtelijke sancties op te leggen, wordt erkend in artikel 39, lid 2, dat bepaalt: „Onverminderd het recht van de lidstaten tot het opleggen van strafrechtelijke sancties…".

De Commissie heeft op 11 april 2012 een verslag gepubliceerd over de toepassing van de derde antiwitwasrichtlijn ([1]) waarin zij voorstelt een gelijkaardige aanpak te bezien als die welke uiteengezet wordt in de mededeling van de Commissie „Het versterken van sanctieregelingen in de financiële sector" ([2]), hetgeen een grotere harmonisatie van de

([1]) COM(2012) 168 final.
([2]) Het versterken van sanctieregelingen in de financiële sector, COM(2010) 716 def. van 8 december 2010, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0716:FIN:NL:PDF.

sanctieregelingen zou inhouden door het voorstellen van een geheel van gemeenschappelijke minimumregels die voor hoofdaspecten van de sanctieregeling moeten gelden.

De Commissie heeft haar voornemen aangekondigd om tegen najaar 2012 een herziening van de derde antiwitwasrichtlijn voor te stellen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003779/12
to the Commission
Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE)
(12 April 2012)

Subject: Directive 2005/60/EC — penalties for non-compliance with obligation to report to a financial intelligence unit (FIU) and ban on cash payments of over EUR 15 000

In accordance with Article 39(1) of Directive 2005/60/EC of 26 October 2005, Member States must ensure that the persons covered by that directive can be held liable for infringements of the national provisions adopted pursuant to the directive. These penalties should be effective, proportionate and dissuasive. Recital 48 of this directive makes it clear that 'nothing in this directive should be interpreted or implemented in a manner that is inconsistent with the European Convention on Human Rights'.

1. If a Member State bans merchants from making cash payments of EUR 15 000 or more instead of subjecting them to customer identification and reporting obligations, should, in accordance with this directive, a criminal penalty within the meaning of Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) be imposed on the merchant and/or the co-contractor for non-compliance with this ban?

2. If a Member State imposes on merchants both a ban on payments of EUR 15 000 or more and an obligation to report to a financial intelligence unit (FIU), should, in accordance with the directive, a criminal penalty within the meaning of Article 6 of the ECHR be imposed:

(a) for non-compliance with the ban on cash payments on:

— the co-contractor?

— the merchant, who must also report this ban to the FIU and, in doing so, would be reporting a criminal offence which he/she and his/her co-contractor has committed, incriminating himself/herself in the process?

— the merchant in so far as he/she fails to comply with the reporting obligation?

(b) on the merchant for non-compliance with the reporting obligation?

3. Would the answer be the same if a Member State adopted a lower threshold than EUR 15 000?

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

Article 39 of Directive 2005/60/EC (the 'Third AMLD' — Anti-Money Laundering Directive) imposes on Member States an obligation to ensure that natural and legal persons falling within the scope of the directive can be held liable for infringements of national legislation implementing the EU rules. The penalties must be 'effective, proportionate and dissuasive'.

The Third AMLD sets a minimum level of harmonisation, meaning that Member States may impose stricter rules at national level, such as the imposition of criminal penalties for non-application of the national rules implementing the directive, or the banning of cash payments above a certain threshold, which may be less than EUR 15,000. The ability of Member States to impose criminal sanctions is recognised in Article 39(2) which states 'Without prejudice to the right of Member States to impose criminal sanctions…'.

The Commission published on 11 April 2012 a report on the application of the Third AMLD ([1]) in which it suggests considering an approach similar to the one set out in the Commission's Communication 'Reinforcing sanctioning regimes in the financial sector' ([2]), which would involve a greater harmonisation of the sanctioning regime by proposing a set of minimum common rules to be applied to key aspects of the sanctioning regime.

The Commission has announced its intention to propose a revision of the Third AMLD by Autumn 2012.

([1]) COM(2012) 168 final.
([2]) Reinforcing sanctioning regimes in the financial services sector, COM(2010)716 final, 8 December 2010, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0716:FIN:EN:PDF.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-003780/12
an die Kommission
Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE)
(12. April 2012)

Betrifft: Konformität des neuen Kraftwerksprojekts im Kosovo mit europäischen Normen

Die Regierung des Kosovo möchte mit Unterstützung der Weltbank ein neues Braunkohlekraftwerk bauen, um den Energiebedarf des Landes zu sichern. Das Projekt sieht die Privatisierung des bestehenden Kraftwerks Kosova B mit einer Leistung von 600 MW sowie den Bau eines neuen Kraftwerks mit weiteren 600 MW vor. Ein Regierungsausschuss hat vier private Investoren vorqualifiziert und wartet nun darauf, dass die Weltbank eine Garantie über einen Teil des Risikos erteilt. Ein Zusammenschluss von kosovarischen und internationalen Organisationen der Zivilgesellschaft ist gegen dieses Projekt und fordert, dass das Kosovo, das bis zu 45 % seiner Energie aufgrund von quasi nicht vorhandenen Effizienzmaßnahmen verliert, in erster Linie in Energieeffizienz investieren sollte. Im Rahmen einer von Dr. Daniel Kammen, ehemals Chief Technical Specialist für erneuerbare Energien und Energieeffizienz bei der Weltbank, durchgeführten Studie wurden die Energieszenarien analysiert und Effizienz sowie erneuerbare Energien als nachhaltigere und wirtschaftlich lebensfähigere Optionen empfohlen. Ein weiterer Anlass zur Sorge besteht darin, dass durch das Projekt nach derzeitigem Stand ein privates Monopol im Energiesektor entsteht, bei dem ein einziges Unternehmen über 95 % des gesamten Energiemarktes beherrscht.

Am 11 Mai 2011 haben die für Energie bzw. Erweiterung und Europäische Nachbarschaftspolitik zuständigen Kommissionsmitglieder, Günther Oettinger und Štefan Füle, gemeinsam ein Schreiben an den Präsidenten der Weltbankgruppe, Robert Zoellick, gesandt und die Bank aufgefordert, das Projekt zu unterstützen. In diesem Schreiben wird behauptet, dass sich das Projekt auf Studien zu Kapazitäten bei alternativen Energien und Energieeffizienz stütze, obwohl diese Studien zu diesem Zeitpunkt nur teilweise abgeschlossen waren und erst im Januar 2012 endgültig veröffentlicht wurden. Ferner wird darin behauptet, das Projekt verfolge „environmental, energy and social/economic development objectives in a mutually reinforcing way" [umweltpolitische, energiepolitische und soziale/wirtschaftliche Entwicklungsziele im Sinne einer gegenseitigen Stärkung], Einzelheiten über die wahrscheinlichen Umwelt- oder sozialen Auswirkungen des neuen Kohlekraftwerks werden jedoch nicht angeführt. Zwar handelt es sich bei diesem Schreiben nicht um ein offizielles Dokument der Kommission, es wird jedoch weithin als Zustimmung der EU für das neue Braunkohleprojekt im Kosovo und das damit entstehende Monopol wahrgenommen.

— Wird das neue Kraftwerksprojekt im Kosovo von der Kommission insgesamt unterstützt?

— Stehen das Projekt und das durch seine Umsetzung entstehende Monopol im Einklang mit dem gemeinschaftlichen Besitzstand?

— Was wird die Kommission unternehmen, um sicherzustellen, dass dieses Projekt in wettbewerbsrechtlicher, umweltpolitischer und sozialer Hinsicht nicht die Zukunft des Kosovo in Europa gefährdet?

Antwort von Herrn Füle im Namen der Kommission
(7. Mai 2012)

Das neue Kraftwerk im Kosovo ist Teil einer umfassenden Energiestrategie, die auch die Modernisierung des Kraftwerks Kosovo B, die Stilllegung des Kraftwerks Kosovo A und die Förderung der Energieeffizienz und der erneuerbaren Energien einschließt. Die Kommission ist der Auffassung, dass dies die kostengünstigste und am wenigsten umweltschädliche Option zur Sicherung einer zuverlässigen Energieversorgung des Kosovos ([1]) ist.

Die Weltbank hat die Sachlage im Vorfeld ihrer Beteiligung anhand einer Studie zu den verschiedenen Optionen für die Energieversorgung („Power Supply Options") und eines Berichts der externen Sachverständigengruppe für den strategischen Rahmen für Entwicklung und Klimawandel (SFDCC External Expert Panel) eingehend analysiert. Die Kommission schließt sich den Ergebnissen dieser Analyse uneingeschränkt an.

([1]) Diese Benennung berührt nicht die Standpunkte zum Status und steht im Einklang mit der Resolution 1244 des VN-Sicherheitsrates und dem Gutachten des Internationalen Gerichtshofs zur Unabhängigkeitserklärung des Kosovos.

Die Kommission hat sich vergewissert, dass das Energiegesetz 2010 des Kosovos, das die Grundlage für die Ausschreibung des neuen Kraftwerks bildet, mit dem Besitzstand vereinbar ist. Durch die enge Einbeziehung der Weltbank und der EU wird gewährleistet, dass das Projekt die höchsten EU-Umweltstandards erfüllt, die besten verfügbaren Techniken für die Nutzung von Braunkohle als Brennstoff einsetzt und dass die in der Energiecharta des Kosovos festgelegten Verpflichtungen zur Umsetzung von EU-Standards in den Bereichen Wettbewerb, Umwelt und Elektrizitätsbinnenmarkt eingehalten werden. Das Projekt ist die beste Option für die zeitnahe Stilllegung des Kraftwerks Kosovo A, die von der Kommission ausdrücklich befürwortet wird und nur dann vorgenommen werden kann, wenn entsprechende Ersatzkapazitäten gesichert sind.

Die Kommission wird zusammen mit dem Sekretariat der Energiegemeinschaft sorgfältig überwachen, dass das Kosovo seine Verpflichtungen erfüllt, und sicherstellen, dass der neue private Kraftwerksbetreiber seine Stellung nicht missbraucht. Die Kommission unterstützt die Energieregulierungsbehörde und die Wettbewerbsbehörde bei der Durchsetzung der Wettbewerbsregeln im Energiesektor. Sie fördert zudem eine stärkere Nutzung von Energie aus erneuerbaren Quellen und führt derzeit Verhandlungen darüber, wie das Kosovo den Inhalt der Richtlinie über Energie aus erneuerbaren Quellen ([2]) umsetzt.

([2]) Richtlinie 2009/28/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 23. April 2009 zur Förderung der Nutzung von Energie aus erneuerbaren Quellen und zur Änderung und anschließenden Aufhebung der Richtlinien 2001/77/EG und 2003/30/EG (Text von Bedeutung für den EWR), ABl. L 140 vom 5.6.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-003780/12
to the Commission
Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE)
(12 April 2012)

Subject: Compliance of New Kosovo Power Plant project with European standards

The government of Kosovo is determined to build, with the support of the World Bank, a new lignite-based power plant in order to secure its energy demands. The project envisages privatisation of the existing Kosova B Power Plant of 600 MW and the construction of a New Kosovo Power Plant with an additional 600 MW capacity. A governmental committee has prequalified four private investors and is waiting for a Partial Risk Guarantee to be issued by the World Bank. A consortium of Kosovar and global civil society organisations opposes this project, claiming that Kosovo, which loses as much as 45% of its energy thanks to virtually non-existent energy efficiency measures, should invest primarily in energy efficiency. A study conducted by Dr Daniel Kammen, formerly Chief Technical Specialist for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency at the World Bank, has analysed the energy scenarios and has recommended efficiency and renewables as constituting a more sustainable and economically viable option. What is also of concern is that the project, as it currently stands, will create a private monopoly in the energy sector, with a single company controlling more than 95% of the entire energy market.

On 11 May 2011, the Commissioner for Energy, Günther Oettinger, and the Commissioner for Enlargement and the European Neighbourhood Policy, Štefan Füle, wrote a joint letter to the President of the World Bank Group, Robert Zoellick, urging the Bank to support the project. This letter claims that the project refers to studies of alternative energy capacities and energy efficiency, although at that point those studies had only been partially completed, being finally published only in January 2012. It further claims that the project will pursue 'environmental, energy and social/economic development objectives in a mutually reinforcing way', but it does not give details on the environmental or social impacts the new coal power plant is likely to have. Although this letter is not a formal Commission document, it is being widely perceived as the EU's green light for the New Kosovo lignite project and the monopoly it will create.

— Does the Commission as a whole support the New Kosovo Power Plant project?

— Are this project and the monopoly that will be created by its implementation in accordance with the *acquis communautaire*?

— What role will the Commission play to ensure that this project will not hinder Kosovo's European future, in competition, environmental and social terms?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(7 May 2012)

The New Kosovo Power Plant is part of a comprehensive energy strategy including the rehabilitation of the Kosovo B plant, closure of Kosovo A and developing energy efficiency and renewable energies. The Commission considers it the least-cost option and the least damaging for the environment to provide Kosovo ([1]) with a reliable energy supply.

The World Bank carried out a rigorous analysis in preparation for its involvement, through its 'Power Supply Options' study and the evaluation of the Strategic Framework for Development and Climate Change panel. The Commission fully subscribes to this analysis.

The Commission ensured that Kosovo's 2010 energy law, the basis for tendering the new plant, was compatible with the *acquis*. Close involvement of the World Bank and the EU will ensure the project meets the highest EU environmental standards and the best available technology for lignite combustion, and complies with Kosovo's Energy Charter obligations to implement EU standards in competition, environment, and single electricity market. The project constitutes the best option for the earliest closure of Kosovo A, which is strongly supported by the Commission and can only be implemented once replacement generation capacity is secured.

([1]) This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo declaration of independence.

The Commission, with the Energy Community Secretariat, will scrupulously monitor that Kosovo meets its commitments and ensure the new private power company will not abuse its position. The Commission is supporting the Energy Regulatory Office and the Competition Authority to enforce energy sector competition rules. The Commission is also promoting a stronger use of renewable energy sources and is negotiating the terms under which Kosovo takes on the content of the Renewables Directive ([2]).

([2]) Directive 2009/28/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2009 on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources and amending and subsequently repealing Directives 2001/77/EC and 2003/30/EC (Text with EEA relevance), OJ L 140, 5.6.2009.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003781/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(12 Απριλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Έκθεση του ΔΝΤ για την αναδιάρθρωση των στεγαστικών δανείων

Σε πρόσφατη έκθεσή του, το Διεθνές Νομισματικό Ταμείο υποστηρίζει την αναδιάρθρωση των στεγαστικών δανείων των πολιτών σε παγκόσμιο επίπεδο. Σύμφωνα με το Ταμείο, οι πολιτικές που αποσκοπούν στη μείωση του χρέους σε σχέση με τα περιουσιακά στοιχεία ενός νοικοκυριού και τις πληρωμές του χρέους της υπηρεσίας σε σχέση με το εισόδημά του, θα μπορούσε να είναι ένας ανέξοδος τρόπος για την οικονομική δραστηριότητα. Θεωρεί επίσης ότι οι πολιτικές αυτές έχουν ιδιαίτερη σημασία για τις οικονομίες όπου σήμερα είναι περιορισμένες οι δυνατότητες για την επεκτατική μακροοικονομική πολιτική και στις οποίες ο χρηματοπιστωτικός τομέας έχει ήδη λάβει κρατική υποστήριξη.

Επιπλέον στην έκθεσή του το ΔΝΤ αναφέρεται στα προγράμματα αναδιάρθρωσης του χρέους των νοικοκυριών, όπως αυτά που εφαρμόστηκαν στις ΗΠΑ στη δεκαετία του '30 και στην Ισλανδία σήμερα, ως πολιτικές που μπορούν να μειώσουν σημαντικά τον αριθμό των αθετήσεων υποχρεώσεων των νοικοκυριών και των κατασχέσεων.

Βάσει των παραπάνω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Έχει λάβει γνώση της εν λόγω έκθεσης και ποια είναι η θέση της αναφορικά με την ανάγκη εφαρμογής προγραμμάτων αναδιάρθρωσης στεγαστικών δανείων στα κράτη μέλη και ειδικά σε αυτά που αντιμετωπίζουν έντονα δημοσιονομικά προβλήματα και ύφεση;

2. Ειδικά στην Ελλάδα, και με δεδομένη τη συνεργασία με το ΔΝΤ, ποια είναι η θέση της Επιτροπής αναφορικά με την αναδιάρθρωση των στεγαστικών δανείων για χιλιάδες νοικοκυριά που για αντικειμενικούς λόγους (μείωση εισοδήματος λόγω περικοπών μισθών, συντάξεων κτλ) αδυνατούν να ανταποκριθούν στην αποπληρωμή τους;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(12 Ιουνίου 2012)

Η σημαντική απομόχλευση που παρατηρείται επί του παρόντος σε διάφορους τομείς αντικατοπτρίζει διορθώσεις του επιπέδων του χρέους σε πιο βιώσιμες θέσεις τόσο στην εσωτερική, όσο και στην εξωτερική πλευρά της οικονομίας. Ως εκ τούτου, η Επιτροπή συμφωνεί ότι η απομόχλευση των νοικοκυριών αποτελεί βασικό στοιχείο που πρέπει να ληφθεί υπόψη, όχι όμως μεμονωμένα, αλλά παράλληλα με τις προσπάθειες για τη σταθεροποίηση του τραπεζικού συστήματος και την επίτευξη υγιών δημοσιονομικών θέσεων. Πράγματι, η αντιμετώπιση αυτών των προκλήσεων αποτελεί προτεραιότητα της συνολικής στρατηγικής για την αντιμετώπιση των κρίσεων και από την άποψη της εποπτείας το Σύμφωνο Σταθερότητας και Ανάπτυξης και η Διαδικασία Μακροοικονομικών Ανισορροπιών είναι ιδιαίτερα κατάλληλα μέσα στο πλαίσιο αυτό. Οι Παγκόσμιες Οικονομικές Προοπτικές (World Economic Outlook) του ΔΝΤ περιγράφουν εναλλακτικές μακροοικονομικές πολιτικές για να βοηθηθούν τα νοικοκυριά να αντιμετωπίσουν την υπερχρέωσή τους. Ωστόσο, δείχνουν επίσης ότι κατά το παρελθόν δεν αποδείχθηκαν εξίσου επιτυχείς όλες οι προσπάθειες για την αναδιάρθρωση του χρέους των νοικοκυριών. Η ελάφρυνση των νοικοκυριών από το υπερβολικό χρέος τους θα πρέπει να αξιολογείται κατά περίπτωση και σε καμία περίπτωση δεν αποτελεί το κατάλληλο εργαλείο για όλες τις χώρες και σε όλες τις περιστάσεις.Όσον αφορά την περίπτωση της Ελλάδας, και όπως καθορίζεται στο μνημόνιο που συμφωνήθηκε μεταξύ της Ελλάδας και της Επιτροπής (εξ ονόματος των κρατών μελών της ζώνης του ευρώ) και του Διεθνούς Νομισματικού Ταμείου (ΔΝΤ), οι τυχόν μεταβολές στο νομικό πλαίσιο της Ελλάδας για την αντιμετώπιση των μη εξυπηρετούμενων δανείων που οφείλουν τα νοικοκυριά και η αντίστοιχη αναδιάρθρωση (επί του παρόντος νόμος 3869/2010), θα πρέπει να διέπονται από διάφορες αρχές, συμπεριλαμβανόμενης της ανάγκης για στοχοθέτηση των παρεμβάσεων ανάλογα με την ικανότητα του χρηματοπιστωτικού τομέα, της διαφύλαξης της νοοτροπίας που επικρατεί στο θέμα των πληρωμών, της αποφυγής στρατηγικών αθετήσεων δανείων και της μεγιστοποίησης της ανάκτησης περιουσιακών στοιχείων.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003781/12
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(12 April 2012)

Subject: IMF report on restructuring housing loans

In a recent report, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) has expressed support for a global restructuring of private citizens' housing loans. According to the IMF, policies aimed at reducing debt on the basis of the assets of a household and debt servicing payments linked to income could be a solution that would not involve burdens on economic activity. It also considers such strategies to be particularly important for economies with currently limited potential for expansive macroeconomic policies and where the fiscal sector has already received support from the state.

The IMF report also states that programmes for restructuring household debt, such as those implemented in the US in the 1930s and in Iceland today, are policies that can significantly reduce the number of defaults on household debts and home repossessions.

In view of the above, would the Commission answer the following:

1. Is it aware of the report in question? What is its position on the need for carrying out a restructuring of housing loans in Member States, in particular in those Member States which have serious fiscal problems and are in recession?

2. In Greece in particular, and given the collaboration with the IMF, what is the Commission's position on the restructuring of housing loans for thousands of households that for objective reasons (reduction in income owing to cuts in salaries, pensions, etc.) are unable to meet the required repayments?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2012)

The substantial deleveraging currently observed across different sectors reflects corrections of debt levels towards more sustainable positions on the internal as well as the external side of the economy. The Commission therefore agrees that household deleveraging is a key element to be considered, however not in isolation, but alongside efforts to stabilise the banking system and provide for sound fiscal positions. Indeed, dealing with these challenges are priorities in the overall strategy to respond to the crises and in terms of surveillance the Stability and Growth Pact and the Macroeconomic Imbalance Procedure are particularly pertinent in this context. The IMF's World Economic Outlook describes alternative macroeconomic policies to help households deal with their excessive debt. However, it also shows that not all efforts to restructure household debt were equally successful in the past. Relieving house holds of their excessive debt should be assessed on a case by case basis and it is by no means the right tool for all countries and in all circumstances. As regards the case of Greece, and as established in the memorandum agreed between Greece and the Commission (on behalf of the euro area Member States) and the IMF, any changes to the legal framework of Greece for addressing non-performing loans owed by households and the respective restructuring (currently Law 3869/2010) should be guided by several principles, including the need to target interventions in line with the financial sector capacity, to preserve the payment culture, avoid strategic loan defaults and, maximise asset recovery.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003782/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Edward McMillan-Scott (ALDE)
(12 April 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Grand Mufti Sheik Abdul Aziz al-Asheik of Saudi Arabia's calls for the destruction of all churches on the Arab Peninsula

The Grand Mufti of Saudi Arabia, Sheik Abdul Aziz al-Asheik, announced last month that the Arabian Peninsula 'must exist under only one religion', and that no more churches should be built. He then encouraged Kuwait to destroy all churches on its territory, effectively issuing a *fatwā* (a ruling concerning Islamic law issued by an Islamic scholar) on Christian places of worship.

The Grand Mufti made these comments to the visiting delegation of a Kuwaiti NGO called the Revival of Islamic Heritage Society (RIHS). The delegation included members of a group identified by the US Government as a supplier of funds to al-Qaeda and al-Qaeda affiliates, including the militant Islamist terrorist organisation Lashkar-e-Toiba. Ten years ago, the UN labelled the RIHS's branches in Afghanistan and Pakistan as associates of — and providers of funds and weapons to –'Al-Qaida, Usama bin Laden or the Taliban'.

The apparent *fatwā* is particularly alarming as the Grand Mufti — the top Saudi cleric — is held in high esteem by the Arabic Islamic world. Indeed, the RIHS delegation sought his opinion because he is a prominent spiritual leader whose views on Islam are seen as immensely authoritative. As such, it is possible to interpret his comments to the organisation as inciting religious intolerance and hatred, and as encouraging terrorist ideology on the Arabian Peninsula.

As Vice-President/High Representative Baroness Catherine Ashton explained in her statement to the European Parliament's Foreign Affairs committee on 20 March 2012, the EEAS 'recognise the problems and difficulties faced by Christian minorities at the present time. And we recognise the importance of our working with [third countries] but within the context too of addressing all forms of discrimination against those who have faith […] Working with countries with whom we need to establish strong relations in order to support our objectives but also in support of our views, values and beliefs.' In light of these comments:

1. Will the Vice-President/High Representative condemn the Grand Mufti's calls to destroy all churches on the Arabian Peninsula?

2. Will the Vice-President/High Representative request that the EU delegation in Riyadh organise meetings with their Gulf counterparts to discuss the Grand Mufti's comments, and the general situation on the ground for Christians, and that it report back to her?

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

The Grand Mufti's comments, which were not issued as a formal *fatwā*, were brought up by the EU side at the latest EU-Gulf Cooperation Council meeting of Senior Officials that took place in Brussels on 28 March 2012. On that occasion the EU expressed its disquiet at the Grand Mufti' pronouncements, asking the GCC to enhance the protection of fundamental freedoms in the Gulf region, including the freedom of religion and belief.

Furthermore, the issue has been discussed by the EU Delegation in Riyadh in its contacts with the Saudi government, which provided assurances that the words of the Grand Mufti do not represent the Kingdom's official policy.

The EU will continue to raise these issues with its Gulf interlocutors, making full use of the opportunities at its disposal.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003783/12
a la Comisión
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Bart Staes (Verts/ALE), Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE), Heide Rühle (Verts/ALE) y Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE)
(12 de abril de 2012)

Asunto: Liberación del objetor de conciencia y activista de derechos humanos turco Halil Savda

El 24 de febrero de 2012, Halil Savda fue detenido para cumplir una condena de 100 días por alienar a los ciudadanos de realizar el servicio militar, en virtud del artículo 318 del Código Penal de Turquía. El 1 de agosto de 2006 expresó su solidaridad públicamente con los objetores de conciencia israelíes Itzik Shabbat y Amir Pastar, que fueron arrestados por negarse a participar en la guerra de Israel en el Líbano. En junio de 2008 Halil Savda recibió una sentencia por ello, que fue ratificada por el Tribunal Superior de Apelación en noviembre de 2010, y de la que recibió notificación en febrero de 2011. No es la primera vez que se arresta a Halil Savda por cuestiones de conciencia. También cumplió una condena total de 17 meses en una prisión militar durante cinco años por su objeción de conciencia al servicio militar en 2004. En 2008, el Grupo de Trabajo de las Naciones Unidas sobre la Detención Arbitraria concluyó que estos arrestos eran arbitrarios (Declaración 16/2008). Halil Savda se enfrenta a otra condena de seis meses de prisión por incumplir el artículo 318, dictada en junio de 2010, y que está siendo deliberada por el Tribunal Superior de Apelación, y también hay otros casos pendientes contra él en virtud del artículo 318. Considerando que:

— el Consejo de Europa se ha manifestado a favor de la objeción de conciencia desde 1967, cuando la Asamblea Parlamentaria adoptó una primera resolución sobre esta cuestión, y que el reconocimiento de este derecho posteriormente se convirtió en un requisito para los Estados que pretendían adherirse a la organización;

— el Tribunal Europeo de Derechos Humanos ha reconocido recientemente, en el caso de Bayatyan contra Armenia, que el derecho a la objeción de conciencia está consagrado en el artículo 9 del Convenio Europeo de Derechos Humanos, por el que se protege la libertad de pensamiento, de conciencia y de religión.

Por todo ello, quisiéramos preguntar:

1. ¿Qué pretende hacer la Comisión para salvaguardar los derechos de los objetores de conciencia en Turquía y para garantizar la liberación de Halil Savda?

2. Considerando el acervo comunitario y los requisitos de adhesión de Turquía, ¿requerirá la Comisión que se derogue el artículo 318 del Código Penal de Turquía alegando para ello que este vulnera el derecho a la libertad de expresión, consagrado también en el artículo 10 del Convenido Europeo de Derechos Humanos y en el artículo 19 del Pacto Internacional de Derechos Civiles y Políticos, del que Turquía también forma parte?

Respuesta del Sr. Füle en nombre de la Comisión
(5 de junio de 2012)

La Comisión es consciente del caso mencionado por Su Señoría, y de la sentencia del Tribunal Europeo de Derechos Humanos a la que hace referencia.

La Comisión ha planteado el caso a las autoridades turcas y sigue su evolución atentamente. Halil Savda fue puesto en libertad condicional el 13 de abril de 2012 en el marco de la reciente enmienda a la Ley sobre la libertad condicional que reduce el umbral fijado para beneficiarse de una situación de libertad probatoria.

Turquía, como país que está negociando su adhesión a la UE debe garantizar los derechos fundamentales y libertades para todos sus ciudadanos, de conformidad con el Convenio Europeo de Derechos Humanos y la jurisprudencia del Tribunal Europeo de Derechos Humanos.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003783/12
an die Kommission
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Bart Staes (Verts/ALE), Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE), Heide Rühle (Verts/ALE) und Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE)
(12. April 2012)

Betrifft: Freilassung des türkischen Militärdienstverweigerers aus Gewissensgründen und Menschenrechtsaktivisten Halil Savda

Am 24. Februar 2012 wurde Halil Savda verhaftet und nach Artikel 318 des türkischen Strafgesetzbuches wegen „Aufrufs zur Militärdienstverweigerung" zu einer 100-tägigen Haftstrafe verurteilt. Am 1. August 2006 hatte er öffentlich seine Solidarität mit den israelischen Militärdienstverweigerern Itzik Shabbat und Amir Pastar bekundet, die wegen ihrer Weigerung, an Israels Krieg gegen den Libanon teilzunehmen, inhaftiert worden waren. Im Juni 2008 wurde Halil Savda deswegen verurteilt, das Urteil wurde jedoch im November 2010 vom Höheren Berufungsgericht ausgesetzt, was ihm im Februar 2011 mitgeteilt wurde. Es ist nicht das erste Mal, dass Halil Savda für eine Militärdienstverweigerung aus Gewissensgründen inhaftiert wurde. Er war außerdem über einen Zeitraum von fünf Jahren für seine Militärdienstverweigerung aus Gewissensgründen im Jahre 2004 insgesamt 17 Monate lang in einem Militärgefängnis. Im Jahre 2008 kam die UN-Arbeitsgruppe für willkürliche Inhaftierung zu dem Schluss, dass diese Inhaftierungen willkürlich waren (Stellungnahme 16/2008). Halil Savda droht für seinen Verstoß gegen Artikel 318 eine weitere sechsmonatige Gefängnisstrafe aus einem im Juni 2010 ergangenen Urteil, das vom Höheren Berufungsgericht geprüft wird, und es sind weitere Verfahren gegen ihn nach Artikel 318 anhängig. In Anbetracht der Tatsache, dass

— das Recht zur Militärdienstverweigerung aus Gewissensgründen vom Europarat seit 1967 anerkannt wurde, als eine erste Entschließung zu diesem Thema von der Parlamentarischen Versammlung angenommen wurde, und eine Anerkennung dieses Rechts später eine Voraussetzung für Staaten wurde, die einen Beitritt zur Organisation anstrebten,

— der Europäische Gerichtshof für Menschenrechte kürzlich im Fall von Bayatyan gegen Armenien anerkannte, dass das Recht auf Militärdienstverweigerung aus Gewissensgründen durch Artikel 9 der Europäischen Menschenrechtskonvention, der die Gedanken-, Gewissens— und Religionsfreiheit schützt, gewährleistet wird,

fragen wir die Kommission:

1. Was wird sie tun, um die Rechte von Militärdienstverweigerern aus Gewissensgründen in der Türkei zu schützen, und welche Maßnahmen wird sie ergreifen, um die Freilassung von Halil Savda zu erreichen?

2. Wird die Kommission in Anbetracht des Besitzstandes der Europäischen Union und der Bedingungen für den Beitritt der Türkei die Aufhebung des Artikels 318 des türkischen Strafgesetzbuches mit der Begründung verlangen, dass dieser gegen das durch Artikel 10 der Europäischen Menschenrechtskonvention und durch Artikel 19 des Internationalen Pakts über bürgerliche und politische Rechte garantierte Recht auf freie Meinungsäußerung verstößt, bei denen die Türkei Vertragsstaat ist?

Antwort von Herrn Füle im Namen der Kommission
(5. Juni 2012)

Der Kommission sind sowohl der von den Damen und Herren Abgeordneten genannte Fall als auch das Urteil des Europäischen Gerichtshofs für Menschenrechte bekannt.

Die Kommission hat den Fall gegenüber den türkischen Behörden zur Sprache gebracht und verfolgt ihn aufmerksam. Halil Savda wurde am 13. April 2012 gemäß der kürzlich erfolgten Änderung des Gesetzes über bedingte Entlassung, mit der die Schwelle zur Inanspruchnahme von Bewährungsdiensten gesenkt wurde, bedingt entlassen.

Die Türkei muss als Land, das mit der EU in Beitrittsverhandlungen steht, die Achtung der Grundrechte und Grundfreiheiten aller Bürger im Einklang mit der Europäischen Menschenrechtskonvention und der Rechtsprechung des Europäischen Gerichtshofs für Menschenrechte gewährleisten.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003783/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Bart Staes (Verts/ALE), Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE), Heide Rühle (Verts/ALE) και Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE)
(12 Απριλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Απελευθέρωση του τούρκου αντιρρησία συνείδησης και υπερασπιστή των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων Halil Savda

Στις 24 Φεβρουαρίου 2012, ο Halil Savda συνελήφθη και καταδικάστηκε σε φυλάκιση 100 ημερών για «αποθάρρυνση ατόμων από την εκπλήρωση στρατιωτικής θητείας», σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 318 του τουρκικού ποινικού κώδικα. Την 1η Αυγούστου του 2006 εξέφρασε δημόσια τη συμπαράστασή του προς τους ισραηλινούς αντιρρησίες συνείδησης Itzik Shabbat και Amir Pastar, οι οποίοι φυλακίστηκαν εξαιτίας της άρνησής τους να συμμετάσχουν στον πόλεμο του Ισραήλ στον Λίβανο. Για τον λόγο αυτόν, τον Ιούνιο του 2008 επιβλήθηκε ποινή στον Halil Savda, η οποία επικυρώθηκε από το Ανώτατο Εφετείο τον Νοέμβριο του 2010 και ανακοινώθηκε στον Halil Savda τον Φεβρουάριο του 2011. Αυτή δεν είναι η πρώτη φορά που ο Halil Savda φυλακίζεται για λόγους συνείδησης. Έχει επίσης εκτίσει συνολική ποινή 17 μηνών σε στρατιωτικές φυλακές μέσα σε περίοδο πέντε ετών ως αντιρρησίας συνείδησης, για την άρνησή του να υπηρετήσει στρατιωτική θητεία το 2004. Το 2008, η ομάδα εργασίας των Ηνωμένων Εθνών για την αυθαίρετη κράτηση κατέληξε στο συμπέρασμα ότι οι εν λόγω φυλακίσεις ήταν αυθαίρετες (Γνωμοδότηση 16/2008). Ο Halil Savda αντιμετωπίζει επίσης ποινή έξι μηνών για παράβαση του Άρθρου 318, η οποία εκδόθηκε τον Ιούνιο του 2010 και εξετάζεται από το Ανώτατο Εφετείο, ενώ εκκρεμούν περαιτέρω υποθέσεις εναντίον του με βάση το άρθρο 318. Εκτιμώντας ότι:

— το δικαίωμα αντίρρησης για λόγους συνείδησης έχει υιοθετηθεί από το Συμβούλιο της Ευρώπης ήδη από το 1967, όταν εγκρίθηκε το πρώτο ψήφισμα για το εν λόγω θέμα από την Κοινοβουλευτική Συνέλευση, η δε αναγνώριση του εν λόγω δικαιώματος αποτελεί προϋπόθεση για τα κράτη που επιθυμούν να ενταχθούν στο Συμβούλιο της Ευρώπης·

— το Ευρωπαϊκό Δικαστήριο Ανθρωπίνων Δικαιωμάτων αναγνώρισε, στην υπόθεση *Bayatyan κατά Αρμενίας*, ότι το δικαίωμα αντίρρησης για λόγους συνείδησης διασφαλίζεται από το άρθρο 9 της Ευρωπαϊκής Σύμβασης για τα Δικαιώματα του Ανθρώπου, προστατεύοντας την ελευθερία σκέψης, συνείδησης και θρησκείας.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. τι θα πράξει για να προστατέψει τα δικαιώματα των αντιρρησιών συνείδησης στην Τουρκία και να εξασφαλίσει την απελευθέρωση του Halil Savda;

2. λαμβάνοντας υπόψη το κεκτημένο της ΕΕ και τις απαιτήσεις προσχώρησης που ισχύουν για την Τουρκία, θα κάνει η Επιτροπή έκκληση για κατάργηση του άρθρου 318 του τουρκικού ποινικού κώδικα με την αιτιολόγηση ότι παραβιάζει το δικαίωμα της ελευθερίας έκφρασης, το οποίο διασφαλίζεται επίσης από το άρθρο 10 της Ευρωπαϊκής Σύμβασης για τα Δικαιώματα του Ανθρώπου και το άρθρο 19 της Διεθνούς Σύμβασης για τα Πολιτικά Δικαιώματα και τα Δικαιώματα του Πολίτη, στις οποίες η Τουρκία είναι συμβαλλόμενο μέρος;

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

Η Επιτροπή είναι ενήμερη σχετικά με την υπόθεση που αναφέρουν τα Αξιότιμα Μέλη και σχετικά με την απόφαση του Ευρωπαϊκού Δικαστηρίου Ανθρωπίνων Δικαιωμάτων.

Η Επιτροπή έχει θέσει το ζήτημα στις τουρκικές αρχές και το παρακολουθεί στενά. Ο Halil Savda αφέθηκε ελεύθερος με όρους στις 13 Απριλίου 2012, στο πλαίσιο πρόσφατης τροποποίησης της νομοθεσίας σχετικά με την αποφυλάκιση υπό όρους, η οποία μειώνει το κατώτατο όριο που έχει καθοριστεί για το ευεργέτημα των υπηρεσιών δικαστικής επιτήρησης.

Η Τουρκία, ως χώρα που διαπραγματεύεται την ένταξή της στην ΕΕ, οφείλει να εγγυηθεί τον πλήρη σεβασμό των θεμελιωδών δικαιωμάτων και ελευθεριών όλων των πολιτών σύμφωνα με την Ευρωπαϊκή Σύμβαση Ανθρωπίνων Δικαιωμάτων και τη νομολογία του Ευρωπαϊκού Δικαστηρίου Ανθρωπίνων Δικαιωμάτων.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003783/12
aan de Commissie
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Bart Staes (Verts/ALE), Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE), Heide Rühle (Verts/ALE) en Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE)
(12 april 2012)

Betreft: Vrijlating van de Turkse dienstweigeraar op grond van gewetensbezwaren en mensenrechtenactivist Halil Savda

Op 24 februari 2012 werd Halil Savda krachtens artikel 318 van het Turkse Strafwetboek gearresteerd om een gevangenisstraf van honderd dagen uit te zitten wegens „het aanzetten tot dienstweigering". Op 1 augustus 2006 had hij zich publiekelijk solidair verklaard met de Israëlische gewetensbezwaarden Itzik Shabbat en Amir Pastar, die werden gevangengezet omdat ze weigerden deel te nemen aan de Israëlische oorlog in Libanon. In juni 2008 werd Halil Savda hiervoor veroordeeld. Dit vonnis werd bevestigd door het Hoger Hof van Beroep in november 2010 en werd hem in februari 2011 medegedeeld. Dit is niet de eerste keer dat Halil Savda ten gevolge van gewetensbezwaren in de cel beland. Gedurende een periode van vijf jaar heeft hij in totaal 17 maanden in een militaire gevangenis gezeten omdat hij in 2004 op grond van gewetensbezwaren weigerde zijn militaire dienstplicht te vervullen. In 2008 concludeerde de VN-werkgroep inzake willekeurige detentie dat deze gevangenisstraffen willekeurig waren (Advies 16/2008). Er hangt Halil Savda nog een gevangenisstraf van zes maanden boven het hoofd die in juni 2010 werd uitgesproken voor het schenden van artikel 318 en die momenteel door het Hoger Hof van Beroep wordt behandeld, en daarnaast lopen er krachtens artikel 318 nog enkele andere zaken tegen hem. Overwegende dat:

— het recht op dienstweigering op grond van gewetensbezwaren door de Raad van Europa wordt gesteund sinds 1967, toen een eerste resolutie over dit onderwerp door de Parlementaire Vergadering werd goedgekeurd; en dat de erkenning van dit recht later een vereiste werd voor landen die tot de organisatie wensen toe te treden;

— het Europees Hof voor de rechten van de mens in de zaak Bayatyan v. Armenië recentelijk erkende dat het recht op dienstweigering op grond van gewetensbezwaren gegarandeerd wordt door artikel 9 van het Europees Verdrag inzake de rechten van de mens, dat vrijheid van gedachte, geweten en godsdienst beschermt.

Wij vragen de Commissie het volgende:

1. Wat zal zij doen om de rechten van dienstweigeraars op grond van gewetensbezwaren in Turkije te vrijwaren en de vrijlating van Halil Savda te bewerkstelligen?

2. Zal de Commissie, gezien het EU-acquis en de toetredingsvereisten voor Turkije, vragen om de intrekking van artikel 318 van het Turkse Strafwetboek aangezien dat het recht op vrije meningsuiting schendt, dat eveneens gegarandeerd wordt door artikel 10 van het Europees Verdrag inzake de rechten van de mens en artikel 19 van het Internationaal Verdrag inzake burgerrechten en politieke rechten, waarvan Turkije een ondertekenende partij is?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(5 juni 2012)

De Commissie is op de hoogte van de door de geachte Parlementsleden genoemde zaak en van de uitspraak van het Europees Hof voor de rechten van de mens.

De Commissie heeft de zaak met de Turkse autoriteiten besproken en volgt deze nauwlettend. Halil Savda werd op 13 april 2012 voorwaardelijk in vrijheid gesteld overeenkomstig de recente wijziging van de wet op voorwaardelijke invrijheidstelling, waarbij de drempel voor voorwaardelijke invrijheidstelling is verlaagd.

Turkije is een kandidaat-lidstaat die met de EU over toetreding onderhandelt en moet derhalve de grondrechten en fundamentele vrijheden van al zijn burgers waarborgen zoals bepaald in het Europees Verdrag tot bescherming van de rechten van de mens en de jurisprudentie van het Europees Hof voor de rechten van de mens.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-003783/12
komissiolle
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Bart Staes (Verts/ALE), Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE), Heide Rühle (Verts/ALE) ja Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE)
(12. huhtikuuta 2012)

Aihe: Turkkilaisen aseistakieltäytyjän ja ihmisoikeusaktivistin Halil Savdan vapauttaminen

Halil Savda pidätettiin 24. helmikuuta 2012 ja vietiin suorittamaan 100 päivän vankeustuomiota, jonka hän oli saanut ”kansan vieraannuttamisesta armeijasta” Turkin rikoslain 318 artiklan perusteella. Hän oli ilmaissut 1. elokuuta 2006 julkisesti solidaarisuutensa kahden Libanonin sodasta kieltäytyneen ja vangitun israelilaisen aseistakieltäytyjän, Itzik Shabbatin ja Amir Pastarin, puolesta. Halil Savda sai tämän johdosta kesäkuussa 2008 vankeustuomion, jonka korkein valitustuomioistuin päätti marraskuussa 2010 pitää voimassa ja josta ilmoitettiin hänelle helmikuussa 2011. Tämä ei ole ensimmäinen kerta kun Halil Savda vangitaan omantunnon syistä. Halil Savda on istunut sotilasvankilassa myös 17 kuukauden ajan kieltäydyttyään asepalveluksesta vuonna 2004. Vuonna 2008 YK:n mielivaltaisia vapaudenriistoja käsittelevä työryhmä antoi johtopäätöksen, jonka mukaan nämä vangitsemiset olivat mielivaltaisia (Opinion 16/2008). Halil Savdaa uhkaa toinen, kesäkuussa 2010 annettu kuuden kuukauden mittainen vankilatuomio 318 artiklan loukkaamisesta. Ylin vetoomustuomioistuin käsittelee parhaillaan tapausta. Tutkinnassa on myös muita häntä vastaan nostettuja syytteitä artikla 318:n loukkaamisesta. Kun otetaan huomioon, että:

— Euroopan neuvosto on puoltanut oikeutta kieltäytyä pakollisesta asepalveluksesta omantunnon syistä jo vuodesta 1967, jolloin parlamentaarinen yleiskokous antoi aiheesta ensimmäisen päätöslauselmansa, ja sittemmin tämän oikeuden tunnustamisesta on tullut edellytys valtioille, jotka haluavat liittyä järjestöön,

— Euroopan ihmisoikeustuomioistuin totesi hiljattain asiassa Bayatyan vastaan Armenia antamassaan tuomiossa, että oikeus kieltäytymiseen omantunnon syistä taataan Euroopan ihmisoikeussopimuksen 9 artiklalla, jolla suojataan ajatuksen, omantunnon ja uskonnon vapaus,

komissiolle esitetään seuraavat kysymykset:

1. Mitä se aikoo tehdä turvatakseen aseistakieltäytyjien oikeudet Turkissa ja varmistaakseen Halil Savdan vapauttamisen?

2. Kun otetaan huomioon EU:n säännöstö ja Turkin liittymisperusteet, aikooko komissio vaatia Turkin rikoslain 318 artiklan kumoamista sen perusteella, että se rikkoo oikeutta sanavapauteen, joka taataan myös Euroopan ihmisoikeussopimuksen 10 artiklassa ja kansalaisoikeuksia ja poliittisia oikeuksia koskevan kansainvälisen yleissopimuksen 19 artiklassa, joihin Turkin valtio kuuluu osapuolena?

Štefan Fülen komission puolesta antama vastaus
(5. kesäkuuta 2012)

Komissio on tietoinen arvoisien parlamentin jäsenten mainitsemasta tapauksesta ja Euroopan ihmisoikeustuomioistuimen tuomiosta.

Komissio on ottanut asian puheeksi Turkin viranomaisten kanssa ja seuraa sitä tiiviisti. Halil Savda pääsi 13.4.2012 ehdonalaiseen vapauteen sen jälkeen, kun ehdonalaisesta vapaudesta annettuun lakiin tehtiin muutos, jolla lievennetään ehdonalaiseen vapauteen pääsyn ehtoja.

Turkin on EU:hun liittymisestä neuvottelevana maana turvattava kaikkien kansalaistensa perusoikeudet ja -vapaudet Euroopan ihmisoikeussopimuksen ja Euroopan ihmisoikeustuomioistuimen oikeuskäytännön mukaisesti.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003783/12
to the Commission
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Bart Staes (Verts/ALE), Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE), Heide Rühle (Verts/ALE) and Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE)
(12 April 2012)

Subject: Release of Turkish conscientious objector and human rights activist Halil Savda

On 24 February 2012, Halil Savda was arrested to serve a 100-day sentence for 'alienating people from performing military service', under Article 318 of the Turkish Penal Code. On 1 August 2006 he had publicly expressed his solidarity with Israeli conscientious objectors Itzik Shabbat and Amir Pastar, who were imprisoned for refusing to participate in Israel's war in Lebanon. In June 2008 Halil Savda received a sentence for this, which was upheld by the Higher Court of Appeal in November 2010 and communicated to him in February 2011. This is not the first time that Halil Savda has been imprisoned for reasons of conscience. He has also served a total of 17 months in military prison over a period of five years for his conscientious objection to military service in 2004. In 2008, the UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention concluded that these imprisonments were arbitrary (Opinion 16/2008). Halil Savda faces another six-month prison sentence for breaching Article 318, handed down in June 2010, which is being considered by the Higher Court of Appeal, and there are further cases pending against him under Article 318. Considering that:

— the right to conscientious objection has been endorsed by the Council of Europe ever since 1967 when a first resolution on the topic was adopted by the Parliamentary Assembly, and the recognition of this right later became a requirement for states seeking accession to the organisation;

— the European Court of Human Rights recently recognised, in the case of Bayatyan v. Armenia, that the right to conscientious objection is guaranteed by Article 9 of the European Convention on Human Rights, protecting freedom of thought, conscience and religion.

We ask the Commission:

1. What will it do to safeguard the rights of conscientious objectors in Turkey and secure the release of Halil Savda?

2. Considering EU *acquis* and the accession requirements of Turkey, will the Commission call for the repeal of Article 318 of the Turkish Penal Code on the grounds that it violates the right to freedom of expression, guaranteed also by Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights and Article 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, to which Turkey is a state party?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2012)

The Commission is aware of the case mentioned by the Honourable Members, and of the judgment of the European Court of Human Rights.

The Commission has raised the case with the Turkish authorities and follows it closely. Halil Savda was released conditionally on 13 April 2012 under the recent amendment to the Law on conditional release that lowers the threshold set to benefit from probation services.

Turkey, as a country negotiating its accession to the EU needs to guarantee fundamental rights and freedoms for all its citizens according to the European Convention of Human Rights and the case law of the European Court of Human Rights.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003784/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(12 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Finanziamento occulto da parte della BCE alle case automobilistiche

Volkswagen Financial Services, braccio finanziario della casa madre automobilistica Volkswagen, ha partecipato all'asta di febbraio indetta dalla BCE e ha preso in prestito 2 miliardi di euro. Essendo a tutti gli effetti una banca ne aveva la facoltà, ma ha utilizzato quei prestiti di favore per prestare, a sua volta, denaro ai clienti a tassi di interessi più bassi rispetto al mercato finanziario per l'acquisto di nuove vetture. Questo appare di fatto un sussidio mascherato al settore automobilistico, che può generare distorsioni nella concorrenza interna.

— La Commissione non ritiene che queste operazioni possano compromettere la libera concorrenza del mercato interno e generare distorsioni?

— La Commissione è a conoscenza di altre case automobilistiche che abbiano attuato la stessa strategia?

— Nel caso così non fosse, la Commissione non ritiene che le altre case automobilistiche possano essere penalizzate in termini di concorrenza?

Risposta di Joaquín Almunia a nome della Commissione
(14 giugno 2012)

L'onorevole parlamentare solleva la questione delle possibili ripercussioni che un prestito di 2 miliardi di EUR concesso dalla Banca centrale europea (BCE) a Volkswagen Financial Services, braccio finanziario del gruppo Volkswagen, potrebbe avere sulla concorrenza tra i produttori di autovetture.

Al momento la Commissione non dispone di informazioni dettagliate su come Volkswagen abbia effettivamente utilizzato il prestito e non sa se altri produttori di automobili abbiano ottenuto finanziamenti dalla BCE.

La normativa dell'UE sulla concorrenza non è applicabile all'operazione di rifinanziamento della BCE cui fa riferimento l'onorevole parlamentare poiché i fondi della BCE non costituiscono un aiuto di Stato ai sensi dell'articolo 107 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003784/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(12 April 2012)

Subject: Hidden funding of car manufacturers by the ECB

Volkswagen Financial Services, the finance arm of the Volkswagen car manufacturing company, participated in the February auction held by the ECB and borrowed EUR 2 billion. Since, to all intents and purposes, it is a bank, it had the power to do so, but it has used these borrowings to lend money to customers to purchase new vehicles at interest rates that are lower than the financial market. This appears to be a masked subsidy of the automotive sector, which could distort internal competition.

— Does the Commission not believe that these operations could compromise the free competition of the internal market and cause distortions?

— Is the Commission aware of other car manufacturers that have implemented the same strategy?

— If there are no others, does the Commission not believe that other car manufacturers may be penalised in terms of competition?

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

The Honourable Member raises the issue of the possible impact on competition between carmakers of a two billion loan granted by the European Central Bank (ECB) to Volkswagen Financial Services, the financing arm of the Volkswagen group.

The Commission has no detailed information at this stage on how the money was indeed used by Volkswagen and whether other car manufacturers also borrowed funds from the ECB.

European competition rules are not applicable to the ECB refinancing operation referred to by the Honourable Member as ECB funds do not constitute state aid in the meaning of Article 107 TFEU.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003785/12
an die Kommission
Antonio Cancian (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Salvatore Caronna (S&D), Lara Comi (PPE), Silvia Costa (S&D), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Salvatore Iacolino (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Mario Mauro (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Claudio Morganti (EFD), Alfredo Pallone (PPE), Mario Pirillo (S&D), Gianni Pittella (S&D), Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Oreste Rossi (EFD), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Marco Scurria (PPE), Debora Serracchiani (S&D), Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Patrizia Toia (S&D), Giommaria Uggias (ALDE), Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Herbert Dorfmann (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Iva Zanicchi (PPE) und Vincenzo Iovine (ALDE)
(12. April 2012)

Betrifft: Das europäische Kulturerbe — welche Rolle spielt es im zukünftigen Programm Horizont 2020?

Die Europäische Union hat in den vergangenen Jahren die Absicht gezeigt, den Schutz des europäischen Kulturerbes (materielles und immaterielles Kulturerbe) zu unterstützen und zu fördern und hat diesem Bereich eine prioritäre Bedeutung zuerkannt. Beispiele dafür sind die Initiative für die gemeinsame Planung sowie das Europäische Kulturerbe-Siegel.

Allerdings ist festzustellen, dass im Legislativvorschlag, den die Europäische Kommission am 30. November 2011 angenommen hat, die Finanzierung von Forschungs— und Innovationsprojekten in diesem Bereich überhaupt nicht erwähnt wird.

Diese Entscheidung könnte sehr negative Auswirkungen haben, da so die Basis der Unterstützungsstrategie für den Erhalt des europäischen Kulturerbes untergraben würde, was im Gegensatz zu einigen Entscheidungen steht, die die Kommission zu diesem Thema getroffen hat. Der Schutz von Kulturgütern auf Gemeinschaftsebene darf die Wissenschaft nicht ausschließen, denn das würde die Nachhaltigkeit der Maßnahmen sowie der bisher investierten monetären Ressourcen und Humanressourcen gefährden.

Die Kommission hat vor kurzem mehrmals bekräftigt, dass das Kulturerbe innerhalb der fünften gesellschaftlichen Herausforderung (Klimaschutz, Ressourceneffizienz und Rohstoffe) und innerhalb der sechsten gesellschaftlichen Herausforderung (integrative, innovative und sichere Gesellschaften) Platz finden werde.

Den Schutz des Kulturerbes nur in den Bereichen Klimaschutz (wegen des Zusammenhangs mit der Energieeffizienz Tausender historischer Gebäude in Europa), Industrien der Nanotechnologie und der fortgeschrittenen Materialien, Tourismus und IKT zu behandeln, erscheint jedoch zu begrenzt.

Daher wird angefragt:

1. Ist die Kommission der Ansicht, dass diesem Sektor innerhalb des zukünftigen Programms Horizont 2020, insbesondere innerhalb des Teils, der den sozialen Herausforderungen gewidmet ist, eine klarere und strategischere Rolle eingeräumt werden kann?

2. Wie beabsichtigt sie, diese Lücke zu schließen und die Bedeutung des europäischen Kulturerbes innerhalb der verschiedenen gesellschaftlichen Herausforderungen, die im Legislativvorschlag Horizont 2020 enthalten sind, auf übergreifender und multidisziplinärer Ebene anzuerkennen?

Antwort von Frau Geoghegan-Quinn im Namen der Kommission
(11. Juni 2012)

1. Die Kommission misst der Unterstützung der Forschung im Bereich des Kulturerbes in allen seinen Formen einen hohen Stellenwert bei. Das neue Forschungs— und Innovationsprogramm „Horizont 2020“ wird diese Fragen auf verschiedene Weise innerhalb aller seiner drei, einander verstärkenden Schwerpunktbereiche „Wissenschaftsexzellenz“, „führende Rolle der Industrie“ und „gesellschaftliche Herausforderungen“ angehen. In letzterem werden vorrausichtlich vor allem die Themen „Klimaschutz, Ressourceneffizienz und Rohstoffe“ sowie „integrative, innovative und sichere Gesellschaften“ entsprechende Fragen abdecken.

2. Sowohl die Rahmenprogramme wie auch jüngste Initiativen wie der „Schwerpunktbereich kulturelles Erbe“ der Europäischen Plattform für Bautechnologie (ECTP-FACH) und die gemeinsame Programmplanungsinitiative (JPI) im Bereich „Kulturerbe und globale Veränderungen: Eine neue Herausforderung für Europa“, eine von den Mitgliedstaaten getragene Initiative, zielen auf multidisziplinäre Forschung ab. Im Bereich „Umwelt“ des letzten

Arbeitsprogramms des Siebten Rahmenprogramms der Europäischen Gemeinschaft für Forschung, technologische Entwicklung und Demonstration (2007 bis 2013) werden verschiedene Aspekte des Kulturerbes durch entsprechende Aufforderungen abgedeckt (zum Beispiel Einsatz für Energieeffizienz in bestehenden Gebäuden, Schutz von Kulturlandschaften). Die gemeinsame Programmplanungsinitiative im Bereich „Kulturerbe und globaler Wandel“ kann auch von einer „ERA-NET Plus“-Maßnahme profitieren, die dem Schutz und der Unterhaltung historischer und moderner Kunstwerke, Gebäude und Orte dient. Es ist zu erwarten, dass Horizont 2020 auch weiterhin den multidisziplinären und sektorenübergreifenden Aspekt der Forschung im Bereich des Kulturerbes unterstützen wird.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003785/12
alla Commissione
Antonio Cancian (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Salvatore Caronna (S&D), Lara Comi (PPE), Silvia Costa (S&D), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Salvatore Iacolino (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Mario Mauro (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Claudio Morganti (EFD), Alfredo Pallone (PPE), Mario Pirillo (S&D), Gianni Pittella (S&D), Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Oreste Rossi (EFD), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Marco Scurria (PPE), Debora Serracchiani (S&D), Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Patrizia Toia (S&D), Giommaria Uggias (ALDE), Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Herbert Dorfmann (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Iva Zanicchi (PPE) e Vincenzo Iovine (ALDE)
(12 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Il patrimonio culturale europeo — quale ruolo nel futuro programma Horizon 2020

L'Unione europea ha dimostrato negli ultimi anni la volontà di sostenere e promuovere la tutela del patrimonio culturale europeo (inteso come un complesso di beni tangibili e intangibili), riconoscendo al settore un'importanza prioritaria. Esempi ne sono la specifica iniziativa di Programmazione Congiunta, nonché lo Europe Heritage Label.

Tuttavia si nota che, all'interno della proposta legislativa adottata dalla Commissione europea il 30 novembre 2011, i finanziamenti a progetti di ricerca e innovazione nel settore non vengono mai menzionati.

Tale decisione potrebbe avere conseguenze molto negative, dato che verrebbe minata alla base la strategia di supporto alla conservazione del patrimonio culturale europeo, in contraddizione rispetto a quelle che sono alcune decisioni della stessa Commissione in merito a questo tema. La protezione dei beni culturali a livello comunitario non può escludere la comunità scientifica, poiché si metterebbe a repentaglio la sostenibilità degli interventi e degli investimenti di risorse monetarie e umane finora impiegate.

La Commissione ha recentemente sostenuto in più di un'occasione che il patrimonio culturale troverà spazio all'interno della quinta sfida sociale (Azioni per il clima, l'efficienza delle risorse e delle materie prime) e della sesta sfida sociale (Società inclusive, innovative e sicure).

Relegare la tutela del patrimonio culturale agli aspetti climatici (per il collegamento con l'efficienza energetica delle migliaia di edifici storici europei), all'industria delle nanotecnologie, a quella dei materiali e a quella del turismo, e alle ICT, appare però riduttivo.

Si chiede pertanto:

1. ritiene la Commissione di poter riconoscere un ruolo più chiaro e strategico al settore all'interno del futuro programma Horizon 2020, in particolare all'interno del pilastro dedicato alle sfide sociali?

2. Come pensa di colmare tale lacuna riconoscendo a livello trasversale e multidisciplinare l'importanza del patrimonio culturale europeo all'interno delle diverse sfide sociali contenute nella proposta legislativa Horizon 2020?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(11 giugno 2012)

1. La Commissione annette grande importanza al sostegno alla ricerca in materia di patrimonio culturale in tutte le sue forme. Il nuovo programma per la ricerca e l'innovazione «Orizzonte 2020» affronterà la ricerca in vari modi in relazione alle sue tre priorità che si valorizzano reciprocamente: «Eccellenza scientifica», «Leadership industriale» e «Sfide sociali». Nell'ambito di quest'ultima, le sfide «Azione per il clima, l'efficienza delle risorse e le materie prime» e «Società inclusive, innovative e sicure» sono particolarmente idonee ad affrontare le questioni connesse al patrimonio culturale.

2. Infatti sia i programmi quadro che le recenti iniziative, quali il settore tematico «Patrimonio culturale» della «piattaforma tecnologica europea per la costruzione» e l'iniziativa di programmazione comune «Patrimonio culturale e cambiamenti globali: una nuova sfida per l'Europa» — un'iniziativa, questa, promossa dagli Stati membri — mirano ad una ricerca multidisciplinare. Nell'ultimo programma di lavoro del Settimo programma quadro di ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico (7° PQ 2007-2013) gli inviti a presentare proposte sul tema «Ambiente» (che comprende i cambiamenti climatici) riguarderanno diversi aspetti connessi al patrimonio culturale (ad esempio, promozione dell'efficienza energetica negli edifici esistenti, tutela dei paesaggi culturali). L'iniziativa del programma comune

«Patrimonio culturale e cambiamenti globali» può anche trarre vantaggio da un'azione ERA-NET Plus dedicata alla tutela e alla gestione di opere d'arte, edifici e siti sia storici che moderni. Si prevede che Orizzonte 2020 continui a promuovere l'aspetto multidisciplinare e trasversale della ricerca sul patrimonio culturale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003785/12
to the Commission
Antonio Cancian (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Salvatore Caronna (S&D), Lara Comi (PPE), Silvia Costa (S&D), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Salvatore Iacolino (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Mario Mauro (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Claudio Morganti (EFD), Alfredo Pallone (PPE), Mario Pirillo (S&D), Gianni Pittella (S&D), Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Oreste Rossi (EFD), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Marco Scurria (PPE), Debora Serracchiani (S&D), Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Patrizia Toia (S&D), Giommaria Uggias (ALDE), Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Herbert Dorfmann (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Iva Zanicchi (PPE) and Vincenzo Iovine (ALDE)
(12 April 2012)

Subject: European cultural heritage-role in the future Horizon 2020 programme

In recent years the European Union has shown its desire to support and promote the protection of European cultural heritage (meaning tangible and intangible assets as a whole), placing a strong priority on the sector. Examples of this are the specific Joint Programming Initiative and the European Heritage Label.

However, it must be noted that in the legislative proposal adopted by the European Commission on 30 November 2011, funding for research and innovation projects in the sector is never mentioned.

This decision could have very negative consequences, considering that the foundations of the European cultural heritage preservation support strategy would be undermined, contradicting some of the Commission's own decisions in this area. The protection of cultural heritage on an EU level must not exclude the scientific community, since this would jeopardise the sustainability of the interventions and investments of monetary and human resources committed up to now.

The Commission has recently stated on more than one occasion that cultural heritage will be covered within the Fifth Societal Challenge (climate action, resource efficiency and raw materials) and the Sixth Societal Challenge (inclusive, innovative and secure societies).

However, relegating the protection of cultural heritage to climatic aspects (based on the connection with the energy efficiency of the thousands of historic buildings in Europe), the nanotechnology, materials and tourism industries and to ICT, seems too simplistic.

Can the Commission therefore answer the following questions:

1. Does it believe that it could identify a clearer and more strategic role for the sector within the future Horizon 2020 programme, in particular within the pillar dedicated to societal challenges?

2. How does it think it might fill this gap, recognising the importance of European cultural heritage on a cross— and multi-disciplinary level as part of the different societal challenges contained in the Horizon 2020 legislative proposal?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2012)

1. The Commission attaches a high importance to support research related to cultural heritage in all its forms. The new Programme for Research and Innovation 'Horizon 2020' will address in different ways and under all its three mutually reinforcing priorities: 'Excellent Science', 'Industrial Leadership' and 'Societal Challenges'. Under the latter, the challenges 'Climate action, resource efficiency and raw materials' and 'Inclusive, innovative and secure societies' are particularly likely to address such issues.

2. Both the framework Programmes and recent initiatives, such as the 'Focus Area Cultural Heritage' of the 'European Construction Technology Platform' (ECTP-FACH), and the Joint Programming Initiative (JPI) on 'Cultural Heritage and Global Change: a new challenge for Europe', a Member State driven initiative, are aiming at multi-disciplinary research. In the last Work Programme of the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development's (FP7, 2007-2013) 'Environment' Theme (including climate change), calls will address several aspects related to cultural heritage (e.g. promoting energy efficiency in existing buildings, protection of cultural landscapes). The Joint PI on 'Cultural heritage and global change' may also benefit from an ERA-NET plus action dedicated to the protection and management of historical and modern artefacts, buildings and sites. It is expected that Horizon 2020 will continue promoting the multi-disciplinary and cross-cutting aspect of cultural heritage research.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003786/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(12 de abril de 2012)

Assunto: Definição de PME (micro, pequena e média empresa)

A recomendação da Comissão Europeia de 6 de maio de 2003 salienta que foi necessário definir um conceito comum europeu para as micro, pequenas e médias empresas (PME), devido ao facto de existir uma «vasta interação entre medidas nacionais e comunitárias a favor das PME, por exemplo no que se refere aos fundos estruturais e à investigação, sendo de evitar que a Comunidade oriente a sua ação para uma certa categoria de PME e os Estados-Membros para outra».

O artigo 2.° do Anexo da mesma recomendação refere que «a categoria das micro, pequenas e médias empresas (PME) é constituída por empresas que empregam menos de 250 pessoas e cujo volume de negócios anual não excede 50 milhões de euros ou cujo balanço total anual não excede 43 milhões de euros».

Na reunião da Comissão do Desenvolvimento Regional do Parlamento Europeu do passado dia 25 de janeiro de 2012, o Comissário da Política Regional, Johannes Hahn, referiu que existem na União Europeia 23 milhões de PME e que, se cada uma empregasse uma pessoa, seria possível eliminar o desemprego existente na altura.

Ao longo dos últimos anos têm sido discutidos os critérios de caracterização de uma PME, considerando muitos especialistas que se deverá proceder a uma adaptação à evolução económica.

O estudo intitulado «Impacto e eficácia dos Fundos Estruturais e das políticas da União Europeia destinadas às PME nas Regiões,» realizado pela Direção-Geral de Política Interna — Departamento Temático B: Políticas Estruturais e de Coesão, refere que a corrente definição de PME a nível europeu é centrada na dimensão da empresa e não reflete totalmente os parâmetros naturais de cada empresa (por exemplo, setor, idade, localização e nível de inovação), nem tem em conta os diferentes ciclos de vida de uma PME (por exemplo, semente, «start-up», jovem e experiente).

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. De acordo com as solicitações de vários especialistas e estudos estratégicos produzidos, está a ponderar rever a atual classificação de PME?

2. Não considera que o termo PME deveria evoluir ao longo do tempo, por forma a estar ajustado aos diversos momentos de conjuntura que a Europa atravessa e aos diversos problemas de evolução das empresas?

Resposta dada por Antonio Tajani em nome da Comissão
(11 de junho de 2012)

A definição de micro, pequenas e médias empresas («definição de PME») é um instrumento estrutural para identificar as empresas que, devido à sua dimensão, estão confrontadas com desafios específicos (por exemplo, o acesso ao financiamento ou aos mercados) e que, por conseguinte, estão autorizadas a receber tratamento preferencial no âmbito dos auxílios estatais e dos fundos da UE. A definição atual de PME já abrange mais de 99 % das empresas da UE e quase três quartos da economia europeia, em termos de emprego.

A Comissão procede a um controlo regular da aplicação da definição de PME. Desde a sua entrada em vigor em 2005, a Comissão realizou duas avaliações e elaborou relatórios de execução em 2006 e 2009, tendo para o efeito consultado os Estados-Membros, as associações empresariais e outras partes interessadas. Em ambos os relatórios, a Comissão concluiu que a definição está a ser aplicada sem quaisquer dificuldades dignas de nota.

Está em curso, em 2012, uma nova revisão da definição de PME, tendo a Comissão assinado um contrato com um consultor externo para a realização de uma avaliação independente. A avaliação terá em conta a evolução económica geral, bem como questões específicas relacionadas com a aplicação da definição.

A avaliação pode não se traduzir necessariamente numa revisão da definição, o que também não foi o caso aquando das anteriores avaliações de 2006 e 2009. Eventuais alterações poderão ser introduzidas, mas apenas na presença de provas concludentes e após ponderação do seu impacto sobre os encargos administrativos para as empresas, já que a estabilidade da definição de PME é um aspeto essencial da segurança jurídica para as empresas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003786/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(12 April 2012)

Subject: The definition of SMEs (micro, small and medium-sized enterprises)

The Commission recommendation of 6 May 2003 highlights the need for a common European definition of micro, small and medium enterprises (SMEs), as there is 'extensive interaction between national and Community measures assisting SMEs, for example in connection with Structural Funds or research. It means that situations in which the Community focuses its action on a given category of SMEs and the Member States on another must be avoided'.

Article 2 of the annex to that recommendation states that 'the category of micro, small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) is made up of enterprises which employ fewer than 250 people and which have an annual turnover not exceeding EUR 50 million, and/or an annual balance sheet total not exceeding EUR 43 million'.

At the meeting of the European Parliament's Committee on Regional Development on 25 January 2012, the Commissioner for Regional Policy, Johannes Hahn, stated that there are 23 million SMEs in the European Union and that, if each of these employed one person, it would be possible to eliminate existing unemployment.

Over recent years, the criteria for defining SMEs have been under discussion, with many specialists believing that the criteria should change with economic developments.

The study 'Impact and effectiveness of the Structural Funds and EU policies aimed at SMEs in the Regions', produced by Policy Department B — Structural and Cohesion Policies — of the Directorate-General for Internal Policies states that the current definition for SMEs at the European level is centred on the size of the enterprise and does not reflect the range of parameters that determine the nature of each SME (e.g. industry sector, age, location and level of innovation), and nor does it take into account the different lifecycle phases of the SME (e.g. seed, start-up, young and mature).

Would the Commission answer the following:

1. Is it considering reviewing the current classification for SMEs, as called for by various specialists and the strategic studies that have been produced?

2. Does it agree that the term SME should evolve over time, so as to adjust to Europe's economic circumstances and the various development challenges for enterprises?

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

The definition of micro, small and medium-sized enterprises ('SME definition') is a structural tool to identify those enterprises which are confronted with particular challenges (e.g. access to finance or markets) due to their size, and who are therefore allowed to receive preferential treatment in State Aid and in EU funds. The current SME definition covers already more than 99% of the enterprises in the EU and almost three-quarters of the European economy in terms of employment.

The Commission carries out a regular monitoring of the implementation of the SME definition. Since its entry into force in 2005, the Commission has carried out two evaluations and prepared respective implementation reports in 2006 and 2009 after consultation of Member States, business organisations and other stakeholders. In both reports, the Commission concluded that the definition was being applied without any notable difficulties.

A new review of the SME definition is being performed in 2012, and the Commission has signed a contract with an external consultant to carry out an independent evaluation. The evaluation will take into account general economic developments as well as specific issues related to the implementation of the definition.

The evaluation may not necessarily translate into a revision of the definition, as it was not the case at the time of previous evaluations in 2006 and 2009. Any changes may be introduced only after obtaining solid evidence and after having weighed their impact on the administrative burden for enterprises, since the stability of the SME definition is a key aspect of legal certainty for enterprises.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-003787/12
alla Commissione
Gianni Pittella (S&D)
(12 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Impegni imposti dalla Commissione a fronte della concessione di aiuti di Stato all'aviazione

Considerando che l'articolo 107 del TFUE si applica anche alle garanzie a copertura di prestiti e che la concessione di tali misure va valutata dalla Commissione alla luce della normativa in materia di aiuti di Stato, siano esse a titolo singolo o contenute in uno schema più ampio;

considerando il dovere della Commissione d'esaminare l'impatto delle misure d'aiuto sulla concorrenza, come pure la prassi costante, in particolare nell'ambito del settore dell'aviazione, a vincolare l'autorizzazione all'aiuto a taluni impegni specifici dei riceventi (cfr. ad esempio le decisioni Air France, Cyprus Airways Public Ltd e Alitalia);

considerando che tali impegni possono comprendere la cessione di elementi dell'attivo, la riduzione delle capacità o della presenza sul mercato ed eventualmente la riduzione del personale, onde prevenire ingiustificate distorsioni della concorrenza;

considerando la costante giurisprudenza della CGUE in merito all'esplicito divieto di utilizzare l'aiuto concesso dallo Stato — sia esso sotto forma di aumento di capitale o di garanzia a copertura di un prestito — per il mero finanziamento dell'ammodernamento dell'impresa beneficiaria o per conservare la competitività o ampliare la flotta;

— ritiene la Commissione che la garanzia prestata da uno Stato membro a una compagnia aerea al fine di garantire l'acquisto di nuovi aeromobili possa essere compatibile con le regole in materia di aiuti di Stato senza un esame — ex ante o al limite ex post — dei servizi della DG COMP?

— Può la Commissione confermare che la valutazione degli effetti reali o potenziali sulla concorrenza dell'aiuto concesso sotto forma di garanzia debba riferirsi al momento della concessione dello stesso e non ex post?

Risposta data da Joaquín Almunia a nome della Commissione
(14 maggio 2012)

L'articolo 108, paragrafo 3, del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione Europea impone agli Stati membri di informare tempestivamente la Commissione in merito ai progetti diretti a istituire o modificare aiuti. L'articolo dispone inoltre che tutti gli aiuti di Stato siano comunicati e valutati dalla Commissione, prima dell'adozione delle misure previste.

L'obbligo di notifica non si applica solamente nei casi previsti dal regolamento generale di esenzione per categoria, nei casi considerati aiuti di importanza minore («de minimis») o che rientrano nell'ambito di applicazione della decisione della Commissione del 20 dicembre 2011 riguardante i servizi di interesse economico generale. Lo Stato può tuttavia partecipare all'economia alle stesse condizioni di un investitore operante in economia di mercato con l'aspettativa di un rendimento sul suo investimento. In altri termini, per le misure statali a favore di un'impresa, concesse alle stesse condizioni che un investitore operante in economia di mercato accetterebbe, non è richiesta la notifica alla Commissione dato che tali misure non sono considerate aiuti di Stato.

Per quanto riguarda l'esempio fornito dall'onorevole parlamentare, se una garanzia concessa da uno Stato membro rientra in una delle eccezioni summenzionate, non è necessaria una notifica preventiva. In caso di dubbio, tuttavia, la Commissione incoraggia gli Stati membri, per ragioni di certezza del diritto, a notificare le misure statali previste prima della loro attuazione. La Commissione procederà poi a valutare l'eventuale distorsione della concorrenza causata dagli aiuti di Stato prima dell'attuazione delle misure. In occasione di un'eventuale denuncia in merito alle misure statali a favore di una determinata impresa o di un determinato settore (indipendentemente dall'avvenuta notifica), la Commissione procede di norma ad un'indagine.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-003787/12
to the Commission
Gianni Pittella (S&D)
(12 April 2012)

Subject: Undertakings imposed by the Commission in response to the granting of state aid to the aviation sector

Whereas Article 107 of the TFEU applies, among other things, to loan guarantees and the granting of such measures must be assessed by the Commission in the light of the regulations on state aid, whether they are one-off measures or part of a wider scheme;

Whereas the Commission has a duty to examine the impact of aid on competition, and there is an established practice, particularly in the aviation sector, of linking aid authorisation to the giving of specific undertakings by the beneficiaries (see for example, the Air France, Cyprus Airways Public Ltd and Alitalia decisions);

Whereas such undertakings can include the sale of assets, and the reduction of capacity or presence on the market and, therefore, a possible reduction in staff, in order to prevent unjustified distortions of competition;

Whereas the Court of Justice of the European Union has consistently held that the use of state aid — whether in the form of capital increases or of loan guarantees — merely to fund the modernisation of the beneficiary company or to maintain its competitive position or to expand its fleet is explicitly forbidden:

— does the Commission believe a guarantee granted by a Member State to an airline, in order to guarantee the purchase of new aircraft, to be compatible with the rules on state aid, without there being an investigation — before or, at the very least, after the event — by the Directorate General for Competition?

— can the Commission confirm that an assessment of the real or potential effects on competition of aid granted in the form of a guarantee must be carried out at the time the aid is granted, and not after the event?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(14 May 2012)

Article 108 (3) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union lays down the obligation for the Member States to inform the Commission in sufficient time of any plans to grant or alter aid. It also requires all state aid measures to be notified and assessed by the Commission before the envisaged measures are implemented.

The obligation to notify is only waived for cases which are covered by the General Block Exemption Regulation or can be considered *de minimis* aid or fall under the scope of the Commission decision on Services of General Economic Interest of 20 December 2011. However, the state may participate in the economy on the same terms and conditions of a market economy investor expecting a return on his investment. In other words, state measures in favour of a company, which are granted on the same commercial terms and conditions as a market economy investor would accept, do not require notification, as such measures are not deemed to involve state aid.

With reference to the example brought forward by the Honourable Member, if a guarantee granted by a Member State falls under one of the abovementioned exceptions, an *ex-ante* notification is not necessary. However, in case of doubt, the Commission encourages Member States to notify the intended state measures before their implementation for reasons of legal certainty. The Commission will then assess the potential distortion of competition caused by any state aid element before the implementation of the measures. In cases where the Commission receives a complaint concerning state measures (regardless of whether they are notified or non-notified) in favour of a certain company or a certain sector, it will normally investigate the matter.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003788/12
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(12 de abril de 2012)

Asunto: Detención de estudiantes en Barcelona

El jueves 29 de marzo, durante las acciones organizadas de la huelga general, los *Mossos d'Esquadra* detuvieron a una cincuentena de personas, entre ellas a tres estudiantes universitarios, quienes ni son delincuentes ni tienen antecedentes policiales. Dos de ellos, de 19 y 21 años, pertenecen a la Asociación de Estudiantes Progresistas y a Comisiones Obreras.

Fueron arrestados y llevados a la Comisaría de *Les Corts* en Barcelona. Fueron trasladados a diferentes centros penitenciarios en régimen de prisión preventiva provisional y sin fianza. A 2 de mayo, los estudiantes siguen en prisión preventiva sin juicio alguno. Se les imputan desórdenes públicos, daños a bienes públicos y atentado contra agentes de la autoridad, entre otros. Se les impone prisión preventiva para asegurar su disponibilidad al tribunal y ante el supuesto peligro de reincidencia. Es un claro caso de violación de presunción de inocencia y de condiciones de prisión preventiva.

La presunción de inocencia es un derecho fundamental reconocido en la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales de la UE (artículo 48, apartado 1). El artículo 3 del TUE dispone que «La Unión ofrecerá a sus ciudadanos un espacio de libertad, seguridad y justicia …». El Parlamento Europeo adoptó una resolución sobre las condiciones de privación de libertad en la UE (2011/2897(RSP)) donde pide a los Estados miembros que garanticen que la prisión preventiva sea una medida excepcional a utilizar bajo estrictas condiciones de necesidad y proporcionalidad y por tiempo limitado, en cumplimiento del principio fundamental de presunción de inocencia y del derecho a la no privación de libertad (…) pide a la Comisión que presente una propuesta legislativa sobre normas mínimas en este terreno basada en el artículo 82, apartado 2, letra b) del TFUE, en la Carta de Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea, en el Convenio Europeo de Derechos Humanos y en la jurisprudencia del Tribunal Europeo de Derechos Humanos.

¿Cree la Comisión que España viola así el artículo 48 de la Carta de Derechos Fundamentales? ¿Tiene la Comisión pensado presentar la propuesta legislativa sobre normas mínimas como pidió el Parlamento Europeo y siguiendo las líneas del Libro Verde publicado por la misma Comisión sobre detención (COM(2011)0327)?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión
(27 de junio de 2012)

La presunción de inocencia está protegida por el artículo 48 de la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales de la UE. No obstante, con arreglo al artículo 51, apartado 1, de la misma, las disposiciones de la Carta están dirigidas a los Estados miembros únicamente cuando apliquen el Derecho de la Unión. Sobre la base de la información proporcionada por Su Señoría, no parece que en el asunto que nos ocupa el Estado miembro estuviese aplicando el Derecho de la UE. Así, pues, en este ámbito corresponde únicamente a los Estados miembros velar por el respeto de sus obligaciones en materia de derechos fundamentales derivadas de acuerdos internacionales y de su legislación interna. Por lo tanto, la Comisión no puede hacer ningún otro comentario sobre los asuntos relativos a los derechos fundamentales que plantea Su Señoría.

La Comisión está reflexionando sobre la forma de reforzar la confianza mutua y el reconocimiento mutuo en toda la Unión en el ámbito de la detención, dentro de los límites de la competencia de la UE. A ese efecto, en junio de 2011 publicó un Libro Verde relativo a la aplicación de la legislación de justicia penal de la UE en el ámbito de la detención ([1]). La Comisión recibió muchas respuestas de los Estados miembros y de otras partes interesadas, y analizará todas las respuestas y procederá a todos los análisis necesarios para determinar si es preciso actuar a escala europea.

([1]) COM(2011) 327; puede consultarse en: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/newsroom/criminal/opinion/110614_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003788/12
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(12 April 2012)

Subject: Detention of students in Barcelona

On Thursday 29 March 2012, during the action organised as part of the general strike, the *Mossos d'Esquadra* (Catalan police) arrested some 50 people, among them three university students, who are not delinquents and have no previous police record. Two of the students, aged 19 and 21, belong to the Spanish Association of Progressive Students (*Asociación de Estudiantes Progresistas*) and the trade union *Comisiones Obreros*.

They were arrested and taken to the Les Corts police station in Barcelona. They were then each transferred to separate prison facilities, where they were held in temporary pre-trial detention without bail.

On 2 May the two students were still being held in detention without any form of trial. They are accused of causing a public disturbance, damaging public property and assaulting police officers, among other offences. They are being held under preventive arrest to ensure their availability to the court and to prevent them from supposedly reoffending. This clearly violates the presumption of innocence and the conditions under which preventive detention may be ordered.

The presumption of innocence is a basic right recognised in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (Article 48(1)). Article 3 of the TEU states that 'the Union shall offer its citizens an area of freedom, security and justice'. The European Parliament has adopted a resolution on detention conditions in the EU (2011/2897(RSP)), in which it calls on Member States to 'ensure that pre-trial detention remains an exceptional measure to be used under strict conditions of necessity and proportionality and for a limited period of time, in compliance with the fundamental principle of presumption of innocence and of the right not to be deprived of liberty' and on the Commission to come up with a legislative proposal on minimum standards in this field based on Article 82(2)(b) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), on the European Charter of Fundamental Rights, on the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and on the case law of the European Court of Human Rights.

Does the Commission consider that Spain is infringing Article 48 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights? Does it intend to present a legislative proposal, as urged by Parliament, along the lines of the Commission's Green Paper on detention (COM(2011)0327)?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2012)

The presumption of innocence is protected by Article 48 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU. However, according to Article 51 (1) of the Charter, its provisions are addressed to the Member States only when they are implementing Union law. On the basis of the information provided by the Honourable Member, it does not appear that in the matter referred to the Member State concerned did act in the course of implementation of EC law. In that matter it is thus for Member States alone to ensure that their obligations regarding fundamental rights — as resulting from international agreements and from their internal legislation — are respected. Therefore, the Commission is not in a position to comment further on the fundamental rights issues raised by the question of the Honourable Member.

The Commission is reflecting on ways to strengthen mutual trust and mutual recognition across the Union in the area of detention, within the limits of EU competence. To that effect, in June 2011, the Commission published a Green Paper on the application of EU criminal justice legislation in the field of detention ([1]).The Commission received many replies from Member States as well as from other stakeholders and will analyse all responses and conduct all necessary research to assess whether any action is required at the European level.

([1]) COM(2011)327, which can be consulted through the following link: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/newsroom/criminal/opinion/110614_en.htm.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003789/12
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(12. April 2012)

Betrifft: Vernichtung des notwendigen Lebensraums von Orang-Utans auf Sumatra

Presseberichten zufolge brennt seit geraumer Zeit der an der Westküste Sumatras (Indonesien) gelegene Torfsumpfwald Tripa. Nach Aussagen von Umweltschutzorganisationen sind die Brände (man spricht von mehr als 100 Brandherden) von Menschenhand gelegt worden, um Palmölplantagen anzulegen. Dieses Waldgebiet ist aber ein wichtiger Lebensraum der selten gewordenen Orang-Utans. Mit der Vernichtung ihres Lebensraumes wird nicht nur ihnen, sondern auch anderen stark reduzierten Populationen, wie etwa Nashörnern und Elefanten, die Heimat genommen.

Daraus ergeben sich folgende Fragen:

1. Ist die Kommission über die systematische Vernichtung des Regenwaldes zum Zweck der Neuanlage von Plantagen auf Sumatra informiert?

2. Fließen EU-Fördermittel nach Indonesien? Wenn ja, aus welchen Titeln und in welcher Höhe?

3. Fließen im speziellen Umwelt- oder Agrarfördermittel aus EU-Budgets nach Indonesien?

4. Sind finanzielle Zuwendungen der EU an Umweltschutzauflagen gekoppelt?

5. In welchen Mengen gelangt indonesisches Palmöl in die EU?

6. Welchen Anteil nimmt daran die Weiterverarbeitung zu Lebensmitteln?

7. Gedenkt die Kommission, Schritte zur Rettung des Regenwaldes auf Sumatra zu unternehmen? Wenn ja, innerhalb welcher Frist?

Antwort von Herrn Potočnik im Namen der Kommission
(28. Juni 2012)

Die Kommission ist über die Entwaldung auf Sumatra und die damit einhergehende Anlage von Plantagen unterrichtet; so hat die Gemeinsame Forschungsstelle der Kommission durch ihre Analyse der Fernerkundungsdaten zu einem besseren Verständnis des Umfangs und der Dynamik der Entwaldung in Südostasien beigetragen.

Indonesien erhält eine finanzielle Unterstützung der EU im Rahmen der normalen Entwicklungszusammenarbeit. Ein Verzeichnis der von der EU mitfinanzierten Projekte findet sich auf der Webseite der EU-Delegation für Indonesien ([1]). In erster Linie werden die Bereiche Umwelt, Governance und Aufbau der Kapazitäten der Zivilgesellschaft, Bildung und regionale Integration unterstützt.

Während die EU-Finanzhilfe an Indonesien generell nicht an die Erfüllung von Umweltschutzauflagen gebunden ist, müssen bei einzelnen Projekten, die mögliche Auswirkungen auf die Umwelt haben, solche Auswirkungen erkannt und entsprechende Gegenmaßnahmen getroffen werden.

Eurostat-Statistiken (Comext-Datenbank) zeigen, dass die EU 2011 aus Indonesien 2,2 Mio. Tonnen Palmöl eingeführt hat. Aus einem vor kurzem veröffentlichten Bericht des Umweltprogramms der Vereinten Nationen ([2]) geht hervor, dass rund drei Viertel des Palmöls für Nahrungsmittel im Allgemeinen und ein Viertel zu Industriezwecken verwendet werden.

Die Kommission wird auch künftig Programme unterstützen, die der Entwaldung in Indonesien entgegenwirken, insbesondere durch die Aushandlung und Umsetzung eines Freiwilligen Partnerschaftsabkommens mit Indonesien über Rechtsdurchsetzung, Politikgestaltung und Handel im Forstsektor (FLEGT-VPA). Dies wird dazu beitragen sicherzustellen, dass Holzausfuhren aus Indonesien in die EU aus Beständen an legal geerntetem Holz stammen. Indonesien hat das Legalitätsüberprüfungssystem, auf dem das VPA basiert, mit Unterstützung der EU bereits eingeführt.

([1]) http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/indonesia/index_en.htm
([2]) http://www.unep.org/pdf/Dec_11_Palm_Plantations.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003789/12
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(12 April 2012)

Subject: Destruction of the essential habitat of orangutans on Sumatra

According to press reports, the Tripa peat swamp forest on the west coast of Sumatra (Indonesia) has been burning for some time. According to environmental protection organisations, the fires (which have over 100 centres) were started by people in order to set up palm oil plantations. However, this forest area is an important habitat for the increasingly rare orangutan. The destruction of their habitat robs not only them but also other greatly reduced populations, such as rhinoceros and elephants, of their natural home.

This gives rise to the following questions:

1. Is the Commission aware of the systematic destruction of the rain forest for the purpose of creating plantations on Sumatra?

2. Does Indonesia receive financial support from the EU, and if so, from which instruments and for what purpose?

3. In particular, does Indonesia receive special environmental or agricultural support from EU budgets?

4. Is the financial support from the EU linked to environmental protection provisions?

5. How much Indonesian palm oil is imported into the EU?

6. What proportion of this volume is used for food processing?

7. Is the Commission considering steps to save the rain forest on Sumatra? If so, what is the timescale involved?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(28 June 2012)

The Commission is aware of the ongoing deforestation in Sumatra associated with plantation development; indeed through its analysis of remote sensing information the Commission's Joint Research Centre has contributed to a greater understanding of the extent and dynamics of such deforestation in South-East Asia.

Indonesia receives support from the EU through normal development cooperation channels. A list of projects funded by the EU can be found at the website of the EU Delegation to Indonesia ([1]). The main areas of support are in the fields of environment, governance and civil society capacity-building, education and regional integration.

While there is no general environmental conditionality for EU financial support to Indonesia, individual projects with a potential impact on the environment must identify and mitigate such impacts.

According to Eurostat statistics (Comext database), the EU imported 2.2 million tons of palm oil from Indonesia in 2011. A recent UNEP report ([2]) suggests that about three quarters of palm oil is used for food at a global level, with a quarter for industrial use.

The Commission continues to provide support to programmes to reduce deforestation in Indonesia, in particular through the negotiation and implementation of a bilateral Forest Law Enforcement Governance and Trade (FLEGT) Voluntary Partnership Agreement (VPA) with Indonesia. This will help ensure that timber exports to the EU from Indonesia are from legally harvested sources. The legality verification system on which the VPA is based is already being rolled out by Indonesia, also with support from the EU.

([1]) http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/indonesia/index_en.htm
([2]) http://www.unep.org/pdf/Dec_11_Palm_Plantations.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003790/12
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(12 April 2012)

Subject: South Sudan

Can the Commission provide details regarding its diplomatic and economic relations with South Sudan?

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

Following South Sudan's independence in July 2011, all EU Member States have given diplomatic recognition to the new state. Following the signature of an Establishment Agreement between the EU and the Republic of South Sudan, the EU has opened a full-fledged Delegation in the capital Juba whereas South Sudan has opened its embassy in Brussels and appointed an ambassador to the EU institutions. In terms of political dialogue, the EU Head of Delegation has regular contacts with representatives of the government. At the highest political level, the President of the Republic of South Sudan, Salva Kiir, visited Brussels in March 2012 and met with the Presidents of the European Council and the Commission, the HR/VP, as well as the Commissioner responsible for International Cooperation, Humanitarian Aid and Crisis Response and the Commissioner responsible for Development.

A more regular and strengthened political dialogue on peace and security, human rights, governance and sustainable economic development will be established between the EU and South Sudan following the latter's request to accede to the EU-ACP Partnership Agreement and the expectation that it will become a member there before the end of 2012.

Economic and trade relations between the EU and South Sudan are limited due to the country's economic structure which is based on oil production and self-sustaining agricultural production and liverstock. EU Member States are not represented among South Sudan's main trading partners for its oil. South Sudan will become eligible for the EU's Everything But Arms (EBA) initiative as soon as it is granted Least Developed Countries (LDC) status.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004028/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Eleni Theocharous (PPE)
(18 Απριλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Κατάφορη παραβίαση των θρησκευτικών ελευθεριών των Ελληνοκύπριων εγκλωβισμένων στην κατεχόμενη Καρπασία

Οι κατοχικές «Αρχές» και η τουρκική Κυβέρνηση συνεχίζουν την ίδια πολιτική στην κατεχόμενη Καρπασία της Κύπρου, αφού δεν επέτρεψαν την ελεύθερη πραγματοποίηση της Θείας Λειτουργίας την ημέρα του Ορθόδοξου Πάσχα. Απαγόρευσαν στον Μητροπολίτη Χριστόφορο να μεταβεί και να πραγματοποιήσει τη Θεία Λειτουργία.

Δεδομένου ότι η Τουρκία εξακολουθεί να εφαρμόζει την πολιτική αυτή στην κατεχόμενη Κύπρο και δη στην Καρπασία, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή αν προτίθεται να λάβει πρωτοβουλίες και ποιες, προκειμένου οι κατοχικές αρχές και η τουρκική Κυβέρνηση να τερματίσουν την κατάφορη παραβίαση των θρησκευτικών ελευθεριών των Ελληνοκύπριων και ειδικότερα εκείνων που βρίσκονται εγκλωβισμένοι στην κατεχόμενη Καρπασία;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(5 Ιουνίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή θα ήθελε να παραπέμψει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος στην απάντησή της στη γραπτή ερώτηση E-003084/2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003793/12
alla Commissione
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(12 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Vescovo Christoforos bloccato a Cipro

Le autorità turco-cipriote hanno negato al Vescovo di Karpassia, Christoforos, l'ingresso nel territorio da loro controllato per celebrare le liturgie della Settimana Santa ortodossa, in vista della Pasqua, il 15 aprile.

Da quando, il 22 maggio 2007, è stato nominato Vescovo di Karpassia dal Santo Sinodo, Christoforos ha potuto tenere la liturgia divina solo tre volte. Dal novembre 2008, il regime di occupazione ha sempre rifiutato le sue numerose richieste di poter celebrare nelle chiese di Rizokarpaso, Ayia Triada e nel Monastero dell'Apostolo Andrea, pur essendo stato autorizzato ad entrare nel territorio occupato.

Inoltre, dal 12 marzo 2012, le autorità turco-cipriote hanno inserito il prelato in una «stop-list», cioè una lista di persone cui non é consentito l'ingresso nel territorio da loro controllato nel nord dell'isola.

Queste misure violano i diritti fondamentali della libertà di movimento e della libertà di religione garantiti dalla Dichiarazione universale dei diritti umani (articoli 13 e 18).

Può dire la Commissione se è al corrente della vicenda? Quali politiche intende attuare per garantire che non venga violato il diritto alla libertà religiosa a Cipro nord? Come intende procedere per permettere al Vescovo Christoforos di celebrare, nelle zone occupate, le liturgie, in particolare quelle legate alla Settimana Santa?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004254/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(24 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Nuova violazione della libertà di religione a Cipro

Il regime di occupazione turco ha respinto le richieste del vescovo di Neapolis, Porfirio e del sacerdote Diomidis Konstantinou, appartenenti alla Chiesa ortodossa di Cipro, di celebrare la messa nei territori occupati. Si tratta dell'ennesima proibizione a danno dei cristiani residenti nei territori occupati a Cipro. Recentemente, inoltre, il vescovo della penisola di Karpasia, Cristoforo, è stato inserito in una lista di persone cui è vietato definitivamente l'ingresso nei territori occupati di Cipro.

Ciò che irrita l'opinione pubblica è l'atteggiamento sfrontato del regime turco di occupazione il quale ha affermato in più occasioni di voler facilitare le celebrazioni di liturgie cristiane. Le restrizioni imposte ai cristiani rivelano la reale volontà di Ankara che è quella di completare la «pulizia etnica» cancellando qualsiasi traccia di presenza cristiana e greca nell'area turco-cipriota. Purtroppo tale disegno ha provocato numerosi danni a edifici religiosi cristiani. Ancora oggi sono centinaia i luoghi di culto e i monumenti saccheggiati, rovinati e sottoposti ad atti vandalici. Le Chiese di San Eufemiano e di San Caralambo sono due esempi evidenti della devastazione dei turchi.

Vi sono decine di migliaia di turco-ciprioti che attraversano ogni giorno i sette check point che permettono la circolazione tra i territori occupati e quelli liberi. Grazie ai punti di transito la popolazione può recarsi al lavoro e ha accesso all'assistenza medica e ad altri servizi.

Le condizioni di vita dei cristiani residenti nei territori occupati non sembrano migliorare. Le violazioni dei diritti umani e delle libertà religiose continuano sotto gli occhi della comunità internazionale.

Considerato che il disegno di «pulizia etnica» di Ankara è iniziato nel 1974 e che il regime turco occupa una parte del territorio di un paese dell'Unione europea, chiedo al Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante se l'Europa intenda continuare sulla strada dell'ingresso della Turchia nell'Unione nonostante le continue violazioni dei diritti umani.

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004255/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(24 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Libertà religiosa nella zona occupata a Cipro

Nella zona occupata dai turchi a Cipro è stata negata la possibilità di celebrare la messa domenicale al vescovo Porfirio della Chiesa ortodossa e al sacerdote Konstantinou. Anche al vescovo Cristoforo della penisola di Karpasia è stato vietato definitivamente l'ingresso nei territori occupati di Cipro. C'è chi sostiene che «ridurre le libertà religiose dei cristiani tuttora residenti nei territori occupati da parte delle forze armate turche rientra nel disegno strategico di Ankara di completare la "pulizia etnica" iniziata nel 1974. Prima sono stati deportati gli abitanti, ora si tratta di cancellare ogni traccia di presenza cristiana e greca.» Sono centinaia i luoghi di culto cristiani e i monumenti archeologici saccheggiati, sconsacrati e sottoposti a vandalismi.

Di fronte a queste interdizioni c'è il rischio — come ha denunciato il primate della Chiesa di Cipro, Arcivescovo Crisostomo II — di chiudere i sette check points, cioè i punti di transito che permettono la circolazione attraverso la linea del cessate il fuoco a decine di migliaia di turco-ciprioti che per motivi di lavoro, per fare uso dell'assistenza medica gratuita o per ottenere documenti di viaggio in modo da poter espatriare, raggiungono i territori liberi di Cipro.

Il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante:

1. È al corrente di questa deplorevole situazione?

2. Fino a quando continuerà a sopportare l'interdizione della libertà religiosa su un territorio dell'UE?

3. Non ritiene preoccupante, anche ai fini della tutela del patrimonio artistico ed architettonico, che i saccheggi e le devastazioni continuino?

4. Quale iniziativa intende intraprendere presso la Turchia per la salvaguardia della libertà religiosa a Cipro e la tutela del suo patrimonio artistico-culturale?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-004261/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(25 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Turchia e violazione del diritto di libertà religiosa nei confronti degli abitanti di Cipro?

Il regime di occupazione turco ha respinto le richieste del vescovo di Neapolis, Porfirio, e del sacerdote Diomidis Konstantinou, ambedue della Chiesa ortodossa di Cipro, di celebrare la messa nei territori occupati. L'ennesima proibizione arriva dopo l'inserimento del vescovo della penisola di Karpasia, Cristoforo, in una lista di persone a cui è vietato definitivamente l'ingresso nei territori occupati di Cipro. La Commissione come intende fermare il progetto di Ankara di ridurre le libertà religiose dei cristiani tuttora residenti nei territori occupati da parte delle forze armate turche? Come valuta questi gesti di chiusura e intolleranza verso i cristiani alla luce del supposto processo di integrazione che dovrebbe portare la Turchia a divenire Stato membro dell'UE?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004341/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Claudio Morganti (EFD), Lorenzo Fontana (EFD), Mario Borghezio (EFD), Oreste Rossi (EFD), Fiorello Provera (EFD), Mara Bizzotto (EFD), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Matteo Salvini (EFD) e Francesco Enrico Speroni (EFD)
(26 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Nuove violazioni della libertà religiosa a Cipro

Negli scorsi giorni si è verificato un ennesimo grave episodio di violazione della libertà religiosa a Cipro: il regime di occupazione turco ha infatti respinto le richieste di due ecclesiastici ciprioti, il vescovo di Neapolis, Porfirio, e il sacerdote Diomidis Konstantinou, ambedue esponenti della Chiesa ortodossa di Cipro, di poter celebrare la messa nei territori occupati.

Questa nuova proibizione avviene a poca distanza dall'inserimento del vescovo della penisola di Karpasia, Cristoforo, in una lista di persone cui è definitivamente vietato l'ingresso nei territori occupati di Cipro; l'episodio aveva già suscitato numerose proteste da parte di molte personalità ed organismi internazionali, puntualmente inascoltate e disattese dal regime turco.

La nuova misura adottata, volta a ridurre le libertà religiose dei cristiani tuttora residenti nei territori occupati da parte delle forze armate turche, sembra rientrare appieno in un disegno strategico di Ankara per completare una sorta di «pulizia etnica» iniziata nel 1974. Dapprima sono stati deportati gli abitanti, mentre ora si tratta di cancellare ogni traccia di presenza cristiana e greca: sono infatti centinaia i luoghi di culto cristiani e i monumenti archeologici saccheggiati, sconsacrati e sottoposti a vandalismi.

Tutto questo avviene in palese violazione ai principi di libertà religiosa sanciti dalla Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea e dalla Dichiarazione universale dei diritti umani e non rispettando le disposizioni del Terzo accordo di Vienna (1975), che stabilisce le condizioni di vita della popolazione greco-cipriota nella parte occupata di Cipro.

Considerando che questi episodi vanno ad aggiungersi ad una serie di altri simili nel recente passato, e che la «moral suasion» sembra non dare frutti, non intende l'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente della Commissione prendere una misura significativa, ovvero l'interruzione immediata di ogni accordo di adesione con la Turchia, fino a quando non sarà risolta la questione cipriota?

Quali misure intende inoltre attuare in concreto per difendere le libertà e il rispetto dei diritti fondamentali di cittadini dell'Unione europea che si trovano, loro malgrado, in un territorio non governato da uno Stato membro?

Risposta congiunta di Füle a nome della Commissione
(5 giugno 2012)

La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-003084/2012 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003793/12
to the Commission
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(12 April 2012)

Subject: Bishop Christoforos stuck in Cyprus

The Turkish Cypriot authorities have denied Bishop Christoforos of Karpasia entry to the Turkish-controlled region to celebrate orthodox Holy Week services, ahead of Easter on 15 April.

Since 22 May 2007, when Christoforos was appointed Bishop of Karpasia by the Holy Synod, he has only been able to conduct the holy service three times. Since November 2008, the occupying regime has always refused his many requests to be allowed to celebrate in the churches of Rizokarpaso, Ayia Triada and in the Apostolos Andreas monastery, despite having been authorised to enter the occupied territory.

Furthermore, since 12 March 2012, the Turkish Cypriot authorities have put the prelate on a stop-list, which is a list of people who are not allowed to enter the Turkish-controlled region to the north of the island.

These measures violate the fundamental rights of freedom of movement and freedom of religion guaranteed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Articles 13 and 18).

Is the Commission aware of this incident? What policies does it intend to implement to ensure that the right to religious freedom in Northern Cyprus is not violated? What does it intend to do to enable Bishop Christoforos to celebrate services in the occupied areas, particularly those relating to Holy Week?

Question for written answer E-004028/12
to the Commission
Eleni Theocharous (PPE)
(18 April 2012)

Subject: Flagrant violation of the religious freedom of Greek Cypriot enclave in occupied Karpasia

The occupying 'authorities' and the Turkish Government are continuing to follow the same policy as before in occupied Karpasia, Cyprus, having refused to allow unimpeded celebration of the Divine Liturgy on the occasion of the Orthodox Easter and denied entry to Bishop Christoforos, thereby preventing him from conducting the service.

Given Turkey's continued implementation of this policy in occupied Cyprus, particularly in Karpasia:

Does the Commission intend to take any measures so that the occupying authorities and the Turkish Government cease this flagrant violation of the religious freedoms of Greek Cypriots, and in particular those forming part of the enclaved community in occupied Karpasia? If so, what are these measures?

Question for written answer E-004254/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(24 April 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — New violation of freedom of religion in Cyprus

The Turkish occupying regime has rejected requests from Bishop Porphyrios of Neapolis and Father Diomidis Konstantinou, members of the Cypriot Orthodox Church, to celebrate mass in the occupied territories. This is yet another prohibition placed upon Christians living in the occupied territory in Cyprus. Recently, moreover, the Bishop of the Karpasia peninsula, Christoforos, has been added to the list of people who are permanently denied entry to the occupied territory of Cyprus.

What annoys the general public is the brazen attitude of the Turkish occupying regime, which has confirmed on many occasions its desire to facilitate celebrations of the Christian liturgy. The restrictions imposed on the Christians reveal Ankara's real wishes, namely to complete 'ethnic cleansing' by removing all traces of Christians and Greeks from the Turkish Cypriot zone. Unfortunately, this plan has resulted in significant damage to Christian religious buildings. Even today, hundreds of places of worship and monuments are being looted, damaged and vandalised. The churches of St Euphemia and St Charalampus are two clear examples of devastation caused by the Turks.

There are tens of thousands of Turkish Cypriots every day who cross the seven checkpoints that allow movement between the occupied and free territories. Thanks to the transit points, people can go to work and access medical assistance and other services.

The living conditions of Christians living in the occupied territories do not seem to be improving. The violations of human rights and religious freedom continue right under the noses of the international community.

Given that the plan by Ankara for 'ethnic cleansing' began in 1974 and that the Turkish regime occupies a part of the territory of a country in the European Union, could the Vice-President/High Representative say whether Europe intends to continue on the road towards Turkey's accession to the European Union despite the continued human rights violations?

Question for written answer E-004255/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(24 April 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Religious freedom in the occupied area of Cyprus

In the area of Cyprus occupied by the Turks, the Orthodox clerics Bishop Porphyrios and Fr. Konstantinou have been refused permission to celebrate a Sunday service. Bishop Christoforos of the Karpass peninsula has also been permanently banned from entering the occupied territories of Cyprus. Some people believe that the Turkish armed forces' restriction of the religious freedom of Christians living in the occupied territories is part of Ankara's strategic plan to finish off the 'ethnic cleansing' that started back in 1974. First, inhabitants were deported and now Turkish forces are attempting to remove every trace of Christian and Greek presence in the area. Hundreds of Christian places of worship and archaeological sites have been ransacked, desecrated and vandalised.

In view of these prohibitions, there is a risk, as pointed out by Archbishop Chrysostomos II, head of the Cypriot Orthodox church, that the seven checkpoints will be closed. These are the transit points that allow movement across the ceasefire line into the free territories of Cyprus for tens of thousands of Turkish Cypriots for work, to gain access to free medical care or to obtain travel documents so that they can expatriate.

Could the Vice-President/High Representative say:

1. Whether she aware of this deplorable situation?

2. How long will she continue to tolerate the prohibition of religious freedom on EU territory?

3. Does she not also consider it worrying, in terms of protecting artistic and architectural heritage, that the plundering and destruction is continuing?

4. What measures does she intend to take in respect of Turkey to safeguard religious freedom in Cyprus and to protect its artistic and cultural heritage?

Question for written answer P-004261/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(25 April 2012)

Subject: Turkey and violation of the right to religious freedom for the inhabitants of Cyprus

The Turkish occupying regime has rejected requests from Bishop Porfirio of Neapolis and Father Diomidis Konstantinou, both from the Cypriot Orthodox Church, to celebrate mass in the occupied territories. The latest in a long line of prohibitions comes after Christoforos, Bishop of Karpasia, was added to the list of people who are permanently denied entry into the occupied territory of Cyprus. How does the Commission intend to stop the plan by Ankara to reduce the religious freedom of Christians still living in the territories occupied by the Turkish armed forces? What view does it take of these obstructive and intolerant gestures towards Christians in view of the supposed process of integration that should be bringing Turkey closer to becoming a member of the EU?

Question for written answer E-004341/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Claudio Morganti (EFD), Lorenzo Fontana (EFD), Mario Borghezio (EFD), Oreste Rossi (EFD), Fiorello Provera (EFD), Mara Bizzotto (EFD), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Matteo Salvini (EFD) and Francesco Enrico Speroni (EFD)
(26 April 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — New violations of religious freedom in Cyprus

Recent days have seen yet another serious violation of religious freedom in Cyprus: the occupying Turkish regime rejected requests by two Cypriot ecclesiastics, Bishop Porphyrios of Neapolis and Father Diomidis Konstantinou, both members of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus, to celebrate mass in the occupied territories.

This new ban has come shortly after Bishop Christoforos of the Karpass peninsula was included on a list of people permanently barred from entering the occupied territories of Cyprus; that episode had already sparked numerous protests by many international personalities and agencies, promptly ignored and disregarded by the Turkish regime.

The new measure aims to reduce the religious freedom of Christians still resident in the territories occupied by the Turkish armed forces, and seems to be part of a strategic plan by Ankara to pursue a sort of 'ethnic cleansing' that began in 1974. Initially, the inhabitants were deported, while now it is a case of erasing all traces of Greek and Christian presence. Indeed, hundreds of Christian places of worship and archaeological monuments have been looted, desecrated and subjected to vandalism.

All this is in clear violation of the religious freedom principles embraced by the European Union's Charter of Fundamental Rights and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and fails to respect the provisions of the Third Vienna Agreement (1975), which establish living conditions for the Greek-Cypriot population in occupied Cyprus.

Given that these episodes are the latest in a series of similar recent events, and that moral suasion does not seem to be bearing fruit, will the Vice-President/High Representative of the Commission not take significant steps by immediately interrupting any accession agreement with Turkey until the Cyprus issue is resolved?

Moreover, what measures does she intend to take specifically to defend the freedom and respect for the fundamental rights of EU citizens who live in a territory not governed by a Member State, through no fault of their own?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-003084/2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003794/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(12 de abril de 2012)

Assunto: Apoios a empresas europeias em dificuldades económicas

Tendo em conta que:

— A generalidade dos países europeus enfrenta sérias dificuldades económicas e orçamentais, implicando que os Governos tenham de adotar severas medidas que originam a diminuição do rendimento disponível das famílias e, por consequência, uma menor propensão ao consumo privado;

— Segundo o Eurostat, em fevereiro e face ao mês anterior, a União Europeia registou uma quebra do volume de negócios a retalho na ordem dos 0,4 %, enquanto que na zona euro se verificou uma diminuição de 0,1 %. Este facto foi ainda mais grave na Eslovénia (-5 %), na Polónia (-2,7 %) e na Roménia (-2,5 %);

— Além da falta de confiança dos consumidores, existem outros fatores que afetam a sustentabilidade das empresas, como é o caso de outras empresas estrangeiras que são muito mais competitivas, um ambiente macroeconómico mais favorável em mercados extraeuropeus e a procura crescente de novos produtos com maior valor acrescentado;

— Várias empresas europeias têm vindo a sentir enormes dificuldades em vender os seus produtos, aplicando planos de ajustamento estruturais que acabam por originar despedimentos conjuntos de trabalhadores;

— A empresa finlandesa Nokia prevê reduzir os seus resultados no segundo trimestre do ano, o que acabou por gerar uma queda das suas ações na ordem dos 14 %;

— Algumas das principais empresas europeias estão a ser adquiridas pelas suas congéneres chinesas, brasileiras, angolanas ou sauditas, existindo uma transferência de propriedade e conhecimentos técnicos e tecnológicos para mercados em vias de desenvolvimento;

— O Fundo Europeu de Ajustamento à Globalização é um instrumento financeiro que apenas é ativado depois de as empresas terem encerrado a sua atividade empresarial, não podendo ser utilizado previamente para fazer face às dificuldades económicas das empresas e assim proteger os postos de trabalho e a manutenção em propriedade europeia.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Quais as iniciativas que estão a ser estudadas com vista a apoiar as empresas que estão a atravessar sérias dificuldades económicas devido à crise financeira existente na União Europeia?

2. Qual a possibilidade de ser criado um instrumento de financiamento europeu semelhante ao FEG mas que atue preventivamente evitando o encerramento das empresas?

3. Tem conhecimento do número de empresas europeias que já foram adquiridas pelas suas congéneres estrangeiras? Não considera que este facto é preocupante para a competitividade do espaço europeu?

Resposta dada por Antonio Tajani em nome da Comissão
(14 de junho de 2012)

1. Como parte do desenvolvimento da política industrial, a Comissão aborda questões horizontais com vista ao estabelecimento de um enquadramento sólido para a competitividade industrial. Nele se incluem o acesso ao financiamento, que será um dos temas em apreço no reexame que no presente ano se fará da Comunicação de 2010 sobre política industrial.

2. O FEG ([1]) pode fornecer apoio a trabalhadores despedidos, ainda que as empresas que os despediram não tenham entrado em falência. Não obstante, o Senhor Deputado assinala e com razão que este Fundo não se destina a tratar as dificuldades com que se deparam as empresas. A criação de um instrumento de auxílio para evitar que as empresas encerrem poderia induzir distorções de concorrência e, em qualquer caso, seria necessária uma alteração do atual quadro de auxílios estatais.

3. A Comissão não tem conhecimento da existência de dados fiáveis sobre o número de aquisições de empresas entre concorrentes diretos. Como orientação, referimos que, de acordo com os dados do Eurostat, o IDE de entrada na UE27 representou 0,8 % do PIB em 2010, encontrando-se geralmente acima dos 2 % nos anos anteriores. O IDE de saída da UE27 representou 1,2 % do PIB em 2010, tendo sido mais elevado nos anos anteriores. Nem todo o IDE representa aquisições de empresas, mas esses dados ilustram que a Europa é um destino atraente para o IDE e que está também ativa em países terceiros. Permanece claro, no entanto, que a UE é uma economia muito aberta, o que tem contribuído para o bem-estar económico geral. Esta é e continua a ser a posição de base da Comissão.

([1]) Fundo Europeu de Ajustamento à Globalização.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003794/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(12 April 2012)

Subject: Support for European companies in economic difficulty

Given that:

— The majority of European countries are facing serious economic and budgetary difficulties, requiring governments to adopt harsh measures that reduce family income and, as a consequence, lower the propensity for private consumption;

— According to Eurostat, in February 2012 the European Union recorded a fall in retail business volume in the order of 0.4% in comparison to the preceding month, while the fall in the euro area was found to be 0.1%. The situation was particularly serious in Slovenia (-5%), Poland (-2.7%) and Romania (-2.5%);

— Aside from the lack of consumer confidence, there are other factors that affect the sustainability of companies, such as foreign companies that are more competitive, a more favourable macroeconomic environment outside of Europe and the increasing demand for new products with greater added value;

— Various European companies have been finding it extremely difficult to sell their products, applying structural adjustment plans that lead to entire workforces being dismissed;

— The Finnish company Nokia predicts a reduction in its revenue in the second quarter of the year, which has led to its share price falling by around 14%;

— Some of Europe's main companies are being acquired by their Chinese, Brazilian, Angolan or Saudi Arabian counterparts, resulting in property and technical and technological knowledge being transferred to developing markets;

— The European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) is a financial instrument that is only activated after companies have stopped their business activity. It cannot be used prior to this to address the economic difficulties companies face and thus protect jobs and maintain European ownership.

I ask the Commission:

1. What initiatives are being considered to support companies that are experiencing serious economic difficulties due to the financial crisis currently affecting the European Union?

2. What is the possibility of creating a European financial instrument similar to the EGF but that can act preventatively to stop companies from closing?

3. Does it know how many European companies have already been acquired by their foreign counterparts? Does it not agree that this fact is worrying when it comes to the competitiveness of the European area?

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

1. As part of the development of industrial policy, the Commission addresses horizontal issues aiming at establishing sound framework conditions for industrial competitiveness. This includes access to finance, which will be one of the issues in this year's review of the 2010 Communication on industrial policy.

2. The EGF ([1]) can provide support to redundant workers even if the companies that dismissed them have not gone bankrupt. Nonetheless the Honourable Member rightly points out that this Fund is not designed to address the difficulties faced by enterprises. Creating an aid instrument to prevent companies from closing.may risk distortions of competition and in any cases it would require a change of the current state aid framework.

([1]) European Globalisation Adjustment Fund.

3. The Commission is not aware of any reliable data on the number of takeovers between direct competitors. As orientation, it may be noted that, according to Eurostat data, the inward FDI coming into EU-27 amounted to 0.8% of GDP in 2010, having been generally above 2% in the previous years. The EU-27 outward FDI amounted to 1.2% of GDP in 2010, having been higher in the previous years. Not all FDI constitutes acquisitions of companies, but such data illustrates that Europe is an attractive destination for FDI, and is also active in third countries. It remains clear, however, that the EU is a highly open economy, and this has contributed to the overall economic well-being. This is and remains the basic position of the Commission.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-003795/12
an die Kommission
Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)
(13. April 2012)

Betrifft: ACTA

Kann die Kommission im Anschluss an die Antwort auf die Anfrage E-001792/2012 die folgenden Fragen beantworten:

1. Werden dem ACTA-Ausschuss sämtliche Dokumente, die im Rahmen der ACTA-Verhandlungen verfasst wurden, zur Verfügung gestellt? Falls nein, warum nicht?

2. Werden dem ACTA-Ausschuss Dokumente zur Verfügung gestellt werden, die unter die in Artikel 4 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1049/2001 vorgesehene Ausnahmereglung fallen? Falls nein, warum nicht?

3. Trifft es zu, dass es keine Geheimdokumente bzw. geheimen Teile von Dokumenten, die ACTA betreffen, gibt, sondern lediglich Dokumente bzw. Teile davon, die nicht in die Öffentlichkeit gelangen sollten?

Um den Verwaltungsaufwand zu verringern, wurden diese Fragen in einer Anfrage zusammengefasst und die einzelnen Fragen mit einer laufenden Nummer versehen. Der Fragesteller ersucht höflich darum, dass die einzelnen Fragen unter Angabe der jeweiligen Nummerierung beantwortet werden.

Antwort von Karel De Gucht im Namen der Kommission
(21. Mai 2012)

1. Die Kommission kann nicht erkennen, welche Bedeutung solche Dokumente für die Tätigkeit des künftigen ACTA-Ausschusses haben sollten. Sie beabsichtigt daher nicht, solche Dokumente an den künftigen ACTA-Ausschuss weiterzuleiten.

2. Artikel 4 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1049/2001 ([1]) bestimmt, dass die Organe der EU Anträge auf Zugang zu Dokumenten verweigern, durch dessen Verbreitung der Schutz bestimmter wichtiger Interessen, beeinträchtigt würde, beispielsweise der Schutz des öffentlichen Interesses im Hinblick auf die öffentliche Sicherheit, die internationalen Beziehungen oder den Schutz personenbezogener Daten. Die besagte Verordnung regelt lediglich den Dokumentenzugang durch die Öffentlichkeit, nicht aber die Verwendung von Dokumenten seitens der EU in internationalen Foren wie dem künftigen ACTA-Ausschuss. Es bleibt der EU unbenommen, Dokumente im künftigen ACTA-Ausschuss nicht offenzulegen, wenn sie der Auffassung ist, dass dies gegen ihre Rechtsvorschriften oder gegen öffentliche oder private Interessen verstößt (siehe Artikel 4 ACTA) ([2]).

3. Die Kommission weist nochmals darauf hin, dass ACTA keine geheimen Anhänge oder Protokolle enthält.

([1]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1049/2001 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 30. Mai 2001 über den Zugang der Öffentlichkeit zu Dokumenten des Europäischen Parlaments, des Rates und der Kommission, ABl. L 145 vom 31.5.2001.

([2]) Wortlaut des Artikels 4 ACTA: „1. Dieses Übereinkommen verpflichtet eine Vertragspartei nicht zur Offenlegung von: a) Informationen, deren Offenlegung gegen das Recht dieser Vertragspartei, einschließlich ihrer Vorschriften zum Schutz der Privatsphäre, oder gegen internationale Übereinkünfte, deren Vertragspartei sie ist, verstoßen würde, b) vertraulichen Informationen, deren Offenlegung die Durchsetzung von Rechtsvorschriften behindern oder in sonstiger Weise dem öffentlichen Interesse zuwiderlaufen würde, oder von c) vertraulichen Informationen, deren Offenlegung die berechtigten Geschäftsinteressen bestimmter öffentlicher oder privater Unternehmen schädigen würde. 2. Stellt eine Vertragspartei schriftliche Informationen nach den Bestimmungen dieses Übereinkommens bereit, so enthält sich die empfangende Vertragspartei, nach Maßgabe ihrer Rechtsvorschriften und ihrer Rechtspraxis, der Offenlegung oder Benutzung der Informationen für einen anderen Zweck als den, zu dem die Informationen bereitgestellt wurden, es sei denn, die bereitstellende Vertragspartei hat ihre vorherige Zustimmung erteilt".

(English version)

Question for written answer P-003795/12
to the Commission
Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)
(13 April 2012)

Subject: ACTA (Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement)

Pursuant to its answer to Question E-001792/2012, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Are all documents drawn up as part of the ACTA negotiations to be made available to the ACTA Committee? If not, why not?

2. Will documents be made available to the ACTA Committee that fall under the derogation provided for in Article 4 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001? If not, why not?

3. Is it the case that there are no secret documents or secret parts of documents that relate to ACTA, just documents or parts of documents that are not intended for publication?

In order to reduce administrative effort, these queries have been framed within one question and have been numbered successively. The author of the question therefore politely requests that the individual queries should be answered with reference to their number.

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(21 May 2012)

1. The Commission fails to see the relevance of such documents for the activities of the future ACTA Committee. Therefore, it does not intend to circulate such documents to the future ACTA Committee.

2. Article 4 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 ([1]) sets out that EU institutions shall refuse applications for access to documents where disclosure would undermine the protection of certain important interests, such as the public interest as regards public security, international relations or the protection of personal data. Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 only regulates access to documents by the public, and not their use by the EU in international fora, such as the future ACTA Committee. The EU will, however, be free not to disclose documents in the future ACTA Committee if it considers that such disclosure would be contrary to its law or other public or private interests (see Article 4 ACTA) [(2)].

3. The Commission reiterates that ACTA does not contain any secret annexes or protocols.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 of Parliament and of the Council of 30 May 2001 regarding public access to Parliament, Council and Commission documents, OJ L 145, 31.5.2001.

([2]) Article 4 ACTA provides: '1. Nothing in this Agreement shall require a Party to disclose: a) information, the disclosure of which would be contrary to its law, including laws protecting privacy rights, or international agreements to which it is party; b) confidential information, the disclosure of which would impede law enforcement or otherwise be contrary to the public interest; or c) confidential information, the disclosure of which would prejudice the legitimate commercial interests of particular enterprises, public or private. 2. When a Party provides written information pursuant to the provisions of this Agreement, the Party receiving the information shall, subject to its law and practice, refrain from disclosing or using the information for a purpose other than that for which the information was provided, except with the prior consent of the Party providing the information.'.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003796/12
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(13 de abril de 2012)

Asunto: Reforma de Código Penal en España

Como respuesta a las recientes movilizaciones sociales en España (15-M, Primavera Valenciana, Huelga General del 29 de marzo) el Gobierno español ha decidido reformar el Código Penal, la ley de Enjuiciamiento Criminal y la ley orgánica de Protección de la Seguridad Ciudadana. Estas reformas pretenden luchar contra lo que el gobierno ha denominado «espiral de violencia», pero supondrá graves restricciones de derechos y de las libertades de expresión, comunicación y manifestación. El gobierno pretende tipificar como delito de «atentado a la autoridad» todo acto de «resistencia pasiva o activa» además de prever una serie de cambios para aplicar la legislación antiterrorista a los movimientos sociales. Estas propuestas también prevén que la difusión a través de internet y redes sociales de convocatorias que alteren gravemente el orden público pueda ser considerada «delito de integración en organización criminal». Además, se va a introducir entre «las modalidades de acometimiento» las amenazas y comportamientos intimidatorios o el lanzamiento de objetos peligrosos.

El art. 11 de la Carta de Derechos fundamentales de la UE define el derecho a «la libertad de opinión y la libertad de recibir o de comunicar informaciones o ideas sin que pueda haber injerencia de autoridades públicas» y el artículo 12 reconoce el «derecho a la libertad de reunión pacífica». A su vez, el art. 49 aclara que «La intensidad de las penas no debe ser desproporcionada en relación con la infracción»

— ¿Conoce la Comisión dicha propuesta?

— ¿Cree que se pueden restringir los derechos fundamentales a organizarse, expresarse a través de redes sociales y concentrarse pacíficamente bajo cualquier pretexto?

— ¿Qué medidas va a tomar para monitorear las futuras reformas y evitar esta grave vulneración de los derechos individuales y colectivos en España?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión
(6 de junio de 2012)

La Comisión no ha recibido ninguna información específica sobre la propuesta mencionada por Su Señoría.

Dentro de sus competencias, la Comisión ha estado siempre firmemente comprometida a garantizar que se respetan estrictamente la libertad de expresión y de información y la libertad de reunión, ya que constituyen la base de una sociedad libre, democrática y pluralista. La Comisión apoya también el libre acceso a Internet y la libertad de expresión y de información a través de Internet.

No obstante, las atribuciones de la Comisión respecto a los actos y omisiones de los Estados miembros se limitan a la supervisión de la aplicación del Derecho de la Unión Europea, bajo el control del Tribunal de Justicia de la Unión Europea (véase el artículo 17, apartado 1, del Tratado de la Unión Europea). Con arreglo al artículo 51, apartado 1, de la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales, las disposiciones de la Carta están dirigidas a los Estados miembros únicamente cuando apliquen el Derecho de la Unión.

Cuando los Estados miembros no aplican el Derecho de la UE, las autoridades nacionales deberán garantizar que respetan sus obligaciones en lo que se refiere a los derechos fundamentales derivados de los acuerdos internacionales y de la legislación interna. España, al igual que todos los demás Estados miembros, está obligada a respetar el Convenio Europeo para la protección de los derechos humanos y de las libertades fundamentales.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003796/12
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(13 April 2012)

Subject: Reform of the Criminal Code in Spain

In response to recent social protest in Spain (15-M, the Valencia Spring, the General Strike of 29 March 2012) the Spanish Government has decided to reform the Criminal Code, the Criminal Procedure Law and the Organic Law on Protection of Public Safety. These reforms seek to combat what the government has termed a 'spiral of violence', but they will mean serious restrictions on rights and freedoms of expression, communication and protest. The government intends to class any act of 'passive or active resistance' as a criminal offence of 'assault on authority' and also plans a number of changes in order to apply anti-terrorism legislation to social protest. These proposals also envisage that dissemination, via the Internet and social networks, of calls to organise gatherings that seriously disturb public order will be considered an 'offence of being a member of a criminal organisation'. Furthermore, threats, intimidating behaviour and the throwing of dangerous objects are to be included among the 'assault categories'.

Article 11 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU lays down the right of 'freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority' and Article 12 recognises the 'right to freedom of peaceful assembly'. Article 49 states that the 'severity of penalties must not be disproportionate to the criminal offence.'

— Is the Commission aware of this proposal?

— Does it believe that individuals' fundamental rights to organise and express themselves through social networks and to gather peacefully can be restricted under any pretext?

— What measures will it take to monitor the prospective reforms and prevent this serious violation of individual and collective rights in Spain?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2012)

The Commission has not received any specific information on the proposal referred to by the Honourable Member.

Within its competences, the Commission has always been strongly committed to ensuring that freedom of expression and information and freedom of assembly are strictly respected since they lie at the very base of a free, democratic and pluralist society. The Commission also stands for a freely accessible Internet and for freedom of expression and freedom of information via the Internet.

However, the Commission's powers regarding acts and omissions by Member States are limited to overseeing the application of European Union law, under the control of the Court of Justice of the European Union (cf. Article 17(1) Treaty on European Union). According to Article 51(1) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights, the provisions of the Charter are addressed to the Member States only when they are implementing Union law.

Where Member States do not implement EC law, it is for the national authorities to ensure that their obligations regarding fundamental rights — as resulting from international agreements and from internal legislation — are respected. Spain, like all the other Member States, is bound to respect the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003797/12
an die Kommission
Axel Voss (PPE)
(13. April 2012)

Betrifft: Verwendung von EU-Mitteln in Rumänien

Die EU-Kommission hat in ihrem aktuellen Zwischenbericht vom 8. Februar 2012 „über Rumäniens Fortschritte im Rahmen des Kooperations- und Kontrollverfahrens" festgestellt, dass es neben einigen erfreulichen Fortschritten weiterhin Mängel beim Kampf gegen die Korruption und bei der Stärkung der Justiz gibt. Besondere Anstrengungen muss Rumänien demnach bei Fällen der öffentlichen Auftragsvergabe unternehmen.

Kann die Kommission dazu folgende Fragen beantworten:

— Ist der Kommission bekannt, dass EU-Gelder in Rumänien nicht sachgerecht oder vorsätzlich falsch verwendet worden sind? Wenn ja, um welche Beträge handelt es sich?

— Wie bewertet die Kommission die Verwaltung von EU-Mitteln durch die nationalen Behörden in Rumänien?

— Über welche Sanktionsmöglichkeiten verfügt die Kommission generell im Falle einer nicht sachgerechten oder vorsätzlich falschen Verwendung von EU-Mitteln? Wurden bisher entsprechende Sanktionen gegen Rumänien veranlasst?

Antwort von Herrn Hahn im Namen der Kommission
(7. Juni 2012)

1. Die Kommission hat in Rumänien im Zusammenhang mit der öffentlichen Auftragsvergabe in Bezug auf eine Reihe von Programmen Mängel an der Funktionsweise des Verwaltungs- und Kontrollsystems festgestellt. Daraufhin hat die Kommission an alle Programmkoordinatoren in Rumänien Mahnschreiben versandt und die rumänischen Behörden aufgefordert, die gesamten Systeme zu überprüfen und zu verbessern. Die rumänischen Behörden müssen bis Ende Juni 2012 schriftlich darlegen, welche Maßnahmen sie zur Verbesserung des Systems ergriffen haben, und eine Bewertung der nationalen Auditbehörde vorlegen.

2. In diesem Zusammenhang kooperiert die Kommission eng mit den rumänischen Behörden im Hinblick auf eine Verbesserung des Systems der öffentlichen Auftragsvergabe.

3. Im Rahmen der Kohäsionspolitik kann die Kommission infolge einer nicht sachgerechten oder vorsätzlich falschen Verwendung von EU-Mitteln gemäß Artikel 99 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1083/2006 des Rates finanzielle Berichtigungen vornehmen. Dieses Verfahren wurde bisher noch nicht auf Rumänien angewandt.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003797/12
to the Commission
Axel Voss (PPE)
(13 April 2012)

Subject: Use of EU resources in Romania

In its latest interim report 'On Progress in Romania under the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism', dated 8 February 2012, the Commission stated that, alongside welcome progress, there were still shortcomings in combating corruption and strengthening the judicial system. It indicated that Romania needs to make particular efforts with regard to public procurement.

Can the Commission say:

— whether it is aware of any improper use or intentional misappropriation of EU funds in Romania? If so, what sums are involved?

— what its assessment is of how EU resources are administered by the national authorities in Romania?

— what scope it has for penalties, in general, where improper use or intentional misappropriation of EU funds is established? Have such penalties been imposed against Romania to date?

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

1. The Commission identified deficiencies in the functioning of the management and control system related to public procurement for a number of programmes in Romania. Consequently, the Commission sent a warning letter to all programmes in Romania and invited the Romanian authorities to verify and improve the whole systems. The Romanian authorities have to provide the answer with the measures taken to correct the system by the end of June 2012, including an assessment by the national audit authority.

2. In this context, the Commission is closely cooperating with the Romanian authorities in order to improve the public procurement system.

3. Under cohesion policy, the Commission may make financial corrections as a result of improper use or intentional misappropriation of EU funds in line with Article 99 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006. This procedure has not been applied to Romania thus far.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003798/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(13 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Autorizzazione per l'immissione sul mercato di quattro varianti di soia OGM

A marzo la Commissione ha autorizzato l'immissione sul mercato per dieci anni, a fini alimentari e per produrre mangimi, di quattro varianti di soia OGM, la A5547-127 della Bayer, la 356043 della Pioneer e le 40-3-2 e Mon87701 di Monsanto.

Pur non essendo stato raggiunto il consenso politico da parte sia del Comitato preposto sia del Consiglio, la Commissione ha proceduto, come previsto dal regolamento (CE) n. 1829/2003, decidendo essa stessa sulla base del parere dell'AESA.

— La Commissione ritiene che, con tale decisione basata esclusivamente sulla valutazione della AESA, sia stato rispettato il principio di precauzione?

— Non ritiene la Commissione che, al fine di tutelare al meglio la salute dei cittadini, si dovrebbe spingere per una modificazione della normativa in favore di una «sperimentazione invertita», che non demandi le valutazioni degli effetti ambientali e sanitari sul lungo periodo agli anni concessi dall'autorizzazione, ma venga fatta ex ante?

Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(12 giugno 2012)

Le decisioni di autorizzare questi quattro prodotti GM per l'alimentazione umana e animale sono state adottate, dopo aver preso nella debita considerazione i pareri scientifici dell'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare (EFSA) ([1]) circa le ripercussioni di tali prodotti sulla salute e sull'ambiente in conformità della normativa UE e tenendo conto del principio di precauzione ([2]). Secondo l'EFSA i quattro prodotti in questione sono altrettanto sicuri dei loro omologhi non geneticamente modificati per quanto riguarda gli effetti potenziali sulla salute umana e degli animali e sull'ambiente.

Gli effetti sulla salute e sull'ambiente sono elementi attentamente considerati dall'EFSA ai fini della valutazione dei rischi connessi alle domande di commercializzazione di OGM.

Alcuni OGM destinati all'alimentazione umana e animale sono sul mercato da più di 10 anni e le loro autorizzazioni sono state prorogate o stanno per esserlo. Finora non sono stati segnalati effetti inattesi di tali prodotti rispetto a quelli già presi in considerazione nella valutazione dei rischi compiuta per l'autorizzazione iniziale.

Allo stadio attuale la Commissione non ritiene pertanto che vi sia la necessità di riconsiderare l'attuale impostazione in tema di autorizzazione degli OGM destinati all'alimentazione umana e animale.

([1]) Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare.
([2]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1829/2003 relativo agli alimenti e ai mangimi geneticamente modificati; GU L 268 del 18.10.2003.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003798/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(13 April 2012)

Subject: Authorisation to place four genetically modified soybean variants on the market

In March 2012, the Commission authorised placing on the market for ten years four genetically modified soybean variants to be used as food or to make feed: A5547-127 by Bayer, 356043 by Pioneer, and 40-3-2 and Mon87701 by Monsanto.

Although a political consensus was not achieved either within the committee responsible or within the Council, the Commission proceeded in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003, deciding on the basis of the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) opinion.

— Given that this decision was based exclusively on the EFSA opinion, does the Commission believe that the precautionary principle was upheld?

— Is the Commission not of the opinion that, in order to protect the public's health more effectively, we should press for the legislation to be amended in favour of 'inverse experimentation' which does not defer assessment of the long-term environmental and health effects to the years for which authorisation has been granted, but carries it out beforehand?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2012)

The decisions for authorising the four GM products for food and feed use were adopted after due consideration of the scientific opinions of the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) ([1]) on their impact on health and the environment, in accordance with EC law taking into account the precautionary principle ([2]). EFSA's opinions concluded that the four products are as safe as their non-genetically modified counterparts with respect to potential effects on human and animal health and on the environment.

Effects on health and the environment are elements watchfully assessed by EFSA in the risk assessment of applications for the placing on the market of GMOs.

Some GMOs for food and feed use are on the market for more than 10 years, and their authorisations have been, or are being renewed. So far, no unexpected effects of these products were reported compared to those already considered in the risk assessments done for the initial authorisation.

Therefore, at this point in time the Commission does not consider that there is a need to reconsider the current approach for the authorisation of GMOs for food and feed use.

([1]) European Food Safety Authority.
([2]) Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003 on genetically modified food and feed, OJ L 268, 18.10.2003.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003799/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(13 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Additivi alimentari a base di alluminio

Da recenti studi scientifici e di settore risulta che il consumatore europeo ingerisce una sempre maggiore quantità di alluminio a causa del largo uso di additivi alimentari a base di alluminio (E173, E520, E521, E523 E541, E544, E545, E554, E555 E556, E559). L'alluminio, in condizioni normali, quindi per un essere umano in buono stato di salute, ha un grado di tossicità inferiore rispetto ad altri metalli pesanti, ma, a differenza di questi (cadmio, mercurio, piombo…) è di più comune ingestione. Esso, non essendo parte del normale ciclo biochimico umano, dopo l'assorbimento persiste a lungo nell'organismo distribuendosi in tutti i tessuti, in particolare in ossa e cervello, ed è anche in grado di raggiungere la placenta e il feto. I danni provocati dall'alluminio sono la perdita delle funzioni intellettuali, della concentrazione e della massa ossea, nonché il danneggiamento dei reni. L'Australia, per esempio, ha ritenuto necessario proibire l'uso del colorante E173.

— La Commissione ritiene sicuro mantenere questi additivi fra quelli approvati e utilizzabili?

— La Commissione reputa necessario dare input a nuovi studi per valutare alternative a tali additivi per una maggiore tutela del consumatore?

— Pensa sia necessario sensibilizzare i cittadini circa i rischi connessi all'ingestione di dosi eccessive di tali additivi?

— L'EFSA (European Food Safety Authority) ha già in programma una nuova valutazione di questi additivi?

Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(21 giugno 2012)

L'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare (EFSA) ([1]) ha valutato la sicurezza del dosaggio di alluminio e ha concluso che la dose settimanale tollerabile di alluminio viene probabilmente superata in una parte significativa della popolazione europea. Per tale motivo la Commissione europea ha adottato misure per ridurre la dose di alluminio proveniente dagli additivi alimentari.

Tali misure rientrano nei regolamenti (EU) n. 1130/2011 ([2]), (UE) n. 231/2012 ([3]) e (UE) n. 380/20124 riguardanti misure relative agli additivi alimentari contenenti alluminio, compresi i pigmenti coloranti a base di alluminio. Le misure proposte riguardano le principali fonti di alluminio legate agli additivi alimentari e dovrebbero produrre una riduzione dell'assunzione complessiva di alluminio. Tre additivi alimentari contenenti alluminio saranno vietati (bentonite (E 558), alluminosilicato di calcio (E 556) e silicato di alluminio (caolino) (E 559). I limiti massimi per tutti gli additivi alimentari contenenti alluminio (ad esempio E 520, E 521, E 523, E 541, E 554, E 555) saranno ridotti in modo significativo. Il colorante alimentare alluminio (E 173) è autorizzato soltanto per il rivestimento esterno di confetteria per la decorazione di dolci e pasticcini. Il suo apporto al dosaggio totale è trascurabile.

La Commissione è fiduciosa che queste misure riporteranno il dosaggio totale a livelli tollerabili. Inoltre, l'EFSA effettuerà entro il 2018 una nuova valutazione esaustiva di tutti gli additivi alimentari contenenti alluminio come stabilito nel regolamento (UE) n. 257/2010 ([4]). Qualora l'EFSA concludesse che le misure adottate non fossero sufficienti, la Commissione proporrà misure ancora più rigorose.

([1]) http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/754.htm
([2]) GU L 295 del 12.11.2011.
([3]) GU L 83 del 22.03.2012.
([4]) GU L 114 del 4.05.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003799/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(13 April 2012)

Subject: Aluminium-based food additives

Recent scientific and industry studies show that European consumers are ingesting an increasing amount of aluminium owing to the widespread use of aluminium-based food additives (E173, E520, E521, E523, E541, E544, E545, E554, E555, E556 and E559). Under normal conditions, namely in a healthy human being, aluminium has a lower level of toxicity than other heavy metals but, unlike other metals (cadmium, mercury, lead, etc.) it is more frequently ingested. Since it is not part of the normal human biochemical cycle, once absorbed it remains in the body for a long time and spreads to all types of tissue, particularly to bones and the brain. It is even capable of reaching the placenta and foetus. The harm caused by aluminium includes loss of intellectual functions, concentration and bone mass, as well as damage to the kidneys. Australia, for example, considered it necessary to ban use of the food colouring E173.

— Does the Commission believe it is safe to continue to include these additives among those approved for use?

— Does the Commission consider it necessary to help new studies evaluate alternatives to these additives in order to improve consumer protection?

— Does it believe it necessary to raise public awareness of the risks associated with ingesting excessive doses of these additives?

— Is the European Food Safety Authority already planning to reassess these additives?

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

The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) ([1]) has assessed the safety of aluminium intake and concluded that the Tolerable Weekly Intake for aluminium is likely to be exceeded in a significant part of the European population. Therefore the European Commission took measures to reduce aluminium intake coming from food additives.

The measures are included in Regulations (EU) No 1130/2011 ([2]), (EU) No 231/2012 ([3]) and (EU) No 380/2012 concerning measures for aluminium containing food additives including aluminium lakes of colours, the proposed measures concern the most significant aluminium sources coming from food additives and are expected to result in a reduction of the total intake. Three aluminium containing food additives will be banned (bentonite (E 558), calcium aluminium silicate (E 556) and aluminium silicate (kaolin) (E 559). The maximum limits for all other aluminium containing food additives (e.g. E 520, E 521, E 523, E 541, E 554, E 555) will be significantly reduced. The food colour aluminium (E 173) is only authorised for external coating of sugar confectionery for the decoration of cakes and pastries. Its contribution to the total intake is negligible.

The Commission is confident that those measures will restore the total intake to tolerable levels. In addition, EFSA will carry out a complete re-evaluation of all aluminium containing food additives by 2018 as set out in the EU Regulation 257/2010 ([4]). In case that EFSA would conclude that the measures taken were not sufficient, the Commission will propose even stricter measures.

([1]) http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/754.htm
([2]) OJ L 295, 12.11.2011.
([3]) OJ L 83, 22.3.2012.
([4]) OJ L 114, 4.5.2012.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-003800/12
do Komisji
Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE)
(13 kwietnia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Ujednolicone zasady wydawania paszportów dla dzieci w UE

Rozporządzenie Rady (WE) nr 2252/2004 z dnia 13 grudnia 2004 r. w sprawie norm dotyczących zabezpieczeń i danych biometrycznych w paszportach i dokumentach podróży wydawanych przez państwa członkowskie ma za zadanie zwiększenie bezpieczeństwa podróżujących poprzez m.in. wymóg wprowadzenia do paszportu danych biometrycznych, takich jak odciski palców. Dane te w przypadku małych dzieci uważane są za niewiarygodne, co powoduje rozbieżności w procesie przyznawania paszportów dla dzieci w poszczególnych państwach członkowskich.

W Anglii paszport dla dzieci do lat 16 ważny jest przez pięć lat, w Irlandii dla dzieci poniżej trzeciego roku życia wydaje się paszport ważny przez trzy lata, a dzieci w wieku od 3 do 17 lat otrzymują paszport na pięć lat. W Polsce, paszport wydawany dzieciom do piątego roku życia jest ważny tylko przez dwanaście miesięcy, co jest okresem zdecydowanie za krótkim i sprawia, że rodzice, którzy coraz częściej podróżują z małymi dziećmi, napotykają na liczne przeszkody i utrudnienia.

— Czy wobec powyższego Komisja dostrzega podstawy do zaproponowania i wprowadzenia ujednoliconych rozwiązań w zakresie wydawania paszportów dla dzieci?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Cecilię Malmström w imieniu Komisji
(11 czerwca 2012 r.)

Zakres rozporządzenia (WE) nr 2252/2004 w sprawie norm dotyczących zabezpieczeń i danych biometrycznych w paszportach i dokumentach podróży wydawanych przez państwa członkowskie, ostatnio zmienionego rozporządzeniem (WE) nr 444/2009 ogranicza się ściśle do harmonizacji zabezpieczeń formatu, w tym zabezpieczeń biometrycznych, ze względu na podstawę prawną, art. 62 ust. 2 lit. a). Rozporządzenie wprowadziło również jako obowiązkowy wymóg zasadę posiadania przez każdą osobę dokumentu (ang. *one person-one document*).

W takich kwestiach jak procedury wydawania paszportów czy okres ważności paszportów i opłaty paszportowe stosowane są przepisy prawa krajowego.

Jedyny obecnie przepis dotyczący minimalnego okresu ważności paszportów określony jest w art. 4 ust. 4 dyrektywy 2004/38/WE w sprawie prawa obywateli Unii i członków ich rodzin do swobodnego przemieszczania się i pobytu na terytorium państw członkowskich: „…Jeżeli prawo państwa członkowskiego nie przewiduje wydawania dowodów tożsamości, okres ważności każdego paszportu, przy jego wydawaniu lub odnowieniu, nie powinien być krótszy niż pięć lat".

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003800/12
to the Commission
Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE)
(13 April 2012)

Subject: Uniform rules for issuing passports to children in the EU

Council Regulation (EC) No 2252/2004 of 13 December 2004 on standards for security features and biometrics in passports and travel documents issued by Member States has as its objective an improvement of travellers' safety by means of, *inter alia*, the requirement to integrate biometric identifiers such as fingerprints in the passport. Such data are not considered reliable in the case of babies, and this leads to discrepancies as to how passports are issued to children in individual Member States.

In the United Kingdom, passports for children under the age of 16 are valid for 5 years. In Ireland, children under the age of 3 receive passports that are valid for 3 years, and in the case of children between 3 and 17 years of age, their passports are valid for 5 years. In Poland, passports issued to children under the age of 5 are valid for 12 months only. This period is definitely too short and creates numerous obstacles and problems for parents who, increasingly, travel with babies.

— In view of the above, does the Commission recognise that there are good grounds for proposing and introducing uniform solutions as regards issuing passports to children?

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

The scope of Regulation (EC) No 2252/ 2004 on standards for security features and biometrics in passports and travel documents issued byMember States as last amended by Regulation (EC) No 444/2009 is strictly limited to the harmonisation of the security features of the format, including biometrics due to the legal basis, Article 62 (2) a. The regulation also introduced the principle 'one person-one document' as a mandatory requirement.

National law applies to the issuing procedures for passports and related provisions such as the duration of validity and the fees.

Currently the only provision related to the minimum validity of passports is laid down in Article 4 (4) of Directive 2004/38/EC on the right of citizens of the Union and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States: '…Where the law of a Member State does not provide for identity cards to be issued, the period of validity of any passport on being issued or renewed shall be not less than five years'.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003802/12
an die Kommission
Evelyn Regner (S&D) und Josef Weidenholzer (S&D)
(13. April 2012)

Betrifft: Datenschutz in Betrieben

Die Kommission hat am 27.1.2012 den Vorschlag für eine Datenschutz-Grundverordnung und den Vorschlag für eine Revision der Datenschutzrichtlinie 95/46 EG vorgelegt.

1. Was spricht dagegen, betriebliche Datenschutzbeauftragte bereits in kleineren Unternehmen (z. B. ab 50 Angestellten) bzw. in Unternehmen, in denen personenbezogene Daten elektronisch verarbeitet werden, verbindlich einzuführen? Warum werden keine konkreteren einheitlichen Grundlagen für die Befugnisse der internen Datenschutzbeauftragten festgelegt (z. B. für alle Betriebe, die personenbezogene Daten von mehr als 20 Personen verarbeiten, ein Mindestausbildungsstandard, ein Kündigungsschutz etc.)? Was geschieht, wenn innerstaatliche Vorgaben bereits jetzt strenger sind als in der VO festgelegt, wie es derzeit zum Beispiel in Deutschland bei der Bestellung von innerbetrieblichen Datenschutzbeauftragten der Fall ist, die ja auch für Unternehmen mit weniger als 250 Angestellten eingesetzt werden müssen?

2. Wie soll die Rechtsdurchsetzung innerhalb des „one-stop-shop"-Prinzips (Grundsatz einer einzigen Anlaufstelle) in der Praxis funktionieren? Wie kann angesichts der Kooperationsvereinbarungen zwischen den einzelstaatlichen Datenschutzbehörden von einem geringeren Verwaltungsaufwand gesprochen werden? Werden dadurch Firmen nicht geradezu eingeladen, mit ihrem „Hauptsitz" in jene EU-Mitgliedstaaten auszuweichen, in denen die Ressourcen der Datenschutzbehörden auf ein weniger zügiges und entschiedenes Handeln schließen lassen — insbesondere angesichts der Tatsache, dass die Behörden nicht mit einer Mindestkapazität an Arbeitskräften ausgestattet wurden?

3. Was wird als rechtliche Grundlage für die Zustimmung zu einer Datenverwendung im Arbeitsverhältnis geltend gemacht, wenn doch einerseits diese Zustimmungserklärung aufgewertet wurde, andererseits aber innerhalb des Arbeitsverhältnisses nicht als materielle Rechtsgrundlage für die Datenverwendung herangezogen werden kann?

4. Warum wurde die sehr effektiv arbeitende „Artikel-29-Datenschutzgruppe" durch ein anderes Gremium ersetzt, und warum wurden ihre Befugnisse nicht auf den Stand der Verordnung ausgeweitet?

5. Warum wurden so ungewöhnlich viele delegierte Rechtsakte eingeführt?

Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(26. Juni 2012)

Die Datenschutz-Grundverordnung ([1]) schreibt im Gegensatz zur bestehenden Richtlinie 95/46/EG ([2]) erstmals verbindlich und unionsweit die Bestellung von betrieblichen Datenschutzbeauftragten vor. Der Schwellenwert von 250 Mitarbeitern beruht darauf, dass, während die Verordnung generell ein hohes Maß an Datenschutz sicherstellt, keine unangemessenen Anforderungen für kleine und mittlere Unternehmen geschaffen werden sollen. Er gilt allerdings nicht für solche Unternehmen, deren Kerntätigkeit in der Verarbeitung personenbezogener Daten besteht. Im Übrigen können Unternehmen auch dann Datenschutzbeauftragte bestellen, wenn sie hierzu nicht durch die Verordnung verpflichtet werden.

Die Rechtsdurchsetzung wird durch klare Kriterien zur Bestimmung der zuständigen Aufsichtsbehörde positiv gefördert. Die Verordnung sieht auch vor, dass diese gleiche Befugnisse und Aufgaben haben und mit den angemessenen Ressourcen auszustatten sind.

Das Verarbeiten von Beschäftigtendaten kann z. B. gemäß Artikel 6 Absatz 1 b) und f) oder Artikel 9 der Verordnung zulässig sein. Darüber hinaus können die Mitgliedstaaten nach Artikel 82 der Verordnung den Beschäftigungsdatenschutz regeln.

Der Europäische Datenschutzausschuss tritt an die Stelle der Artikel 29-Gruppe. Die neue Bezeichnung spiegelt den erweiterten Tätigkeitsbereich dieses Gremiums wider.

([1]) Vorschlag für Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zum Schutz natürlicher Personen bei der Verarbeitung personenbezogener Daten und zum freien Datenverkehr (Datenschutz-Grundverordnung), KOM(2012)11 endg. („Verordnung").

([2]) Richtlinie 95/46/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 24. Oktober 1995 zum Schutz natürlicher Personen bei der Verarbeitung personenbezogener Daten und zum freien Datenverkehr (ABl. L 281 vom 23.11.95, S. 31-50).

Die Verordnung sieht eine überschaubare Anzahl delegierter Rechtsetzungsakte vor, wo dies zur Ergänzung oder Änderung bestimmter nichtwesentlicher Elemente des Gesetzgebungsakts in Übereinstimmung mit den Verträgen erforderlich erschien.

Die Kommission steht in dieser Angelegenheit in regelmäßigem Kontakt mit dem Europäischen Parlament und wird in den kommenden Monaten die Verhandlungen intensivieren.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003802/12
to the Commission
Evelyn Regner (S&D) and Josef Weidenholzer (S&D)
(13 April 2012)

Subject: Data protection in businesses

On 27 January 2012, the Commission presented a proposal for a General Data Protection Regulation and a proposal for revision of Data Protection Directive 95/46/EC.

1. What reasons are there for not making the appointment of company data protection officers mandatory in small businesses (e.g. 50 employees or more) in which personal data are electronically processed? Why is it that a more specific uniform basis for the powers of internal data protection officers is not defined (e.g. a minimum level of training, employment protection, etc.) for all businesses that process the personal data of more than 20 persons?) What happens if national provisions are already more stringent than the regulation, as is currently the case in Germany, for example, as regards the appointment of in-house data protection officers, which is mandatory also for businesses with fewer than 250 employees?

2. How is enforcement meant to function, in practice, on the basis of the 'one-stop shop' principle? In view of the cooperation agreements between national data protection authorities, how can it be claimed that there will be less red tape? Is this not an open invitation to companies to move their 'headquarters' to EU Member States where the resources of data protection authorities would suggest that action is taken less speedily and less decisively, particularly in view of the fact that the authorities have not been given the minimum level of manpower needed?

3. What legal basis is to be applied regarding consent to the use of data in an employment context if, on the one hand, greater importance is attached to consent, but, on the other, consent cannot be cited within an employment context as a material legal basis for the use of data?

4. Why has the very effective Article 29 Data Protection Working Party been replaced by another body, and why have its powers not been extended in line with the regulation?

5. Why is it that such an unusually large number of delegated acts have been introduced?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(26 June 2012)

The General Data Protection Regulation ([1]) differs from the existing Directive 95/46/EC ([2]) in that for the first time it lays down binding rules on the designation of company data protection officers throughout the Union. The reason for the threshold of 250 employees is that, whilst the regulation guarantees a high level of data protection in general, it would be inappropriate for it to establish any unreasonable requirements for SMEs. However, this does not apply to companies whose core business is the processing of personal data. In addition, companies may also designate data protection officers even if they are not obliged to do so under the regulation.

Law enforcement will be promoted through transparent criteria to establish the supervisory authority responsible. The regulation also stipulates that such authorities are to have identical powers and duties, and that they are to be provided with appropriate resources.

Processing employee data may, for instance, be lawful under Articles 6(1)(b) and (f) or 9 of the regulation. Moreover, the Member States can regulate employee data protection under Article 82 of the regulation.

The European Data Protection Committee is replacing the article 29 Group. The new title reflects its broader remit.

The regulation provides for a limited number of delegated law enforcement acts where this appears necessary to complete or amend certain less essential aspects of the legislative act in accordance with the Treaties.

([1]) Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free flow of such data (General Data Protection Regulation), COM(2012) 11 final ('Regulation').

([2]) Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data (OJ L 281, 23.11.1995, pp. 31-50).

The Commission is in constant contact with the European Parliament on this matter and will be stepping up negotiations in the months ahead.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003803/12
an die Kommission
Evelyn Regner (S&D) und Josef Weidenholzer (S&D)
(13. April 2012)

Betrifft: Mehr Verbraucherschutz durch Verordnung über ein Gemeinsames Europäisches Kaufrecht?

In einer Pressemitteilung (IP/11/1175) wird Kommissionsmitglied Reding anlässlich der Vorstellung des Vorschlags für eine Verordnung über ein Gemeinsames Europäisches Kaufrecht (CESL) damit zitiert, dass dieses den Unternehmen eine unkomplizierte und kostengünstige Ausweitung ihrer Geschäftstätigkeit sowie den Verbrauchern Kaufvorteile und mehr Verbraucherschutz bietet.

Sowohl Unternehmensvertretungen als auch Verbraucherschutzorganisationen auf EU-Ebene und auf nationaler Ebene haben uns mitgeteilt, dass der Vorschlag ein hohes Maß an Rechtsunsicherheit beziehungsweise ein niedrigeres Verbraucherschutzniveau bringen soll. Eine österreichische Verbraucherschutzorganisation hat diesen Vorwurf mit einigen konkreten Beispielen untermauert:

— Das anlässlich der Umsetzung der Richtlinie 93/13/EWG in österreichisches Recht eingeführte Transparenzgebot führt zur Unwirksamkeit intransparenter Vertragsklauseln. Dagegen wird die Frage der Transparenz im CESL lediglich zu einem Bestandteil der Unfairness-Kontrolle gemacht; zudem sind weitere Kriterien zu prüfen. Die Wahl des CESL würde somit zu einer Verdrängung der für Verbraucher günstigeren österreichischen Regelungen und der Rechtsprechung des OGH führen.

— In Österreich bestehen Klauselverbote, gemäß welchen automatische Verlängerungen von Verträgen oder nachträgliche Preisänderungen per se ungültig sind, sollten nicht bestimmte Voraussetzungen vorliegen. Diese Bestimmungen sind strenger als die entsprechenden Regelungen des CESL.

— Auch bei nachträglichen Leistungsänderungen ist das österreichische Recht strenger, da — sofern dies nicht im Einzelnen ausgehandelt ist — nur geringfügige und sachlich gerechtfertigte Änderungen zulässig wären.

Kann die Kommission die Richtigkeit dieser Beispiele bestätigen? Wenn ja, auf welcher Grundlage hat Kommissionsmitglied Reding behauptet, der Vorschlag bringe „mehr Verbraucherschutz"? Wenn nein, warum treffen die Beispiele nicht zu? Um die Verbesserungen und Verschlechterungen beim Verbraucherschutz besser beurteilen zu können, wird die Europäische Kommission darüber hinaus um die Vorlage einer Vergleichstabelle ersucht, in der die 27 nationalen Verbraucherschutzregelungen der vorgeschlagenen EU-Kaufrechtsverordnung gegenübergestellt werden.

Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(1. Juni 2012)

Das Gemeinsame Europäische Kaufrecht bietet insgesamt ein hohes Verbraucherschutzniveau, das dem in den meisten Mitgliedstaaten entspricht oder höher ist. Diese allgemeine Bewertung gilt unbeschadet einiger nationaler Einzelvorschriften, die Verbrauchern unter Umständen einen größeren Schutz als die entsprechenden Bestimmungen des Vorschlags bieten. Diese Einzelvorschriften werden jedoch durch entsprechende Elemente des Vorschlags ausgeglichen, die bei gemeinsamer Anwendung ein hohes Schutzniveau gewährleisten.

Die Kommission dankt der Frau Abgeordneten und dem Herrn Abgeordneten für die Mitteilung der drei Beispielfälle, in denen die Vorschriften über unlautere Vertragsbedingungen im Gemeinsamen Europäischen Kaufrecht ein geringeres Schutzniveau als das österreichische Recht bieten. Dennoch schätzt die Kommission das vorgeschlagene allgemeine Niveau des Schutzes gegen unfaire Vertragsbestimmungen als hoch ([1]) ein. Der Verordnungsvorschlag bietet in mancherlei Hinsicht ein höheres Verbraucherschutzniveau, da es eine Vermutung der Unfairness ([2]) für Vertragsbestimmungen enthält, die nach österreichischem Recht nicht explizit als unfair gelten.

([1]) Ein Verstoß gegen das Transparenzgebot führt gemäß österreichischem Recht zur Unwirksamkeit intransparenter Vertragsklauseln und ist gleichzeitig aber auch Bestandteil der Unfairness-Kontrolle im Verordnungsvorschlag. Die als Beispiele genannten Bestimmungen zum Verbot einseitiger nachträglicher Leistungsänderungen, einseitiger nachträglicher Preisänderungen und der automatischen Verlängerung von Verträgen bieten nur ein geringfügig höheres Verbraucherschutzniveau; während für entsprechende Vertragsklauseln gemäß der einschlägigen Bestimmungen in Artikel 85 Buchstaben j, k und h des Verordnungsvorschlags die Vermutung der Unfairness gilt, gelten diese Klauseln gemäß österreichischem Recht per se als unfair (vgl. § 6 Absatz 2 Ziffer 3 sowie Absatz 1 Ziffern 5 und 2 des österreichischen Konsumentenschutzgesetzes). Da es in der Praxis jedoch ziemlich schwer ist, die Unfairnessvermutung zu widerlegen, wirkt sich dieser Unterschied nur minimal aus.

([2]) Artikel 85 sieht beispielsweise vor, dass für Bestimmungen die Vermutung der Unfairness gilt, wenn sie den Verbraucher ohne Grund daran hindern, Lieferungen oder Reparaturleistungen von Dritten zu beziehen (Buchstabe t) oder den Vertrag ohne Grund an einen anderen Vertrag mit dem Unternehmer, einem Tochterunternehmen oder einem Dritten in einer für den Verbraucher nicht zu erwartenden Weise koppeln (Buchstabe u). Gemäß Artikel 85 Buchstabe c, der einen breiteren Anwendungsbereich als § 6 Absatz 1 Ziffer 8 des österreichischen Verbraucherschutzgesetzes hat, gelten Bestimmungen als unfair, wenn sie das Recht auf Aufrechnung etwaiger Forderungen in unangemessener Weise ausschließen oder beschränken.

Die Kommission weist in diesem Zusammenhang darauf hin, dass zurzeit zur Unterstützung des Gesetzgebungsverfahrens eine Vergleichstabelle erstellt wird, die eine Gegenüberstellung der einschlägigen EU-Rechtsvorschriften und des Verordnungsvorschlags enthält. Diese wird dem Europäischen Parlament in Kürze übermittelt. Der Tabelle wird noch eine Gegenüberstellung der einschlägigen Verbraucherschutzbestimmungen im Verordnungsvorschlag und den Verbraucherschutzvorschriften der meisten Mitgliedstaaten folgen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003803/12
to the Commission
Evelyn Regner (S&D) and Josef Weidenholzer (S&D)
(13 April 2012)

Subject: Greater consumer protection through a regulation on a Common European Sales Law?

In a press release issued when the proposal for a regulation on a Common European Sales Law (CESL) was presented (IP/11/1175), Commissioner Reding is quoted as saying that this will *provide firms with an easy and cheap way to expand their business to new markets while giving consumers better deals and a high level of protection*.

Both representatives of the business community and consumer protection organisations at EU and national level have informed us that the proposal will introduce a great deal of legal uncertainty and result in a lower level of consumer protection. An Austrian consumer protection organisation has underpinned these concerns by giving a number of specific examples:

— The transparency requirement introduced into Austrian law when Directive 93/13/EEC was transposed makes non-transparent contractual terms invalid. By contrast, the question of transparency in the CESL is simply made part of the unfairness checks, and further criteria would also have to be examined. Thus, as a result of opting for the CESL the Austrian provisions more favourable to the consumer and the case-law of the Austrian Supreme Court would be superseded.

— In Austria, provisions exist which invalidate automatic extensions of contracts or subsequent price changes if certain conditions are not met. These provisions are stricter than the corresponding provisions of the CESL.

— Austrian law is also more strict in relation to alterations to work or services performed, given that, unless such alterations are specifically negotiated, only minor and objectively justified alterations would be permissible.

Can the Commission confirm that these examples are correct? If so, what was the basis for Commissioner Reding's claim that the proposal would offer 'more consumer protection'? If not, in what way are the examples incorrect? In order to be able to assess the pros and cons in relation to consumer protection more effectively, the Commission is also requested to provide a comparative table in which the national consumer protection legislation of the 27 Member States can be compared with the proposed EU Sales Law.

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(1 June 2012)

Overall, the Common European Sales Law offers a high level of consumer protection which is comparable or higher than that in most Member States. This general assessment is without prejudice to some individual national provisions, which might offer consumers a higher protection than the corresponding rules in the proposal. However, those individual rules are counterbalanced by corresponding elements of the proposal which, when applied together, ensure the high level of protection.

The Commission is grateful that Honourable Members brought to our attention the three instances where rules on unfair contract terms in the Common European Sales Law per se offer a level of protection which is not as high as the Austrian law. Still, the Commission considers the proposed, overall level of protection against unfair terms as high ([1]). Indeed, the proposal provides in some respects a higher level of consumer protection as it provides a presumption of unfairness ([2]) for contract terms which are not explicitly considered unfair in Austrian law.

([1]) Indeed, a breach of the transparency requirement according to Austrian law makes the non-transparent contractual terms invalid, whereas this is certainly also an element in the unfairness assessment in the proposal.
The examples concerning the prohibition of unilateral alteration of characteristics of a product or a service, the unilateral price increase and the automatic extension of a contract provide only a slightly higher consumer protection level as the relevant provisions in Article 85 j), k) and h) are presumed to be unfair whereas they are considered per se unfair in Austrian law (s. § 6 paragraph 2 No 3, paragraph 1 No 5 and 2 of the Austrian consumer protection code (Konsumentenschutzgesetz)). However, considering that it is in practice rather difficult to refute the presumption, the impact of this difference is minor.

([2]) Article 85 provides that e. g. a clause is presumed to be unfair if it unjustifiably prevents the consumer from obtaining supplies or repairs from third party sources (litt. t) or if it unjustifiably bundles the contract with another one with the trader, a subsidiary of the trader, or a third party, in a way that cannot be expected by the consumer (litt. u). By virtue of Article 85 litt. c) which has a larger scope than § 6 paragraph 1 No 8 of the Austrian consumer protection code, a provision is presumed to be unfair if it inappropriately excludes or limits the right to set-off claims.

The Commission would like to inform the Honourable Members that in order to assist in the legislative process a comparison table between relevant EU legislation and the proposal is being prepared. It will shortly be transmitted to the European Parliament. This table will be followed by a comparison between pertinent consumer protection provisions in the proposal and consumer laws of the majority of Member States.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003804/12
to the Commission
Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE)
(13 April 2012)

Subject: European far-right extremist movement

Far-right extremist groups from a range of European countries are apparently seeking to form a European-wide movement to coordinate anti-Muslim and anti-immigrant protests and attacks. Although their recent meeting in Aarhus in Denmark was reportedly poorly attended, Europol's EU Terrorism Situation and Trend Report 2011 noted that right-wing extremist groups are in fact becoming more professional and maintain close contacts throughout the EU. A new more cohesive and coordinated European network of such groups would potentially increase the likelihood of hostile attacks.

The Commission liaises closely with national law enforcement authorities and Europol. It has also formulated the EU Strategy for Combating Radicalisation and Recruitment to Terrorism and coordinates the EU Network of Experts on Radicalisation in order to monitor and counteract potential terrorist activities.

How has the Commission ensured that efforts to combat right-wing extremists are fully included in the EU Strategy and Network on radicalisation so that these are not limited to Islamist extremism? Will the Commission encourage Member States to instruct their own law enforcement authorities to pay closer attention to international links and cooperation amongst far-right extremist groups operating within their countries?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(28 May 2012)

Last year's tragic events in Norway and recent revelations in Germany highlighted the dangers of far-right extremism, and have led the European Union once again to assess the tools and mechanisms used in the fight against terrorism.

The attacks in Norway in particular confirmed that terrorist activity, due to its cross-border nature and regardless of its motivation or precise modus operandi, is not only a matter for the country directly affected. International and multilateral cooperation ensures the support of other countries and broadens the scope of counter-terrorism activities. It encourages preventive steps and helps, where necessary, in reacting to an attack and managing its effects. Exchange of information, both at national and international level, is a crucial element in dealing with the threat of potential terrorists of any nature.

Member States have several channels for cooperation and information exchange, including the Secure Information Exchange Network Application (SIENA) and the system of national liaison officers in Europol from all Member States and from countries and organisations outside the EU which have agreements in place.

The Commission will continue to strengthen its efforts on the challenges posed by all forms of violent extremism and radicalisation processes. The EU Radicalisation Awareness Network connects key stakeholders involved in countering violent radicalisation of any origins ([1]).

([1]) See answer to Written Question E-012195/11.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003805/12
aan de Commissie
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(13 april 2012)

Betreft: Nieuwe zet in handelsoorlog: India verbiedt deelname Europese luchtvaarttaks

Het Indiase Ministerie voor de Luchtvaart heeft 9 april jl. alle Indiase luchtvaartmaatschappijen formeel verboden te participeren in het ETS voor de luchtvaart. Dit ministeriële besluit is het zoveelste in een reeks van openeevolgende wereldwijde protesten. China heeft participatie eerder verboden en in de VS zijn vergevorderde plannen tot een vergelijkbaar verbod.

1. Is de Commissie ervan op de hoogte dat het Indiase Ministerie voor Civiele Luchtvaart op 9 april jl. in een brief Indiase luchtvaartmaatschappijen heeft verboden te participeren in het ETS?

2. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat dit een zeer zorgelijke ontwikkeling is die aantoont hoe sterk en wijdverbreid het wereldwijde protest tegen het ETS is? Zo neen, waarom niet?

3. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat de EU per direct moet afzien van het ETS, om een verdere verslechtering van de handelsrelaties en schade voor de Europese luchtvaartsector te voorkomen? Zo neen, waarom niet?

Antwoord van mevrouw Hedegaard namens de Commissie
(24 mei 2012)

De Commissie voert over deze kwestie een permanente bilaterale dialoog met de Indiase autoriteiten. Wij wijken niet van ons standpunt dat vliegtuigexploitanten die ervoor kiezen om van en naar de Europese Unie te vliegen onze wetgeving moeten naleven en de rechtsstaat moeten eerbiedigen.

De Commissie erkent de door bepaalde derde landen geuite bezorgdheid over de opneming van de luchtvaart in de EU-ETS en neemt deze zeer ernstig. Zij voert momenteel actief besprekingen, zowel bilateraal als in het kader van de ICAO, om de geuite bezwaren weg te nemen. Terzelfder tijd merkt de Commissie op dat het zo spoedig mogelijk bereiken van een overeenkomst over mondiale actie om emissies door de internationale luchtvaart aan te pakken dankzij de EU-wetgeving hoger op de politieke agenda is komen te staan.

De EU-ETS-verordening is van kracht en er zijn geen plannen om de wetgeving anders te wijzigen dan is vermeld in het antwoord van de Commissie op schriftelijke vraag E-958/2012 van mevrouw Beňová ([1]). De wetgeving zal geen significante economische impact op de sector of op de gehele economie hebben. Het merendeel van de emissierechten voor de luchtvaart zal gratis worden toegekend aan de luchtvaartmaatschappijen. De extra kosten per vlucht zijn daardoor laag.

([1]) http://europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003805/12
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(13 April 2012)

Subject: New move in trade war: India forbids participation in European aviation tax

On 9 April 2012, the Indian Ministry for Aviation formally forbade all Indian airline companies from participating in the Emission Trading Scheme (ETS) for aviation. This ministerial decision is yet another in a series of successive worldwide protests. China forbade participation earlier and there are advanced plans for a similar ban in the United States.

1. Is the Commission aware that in its letter of 9 April 2012, the Indian Ministry for Civil Aviation forbade Indian airline companies from participating in the ETS?

2. Does the Commission agree with the Partij Voor de Vrijheid (Party for Freedom, PVV) that this is an extremely disturbing development that shows how strong and widespread the worldwide protest against the ETS is? If not, why not?

3. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that the EU must abandon the ETS immediately, in order to prevent a further deterioration in trade relations and damage to the European aviation sector? If not, why not?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(24 May 2012)

The Commission is in continued bilateral dialogue with the Indian authorities on this issue. We are firm in the position that aircraft operators who choose to fly to and from the European Union must respect our legislation and the rule of law.

The Commission recognises and takes very seriously the concerns about the inclusion of aviation in the 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, the Commission notes that the EU legislation has increased the momentum for global action addressing international aviation emissions to be agreed as soon as possible.

The EU ETS law is in force and there are no plans to change the legislation except as mentioned in the Commission's answer to Written Question E-958/2012 by Mrs Beňová ([1]). 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.*

([1]) http://europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003806/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(13 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Costi delle nuove regole per il processo di allargamento dell'UE

I nuovi fondi di preadesione predisposti dalla Commissione europea non intendono più fare distinzione tra paesi potenzialmente candidati e paesi formalmente candidati. Questo comporterà un allungamento dei tempi della procedura di adesione e un conseguente estendersi del periodo di fruizione di tali fondi da parte dei paesi candidati.

— La Commissione ha valutato i costi che tali nuove regole comporteranno?

— Quale sarà la tempistica, ovvero per quanti anni i paesi in preadesione potranno usufruire di tali fondi?

— La Commissione non ritiene che, data la situazione economica attuale, sia opportuno valutare la sospensione di tali fondi e impiegarli a favore degli Stati membri?

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(25 giugno 2012)

Come avviene con l'attuale strumento ([1]), la proposta della Commissione relativa al nuovo strumento di assistenza preadesione per il periodo 2014-2020 (IPA II) prevede un sostegno finanziario sia per i paesi candidati che per i candidati potenziali. La Commissione propone di destinare 14,1 miliardi di euro per l'assistenza preadesione per il periodo 2014-2020. L'unica differenza consiste nel fatto che, nell'ambito dell'attuale strumento, l'assistenza è assegnata tramite due o cinque «componenti IPA» a seconda della situazione del paese; questo cambiamento non inciderà né sulla durata del processo di adesione né sui costi da sostenere.

La durata del periodo necessario per preparare un paese candidato all'adesione dipende in primo luogo dalle riforme che il paese deve realizzare per soddisfare le norme e i requisiti dell'UE, e dalla sua capacità di attuare tali riforme. Sulla base del consenso rinnovato in materia di allargamento ([2]), la Commissione propone che l'Unione fornisca assistenza finanziaria ai paesi candidati all'adesione durante i preparativi preadesione.

La Commissione ritiene che l'assistenza preadesione sia un investimento nel futuro dell'UE, in quanto favorisce la stabilità e la prosperità dei paesi vicini e assicura l'effettiva capacità dei futuri Stati membri di attuare l'acquis. Tale assistenza crea, tra l'altro, opportunità per le imprese e garantisce la redditività degli investimenti.

([1]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1085/2006 del Consiglio, del 17 luglio 2006 (GU L 2010 del 31.7.2006, pag. 5).
([2]) Conclusioni del Consiglio europeo del 5 dicembre 2011 sull'allargamento e la stabilizzazione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003806/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(13 April 2012)

Subject: Costs of new rules for the EU enlargement process

The new pre-accession funds provided by the European Commission no longer intend to distinguish between potential candidate countries and countries that are formal candidates. This will lead to the accession procedure taking longer and, consequently, a longer period in which these funds can be used by candidate countries.

— Has the Commission calculated the costs that these new rules will entail?

— What will the timetable be? In other words, for how many years pre-accession will it be possible to use these funds?

— Does the Commission not believe that, in view of the current economic situation, it is appropriate to consider suspending these funds and using them in favour of the Member States?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(25 June 2012)

As under the current instrument ([1]) the Commission proposal for the new Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance for the period 2014-2020 (IPAII) provides for financial support to both candidate countries and potential candidates. The Commission proposes to allocate EUR 14.1 billion to pre-accession assistance for the period 2014-2020. The only difference is that under the current instrument the assistance is channelled through two or five IPA 'components', depending on the status of the country; this change will have no consequences for the length of the accession procedure, nor for the costs that are incurred.

The length of the period needed for preparing a candidate country for membership depends in the first instance on the reforms that need to be implemented by the candidate country to meet EU standards and requirements, as well as the capacity of that country to implement these reforms. Based on the renewed consensus on enlargement ([2]) the Commission proposes that the Union provides financial assistance to the enlargement countries throughout their pre-accession preparations.

The Commission considers that pre-accession assistance is an investment in the future of the EU, supporting the stability and prosperity of neighbouring countries and ensuring the effective capacity of future EU members to implement the *acquis*. Such assistance creates, *inter alia*, opportunities for the businesses and provides tangible returns on investment.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1085/2006 of 17 July 2006, OJ L 2010, 31.7.2006, p. 82.
([2]) European Council conclusion of 5 December 2011 on Enlargement and the Stabilisation.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003807/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(13 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Diminuzione degli aiuti allo sviluppo per i Paesi Terzi

Oltre la metà dei soldi spesi per aiutare i paesi poveri proviene dall'Unione europea e dai suoi Stati membri; l'Unione è quindi il maggiore donatore a livello mondiale. L'obiettivo globale e principale della politica di sviluppo dell'UE è estirpare la povertà in maniera durevole.

Da una recente inchiesta portata avanti da un'organizzazione per la cooperazione e lo sviluppo risulta che l'aiuto allo sviluppo degli Stati Membri dell'Unione Europea è diminuito, lo scorso anno, per la prima volta negli ultimi dieci anni. Tutti gli Stati dell'UE, tranne nove, hanno donato meno contributi nel 2011 rispetto all'anno 2010. In totale i 27 Stati Membri dell'UE hanno donato 55,2 miliardi di euro all'aiuto allo sviluppo, che in totale rappresenta lo 0,42 % del PIL lordo nazionale.

Alla luce delle statistiche sovraesposte, può pertanto la Commissione rispondere a quanto segue:

Come intende esortare le autorità nazionali a fissare nuovi e rinnovati obiettivi finanziari per le sovvenzioni allo sviluppo al fine di dimostrare il loro impegno a raggiungere gli OSM?

Risposta data da Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione
(23 maggio 2012)

La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alla risposta fornita alla precedente interrogazione scritta E-009731/2011 dell'On. Crețu ([1]) e che affronta la stessa questione. La Commissione evidenzia inoltre che il comunicato stampa ([2]) del comitato di assistenza allo sviluppo dell'Organizzazione per la cooperazione e lo sviluppo economico (OCSE) fa riferimento solo ai livelli di aiuto pubblico allo sviluppo (APS) dei paesi membri dell'OCSE e pertanto la Commissione ha pubblicato contemporaneamente i dati sui risultati preliminari riguardanti gli APS ([3]) di tutti gli Stati membri. La Commissione continuerà a esortare gli Stati membri a raggiungere gli obiettivi dell'UE in materia di APS, in linea con gli impegni assunti collettivamente e individualmente. La Commissione prevede che il Consiglio «Affari esteri» di maggio 2012 discuta ulteriormente la questione e adotti le conclusioni del Consiglio sulla relazione annuale 2012 al Consiglio europeo sugli obiettivi in materia di aiuti allo sviluppo dell'UE.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=IT.
([2]) http://www.oecd.org/document/3/0,3746,en_21571361_44315115_50058883_1_1_1_1,00.html
([3]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/12/348&format=HTML&aged=0&language=IT&guiLanguage=fr.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003807/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(13 April 2012)

Subject: Reduction of development aid to non-EU countries

More than half of the financial aid given to poor countries comes from the European Union and its Member States: the Union is therefore the world's largest donor. The global and primary objective of the EU's development policy is to eradicate poverty on a lasting basis.

A recent survey carried out by a cooperation and development organisation reveals that development aid from the Member States of the European Union fell, last year, for the first time in 10 years. All but nine EU states donated less in 2011 than they did in 2010. In total, the 27 EU Member States donated EUR 55 200 000 000 in development aid, representing an average of 0.42% of GDP.

In light of the above statistics, how does the Commission propose to urge national authorities to set new and updated financial targets for development aid in order to demonstrate their commitment to achieving the Millennium Development Goals?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(23 May 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to previous Written Question E-009731/2011 by Ms Creţu ([1]), which addresses the same issue. Furthermore, the Commission points out that the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)'s Development Assistance Committee's press release ([2]) covers only the Official Development Assistance (ODA) levels of OECD members, and therefore the Commission published in parallel the details on all Member States' preliminary ODA results ([3]). The Commission continues to call on Member States to deliver on the agreed EU ODA targets, in line with the EU's collective and individual commitments. The Commission expects the Foreign Affairs Council of May 2012 to further discuss this issue and to adopt Council conclusions on the Annual Report 2012 to the European Council on EU Development Aid Targets.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN.
([2]) http://www.oecd.org/document/3/0,3746,en_21571361_44315115_50058883_1_1_1_1,00.html
([3]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/12/348&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=fr.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003808/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(13 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Epurazioni in Cina, caso Bo Xilai

Bo Xilai, politico emergente della Repubblica Popolare Cinese, caduto in disgrazia a seguito di alcuni scandali relativi a una presunta corruzione avvenuta nella provincia di Chongqing, è stato sospeso ufficialmente dall'ufficio politico del Comitato Centrale del Pcc e dal comitato centrale stesso.

Bo Xilai è finito nei guai dopo la fuga del suo ex capo della polizia, Wang Lijun, che si era rifugiato nel consolato americano per chiedere asilo politico. Come se non bastasse, la sua posizione è stata ulteriormente aggravata dalla morte misteriosa di un uomo d'affari britannico, Neil Heywood, per la quale è stata indagata proprio la moglie di Bo Xilai.

Le autorità cinesi hanno ufficializzato la riapertura del fascicolo sulla morte di Heywood e hanno incriminato ufficialmente Gu Kailai, mettendo Bo Xilai di fronte al dato di fatto. Sostanzialmente quindi le autorità ipotizzano che Heywood sia stato assassinato, e che Bo Xilai e sua moglie siano fortemente sospettati. Questo spiegherebbe anche lo strano comportamento di Wang Lijun, il quale avrebbe cercato di chiedere asilo politico agli Stati Uniti. Nell'ultimo mese, tutti gli uomini fedeli a Bo Xilai sono stati espulsi o arrestati e il Pcc ha lanciato una vera e propria «purga» anche contro i siti neomaoisti fatti costruire dall'ex leader. In molti sospettano che Bo Xilai stia pagando ora la sua ambizione, un'ambizione che lo aveva accecato al punto da portarlo ad avanzare pretese sull'essere l'«erede politico» di Mao Zedong.

Alla luce di quanto citato, può l'Alto Rappresentante far sapere quanto segue:

— è informato sulla vicenda e quali informazioni ha in merito all'uccisione dell'uomo d'affari britannico, Neil Heywood, e quali provvedimenti e azioni diplomatiche la delegazione dell'Unione Europea presso la Repubblica popolare cinese intende intraprendere per garantire che Bo Xilai e sua moglie siano giudicati nell'ambito di un processo giusto ed equo e perevitare arresti sommari?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(21 giugno 2012)

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente è tenuta al corrente degli importanti sviluppi, politici e di altro genere, in Cina.

La morte di Neil Heywood, uomo d'affari britannico, è attualmente oggetto di indagine penale da parte delle autorità cinesi e la moglie di Bo Xilai, Gu Kailai, è stata arrestata in relazione a quanto avvenuto. Bo Xilai è stato sospeso dai sui incarichi nel Partito comunista cinese ed è attualmente sotto indagine da parte della Commissione Centrale per le indagini disciplinari del partito.

La delegazione dell'Unione europea in Cina è impegnata nella promozione dei diritti dell'uomo e dello Stato di diritto e le preoccupazioni sul tema vengono espresse nelle riunioni ad alto livello con i leader cinesi, da ultimo quando, il 3 maggio 2012, il presidente del Consiglio europeo e il presidente della Commissione hanno ricevuto a Bruxelles il vice primo ministro cinese Li Keqiang. Il dialogo tra UE e Cina sui diritti umani, giunto al 31° incontro il 29 maggio 2012, offre un contesto non solo per esporre le preoccupazioni riguardanti la situazione dei diritti umani in Cina, compresi i procedimenti giudiziari e l'applicazione delle leggi in materia, ma anche un'occasione per discutere della cooperazione nell'ambito delle riforme giuridiche e della promozione dello Stato di diritto. Il rispetto del diritto ad un equo processo resta una delle priorità dell'UE nell'ambito del dialogo con la Cina.

La delegazione inoltre agevola i progetti di cooperazione con i partner cinesi per la promozione delle riforme giudiziarie e dello Stato di diritto e per la tutela dei diritti umani.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003808/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(13 April 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Purges in China, case of Bo Xilai

Bo Xilai, a rising politician in the People's Republic of China who has now fallen into disgrace following a number of scandals relating to alleged corruption in the province of Chongqing, has been officially suspended from political office by the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, as well as from the Central Committee itself.

Bo Xilai got into trouble after the flight of his former police chief, Wang Lijun, who took refuge in the US consulate to request political asylum. As if that were not enough, his position was further worsened by the mysterious death of a British businessman, Neil Heywood, for which Bo Xilai's own wife was investigated.

The Chinese authorities have officially reopened the file on Heywood's death, and have officially charged Gu Kailai, confronting Bo Xilai with the de facto evidence. In essence, therefore, the authorities are assuming that Heywood was assassinated, and that Bo Xilai and his wife are prime suspects. This would also explain the strange behaviour of Wang Lijun, who is thought to have requested political asylum in the United States. In the last month, everyone loyal to Bo Xilai has been expelled or arrested, and the CCP has also launched a veritable 'purge' against the neo-Maoist websites set up by the former leader. Many people suspect that Bo Xilai is now paying for his ambition — an ambition which had blinded him to the extent of leading him to make claims to being the 'political heir' of Mao Zedong.

In view of the above, can the High Representative answer the following question:

— has she been informed of the affair, what information does she have about the killing of the British businessman Neil Heywood, and what diplomatic measures and actions does the delegation of the European Union to the People's Republic of China propose to take to ensure that Bo Xilai and his wife receive a just and fair trial and to avoid summary arrests?

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

The HR/VP is kept informed of important political and other developments in China.

The death of British businessman Neil Heywood is currently subject to criminal investigation by Chinese authorities, and the wife of Bo Xilai, Gu Kailai, has been arrested in connection with it. Bo Xilai has been suspended from his Party positions, and is currently being investigated by the Party Central Commission for Discipline Inspection.

The Delegation of the European Union to China is active in promoting human rights and the rule of law. Concerns over human rights in China are regularly brought up in high level meetings with Chinese leaders, most recently when the President of the European Council and the President of the Commission received the Chinese Vice Premier Li Keqiang in Brussels on 3 May 2012. The EU-China human rights dialogue, the 31st round being held on 29 May 2012, provides a forum not only for expressing concerns related to Human Rights in China, including judicial processes and the implementation of related laws, but also to discuss cooperation in the fields of legal reform and promoting rule of law. Respect for the right to a fair trial remains one of the EU's priorities in this Dialogue with China.

The Delegation also facilitates cooperation projects with Chinese partners aimed at promoting legal reform, the rule of law and the safeguarding of human rights.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003809/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(13 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Europei: abitudini alimentari a confronto

Lo studio HELENA (Healthy Lifestyle in Europe by Nutrition in Adolescents), progetto di 3 anni finanziato dall'Unione Europea per approfondire la conoscenza delle abitudini alimentari e degli stili di vita correlati dei giovani di età compresa fra i 13 e i 16 anni in dieci paesi europei, fornisce nuove informazioni sulle abitudini alimentari e sugli stili di vita dei giovani in cinque paesi europei ed evidenzia sorprendenti somiglianze, oltre ad alcune differenze sostanziali, in tutta Europa.

Può pertanto la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Può indicare quali risultati ha prodotto lo studio in questione, in particolare se ha individuato stili di vita legati a diete particolari che potrebbero ricondurre ad una vita più salutare nonché all'allungamento della speranza di vita per i cittadini europei?

2. Se questo fosse il caso, come intende divulgare i risultati del programma HELENA affinché un numero sempre maggiore di giovani cittadini possa essere consapevole ed adottare una buona condotta alimentare?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(12 giugno 2012)

Il progetto HELENA ([1]), ([2]) ha reso possibile, grazie alla collaborazione di ventisei partner in dieci diversi paesi e a un contributo dell'UE di 5 milioni di euro, la prima raccolta di dati comparabili sul livello di micronutrienti assunti dagli adolescenti europei. Inoltre, tale progetto ha permesso di individuare gli adolescenti a rischio di disordini alimentari, di promuovere un'alimentazione sana e di proporre strategie di marketing volte a migliorare il regime alimentare degli adolescenti. Il progetto ha contribuito altresì a ottenere una migliore comprensione della salute degli adolescenti in termini di carenze di sostanze nutrienti, delle preferenze alimentari degli adolescenti e dei fattori che motivano le loro scelte. Tale progetto ha inoltre permesso di farsi una prima idea su come sviluppare prodotti mettendo al centro il consumatore.

Il progetto HELENA è stato oggetto di sessantadue articoli scientifici già pubblicati in riviste specializzate del settore, mentre altri ottantotto sono attualmente in fase di elaborazione. Gli articoli pubblicati sono stati raccolti in un libro, nel quale sono trattate anche le procedure operative standard e gli strumenti utilizzati nel quadro del progetto. I risultati del progetto sono inoltre divulgati attraverso diversi strumenti che, in linea con gli obiettivi del progetto, mirano a promuovere uno stile di vita sano in maniera attraente. Tra questi figurano il «Food-O-Meter» e l'«Activ-O-Meter», strumenti basati su Internet che valutano lo stato nutrizionale degli adolescenti. Come previsto dal Settimo programma quadro per la ricerca e lo sviluppo tecnologico (7° PQ, 2007-2013), la divulgazione dei risultati è parte integrante della convenzione di sovvenzione. Il progetto HELENA è inoltre stato definito dalla Commissione europea come un progetto di ricerca di grande successo, che ha mostrato ai cittadini i benefici delle attività di ricerca e innovazione.

([1]) Il progetto HELENA, condotto nell'ambito del Sesto programma quadro di ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico, è stato lanciato l'1.5.2005 e si è concluso il 31.10.2008.
([2]) http://www.helenastudy.com/.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003809/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(13 April 2012)

Subject: Europeans: dietary habits compared

The HELENA study (Healthy Lifestyle in Europe by Nutrition in Adolescence), a 3-year project funded by the European Union to find out more about the dietary and related lifestyle habits of young people between the ages of 13 and 16 years in ten European countries, provides new information on the dietary and lifestyle habits of young people in five European countries and reveals surprising similarities, as well as some substantial differences, across Europe.

The Commission is therefore invited to answer the following questions:

1. Can it state what results have been produced by the study in question, and particularly whether it has identified any lifestyles associated with particular diets that might lead to a healthier life and longer life expectancy for European citizens?

2. If this is the case, how does it propose to disseminate the results of the HELENA programme so that increasing numbers of young people can be made aware and adopt a good diet?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2012)

The Helena ([1]) ([2]) project provided with the help of 26 partners in 10 countries and an EU contribution of EUR 5 million for the first time comparable data about the micronutrient status of European adolescents. In addition, the project identified adolescents at risk of nutrition-related disorders, developed healthy foods and provided marketing strategies for consumers to improve the diet of adolescents. It helped understanding adolescent health in terms of nutrient deficiencies and understanding adolescent behaviour related to food choices and preferences and motivating factors. It also gave insights into consumer-led product development.

Helena led to 62 scientific papers in peer reviewed journals and has 88 papers under development. It resulted in a book including the standard operating procedures and the tools used in the project. Its results are also disseminated through different healthy and appealing products fitting the objectives of the project such as the 'food-o-meter and active-o-meter', a web-based tool for the determination of the nutritional status. According to the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013)'s rules, dissemination of results is part of the grant agreement. Helena is one of the research projects that has been identified by the Commission as success story showing the benefits of R&I to citizens.

([1]) The Sixth Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development's Helena project started on 1.5.2005 and terminated on 31.10.2008.
([2]) http://www.helenastudy.com/.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003810/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(13 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Migliori pratiche del programma «Sostegno allo sviluppo di progetti di produzione» nel campo audiovisivo

Il programma «Sostegno allo sviluppo di progetti di produzione — Fiction, documentari di creazione e opere di animazione — Progetti individuali, Slate Funding» persegue l'obiettivo di favorire lo sviluppo di progetti di produzione di opere audiovisive destinate al mercato europeo e internazionale.

I beneficiari possibili sono le società audiovisive indipendenti, legalmente costituite da almeno 12 mesi dalla data di presentazione del progetto.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione far sapere quali sono stati i casi di eccellenza risultanti dallo strumento «Sostegno allo sviluppo di progetti di produzione — Fiction, documentari di creazione e opere di animazione — Progetti individuali, Slate Funding»?

Risposta di Androulla Vassiliou a nome della Commissione
(20 giugno 2012)

Tra i progetti d'eccellenza che hanno ricevuto un sostegno tramite Slate Funding vi sono:

— «Welcome» — premio Lux 2009 (società di produzione francese Nord Ouest);

— «Une histoire de fou» di Robert Guediguian (che ha vinto il premio Lux 2011);

— «Rundskop-Bullhead» di Michael R. Roskam, che ha ricevuto una nomination per un Oscar, come miglior film in lingua straniera 2012 (società di produzione belga Savage Production Bvba);

— «A Perdre la raison» di Joachim Lafosse, selezionato per Cannes 2012;

— «The Royal Affair» di Nicolaj Arcel, vincitore dell'Orso d'argento al Festival internazionale del cinema di Berlino 2012;

— «Jagten» di Thomas Vinterberg, nominato per la Palma d'oro, Festival del film di Cannes 2012;

— «In a better world» vincitore dell'Oscar per il miglior film in lingua straniera 2011;

— «Gomorra» di Matteo Garrone (Grand Prix du Jury, Cannes 2008);

— «This must be the place» di Paolo Sorrentino (premio ecumenico e nomination alla Palma d'oro 2011);

— «L'enfer d'Henri-Georges Clouzot» (César per il miglior documentario 2010).

Annualmente sono state selezionate in media 65 società per uno slate funding per tre-cinque progetti: tra le selezioni recenti vi sono la società britannica Film & Music Entertainment, che ha coprodotto «Parada» di Srdjana Dragojevica (premio Lux 2012), Sixteen Films (produttore di film di Ken Loach), Neue Road Movies (produttore di «Pina» di Wim Wenders) e La Petite Reine (produttore di «The Artist» coronato da un Oscar).

I progetti singoli comprendono:

— Corazon International — che ha ottenuto due volte il sostegno per progetti con la scenografia e la regia di Fatih Akin (premio Lux 2007);

— Independent Artists Filmproduktion — che ha ricevuto un sostegno per il nuovo progetto di Feo Aladag (premio Lux 2010);

— Les Armateurs Sarl — produttore del film d'animazione «Ernest et Céléstine», selezionato alla Quinzaine des réalizateurs, Cannes 2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003810/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(13 April 2012)

Subject: Best practices of the 'Support for the development of production projects' programme in the audiovisual field

The aim of the 'Support for the development of production projects — Animation, creative documentaries and drama — Single Projects, Slate Funding' programme is to promote the development of production projects for audiovisual works intended for the European and international market.

Potential beneficiaries are independent audiovisual companies, legally established for at least 12 months from the date of presentation of the project.

In view of the above, can the Commission say what examples of excellence have resulted from the 'Support for the development of production projects — Animation, creative documentaries and drama — Single Projects, Slate Funding' instrument?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2012)

Among the excellent projects supported through Slate Funding are:

— 'Welcome' — Lux prize 2009 (French production company Nord Ouest);

— 'Une histoire de fou' by Robert Guediguian (who won the Lux prize 2011);

— 'Rundskop-Bullhead' by Michael R. Roskam, nominated for Oscar, Best Foreign Language Film of the Year 2012 (Belgian production company Savage Production Bvba);

— 'A Perdre la raison' by Joachim Lafosse, selected for Cannes 2012;

— 'The Royal Affair' by Nicolaj Arcel, winner of the Silver Bear in Berlin International Film Festival 2012;

— 'Jagten' by Thomas Vinterberg, nominated for Palme d'Or, Cannes Film Festival 2012;

— 'In a better world' winner of the Oscar for best Foreign Language Film 2011;

— 'Gomorra' by Matteo Garrone (Grand Prix du Jury Cannes 2008);

— 'This must be the place' by Paolo Sorrentino (Prize of the Ecumenical Jury and Palme d'Or nominated 2011);

— 'L'enfer d'Henri-Georges Clouzot' (César for best documentary 2010).

On average 65 companies are selected every year for Slate Funding support for three to five projects: recent selections include the British company Film & Music Entertainment, which co-produced 'Parada' by Srdjan Dragojevic (Lux Prize 2012), Sixteen Films (producer of Ken Loach's films), Neue Road Movies (producer of 'Pina' by Wim Wenders) and La Petite Reine (producer of the Oscar winning 'The Artist').

Single Projects include:

— Corazon International — supported twice for projects to be written and directed by Fatih Akin (Lux Prize 2007);

— Independent Artists Filmproduktion — supported for the new project of Feo Aladag (Lux Prize 2010);

— Les Armateurs Sarl — producer of the feature animation 'Ernest et Céléstine', selected for Cannes Directors' Fortnight 2012.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003816/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(13 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Marchi di qualità per i prodotti alimentari

Il sistema di marchi di qualità aiuta a proteggere e promuovere i prodotti agricoli e alimentari tradizionali dell'Europa. Oltre a tutelare il lavoro di migliaia di agricoltori e produttori artigianali, conservando e sviluppando il patrimonio rurale dell'UE, migliora anche la fiducia dei consumatori nei prodotti con questi marchi.

Negli ultimi anni il cittadino/consumatore ha avvertito sempre più il bisogno di qualità orientando le proprie scelte su prodotti ed alimenti più gustosi, genuini e ricchi di sapore, garantiti da processi di produzione rigorosi e certificati e metodi più rispettosi dell'ambiente e della natura.

Per salvaguardare e proteggere questo patrimonio gastronomico e culturale in un mercato ormai divenuto globale, dove molti prodotti si definiscono genuini e presentano una denominazione simile se non la medesima in presenza di una politica di concorrenza sleale, la Comunità europea nel 1992 ha istituito tre sistemi di protezione noti come DOP, IGP e STG per promuovere e tutelare i prodotti agroalimentari di qualità.

Poiché in Italia esiste un gran numero di prodotti caratteristici legati al territorio, alla storia e alla cultura di un luogo, si chiede alla Commissione:

Quali sono i passaggi nel dettaglio (enti responsabili e richieste specifiche) e le tempistiche per il riconoscimento di un prodotto alimentare come DOP, IGP o STG, e quali buone pratiche si consigliano al fine di riuscire ad ottenere il riconoscimento della qualità del prodotto a livello europeo?

Risposta data da Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(31 maggio 2012)

La procedura di registrazione di una DOP, di un'IGP o di una STG a norma del regolamento (CE) n. 510/2006 ([1]) e del regolamento (CE) n. 509/2006 ([2]) è identica.

Un'associazione di produttori deve definire il prodotto conformemente ad un disciplinare ben preciso.

La suddetta associazione deve quindi inoltrare domanda presso il competente organismo nazionale, che, nel caso dell'Italia, è il Ministero delle Politiche Agricole e Forestali — Direzione Generale per lo sviluppo agroalimentare, per la qualità e per la tutela del consumatore. Sempre presso il medesimo organismo nazionale il richiedente può trovare qualsivoglia informazione relativa alla procedura a livello nazionale.

A conclusione della suddetta procedura nazionale, spetta all'autorità nazionale interessata trasmettere alla Commissione europea le domande che essa reputa conformi al regolamento di cui trattasi.

Come buona prassi, si consiglia alle associazioni richiedenti che devono compilare il documento unico di consultare l'apposita guida; quest'ultima è disponibile sul sito Europa al seguente indirizzo:
http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/quality/schemes/guides/guide-for-applicants_it.pdf

Utili informazioni sono disponibili altresì al seguente indirizzo:
http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/quality/schemes/index_fr.htm

([1]) GU L 93 del 31.3.2006, pagine 12-25.
([2]) GU L 93 del 31.3.2006, pagine 1-11.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003816/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(13 April 2012)

Subject: Quality marks for foodstuffs

The quality marks system helps to protect and promote the traditional agricultural and food products of Europe. In addition to protecting the work of thousands of farmers and small producers, by preserving and developing the EU's rural heritage, it also improves consumers' faith in products that display these marks.

In recent years, urban consumers have felt an increasing need for quality and have been drawn to more tasty, genuine and flavoursome products and foodstuffs, guaranteed by rigorous, certified production processes and methods that respect the environment and nature.

In order to safeguard and protect this food and cultural heritage in a market that has now become global, where many products are defined as genuine and have a similar — if not the same — name but employ dishonest competition policies, in 1992 the European Community established three protection systems known as PDO, PGI and TSG in order to promote and protect quality foodstuffs.

Since there are many characteristic products in Italy connected with the territory, history and culture of a given location:

Can the Commission indicate in detail, the steps (naming the responsible bodies and specific applications) and timeframes required for a food product to be recognised as PDO, PGI or TSG? What best practices are recommended in order to succeed in obtaining recognition of product quality at European level?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par Mr Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(31 mai 2012)

La procédure d'enregistrement d'une AOP, IGP ou d'une STG au titre des règlements (CE) n° 510/2006 ([1]) et n° 509/2006 ([2]) est identique.

Un groupement de producteurs doit définir le produit conformément à un cahier des charges précis.

Ledit groupement doit ensuite introduire une demande auprès de l'organisme national compétent à savoir, dans le cas de l'Italie, le Ministero delle Politiche Agricole e Forestali Direzione Generale per lo sviluppo agroalimentare, per la qualità e per la tutela del consumatore. C'est également auprès de cet organisme national que le demandeur peut trouver toute information concernant la procédure au niveau national.

À la fin de ladite procédure nationale, il appartient à cette autorité nationale d'envoyer les demandes qu'elle juge en conformité avec le règlement visé à la Commission européenne.

Comme bonne pratique, il est conseillé aux groupements demandeurs qui doivent remplir le document unique de consulter le guide pour les demandeurs disponible sur le site europa à l'adresse suivante (pour sa version italienne):
http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/quality/schemes/guides/guide-for-applicants_it.pdf

Des informations utiles peuvent également être trouvées à l'adresse suivante:
http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/quality/schemes/index_fr.htm

([1]) JO L 93 du 31.3.2006 pp.12-25.
([2]) JO L 93 du 31.3.2006 pp. 1-11.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003823/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(13 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Nuova tipologia di impianto fotovoltaico

Un impianto fotovoltaico dalla buccia d'uva. Da un Istituto tecnico industriale arriva una nuova rivoluzionaria invenzione. Tre giovani studenti si sono cimentati nell'individuazione di molecole dal potere fotovoltaico ottenute grazie alle bucce di uva.

Si tratta di una branca che negli ultimi tempi sta prendendo piede nella ricerca: il fotovoltaico biologico ottenuto da materiali organici. Grazie a questo esperimento si potrà ottenere energia dagli scarti, quindi a costo quasi zero. Si è deciso di iniziare l'esperimento nello scorso settembre, quando ormai la vendemmia era quasi terminata, grazie anche alla collaborazione di un'azienda che ha fornito il materiale. Se è vero che per ora non è possibile creare pannelli fotovoltaici alla buccia d'uva, è però prevedibile un'applicazione immediata anche nella vita quotidiana di questa scoperta: il potere di creare energia dal sole di queste molecole può essere usato, per esempio, per ricaricare il cellulare.

È al corrente la Commissione della nuova ricerca riguardante i pannelli solari?

Ritiene che si possa finanziare un tale progetto, che potrebbe essere in grado di agevolare il percorso verso la concretizzazione degli obiettivi inseriti nella strategia «Energia 2020»?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(21 giugno 2012)

Le celle solari a colorante sensibilizzatore (DSSCs), cui l'onorevole parlamentare fa riferimento, sono studiate e finanziate da più di vent'anni dalla Commissione europea. Tuttavia la loro diffusione sul mercato sta subendo ritardi per questioni di stabilità e di incremento di scala. Recentemente sono state effettuate dimostrazioni utilizzando sensibilizzatori naturali, ottenuti da uva, more di gelso, more di rovo, ecc.

Come per tutte le priorità di ricerca tematica del Settimo programma quadro di ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico (7° PQ, 2007-2013) i progetti di collaborazione transnazionali per la ricerca sul fotovoltaico possono essere finanziati dalla Commissione europea, con formule di compartecipazione finanziaria, successivamente ad un invito a presentare proposte in conformità ai requisiti dei pertinenti programmi specifici («Cooperazione»), e dei programmi di lavoro («Energia», «Nanoscienze, nanotecnologie, materiali e nuove tecnologie di produzione» ecc.). Tramite il programma «Idee» possono essere concesse sovvenzioni per la «ricerca di frontiera» (sovvenzioni CER). Le informazioni sugli imminenti inviti a presentare proposte nell'ambito del 7° PQ sono disponibili sul portale dei partecipanti.

È previsto che il programma Orizzonte 2020 continui a sostenere la ricerca e l'innovazione in materia di energia solare.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003823/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(13 April 2012)

Subject: New type of photovoltaic system

A photovoltaic system has been made from grape skins. An industrial technology institute has come up with a revolutionary new invention. Three young students have been involved in identifying molecules with photovoltaic potential obtained from grape skins.

This is an area of research that has been recently gaining ground: biological photovoltaic energy produced from organic materials. This experiment will make it possible to produce energy from waste; in other words at virtually no cost. It was decided to begin the experiment last September, when the grape harvest was almost over. A company also helped with the work by supplying equipment. While it is true that thus far it has not been possible to create photovoltaic panels made from grape skins, it is nevertheless anticipated that this discovery could have an immediate effect on daily life. The capacity of these molecules to generate solar energy can be used to recharge a mobile phone for example.

Is the Commission aware of this new research concerning solar panels?

Does it believe that it could fund such a project, which could pave the way towards achieving the objectives stated in the Energy 2020 strategy?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(21 June 2012)

Dye Sensitised Solar Cells (DSSCs) to which the Honourable Member is referring, are being studied and supported by the European Commission for more than 20 years now. However, their market deployment is being delayed because of stability and scale up issues. Recently the use of natural sensitizers, extracted from grape, mulberry, blackberry, etc., has been demonstrated.

As with all Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013) thematic research priorities, transnational collaborative projects on photovoltaic research can be funded by the European Commission on a shared cost basis, following a call for project proposals in accordance with the requirements laid down in the relevant specific programmes ('Cooperation') and work programmes ('Energy', 'Nanosciences, nanotechnologies, materials and new production technologies (NMP)', etc.). Grants for individual research may be available for 'frontier research' through the 'Ideas' programme ('ERC'). Information on upcoming FP7 calls for proposals can be found on the participants' portal.

It is anticipated that Horizon 2020 will continue the support to solar energy research and innovation.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003827/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(13 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Orti urbani collettivi

Da alcuni anni si assiste ad una riscoperta degli orti urbani, non più soltanto nella tradizionale forma individuale, ma soprattutto in forma associata: i cosiddetti orti condivisi o collettivi.

Il progetto intende promuovere lo sviluppo dell'agricoltura nel territorio urbano: coltivazioni sostenibili e indirizzate al concetto di «catena corta», agricoltura sociale, orticoltura individuale o collettiva, agriturismo, forestazione urbana. L'attuazione del progetto deve avvenire tramite l'utilizzo di aree urbane a fini agricoli da parte di privati attraverso forme di partenariato e collaborazione con agricoltori già proprietari di un'azienda o attraverso la concessione di aree ed edifici comunali. Le istituzioni pubbliche incontrano le associazioni e le cooperative affidatarie degli orti urbani esistenti in città, con l'intento di iniziare una discussione volta a modificare la destinazione d'uso di quegli spazi e delle aree parco con finalità agricole della città.

Si tratta di incentivare una gestione che riconosca le valenze alimentari ma anche sociali, ambientali e di tutela del suolo dell'attività agricola, valenze già riconosciute a livello europeo dalla Politica Agricola Comunitaria. Il punto di arrivo del progetto è la realizzazione di un nuovo modello per un vivere cittadino maggiormente legato al contatto con la terra e con la natura, che abbia ricadute positive economiche per chi abita in città, come aiuto rispetto ai problemi alimentari ed ecologici, e per il Comune, che può in questo modo ridurre i costi di gestione del patrimonio del verde urbano. Le ricadute sono poi anche di tipo sociale, con la realizzazione di percorsi riabilitativi e di integrazione lavorativa per soggetti svantaggiati, e di tipo educativo, con i percorsi didattici per scuole e famiglie e di presidio del territorio.

Alla luce di quanto sopraesposto, può la Commissione far sapere quanto segue:

Ritiene che quello descritto sia un progetto che possa essere inserito nella nuova PAC e portato a conoscenza dei vari comuni degli Stati membri al fine di fare un ulteriore passo in avanti verso l'obiettivo di raddoppiare la produzione alimentare entro il 2050?

Risposta data da Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(31 maggio 2012)

Le proposte per la nuova politica agricola comune (PAC) ([1]), presentate dalla Commissione nell'ottobre 2011, sono attualmente all'esame del Consiglio e del Parlamento europeo. L'assetto del nuovo quadro normativo sulla PAC dipenderà dall'esito delle discussioni.

Pertanto la Commissione non è in grado di valutare proposte di progetti per il periodo successivo al 2013, in quanto la base giuridica su cui potrebbero poggiare è ancora inesistente. Spetta (e spetterà) alle autorità nazionali e/o regionali valutare tali proposte di progetti nel contesto dei rispettivi programmi di sviluppo rurale e alla luce dei vari criteri di ammissibilità che saranno in vigore in quel momento.

([1]) Tutte le proposte legislative sulla PAC dopo il 2013 sono reperibili alla pagina web: http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-post-2013/legal-proposals/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003827/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(13 April 2012)

Subject: Urban allotments

Over the past several years, there has been a rediscovery of urban allotments, no longer just the traditional individual form, but particularly the associated form: the so-called shared or collective allotment.

The project aims to promote the development of agriculture in urban areas: sustainable agriculture that applies the concepts of 'short chain' farming, social agriculture, individual or collective horticulture, agritourism and urban forestation. The project must be implemented by private individuals making use of urban areas for agricultural purposes through forms of partnership and collaboration with existing commercial farmers, or by the concession of municipal land and buildings. Public authorities are meeting the associations and cooperatives that manage existing allotments in cities with the intention of starting a discussion aimed at changing the use of these spaces and of park areas for agricultural purposes for the benefit of the city.

The aim is to provide incentives for a form of management that recognises not only the food value but also the social, environmental and soil protection value of agricultural activity-values already recognised at European level by the common agricultural policy. The goal of the project is to create a new model for city living which is more closely linked to the earth and to nature, which has positive economic effects for those living in cities, such as help with dietary and environmental problems, and for the local authority, which can thus reduce the costs of managing the stock of urban green spaces. There are also social benefits, such as the creation of rehabilitation and employment integration courses for disadvantaged people, and educational benefits, with teaching courses for schools and families, as well as land management benefits.

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

Does it believe that what I have described is a project that might be included in the new CAP and brought to the attention of the various local authorities of the Member States in order to take a further step towards the goal of doubling food production by 2050?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(31 May 2012)

The Commission has tabled its proposal for the new Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) in October 2011 ([1]). These proposals are currently being discussed in the Council and in the European Parliament. Depending on the outcomes from these discussions, the new legal framework of the CAP will be set.

Therefore, the Commission is not in a position to evaluate project proposals for the post-2013 as the legal basis for these is not yet existent. It is (and it will be) the task of the national and/or regional authorities to evaluate such project proposals in the context of their Rural Development Programmes and various eligibility criteria that will be in place.

([1]) All legal proposals on CAP post-2013 are available here: http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-post-2013/legal-proposals/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003839/12
to the Commission
Marian Harkin (ALDE)
(13 April 2012)

Subject: Homeopathic medicinal products in the EU

Authorisation requirements for homeopathic medicinal products are currently subject to the clinical trial standards contained in Directive 2001/83/EC ([1]), which are the same for conventional pharmaceuticals (Articles 16(1), 8(3)(i), Annex A). The same clinical testing criteria are set for both types of product, even though they are different. While the clinical testing standards are suitable for single-targeted conventional pharmaceuticals, this is not the case for multi-targeted homeopathic medicinal products on account of the differences between the two types of product. The authorisation of different products should be subject to different clinical testing criteria.

This has led to a situation where, on the basis of the current EU clinical testing standards, no homeopathic products have been authorised under the directive. Instead, in accordance with the directive, homeopathic products achieve only registration, meaning that no therapeutic indication for the product may be given to consumers, patients and healthcare providers, although clinical trial results showing the efficacy of homeopathic products 'as a whole' can be made available.

Homeopathic medicinal products are known to have an excellent safety profile (with almost no side-effects or interactions), can alleviate public health costs by savings of up to 30 % on the cost of medication, and have been proven to have positive effects on human health.

1. Is the Commission aware of the difference between conventional pharmaceuticals and homeopathic medicinal products in terms of their single- or multi-targeted nature?

2. Is the Commission aware that, under current harmonised authorisation requirements, clinical testing standards make the authorisation of homeopathic medicinal products practically impossible?

3. Does the Commission intend to take any action to rectify this situation?

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

As any other medicinal products, homeopathics are subject to the requirement of a marketing authorisation to be placed on the EU market as established in Directive 2001/83/EC ([2]). The requirements to be fulfilled by the applicant include, amongst others, pre-clinical tests and clinical trials to demonstrate safety and efficacy of the products.

However, since the beginning of the 1990s, the pharmaceutical *acquis* has provided for a simplified registration procedure for specific homeopathic medicinal products. The simplified procedure allows the registration of homeopathic medicinal products without requiring particulars and documents on tests and trials on safety and efficacy, provided that they are administered orally or externally, no specific therapeutic indication appears on the labelling or in any information relating to the product, and that there is a sufficient degree of dilution to guarantee the safety of the medicinal product. It is in the interest of the patients that any indication is supported by scientific data.

The Commission is aware of the multi-targeted nature of certain homeopathic medicinal products. The EU's existing legal framework for medicinal products provides flexibility for the authorisation or registration of homeopathic medicinal products taking into account their specificities without compromising the quality, safety and efficacy of these products.

The Commission therefore does not envisage, in the context of the forthcoming review of the EU rules on clinical trials, to introduce specific requirements for homeopathic medicinal products.

([1]) OJ L 311, 28.11.2001, p. 67.
([2]) OJ L 311, 28.11.2001.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003843/12
to the Commission
Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE)
(13 April 2012)

Subject: EU/Latin America trade agreements

What safeguards are in place in the EU/Colombia-Peru Association Agreement and the EU/Central America Association Agreement for the protection of human rights?

What is the Commission's position on a proposed human rights action plan being initiated before ratification of the EU/Colombia-Peru Association Agreement?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(25 May 2012)

The EU/Colombia-Peru Trade Agreement and the EU/Central America Association Agreement respond to the objectives of the EU's external action, as set out in Article 21(1) of the Treaty of the European Union, including the consolidation and support of human rights in the EU and its partner countries.

Benefits under the Agreements are premised on the respect for human rights, democracy, and the rule of law. The human rights clause — the first article embedded in both Agreements — asserts that respect for fundamental human rights, as laid down in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, constitutes an 'essential element' of the Agreements. This means that failure to respect these rights would constitute a 'material breach' of the Agreements which would entitle the other Party to adopt appropriate measures — including the possibility to suspend partially or totally the Agreement.

Further, these agreements need to be seen in the context of the broader relations between the EU and these trading partners where human rights issues are regularly raised.

The Commission sees no need for drawing up an additional action plan on human rights, since the issue is well covered through the bilateral human rights dialogue, human rights-related cooperation programmes and other human rights policy mechanisms. Moreover, the agreement in itself, through its human rights clause, the sustainable development chapter, and related monitoring and enforcement mechanisms will provide us with additional instruments to promote and leverage continued progress on human rights. In the case of the US it should be noted that they only had to develop a specific action plan because their agreement did not contain such stringent provisions on human rights.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003879/12
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(13 April 2012)

Subject: Web accessibility for the visually impaired

One in six people in the EU (around 80 million) have a disability. Included in this figure are the estimated 15.5 million European citizens who are visually impaired.

In the Digital Agenda for Europe, under Action 64, the European Commission stated that it would ensure that 'public sector websites (and websites providing basic services to citizens) are fully accessible by 2015' and would make a proposal to that effect by the end of 2011.

Can the Commission give an indication of the proposed timeline for the publication of these proposals?

Is the Commission planning to propose binding legislation to ensure that the public sector websites and websites providing basic services to citizens are fully accessible by 2015?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(29 May 2012)

The proposal for an EU legislative intervention on web-accessibility is progressing and should be submitted for adoption to the college within the 2nd quarter of 2012.

The Impact Assessment Board of the Commission has given its opinion on the accompanying Impact Assessment in February 2012. Currently the proposal is being prepared for a legislative intervention in order to ensure efficiency of efforts by avoiding fragmentation of the European market for web-accessibility products and services. The effect of this action will help to ensure that public sector websites offering essential information and services for the citizens are fully accessible by 2015 and it will encourage extending the scope to all public sector websites and/or sites providing basic services to citizens. In addition to this action goal of the Digital Agenda for Europe, the intervention will also support the fulfilment of other political commitments such as Article 9 of the UNCRPD ([1]) on 'ensuring equal rights on the access to online services'.

In the context of the EU Disability Strategy 2010-2020 and the UNCRPD, the Commission is also working on a proposal for a 'European Accessibility Act'.

([1]) UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-003893/12
Komisi
Pavel Poc (S&D), Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D) a Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE)
(13. dubna 2012)

Předmět: Bezpečnost léčivých přípravků obsahujících methylfenidát uváděných na trh EU

Ze studií provedených společností Janssen-Cilag (Johnson & Johnson) vyplývají nové důkazy o škodlivých účincích léčivých přípravků obsahujících methylfenidát. Důkazy byly předloženy spolu se žádostí o schválení přípravku Concerta (s účinnou látkou methylfenidát) pro dospělé v Evropě. Evropské orgány tuto žádost zamítly dne 26. května 2011 (závěrečná zpráva o posouzení změn, přípravek Concerta).

Bylo zjištěno, že přípravek Concerta má negativní poměr přínosů a rizik: „U přípravku Concerta byla zjištěna příčinná souvislost s agresivitou, tiky a depresí"; „Hlavní nové obavy týkající se bezpečnosti přípravku, které vyplývají z údajů studie, souvisejí s četností nežádoucích psychiatrických poruch a skutečností, že k nim často dochází *de novo*"; „Výskyt úzkosti je významný, zvýšil se však také podíl depresí a agresivního a nepřátelského chování"; „Posouzení uvádí, že u přípravku Concerta existuje významné riziko zneužití a nevhodného použití".

1. S ohledem na tyto nové důkazy a skutečnost, že tytéž účinky, nebo i horší, byly po schválení přípravku pro uvedení na trh pozorovány u dětí, co hodlá Komise učinit v zájmu bezpečnosti dětí, kterým mohou být takové léčivé přípravky podávány?

2. Má Komise k dispozici podklady, které dokládají, že byly splněny ostatní podmínky pro udělení rozhodnutí o registraci přípravku v souladu s rozhodnutím Komise (příloha IV)?

3. Je-li tomu tak, může je Komise Parlamentu poskytnout?

Odpověď Johna Dalliho jménem Komise
(22. srpna 2012)

1. Léčivé přípravky obsahující methylfenidát byly členskými státy registrovány.

Dne 22. června 2007 předložila Komise žádost o posouzení všech přípravků obsahujících methylfenidát podle článku 31 směrnice 2001/83/ES, ve znění pozdějších předpisů, Výboru pro humánní léčivé přípravky Evropské agentury pro léčivé přípravky. Hodnocení bezpečnosti se zejména zaměřilo na obavy, které mohou být spojeny s léčbou methylfenidátem, konkrétně na riziko kardiovaskulárních, cerebrovaskulárních onemocnění, psychických poruch, karcinogenitu, účinky na růst a vlivy dlouhodobé léčby. Výbor doporučil zachovat registrace, avšak pozměnit informace o přípravku a podmínky registrací. Dne 27. května 2009 Komise přijala rozhodnutí v souladu s těmito závěry.

2. Rozhodnutí Komise je určeno členským státům a jejich odpovědností je zajistit dodržování tohoto rozhodnutí.

((NI)I)a zasedání stálého výboru dne 13. září 2011 Komise požádala členské státy o informace o tom, jak bylo rozhodnutí Komise provedeno.

3. Komise panu předává dále dopisy obdržené z několika členských států.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003893/12
à la Commission
Pavel Poc (S&D), Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D) et Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE)
(13 avril 2012)

Objet: Sécurité des médicaments contenant du méthylphénidate commercialisés sur le marché de l'UE

Des études menées par Janssen-Cilag (Johnson & Johnson) ont apporté de nouvelles preuves des effets nocifs des médicaments contenant du méthylphénidate. Ces preuves ont été présentées en même temps qu'une demande d'autorisation du Concerta (dont le principe actif est le méthylphénidate) pour les adultes en Europe. La demande a été rejetée par les autorités européennes le 26 mai 2011 (rapport final sur l'évaluation de la variation, Concerta).

Elles ont estimé que le Concerta a un rapport bénéfices/risques négatif pour les adultes: «Un lien de causalité a été établi entre le Concerta et l'agressivité, les tics et la dépression»; «D'après les données de l'étude, la principale nouvelle inquiétude concernant la sécurité porte sur la fréquence des effets psychiatriques négatifs et sur le fait qu'ils sont souvent de novo [nouveau]»; «Il convient de noter l'incidence de l'anxiété, mais des cas de dépression et de comportement agressif et hostile sont aussi signalés»; «Nous estimons que le Concerta présente un important risque d'abus et de détournement de son usage».

1. À la lumière de ces nouvelles preuves et du fait que des effets identiques, voire plus graves, ont été observés chez des enfants après l'autorisation de la mise sur le marché, qu'entend faire la Commission pour la sécurité des enfants qui peuvent se voir administrer des médicaments de ce genre?

2. La Commission possède-t-elle des documents établissant que les autres conditions régissant l'autorisation de mise sur le marché conformément à la décision de la Commission (annexe IV) ont été remplies?

3. Dans l'affirmative, la Commission peut-elle transmettre ces documents au Parlement?

Réponse donnée par M. Dalli au nom de la Commission
(22 août 2012)

1. Les médicaments contenant du méthylphénidate sont autorisés par les États membres.

En vertu de l'article 31 de la directive 2001/83/CE (telle que modifiée), la Commission a, le 22 juin 2007, saisi le comité des médicaments à usage humain de l'Agence européenne des médicaments du dossier des médicaments contenant du méthylphénidate. L'évaluation des risques a porté essentiellement sur les problèmes susceptibles d'être liés à l'administration de médicaments contenant du méthylphénidate, à savoir les risques cardiovasculaires et cérébrovasculaires, les troubles mentaux, la cancérogénicité, les effets sur la croissance et les conséquences d'une administration à long terme. Le comité a recommandé le maintien des autorisations tout en préconisant la modification des informations sur les médicaments ainsi que des conditions d'autorisations de mise sur le marché. Le 27 mai 2009, la Commission a adopté une décision en ce sens.

2. Les États membres sont destinataires de la décision de la Commission et il leur incombe de garantir le respect de ses dispositions.

Lors de la réunion du Comité permanent du 13 septembre 2011, la Commission a demandé aux États membres des informations sur les modalités d'application de la décision de la Commission.

3. La Commission transmet séparément aux auteurs de la question les lettres de réponse de plusieurs États membres.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-003893/12
adresată Comisiei
Pavel Poc (S&D), Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D) şi Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE)
(13 aprilie 2012)

Subiect: Siguranța medicamentelor care conțin metilfenidat, introduse pe piața UE

În studiile realizate de către Janssen-Cilag (Johnson & Johnson) au apărut noi probe cu privire la efectele nocive ale medicamentelor care conțin metilfenidat. Aceste probe au fost prezentate împreună cu o cerere de aprobare a comprimatelor Concerta (care conțin metilfenidat, ca ingredient activ) pentru adulții din Europa. Cererea a fost refuzată de către autoritățile europene la 26 mai 2011 (Raportul final de evaluare a variației, Concerta).

S-a constatat că medicamentul Concerta are un raport beneficii/riscuri negativ pentru adulți: „A fost stabilită o relație de cauzalitate cu comprimatele Concerta în ceea ce privește agresivitatea, ticurile și depresia"; „Principala nouă preocupare privind siguranța din datele studiului se referă la frecvența efectelor negative de natură psihiatrică și la faptul că acestea sunt de multe ori *de novo* [noi]"; „De remarcat este incidența anxietății, însă și ratele crescute privind depresia, precum și comportamentul agresiv și ostil"; „Se estimează că există un risc semnificativ de abuz și diversiune în legătură cu comprimatele Concerta".

1. Având în vedere aceste probe noi, precum și faptul că aceleași efecte sau chiar mai grave au fost observate la copii în urma aprobării pentru comercializare, ce intenționează Comisia să facă pentru siguranța copiilor cărora le pot fi administrate medicamente de acest tip?

2. Se află Comisia în posesia unor documente care stabilesc că au fost îndeplinite celelalte condiții care guvernează autorizația de comercializare în conformitate cu decizia Comisiei (anexa IV)?

3. În caz afirmativ, poate transmite Comisia acele documente Parlamentului?

Răspuns dat de dl Dalli în numele Comisiei
(22 august 2012)

1. Medicamentele care conțin metilfenidat au fost autorizate de către statele membre.

La data de 22 iunie 2007, Comisia a solicitat sesizarea Comitetului pentru medicamente de uz uman din cadrul Agenției Europene pentru Medicamente, în temeiul articolului 31 din Directiva 2001/83/CE, astfel cum a fost modificată, pentru toate medicamentele care conțin metilfenidat. Evaluarea siguranței s-a axat în mod special pe preocupările potențial asociate tratamentelor cu metilfenidat, mai precis pe riscurile cardiovasculare, riscurile cerebrovasculare, afecțiunile psihiatrice, carcinogenitatea, efectul asupra creșterii și efectele tratamentului pe termen lung. Comitetul a recomandat menținerea autorizațiilor, însă cu condiția modificării informațiilor referitoare la produs și a condițiilor de acordare a autorizațiilor de introducere pe piață. La data de 27 mai 2009, Comisia a adoptat o decizie în conformitate cu aceste concluzii.

2. Decizia Comisiei se adresează statelor membre, iar responsabilitatea de a asigura respectarea deciziei respective revine statelor membre.

La comitetul permanent din 13 septembrie 2011, Comisia a solicitat statelor membre informații despre modul în care a fost pusă în aplicare decizia Comisiei.

3. Comisia transmite separat distinsului membru scrisorile primite din partea mai multor state membre.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003893/12
to the Commission
Pavel Poc (S&D), Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D) and Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE)
(13 April 2012)

Subject: Safety of methylphenidate containing medicinal products placed on the EU market

New evidence of the harmful effects of drugs containing methylphenidate has emerged in studies undertaken by Janssen-Cilag (Johnson & Johnson). This evidence was submitted together with an application to have Concerta (active ingredient methylphenidate) approved for adults in Europe. The application was turned down by the European authorities on 26 May 2011 (Final Variation Assessment Report, Concerta).

It was found that Concerta has a negative benefit/risk balance for adults: 'A causal relationship with Concerta was established for aggression, tics and depression'; 'The main new safety concern from the study data is around the frequency of psychiatric adverse effects and that this is often *de novo* [new]'; 'Of note is the incidence of anxiety but also rates of depression and aggressive and hostile behaviour are raised'; 'It is assessed there is a significant abuse and diversion risk with Concerta'.

1. In the light of this new evidence and the fact that the same effects, or worse, have been observed in children after approval for marketing, what does the Commission intend to do for the safety of children who may be administered drugs of this kind?

2. Is the Commission in possession of documents establishing that the other conditions governing marketing authorisation pursuant to the Commission decision (Annex IV) have been fulfilled?

3. If so, can the Commission forward those documents to Parliament?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(22 August 2012)

1. Methylphenidate-containing medicinal products have been authorised by Member States.

On 22 June 2007, the Commission requested a referral to the European Medicines Agency's Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use under Article 31 of Directive 2001/83/EC, as amended, for all methylphenidate containing products. The safety evaluation was mainly focusing on concerns potentially associated with methylphenidate treatment, namely cardiovascular risks, cerebrovascular risks, psychiatric disorders, carcinogenicity, effect on growth and effects of long-term treatment. The Committee recommended to maintain the authorisations, but to amend the product information and the conditions of the marketing authorisations. On 27 May 2009, the Commission adopted a decision in accordance with these conclusions.

2. The Commission decision is addressed to the Member States and it is their responsibility to ensure that the decision is complied with.

At the Standing Committee of 13 September 2011 the Commission asked Member States for information on how the Commission Decision has been implemented.

3. The Commission is transmitting separately to the Honourable Member the letters received from a number of Member States.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003904/12
to the Commission
Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE)
(16 April 2012)

Subject: IMF World Economic Outlook report 2012

According to research published by the IMF in its 2012 World Economic Outlook report, household debt restructuring programmes can help prevent recessions becoming deeper and more protracted.

Does the Commission agree with this assessment?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(15 June 2012)

In the context of the ongoing macroeconomic adjustment, the existence of excessive debt is indeed a drag on growth. The substantial deleveraging currently observed across different sectors reflects corrections of debt levels towards more sustainable positions on the internal as well as the external side of the economy. Indeed, dealing with these challenges are priorities in the overall strategy to respond to the crises including the surveillance in the European Semester where the Stability and Growth Pact and the Macroeconomic Imbalance Procedure are particularly pertinent in this context. The Commission therefore strongly agrees that household deleveraging is a key element to be considered, however not in isolation, but alongside efforts to stabilise the banking system and provide for sound fiscal positions. As the IMF's World Economic Outlook demonstrates, there are indeed a number of alternative macroeconomic policies to help households deal with their excessive debt. However, as this analysis also shows, not all efforts to restructure household debt were equally successful in the past. Relieving households of their excessive debt should be assessed case by case and it is by no means the right tool for all countries and in all circumstances. Also, the design of any debt relief programme would have to ensure that it is well targeted and does not generate moral hazard risks. Such actions should therefore be assessed in a broader context of the need to reduce the overall burden of debt and not just that of the households.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003912/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(16 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Moria di delfini

È allarme in Perù per una moria di delfini che, secondo le associazioni ambientaliste, è da attribuire all'uso di sistemi sonar in acque profonde nel settore dei trasporti marittimi. Nelle ultime settimane 615 delfini si sono arenati lungo un tratto di costa di 135 chilometri e dall'inizio dell'estate ben 3 000 esemplari sono stati trovati morti.

I ricercatori dell'Organizzazione per la conservazione di animali acquatici (Orca), hanno spiegato che le navi che utilizzano sonar in acque profonde disorientano i delfini perché danneggiano le ossa dell'apparato uditivo dei mammiferi. I segnali sonar, che creano vere e proprie raffiche di onde sonore, sono usati per la ricerca di petrolio. Orca calcola che quello registrato quest'anno è il più alto numero di delfini spiaggiati in tutto il mondo nell'ultimo decennio.

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

1. è a conoscenza del fenomeno della moria di delfini dovuto ai sistemi sonar?

2. può fornire dati su eventuali casi simili nelle acque dell'Unione Europea?

3. intende prendere misure intese ad evitare che si ripetano questi casi?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(14 giugno 2012)

La Commissione è consapevole della possibilità che si verifichino spiaggiamenti di cetacei, anche se essi non si limitano necessariamente ai delfini. È inoltre consapevole che, nonostante a volte questi episodi di spiaggiamento possano essere causati da sistemi sonar, esistono anche altre cause scatenanti tra cui condizioni meteorologiche, errori di navigazione, un capo branco malato, urti con attrezzi da pesca, ecc.

Benché in alcuni paesi europei siano state create reti di monitoraggio degli spiaggiamenti per controllare i livelli e le cause di questo fenomeno, la Commissione non possiede dati su episodi di spiaggiamento in acque dell'UE.

È risaputo che i sonar e altre forme di inquinamento acustico sottomarino possono influenzare il comportamento di alcuni cetacei. Per questa ragione, l'inquinamento acustico sottomarino costituisce uno dei descrittori della direttiva quadro sulla strategia per l'ambiente marino (2008/56/CE) ([1]), il cui obiettivo è il raggiungimento ed il mantenimento — entro il 2020 — del Buono Stato Ecologico (BSE) nelle acque marine dell'UE. Ciò significa che l'inquinamento acustico sottomarino dovrebbe mantenersi a un livello tale da non compromettere l'ambiente marino. La decisione 2010/477/UE della Commissione ([2]), che stabilisce i criteri del BSE, introduce un indicatore dei suoni intensi intermittenti. Per raggiungere l'obiettivo indicato nella direttiva, gli Stati membri devono prendere in considerazione tale indicatore nell'elaborazione delle strategie marine.

([1]) Direttiva 2008/56/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 17 giugno 2008, che istituisce un quadro per l'azione comunitaria nel campo della politica per l'ambiente marino, GU L 164 del 25.6.2008.

([2]) Decisione 2010/477/UE della Commissione, del 1° settembre 2010, sui criteri e gli standard metodologici relativi al buono stato ecologico delle acque marine, GU L 232 del 2.9.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003912/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(16 April 2012)

Subject: Dolphin deaths

There is great concern in Peru about a spate of dolphin deaths. According to environmental organisations, this is being caused by the use of sonar systems in deep waters in the maritime transport sector. Over the last few weeks 615 dolphins have become beached on a 135 km stretch of coastline and as many as 3000 have been found dead since the start of the summer.

Researchers from Organisation Cetacea (ORCA), a charity responsible for the protection of whales, dolphins and porpoises, explained that ships which use sonar in deep waters disorientate the dolphins because they damage the bones in their auditory systems. Sonar signals, which create actual bursts of sound waves, are used to search for oil. According to ORCA's calculations, this year's total is the highest number of beached dolphins recorded across the world in the last decade.

In view of this:

1. Is the Commission aware of the phenomenon of mass dolphin deaths caused by sonar systems?

2. Can it provide data on any similar cases in European Union waters?

3. Does it intend to adopt measures aimed at preventing this from happening again?

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

The Commission is aware of the possible occurrence of stranding of cetaceans — but not necessarily restricted to dolphins. It is argued that sometimes these stranding events might be caused by sonar systems but many aspects can play a role such as weather conditions, navigational mistake, sick lead animal, interactions with fishing gears etc.

The Commission does not have data for cases in EU waters although stranding networks have been established in a number of EU countries to monitor the levels and causes of stranding.

It is recognised that sonar and other forms of underwater noise can have an influence on the behaviour of certainly cetaceans. Underwater noise is therefore one of the descriptors of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (2008/56/EC) ([1]) which aims at reaching and maintaining Good Environmental Status (GES) in EU marine waters by 2020. This means that underwater noise should be at levels that do not adversely affect the marine environment. Commission Decision 2010/477/EU ([2]) laying down criteria for GES introduces an indicator for loud impulsive sounds. Member States have to take this indicator into account in their marine strategies to achieve the objective of the directive.

([1]) Directive 2008/56/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 June 2008 establishing a framework for community action in the field of marine environmental policy, OJ L 164, 25.6.2008.

([2]) Decision No 477/2010/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 May 2010 repealing Council Decision 79/542/EEC drawing up a list of third countries or parts of third countries, and laying down animal and public health and veterinary certification conditions, for importation into the Community of certain live animals and their fresh meat, OJ L 135, 2.6.2010.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003913/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(16 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Direttiva 2010/31/UE

La realizzazione di edifici ad energia quasi zero riveste oggi un'importanza primaria.

La crisi energetica degli inizi degli anni '70 ci ha fatto prendere coscienza in maniera piuttosto brusca che le fonti fossili (carbone, petrolio, gas naturale) si possono esaurire e che, non essendo l'Italia autosufficiente per quanto riguarda tali risorse, venivamo vincolati saldamente alle importazioni. Le conferenze di Rio de Janeiro (Agenda21) e di Kyoto hanno preso atto delle difficoltà in cui versa il nostro pianeta per quanto riguarda sia l'approvvigionamento energetico sia la salvaguardia dell'ambiente.

Il cammino verso l'efficienza energetica degli edifici ha avuto inizio diversi anni fa e da allora molte leggi, riforme, decreti e direttive, nel bene o nel male, hanno caratterizzato questo percorso, portandoci direttamente alla più recente direttiva europea sull'efficienza energetica ovvero la 2010/31/UE.

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

1. se, vista l'immediata data di scadenza del termine di recepimento, gli Stati membri hanno avviato le procedure per garantire il rispetto della data?

2. quali Stati hanno recepito la direttiva in esame e quali ancora no?

3. quali provvedimenti intende adottare l'UE per garantire che i principi della direttiva vengano adottati al più presto in tutta l'UE?

Risposta data da Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(25 maggio 2012)

Gli Stati membri hanno l'obbligo di recepire la direttiva 2010/31/UE sulla prestazione energetica nell'edilizia (rifusione) ([1]) entro il 9 luglio 2012. In base alle informazioni di cui dispone la Commissione, tutti gli Stati membri hanno avviato le procedure legislative necessarie al recepimento di tale direttiva.

([1]) GU L 153 del 18.6.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003913/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(16 April 2012)

Subject: Directive 2010/31/EU

The construction of almost-zero energy buildings has become of paramount importance today.

The energy crisis of the early 1970s gave us a rude awakening. We were forced to realise that fossil fuel sources (coal, oil, natural gas) could be exhausted and that, since Italy is not self-sufficient in terms of these resources, we would be highly dependent on importing them. The conferences in Rio de Janeiro (Agenda 21) and Kyoto highlighted the difficulties our planet faces in terms of both energy provision and environmental protection.

The road to energy efficiency in buildings began many years ago and, for better or for worse, the route has ever since been marked by various laws, reforms, decrees and directives, leading to the most recent European directive on energy efficiency, Directive 2010/31/EU.

In view of this:

1. Can the Commission indicate whether the Member States have initiated procedures to guarantee compliance with the impending deadline for transposition?

2. Which States have transposed the directive and which have yet to do so?

3. What measures does the EU intend to adopt to ensure that the directive's principles are adhered to across the whole EU as soon as possible?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(25 May 2012)

Member States must transpose Directive 2010/31/EU on the energy performance of buildings (recast) ([1]) by 9 July 2012. Based on the information available to the Commission, all Member States have initiated the necessary legislative procedures to transpose the directive.

([1]) OJ L 153, 18.6.2010.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003920/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(16 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Moneta digitale e transazioni con telefoni cellulari

Anonima e non tracciabile, la moneta digitale aspira a diventare la nuova frontiera delle transazioni su Internet, ma è anche la moneta ideale per fare pagamenti illegali, rigorosamente online. Sono queste le due sue anime: libertà nei pagamenti e zero inflazione, ma anche denaro virtuale per pagare armi e droga al riparo da ogni forma di controllo. L'idea su cui si basa la moneta elettronica creata nel 2009 è quella di creare e trasferire denaro usando la crittografia, invece che fare riferimento ad autorità centrali.

Essa permette di restare anonimi su tutti i pagamenti e essere slegati dai tradizionali processi economici come l'inflazione, le tasse, le commissioni, i vincoli delle banche. È un sistema di pagamento digitale privo di un ente centrale, non tracciabile e creato in una rete peer to peer. Ognuno può coniare bitcoin che vengono usate per compravendite online da coloro che hanno scaricato (anonimamente) il software open source in grado di gestire le transazioni. Entrare nel mondo del cash digitale non è un processo immediato, ma nemmeno difficile. Per cominciare a utilizzare la bitcoin occorre crearsi prima un portafoglio dove le bitcoins saranno conservate: si fa attraverso un client oppure attraverso un sito dedicato. La moneta virtuale, infatti, si può conservare sul proprio PC, rischiando di perdere tutto se il computer si rompe, oppure si può archiviare online.

Alla luce di quanto sopraesposto, può la Commissione far sapere se è in possesso di dati inerenti alle percentuali di utilizzo di moneta digitale nei vari Stati membri e se le transazioni in rete effettuate tramite telefono cellulare e smartphone hanno registrato ritmi di espansione nell'arco degli ultimi anni?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(15 giugno 2012)

La moneta elettronica (*e-money*) è uno strumento di pagamento equivalente ai contanti, digitale e prepagato, contenuto in un dispositivo elettronico (ad esempio, un telefono cellulare) o memorizzato a distanza su un server (ad esempio, tramite internet). La direttiva sulla moneta elettronica ([1]) disciplina la fornitura dei servizi connessi a tale strumento, nonché l'accesso al relativo mercato, e fissa norme prudenziali e a tutela dei consumatori.

Alcune delle cosiddette valute virtuali (ad esempio, il «bitcoin») non vengono emesse da un ente a livello centrale. Tali forme di valuta virtuale non rientrano nel campo di applicazione della direttiva sulla moneta elettronica né in quello della direttiva sui servizi di pagamento ([2]). Gli importi in circolazione di dette valute sono trascurabili e non dovrebbero rappresentare un rischio in termini monetari. Ad esempio, si stima che il valore totale di «bitcoin» attualmente in circolazione a livello mondiale ammonti a circa 35 milioni di euro. La Commissione non dispone di informazioni riguardo alla percentuale della popolazione che utilizza queste valute. Tuttavia, sulla base degli importi in circolazione, tale percentuale dovrebbe essere relativamente bassa.

I pagamenti mobili (*m-payment*) sono pagamenti nei quali i dati e l'ordine di pagamento sono emessi, trasmessi o confermati tramite un telefono o un dispositivo mobile. Possono essere utilizzati per gli acquisti, sia on-line sia tradizionali, di servizi, prodotti digitali o beni fisici. Rispetto al volume di tutte le operazioni di pagamento al dettaglio, i pagamenti mobili rappresentano ancora una percentuale esigua. Tuttavia, con la crescente penetrazione degli smart phone nel mercato, negli ultimi anni i pagamenti mobili sono aumentati e si prevede che triplicheranno fino al 2015 ([3]), anche se a partire da una base relativamente modesta. Nel gennaio 2012 la Commissione ha pubblicato un libro verde sui pagamenti tramite carte, internet e telefono mobile ([4]), al fine di migliorare l'integrazione del relativo mercato a livello europeo. La Commissione seguirà da vicino gli sviluppi del mercato dei pagamenti mobili in questo contesto.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:267:0007:0017:IT:PDF.
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:319:0001:0036:IT:PDF.
([3]) http://www.juniperresearch.com/viewpressrelease.php?pr=291.
([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0941:FIN:IT:PDF.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003920/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(16 April 2012)

Subject: Digital money and transactions using mobile phones

Anonymous and untraceable, digital money is aiming to become the new frontier of Internet transactions, but it is also ideally suited to making illegal, strictly online payments. Its two most important features are freedom of payments and zero inflation, but it is also virtual money that can be used to pay for weapons and drugs, shielded from any kind of control. Created in 2009, electronic money is based on the idea of creating and transferring money using cryptography, instead of referring to central authorities.

This makes it possible to remain anonymous in all payments and to be unaffected by traditional economic processes such as inflation, taxes, commission and banking constraints. It is a digital payment system with no central organisation, in which payments are untraceable and which is created over a peer-to-peer network. Anyone can create bitcoins, which are used for online transactions by those who have (anonymously) downloaded the open-source transaction management software. Entry to the world of digital cash is not instant, but nor is it difficult. To start using bitcoins, first you need to create a wallet in which to store the bitcoins. This is done using a client or through a dedicated website. The virtual money can be kept on your own PC, with the risk of losing everything if the computer breaks, or can be stored online.

In view of the above, can the Commission state whether it has data on the percentage of digital money users in the various Member States and whether online transactions made via mobile phones and smartphones have grown in recent years?

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

Electronic money (E-Money) is a pre-paid digital equivalent of cash, stored on an electronic device (e.g. a mobile phone) or remotely at a server (e.g. on the Internet). The E-Money Directive ([1]) regulates the provision of the relevant services, market access and sets prudential and consumer protection rules.

Certain forms of so-called virtual currencies (e.g. Bitcoin) which are not centrally issued by any organisation fall outside the scope of the E-Money Directive and the Payment Services Directive ([2]). The amounts of these currencies in circulation are relatively marginal and do not seem to pose a risk in monetary terms. For example, the total value of Bitcoins currently in circulation is estimated at around EUR 35 million at global level. The Commission does not have information on the percentage of the population using such currencies, but based on the amounts in circulation such figures would appear to be relatively low.

Mobile payments or M-Payments are payments for which the payment data and the payment instruction are initiated, transmitted or confirmed via a mobile phone or device. This can apply to online or offline purchases of services, and to digital or physical goods. As a volume percentage of all retail payment transactions, M-Payments are still marginal. However, with the growing market penetration of smart phones, M-Payment transactions have increased over the past few years and they are expected to triple until 2015 ([3]), albeit from a relatively low base. In January 2012, the Commission published a Green Paper on card, Internet and mobile payments ([4]), with the aim of achieving better market integration at European level. The Commission will closely follow the market developments of M-Payments in this context.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:267:0007:0017:EN:PDF
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:319:0001:0036:EN:PDF
([3]) http://www.juniperresearch.com/viewpressrelease.php?pr=291
([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0941:FIN:EN:PDF

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-003938/12
lill-Kummissjoni
David Casa (PPE)
(16 ta' April 2012)

Suġġett: Shubija fis-SEAE

Minħabba li s-Servizz Ewropew għall-Azzjoni Esterna (SEAE) huwa l-korp li jmexxi u jieħu ħsieb il-politika barranija kollha tal-UE, il-Kummissjoni għandha xi kummenti x'tagħmel fir-rigward tat-tħassib espress mill-Istati Membri li s-SEAE se tkun dominata kompletament minn pajjiżi akbar?

Tweġiba mogħtija mir-Rappreżentant Għoli/il-Viċi President Ashton f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(6 ta' Lulju 2012)

Il-Kummissjoni ma ġietx infurmata bit-tħassib imsemmi mill-Onorevoli Membru. F'kull eventwalità l-Artikolu 6 tad-Deċiżjoni tal-Kunsill 2010/427/UE tas-26 ta' Lulju 2010 li tistabbilixxi l-organizzazzjoni u l-funzjonament tas-Servizz Ewropew għall-Azzjoni Esterna (SEAE) (li ġiet adottata fuq proposta tar-Rappreżentant Għoli wara konsultazzjoni mal-Parlament Ewropew u wara li nkiseb il-kunsens tal-Kummissjoni) jistipula d-dispożizzjonijiet rilevanti għall-Persunal tas-SEAE inkluż il-fatt li:

— Is-SEAE għandu jinkludi uffiċjali u aġenti oħra tal-Unjoni Ewropea, inklużi membri tal-persunal mis-servizzi diplomatiċi tal-Istati Membri maħturin bħala aġenti temporanji.

— Il-persunal tas-SEAE għandu jwettaq dmirijietu u jimxi biss mal-interessi tal-Unjoni.

— Ir-reklutaġġ għas-SEAE għandu jissejjes fuq il-mertu filwaqt li jiżgura bilanċ xieraq ġeografiku u bejn is-sessi.

— Bil-kapaċità sħiħa, il-persunal tas-SEAE mis-servizzi diplomatiċi tal-Istati Membri għandu jirrappreżenta mill-anqas terz tal-persunal kollu tas-SEAE fil-livell AD. Bl-istess mod, l-uffiċjali permanenti tal-Unjoni għandhom jirrappreżentaw mill-anqas sittin fil-mija tal-persunal kollu tas-SEAE fil-livell AD.

Għal aktar tagħrif dwar il-qagħda attwali tar-reklutaġġ, ir-Rappreżentant Għoli ressqet rapport lill-Parlament Ewropew, lill-Kunsill u lill-Kummissjoni dwar l-ewwel sena tal-istabbilment tas-SEAE (Rapport mir-Rappreżentant Għoli lill-Parlament Ewropew, lill-Kunsill u lill-Kummissjoni tat-22 ta' Diċembru 2011 — PROC HR(2011) 018).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003938/12
to the Commission
David Casa (PPE)
(16 April 2012)

Subject: EEAS membership

Given that the European External Action Service (EEAS) is the body that directs and handles the EU's foreign policy as a whole, has the Commission any comments to make regarding the concerns expressed by Member States that the EEAS will be completely dominated by larger countries?

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

The Commission has not been informed of the concerns referred to by the Honourable Member. In any event Article 6 of Council Decision 2010/427/EU of 26 July 2010 establishing the organisation and functioning of the European External Action Service (EEAS) (which was adopted on a proposal from the High Representative after consulting the European Parliament and after obtaining the consent of the Commission) sets out the relevant provisions for the Staff of the EEAS including the fact that:

— The EEAS shall comprise officials and other servants of the European Union including personnel from the diplomatic services of the Member States appointed as temporary agents.

— The staff of the EEAS shall carry out its duties and conduct themselves solely with the interests of the Union in mind.

— Recruitment to the EEAS shall be based on merit whilst ensuring adequate geographical and gender balance.

— At full capacity, EEAS staff from Member States' diplomatic services should represent at least one third of all EEAS staff at AD level. Likewise permanent officials of the Union should represent at least 60 % of all EEAS staff at AD level

For more information on the state of play of recruitment, the High Representative has submitted a report to the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission on the first year of the establishment of the EEAS (Report by the High Representative to the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission of 22 December 2011 — PROC HR(2011) 018).

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003945/12
aan de Commissie
Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE)
(16 april 2012)

Betreft: Nederlandse doelstelling voor duurzame energie

Volgens het antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie d.d. 31 augustus 2011 ([1]), zal Nederland in het voortgangsverslag energie uit hernieuwbare bronnen, verslag uitbrengen over de wijze waarop Nederland zal voldoen aan zijn verplichting om uiterlijk in 2020 14 % van het energieverbruik uit hernieuwbare bronnen te halen.

1. Heeft de Commissie ondertussen kennis genomen van het Nederlandse voortgangsverslag ([2])?

Op pagina 14 van het voortgangsverslag staat dat het PBL (Planbureau voor de leefomgeving) een groei van het aandeel hernieuwbare energie voorziet van 4 % in 2009 tot circa 7-8 % in 2015/2016 en 12 % in 2020. Volgens de PBL-publicatie ([3]) (blz. 6) wordt overigens gesproken over 9 tot 12 % hernieuwbare energie in 2020, waarbij 12 % in 2020 alleen bereikt kan worden als alles meezit. In de PBL-publicatie wordt niet gerept over het verwachte aandeel hernieuwbare energie in 2015/2016.

2a. Volgens het voortgangsverslag kan Nederland niet aan het EU-doel van 14 % hernieuwbare energie in 2020 voldoen. Is de Commissie hiervan op de hoogte?

2b. Is de Commissie ervan verzekerd dat Nederland op koers ligt en dat het indicatieve streefcijfer van 7,6 %, dat in de Richtlijn 2009/28/EG is gesteld voor 2015-2016, gehaald wordt? Heeft Nederland bewijs overgelegd waaruit duidelijk wordt waarop de schatting van 7-8 % in 2015/2016 gebaseerd is, aangezien deze schatting geen onderdeel vormt van de genoemde PBL-publicatie?

In het voorgaande antwoord van de Commissie stond: „De Commissie zal de nodige maatregelen nemen en indien nodig inbreukprocedures inleiden indien de lidstaten niet aan de eisen van de richtlijn zouden voldoen."

3. Welke vervolgstappen zal de Commissie richting Nederland nemen nu blijkt dat Nederland niet kan voldoen aan zijn verplichting voor 2020?

Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie
(30 mei 2012)

De Commissie heeft opgemerkt dat in het Nederlandse voortgangsrapport is aangegeven dat het huidige beleid zal uitmonden in een aandeel van hernieuwbare energie van 12 % in 2020, wat 2 % lager ligt dan het streefcijfer, en dat de Nederlandse regering in 2014 zal e.a.ueren of eventueel aanvullende maatregelen moeten worden getroffen. In haar verslag bevestigt de Nederlandse regering dus haar vastbeslotenheid om maatregelen te nemen teneinde haar 2020-doelstelling te bereiken.

Het eerste tussentijdse trajectpunt waarnaar de Commissie zal kijken is dat van 2011/2012, wat voor Nederland een aandeel inhoudt van 4,72 % energie uit hernieuwbare bronnen. Overeenkomstig artikel 23 van de richtlijn hernieuwbare energie zal de Commissie eind 2012 verslag uitbrengen over de door de lidstaten geboekte vooruitgang op het gebied van het gebruik van energie uit hernieuwbare bronnen. Dit verslag zal betrekking hebben op de periode 2009-2010.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2011-007480&language=NL.
([2]) https://www.agentschapnl.nl/sites/default/files/bijlagen/Voortgangsrapportage%20energie%20uit%20.hernieuwbare%20bronnen%20in%20Nederland%202009-2010.pdf
([3]) http://www.pbl.nl/sites/default/files/cms/publicaties/PBL-notitie%20Doorrekening%20motie%20Halsema.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003945/12
to the Commission
Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE)
(16 April 2012)

Subject: Dutch target for sustainable energy

According to the answer from Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission of 31 August 2011 ([1]), in the progress report on energy from renewable sources the Netherlands will indicate on how it will meet its obligation to achieve 14 % of its energy consumption from renewable sources by 2020 at the latest.

1. Has the Commission taken note of the Dutch progress report ([2])?

On page 14 of the progress report it is stated that the Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (PBL) envisages an increase in the share of renewable energy from 4 % in 2009 to approximately 7-8 % in 2015/2016 and 12 % in 2020. Page 6 of the PBL publication ([3]) refers to 9-12 % renewable energy in 2020 although 12 % in 2020 can only be achieved if all goes well. The PBL publication makes no mention of the expected share of renewable energy in 2015/2016.

2a. According to the progress report, the Netherlands cannot meet the EU renewable energy target of 14 % in 2020. Is the Commission aware of this?

2b. Is the Commission confident that the Netherlands is on course and that the indicative target figure of 7.6 %, which is specified in Directive 2009/28/EC for 2015/2016, will be achieved? Has the Netherlands provided evidence to clarify the basis for the estimate of 7-8 % in 2015/2016, in view of the fact that this estimate is not included in the aforementioned PBL publication?

The previous answer from the Commission stated 'The European Commission will take appropriate action and, if necessary, open infringement procedures, should Member States not comply with the requirements of the directive.'

3. What further action will the Commission take with regard to the Netherlands now that it appears that the Netherlands is unable to meet its obligation for 2020?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2012)

The Commission has noted that the Dutch progress report indicates that current policies would lead to 12 % renewable energy in 2020, 2 % short of the target, and that in 2014 an evaluation will take place by the Dutch government for necessary additional measures. Thus, the Dutch government confirms in its report its commitment to introduce measures to meet its 2020 target.

The first interim trajectory point the Commission will be looking at is the one for 2011/2012, which for the Netherlands means a share of 4.72 % energy from renewable sources. As required by Article 23 of the Renewable Energy Directive, the Commission will report by the end of 2012 on the progress of Member States on the use of energy from renewable sources. This report will cover the period 2009-2010.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2011-007480&language=EN
([2]) https://www.agentschapnl.nl/sites/default/files/bijlagen/Voortgangsrapportage%20energie%20uit%20hernieuwbare%20bronnen%20in%20Nederland%202009-2010.pdf
([3]) http://www.pbl.nl/sites/default/files/cms/publicaties/PBL-notitie%20Doorrekening%20motie%20Halsema.pdf

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003965/12
a la Comisión
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(17 de abril de 2012)

Asunto: Efectos de la sequía en el sector agrícola de Galicia

La situación de sequía invernal que ha experimentado en los últimos meses la península ibérica ha motivado diversas reacciones tanto de la Comisión Europea como por parte de diversos gobiernos de Estados miembros y de instituciones gubernamentales de naturaleza subestatal.

Los efectos de la sequía han sido devastadores en el ámbito agrario. El sector agrícola, tan importante en naciones como Galicia, se ha visto gravemente afectado por esta situación. El impacto económico se traduce, para una explotación ganadera destinada al sector lácteo, en un gasto adicional de 18 000 euros al mes, según datos de organizaciones agrarias de Galicia. Así, las pérdidas globales se cifrarían, solo en el ámbito de los cereales y la ganadería, en unos 1 500 millones de euros en todo el Estado español. A esta cantidad habríamos de sumar las cuantiosas pérdidas económicas en sectores como el vitivinícola o el de cultivos de huerta, con más peso en otras partes del Estado español.

La Comisión Europea, en palabras de su Comisario de Agricultura y Desarrollo Rural, Dacian Cioloş, afirmó estar dispuesta a avanzar las ayudas a los países que lo pidieran de forma argumentada. Asimismo, el Estado español manifestó su intención de acogerse a esta intención para poder percibir las ayudas directas de la Política Agraria Común (PAC) en el mes de octubre.

— ¿Adelantará la Comisión el pago de parte de estas ayudas?

— ¿Cual será el importe total del adelanto de las ayudas?

— ¿Qué porcentaje representará este adelanto de las ayudas sobre la cuantía total que percibirán los agricultores del Estado español?

— ¿Qué otras medidas para compensar las graves pérdidas ocasionadas por la sequía tiene previsto implementar la Comisión?

Respuesta del Sr. Cioloş en nombre de la Comisión
(8 de junio de 2012)

Respecto a los pagos directos relacionados con la sequía que afectó a la Península Ibérica, la Comisión puede autorizar al Estado miembro afectado, previa solicitud y en función de la situación presupuestaria, a abonar anticipos, antes del 1 de diciembre de 2012, aunque no antes del 16 de octubre de 2012 y tampoco antes de la comprobación de las condiciones de subvencionabilidad, en las zonas en que la sequía haya provocado graves dificultades financieras. La Comisión puede autorizar el anticipo de hasta un 50 % de los pagos, o de hasta un 80 % de los mismos cuando ya se hayan previsto anticipos.

La Comisión está evaluando actualmente la solicitud de anticipos presentada por España.

El Reglamento de la organización común de mercados única prevé la posibilidad de que los Estados miembros incluyan los seguros de cosechas como medida subvencionable al amparo de sus programas operativos en el sector de las frutas y hortalizas o de su programa nacional de apoyo en el sector del vino.

Con arreglo a las normas en materia de competencia, los Estados miembros pueden conceder una ayuda *de minimis* de hasta 7 500 euros por productor primario a lo largo de un período de tres ejercicios contables. Este importe de ayuda limitado no se considera ayuda estatal. Los Estados miembros pueden también conceder una ayuda estatal de hasta el 80 % de los daños (o el 90 %, según la zona afectada), siempre que se considere compatible con el mercado interior tras su examen por la Comisión.

La política de desarrollo rural de la UE prevé que la medida «Reconstrucción del potencial de producción agraria dañado por catástrofes naturales» pueda utilizarse para hacer frente a la situación al efecto de reconstituir el potencial agrícola y forestal. Esta medida, que no sirve en ningún caso para conceder una ayuda temporal, no se contempla actualmente en el programa de desarrollo rural de Galicia. Las autoridades españolas, si lo creen oportuno, pueden presentar a la Comisión una modificación encaminada a introducir esta medida en el programa de desarrollo rural.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003965/12
to the Commission
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(17 April 2012)

Subject: Effects of drought on the Galician agricultural sector

The winter drought affecting the Iberian Peninsula in recent months has prompted various reactions from the Commission, from the governments of several Member States and from regional government institutions.

The drought has had a devastating effect on agriculture. The farming sector, which is so important in regions such as Galicia, has been badly hit by this situation. According to data provided by Galician agricultural organisations, the economic impact on dairy farms amounts to a further EUR 18 000 in costs per month. It is estimated that the overall losses throughout Spain for cereals and livestock farming alone could amount to some EUR 1.5 billion. To this amount we should add the substantial economic losses to sectors such as the wine industry and horticultural sector, which carry more weight in other regions of Spain.

The Commissioner for Agriculture and Rural Development, Dacian Cioloş, has said that the Commission is willing to advance aid to those countries which present reasoned requests. Spain has expressed its intention of taking up this offer, so that it can receive direct payments under the common agricultural policy in October 2012.

— Will the Commission advance payment of part of this aid?

— What will be the total amount of aid disbursed in advance?

— What percentage of the total amount of aid payable to farmers in Spain will be disbursed in advance?

— What other measures does the Commission intend to implement to offset the heavy losses caused by the drought?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(8 June 2012)

With regard to direct payments in reference to the drought affecting the Iberian Peninsula, the Commission may upon request authorise the Member State concerned and subject to the budgetary situation, to pay prior to 1 December 2012 but not before 16 October 2012 and not before the verification of the eligibility conditions, advances in regions where the drought has caused severe financial difficulties. The Commission may authorise the advances of up to 50 % of the payments or of up to 80 % of the payments where advances have already been provided for.

The Commission is presently evaluating the request for advances submitted by Spain.

The Single Common Market Organisation Regulation provides the possibility for Member States to include harvest insurance as an eligible measure under their fruit and vegetables operational programmes or their wine national support programme.

Under competition rules, Member States can grant a '*de minimis*' aid up to EUR 7 500 per primary producer over a period of three fiscal years. That limited amount of aid is not considered as a state aid. Member States can also grant a state aid up to 80 % (or 90 % according to the affected area) of the damage, provided it is considered compatible with the internal market after scrutiny by the Commission.

The EU Rural Development policy foresees the measure 'Restoring agricultural production potential damaged by natural disasters' that can be used to cope with the situation in order to restore the potential of agriculture and forestry. This measure, which is in any event not appropriate to grant a temporary aid, is currently not foreseen in the Rural Development programme (RDP) of Galicia. The Spanish authorities, if they consider it appropriate, may submit to the Commission an amendment to introduce this measure in the RDP.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003984/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(17 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Paga quanto butti

Combinare imposte e divieti su discariche e incenerimento dei rifiuti, responsabilizzare i produttori e applicare il sistema «paga quanto butti»: è questa la ricetta vincente per gestire meglio l'immondizia nell'UE. È quanto emerge da una relazione della Commissione europea, secondo cui ancora troppi paesi fanno ricorso alla discarica. «I rifiuti» — afferma il Commissario europeo all'ambiente, Janez Potocnik — «sono troppo preziosi per essere semplicemente buttati via: con una gestione oculata è possibile iniettarne nuovamente il valore nell'economia». In questo ambito, gli Stati membri più virtuosi hanno anche creato industrie fiorenti e numerosi posti di lavoro. Come ci sono riusciti? «Aumentando l'attrattiva economica della prevenzione, del riutilizzo e del riciclo.»

Alla luce di quanto sopra esposto, può dire la Commissione se vi sono Stati che siano in linea con quanto previsto dalla direttiva europea 2008/98/CE ([1]), la quale prevede che qualsiasi programma di gestione dei rifiuti in territorio europeo debba rispettare priorità ben precise, stabilite da una chiara gerarchia fra le diverse modalità di gestione dei rifiuti stessi: in primis la prevenzione, poi il riuso, quindi il riciclaggio, compreso il compostaggio, seguito dall'utilizzo degli inceneritori con il recupero di energia e, solo come ultima ratio, la messa in discarica dei rifiuti? Può dire, altresì, se siano previsti incentivi per gli Stati che attuano una buona gestione dei rifiuti fra le condizioni per l'ottenimento di determinati fondi europei?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(5 giugno 2012)

In materia di gestione dei rifiuti sussistono ancora lacune a livello di attuazione nell'Unione europea. Le statistiche pubblicate di recente da EUROSTAT ([2]) sulla gestione dei rifiuti urbani indicano che diversi Stati membri non rispettano alcuni obblighi fondamentali previsti dalla normativa dell'UE, tra cui la gerarchia dei rifiuti. Per rimediare a tali lacune, la Commissione sta elaborando una serie di disposizioni volte a garantire che i paesi interessati intensifichino il loro impegno per conformarsi pienamente agli obblighi della direttiva quadro sui rifiuti ([3]). Dette disposizioni contempleranno vari aspetti, dal controllo delle misure nazionali di attuazione e dei piani di gestione dei rifiuti, all'anticipazione di potenziali lacune di attuazione future, fino, se necessario, a eventuali procedimenti giudiziari. Saranno presi in considerazione strumenti economici, quali ad esempio i sistemi di «paga quando butti», che potrebbero essere applicati, laddove risulti appropriato, per ottenere risultati migliori nella gestione dei rifiuti.

Il 6 ottobre 2011 la Commissione ha adottato la sua proposta per la politica di coesione per il periodo 2014-2020 ([4]). Tale proposta introduce nel settore della gestione dei rifiuti una serie di condizionalità ex ante, relative all'adozione di piani per la gestione dei rifiuti che riprendano i principi della direttiva quadro, ivi compresi la gerarchia dei rifiuti e i programmi di prevenzione dei rifiuti, e all'obbligo per gli Stati membri di adottare le misure necessarie per conseguire l'obiettivo del 2020 su riutilizzo e riciclaggio, conformemente all'articolo 11 della stessa direttiva.

([1]) http://www.reteonu.it/dn/DirCE2000898.pdf
([2]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/eurostat/home
([3]) Direttiva 2008/98/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 19 novembre 2008, relativa ai rifiuti, GU L 312 del 22.11.2008.
([4]) COM(2011)615 definitivo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003984/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(17 April 2012)

Subject: Pay as you throw

Continuing landfilling and waste incineration taxes and bans with producer responsibility and the implementation of 'pay-as-you-throw' schemes is the successful formula for improving waste management in the EU. This is the conclusion of a European Commission report, according to which too many countries are still using landfill. In the words of European Commissioner for the Environment, Janez Potočnik, 'waste is too valuable to just throw away, and if you manage it right you can put that value back into the economy.' In this regard, the top performing Member States have also created thriving industries and many jobs. How have they achieved it? 'By making prevention, reuse and recycling more economically attractive.'

In view of the above, can the Commission say whether there are any Member States are complying comply with the provisions of Directive 2008/98/EC ([1]), which lays down that any waste management programme in Europe must abide by well-defined priorities, based on a clear hierarchy of the various waste management methods: first prevention, then reuse, then recycling (including composting), followed by incineration with energy recovery and, only as a last resort, landfill? Can it also say whether incentives for Member States that implement good waste management are contained in the conditions of eligibility for certain European funds?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2012)

As regards waste management, an implementation gap in waste legislation still persists in the EU. The statistics recently published by Eurostat ([2]) on municipal waste management show that several Member States do not comply with some fundamental requirements laid down in EU legislation, including the waste hierarchy. In order to address this implementation gap, the Commission is preparing a range of measures to ensure that those countries step up efforts to fully comply with the Waste Framework Directive's ([3]) WFD) requirements. These will range from the control of the national transposition measures and waste management plans, through anticipation of potential future implementation gaps, to legal action where necessary. Economic instruments like pay-as-you-throw schemes will be considered and their use may be suggested as means to achieve better waste management performance, where appropriate.

On 6 October 2011, the Commission adopted its proposal for the 2014-2020 cohesion policy ([4]). This introduces *ex-ante* conditionalities in the area of waste management. The conditionalities are related to the adoption of waste management plans reflecting the principles of the WFD, including the waste hierarchy and waste prevention programmes; and the requirement for Member States to take the necessary measures to achieve the 2020 target on re-use and recycling in accordance with Article 11 of the WFD.

([1]) http://www.reteonu.it/dn/DirCE2000898.pdf
([2]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/eurostat/home.
([3]) Directive 2008/98/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 November 2008 on waste, OJ L 312, 22.11.2008.
([4]) COM(2011) 615 final.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004005/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Niki Tzavela (EFD)
(18 Απριλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Στρατιωτική χούντα στο Μαλί

Η Οικονομική Κοινότητα Κρατών Δυτικής Αφρικής (CEDEAO) με απόφαση την οποία εξέδωσε σήμερα στο Ντακάρ (Σενεγάλη) επιβάλλει «καθολικές κυρώσεις» σε βάρος της στρατιωτικής χούντας, η οποία κατέλαβε προ 15θημέρου την εξουσία στο Μαλί, ανακοίνωσε σήμερα ο πρόεδρος του CEDEAO για το τρέχον χρονικό διάστημα Αλασάν Ουαταρά, πρόεδρος της Ακτής του Ελεφαντοστού.

«Όλες ανεξαιρέτως οι κυρώσεις (διπλωματικές, οικονομικές, πιστωτικές, μαζί με κάποιες άλλες), εφαρμόζονται ήδη από σήμερα. Οι κυρώσεις αυτές θα αρθούν μόνον στην περίπτωση, κατά την οποία θα διαπιστωθεί — με τρόπο αδιαμφισβήτητο — η επιστροφή της συνταγματικής τάξης στο Μαλί», επισήμανε ο πρόεδρος Ουαταρά. «Εμείς, ως προεδρία, προτείναμε αυτές οι κυρώσεις να είναι καθολικές», υπογράμμισε ο πρόεδρος Ουαταρά.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή ποια είναι η επίσημη θέση της για την κατάσταση που επικρατεί στην περιοχή.

Απάντηση της Ύπατης εκπροσώπου/Αντιπροέδρου Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(19 Ιουνίου 2012)

Η ΕΕ έχει πλήρη επίγνωση της τρέχουσας κατάστασης στο Μαλί και την παρακολουθεί με μεγάλη ανησυχία. Την επομένη του πραξικοπήματος, η ΥΕ/ΑΠ έκανε δήλωση καταδικάζοντας το πραξικόπημα και ζητώντας την επαναφορά της συνταγματικής τάξης και τη διοργάνωση δημοκρατικών εκλογών το συντομότερο δυνατό. Η θέση της ΕΕ είναι να παρέχει πλήρη στήριξη των προσπαθειών των περιφερειακών οργανώσεων –της ECOWAS και της Αφρικανικής Ένωσης– να βρουν μια κοινώς αποδεκτή λύση ώστε να αποκαταστηθούν τα δημοκρατικά εκλεγμένα όργανα. Προκειμένου να ασκηθεί πίεση στη στρατιωτική χούντα και, επιπλέον των κυρώσεων της ECOWAS, λήφθηκαν αμέσως προληπτικά μέτρα από την Επιτροπή σε σχέση με την αναπτυξιακή συνεργασία της ΕΕ. Η ΕΕ εξέφρασε την ικανοποίησή της για τη συμφωνία που επιτεύχθηκε στις 6 Απριλίου 2012 για την αποκατάσταση των νόμιμων θεσμικών οργάνων και ελπίζει πως θα διεξαχθούν εκλογές το συντομότερο δυνατό.

Στις 23 Απριλίου, τα συμπεράσματα του Συμβουλίου σχετικά με το Μαλί δήλωσαν ότι η ΕΕ παραμένει πρόθυμη να υποστηρίξει τη μετάβαση υπό πολιτική ηγεσία σε στενή συνεργασία με περιφερειακούς οργανισμούς και άλλους διεθνείς εταίρους.

Σε περίπτωση απόπειρας αποσταθεροποίησης της διαδικασίας μετάβασης, η ΕΕ θα αποφασίσει να λάβει σειρά μέτρων.

Σχετικά με την κατάσταση στο βόρειο του Μαλί, η ΕΕ εξακολουθεί να ευνοεί την επίλυση της διαμάχης δια της διαπραγματευτικής οδού μέσω μιας πολιτικής διαδικασίας.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004005/12
to the Commission
Niki Tzavela (EFD)
(18 April 2012)

Subject: Military junta in Mali

Through a resolution published today in Dakar (Senegal), the Economic Community Of West African States (Ecowas) has imposed 'comprehensive sanctions' against the military junta that seized power a fortnight ago in Mali. This was announced today by the current chairman of Ecowas, Côte d'Ivoire president Alassane Ouattara.

'All measures without exception (diplomatic, economic, financial and others) are applicable from today. They will only be lifted when it is ascertained — unequivocally — that constitutional order has been re-established,' President Ouattara pointed out. 'We, as the presidency, proposed that the sanctions be comprehensive,' he emphasised.

Will the Commission answer the following: what is its official position on the situation in the region in question?

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

The EU is well aware of the current situation in Mali and follows it with great concern. The day following the coup d'état, the HR/VP made a declaration condemning the coup and calling for the reestablishment of the constitutional order and the holding of democratic elections as soon as possible. The EU position is to support fully the efforts of regional organisations — Ecowas and the African Union — to find an agreed solution to restore democratically elected institutions. In order to put pressure on the military junta and in addition to Ecowas' sanctions, precautionary measures were rapidly taken by the Commission in relation to EU development cooperation. The EU has welcomed the agreement found on 6 April 2012 to restore legitimate institutions and hopes the elections will take place as soon as possible.

The 23 April Council conclusions on Mali stated that the EU stands ready to provide support to the civilian-led transition in Mali in close cooperation with regional organisations and other international partners.

In the case of any attempt to destabilise the transition process, the EU could decide on a range of responses.

Concerning the situation in the north of Mali, the EU continues to favour a negotiated solution through a political process.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004013/12
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(18 April 2012)

Subject: EULEX and Russian convoys to Kosovo

It has been reported that EULEX prevented several dozen Russian aid trucks from taking aid to ethnic Serbs in Kosovo ([1]). EULEX said that the convoy would be allowed to proceed only if escorted by Albanian forces, or if it crossed the border via an Albanian check-point. This was seen by the Russians as a means of trying to get them to recognise Albanian authority in Kosovo. Could the Commission comment on this incident? In particular, what measures does it intend to take to prevent similar confrontations?

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

In mid-December 2011 a Russian convoy consisting of 24 trucks carrying humanitarian goods destined for Serbs in Kosovo* arrived at Gate 1 in the north of Kosovo.

The EU Rule of Law Mission in Kosovo (EULEX Kosovo) and the Russian embassy in Serbia agreed beforehand that EULEX would provide escort assistance back and forth from the Gate 1 to the Serbian Red Cross warehouse in Zvecan.

However, the convoy was forced to wait at Gate 1 for three days as EULEX vehicles were repeatedly blocked by Kosovo Serbs at barricades north of the Ibar River. Eventually, an agreement was reached, allowing EULEX vehicles to travel to Gate 1 and thereafter to successfully escort the convoy to its destination.

* This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with the United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1244 and the International Court of Justice (ICJ) Opinion on the Kosovo Declaration of Independence

([1]) See Russia Today, 14 December 2011, 'Aid Delayed: EU Police block Russian convoy at "Kosovo border"'.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004035/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(18 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Emergenza amianto in Veneto

Gli ultimi dati forniti dalla IAES (International Academy of Environmental Sciences) in merito alla «questione amianto» in Veneto parlano di 6000 lavoratori ad esso esposti; negli ultimi 11 anni ben 7347 visite che hanno portato alla diagnosi di 33 tumori al polmone, 44 mesoteliomi, 55 casi di asbestosi e 680 di placche pleuriche connessi ad essa. La direttiva 2009/148/CE e la legislazione ad oggi in essere in Italia, compresa quella che ha costituito il «Fondo vittime amianto», tutelano i lavoratori colpiti da patologie insorte per aver lavorato e respirato questa fibra.

— È la Commissione a conoscenza della specifica situazione in Veneto? In quali altri Stati membri e in quali regioni si sta affrontando una simile emergenza?

— Non ritiene che, oltre alla salute dei lavoratori tutelata dalla direttiva, esista un concreto rischio anche per gli abitanti delle zone limitrofe ai siti industriali che trattavano e trattano la lavorazione dell'amianto?

— Come intende tutelare questi cittadini che loro malgrado si trovano ad abitare nei pressi delle zone a rischio, contaminate dall'amianto? Ritiene eventualmente opportuno creare un fondo ad hoc per le vittime dell'inquinamento ambientale?

— Può far sapere se sono previsti fondi europei a disposizione degli Stati membri al fine di sostenere sia la messa in sicurezza dei siti contaminati sia la tutela e la prevenzione della salute dei cittadini?

Risposta di Laszlo Andor a nome della Commissione
(13 giugno 2012)

La Commissione desidera ringraziare l'onorevole deputata per aver sottoposto alla sua attenzione questi dati poiché la Commissione non dispone di un sistema di raccolta sistematica di simili dati che consenta il raffronto con le situazioni analoghe che registratesi altrove.

La legislazione dell'UE sullo smaltimento dei rifiuti intende tutelare le persone che vivono vicino ai siti industriali. La direttiva 2008/98/CE ([1]), in particolare gli articoli 13, 17 e 18, definisce le misure da applicare ai rifiuti contenenti amianto. Tali disposizioni si applicano in combinato disposto con quelle della direttiva 1999/31/CE ([2]) e della decisione 2003/33/CE ([3]), in particolare la sezione 2.3.3 dell'allegato della stessa.

La Commissione ribadisce che compete pertanto alle autorità italiane far rispettare le disposizioni nazionali che recepiscono la direttiva 2009/148/CE ([4]), la quale deve essere applicata in modo corretto ed efficace. I lavoratori che in passato siano stati esposti all'amianto sul posto di lavoro e che abbiano contratto una malattia professionale riconosciutamente legata all'amianto, come il mesotelioma, possono aver titolo a un indennizzo in forza delle disposizioni nazionali.

Per quanto concerne i Fondi strutturali, l'articolo 5, paragrafo 2, del regolamento (CE) n. 1080/2006 ([5]) prevede il cofinanziamento di progetti volti a migliorare la prevenzione dei rischi e al recupero dell'ambiente fisico, compresi i siti contaminati e i siti industriali in abbandono.

Il programma Veneto 2007-13 consente il cofinanziamento di tali progetti nell'ambito dell'asse prioritario III (Ambiente e valorizzazione del territorio), a patto che si soddisfino determinate condizioni.

In linea con il principio di gestione condivisa usato per l'amministrazione dei Fondi strutturali la selezione e la realizzazione dei progetti competono però alle autorità nazionali. La Commissione suggerisce pertanto all'onorevole deputata di mettersi direttamente in contatto con l'autorità di gestione ([6]) del programma operativo regionale.

([1]) Direttiva 2008/98/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 19 novembre 2008, relativa ai rifiuti e che abroga alcune direttive, GU L 312 del 22.11.2008, pag. 3.

([2]) Direttiva 1999/31/CE del Consiglio, del 26 aprile 1999, relativa alle discariche di rifiuti, GU L 182 del 16.7.1999, pag. 1.

([3]) Decisione 2003/33/CE del Consiglio, del 19 dicembre 2002 che stabilisce criteri e procedure per l'ammissione dei rifiuti nelle discariche ai sensi dell'articolo 16 dell'allegato II della direttiva 1999/31/CE, GU L 11 del 16.1.2003, pag. 27.

([4]) Direttiva 2009/148/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 30 novembre 2009, sulla protezione dei lavoratori contro i rischi connessi con un'esposizione all'amianto durante il lavoro, GU L 330 del 16.12.2009, pag. 28.

([5]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1080/2006 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 5 luglio 2006, relativo al Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale e recante abrogazione del regolamento (CE) n. 1783/1999, GU L 210 del 31.7.2006, pag. 1.

([6]) Regione Veneto, Direzione Programmazione, Ing. Carlo Terrabujo, Managing Authority Director, Palazzo ex ULSS, Rio dei Tre Ponti — Dorsoduro, 3494/A, 30123 Venezia (VE), Tel. 041 2791469-1470-1472; Fax 041 2791477; E-mail: programmazione@regione.veneto.it

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004035/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(18 April 2012)

Subject: Asbestos emergency in Veneto

The most recent figures provided by the International Academy of Environmental Sciences concerning the 'asbestos issue' in Veneto speak of 6 000 workers exposed to this substance. In the last 11 years, there have been as many as 7 347 examinations resulting in the diagnosis of 33 cases of lung cancer, 44 of mesothelioma, 55 of asbestosis and 680 of asbestos-related pleural plaques. Directive 2009/148/EC and the legislation currently in force in Italy, including the law which established the 'Asbestos victims' fund', protect workers suffering from diseases caused by working with and breathing this fibre.

— Is the Commission aware of the specific situation in Veneto? In which other Member States and in which regions is a similar emergency being faced?

— Does it not consider that, in addition to the health of the workers protected by the directive, there is also a real risk for people living in the areas adjacent to industrial sites that have involved and currently involve the handling of asbestos?

— How does it propose to protect these citizens who, despite themselves, are living in the vicinity of the areas contaminated by asbestos? Would it not consider it appropriate to establish an ad hoc fund for the victims of environmental pollution?

— Can it say whether any EU funds are available to Member States to support both the cleaning up of contaminated sites and the protection and safeguarding of citizens' health?

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

The Commission would like to thank the Honourable Member for bringing this data to its attention as the Commission does not have in place the systematic collection of such data allowing for the comparison with similar situations elsewhere.

EU legislation on the disposal of waste is there to protect people living close to industrial sites. Directive 2008/98/EC ([1]), and in particular Articles 13, 17 and 18 thereof, lays down measures applicable to asbestos waste. They work in tandem with those in Directive 1999/31/EC ([2]) and Decision 2003/33/EC ([3]), and in particular Section 2.3.3 of the annex thereto.

The Commission would stress that it is therefore for the competent Italian authorities to enforce the national provisions transposing Directive 2009/148/EC ([4]), which must be correctly and effectively implemented. Workers who have been exposed to asbestos at the workplace in the past and who have contracted any recognised asbestos-related occupational disease, such as mesothelioma, may qualify for compensation under national provisions.

As to Structural Funds, Article 5(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1080/2006 ([5]) provides for the co-financing of projects to improve risk prevention and rehabilitate the physical environment, including contaminated and brownfield sites.

The 2007-13 Veneto Programme allows such projects to be co-financed under Priority Axis III (Environment and enhancement of the territory), provided specific conditions are met.

In line with the shared management principle used for the administration of Structural Funds, however, project selection and implementation is the responsibility of the national authorities. The Commission therefore suggests that the Honourable Member contact directly the Managing Authority ([6]) of the regional operational programme.

([1]) Directive 2008/98/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 November 2008 on waste and repealing certain Directives, OJ L 312, 22.11.2008, p. 3.

([2]) Council Directive 1999/31/EC of 26 April 1999 on the landfill of waste, OJ L 182, 16.7.1999, p. 1.

([3]) Council Decision 2003/33/EC of 19 December 2002 establishing criteria and procedures for the acceptance of waste at landfills pursuant to Article 16 of and Annex II to Directive 1999/31/EC, OJ L 11, 16.1.2003, p. 27.

([4]) Directive 2009/148/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the protection of workers from the risks related to exposure to asbestos at work, OJ L 330, 16.12.2009, p. 28.

([5]) Regulation (EC) No 1080/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 July 2006 on the European Regional Development Fund and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1783/1999, OJ L 210, 31.7.2006, p. 1.

([6]) Regione Veneto, Direzione Programmazione, Ing. Carlo Terrabujo, Managing Authority Director, Palazzo ex ULSS, Rio dei Tre Ponti — orsoduro, 3494/A, 30123 Venezia (VE), Tel. 041 2791469 — 1470 — 1472, Fax 041 2791477, E-mail: programmazione@regione.veneto.it.

(Slovenska različica)

Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-004040/12
za Komisijo
Mojca Kleva (S&D)
(18. april 2012)

Zadeva: Nova Googlova politika zasebnosti

Tako evropski nadzornik za varstvo podatkov kot tudi *Commission Nationale de l'Informatique et des Libertés (CNIL, francoski organ za varstvo podatkov) sta na podlagi svojih raziskav ugotovila, da nova Googlova politika zasebnosti neposredno krši Direktivo 95/46/ES Evropskega parlamenta in Sveta o varstvu posameznikov pri obdelavi osebnih podatkov in o prostem pretoku takih podatkov*, zlasti v zvezi s podatki, ki so posredovani osebam, na katere se nanašajo.

Francoski organ za varstvo podatkov je ugotovil, da povprečni uporabnik, ki se seznani s to novo politiko, ne more razbrati, kateri nameni, pridobljeni podatki, prejemniki ali pravice dostopa so povezani z njegovo trenutno uporabo Googlovih orodij ali storitev. Ugotovil je tudi, da celo usposobljeni strokovnjaki izjemno težko natančno razumejo, kateri podatki so skupni katerim storitvam za katere namene. Ker Google za večino svojih storitev, vključno z Googlovim iskalnikom in storitvijo elektronske pošte Gmail, uporablja enotno politiko zasebnosti, ta povzroča velike dvome in strahove. Ob upoštevanju zgoraj povedanega:

1. Ali Komisija meni, da je Googlova politika skladna z zakonodajo EU o varstvu podatkov ali s sodno prakso Sodišča Evropske unije na področju zasebnosti in, če ne, kakšne ukrepe ima na voljo Komisija, da zagotovi skladnost z zakonodajo EU?

2. Kakšne ukrepe je Komisija že sprejela v zvezi z ugotovitvami evropskega nadzornika za varstvo podatkov in francoskega organa za varstvo podatkov, da je Googlova politika zasebnosti v nasprotju z evropsko zakonodajo, in kaj namerava v zvezi s tem storiti v prihodnosti?

Odgovor komisarke Viviane Reding v imenu Komisije
(11. junij 2012)

Evropska komisija in organi držav članic Evropske unije za varstvo podatkov so zaskrbljeni zaradi ukrepov, ki jih je 1. marca 2012 sprejel Google.

Brez poseganja v pooblastila Evropske komisije kot varuhinje pogodb so za izvajanje zakonodaje s področja varstva podatkov odgovorni pristojni organi držav članic, zlasti neodvisni nadzorni organi za varstvo podatkov.

Evropska komisija pozorno spremlja preiskave, ki jih trenutno izvajajo organi za varstvo podatkov v zvezi z Googlovo novo politiko zasebnosti, zlasti preiskavo francoske komisije za informatiko in svoboščine (Commission nationale de l'informatique et des libertés: CNIL) ter razprave o tem vprašanju v okviru skupine iz člena 29.

Evropska komisija meni, da je ta preiskava potrebna in koristna, da se ugotovi, ali Google obdeluje podatke skladno z veljavnimi pravili in pri tem spoštuje pravico posameznikov, da se njihovi podatki obdelujejo na zakonit, korekten in pregleden način.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004040/12
to the Commission
Mojca Kleva (S&D)
(18 April 2012)

Subject: The new Google privacy policy

Both the European Data Protection Supervisor and the Commission Nationale de l'Informatique et des Libertés (CNIL, the French data protection authority) have reached the conclusion, on the basis of their investigations, that Google's new privacy policy directly violates Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, especially as regards the information provided to 'data subjects'.

The CNIL concluded that it is impossible for the average user who reads the new policy to distinguish which purposes, collected data, recipients or access rights are currently relevant to his or her use of particular Google tools or services. The CNIL also found that, even for trained professionals, it is extremely difficult to know exactly which data is combined between which services for which purposes. Since Google applies a single privacy policy across most of its services, including the Google search engine and the Gmail email service, the policy is raising significant doubts and fears. In view of the foregoing,

1. Does the Commission consider that Google's policy is compatible with EU data protection law or with the jurisprudence developed by the European Court of Justice with regard to privacy, and, if not, what measures are available to the Commission to enforce compliance with EC law?

2. What action has the Commission taken so far with regard to the findings of the European Data Protection Supervisor and the CNIL that Google's privacy policy is in violation of European law, and what does the Commission intend to do about this situation in the future?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Reding au nom de la Commission
(11 juin 2012)

Les mesures mises en place par Google le 1^er^ mars 2012 font l'objet d'une très grande attention de la part de la Commission européenne et des autorités de protection des données des États membres de l'Union européenne.

Sans préjudice des pouvoirs de la Commission Européenne en tant que gardienne des traités, la mise en œuvre de la législation de protection des données relève des autorités compétentes, en particulier les autorités indépendantes de contrôle de la protection des données.

La Commission Européenne suit avec attention les enquêtes, actuellement en cours, des autorités de protection des données concernant la nouvelle politique vie privée de Google, et en particulier l'enquête de la CNIL et les discussions sur ce sujet au sein du groupe de l'article 29.

La Commission Européenne considère que cette enquête est nécessaire et bienvenue, afin de vérifier que les traitements de données effectués par Google soient conformes aux règles en vigueur et respectent notamment le droit des individus à ce que leurs données soient traitées de manière licite, loyale et transparente.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004045/12
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(19 de abril de 2012)

Asunto: 400 millones de niños y niñas en situación de esclavitud. Criterio de trazabilidad de los productos y regulación de la actividad de las multinacionales europeas en terceros países

Tal y como han denunciado recientemente varias ONG y organismos internacionales de defensa de la infancia como U*nicef, actualmente 400 millones de niños y niñas sufren una situación de esclavitud en el mundo*.

Asimismo, numerosas investigaciones concluyen que muchos de estos niños y niñas trabajan en países empobrecidos en la fabricación de productos comercializados en la *UE por empresas multinacionales de capital europeo*. *Así, un responsable de estas asociaciones ha alertado de* «que puede que los plátanos que comemos, el café que bebemos, estén empapados del sudor de muchos niños y niñas esclavos».

La laxitud de la regulación del comercio internacional, la escasa vinculación y posibilidad de monitorización de los Acuerdos de Asociación de la Unión Europea con terceros países en lo relativo a la garantía del cumplimiento de los derechos humanos, así como la inexistencia de una regulación social y laboral de la actividad de las empresas multinacionales de capital europeo en estos países, son las principales causas de esta dramática situación.

Desde hace mucho tiempo numerosas asociaciones y partidos políticos reclaman que la Unión Europea incluya en todos sus acuerdos comerciales criterios de trazabilidad e identificación de los productos que se comercian en la UE, lo que permitiría reconstruir el historial del producto, identificar cómo y en qué condiciones han sido elaborados y restringir la entrada en el mercado europeo de los que no cumplan unos criterios laborales mínimos y supongan el incumplimiento de los derechos humanos.

De esta manera, además de evitar dramas como la esclavitud infantil o la explotación de personas, se evitaría el dumping que sufren los productos europeos al tener que competir *mediante el precio con productos provenientes de terceros países donde no se respetan unas condiciones laborales justas para los trabajadores ni se tienen en cuenta criterios fitosanitarios adecuados para asegurar la calidad del producto y su inocuidad para la salud.*

— ¿Piensa la Comisión regular la trazabilidad de los productos fabricados en terceros países para poder identificar incumplimientos de los derechos humanos en la fabricación de productos y evitar su comercialización dentro de la Unión Europea?

— ¿No considera necesario la Comisión regular la actividad de las multinacionales con capital europeo en países terceros exigiendo el cumplimiento de criterios sociales, laborales y medioambientales comparables con los europeos?

Respuesta del Sr. De Gucht en nombre de la Comisión
(19 de junio de 2012)

Además de la información facilitada en su respuesta a la pregunta escrita E-002983/2012 ([1]), la Comisión desea subrayar que toda propuesta de regulación de la trazabilidad de los productos fabricados en terceros países a fin de poder identificar violaciones de los derechos humanos debería examinarse atentamente con respecto a su viabilidad (teniendo en cuenta las obligaciones que emanan de la Organización Mundial del Comercio), su efectividad y su proporcionalidad. Por ejemplo, cabe señalar que solo una parte de los productos fabricados con mano de obra infantil entra en la UE.

Las empresas que operan en terceros países tienen la obligación de respetar los requisitos legales existentes. La Comisión sigue atentamente el trabajo de los organismos internacionales pertinentes que promueven y elaboran códigos de conducta empresarial responsable, y colabora con ellos. Asimismo, anima encarecidamente a las empresas de la UE a cumplir las orientaciones y los principios reconocidos internacionalmente, como las Directrices de la OCDE para las Empresas Multinacionales, recientemente actualizadas, y los Principios Rectores de las Naciones Unidas sobre Empresas y Derechos Humanos.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004045/12
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(19 April 2012)

Subject: Four hundred million children living in slavery. Product traceability criteria and regulating the activities of European multinationals in third countries

As recently reported by several NGOs and international children's organisations, such as Unicef, there are currently 400 million children living in slavery worldwide.

Furthermore, numerous studies conclude that many of these children are working in poor countries in the manufacture of products sold in the EU by multinationals funded by European capital. A representative of these associations has warned that the bananas we eat and the coffee we drink may be soaked in the sweat of many enslaved children.

The main causes of this tragic situation are lax regulation of international trade, poor links and limited ability to monitor EU Association Agreements with third countries in terms of ensuring compliance with human rights, and the lack of any social and labour regulations governing the activities in these countries of multinationals funded by European capital.

For a long time, numerous associations and political parties have been calling on the European Union to include in all its trade agreements criteria for the traceability and identification of goods sold in the EU, which would make it possible to trace the history of products, identify how and under what conditions they were made and restrict entry into the European market of any products that fail to meet minimum labour standards and which infringe human rights.

A*s well as* preventing tragedies such as child slavery and human exploitation, this would prevent the dumping of European products, which have to compete on price with products from third countries where there is no respect for fair working conditions and where appropriate phytosanitary standards to ensure product quality and safety for human health are disregarded.

— Does the Commission intend to regulate the traceability of products manufactured in third countries, in order to identify human rights abuses in the manufacture of products and to prevent the sale of such products within the EU?

— Does the Commission not see a need to regulate the activities of multinationals based on European capital in third countries, by demanding compliance with social, environmental and labour standards comparable to those in Europe?

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

In addition to information provided in its reply to Written Question E-002983/2012 ([1]), the Commission highlights that any proposal to regulate the traceability of products manufactured in third countries for purposes of identifying human rights abuses would need to be carefully assessed with regard to its feasibility (including with regard to World Trade Organisation obligations), effectiveness, and proportionality. For example, it should be noted that only a fraction of goods produced by child labour enters the EU.

Enterprises operating in third countries are obliged to respect existing legal requirements.. The Commission closely follows the work of, and cooperates with, relevant international bodies that promote or provide codes of responsible business conduct. It actively encourages EU companies to adhere to internationally recognised guidelines and principles like the recently updated OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises and the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004071/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(19 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Sequestro di scarpe contraffatte

La Guardia di Finanza di Napoli sta eseguendo ventinove misure cautelari, emesse dal Tribunale di Napoli, nei confronti di un'organizzazione criminale dedita alla fabbricazione e alla commercializzazione di scarpe contraffatte di un noto marchio. Le indagini delle Fiamme Gialle hanno consentito di sequestrare diciassette opifici e depositi, 160 macchinari, ventuno cliché riproducenti il marchio e oltre 600mila scarpe finite o in fase di lavorazione. Le scarpe, prodotte nell'hinterland partenopeo, erano cedute ad ambulanti operanti in mercati dell'Italia settentrionale e in Puglia o attraverso la vendita on-line.

Considerando che il fenomeno in questione arreca gravi danni al tessuto produttivo italiano e comunitario, aggravati dall'attuale congiuntura economica negativa, e prendendo atto che la quota di beni sequestrati rappresenta una percentuale ridotta rispetto al quantitativo illegalmente importato in territorio comunitario, si interroga la Commissione per sapere:

1. se è a conoscenza del blitz della Guardia di Finanza di Napoli;

2. quali sono le politiche messe in atto nell'ultimo anno dall'UE al fine di contrastare il fenomeno della contraffazione delle merci e pirateria, per tutelare la sicurezza e la salute pubblica ma anche i posti di lavoro nelle imprese che operano a norma di legge;

3. se si sono avuti riscontri positivi dalle indagini dell'Ufficio europeo per la lotta antifrode (OLAF).

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(21 giugno 2012)

1. e 2. La Commissione segue da vicino gli sviluppi della lotta contro la contraffazione negli Stati membri. A livello dell'UE la direttiva 2004/48/CE sul rispetto dei diritti di proprietà intellettuale (DPI) ha già contribuito a contrastare il fenomeno imponendo agli Stati membri alcuni obblighi grazie ai quali gli aventi diritto possono far valere i propri diritti in caso di infrazione. La Commissione sta attualmente riesaminando il testo della direttiva per determinare se occorra prevederne la revisione nel corso del prossimo anno. Il nuovo regolamento sul controllo, da parte delle autorità doganali, del rispetto dei DPI dovrebbe essere adottato quest'anno. Inoltre, per rafforzare la collaborazione fra autorità, la Commissione europea ha istituito nel 2009 l'Osservatorio europeo delle infrazioni ai DPI che costituisce una piattaforma per agevolare l'azione comune, lo scambio di esperienze e di informazioni nonché la diffusione delle migliori pratiche in materia di controllo. Il suo ruolo è stato recentemente ampliato e la sua gestione affidata all'Ufficio per l'armonizzazione nel mercato interno ([1]). Infine, la Commissione ha avviato nel 2011 uno studio finalizzato alla messa a punto di una metodologia capace di valutare efficacemente ed obiettivamente il quantitativo di prodotti contraffatti nell'UE e le relative tendenze. La Commissione, di concerto con gli Stati membri, è attivamente impegnata nel controllo dell'applicazione dei DPI alle frontiere tramite l'attuazione del piano d'azione adottato dal Consiglio ([2]).

3. A partire dal febbraio 2012 l'Ufficio europeo per la lotta antifrode si occupa anche dell'investigazione in materia di frodi connesse ai DPI alle frontiere esterne dell'Unione europea ([3]). Tuttavia, il mandato dell'OLAF non riguarda la produzione ed i movimenti infraeuropei di merci contraffatte cui si riferisce l'onorevole parlamentare nella sua interrogazione.

([1]) Regolamento (UE) n. 386/2012, GU L 129 del 19.4.2012, pag. 1.
([2]) Risoluzione 2009/C71/01.
([3]) In base al disposto del regolamento (CE) n. 515/97 del Consiglio e alle norme della mutua assistenza in materia doganale convenute in concerto con i paesi terzi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004071/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(19 April 2012)

Subject: Seizure of counterfeit shoes

The Naples tax police are enforcing 29 preliminary injunctions, ordered by the Court of Naples, against a criminal organisation solely focused on counterfeiting the shoes of a well-known brand and selling them. The tax police's investigations have led to the seizure of 17 factories and warehouses, 160 machines, 21 trademark printing plates and over 600 000 finished or semi-finished shoes. The shoes were produced in the suburbs of Naples and passed on to street traders operating in the markets of northern Italy and Apulia, or sold online.

Considering that the phenomenon in question causes serious harm to the productive fabric of Italy and the EU, which is made worse by the current adverse economic situation, and considering that the volume of goods seized is a small percentage of the amount illegally imported into the EU:

1. Is the Commission aware of the blitz by the Naples tax police?

2. What policies has the EU implemented in the last year to tackle counterfeit goods and piracy, in the interests of health and safety, as well as the jobs of those who work for legitimate manufacturers?

3. Have the investigations by the European Anti-Fraud Office yielded positive findings?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission
(21 juin 2012)

1. et 2. La Commission suit les développements intervenus dans la lutte contre la contrefaçon au niveau des États membres. À l'échelle de l'UE la directive 2004/48/CE sur le respect des droits de propriété intellectuelle (DPI) a déjà contribué à cet objectif en imposant aux États membres certaines exigences permettant aux ayants droits de faire valoir leurs droits en cas d'infraction. La Commission procède actuellement à un réexamen de ce texte, afin de déterminer s'il y a lieu d'envisager sa révision. au cours de l'année prochaine. Le nouveau règlement sur le contrôle par les autorités douanières du respect des DPI devrait être adopté cette année. En outre, pour renforcer la coopération entre autorités, la Commission européenne a créé en 2009 l'Observatoire européen des infractions aux DPI, qui offre une plateforme facilitant l'action commune, l'échange d'expérience et d'information et la diffusion des meilleures pratiques en matière de contrôle. Son rôle a récemment été étendu et sa gestion confiée à l'Office de l'harmonisation dans le marché intérieur ([1]). Enfin, la Commission a lancé en 2011 une étude visant à développer une méthodologie visant à estimer plus efficacement et objectivement la quantité de produits de contrefaçon dans l'UE et les tendances à l'œuvre. La Commission et les États membres s'attachent par ailleurs à faire respecter les DPI aux frontières en mettant en œuvre le plan d'action adopté par le Conseil ([2]).

3. En février 2012, l'Office européen de lutte antifraude a vu son champ d'action s'élargir aux fraudes liées aux DPI aux frontières extérieures de l'Union ([3]). La production et la circulation dans l'Union des marchandises de contrefaçon visées dans la question n'entrent toutefois pas dans son mandat.

([1]) Règlement 386/2012, JO L 129 du 19.4.2012, p. 1.
([2]) Résolution 2009/C71/01.
([3]) Sur la base des dispositions du règlement (CE) n° 515/97 du Conseil et des accords d'assistance mutuelle administrative en matière douanière conclus avec des pays tiers.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004076/12
adresată Comisiei
Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE)
(19 aprilie 2012)

Subiect: Achiziții publice ecologice

Conform „Foii de parcurs către o Europă eficientă din punct de vedere energetic", COM(2011)0571, pentru a promova în continuare producția și consumul sustenabile, Comisia: „va consolida cerințele privind achizițiile publice ecologice (APE) în cazul produselor cu un impact semnificativ asupra mediului; va evalua cazurile în care APE ar putea fi legat de proiecte finanțate de UE; și va promova achizițiile publice comune și rețelele de responsabilii cu achizițiile publice în sprijinul APE (în 2012); va stabili o abordare metodologică comună pentru a permite statelor membre și sectorului privat să evalueze, să afișeze și să examineze comparativ performanța de mediu a produselor, serviciilor și societăților, pe baza unei evaluări complete a impactului asupra mediului pe toată durata ciclului de viață («amprenta ecologică») (în 2012) […]".

Comisia are în vedere pentru perioada următoare de programare o corelare a achizițiilor publice ecologice cu proiectele finanțate de UE?

Răspuns dat de dl Potočnik în numele Comisiei
(5 iunie 2012)

Autoritățile publice care pun în aplicare proiecte finanțate de UE vor fi încurajate să utilizeze criteriile facultative ale UE pentru achizițiile publice ecologice (APE) în momentul achiziționării de bunuri, de lucrări și de servicii pentru care există astfel de criterii. Nu va exista nicio obligație de a aplica criteriile APE în următoarea perioadă de programare.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004076/12
to the Commission
Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE)
(19 April 2012)

Subject: Green Public Procurement

The Roadmap to a Resource Efficient Europe (COM(2011) 0571) states that, in order to promote further sustainable consumption and production, the Commission will: 'strengthen the requirements on Green Public Procurement (GPP) for products with significant environmental impacts; assess where GPP could be linked to EU funded projects; and promote joint procurement, and networks of public procurement officers in support of GPP (in 2012); establish a common methodological approach to enable Member States and the private sector to assess, display and benchmark the environmental performance of products, services and companies based on a comprehensive assessment of environmental impacts over the life-cycle ("environmental footprint") (in 2012); […]'.

Does the Commission intend to ensure correlation between Green Public Procurement and EU-funded projects over the next programming period?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2012)

Public authorities that implement EU-funded projects will be encouraged to use the voluntary EU GPP criteria when purchasing supplies, works and services for which such criteria exist. There will be no obligation for the application of GPP criteria in the next programming period.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-004082/12
alla Commissione
Francesco Enrico Speroni (EFD)
(19 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Applicabilità da parte dell'Italia di un'imposta su aeromobili immatricolati nell'Unione

L'articolo 14 bis del decreto legge 6 dicembre 2011, n. 201, convertito con legge 22 dicembre 2011, n.214, istituisce l'obbligo di pagamento dell'imposta di cui all'articolo 11 del medesimo decreto legge per taluni aeromobili non immatricolati nel registro aeronautico italiano la cui sosta nel territorio italiano si protrae oltre quarantotto ore.

L'applicazione di tale imposta agli aeromobili immatricolati in uno Stato membro è conforme alla normativa dell'Unione?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-004145/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(20 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Compatibilità dell'imposta italiana sugli aeromobili

L'articolo 14 bis del decreto legge 6 dicembre 2011, n. 201, convertito con legge 22 dicembre 2011, n.214, istituisce l'obbligo di pagamento dell'imposta di cui all'articolo 11 del medesimo decreto legge per taluni aeromobili non immatricolati nel registro aeronautico italiano la cui sosta nel territorio italiano si protrae oltre quarantotto ore. Tale imposta colpisce anche agli aeromobili immatricolati in uno Stato membro, indipendentemente dal motivo della sosta, comprendendo quindi, fra l'altro, quelle dovute a manutenzione, e mettendo quindi le imprese di manutenzione aeronautica poste sul territorio italiano in posizione di svantaggio, dovendo il committente sostenere il costo addizionale dell'imposta.

Anche alla luce delle norme sulla libera circolazione di beni e servizi, si ritiene tale imposta conforme alla normativa dell'Unione?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-004743/12
alla Commissione
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(9 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Imposta sugli aeromobili in Italia

Nella risposta all'interrogazione E-001176/2012 riguardante l'introduzione in Italia di un'imposta sugli aeromobili stranieri, la Commissione aveva affermato di avere iniziato un'indagine al riguardo.

Può la Commissione far sapere quali sono gli sviluppi della situazione e quali i tempi previsti per la conclusione dell'indagine?

Risposta congiunta data da Algirdas Šemeta a nome della Commissione
(22 maggio 2012)

La Commissione europea è a conoscenza della questione sollevata nell'interrogazione scritta dell'onorevole parlamentare riguardante la parità di trattamento degli operatori di aeromobili non italiani nell'ambito del decreto «Salva Italia». Essa informa l'onorevole parlamentare di aver avviato un'indagine in merito, che copre i diversi aspetti citati dal medesimo.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004082/12
to the Commission
Francesco Enrico Speroni (EFD)
(19 April 2012)

Subject: Applicability on the part of Italy of a tax on aircraft registered in the EU

Article 14a of Decree Law No 201 of 6 December 2011, converted by Law No 214 of 22 December 2011, establishes the obligation to pay a tax, referred to in Article 11 of the same Decree Law, for certain aircraft not registered in the Italian Aeronautical Registry which remain on Italian soil for more than 48 hours.

Does the application of this tax on aircraft registered in a Member State conform to EU legislation?

Question for written answer P-004145/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(20 April 2012)

Subject: Compatibility of Italian aircraft tax

Article 14(a) of Decree Law No 201 of 6 December 2011, brought into law through Law No 214 of 22 December 2011, makes payment of the tax referred to in Article 11 of the Decree Law mandatory for any aircraft not registered in the Italian Aviation Register which stops on Italian soil for longer than 48 hours. This tax also affects aircraft registered in a Member State, regardless of the reason for their stopover, which may therefore include maintenance. This puts aircraft maintenance companies in Italy at a disadvantage since their customers are then subject to the additional cost of this tax.

Does this tax comply with EU legislation, also bearing in mind the rules on free movement of goods and services?

Question for written answer P-004743/12
to the Commission
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(9 May 2012)

Subject: Tax on aircraft in Italy

In reply to Question E-001176/2012 concerning the introduction in Italy of a tax on foreign aircraft, the Commission confirmed that it had started an investigation in this respect.

Can the Commission state what progress has been made and how long it will take to complete the investigation?

Joint answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(22 May 2012)

The European Commission is aware of the issues raised in the written question concerning the equal treatment of non-Italian aircraft operators under the 'Salva Italia' Decree Law. The Honourable Member of the European Parliament is informed that the Commission has started an investigation on this matter covering the different aspects mentioned by the Honourable Member.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004087/12
alla Commissione
Adrian Severin (NI) e Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(19 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Situazione dell'ordinamento giuridico in Ucraina

Nelle risposte alle interrogazioni scritte sul modo in cui l'UE sta seguendo i progressi delle riforme giuridiche in alcuni paesi, il presidente della Commissione riafferma il principio secondo cui «la Commissione non esamina né si esprime riguardo a singoli casi». Ciò nonostante, il commissario Fule ha affermato che «le indagini penali nei confronti di alti funzionari del precedente governo ucraino, tra cui Yulia Tymoshenko, (…) sono state seguite scrupolosamente da parte dei diplomatici dell'UE a Kiev e da esperti giuristi, tra cui quelli provenienti dalla società civile e da organizzazioni internazionali, aventi comprovate competenze nel campo dei procedimenti giudiziari» e ha presentato le conclusioni cui sono pervenuti.

Analogamente, il presidente del Consiglio europeo ha preso atto del fatto che: l'11 ottobre 2011 l'AR/VP Catherine Ashton ha rilasciato una dichiarazione, a nome dell'Unione europea, in cui esprime il profondo disappunto dell'UE circa il verdetto […] sul caso di Yulia Tymoshenko. Il verdetto è stato raggiunto al termine di un processo nel quale non sono stati rispettati gli standard internazionali di equità, trasparenza e indipendenza del procedimento giudiziario. Come conseguenza delle suddette conclusioni, l'Ucraina ha subito il differimento della sua «associazione politica e integrazione economica con l'UE, tra cui la conclusione dell'accordo di associazione e la sua conseguente attuazione». Poiché nelle relazioni annuali della Commissione non figurano dati specifici sui quali si basano le suddette conclusioni, la Commissione è invitata a rispondere alle seguenti domande:

1. Chi sono gli eminenti giuristi che hanno osservato i procedimenti e presentato le proprie conclusioni, sulla base delle quali l'UE ha definito la propria posizione politica?

2. Su quali basi il processo è stato definito non equo, non trasparente e non indipendente? (Per esempio, il diritto alla difesa è stato negato o impropriamente limitato? Esistono prove del fatto che i giudici abbiano seguito ordini politici in questo caso? Il processo non era forse aperto al pubblico?)

3. Essendo l'Ucraina un membro del Consiglio d'Europa e spettando alla Corte europea dei diritti dell'uomo (CEDU) verificare l'equità dei procedimenti giudiziari, ritiene la Commissione di possedere l'autorità e le competenze per sostituirsi alla CEDU?

4. Avendo l'UE espresso il suo disappunto circa il verdetto, se il procedimento fosse stato lo stesso, un altro verdetto sarebbe stato accettabile? Sono le critiche dell'UE nei confronti del verdetto compatibili con il suo principio di astenersi dall'esprimere qualsiasi giudizio su singoli casi?

5. Non sono forse le critiche nei confronti di una sentenza giuridica, in particolare nei confronti di una sentenza non ancora passata in giudicato e delle sue conseguenti sanzioni (politiche), equiparabili a limitare l'indipendenza del potere giudiziario e a interferire con l'operato della giustizia?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(18 giugno 2012)

L'Unione europea non ha emesso sanzioni contro l'Ucraina.

La Commissione e l'Alta Rappresentante, nei loro commenti e nelle loro osservazioni circa la giustizia «selettiva» in Ucraina, hanno sempre evitato di prendere le parti di singole persone coinvolte, riferendosi invece più volte alle sistematiche carenze del sistema giudiziario, che sono emerse chiaramente in un gran numero di casi differenti. Né la Commissione né l'Alta rappresentante hanno sentenziato in via preliminare la colpevolezza o l'innocenza di alcun imputato. La delusione espressa dall'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente nella sua dichiarazione sul verdetto nei confronti di Yulia Tymoshenko si riferisce alla conclusione di un «processo che non ha rispettato le norme internazionali per quanto concerne una procedura giudiziaria equa, trasparente e indipendente».

La Commissione e l'Alta Rappresentante non sono le uniche istanze ad aver espresso preoccupazione per specifici aspetti del sistema giudiziario penale in Ucraina, e hanno peraltro tenuto conto delle relazioni di osservatori dell'UE presenti al processo e di esperti indipendenti, relazioni che riguardano tutti gli elementi del procedimento giudiziario. A prescindere dalla sentenza finale formulata nei vari processi su membri del precedente governo in Ucraina, l'UE ritiene che tali problemi debbano essere affrontati in via prioritaria nell'ambito di una riforma generale del sistema giudiziario, che da parte sua è disposta a sostenere.

La Commissione e l'Alta Rappresentante non hanno mai cercato di influenzare il risultato di alcun processo celebrato dalla Corte europea dei diritti dell'uomo. La Commissione e l'Alta Rappresentante si sono a più riprese dichiarate disposte a collaborare con l'Ucraina per una riforma generale del sistema giudiziario, sulla base di sviluppi recenti quali l'adozione di un nuovo codice di procedura penale.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004087/12
adresată Comisiei
Adrian Severin (NI) şi Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(19 aprilie 2012)

Subiect: Situația privind sistemul judiciar din Ucraina

În răspunsurile sale la întrebările cu solicitare de răspuns scris referitoare la modul în care UE urmăreşte evoluția reformelor judiciare în anumite țări, Preşedintele Comisiei reafirmă principiul potrivit căruia „Comisia nu analizează şi nu face comentarii cu privire la cazuri individuale". Cu toate acestea, comisarul Füle a declarat că „anchetele penale îndreptate împotriva unor membri marcanți ai fostului guvern ucrainean, inclusiv împotriva dnei Iulia Timoşenko, (…) au fost urmărite îndeaproape de către diplomații UE de la Kiev, alături de experți jurişti, provenind din rândul societății civile şi al organizațiilor internaționale, cu experiență recunoscută în domeniul procedurilor juridice", după care a prezentat concluziile la care aceştia au ajuns.

În mod similar, Preşedintele Consiliului European a observat că: „ÎR/VP Catherine Ashton a făcut, la 11 octombrie 2011, o declarație în numele Uniunii Europene, prin care exprima profunda dezamăgire a UE în ceea ce priveşte verdictul […] în cazul dnei Iulia Timoşenko. Verdictul a urmat unui proces care nu a respectat normele internaționale în ceea ce priveşte procedurile judiciare echitabile, transparente şi independente." Ca o consecință a concluziilor menționate mai sus, Ucraina a fost confruntată cu amânarea „asocierii politice şi a integrării economice cu UE, inclusiv a încheierii Acordului de asociere şi a implementării ulterioare a acestuia". Dat fiind faptul că rapoartele anuale ale Comisiei nu cuprind datele specifice pe care se bazează concluziile de mai sus, i se solicită Comisiei să răspundă la următoarele întrebări:

1. Cine sunt experții de prim rang care au observat procedurile şi şi-au prezentat concluziile pe baza cărora UE şi-a definit poziția politică?

2. Care sunt motivele în baza cărora s-a ajuns la concluzia că procesul nu a fost echitabil, transparent şi independent? (De exemplu, a fost refuzat sau restricționat în mod inadecvat dreptul la apărare? Există dovezi potrivit cărora judecătorii au urmat instrucțiuni politice în această chestiune? Nu a fost permis accesul publicului la proces?)

3. Dat fiind faptul că Ucraina este membru al Consiliului Europei, precum şi faptul că organismul care are competența de a verifica corectitudinea procedurilor juridice este Curtea Europeană a Drepturilor Omului (CEDO), consideră Comisia că deține autoritatea şi mijloacele necesare pentru a se substitui CEDO?

4. Dat fiind faptul că UE şi-a exprimat dezamăgirea cu privire la verdict, trebuie să înțelegem că un alt verdict ar fi fost acceptabil, chiar dacă procedura urmată ar fi fost aceeaşi? Este compatibilă critica exprimată de UE la adresa verdictului cu principiul potrivit căruia UE se abține de la orice comentariu cu privire la cazuri individuale?

5. Nu reprezintă critica exprimată la adresa unei hotărâri judecătoreşti, în special a uneia care nu are încă valoare de *res judicata*, şi sancțiunile (politice) care o însoțesc o limitare a independenței sistemului judiciar şi o ingerință în actul de justiție?

Răspuns dat de dna Ashton în numele Comisiei
(18 iunie 2012)

UE nu a impus sancțiuni împotriva Ucrainei.

Comisia și Înaltul Reprezentant, în comentariile și observațiile formulate privind justiția selectivă în Ucraina, au evitat, în mod sistematic, să ia partea vreuneia din personalitățile implicate. Aceste comentarii și observații au făcut trimitere în mod repetat la deficiențe sistemice ale procesului judiciar, care s-au manifestat într-un număr semnificativ de cazuri diferite. Nici Comisia, nici Înaltul Reprezentant nu s-au exprimat cu privire la vinovăția sau la nevinovăția vreunei persoane. Dezamăgirea reflectată în declarația Înaltului Reprezentant/Vicepreședinte al Comisiei privind verdictul în cazul Timoșenko se referă la încheierea „unui proces care nu a respectat standardele internaționale în ceea ce privește o procedură judiciară echitabilă, transparentă și independentă".

Comisia și Înaltul Reprezentant nu au fost singurii care au exprimat îngrijorare cu privire la aspecte specifice ale sistemului de justiție penală din Ucraina și care au luat în considerare în mod corespunzător rapoartele observatorilor UE prezenți la procese, precum și rapoartele unor experți independenți. Aceste rapoarte acoperă toate aspectele legate

de procedura judiciară. Indiferent de verdictul definitiv în oricare din procesele membrilor fostului guvern din Ucraina, UE a identificat aceste aspecte ca fiind domenii prioritare de acțiune în contextul unei reforme judiciare mai ample pe care este pregătită să o sprijine.

Comisia și Înaltul Reprezentant nu au încercat în niciun moment să influențeze rezultatele niciunui proces în fața Curții Europene a Drepturilor Omului. Comisia și Înaltul Reprezentant s-au declarat în mod repetat gata să colaboreze cu Ucraina cu privire la o amplă reformă judiciară, pe baza evoluțiilor recente cum ar fi adoptarea noului Cod de procedură penală.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004087/12
to the Commission
Adrian Severin (NI) and Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(19 April 2012)

Subject: The situation regarding the justice system in Ukraine

In his replies to written questions on the manner in which the EU is following the progress of judicial reforms in certain countries, the President of the Commission reaffirms the principle that 'the Commission does not examine or comment on merits of individual cases'. This notwithstanding, Commissioner Fule has stated that 'the criminal investigations against senior officials of the former Government of Ukraine, including Mrs Yulia Tymoshenko, (…) have been closely followed by EU diplomats in Kyiv, together with legal experts, including those from civil society and from international organisations with recognised expertise in the area of legal proceedings', whereupon he presented the conclusions they had reached.

Likewise, the President of the European Council noted that: 'the HR/VP Catherine Ashton issued a declaration on behalf of the European Union on 11 October 2011 expressing the EU's deep disappointment with the verdict […] in the case of Ms Yulia Tymoshenko. The verdict came after a trial which did not respect international standards as regards fair, transparent and independent legal process.' As a consequence of the conclusions mentioned above, Ukraine saw the postponement of its 'political association and economic integration with the EU, including the conclusion of the Association Agreement and its subsequent implementation'. Since the Commission's annual reports do not include the specific data on which the conclusions above are based, it is asked to answer the following questions:

1. Who are the prominent experts who observed the procedures and submitted their conclusions, on the basis of which the EU has established its political position?

2. On what grounds was the trial qualified as unfair, not transparent and not independent? (For example, was the right to legal defence denied or improperly restricted? Is there evidence that the judges followed political instructions in the matter? Was the trial not open to the public?)

3. Given that Ukraine is member of the Council of Europe, and that it is the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) that has the competence to verify the fairness of legal procedures, does the Commission believe it has the authority and the wherewithal to supplant the ECHR?

4. Given that the EU expressed its disappointment over the verdict, are we to understand that another verdict would have been acceptable, even if the procedure had been the same? Is the EU's criticism of the verdict compatible with its principle of abstaining from any comment on individual cases?

5. Is not criticism of a judicial ruling, particularly one which does not yet have the value of *res judicata* and the (political) sanctions that go with it, tantamount to limiting the independence of the judiciary and interfering in the act of justice?

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

The EU has no sanctions against Ukraine.

The Commission and the High Representative, in their comments and observations on selective justice in Ukraine, have consistently avoided taking sides with any personality. These comments and observations referred repeatedly to systemic weaknesses of judicial process, manifest across a significant number of different cases. Neither the Commission nor the HR have prejudged the guilt or innocence of any individual. The disappointment reflected in the High Representative/Vice-President's statement on the Tymoshenko verdict was expressed at the conclusion of 'a trial which did not respect the international standards as regards fair, transparent and independent legal process'.

The Commission and the HR have not been alone in expressing concerns at specific aspects of the criminal justice system in Ukraine, and have taken account of the reports of EU observers at the trials, as well as independent experts. These reports cover all aspects of the legal process. Regardless of the final verdict in any of the trials of members of the former government in Ukraine, the EU has identified these issues as priority areas for action in a broader judicial reform which it is ready to support.

The Commission and the HR have at no stage sought to prejudge the outcome of any process before the European Court of Human Rights. The Commission and the HR have repeatedly stated their readiness to work with Ukraine on a comprehensive judicial reform, building on recent developments such as the adoption of a new Criminal Procedures Code.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-004125/12
komissiolle
Hannu Takkula (ALDE) ja Mitro Repo (S&D)
(20. huhtikuuta 2012)

Aihe: Eurooppa-koulun budjetista ja tulevaisuudesta

Eurooppa-kouluun liittyvät kysymykset ovat olleet säännöllisin väliajoin Euroopan parlamentin ja erityisesti sen kulttuuri- ja koulutusvaliokunnan käsittelyssä. Viimeisten kuukausien aikana monet parlamentin jäsenet ovat saaneet huolestuneita viestejä Eurooppa-koulun asianosaisilta, sekä opettajilta että oppilaiden vanhemmilta. Viesteissä on sama, huolestuttava teema: koulujen oppilasmäärä kasvaa kovaa vauhtia mutta koulujen käyttöbudjetit eivät; luokkakoot ja opetusryhmät suurenevat mutta avustavien opettajien määrää jopa vähennetään ja ainevalintoja supistetaan.

On ymmärrettävää, että näinä aikoina säästöjä haetaan julkishallinnon eri kohteista. On kuitenkin väärin ajatella, että Eurooppa-koulu voisi jatkuvasti kasvattaa oppilasmääränsä – mihin se tuntuu olevan pakotettu – ilman että sille osoitetaan riittäviä varoja laadukkaan opetuksen järjestämiseen.

Tiedustelemmekin nyt komissiolta, mikä on sen lyhyen sekä pitkän aikavälin suunnitelma koskien Eurooppa-koulua ja sen budjettia? Onko komissio sitä mieltä, että budjetin tulisi olla suhteessa koulun oppilasmäärään? Koska Eurooppa-koulun pääidea on opetuksen antaminen kaikille oppilaille heidän äidinkielellään, mitä komissio aikoo tehdä, jotta tämä turvataan nyt ja jatkossa?

Maroš Šefčovičin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(4. kesäkuuta 2012)

Komissio suosittelee, että arvoisa parlamentin jäsen tutustuu Fisas Ayalan kirjalliseen kysymykseen E-3219/2012 ([1]) annettuun komission vastaukseen.

Lyhyen aikavälin suunnittelun osalta voidaan todeta, että Eurooppa-koulujen johtokunta on komission tukemana hyväksynyt Eurooppa-koulujen talousarvion vuodelle 2013. Eurooppa-koulujen kokonaistalousarvio vuodelle 2013 on 288,3 miljoonaa euroa. Vuoden 2012 talousarvioon (282,5 miljoonaa euroa) verrattuna lisäystä on 2,1 prosenttia. On suunniteltu, että EU:n osuudeksi vahvistetaan 173,9 miljoonaa euroa.

Kun asiaa tarkastellaan lyhyellä aikavälillä, on hyvin tärkeää huomata, että budjettivallan käyttäjän on hyväksyttävä EU:n rahoitusosuus.

Pitkän aikavälin suunnittelun osalta voidaan todeta, että EU:n seuraavassa monivuotisessa rahoituskehyksessä vuosille 2014–2020 Eurooppa-koulujen menojen kehitystä on arvioitu tarkastelemalla useita eri muuttujia, kuten koulujen oppilas- ja opettajamäärän kehityksestä johtuvia kustannuksia, lähetettyjen ja osa-aikaisten opettajien palkkataulukoiden tarkistamisesta seuraavia säästöjä, uusien koulujen avaamista jne.

Komission ehdotuksessa monivuotiseksi rahoituskehykseksi vuosille 2014–2020 otetaan huomioon nämä tekijät samoin kuin opetuksen ydintarjonnan säilyttäminen, johon kuuluu myös oikeus äidinkielellä annettavaan opetukseen.

On pidettävä mielessä, että pitkällä aikavälillä tarkasteltuna budjettivallan käyttäjät eli Euroopan parlamentti ja neuvosto viime kädessä päättävät seuraavassa monivuotisessa rahoituskehyksessä vuosille 2014–2020 vahvistettavasta EU:n rahoitusosuudesta Eurooppa-kouluille.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sidesSearch/sipadeMapUrl.do?L=EN

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004125/12
to the Commission
Hannu Takkula (ALDE) and Mitro Repo (S&D)
(20 April 2012)

Subject: The budget for and the future of the European Schools

Questions related to the European Schools have regularly been discussed by the European Parliament, particularly its Committee on Culture and Education. In recent months, many Members of the European Parliament have received worrying messages from teachers and parents of pupils at the European Schools. The messages have the same, worrying theme: the number of pupils attending the schools is increasing rapidly but the schools' budgets are not; class and group sizes are growing but the number of assistant teachers is, in some cases, decreasing; and the number of subjects on offer is being reduced.

In the current climate, it is understandable that cost savings are being identified in various areas of public administration. However, it is incorrect to think that the European Schools can continuously increase the number of pupils they admit — which they appear to have been obliged to do — without being allocated sufficient resources to be able to provide high-quality education.

We therefore ask the Commission to provide details of its short- and long-term plans for the European Schools' budget. Does the Commission believe that the budget should be proportionate to the number of pupils attending the schools? Since the core principle behind European Schools is to provide education to all pupils in their mother tongue, what does the Commission intend to do to safeguard this right, both now and in the future?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-3219/2012 by Mr Fisas Ayala ([1]).

Regarding the short term planning, the European School's (ES) 2013 budget has been approved by the Board of Governors with the support of the Commission. The ES total 2013 budget amounts to EUR 288.3 million i.e. an increase of 2.1 % as compared to 2012 (EUR 282.5 million). The foreseen EU contribution is proposed to be set at EUR 173.9 million.

Seen in a short-term perspective, it is very important to note that the EU financial contribution to the ES has to be approved by the budgetary authority.

Concerning the long-term planning in the next EU Multi-Annual Financial Framework (MFF) 2014-2020 the evolution of expenditure for the ES has been estimated considering a number of parameters, including the costs stemming from the progression in the school population, the economies resulting from revised salary grids for seconded and part-time teachers, the opening of new schools, etc.

The Commission proposal for the MFF 2014-2020 takes into account these factors and also the preservation of the core educational offer, including the right to mother tongue education.

It must be borne in mind that for the long-term perspective it is the budgetary authority — European Parliament and Council — who will have the final say on the level of EU financial contribution to be laid down in the next MFF 2014-2020 for the ES.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-004133/12
til Kommissionen
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(20. april 2012)

Om: Ændring af væskeregler i lufthavne

Kommissionen har fremsat et forslag om, at flyrejsende fra d. 29. april 2013 igen må medbringe væsker i håndbagagen ud fra et ønske om at forbedre rejseoplevelsen. For at sikre passagerernes sikkerhed foreslås dette gennemført ved krav om skærpet scanning af håndbagage med nye teknologier, der kan opdage eventuelle flydende sprængstoffer.

De pågældende teknologier er imidlertid uprøvede i operationel lufthavnssammenhæng, og en række tests — foretaget i samarbejde med det uvildige konsulentbureau Booz & Co. i tolv forskellige lufthavne i EU — viser, at udstyret har så mange tekniske fejlindikationer, at det i stedet for at gøre bagagescanningen hurtig og effektiv i stedet har skabt længere ventetid for passagererne, markante gener i form af langt hyppigere eftersyn af håndbagagen, samt en fortsat inddragelse af væsker der ikke kan godkendes.

På baggrund af de ovennævnte tests bedes Kommissionen oplyse, om ikke den finder det formålstjenligt, med særlig tanke på ønsket om at sikre en god rejseoplevelse, at udskyde ikrafttrædelsen af de nye regler, indtil teknologierne er udviklet til et niveau, der tilgodeser både de rejsendes sikkerhed, bekvemmelighed og ikke mindst privatliv.

Samlet svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Siim Kallas
(18. juni 2012)

EU-lovgivningen ([1]) fastsætter, at der senest den 29. april 2013 skal tages metoder og teknologier i brug til sporing af flydende sprængstoffer i alle EU's lufthavne. Denne foranstaltning skal gøre det nemmere for passagerer at rejse, da væsker vil kunne tages med om bord på flyet uden at være underlagt strenge restriktioner eller blive konfiskeret, som det er tilfældet i dag. Dermed vil det igen blive mere behageligt at rejse.

En lang række screeningteknologier er for nylig blevet testet i fungerende lufthavnsmiljøer. Selvom testresultaterne ikke er repræsentative for alle EU-lufthavne, synes pålideligheden i forbindelse med visse former for udstyr ganske rigtigt at have skabt bekymring. Undersøgelserne viser imidlertid også, at forbedrede operationelle foranstaltninger og bedre information til passagererne medvirker til en bedre screeningsproces, hvilket betyder, at behovet for yderligere kontrol mindskes, at der konfiskeres færre væsker, at passagergennemstrømningen øges, og at passagererne bliver mere tilfredse. Det er også konstateret, at ventetiden kan reduceres yderligere, hvis checkpunkterne udformes anderledes og sikkerhedspersonalet uddannes bedre.

Indførelse af screening af væsker fra den 29. april 2013 er et lovmæssigt krav og er — set fra Kommissionens synspunkt — vejen frem mod at gøre det lettere at rejse, uden at luftfartssikkerheden dermed bliver bragt i fare. Kommissionen vil for at opfylde den forpligtelse, den indgik med vedtagelsen af lovgivningen, indsamle oplysninger om de erfaringer, der høstes gennem afprøvning af udstyr og andre informationskilder, og orientere Europa-Parlamentet og medlemsstaterne herom senest i juli måned i år.

([1]) Kommissionens forordning (EU) nr. 272/2009 af 2. april 2009 om supplering af de fælles grundlæggende normer for civil luftfartssikkerhed for så vidt angår gradvis indførelse af screening af væsker, aerosoldåser og geléer i EU's lufthavne, EUT L 91 af 3.4.2009, ændret ved Kommissionens forordning (EU) nr. 720/2011 af 22. juli 2011, EUT L 193 af 23.7.2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004133/12
to the Commission
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(20 April 2012)

Subject: Change of regulations relating to liquids at airports

In an attempt to improve the travelling experience, the Commission has proposed that from 29 April 2013 air passengers again be allowed to carry liquids in their hand luggage. To ensure passenger safety, it is proposed that the amendment involve more stringent scanning of hand luggage with new technologies that can detect any liquid explosives.

The relevant technologies have not, however, been tested in an operational airport environment and a series of tests — undertaken in cooperation with independent consultancy firm Booz & Co. in 12 airports in the EU — shows that the equipment makes so many errors that, instead of streamlining baggage scanning, it creates longer waiting times for passengers, significant inconvenience in the form of more frequent secondary inspections of hand luggage and continued confiscation of liquids which it is not possible to approve.

In view of the above tests, would the Commission state whether it would not be helpful, with the aim of ensuring that travelling is a pleasant experience, to postpone the entry into force of the new rules until the technology has been developed to a level at which passenger safety, comfort and — not least — privacy can be protected?

Question for written answer E-004609/12
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(7 May 2012)

Subject: Removal of liquids ban in airports

This question relates to the answer to Written Questions E-012517/11 and E-012518/11 on the removal of the liquids ban in airports, with specific reference to the words, 'By summer 2012 the Commission will report on and assess the progress'. Can the Commission provide a definite deadline as to when this report will be published?

What are the Commission's intentions should it arise that the equipment on trial is insufficient?

Could the Commission outline when it intends to make a decision on the matter, and assure the travelling public and airport operators that a decision will be made some months in advance, so that the situation which arose with the partial removal of the liquids ban, i.e. a complete U-turn by the Commission with just a few days' notice, will not be allowed to happen again?

Joint answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(18 June 2012)

EU legislation ([1]) foresees that, by 29 April 2013 at the latest, methods including technologies should be deployed at all European airports to allow the detection of liquid explosives. This measure was designed to facilitate air passengers' travelling, as liquids can then be taken on board an aircraft with much less restrictions and confiscations as it is the case now, making travelling again a more pleasant experience.

A wide range of different screening technologies has been recently tested in operational airport environments. Although the trial results were not representative for all EU airports, the reliability of certain equipment seemed indeed to cause a concern. However, the trials also stress that improving operational measures and providing better passenger information can contribute considerably to a better screening process, resulting in less frequent secondary screening, reduced confiscation rates and consequently higher throughput and passenger satisfaction. Moreover, it was found that waiting times can further be reduced by an improved checkpoint design and better training of security officers.

([1]) Commission Regulation (EC) No 272/2009 of 2 April 2009, supplementing the common basic standards on civil aviation security as regards the phasing-in of the screening of liquids, aerosols and gels at EU airports, OJ L 91 of 3 April 2009, as amended by Commission Regulation (EU) No 720/2011 of 22 July 2011, OJ L 193 of 23 July 2011.

The mandatory introduction of liquid screening as of 29 April 2013 is a legal requirement and in the Commission's view a way forward to facilitate passengers' travelling without compromising aviation security. In line with the commitment it gave when it adopted the legislation the Commission will record its findings based on operational trials and other information and report to the European Parliament and Member States by July this year.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004138/12
to the Commission
John Stuart Agnew (EFD)
(20 April 2012)

Subject: When is a paper a non-paper?

When is a paper a non-paper (e.g. 20120326 Non paper_OTF SI.doc)?

Does the Commission understand that, in English at least, this is a linguistic absurdity? (We could perhaps call it an 'antimoron' if that is the opposite of an oxymoron.)

What is the status of such 'non-papers' in law, especially if cited in court?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2012)

Within the Commission, there is no specific rule governing the use of the term 'non-paper' in the title of a document.

In practice, a document named in this way is generally a technical contribution submitted as a basis for discussion within the institutions of the Union, in international organisations or in negotiations with third countries. It is not an official document of the institution. The use of 'non-papers' is a common practice in other institutions and states. Such documents have no legal value.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004141/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(20 de Abril de 2012)

Assunto: Acordo entre a União Europeia e o Mercosul

Tendo em conta que:

— Em 1990, o Brasil e a Argentina tomaram a iniciativa de promover um acordo económico entre as duas nações, a que se juntaram o Uruguai e o Paraguai em 1991, num projeto de União Aduaneira denominado Mercado Comum do Sul (Mercosul);

— Desde 2006, a Venezuela depende da aprovação dos congressos nacionais para que a sua entrada seja aprovada, mais especificamente do Parlamento paraguaio, visto que os outros três países já a ratificaram;

— A integração entre os vários membros permite criar um mercado comum, onde são adotadas tarifas de importação e exportação comuns, a livre circulação de mercadorias, capitais e serviços;

— No futuro, pretende-se criar um Mercado Comum, proporcionando também a livre circulação de pessoas entre os Estados-Membros do Mercosul;

— A União Europeia e o Mercosul estão a analisar a possibilidade de estabelecerem um acordo comercial, com vantagens estratégicas em diversas áreas económicas;

— Um dos países fundadores do Mercosul, nomeadamente a Argentina, pretende expropriar 51 % do capital da empresa petrolífera YPF, controlada pela companhia espanhola Repsol, colocando assim em causa o investimento direto estrangeiro realizado naquele país e em plena discordância com os acordos internacionais celebrados com a União Europeia e a Organização Mundial do Comércio;

— Na sessão plenária do Parlamento Europeu do passado dia 17 de abril de 2012, a Alta Representante da União para os Negócios Estrangeiros e a Política de Segurança referiu que a decisão da Argentina constitui uma grave preocupação, devido ao facto de colocar em causa a segurança legal de todas as empresas europeias naquele país da América do Sul;

— Catherine Ashton também salientou que a Presidente da Argentina se referiu a outras empresas do setor das telecomunicações e da banca, tendo decidido cancelar a reunião da Comissão Europa-Argentina;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Considera que o acordo que está atualmente a ser negociado com o Mercosul poderá ser afetado com a presente posição da Argentina?

2. Quais as implicações comerciais que daí poderão advir para a União Europeia?

Resposta dada por Karel De Gucht em nome da Comissão
(30 de Maio de 2012)

A Comissão está extremamente preocupada com as medidas protecionistas recentemente adotadas pela Argentina, em especial a decisão de nacionalizar a participação de 51 % da Repsol na Yacimientos Petrolíferos Fiscales (YPF). A Comissão já reagiu vigorosamente, nomeadamente através do Presidente Barroso, de uma carta do Comissário responsável pelo Comércio, Karel De Gucht, dirigida ao Ministro argentino dos Negócios Estrangeiros, Hector Timerman, e de uma declaração da Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente, instando a Argentina a respeitar os seus compromissos internacionais. A Comissão informou a Argentina de que manteria em aberto todas as opções possíveis para resolver este problema, tanto a nível multilateral como bilateral. Devido ao clima criado pela decisão argentina, foi igualmente decidido adiar o Comité Misto UE-Argentina, inicialmente previsto para 19 e 20 de abril de 2012.

No que diz respeito ao impacto que a medida poderá ter nas negociações UE-Mercosul, recorde-se, em primeiro lugar, que a Comissão não negocia com a Argentina a nível bilateral, mas sim com o Mercosul como região. Não obstante, a Comissão considera que esta medida parece incompatível com o espírito subjacente a essa negociação e que é

fundamental manter um clima de confiança entre as partes se quisermos que a referida negociação seja concluída. Esta mensagem foi transmitida à Argentina.

Em termos de implicações comerciais, a Comissão estima que as medidas afetam negativamente o clima geral empresarial e de investimento na Argentina, o que é especialmente lamentável, uma vez que a UE é o maior investidor estrangeiro na Argentina e contribui para a atividade económica e o emprego, praticamente em todos os setores da economia daquele país.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004141/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(20 April 2012)

Subject: Agreement between the European Union and Mercosur

In 1990, Brazil and Argentina decided to establish an economic agreement between the two nations, to which Uruguay and Paraguay acceded in 1991, in a customs union project called the common market of the South (Mercosur).

Since 2006, Venezuela has been waiting for its entry into Mercosur to be approved by the national parliaments of the other countries, specifically Paraguay. The other three member countries have already ratified its accession.

Integration between the various members allows the creation of a common market, with the adoption of common import and export tariffs ands free movement of goods, capital and services.

A common market which will also allow the free movement of persons between Mercosur member states is planned for the future.

The European Union and Mercosur are examining the possibility of establishing a trade agreement, with strategic advantages in several economic areas.

Argentina, a founding member of Mercosur, plans to expropriate a 51 % stake in the oil company YPF, a subsidiary of the Spanish company Repsol, thereby jeopardising direct foreign investment made in the country and contravening the international agreements concluded with the European Union and the World Trade Organisation.

During the European Parliament's plenary session on 17 April 2012, the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy stated that Argentina's decision was of serious concern, as it jeopardised the legal security of all European companies in the South American country.

Baroness Ashton also stressed that the Argentinian President had mentioned other companies in the telecommunications and banking sector, and had decided to cancel the meeting of the EU-Argentina Joint Cooperation Committee.

Could the Commission say:

1. Whether it believes the agreement currently being negotiated with Mercosur could be affected by Argentina's present stance?

2. What the potential trade implications are for the European Union?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2012)

The Commission is extremely concerned by the protectionist measures recently taken by Argentina, in particular the decision to nationalise the 51 % stake of Repsol in Yacimientos Petrolíferos Fiscales (YPF). The Commission has already reacted strongly, including through President Barroso, a letter from Trade Commissioner De Gucht to the Argentinean Minister of Foreign Affairs Hector Timerman and a statement from the High Representative/Vice-President, and has urged Argentina to respect its international commitments. The Commission informed Argentina that it would keep open all possible options to address this matter at the multilateral as well as at the bilateral level. Due to the climate created by the Argentinean decision, it was also decided to postpone the EU-Argentina Joint committee initially foreseen for 19-20 April 2012.

Regarding the impact that this measure could have on EU-Mercosur negotiations, it should first be recalled that the Commission does not negotiate with Argentina bilaterally but with Mercosur as a region. The Commission is nevertheless of the opinion that this measure appears inconsistent with the spirit underpinning this negotiation and that it is crucial to maintain a climate of trust and confidence between the negotiating parties if we want this negotiation to be concluded. This message has been conveyed to Argentina.

In terms of commercial implications, the Commission estimates that such a measure negatively affects the overall business and investment climate in Argentina. This is especially regrettable since the EU is the largest foreign investor in Argentina and contributes to economic activity and employment in virtually all sectors of Argentinean economy.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004147/12
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(23 de abril de 2012)

Asunto: Prisiones italianas

Vincenzo Roveto desde 2 de diciembre de 2010 está preso en prisión preventiva en la cárcel de Palmi, en Calabria. Roveto fue acusado de pertenecer a una asociación ilegal y fue detenido junto a 77 personas más, bajo la operación «Overloading», coordinada por la Dirección de Catanzaro contra organizaciones de tráfico internacional de estupefacientes. El Sr. Roveto lleva casi 1 año y medio en prisión preventiva y el proceso judicial aún no ha empezado. El preso está obligado a vivir en un celda de 25 metros cuadrados y según la familia y otros reclusos Roveto padece cáncer de vejiga y no está recibiendo los tratamientos ni asistencia médica adecuada. El preso pesa 50 kg y necesita asistencia constante, hasta para andar o vestirse. Roveto podría morir si sigue en estas condiciones inhumanas y no es asistido inmediatamente por médicos especializados. Las malas condiciones de encarcelamiento son frecuentes en prisiones italianas, en lo que llevamos de 2012, 53 personas han muerto dentro de las prisiones, de las cuales sólo 17 se confirmaron como suicidios.

Considerando los artículos 1 y 4 de la Carta de Derechos fundamentes donde se establece que el derecho a la dignidad humana es inviolable; el TEDH donde se declara que la «prisión preventiva ha de ser considerada una medida excepcional»; el artículo 3 del Convenio Europeo de Derechos Humanos, donde se afirma que «las condiciones de detención que proporcionan un empeoramiento de la enfermedad de un preso constituye un trato inhumano y degradante» y la recomendación del Comité de Ministros del Consejo de Europa de 12.2.1987 sobre «reglas penitenciarias europeas», preguntamos a la Comisión

— ¿Qué va a hacer para garantizar las condiciones humanas y de salud del preso Vincenzo Roveto?

— ¿Qué medidas va a tomar para asegurar que se respeten las reglas penitenciaras europeas y acabar con las condiciones inhumanas y degradantes en las que viven muchos presos?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión
(7 de junio de 2012)

Las cuestiones relativas a las detenciones, tanto si estas afectan a personas que todavía no han sido juzgadas como a personas sobre las que pesa una pena de prisión, son en general competencia de los Estados miembros.

En principio, las competencias de la Comisión en relación con los actos y omisiones de los Estados miembros se limitan a supervisar la aplicación del Derecho de la Unión bajo el control del Tribunal de Justicia de la Unión Europea (véase el artículo 17, apartado 1, del TUE). Sobre la base de la información facilitada por Su Señoría, no parece que, en el asunto comentado, el Estado miembro en cuestión haya actuado en cumplimiento de la aplicación de la legislación de la UE. Por lo tanto, corresponde a las autoridades nacionales proceder a la evaluación solicitada por Su Señoría, teniendo en cuenta las circunstancias concretas del caso y su contexto, y de conformidad con la legislación nacional e internacional pertinente. Por lo que atañe, en concreto, a las cuestiones relativas a los derechos humanos planteadas por Su Señoría, la Comisión recuerda que, de conformidad con el artículo 51, apartado 1, de la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales, las disposiciones de la Carta están dirigidas a los Estados miembros únicamente cuando aplican el Derecho de la Unión. En consecuencia, en el asunto de que se trata incumbe exclusivamente a los Estados miembros velar por el respeto de sus obligaciones en relación con los derechos fundamentales, derivadas de los acuerdos internacionales y de su legislación interna.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004147/12
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(23 April 2012)

Subject: Italian prisons

Vincenzo Roveto has been held in preventive detention in Palmi prison, in Calabria, since 2 December 2010. Roveto was accused of belonging to an illegal association and was arrested, along with 77 other people, under the 'Overloading' operation, coordinated by the Catanzaro Division against international drug trafficking organisations. Mr Roveto has been held in preventive detention for almost a year and a half and the judicial process has still not begun. He is forced to live in a 25-square-metre cell and, according to his family and other inmates, has bladder cancer and is not receiving adequate medical treatment or assistance. The prisoner weighs 50 kg and needs constant assistance, even to walk and get dressed. Roveto could die if he remains in these inhumane conditions and is not immediately attended by specialist doctors. Poor conditions of detention are common in Italian prisons: so far, in 2012, 53 people have died in prisons, of whom only 17 were confirmed as suicides.

In light of Articles 1 and 4 of the European Charter of Fundamental Rights, which state that human dignity is an inviolable right; of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), which states that preventive detention must be considered an exceptional measure; of Article 3 of the ECHR, which states that conditions of detention that lead to a worsening of a prisoner's illness constitute inhuman and degrading treatment; and of the recommendation made by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, dated 12 February 1987, regarding European Prison Rules, I ask the Commission:

— What will it do to ensure humane conditions and the health of the prisoner Vincenzo Roveto?

— What measures will it take to ensure that European prison rules are respected and to put an end to the inhumane and degrading conditions endured by many prisoners?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(7 June 2012)

Detention issues, whether they relate to pre-trial detainees or convicted persons, essentially lie with the responsibility of Member States.

As a matter of principle, the Commission's powers regarding acts and omissions by Member States are limited to overseeing the application of Union law, under the control of the Court of Justice (cf. Article 17 (1) TEU). On the basis of the information provided by the Honourable Member, it does not appear that in the matter referred to the Member State concerned did act in the course of implementation of Union law. Therefore it is for national authorities to make the assessment requested by the Honourable Member, according to the surrounding circumstances and context, and in conformity with relevant national and international law. Regarding more particularly the fundamental rights issues raised by the Honourable Member, the Comission would recall that, according to Article 51 (1) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights, the provisions of the Charter are addressed to Member States only when they are implementing Union law. In the matter referred to by the Honourable Member it is thus for Member States alone to ensure that their obligations regarding fundamental rights — as resulting from international agreements and from their internal legislation — are respected.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004148/12
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(23. April 2012)

Betrifft: EU-Richtlinie 98/8/EG — Überarbeitung der EU-Pestizid-Regeln

Die EU-Richtlinie 98/8/EG, mit der das Inverkehrbringen und die Vermarktung von Biozid-Produkten wie Schädlingsbekämpfungsmitteln, Holzschutzmitteln oder Desinfektionsmitteln geregelt wird, wurde überarbeitet. Eine neue Studie des Pestizid-Netzwerks-Europa (PAN-Europe) zeigt, wie EU-Mitgliedstaaten und die Generaldirektion Gesundheit der EU-Kommission (GD SANCO) Regeln aber so auslegen, dass letztlich auch augenscheinlich verbotene Pflanzenschutzmittel wieder zugelassen werden können. Alles beruht auf einem System der Wiedervorlage (Resubmission) bei großen Datenlücken, denn solange nicht ausreichend viele Informationen für eine Risikobewertung bzw. die Gefährlichkeit von bestimmten Pestiziden vorliegen, können diese Pestizide auch nicht endgültig verboten werden. Bei Stichproben fand PAN-Europe heraus, dass in acht von zehn Fällen eine Bewertung aus Verbraucherschutzsicht nicht möglich war, weil nicht genug Daten vorlagen. Laut Pestizid-Richtlinie 91/414 müssten aber alle Toxizitätsstudien durchgeführt werden, Datenlücken sind auch nicht gestattet. Solange Pestizide nicht verboten sind, können sie bei Zweifeln über ihre Sicherheit noch jahrelang auf dem Markt bleiben — oder die Industrie bekommt die Gelegenheit, Stoffe „freiwillig zurückzuziehen". Laut PAN-Europe wird dadurch der dringend notwendige Prozess der Erneuerung des Pestizidzulassungssystems verschleppt und die Zulassungsbehörden würden ihre Aufgabe, Mensch und Umwelt vor Gefahren zu schützen, vernachlässigen.

1. Wie beurteilt die Kommission diesen „Handel" mit der Industrie?

2. Ist durch diese Vorgangsweise nicht zu befürchten, dass das Wiedervorlageverfahren (Resubmission), das über 80 Wirkstoffe betrifft, das Bewertungssystem der GD SANCO und der Lebensmittelbehörde EFSA behindern könnte?

3. Welches System könnte dafür sorgen, dass die fehlenden großen Datenlücken für die Risikobewertung bzw. Gefährlichkeit von bestimmten Pestiziden geschlossen werden?

4. Ein weiteres Studienergebnis zeigt, dass kein Mitgliedstaat jemals ein Pestizid verbieten würde, nur weil Umweltrisiken bestehen. Ist dies nicht bedenklich aus Sicht der Kommission?

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

Die Kommission kennt die vom Herrn Abgeordneten angesprochene Studie. Die Vermarktung von Pestiziden unterliegt der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1107/2009 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates über das Inverkehrbringen von Pflanzenschutzmitteln und zur Aufhebung der Richtlinien 79/117/EWG und 91/414/EWG des Rates ([1]).

1. Der gesamte Zulassungsprozess für Pestizide ist vollständig transparent und entspricht den hohen, in den Rechtsvorschriften festgelegten Schutzstandards und den bestehenden Beschlussfassungsregeln der Kommission. Seit Annahme des Wiedervorlageverfahrens hat die Industrie 35 Gerichtsverfahren gegen die Kommission angestrengt. Dies unterstreicht die Entschlossenheit der Kommission, ein hohes Schutzniveau für Mensch, Tier und Umwelt sicherzustellen.

2. Das Programm der Wiedervorlage wurde durch die Verordnung (EG) Nr. 33/2008 der Kommission mit Durchführungsbestimmungen zur Richtlinie 91/414/EWG des Rates in Bezug auf ein reguläres und ein beschleunigtes Verfahren für die Bewertung von Wirkstoffen im Rahmen des in Artikel 8 Absatz 2 dieser Richtlinie genannten Arbeitsprogramms, die nicht in Anhang I dieser Richtlinie aufgenommen wurden ([2]), eingeführt und im Dezember 2011 abgeschlossen. Dieses Programm ermöglichte der EFSA und der Kommission, ihre Arbeit sorgfältig zu planen. Die Durchführung der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1107/2009 macht gute Fortschritte und erfolgt innerhalb der gesetzlichen Fristen.

([1]) ABl. L 309 vom 24.11.2009, S. 1.
([2]) ABl. L 15 vom 18.1.2008, S. 5.

3. Wirkstoffe können nur genehmigt werden, wenn mindestens eine sichere Anwendung belegt werden kann. Größere Datenlücken führen dazu, dass ein Wirkstoff nicht genehmigt wird.

4. Unannehmbare Umweltauswirkungen sind ein entscheidender Faktor im Beschlussfassungsverfahren der Kommission und der Mitgliedstaaten über Pestizide.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004148/12
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(23 April 2012)

Subject: EU Directive 98/8/EC — Revision of the EU regulations on pesticides

EU Directive 98/8/EC, which regulates the placing of biocidal products such as pesticides, wood protection agents or disinfectants on the market, has been revised. However, a new study by the Pesticide Action Network (PAN Europe) shows how EU Member States and the Commission's Directorate-General for Health and Consumers (DG SANCO) are framing rules which could result in pesticides that are currently banned being permitted once again. The whole thing hinges on a 'resubmission' system where there are major gaps in available data, since so long as there is insufficient information for a risk assessment or an assessment of the level of danger associated with certain pesticides, those pesticides cannot be banned conclusively. In random sampling, PAN Europe found that in eight out of ten cases, consumer risk assessment was not finalised due to a lack of data. Under pesticide Directive 91/414, however, all toxicity studies must be carried out and data gaps are not permitted. So long as pesticides are not banned, they may remain on the market for years with the safety of their usage in doubt, or else the industry will be given the opportunity to withdraw substances voluntarily. According to PAN Europe, this is delaying the essential renewal of the pesticide authorisation system, and pesticide licensing authorities are neglecting their duty to protect humans and the environment from danger as a result.

1. What is the Commission's opinion of these 'deals' with the industry?

2. Does this approach not give reason to fear that the resubmission process, which concerns more than 80 active substances, could hamper the system of evaluation by DG SANCO and the European Food Safety Authority?

3. What type of system could ensure that the major data gaps for risk assessment or assessment of the level of danger of particular pesticides are closed?

4. Further study results indicate that no Member State would ban a pesticide simply because it posed a risk to the environment. Does the Commission not find this worrying?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(22 June 2012)

The Commission is aware of the study the Honourable Member refers to. The placing on the market of pesticides is based on Regulation No 1107/2009 of the Parliament and Council (EC) concerning the placing of plant protection products on the market and repealing Council Directives 79/117/EEC and 91/414/EEC ([1]).

1. The approval process for pesticides as a whole is fully transparent and is in line with the high standards of protection laid down in the legislation and with the established decision making rules of the Commission. Furthermore, since the adoption of the resubmission procedure industry initiated 35 court cases against the Commission. This underlines the Commission determination to ensure a high level of protection for humans, animals and the environment.

2. The re-submission programme was established by Commission Regulation (EC) No 33/2008 laying down detailed rules for the application of Council Directive 91/414/EEC as regards a regular and an accelerated procedure for the assessment of active substances which were part of the programme of work referred to in Article 8(2) of that directive but have not been included into its Annex I ([2]) and was concluded in December 2011. This programme allowed EFSA and the Commission to plan properly their work. The implementation of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 is progressing well and keeps pace with the legal deadlines.

3. Active substances can only be approved when at least a safe use can be demonstrated. Major data gaps will not lead to the approval of a substance.

4. The unacceptable impact on the environment is a decisive factor for the Commission and Member States decision-making on pesticides.

([1]) OJ L 309, 24.11.2009, p. 1.
([2]) OJ L 15, 18.1.2008, p. 5.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004152/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(23 Απριλίου 2012)

Θέμα: ΧΥΤΑ Καρβουναρίου Παραμυθιάς

Για τον ΧΥΤΑ στην περιοχή Καρβουναρίου Παραμυθιάς, που συγχρηματοδοτήθηκε από την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή, έχει υποβληθεί η Αναφορά 0212/2008 στην Επιτροπή Αναφορών του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου (PETI). Στην συνεδρίαση της Επιτροπής Αναφορών, στις 20.12.2011, οι εκπρόσωποι της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής υποστήριξαν ότι δεν υπάρχει καμία παραβίαση του κοινοτικού δικαίου και απέρριψαν τα επιχειρήματα του αναφέροντα ότι η Μελέτη Περιβαλλοντικών Επιπτώσεων (ΜΠΕ) περιέχει σφάλματα αλλά και ότι η κατασκευή είναι ελλιπής, ειδικά ως προς την διαχείριση των στραγγισμάτων. Στις 21.3.2012, η Περιφέρεια Ηπείρου, πραγματοποίησε αυτοψία στον ΧΥΤΑ, όπου διαπιστώθηκαν κατασκευαστικά λάθη και παραλείψεις και δεσμεύτηκε άμεσα να ζητήσει «την πραγματοποίηση δειγματοληψίας και χημικών αναλύσεων των υγρών που εκρέουν κατάντι του ΧΥΤΑ». Επίσης, η εταιρία, που από 1.8.2011 ανέλαβε τη διαχείριση του ΧΥΤΑ, απέστειλε επιστολές προς την περιφέρεια Ηπείρου στις οποίες ανέφερε ότι το έργο δεν ανταποκρίνεται στις προδιαγραφές της ΜΠΕ και μεταξύ πολλών άλλων αναφέρει: «δεν έχει κατασκευαστεί φρεάτιο άντλησης στραγγισμάτων εντός λεκάνης του ΧΥΤΑ καθώς επίσης δεν έχουν τοποθετηθεί οι δύο αντλίες ανύψωσης των στραγγισμάτων» (6.9.2011) … «οι ανιχνευτές μεθανίου δεν είναι όλοι εγκατεστημένοι» (27.7.2011) … «έλλειψη αποστραγγιστικής στρώσης στα πρανή με απότομη κλίση» (9.12.2011).

Με δεδομένα τα παραπάνω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. εξακολουθεί να έχει την άποψη πως το έργο ολοκληρώθηκε επιτυχώς και τηρεί τις προδιαγραφές της νομοθεσίας; Αν όχι τι έπραξε προκειμένου να ελεγχθούν οι καταγγελίες για τα σφάλματα και της παραλείψεις κατά τη διάρκεια της κατασκευής και πριν το έργο ολοκληρωθεί;

2. Σε πολλές περιπτώσεις καταγγελιών η Επιτροπή απαντά πως μπορεί να παρέμβει κατά τη διάρκεια της κατασκευής, μόνο σε περίπτωση πρόδηλων σφαλμάτων της ΜΠΕ διαφορετικά τα όποια σφάλματα θα διαπιστωθούν κατά τη λειτουργία του έργου. Θεωρεί η Επιτροπή ότι πρέπει να παρεμβαίνει πιο έγκαιρα για να αποτρέπει την κατασπατάληση πόρων;

Απάντηση του κ. Potočnik εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(15 Ιουνίου 2012)

Με βάση τις πληροφορίες που διαβιβάσθηκαν από τις ελληνικές αρχές στην Επιτροπή, ο ΧΥΤΑ Καρβουναρίου εγκρίθηκε και κατασκευάστηκε με τήρηση της ενωσιακής νομοθεσίας. Ωστόσο, επειδή πρόσφατα παρατηρήθηκαν κάποια προβλήματα δυσλειτουργίας, τα οποία γνωστοποιήθηκαν στην Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή μέσω της Επιτροπής Αναφορών του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή αποφάσισε να επικοινωνήσει με τις ελληνικές αρχές ώστε να λάβει τις αναγκαίες διευκρινίσεις και να κρίνει εάν έχουν ληφθεί επαρκή μέτρα που θα επιτρέψουν στον ΧΥΤΑ να λειτουργήσει και πάλι με τήρηση της περιβαλλοντικής νομοθεσίας της ΕΕ.

Η Επιτροπή επιβεβαιώνει ότι η οδηγία 2011/92/ΕΕ για την εκτίμηση των επιπτώσεων ορισμένων σχεδίων δημοσίων και ιδιωτικών έργων στο περιβάλλον ([1]) δεν της παραχωρεί αρμοδιότητα να παρεμβαίνει σχετικά με τη σκοπιμότητα ενός έργου ή να ελέγχει την ποιότητα της μελέτης περιβαλλοντικών επιπτώσεων και την καταλληλότητα των όρων που επιβάλλονται σε ένα έργο, εκτός από τις περιπτώσεις προδήλου σφάλματος εκτίμησης (και όχι «προφανούς σφάλματος»). Επί του προκειμένου, δεν υφίσταται πρόδηλο σφάλμα εκτίμησης, αλλά περίπτωση μη τήρησης των αποφασισθέντων μέτρων κατόπιν της διενεργηθείσας αξιολόγησης και αδειοδότησης.

([1]) ΕΕ L 26 της 28.1.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004152/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(23 April 2012)

Subject: Landfill site in Karvounari (Paramithia)

Petition 0212/2008 was submitted to the Committee on Petitions of the European Parliament regarding the landfill site in the Karvounari (Paramithia) area, which is co-financed by the European Commission. At a meeting of the Committee on Petitions held on 20 December 2011, the representatives of the European Commission maintained that there had been no breach of Community law and rejected the arguments that the environmental impact assessment (EIA) contained errors and that the construction of the site was inadequate, especially with regard to the management of drainage. On 21 March 2012, the Epirus regional authority inspected the landfill site and discovered construction errors and omissions; the authority immediately promised to request sampling and chemical analyses of the water downstream of the site. The company which took over the management of the site on 1 August 2011 has since written to the Epirus regional authority to say that the site does not meet the specifications of the EIA and, among many other points, the company states that no drainage pumping shaft has been constructed within the site and the two drainage pumps have not been installed (6 September 2011), the methane detectors have not all been fitted (27 July 2011) and there is no drainage layer on steep slopes (9 December 2011).

In view of this:

1. Does the Commission still take the view that the site was completed successfully and that it complies with the existing legislation? If not, what has it done to investigate the claims about construction errors and omissions before the site was completed?

2. In many cases of complaint, the Commission answers that it can intervene during construction only if there are clear errors in the EIA, otherwise any errors will be discovered during the operation of the site. Does the Commission think that it should intervene sooner to avoid wasting resources?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par Mr Potočnik au nom de la Commission
(15 juin 2012)

Sur la base des informations communiquées par les autorités helléniques à la Commission, la décharge de Karvounari a été approuvée et construite dans le respect de la législation de l'UE. Cependant certains problèmes de dysfonctionnement ayant été récemment observés, et communiqués à la Commission via le Comité des pétitions du Parlement européen, la Commission a décidé de contacter les autorités helléniques afin d'obtenir les clarifications nécessaires et voir si les mesures adéquates ont été prises afin de permettre à la décharge de fonctionner à nouveau dans le respect de la législation environnementale de l'UE.

La Commission confirme que la directive 2011/92/CE sur l'évaluation des incidences de certains projets sur l'environnement ([1]) ne lui donne pas la compétence d'intervenir quant à l'opportunité d'un projet ou de contrôler la qualité d'une étude d'impact environnemental et le caractère approprié des conditions imposées à un projet, sauf en cas d'erreur manifeste d'appréciation (et non d'une «erreur claire»). En l'espèce il ne s'agit pas d'une erreur manifeste d'appréciation, mais d'un cas de non-respect des mesures décidées à l'issue de la procédure d'évaluation et d'autorisation qui avait été effectuée.

([1]) JO L 26 du 28.1.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004153/12
to the Commission
John Stuart Agnew (EFD)
(23 April 2012)

Subject: Does water hydrate?

Does water hydrate?

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

In order to provide the Honourable Member with an appropriate answer, the Commission would need specific information on the aspects that the question is aimed to address.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004154/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Andrew Henry William Brons (NI)
(23 April 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — The Falkland Islands

Cristina Fernández, Argentina's President, is accusing Britain of militarising the Falklands, has called upon Argentine companies to cease importing British goods and is threatening a blockade of the islands.

Her position is likely to become more entrenched later this year and again next year, which marks the 180th anniversary of re-establishment of British rule on the Islands, after the illegal and arbitrary pronouncements of sovereignty by the then United Provinces of South America.

The Falklands' population have made clear their determination that the islands remain British. Currently, they are supported by the British Government.

— What action is the Vice-President/High Representative taking to support the islanders and also the current stance of the British Government that the Falklands will remain British?

— Has the Vice-President/High Representative made any representations to the Argentine Government on this issue and, if so, what?

— Has the Vice-President/High Representative received any representations from the Argentinians and, if so, what?

— Can the Falklands Government rely upon the Vice-President/High Representative to back unambiguously both the Falklands Government and the British Government in their position on the future of the islands and in respect of their stance in relation to the hostile opinions expressed by the Argentine President? If not, why not?

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

The Falkland Islands are one of Overseas Countries and Territories (OCT) outside mainland Europe that have constitutional ties with EU Member States. Indeed, under Part IV of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), 'the Member States agree to associate with the Union the non-European countries and territories which have special relations with Denmark, France, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom'.

The purpose of association is to promote the economic and social development of the countries and territories and to establish close economic relations between them and the Union as a whole. The current EU-OCT association agreement expires at the end of 2013 and the next one is currently being prepared by the Commission with a view to presenting a proposal to Council and Parliament before July 2012.

It was a sovereign decision of the United Kingdom to ask for the association of these territories and any change in their status is only possible by amending the TFEU.

The High Representative/Vice-President has not had meetings with Argentinean Government authorities over the past two years and as such has not had any direct representations made on the issue.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004156/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(23 Απριλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Απόφαση κατά της Ελλάδας, εκδοθείσα το 2009 από το Ευρωπαϊκό Δικαστήριο, σχετικά με την προστασία των ζώων κατά τη μεταφορά και κατά τη σφαγή

Την 21η Μαρτίου 2007, η Επιτροπή παρέπεμψε την Ελλάδα στο Ευρωπαϊκό Δικαστήριο λόγω της αδυναμίας ορθής εφαρμογής και επιβολής της ευρωπαϊκής νομοθεσίας σχετικά με την καλή διαβίωση των ζώων κατά τη μεταφορά και τη σφαγή τους.

Τον Σεπτέμβριο του 2009, το Δικαστήριο εξέδωσε απόφαση για την υπόθεση C-416/07, Επιτροπή κατά Ελληνικής Δημοκρατίας, σχετικά με την προστασία των ζώων κατά τη μεταφορά και τη σφαγή. Στην απόφασή του, το Δικαστήριο δηλώνει ότι καθώς η Ελλάδα δεν έλαβε όλα τα αναγκαία μέτρα για την αποκατάσταση της έλλειψης προσωπικού, παρέβη τις υποχρεώσεις που υπέχει από το άρθρο 4, παράγραφος 2, στοιχείο γ του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 882/2004 για τους επίσημους ελέγχους ([1]).

Το Δικαστήριο ζήτησε από την Ελλάδα να λάβει τα απαραίτητα μέτρα ώστε να συμμορφωθεί με την απόφαση.

Έκτοτε, δεν προέκυψε κανένα νέο στοιχείο για το εάν οι ελληνικές αρχές έλαβαν τα εν λόγω μέτρα ή για τις διαδικαστικές ενέργειες της Επιτροπής με σκοπό την παρακολούθηση της κατάστασης.

Ζητείται από την Επιτροπή να απαντήσει στα ακόλουθα ερωτήματα:

— Ποια μέτρα έλαβε η Ελλάδα προκειμένου να συμμορφωθεί με την απόφαση του Δικαστηρίου;

— Θεωρεί η Επιτροπή ότι τα εν λόγω μέτρα επαρκούν για να συμμορφωθεί η Ελλάδα με την απόφαση;

— Εάν η Επιτροπή θεωρεί ότι δεν επαρκούν τα μέτρα, διατίθεται να παραπέμψει εκ νέου την υπόθεση στο δικαστήριο και να επιβάλει στην Ελλάδα, κατά την κρίση της και λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τις ιδιαίτερες τρέχουσες περιστάσεις, την καταβολή εφάπαξ ποσού ή χρηματικής ποινής, σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 260 της Συνθήκης για τη λειτουργία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης;

Απάντηση του κ. Dalli εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(22 Ιουνίου 2012)

Στις 10 Σεπτεμβρίου 2009 το Δικαστήριο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, στην απόφαση που εξέδωσε για την υπόθεση C-416/07 ([2]), αποφάνθηκε ότι η Ελλάδα, αφού δεν έλαβε τα αναγκαία μέτρα, παρέβη τις υποχρεώσεις που υπέχει δυνάμει του άρθρου 5 (Α) παράγραφος 2 στοιχείο δ) σημείο i) πρώτη περίπτωση και του άρθρου 8 της οδηγίας 91/628/ΕΟΚ ([3]) για την προστασία των ζώων κατά τη μεταφορά, του σημείου 48.7 στοιχείο β) του κεφαλαίου VII του παραρτήματος της εν λόγω οδηγίας, καθώς και του άρθρου 3, του άρθρου 5 παράγραφος 1 στοιχείο δ), του άρθρου 6 παράγραφος 1 και του άρθρου 8 της οδηγίας 93/119/ΕΚ ([4]) για την προστασία των ζώων κατά τη σφαγή.

Η Επιτροπή έχει ξεκινήσει διαρθρωμένο διάλογο με τις ελληνικές αρμόδιες αρχές σχετικά με τις ενέργειες που προτίθενται να λάβουν προκειμένου να συμμορφωθούν με την απόφαση. Η Επιτροπή αξιολογεί επί του παρόντος τις ενέργειες που σχεδιάζονται ή λαμβάνονται ήδη από τις ελληνικές αρχές.

Η Επιτροπή θα αποφασίσει τις επόμενες κινήσεις της μόλις οριστικοποιηθεί αυτή η αξιολόγηση.

([1]) http://curia.europa.eu/juris/liste.jsf?language=el&num=C-416/07
([2]) C-416/07, Συλλογή 2009, σ. I-7883.
([3]) Οδηγία 91/628/ΕΟΚ του Συμβουλίου, της 19ης Νοεμβρίου 1991, για την προστασία των ζώων κατά τη μεταφορά και για την τροποποίηση των οδηγιών 90/425/ΕΟΚ και 91/496/ΕΟΚ, ΕΕ L 340 της 11.12.1991.
([4]) Οδηγία 93/119/ΕΚ του Συμβουλίου, της 22ας Δεκεμβρίου 1993, για την προστασία των ζώων κατά τη σφαγή ή/και τη θανάτωσή τους, ΕΕ L 340 της 31.12.1993.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004156/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(23 April 2012)

Subject: The 2009 ruling of the European Court of Justice against Greece regarding the protection of animals during transport and at the time of slaughter

On 21 March 2007, the Commission referred Greece to the European Court of Justice for failure to implement and enforce properly EU legislation on animal welfare during transport and at the time of slaughter.

In September 2009, the Court of Justice issued its ruling on Case C-416/07, *Commission* v *Hellenic Republic*, concerning the protection of animals during transport and at the time of slaughter. In its ruling, the Court declared that, by not having adopted all the measures necessary to remedy the shortage of staff, Greece had failed to fulfil its obligations under Article 4(2)(c) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 on official controls ([1]).

The Court required Greece to take the measures necessary to comply with the judgment.

Since then, no further information has come to light as to whether the Greek authorities have adopted the measures needed to comply with the ruling, or as to the procedural steps that have been taken by the Commission in order to monitor the situation.

The Commission is asked to answer the following:

— What measures has Greece taken to comply with the Court's judgment?

— Is the Commission satisfied that these measures are sufficient to comply with the judgment?

— If the Commission is not satisfied that the measures are sufficient, is it prepared to bring the case back to court, and to ask that Greece be fined a lump sum or penalty payment that the Commission considers appropriate in the particular circumstances, in accordance with Article 260 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(22 June 2012)

On 10 September 2009, the European Court of Justice declared in its ruling in Case C-416/07 ([2]) that, by failing to take the necessary measures, Greece had failed to fulfil its obligations under the first indent of Article 5(A)(2)(d)(i) and Article 8 of Directive 91/628/EEC ([3]) on animal transport, point 48.7(b) of Chapter VII of the annex to that directive, and Articles 3, 5(1)(d), 6(1) and 8 of Directive 93/119/EC ([4]) on slaughter.

The Commission has started a structured dialogue with the Greek competent authorities on which actions are envisaged in order to comply with the judgment. The Commission is currently assessing actions planned or being taken by the Greek authorities.

The Commission will decide on the next steps once such an assessment is finalised.

([1]) http://curia.europa.eu/juris/liste.jsf?language=en&num=C-416/07
([2]) C-416/07, ECR 2009, p. I-7883.
([3]) Council Directive 91/628/EEC of 19 November 1991 on the protection of animals during transport and amending Directives 90/425/EEC and 91/496/EEC, OJ L 340, 11.12.1991.
([4]) Council Directive 93/119/EC of 22 December 1993 on the protection of animals at the time of slaughter or killing, OJ L 340, 31.12.1993.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004157/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(23 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Disputa tra la Repubblica islamica dell'Iran e gli EAU in merito alle isole nel Golfo persico

Il 19 aprile 2012 il Generale Ahmad Reza Pourdastan, comandante delle forze di terra iraniane, ha annunciato che il suo paese è pronto a intervenire militarmente in riferimento alla contesa isola di Abu Musa nel Golfo persico, controllata dall'Iran ma rivendicata dagli Emirati arabi uniti (EAU).

All'inizio di quest'anno, in seguito all'imposizione di nuove sanzioni contro l'Iran, il Presidente iraniano Mahmoud Ahmadinejad ha minacciato di bloccare lo stretto di Hormuz. Il Presidente Ahmadinejad si è recentemente recato sulla contesa isola di Abu Musa, spingendo il ministro degli Esteri degli EAU, lo sceicco Abdullah bin Zayed Al Nahyan, a dichiarare che l'«occupazione» delle isole da parte dell'Iran potrebbe compromettere «la sicurezza e la pace internazionali». Il Presidente Ahmadinejad ha risposto affermando che l'Iran è «pronto a proteggere la sua esistenza e la sua sovranità». Il regime ha rifiutato le rivendicazioni degli EAU, definendole «ingiustificate e infondate». Storicamente, ci sono state delle dispute per l'isola di Abu Musa e per altre due isole nel Golfo persico, Grande Tunb e Piccola Tunb, sin dalla scoperta dei giacimenti petroliferi.

L'agenzia di stampa AFP ha riferito che gli Stati Uniti hanno sollecitato l'Iran ad avviare un dialogo con gli EAU sulle dispute territoriali e hanno inoltre criticato il Presidente Ahmadinejad per essersi recato sull'isola contestata. Il portavoce del Dipartimento di Stato degli Stati Uniti, Mark Toner, ha affermato che gli Stati Uniti sosterranno una «risoluzione pacifica» della disputa per le tre isole di Abu Musa, Grande Tunb e Piccola Tunb, e ha sostenuto l'invito degli EAU affinché la questione sia risolta attraverso il dialogo o il ricorso dinnanzi alla Corte internazionale di giustizia.

1. Qual è la posizione del Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante circa la disputa tra gli EAU e l'Iran per le isole di Abu Musa, Grande Tunb e Piccola Tunb?

2. È l'UE pronta a discutere la questione con il Consiglio di cooperazione del Golfo e le autorità iraniane per cercare di raggiungere un compromesso?

3. È il VP/AR pronto a sostenere, insieme agli Stati Uniti, l'invito degli EAU affinché la questione sia risolta attraverso il ricorso dinnanzi alla Corte internazionale di giustizia?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(20 giugno 2012)

Riguardo alla controversia tra gli Emirati arabi uniti e la Repubblica islamica dell'Iran in merito alle tre isole di Abu Musa, Piccola Tunb e Grande Tunb, l'Unione europea si è ripetutamente dichiarata a favore di una risoluzione pacifica della disputa in conformità del diritto internazionale, attraverso negoziati diretti tra le parti o mediante il ricorso dinnanzi alla Corte internazionale di giustizia.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004157/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(23 April 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Dispute between the Islamic Republic of Iran and the UAE over islands in the Persian Gulf

On 19 April 2012, General Ahmad Reza Pourdastan, Commander of Iran's ground forces, announced that his country is prepared to take military action over the disputed Persian Gulf island of Abu Musa, which is controlled by Iran but claimed by the United Arab Emirates (UAE).

Earlier this year, as more sanctions were imposed on Iran, Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad threatened to block the Strait of Hormuz. President Ahmadinejad recently visited the disputed island of Abu Musa, prompting the UAE's foreign minister, Sheikh Abdullah bin Zayed Al Nahyan, to declare that Iran's 'occupation' of the islands could affect 'international security and peace'. President Ahmadinejad responded by saying that Iran is 'ready to protect its existence and sovereignty'. The regime has rejected the UAE's claims as 'unfounded and baseless'. Historically, there have been disputes over Abu Musa and two other Persian Gulf islands, Greater Tunb and Lesser Tunb, since the discovery of oil.

The AFP news agency reported that the United States has urged Iran to enter talks with the UAE over the territorial disputes, and also criticised President Ahmadinejad for visiting a contested island. US State Department spokesman Mark Toner said that the United States would support 'a peaceful resolution' over the three islands of Abu Musa, Greater Tunb and Lesser Tunb, and backed the UAE's call for the issue to be resolved through talks or by referral to the International Court of Justice.

1. What is the position of the Vice-President/High Representative regarding the dispute between the UAE and Iran over the islands of Abu Musa, Greater Tunb and Lesser Tunb?

2. Is the EU prepared to discuss this issue with the Gulf Cooperation Council and the Iranian authorities in order to work out a compromise?

3. Is the VP/HR prepared to support, along with the United States, the UAE's call for the issue to be resolved by referral to the International Court of Justice?

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

Concerning the dispute between the United Arab Emirates and the Islamic republic of Iran over the three islands of Abu Musa, Lesser Tunb and Greater Tunb, the EU has repeatedly expressed its support for a peaceful settlement in accordance with international law, either through direct negotiations between the parties or by referring the matter to International Court of Justice.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004158/12
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(23 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Tagli agli incentivi dell'industria italiana del fotovoltaico e concorrenza sleale cinese

La filiera del fotovoltaico italiano affronta in questo periodo una forte concorrenza sleale da parte dell'industria cinese, purtroppo avvantaggiata dagli incentivi concessi dalle autorità governative a sostegno dell'esportazione (che vale circa il 15 % del valore del prodotto) permettendo alle aziende cinesi di offrire sotto costo i loro prodotti nei mercati internazionali. Ulteriori incentivi per il settore fotovoltaico vengono attivati quando l'80 % dell'impianto viene realizzato con componenti prodotti in Cina. Anche in Italia vigeva durante il precedente governo la regola del «Made in Europe» inserita nel «Quarto Conto Energia» per gli impianti fotovoltaici con almeno il 60 % di componenti di fabbricazione europea, nonché ulteriori benefici connessi.

Tuttavia, con il nuovo decreto Energie Rinnovabili (il c.d. «Quinto Conto Energia») illustrato dall'attuale governo italiano, questi incentivi verranno tagliati con una conseguente perdita occupazionale di circa 1 500 unità, senza contare l'impatto negativo sull'intero indotto che conta all'incirca 20 000 addetti. Inoltre, la chiusura o il ridimensionamento delle imprese determinerà il venir meno degli investimenti nei programmi di innovazione e ricerca rivolti al raggiungimento della cosiddetta «grid parity» (ovvero il punto in cui l'energia elettrica prodotta con fonti rinnovabili ha lo stesso prezzo dell'energia prodotta con fonti fossili).

Considerando che le disposizioni contenute nel nuovo decreto non faranno altro che aggravare le condizioni dell'industria fotovoltaica italiana, capofila nell'applicazione del «Made in Europe» e considerando altresì che in questi giorni è stato presentato a Strasburgo dalla Commissione europea il «Pacchetto occupazione» il quale prevede un insieme di misure concrete che puntano sulla green economy, può la stessa far sapere:

1. se è al corrente della situazione suesposta;

2. se intende consultare le autorità nazionali o quali provvedimenti può adottare;

3. se concorda sul fatto che queste disposizioni ledono gli sforzi fatti da migliaia di aziende italiane che hanno investito e creduto nella green economy creando numerosi posti di lavoro;

4. come occorre fronteggiare la concorrenza sleale dei paesi extra-UE?

Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(15 giugno 2012)

La Commissione, regolarmente informata dalle autorità italiane, è consapevole delle modifiche previste in Italia per gli incentivi a sostegno dei progetti nel settore dell'energia fotovoltaica. Occorre rilevare che il mix di tecnologie basate su fonti rinnovabili e i regimi di sostegno ad esso collegati differiscono tra i vari Stati membri, a cui spetta curarne la progettazione in funzione delle condizioni nazionali e conformemente alla normativa europea pertinente.

La Commissione ritiene che siano necessarie riforme dei regimi di sostegno e che gli Stati membri debbano seguire le migliori pratiche presenti in Europa nel settore del fotovoltaico cercando di ridurre i disagi e la confusione negli investitori e negli operatori del mercato, i quali stanno creando la crescita e l'occupazione di cui l'Europa ha bisogno.

In caso di distorsione del commercio internazionale di pannelli solari a causa di pratiche compensative e/o di dumping pregiudizievoli per l'industria dell'Unione, la Commissione, dopo aver svolto le relative indagini, può decidere di imporre dazi antisovvenzioni e/o antidumping.

La Commissione può decidere di avviare un'inchiesta antisovvenzioni e/o antidumping se in possesso di indizi sufficienti a dimostrare l'esistenza di pratiche di dumping o di sovvenzioni che comportano un grave pregiudizio per l'industria dell'Unione. Se otterrà tali elementi di prova, la Commissione procederà ad analizzare attentamente i fatti e, qualora sussistano i presupposti giuridici, potrà decidere di aprire un'inchiesta.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004158/12
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(23 April 2012)

Subject: Cuts in incentives for the Italian photovoltaic industry and unfair Chinese competition

The photovoltaic energy sector in Italy is currently facing strong and unfair competition from Chinese industry, which unfortunately is bolstered by government export incentives (amounting to around 15% of the value of the product), enabling Chinese companies to sell below cost on international markets. Further incentives for photovoltaic plant are paid when 80% of the components are produced in China. Similarly, in Italy under the previous Government, the 'Made in Europe' regulation was implemented as part of the 'Fourth Energy Bill', where at least 60% of photovoltaic panel components were made in Europe, in addition to further related benefits.

However, with the new Renewable Energy Decree (the 'Fifth Energy Bill') set out by the current Government, these incentives will be cut, leading to a total loss of approximately 1 500 jobs, without even taking into account the negative impact on all related industries employing around 20 000 staff. Furthermore, the closure or restructuring of companies will lead to the disappearance of investment in innovation and research programmes aimed at reaching so called 'grid parity' (when electricity generated from renewable sources reaches the same price as energy from fossil fuels).

Given that the provisions of the new decree are doing nothing but worsen the situation in the Italian photovoltaic industry, leader in the application of 'Made in Europe', and considering moreover that the European Commission is currently presenting the 'employment package' in Strasbourg, which lays out a set of concrete measures focused on the green economy:

1. Is the Commission aware of this situation?

2. Will it consult the national authorities? What other measures does it intend to take?

3. Does it agree that these regulations are hindering efforts by thousands of Italian companies that have both invested in and believe in the green economy, thereby creating numerous jobs?

4. How does it consider that unfair competition from non-EU countries should be tackled?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(15 June 2012)

The Commission is aware of the proposed changes being made to financial incentives for solar PV projects in Italy and is kept informed by the Italian authorities. It should be noted that the renewable energy technology mix and the related support schemes vary amongst Member States which are responsible for designing them according to national conditions, in compliance with the relevant European legislation.

The Commission believes that reforms to support schemes are needed, that Member States should follow best practice across Europe and strive to minimise disruption and confusion to investors and market players who are creating the jobs and growth Europe needs.

In cases where international trade in solar panels is distorted insofar as countervailing and/or dumping practices cause injury to the Union industry, anti-subsidy and/or anti-dumping duties may be imposed after investigation by the Commission.

The Commission can consider opening an anti-subsidy and/or an anti-dumping investigation when it has sufficient prima facie evidence that dumping or subsidisation takes place and the Union industry is suffering material injury, caused by the dumped or subsidised imports. If the Commission obtains such evidence, it will carefully analyse all facts and may initiate an investigation if all legal conditions are met.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004160/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(23 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Farmaci potenzialmente pericolosi

La Food and Drug Administration (FDA) lancia un allarme: i cerotti antidolorifici a base di oppioidi sono pericolosi per i bambini. La FDA, l'ente governativo statunitense che si occupa della regolamentazione dei prodotti alimentari e farmaceutici, ha fatto sapere che in quindici anni negli Stati Uniti si sono verificati 26 episodi di esposizione accidentale ai cerotti in questione: dieci casi si sono conclusi con il decesso dei bambini e dodici con un ricovero ospedaliero.

I danni che possono causare nei soggetti in età pediatrica possono essere molto gravi a seconda della quantità, del farmaco incriminato, contenuta nel cerotto. Pochi giorni fa, un bambino di tre anni e mezzo è stato ricoverato in terapia intensiva, presso un ospedale di Torino, dopo che per errore gli è stato applicato sotto un piede un cerotto antidolorifico che gli ha causato un coma per overdose da oppiacei.

In merito a quanto sopraesposto, può la Commissione far sapere se ritiene che l'Agenzia europea per i medicinali (EMA) debba rivedere la valutazione scientifica della qualità, sicurezza ed efficacia dei prodotti farmaceutici incriminati affinché si possa proteggere le persone da minacce per la salute?

Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(22 giugno 2012)

Un'autorizzazione all'immissione in commercio di medicinali nella UE può essere rilasciata dalla Commissione europea o dagli Stati membri ([1]). Il Comitato per i medicinali per uso umano dell'Agenzia europea per i medicinali valuta la qualità, la sicurezza e l'efficacia di medicinali autorizzati a livello centrale. Ma interviene anche nella valutazione scientifica di medicinali autorizzati a livello nazionale[1], se, a livello UE, vengono sollevate questioni relative alla qualità, alla sicurezza o all'efficacia di tali prodotti.

Alcuni Stati membri hanno autorizzato l'immissione in commercio di medicinali contenenti oppioidi in cerotti transdermici. Spetta pertanto principalmente agli Stati membri affrontare eventuali rischi connessi all'uso di tali prodotti, ad es. accludendovi informazioni pertinenti al medicinale o allo smaltimento sicuro dei cerotti. L'esposizione accidentale è un rischio noto dell'uso di oppiacei in cerotti transdermici.

Autorizzazioni nazionali di immissione in commercio di medicinali contenenti oppioidi sono state notificate all'agenzia nel 2007 e nel 2009. In quel momento, le informazioni sul prodotto autorizzato dagli Stati membri affrontavano già in misura sufficiente i rischi di esposizione accidentale ai cerotti (p. es. da parte dei bambini) e i modi per attenuarli e l'Agenzia non raccomandò alcuna modifica.

Poiché i medicinali contenenti oppioidi sono già stati riesaminati dall'Agenzia e non esistono nuove risultanze in materia, per la Commissione non è necessario chiedere ulteriori revisioni.

([1]) Regolamento (CE) n. 726/2004 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio del 31 marzo 2004 che istituisce procedure comunitarie per l'autorizzazione e la sorveglianza dei medicinali per uso umano e veterinario, e che istituisce l'agenzia europea per i medicinali, e successive modifiche, nonché direttiva 2001/83/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 6 novembre 2001, recante un codice comunitario relativo ai medicinali per uso umano, e successive modifiche.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004160/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(23 April 2012)

Subject: Potentially dangerous drugs

The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has issued a warning: opioid-based pain-relieving patches are dangerous for children. The FDA, the US government agency which deals with the regulation of food and pharmaceutical products, has stated that in 15 years, 26 episodes of accidental exposure to the patches in question have been confirmed in the United States: ten cases resulted in the death of the babies and twelve in hospitalisation.

The damage they can cause in infants can be very serious depending on the quantity of the offending drug that is contained in the patch. A few days ago, a three-and-a-half-year-old child was admitted into intensive care at a hospital in Turin, after a pain-relieving patch was applied by mistake to the underside of the child's foot causing a coma due to an overdose of opiates.

In view of the above, can the Commission state whether it considers that the European Medicines Agency (EMA) should review the scientific evaluation of the quality, safety and efficacy of the offending pharmaceutical products so that people can be protected against threats to their health?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(22 June 2012)

Marketing authorisation for medicinal products in the EU can be granted either by the European Commission or by the Member States ([1]). The Committee for Medicinal Products for Human use of the European Medicine Agency performs an assessment of quality, safety and efficacy of centrally authorised products. It is also involved in scientific evaluations of nationally authorised medicines[1], when concerns related to quality, safety or efficacy of such products are referred to the EU level.

Marketing authorisations for medicinal products containing opioids in a transdermal patch have been granted by the Member States. Therefore it is primarily the Member States' competence to address any risk related to the safe use of these products, e.g. to include in the product information relevant warnings or to address the safe disposal of used patches. An accidental exposure is a known risk associated with the use of opioid patches.

National marketing authorisations for medicinal products containing opioids were referred to the Agency in 2007 and 2009. At that time, the product information as authorised by the Member States contained already sufficient statements on the risks of the accidental exposure to the patches (e.g. by children) and how these risks can be mitigated, therefore the Agency did not recommend any changes.

Considering that medicinal products containing opioids have already been reviewed by the Agency and that no new relevant information is available, the Commission does not consider it necessary to ask for a further review.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 31 March 2004 laying down community procedures for the authorisation and supervision of medicinal products for human and veterinary use and establishing a European Medicines Agency as amended, and Directive 2001/83/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 November 2001 on the Community Code relating to medicinal products for human use as amended.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004161/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(23 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Operazione antifrode a Foggia

Una vera e propria zecca clandestina è stata scoperta in un capannone alla periferia di Foggia da militari della Guardia di Finanza. È la prova evidente, secondo la Direzione Distrettuale Antimafia di Bari, che la «Società foggiana», la mafia del capoluogo dauno, ha deciso di diversificare le attività illecite. Nell'ambito dell'operazione Fake money, avviata due anni fa, la guardia di finanza ha infatti scoperto un vero e proprio business che la mafia locale ha avviato inizialmente in «joint venture» con la camorra napoletana, ovvero quello della specializzazione nella produzione di banconote false da immettere sul mercato locale e nazionale.

È dalla violazione di un posto di blocco, nel settembre del 2010, che prende l'avvio l'indagine che ha portato agli arresti di oggi: i militari del Comando della Guardia di Finanza di Foggia, in servizio di «controllo economico» sulle strade del territorio, intimavano l'alt a un'automobile, il cui conducente, invece che fermarsi, accelerava e tentava inutilmente la fuga. La perquisizione dell'auto rivelava il motivo della tentata fuga: nel portabagagli l'uomo nascondeva un vero e proprio kit, altamente sofisticato, per la riproduzione illecita di banconote (un centinaio di fogli di carta filigranata originale, due stampanti con diverse cartucce di inchiostro, attrezzature utili al taglio delle banconote ed un computer contenente file riproducenti banconote di vario taglio). Tutto il materiale veniva posto sotto sequestro e la Procura di Foggia avviava un'inchiesta.

In merito a quanto sopraesposto, si interroga la Commissione per sapere:

1. È a conoscenza del blitz portato a termine dai militari pugliesi?

2. Esistono nuovi progetti ed iniziative, rientranti nella politica della lotta alla contraffazione delle monete in euro, da parte dell'Ufficio europeo per la lotta antifrode (OLAF)?

3. È in possesso di dati inerenti al valore totale delle banconote false sequestrate nei vari Stati membri da quando è entrata in vigore la moneta unica?

Risposta di Algirdas Šemeta a nome della Commissione
(6 giugno 2012)

1. L'ufficio europeo per la lotta antifrode (OLAF) è stato informato del blitz effettuato in Puglia a cui fa riferimento l'onorevole parlamentare.

2. Per quanto concerne la protezione dell'euro, la competenza della Commissione riguarda principalmente tre settori:

— proposte politiche o legislative nel quadro della protezione dell'euro ([1]);

— formazione e assistenza tecnica, principalmente sulla base del programma Pericle ([2]);

— analisi tecnica di monete in euro contraffatte, tramite il centro tecnico-scientifico europeo (CTSE), che fornisce assistenza agli Stati membri, agli organi di polizia e alle autorità di paesi terzi.

3. Secondo le informazioni trasmesse dalla Banca centrale europea e dal CTSE:

— 7 508 417 banconote (per un valore complessivo di 476 314 000 euro) e

— 1 594 314 monete (per un valore complessivo di 2 641 000 euro)

— sono state confiscate prima e dopo l'immissione in circolazione nel periodo tra il 2002 e il 2011.

([1]) La Commissione sta preparando una proposta di direttiva che sostituisca l'attuale decisione quadro 2000/383/GAI per migliorare la protezione dell'euro contro la falsificazione attraverso misure di diritto penale.

([2]) Nell'ambito del programma di lavoro annuale, l'OLAF sta attuando un programma formativo PERICLE (decisione del Consiglio 2001/923/CE del 17.12.2001).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004161/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(23 April 2012)

Subject: Anti-fraud operation in Foggia

Officers of the Guardia di Finanza (Italian serious fraud police) discovered a veritable illegal mint in a warehouse on the outskirts of Foggia. The anti-mafia directorate in the region of Bari stated that this is clear proof that the 'Società Foggiana', the Daunian capital's mafia, has decided to diversify its illegal activities. As part of operation 'Fake Money' launched two years ago, the Guardia di Finanza has uncovered a veritable business initially launched by the local mafia as a 'joint venture' with the Neapolitan Camorra mafia, namely specialising in the production of counterfeit banknotes to be placed on local and national markets.

It was failure to stop at a roadblock in September 2010 that triggered off the investigation that led to these arrests. Officers from Foggia's Guardia di Finanza were carrying out stop-and-search checks along local roads when they signalled a car to pull over; however instead of stopping the driver accelerated and attempted a failed getaway. The reason for the attempted getaway became apparent when the car was searched: concealed in the boot was a complete, highly sophisticated kit (100 sheets of original watermarked paper, two printers with various ink cartridges, devices for cutting banknotes and a computer containing files reproducing banknotes of various denominations) for the unlawful reproduction of banknotes. All the materials were seized and the Director of Public Prosecutions for Foggia opened an investigation.

With regard to the above, could the Commission state whether:

1. It is aware of the raid carried out by the officers in Apulia?

2. The European Anti-Fraud Office has any new projects and initiatives in view to combat counterfeiting of euro currency?

3. It has information on the value of all the counterfeit notes seized in the various Member States since the single currency entered into force?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2012)

1. The European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) has been informed about the raid carried out in Apulia to which the Honourable Member refers.

2. The competence of the Commission with regard to the protection of the euro mainly concerns three domains:

— policy or legislative proposals in the framework of the protection of the euro ([1]);

— training and technical assistance, based mainly on the Pericles programme ([2]);

— the technical analysis of counterfeit euro coins, through the European Technical and Scientific Centre (ETSC). ETSC provides assistance to the Member States, police agencies and third countries' authorities.

3. According to the information provided by the European Central Bank and the ETSC:

— 7 508 417 banknotes (value: EUR 476 314 000 in total) and 1 594 314 coins (value: EUR 2 641 000 in total) have been seized before and after circulation in the period 2002-2011.

([1]) The Commission is preparing a proposal for a directive in order to replace the current Framework Decision 2000/383/JHA to improve the protection of the euro against counterfeiting by criminal law.

([2]) OLAF is implementing with an annual work programme a training programme Pericles (Council Decision 2001/923/EC of 17.12.2001).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004162/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(23 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Ricerca contro i tumori

Utilizzare cellule staminali mesenchimali per la terapia contro i tumori ossei infantili e ricostruire l'arto dei bambini colpiti da questa malattia nel modo che sia il più possibile affidabile e duraturo nel tempo è l'obiettivo del progetto coordinato da ricercatori italiani.

A rendere evidenti le sinergie che questo progetto favorisce è un centro clinico di oncologia ricostruttiva che adotta per i piccoli pazienti terapie rigenerative utilizzando le cellule staminali. Il centro ha scelto di puntare sulle cellule staminali mesenchimali per le loro caratteristiche: sono infatti capaci di autorinnovarsi e differenziarsi, diventando i «mattoni» di terapie innovative in molteplici campi. Queste cellule possono essere utilizzate per ripopolare strutture naturali o sintetiche, impiantate a scopo sostitutivo in resezioni ossee dovute a tumore. Inoltre, opportunamente ingegnerizzate potranno diventare mezzi di trasporto di composti bioattivi sulle cellule tumorali, contribuendo alla regressione di gravi forme tumorali.

In merito a quanto sopraesposto, può la Commissione:

1. far sapere se è a conoscenza del nuovo studio e se ritiene che la ricerca summenzionata possa essere finanziata attraverso il Settimo programma quadro (7° PQ) oppure il Programma quadro per la competitività e l'innovazione?

2. fornire informazioni circa il numero d'individui che soffrono di tumori ossei infantili in Europa?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(22 giugno 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza dell'iniziativa menzionata dall'onorevole parlamentare, coordinata dall'Associazione di Genitori italiana «Noi per Voi per il Meyer» e sostenuta dalla fondazione Just Italia ([1]).

1. La ricerca su nuovi interventi terapeutici contro i tumori infantili ha costituito una priorità del Sesto e del Settimo programma quadro di ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico (6° PQ, 2002-2006 — 7° PQ, 2007-2013). Fino ad ora sono stati destinati 145 milioni di euro (31 progetti) alla ricerca oncologica, in particolare alla ricerca sui tumori ematologici, cerebrali, embrionali e del tessuto connettivo osseo e molle. Le aree tematiche interessate includono lo studio di nuove terapie, la ricerca sulla qualità della vita e i fattori di rischio ed epidemiologici.

Nonostante la ricerca sull'uso di cellule staminali mesenchimali nella ricostruzione degli arti nei bambini affetti da tumore osseo non sia stata finora sostenuta dal programma quadro dell'UE, vi sono diversi progetti che si occupano di questo tipo di terapia per la rigenerazione ossea in altre indicazioni terapeutiche. Ad esempio, VASCUBONE ([2]) ha come obiettivo misurare gli effetti che diverse combinazioni di biomateriali e tipi di cellule hanno sulla rigenerazione ossea; REBORNE ([3]) si propone di eseguire test clinici con cellule e biomateriali avanzati che inducono la cicatrizzazione ossea nei pazienti; OSTEOGROW ([4]) utilizza composti che inducono la crescita delle ossa per migliorarne la rigenerazione.

Ulteriori opportunità per la ricerca collaborativa sulle cellule staminali mesenchimali nei bambini affetti da tumore potranno emergere dagli inviti a presentare proposte del 7° PQ che sarà pubblicato a luglio 2012 ([5]).

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

2. In Europa, 46 000 tra bambini, adolescenti e giovani risultano essere affetti da tumori ossei ([6]).

([1]) http://www.stamptoscana.it/articolo/salute/in-toscana-si-sperimenta-sulle-cellule-staminali-per-curare-i-tumori-alle-o ; http://www.italiasalute.it/copertina.asp?Articolo_id=11004.
([2]) www.vascubone.fraunhofer.eu.
([3]) www.reborne.org.
([4]) www.osteogrow.eu.
([5]) https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/home.
([6]) Gatta et al. (2011) European Journal of Cancer 47: 2493-2511.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004162/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(23 April 2012)

Subject: Cancer research

The objective of a project coordinated by Italian researchers is to use mesenchymal stem cells to treat bone cancer in children and rebuild the limbs of children affected by this disease so that they will be as reliable and long-lasting as possible.

The synergy that this project promotes is clearly demonstrated by a clinical reconstructive oncology centre that uses regenerative stem-cell treatment for its young patients. The centre has decided to focus on mesenchymal stem cells because of their characteristics: they are indeed capable of self-renewal and differentiation, becoming the 'building bricks' of innovative treatment in numerous fields. These cells can be used to repopulate natural or synthetic structures, implanted as replacements during bone resections performed due to cancer. Furthermore, when appropriately engineered, they will be able to transport bioactive compounds to cancer cells, thereby contributing to the regression of serious forms of cancer.

With reference to the above, can the Commission:

1. state whether it is aware of this new study and whether it believes that the above research could be funded by the Seventh Framework Programme (FP7) or the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme;

2. provide information on the number of children suffering from bone cancer in Europe?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(22 June 2012)

The Commission is aware of the initiative mentioned by the Honourable member, coordinated by the Italian Parent Association 'Noi per Voi per il Meyer' and supported by the Foundation Just Italia ([1]).

1. Research on new therapeutic approaches for childhood cancers has been a priority across the Sixth and Seventh Framework Programmes for Research and Technological Development (FP6, 2002-2006 — FP7, 2007-2013). So far, EUR 145 million (31 projects) have been devoted to research on haematological and brain cancers, embryonic tumours, soft and bone connective tissue cancers. Areas addressed include novel therapies, quality-of-life research, epidemiology and risk factors.

Although research on the use of mesenchymal stem cells for the reconstruction of limbs in children with bone cancer has not been supported so far in the EU Framework Programme, several projects address mesenchymal stem cell therapy for bone regeneration in other disease indications. For example, Vascubone ([2]) will test the effects of different combinations of biomaterials and cell types on bone regeneration; Reborne ([3]) will perform clinical trials using advanced biomaterials and cells triggering bone healing in patients; Osteogrow ([4]) will use bone growth-inducing compounds for improving bone regeneration.

Further opportunities for collaborative research on mesenchymal stem cells in children with cancer may arise in calls for proposals under FP7 to be published in July 2012 ([5]).

In line with the decision on the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme, this programme does not support any kind of research.

2. In Europe, 46 000 children, adolescents and young adults present with bone tumours ([6]).

([1]) http://www.stamptoscana.it/articolo/salute/in-toscana-si-sperimenta-sulle-cellule-staminali-per-curare-i-tumori-alle-o; http://www.italiasalute.it/copertina.asp?Articolo_id=11004.
([2]) www.vascubone.fraunhofer.eu.
([3]) www.reborne.org.
([4]) www.osteogrow.eu.
([5]) https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/home.
([6]) Gatta et al. (2011) European Journal of Cancer 47: 2493-2511.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004163/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(23 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Un Parlamento europeo dei giovani

I consigli comunali dei ragazzi sono istituiti per la prima volta in Francia nel 1979. In quell'anno, il sindaco e i rappresentanti locali di Schiltigheim, un piccolo comune dell'Alsazia (Francia orientale), pensarono di creare una struttura in cui i giovani potessero essere, in prima persona, portavoce dei propri interessi secondo diverse fasce d'età. Da allora, in Francia sono sorti oltre mille consigli comunali dei ragazzi organizzati in una struttura denominata ANACEJ (Association nationale des conseils d'enfants et de jeunes). Questa iniziativa, che vede collaborare le amministrazioni comunali con le istituzioni scolastiche, si sta gradualmente diffondendo in altri paesi europei. In Italia, i consigli comunali dei ragazzi sono all'incirca un centinaio.

Essi rappresentano un modo nuovo e originale per far partecipare, da protagonisti, i giovani alla vita interna delle istituzioni educative e anche alle proposte formative delle amministrazioni comunali. Al tempo stesso, il consiglio comunale dei ragazzi costituisce un gruppo attivo e propositivo di persone che individuano problemi e propongono strategie risolutive a educatori e amministratori, con il contributo della propria creatività, progettualità, intraprendenza, desiderio di collaborazione e di essere presenza operativa all'interno della scuola e del proprio territorio.

Un consiglio comunale dei ragazzi, nel momento in cui entra in relazione con le realtà socio-culturali ed economiche del territorio, è vera espressione di azione partecipata al servizio della comunità giovanile e, di riflesso, di tutta la comunità locale che riceverà benefici in termini di miglioramento e risanamento del fondamento della società: la componente giovanile.

Alla luce di quanto sopraesposto, s'interroga la Commissione per sapere:

1. se è in possesso di dati inerenti al numero di consigli comunali dei ragazzi presenti nell'UE;

2. se ritiene che, in futuro, si possa considerare la possibilità di creare un'istituzione a livello europeo ispirata a quella summenzionata.

Risposta di Androulla Vassiliou a nome della Commissione
(22 giugno 2012)

La promozione della partecipazione dei giovani alla vita civica fa parte integrante della politica UE per la gioventù fin da quando essa apparve, oltre 10 anni fa. La partecipazione dei giovani è uno dei campi di intervento della Strategia UE per i giovani (2010-18) e l'attuale priorità tematica del cosiddetto *dialogo strutturato con i giovani* è «Partecipazione dei giovani alla vita democratica». Sostenere i progetti di partecipazione giovanile è anche una priorità del programma «Gioventù in azione» (2007-2013).

La Commissione è favorevole a ogni iniziativa a livello regionale e locale che possa favorire la partecipazione dei giovani e alla società e lo sviluppo del loro senso civile (*cittadinanza attiva*). Pur non disponendo di dati specifici sul numero di consigli comunali dei giovani nella UE, la Commissione ne conosce l'esistenza in vari Stati membri e sa che il loro status, i loro punti di riferimento e la gamma delle loro attività variano molto. Anche a causa del principio di sussidiarietà, non spetta alla Commissione istituire una qualche struttura a livello europeo basata sui consigli comunali dei giovani.

La Commissione tuttavia coopera strettamente con il Forum europeo della gioventù, che è l'organizzazione europea sotto la cui egida si raccolgono i consigli nazionali della gioventù e altre organizzazioni giovanili. Il Forum europeo della gioventù presiede il Comitato direttivo europeo del Dialogo strutturato con i giovani e le loro organizzazioni; i gruppi di lavoro nazionali, che gestiscono il Dialogo strutturato a livello nazionale, sono di solito guidati da consigli della gioventù nazionali. Il programma Gioventù in azione sovvenziona annualmente il funzionamento del Forum europeo della gioventù.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004163/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(23 April 2012)

Subject: A European parliament for young people

Youth local councils were established for the first time in France in 1979. In that year, the mayor and local representatives of Schiltigheim, a small town in Alsace (eastern France), decided to create a body where young people could personally voice their own interests, according to their age group. Since then, over 1 000 youth local councils have been created in France, under the umbrella of the ANACEJ (National Association of Children's and Youth Councils). This initiative, where local administrations collaborate with schools, is gradually spreading to other European countries. In Italy, there are approximately 100 youth local councils.

They are a new and original way of getting young people involved, as key players, in the inner workings of educational institutions and also in the educational proposals of local authorities. Youth local councils are also a dynamic, proactive group of people who identify issues and put forward strategies to resolve them, to both teachers and administrators, drawing on their creativity, planning skills, resourcefulness, desire to collaborate and to have an operational presence within schools and their region.

When it comes into contact with the social, cultural and economic realities of the region, a youth local council becomes the true expression of collective action which serves the young community and, as a consequence, the entire local community. The latter benefits in terms of having an improved and restored bedrock of society: young people.

In view of the above, can the Commission state:

1. whether it has data on the number of youth local councils in the EU;

2. whether it believes that, in the future, it might consider the possibility of creating an institution at European level, based on the aforesaid councils?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(22 June 2012)

Promoting youth participation in civic life has been a cornerstone in EU youth policy, ever since its inception more than a decade ago. The EU Youth Strategy (2010-18) has youth participation as one of its fields of action, and the current thematic priority of the Structured Dialogue with youth is 'youth participation in democratic life'. Support to youth participation projects is also a priority of the Youth in Action programme (2007-13).

The Commission welcomes initiatives at regional and local level which foster young people's participation in society and their active citizenship. While the Commission does not have specific data on the number of local youth councils in the EU, it is well aware of their existence in several Member States, where their status, terms of reference and range of activities tend to differ. Taking into account also the principle of subsidiarity, it is not for the Commission to set up any structures at European level based on local youth councils.

The Commission, nevertheless, cooperates closely with the European Youth Forum, which is the European umbrella organisation of national youth councils and other youth organisations. The European Youth Forum chairs the European Steering Committee for the Structured Dialogue with young people and youth organisations, and National Working Groups, who manage the conduct of Structured Dialogue at national level, are in most cases led by national youth councils. The Youth in Action programme provides an annual operating grant for the European Youth Forum.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004164/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(23 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Diritti umani dei kachin in Birmania

La Birmania o Myanmar è un mosaico di sette Stati e altrettante regioni abitate da numerose etnie differenti. Purtroppo, ancora oggi, alcune etnie sono costrette a vivere nel timore di attacchi e persecuzioni a causa della loro cultura e religione. I kachin, un popolo di religione cattolica che risiede al nord della Birmania, ha organizzato un vero e proprio esercito, il Kia (esercito indipendentista dei kachin), costituito da circa 20 mila uomini, a detta di fonti locali. Le ultime crudeli violenze a seguito di scontri tra il Kia e le forze armate birmane, hanno causato centinaia di morti e almeno 60 mila profughi. Donne, bambini e anziani in fuga si sono rifugiati in diversi campi situati anche dall'altra parte del confine con la Cina. I kachin hanno una grande fede che permette loro di lottare per i propri diritti e resistere ormai da 51 anni. Le chiese rudimentali dei kachin presentano evidenti danni e segni dei combattimenti.

Le immagini e le icone sacre sono poche e rovinate. I cristiani kachin hanno aspettato a lungo il cambiamento politico avvenuto recentemente nel governo birmano. L'elezione in Parlamento del Premio Nobel per la pace Aung San Suu Kyi può essere considerata storica e lascia intendere che il Paese sta lentamente avanzando verso un sistema democratico. Tuttavia, la nuova costituzione non prevede alcuna tutela né autonomia per le minoranze.

Considerato che la Birmania sta muovendo i primi passi verso la democrazia ma che la libertà di religione e di espressione sancite nella Dichiarazione universale dei diritti dell'uomo, sono continuamente messe in discussione, chiedo al Vice Presidente/Alto Rappresentante quali sono le posizioni dell'Unione europea riguardo all'attuale politica birmana e agli scontri tra il Kia e l'esercito Tatmadaw e se intende adottare misure particolari per proteggere i cristiani kachin?

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

In Birmania/Myanmar la guerra civile è in corso dal 1948, anno dell'indipendenza, e decenni di turbolenze e repressioni hanno indubbiamente causato grandi sofferenze ai gruppi etnici del paese.

A differenza del precedente governo militare, che ha ripetutamente risposto ai disordini con ulteriore violenza, il governo del presidente U Thein Sein ha compiuto notevoli sforzi per ottenere un cessate il fuoco, un primo passo per giungere ad accordi di pace con i gruppi etnici armati, offrendo una prospettiva di sviluppo a più lungo termine delle regioni etniche. Circa una decina di negoziati con diversi gruppi sono già andati a buon fine, con l'unica eccezione dello Stato di Kachin. Dal giugno 2011, decine di migliaia di civili sono stati sfollati nello Stato di Kachin e nello Stato settentrionale dello Shan. Alcuni hanno trovato rifugio in aree controllate dal governo (ad es. in edifici delle chiese) dove sono stati aiutati dalle organizzazioni umanitarie internazionali e locali. Il numero degli sfollati varia dato che alcuni sono in continuo movimento nel tentativo di prendersi cura dei loro terreni e di proteggere le loro proprietà.

L'Unione europea ha sollevato presso il governo la questione di un accesso maggiormente facilitato per le organizzazioni umanitarie. Il presidente U Thein Sein, nel suo ultimo incontro con l'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton, ha riconosciuto le sofferenze della popolazione e ha ribadito il suo impegno per risolvere pacificamente il problema di Kachin, come dimostra anche la sua precedente decisione di sospendere la costruzione di un discusso progetto per la rete idrica.

Il problema non può essere ridotto ad una mera questione di persecuzione religiosa. I problemi sono legati a decenni di violenza, sottosviluppo, mancanza di riconoscimento delle identità culturali, etniche e linguistiche e a interessi economici (Kachin è una regione con notevoli risorse naturali).

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha chiarito che l'UE è pronta ad aiutare la Birmania/Myanmar ad attuare riforme politiche ed economiche, specialmente nelle aree dove risiedono le minoranze etniche.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004164/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(23 April 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Human rights of Burma's Kachin people

Burma, or Myanmar, is a mosaic of seven states and seven regions inhabited by many different ethnic groups. Unfortunately, even today, several ethnic groups are forced to live in fear of attack and persecution because of their culture and religion. The Kachins are a Catholic people, in the north of Burma, who have formed their own army, the Kachin Independence Army (KIA), comprising about 20 000 men according to local sources. The latest violent clashes between the KIA and Burmese armed forces left hundreds of dead and at least 60 000 refugees. Fleeing women, children and elderly people took refuge in several camps, some on the Chinese side of the border. The Kachins have a strong faith which has driven them to fight for their rights and resist for the past 51 years. The rudimentary Kachin churches show clear evidence of damage and fighting.

There are few — ruined — religious icons. Kachin Christians have been waiting for years for the political change that recently came about in the Burmese government. The election to parliament of Nobel Peace Prize winner Aung San Suu Kyi can be considered a watershed and suggests that the country is slowly moving towards a democratic system. Nevertheless, the new constitution does not include protection or autonomy for minorities.

Given that Burma is taking its first steps towards democracy but the freedom of religion and expression endorsed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are constantly being challenged, can the Vice-President/High Representative state the European Union's position on Burma's current policies and on the clashes between the KIA and the Tatmadaw army, and whether she intends to adopt special measures to protect Kachin Christians?

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

Burma/Myanmar has seen civil war since independence in 1948. Decades of unrest and repression undoubtedly caused great suffering for ethnic groups in Burma/Myanmar.

Unlike the former military Government, which had routinely responded by more violence, the Government of President U Thein Sein has made great efforts to achieve cease fires as a first step towards peace settlements with armed ethnic groups, while offering a longer-term developmental perspective to the ethnic regions. About a dozen negotiations with various groups have been successful. Kachin State is the exception. Since June 2011, tens of thousands of civilians have been displaced in Kachin State and northern Shan State. Some people have taken shelter in government-controlled areas (e.g. church compounds), where they receive support from international and national humanitarian organisations. Numbers fluctuate, as some people move back and forth, to try to tend their fields and to protect property.

The EU has raised the need for better humanitarian access with the Government. President U Thein Sein, in his recent meeting with High Representative/Vice-President Ashton, acknowledged the suffering of the people and underlined his commitment to solve the Kachin issue peacefully. His earlier decision to suspend construction of a disputed hydro-project illustrates this.

The problem cannot be reduced to only one of religious persecution. Grievances are linked to the heritage of decades of violence, underdevelopment, lack of recognition of cultural, ethnic and linguistic identity and business interests — Kachin is a region with significant natural resources.

The High Representative/Vice-President has made it clear that the EU stands ready to help Burma/Myanmar pursue political and economic reforms, notably in the ethnic areas.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004165/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(23 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — La crisi in Tibet

La diciannovesima sessione del Consiglio dei diritti umani delle Nazioni Unite ha rivelato la grande preoccupazione di tutti i paesi europei e degli Stati Uniti per la situazione in Tibet. Lo scorso marzo, infatti, i governi hanno condannato le dure repressioni sferrate dalla Cina al popolo tibetano. Le dichiarazioni rilasciate dai governi indicano la grave violazione dei diritti umani presente in Cina. Dal 2009 ben 33 tibetani si sono immolati in segno di protesta, 20 solo dall'inizio del 2012, 23 persone sono decedute dopo essersi immolate. La maggior parte erano monaci o ex monaci del monastero Kirti in Ngaba. Le motivazioni di tali proteste sono palesi: libertà di vivere senza costrizioni la loro cultura e religione e il ritorno del simbolo della loro identità, il Dalai Lama.

Per garantire i diritti fondamentali ai tibetani, il governo cinese dovrebbe riconsiderare la sua politica di oppressione e intimidazione nei confronti di questa etnia e trasformare in un' opportunità per la Cina la concezione negativa che attualmente vede i tibetani buddisti come un ostacolo al partito unico.

Lo stesso Ban Ki-moon ha reagito allo sciopero della fame che un attivista ha intrapreso davanti al quartier generale dell'ONU a New York.

Considerato che le proteste dei tibetani riescono a scuotere l'opinione pubblica e a far puntare i riflettori sulla violazione dei diritti umani che avviene costantemente in Cina, chiedo al Vice Presidente/Alto Rappresentante qual è la sua opinione sui risultati del Consiglio dei diritti umani svoltosi lo scorso marzo nonché se e come intende contribuire a fermare le immolazioni dei tibetani che sono in continuo aumento?

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

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente annette grande importanza alla situazione in Tibet. Segue inoltre da vicino gli sviluppi nelle zone popolate da tibetani, dove negli ultimi mesi si è immolato un numero crescente di persone e si sono verificati gravi scontri tra la polizia e la popolazione locale.

L'UE ha colto l'occasione di alcuni incontri politici ad alto livello con le controparti cinesi ed ha avviato varie iniziative per esprimere la propria inquietudine riguardo alla situazione in Tibet e per attirare l'attenzione su singoli casi che destano preoccupazione. In tali occasioni, ha ripetutamente chiesto alle autorità cinesi di non ricorrere all'uso della forza contro i manifestanti, di consentire al popolo tibetano di esercitare senza limitazioni i propri diritti in campo religioso, linguistico e culturale, e infine di affrontare le cause alla base della tragica serie di autoimmolazioni, in particolare la mancanza di una vera partecipazione del popolo tibetano alla politica di sviluppo della regione. L'UE ha inoltre chiesto il permesso di recarsi senza restrizioni nelle regioni abitate dai tibetani, ma la richiesta finora non è stata accolta. Al vertice UE-Cina del 14 febbraio 2012, il Presidente Van Rompuy ha sollecitato la Cina ad affrontare le rimostranze al suo interno, incluso il Tibet, senza eccessi e in modo equilibrato. L'UE ha inoltre espresso la propria preoccupazione per la situazione in Tibet nel corso dell'ultima tornata del Consiglio dei diritti umani all'inizio di marzo e durante l'ultima sessione del dialogo sui diritti umani tra UE e Cina, svoltasi il 29 maggio 2012.

L'UE continuerà ad attirare l'attenzione della Cina su tali questioni. In seguito all'ultima riunione fra le autorità cinesi e gli inviati del Dalai Lama all'inizio del 2010, sosteniamo con forza la ripresa del dialogo fra tutte le parti al fine di contribuire a trovare una soluzione duratura.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004165/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(23 April 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — The crisis in Tibet

The 19th Session of the United Nations Human Rights Council revealed the deep concern felt by all European countries and the United States with regard to the situation in Tibet. In March 2012, their governments condemned the harsh repression inflicted by China on the people of Tibet. Government statements point to a gross violation of human rights in China. Since 2009, no less than 33 Tibetans have protested by resorting to self-immolation, with 20 incidents from the start of 2012 alone; 23 people have died from their burns. Most of the protesters were monks or former monks from the Ngaba Kirti Monastery. The reason for these protests is clear: they want freedom to practise their culture and religion without constraint, as well as the return of the Dalai Lama, the iconic figure who represents them.

In order to guarantee fundamental rights for Tibetans, the Chinese Government must reconsider its policy of oppression and intimidation that it is inflicting on this ethnic group and must turn the negative perception that it currently has of Tibetan Buddhists as an obstacle to single-party rule into an opportunity for China.

Ban Ki-moon himself reacted to the hunger strike by an activist in front of the UN headquarters in New York.

Since Tibetan protests are able to shock public opinion and shine a constant spotlight on human rights violations in China, how does the Vice-President/High Representative view the conclusions of the Human Rights Council held last March, does she intend to help stop the increasing number of Tibetan self-immolations, and, if so, how?

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

The High Representative/Vice-President attaches great importance to the situation in Tibet. She follows closely the developments in Tibetan-populated areas, where an increasing number of self-immolations have occurred and where serious clashes between the police and the local population took place over the last few months.

The EU has taken the opportunity of high-level political meetings with its Chinese counterparts as well as several demarches to express its anxiety regarding the situation in Tibet and to raise individual cases of concern. On these occasions, the EU has repeatedly urged the Chinese authorities to refrain from the use of force against demonstrations, to allow the Tibetan people to exercise their religious, linguistic and cultural rights without restriction and to address the root causes of the tragic series of self-immolations, and in particular the lack of genuine participation by the Tibetan population in the development policy of the region. The EU has also asked to be allowed to visit the regions inhabited by Tibetans in an unrestricted way but this request has been denied so far. At the EU-China Summit on 14 February 2012, President Van Rompuy called on China to deal with grievances in the country, including in Tibet, in a restrained and balanced manner. The EU also expressed its concerns about Tibet at the last round of the Human Rights Council in early March and at the last session of the EU-China Human Rights dialogue which took place on 29 May 2012.

The EU will continue to engage China on these issues. Following the last meeting between the Chinese authorities and the Envoys of the Dalai Lama in early 2010, we strongly support the restart of the dialogue between all parties in order to contribute to a durable solution.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004166/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(23 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Parchi eolici: impatto sulla popolazione di uccelli

Il settore eolico è cresciuto molto rapidamente in anni recenti con oltre 3000 turbine installate in 300 centrali nella sola Gran Bretagna secondo i dati di RenewableUK. Malgrado il loro apporto sia essenziale per la produzione di energia rinnovabile, le fattorie del vento sono in grado però di provocare effetti nocivi sulla fauna naturale. Uccelli e pipistrelli rappresentano i gruppi più colpiti. I rischi per l'avifauna includono la morte per collisione diretta con pale e altre parti dell'aerogeneratore o l'allontanamento e scomparsa degli animali conseguente a rumore e altri disturbi. Giungere a una migliore comprensione del fenomeno è tuttavia decisivo per consentire di conciliare lo sviluppo dei progetti di energia rinnovabile con gli obiettivi di conservazione della natura. In base a quanto osservato, gli uccelli sono in grado di coesistere con torri e turbine ma con notevoli differenze da specie a specie.

Visto l'interesse dell'Europa per la creazione di energia rinnovabile e alternativa, può la Commissione far sapere se intende richiedere agli Stati, qualora fossero interessati alla realizzazione di parchi eolici, una valutazione di impatto degli stessi a tutela della fauna aviaria?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(15 giugno 2012)

Lo sviluppo dell'energia eolica è fondamentale affinché l'UE possa raggiungere i suoi obiettivi in materia di clima ed energia. D'altro canto, la Commissione è pienamente consapevole che gli uccelli selvatici possono essere particolarmente colpiti dagli sviluppi nel settore eolico. Tutte le specie di uccelli selvatici sono protette a norma della direttiva Uccelli ([1]), che stabilisce un regime di protezione generale, nonché di tutela degli habitat, in particolare attraverso la rete Natura 2000. Ai sensi dell'articolo 6, paragrafo 3, della direttiva Habitat ([2]), i parchi eolici che potrebbero avere incidenze negative su un sito della rete Natura 2000 devono essere oggetto di un'opportuna valutazione, che tenga conto degli obiettivi di conservazione del sito in questione.

Tuttavia, i piani e i progetti relativi a parchi eolici sono regolamentati da una gamma più ampia di norme in materia ambientale, che impone una valutazione d'impatto sulla fauna selvatica e su altri aspetti connessi all'ambiente. Vi si applicano infatti le disposizioni delle direttive sulla valutazione ambientale strategica ([3]) e sulla valutazione dell'impatto ambientale ([4]). Inoltre, i parchi eolici sono elencati nell'allegato II della direttiva sulla valutazione dell'impatto ambientale e ciò implica che, in taluni casi, potrebbero essere soggetti a una valutazione d'impatto completa. Nella valutazione dell'impatto ambientale vengono presi in considerazione, tra altri aspetti, gli effetti che un determinato progetto potrebbe avere sull'uomo, sulla fauna, sulla flora e sul paesaggio.

Per facilitare lo svolgimento di valutazioni appropriate nel settore eolico, nel 2011 la Commissione ha pubblicato un documento di orientamento sull'applicazione ai parchi eolici della legislazione dell'UE relativa al patrimonio naturale ([5]).

([1]) Direttiva 2009/147/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 30 novembre 2009, concernente la conservazione degli uccelli selvatici, GU L 20 del 26.1.2010.

([2]) Direttiva 92/43/CEE del Consiglio, del 21 maggio 1992, relativa alla conservazione degli habitat naturali e seminaturali e della flora e della fauna selvatiche, GU L 206 del 22.7.1992.

([3]) Direttiva 2001/42/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 27 giugno 2001, concernente la valutazione degli effetti di determinati piani e programmi sull'ambiente, GU L 197 del 21.7.2001.

([4]) Direttiva 2011/92/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 13 dicembre 2011, concernente la valutazione dell'impatto ambientale di determinati progetti pubblici e privati, GU L 26 del 28.1.2012.

([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/Wind_farms.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004166/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(23 April 2012)

Subject: Wind farms: impact on the bird population

The wind energy sector has grown extremely rapidly in recent years, with over 3 000 wind turbines now installed in 300 wind farms in the United Kingdom alone, according to data provided by RenewableUK. Despite their vital contribution to renewable energy generation, wind farms can, however, have adverse impacts on wildlife. Birds and bats are most affected. Risks to bird-life include death due to collisions with rotors and other parts of wind generators, or the displacement and disappearance of birds owing to noise or other disturbances. A better understanding of the phenomenon is, however, crucial if the planning of renewable energy projects is to be reconciled with the aims of nature conservation. Birds have been found to be capable of coexisting with wind towers and turbines, but with significant differences from one species to another.

Given Europe's interest in the production of alternative renewable energy, will the Commission require Member States, should they be interested in building them, to assess the impact of wind farms in order to safeguard bird-life?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(15 June 2012)

While further deployment of wind energy is important in order for the EU to meet its climate and energy objectives, the Commission is fully aware that wild birds can be particularly sensitive to wind energy developments. All wild birds are protected under the Birds Directive ([1]) requiring a general protection regime as well as habitat protection, particularly by the means of the Natura 2000 network. Wind farms likely to have an adverse effect on a Natura 2000 site must be subject to an appropriate assessment in light of the site's conservation objectives, according to Article 6.3 of the Habitats Directive ([2]).

However, wind farm plans and projects are subject to a wider range of environmental legislation that requires an assessment of impact on wildlife and other environmental areas: the provisions of the directives on Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA ([3])) and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA ([4])) respectively apply to them. Wind farms are listed in Annex II of the EIA Directive which means that in certain cases a full impact assessment is required. If an EIA is carried out it has to assess, amongst other things, the effects of a project on human beings, fauna, flora, and landscape.

To facilitate the process of appropriate assessments in the context of wind energy, the Commission issued a specific guidance document on application of EU nature legislation to wind farms ([5]) in 2011.

([1]) Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, OJ L 20, 26.1.2010.
([2]) 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.
([3]) Directive 2001/42/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 June 2001 on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment, OJ L 197, 21.7.2001.
([4]) Directive 2011/92/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment, OJ L 26, 28.1.2012.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/Wind_farms.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004167/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(23 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Allucinogeni e stimolanti in crescita tra gli under 20

Gli allucinogeni sono una classe di droghe chimicamente varia e sono caratterizzati dalla capacità di produrre sensazioni distorte e di alterare marcatamente l'umore e i processi mentali. Nell'ultimo decennio l'interesse dei media per l'uso dei funghi allucinogeni è stato stimolato dalla libera commercializzazione di questi funghi e dai cambiamenti legali introdotti in alcuni paesi allo scopo di proibirne il traffico. Alla fine degli anni 90, la vendita di funghi allucinogeni nei cosiddetti smart shop e sulle bancarelle nei Paesi Bassi e nel Regno Unito ne ha favorito il consumo.

Peraltro, non essendo disponibili le cifre esatte relative al ricavato di quest'attività, le informazioni raccolte nei due paesi citati costituiscono soprattutto un'indicazione degli interessi economici in gioco. A seguito di un'indagine compiuta dal Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche (CNR), che ha monitorato 350 mila ragazzi di età compresa tra i 15 e i 19 anni nel decennio 1999-2009, si è potuto constatare che, in linea generale, i consumatori abituali di sostanze stimolanti e allucinogene sono giovani studenti.

Considerato che l'uso delle droghe sintetiche è sempre più diffuso, vista anche la facilità di reperimento delle stesse, sono a chiedere alla Commissione europea quali misure intenda adottare al fine di attuare le campagne di sensibilizzazione nelle scuole a livello europeo e se, vista la drammaticità della situazione che interessa in linea generale i giovani, intenda predisporre una sezione del programma Health dedicata alla sensibilizzazione all'uso delle droghe.

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(7 giugno 2012)

In materia di elaborazione e attuazione di politiche relative alla prevenzione e cura della tossicodipendenza e alla riduzione dei danni che ne derivano sono gli Stati membri ad essere competenti e a scegliere le strategie più efficaci nel loro contesto socio-economico e culturale. La Commissione europea supporta e integra l'azione degli Stati membri relativa alla riduzione della domanda di droga attraverso il programma finanziario dell'UE, il programma di prevenzione e informazione in materia di droga ([1]). Il programma d'azione in materia di salute dell'UE ([2]) inanzia anche progetti relativi a specifici aspetti di riduzione della domanda di droga collegati alla salute.

Nella Comunicazione «Verso un'azione europea più incisiva nella lotta alla droga» ([3]), la Commissione ha annunciato l'intenzione di presentare proposte legislative per rispondere in modo più efficace e sostenibile all'emergere e al diffondersi delle nuove sostanze psicoattive dannose all'interno della UE.

([1]) Decisione n. 1150/2007CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 25 settembre 2007, che istituisce per il periodo 2007-2013 il programma specifico Prevenzione e informazione in materia di droga nell'ambito del programma generale Diritti fondamentali e giustizia, GU L 257 del 3.10.2007.

([2]) Decisione n. 1350/2007/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 23 ottobre 2007, che istituisce un secondo programma d'azione comunitaria in materia di salute (2008-2013), GU L 301 del 20.11.2007.

([3]) COM(2011)689 del 25.10.2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004167/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(23 April 2012)

Subject: Increased use of hallucinogens and stimulants amongst the young under 20 years of age

Hallucinogens are a class of chemically diverse drugs and are characterised by their ability to produce distorted sensations and cause marked changes in mood and mental processes. Over the last decade, media interest in the use of hallucinogenic mushrooms was stimulated by the free sale of these mushrooms and legal changes were introduced in some countries in order to prohibit trafficking. In the late 1990s, the sale of hallucinogenic mushrooms in so-called smart shops and on stalls in the Netherlands and in the United Kingdom encouraged consumption.

Moreover, whilst no exact figures are available with respect to the proceeds generated by this trade, information gathered in the aforementioned countries paints a rough picture of the economic interests at stake. Following an investigation carried out by the Italian National Research Council, which in the period 1999-2009 monitored 350 000 young people between 15 and 19 years of age, it was noted that, in general, the regular consumers of stimulants and hallucinogens are young students.

Considering that the use of synthetic drugs is increasingly widespread and given that this can also be attributed to the free availability of such drugs, can the European Commission state what measures it intends to adopt in order to implement awareness-raising campaigns in schools on a European level and, given the serious nature of the situation where young people in general are affected, whether it intends to dedicate part of its health programme to raising awareness against the use of drugs?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(7 June 2012)

Member States are competent for developing and implementing policies on drug prevention, treatment and harm reduction that work best in their socioeconomic and cultural contexts. The European Commission supports and complements Member States' action on drug-demand reduction through the EU financial programme, the Drug Prevention and Information Programme ([1]). The Public Health Programme ([2]) also finances projects on targeted health-related aspects of drug-demand reduction.

The Commission announced in the communication 'Towards a stronger European response to drugs' ([3]) its plans to present legislative proposals to enable a more effective and sustainable response to the emergence and spread of harmful new psychoactive substances across the EU.

([1]) Decision No 1150/2007/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 September 2007 establishing for the period 2007-2013 the Specific Programme Drug prevention and information as part of the General Programme Fundamental Rights and Justice, OJ L 257, 3.10.2007.
([2]) Decision No 1350/2007/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2007 establishing a second programme of Community action in the field of health (2008-2013), OJ L 301, 20.11.2007.
([3]) COM(2011)689, 25.10.2011.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004168/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(23 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Attacchi violenti e violazione dei diritti umani in Pakistan

Anche negli ultimi mesi ci sono stati gravi episodi di violenza nei confronti del popolo muhajir in Pakistan. In particolare lo scorso 23 marzo, giorno di festa nel Paese, alcuni attivisti dell'eterogenea provincia del Sindh hanno organizzato una marcia nella città di Karachi. L'impiego delle armi ha allertato i musulmani muhajir, che sono stati vittime di violenze e di furti. Fonti locali parlano di soprusi nei confronti di donne e bambini e di spari a raffica in aria, che purtroppo hanno colpito a morte un adolescente, Mohammad Nadeem. Mentre l'obiettivo ufficiale del corteo era quello di protestare per una maggiore garanzia dei diritti umani nel Sindh, i manifestanti non hanno esitato a utilizzare le armi per spaventare, minacciare e derubare i muhajir.

L'interminabile conflitto etnico in questa zona del Pakistan sembra acuirsi sempre di più. Solo pochi giorni dopo, il 25 marzo, è avvenuto un altro triste episodio di intolleranza che ha provocato altri decessi nella stessa Karachi, nell'ambito di un evento organizzato dal Comitato dei residenti di Clifton appartenenti al Movimento Muttahida Quami (MQM).

L'incontro letterario, che vedeva riuniti poeti di diverse etnie, è stato improvvisamente interrotto dall'incursione di circa 10 uomini armati che hanno aperto il fuoco indiscriminatamente. L'intervento della polizia ha evitato il peggio. Gli uomini armati, che sono stati arrestati dalle forze dell'ordine, appartenevano al Partito Nazionale Awami (ANP). Il bilancio dell'attacco, secondo il *Daily Times*, è stato di una vittima — un uomo dell'ANP — e molti feriti.

I due episodi descritti sono solo alcuni dei numerosi scontri che avvengono continuamente nella tormentata provincia del Sindh. Il conflitto etnico, che ha radici profonde, sembra essere lontano da una soluzione pacifica. A detta del suo leader, il MQM crede nella non violenza e desidera per la sua gente condizioni di vita migliori da raggiungere attraverso mezzi democratici e non discriminatori.

Considerata la recente adozione da parte del Consiglio del programma di cooperazione quinquennale UE-Pakistan, chiedo al Vice Presidente/Alto Rappresentante quali siano le misure concrete che intende adottare per contribuire alla risoluzione del conflitto tra sindhi e muhajir.

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005778/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(8 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Tensione e violenza a Karachi: continua la violazione dei diritti umani

Ritorna la tensione nella metropoli meridionale pachistana di Karachi. Negli ultimi due mesi un'escalation di atti di violenza ha imperversato su tutto il territorio. Gli episodi di veemente brutalità aumentano ogni giorno nei confronti della popolazione indifesa.

Nel mese di aprile la polizia di Sindh ha sequestrato un'ingente quantità di armi da fuoco accusando anche un gruppo di terroristi facente capo a Lyar Gangster ed ha arrestato 22 sospetti in varie aree della metropoli. La violazione dei diritti umani e la scia di sangue sono proseguite anche nel mese di maggio con la tortura e l'uccisione dei collaboratori della MQM da parte del gruppo terroristico Haqiqi. Nelle notti del 15 e 16 di maggio i corpi di sei dei loro affiliati sono stati trovati in diversi punti della città, con evidenti segni di torture disumane e colpi di arma da fuoco.

Questi eventi tragici non tendono a diminuire e la popolazione inerme è costretta a subire continue violazioni dei loro diritti, come conseguenza degli incessanti conflitti dei gruppi politici.

Considerando che gli abitanti di Karachi stanno subendo pressioni psicologiche e non possono godere appieno dei loro diritti fondamentali, si chiede alla Commissione se intende adottare misure cautelari e specifiche in merito alla risoluzione dei conflitti in questa regione.

Risposta congiunta di Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione

(19 luglio 2012)

L'UE è preoccupata per il conflitto tra Sindhi e Muhajir e per la situazione critica nel Sindh, nonché per la situazione dell'ordine pubblico e della sicurezza nella città di Karachi, principale snodo commerciale del paese.

Pur non potendo intervenire direttamente negli affari interni di un paese partner, l'UE può esprimere le proprie preoccupazioni per i danni che un clima di violenza e intimidazioni può causare allo sviluppo del paese. L'UE mantiene già un dialogo costante con il Pakistan e ha invitato le autorità pakistane ad adottare misure per garantire la sicurezza fisica e tutelare i diritti di tutti i cittadini pakistani. A seguito dell'adozione del piano d'impegno UE-Pakistan, i contatti esistenti aumenteranno grazie a dialoghi settoriali periodici in materia di sicurezza, lotta al terrorismo e diritti umani. La lotta all'estremismo violento dovrebbe rientrare nel dialogo.

L'UE sostiene inoltre progetti finalizzati a migliorare l'accesso alla giustizia e le attività di contrasto in Pakistan, anche in collaborazione con le forze di polizia e le autorità giudiziarie. Dopo che, nel giugno 2012, il Consiglio «Affari esteri» ha adottato la strategia dell'UE di lotta al terrorismo e di sicurezza per il Pakistan, è presumibile che le attività dell'UE a sostegno della sicurezza e della lotta al terrorismo possano essere rafforzate.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004168/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(23 April 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Violent attacks and human rights violations in Pakistan

In recent months, there have been serious episodes of violence against the Muhajir people in Pakistan. In particular, on 23 March, a public holiday in the country, several activists from the heterogeneous province of Sindh organised a march in the city of Karachi. The use of firearms alerted the Muhajir Muslims, who have been the victims of violence and robberies. Local sources speak of women and children being bullied and of bursts of gunfire into the air, which unfortunately hit and killed a young man, Mohammad Nadeem. While the official objective of the parade was to protest for greater human rights guarantees in Sindh, demonstrators did not hesitate to use weapons to frighten, threaten and rob the Muhajir.

The interminable ethnic conflict in this part of Pakistan seems to be growing ever more acute. Only a few days afterwards, on 25 March, there was another sad episode of intolerance that caused further deaths in Karachi, as part of an event organised by the Clifton Residents Association who are members of the Muttahida Qaumi Movement (MQM).

The literary meeting, which had brought together poets from diverse ethnic backgrounds, was suddenly interrupted by an incursion of around 10 armed men who opened fire indiscriminately. Police intervention prevented it from getting any worse. The armed men, who were arrested by the police, belonged to the Awami National Party (ANP). According to the *Daily Times*, the attack resulted in one death — a man from the ANP — and many injuries.

The two episodes described are only some of the numerous clashes which happen continually in the troubled Sindh province. The ethnic conflict, which has deep roots, seems to be a long way away from a peaceful solution. According to its leader, the MQM believes in non-violence and wants better living conditions for its people to be achieved by democratic and non-discriminatory means.

Given the recent adoption on the part of the Council of the five-year EU-Pakistan Cooperation Programme, what tangible measures does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to adopt to help to resolve the conflict between Sindhi and Muhajir?

Question for written answer E-005778/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(8 June 2012)

Subject: Tension and violence in Karachi: continuing human rights violations

Tension is returning to the southern Pakistan city of Karachi. Over the past two months, there has been an escalation of violence throughout the area. Reports of incidents of violent brutality against the defenceless population increase every day.

In April, police in Sindh seized a large quantity of firearms, allegedly from a group of terrorists headed by a Lyari gangster, and arrested 22 suspects in various areas of the city. The violation of human rights and the trail of blood continued in May, with the torture and killing of MQM workers by the Haqiqi terrorist group. On the nights of 15 and 16 May, the bodies of six members were found in different parts of the city, showing obvious signs of brutal torture and gunshot wounds.

These tragic events show no sign of abating, and the helpless population is forced to endure continuing violations of their rights as a result of incessant conflicts between political groups.

Since the inhabitants of Karachi are suffering psychological stress and being denied the full enjoyment of their fundamental rights, does the Commission intend to adopt any precautionary measures with a view to resolving the conflict in this region?

Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(19 July 2012)

The EU is concerned about the conflict between Sindhi and Muhajir and difficult situation faced in Sindh, as well as the law and order situation in Karachi, the country's major business hub.

The EU cannot intervene directly in the internal affairs of a partner country. But it can convey concern at the damage that a climate of violence and intimidation does to a country's development. The EU already engages in regular dialogue with Pakistan and has called on the Pakistani authorities to adopt measures to ensure the physical security and protect the rights of all Pakistani citizens. Following adoption of the EU-Pakistan Engagement Plan, the existing dialogue will be enhanced by regular sector dialogues on security, including counter-terrorism, as well as human rights. Countering violent extremism is expected to be part of the dialogue.

At the same time the EU is supporting projects which are intended to improve access to justice and also to improve the quality of law enforcement in Pakistan, not least with the police and prosecution services. After the adoption of the EU CT/Security Strategy for Pakistan by the June 2012 Foreign Affairs Council, it is expected that EU activities in support of security and counter-terrorism in Pakistan will be reinforced.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004169/12
alla Commissione
Giommaria Uggias (ALDE)
(23 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Inquinamento da attività militare nelle aree circostanti il poligono di Quirra

Dal 1956 è in attività il poligono sperimentale di addestramento interforze del Salto di Quirra, in Sardegna. Ogni attività che avviene al suo interno, è coperta dal segreto militare. Alcune ricerche sanitarie hanno rilevato, tra i residenti nelle aree circostanti il poligono, una percentuale anomala di tumori al sistema emolinfatico, in particolare leucemie, con punte superiori al 60 % negli insediamenti più prossimi al poligono. Altri esami eseguiti dall'Università di Modena hanno accertato tracce di nanoparticelle di metalli pesanti identiche a quelle riscontrate nei militari italiani deceduti per patologie tumorali dopo aver prestato servizio nelle regioni balcaniche. Questi numeri giustificano l'espressione «sindrome di Quirra» relativamente a tali fenomeni.

Sulla base di questi esami, la Magistratura italiana ha avviato un'indagine, conclusasi il 25 marzo scorso, nella quale, attraverso risultanze tecniche precise, si afferma che esiste un'interconnessione tra l'alto riscontro di malattie tumorali nei territori dove sorge il poligono di Quirra e le esercitazioni militari e le sperimentazioni effettuati nella base. È stata infatti riscontrata la presenza di torio e cerio oltre ogni soglia, e nello specifico il torio in percentuale 35 volte superiore rispetto alla sua naturale presenza in natura. Questi due elementi, secondo il Procuratore della Repubblica, si ritrovano sul territorio a seguito delle attività di brillamento che hanno luogo nel poligono, e sono altamente nocive, in presenza così elevata, per la salute umana.

Già nel gennaio 2011 è stata da me presentata un'interrogazione in merito, e in quell'occasione la Commissione ha assicurato che, nel caso in cui l'evoluzione della situazione in prossimità del sito militare di Quirra avesse portato a una violazione delle norme europee di tutela della salute umana, essa avrebbe richiesto alle autorità italiane di adottare i provvedimenti necessari per porre rimedio alla grave situazione. Tutto ciò premesso:

1. Può la Commissione verificare se sia stato violato il diritto fondamentale alla salute dei cittadini e alla salubrità ambientale?

2. In questo caso, intende inoltre la Commissione chiedere alle autorità italiane di adottare i provvedimenti necessari, in particolare la bonifica dei territori in questione e la sanzione nei confronti di coloro che hanno prodotto e/o nascosto i gravi effetti dell'inquinamento militare dovuto alla presenza del poligono di Quirra sul territorio, secondo il principio europeo del «chi inquina paga»?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(19 luglio 2012)

La direttiva 2004/35/CE sulla responsabilità ambientale in materia di prevenzione e riparazione del danno ambientale ([1]) (di seguito: direttiva responsabilità ambientale) è volta a prevenire e riparare il danno ambientale, fondandosi sul principio «chi inquina paga». I danni ambientali sono definiti come danni alle specie e agli habitat naturali protetti, danni all'acqua e danni al terreno. Il danno al terreno è definito come qualsiasi contaminazione del terreno che crei un rischio significativo di effetti negativi sulla salute umana a seguito dell'introduzione diretta o indiretta nel suolo, sul suolo o nel sottosuolo di sostanze, preparati, organismi o microrganismi nel suolo.

Le attività militari non rientrano nelle attività professionali pericolose per l'ambiente, di cui all'allegato III della direttiva sulla responsabilità ambientale, che riguardano la responsabilità oggettiva. Inoltre la direttiva esclude espressamente le attività «il cui scopo principale è la difesa nazionale o la sicurezza internazionale». Pertanto la direttiva sulla responsabilità ambientale non è applicabile all'inquinamento causato dalle attività militari che si svolgono nelle aree limitrofe al poligono di Quirra.

([1]) GU L 143 del 30.4.2004.

Per quanto attiene alla questione dei diritti fondamentali sollevata dall'onorevole parlamentare, la Commissione desidera ricordare che l'Unione europea non ha competenza generale in materia di diritti fondamentali. Non rientra fra i poteri della Commissione europea valutare se i diritti fondamentali siano stati rispettati da uno Stato membro nei casi in cui la presunta violazione di tali diritti non è connessa all'applicazione della legislazione dell'UE. Poiché la questione cui fa riferimento l'onorevole parlamentare non è contemplata dal diritto dell'Unione europea, spetta unicamente agli Stati membri adoperarsi al fine di rispettare i loro obblighi in materia di diritti fondamentali derivanti dagli accordi internazionali e dalla legislazione nazionale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004169/12
to the Commission
Giommaria Uggias (ALDE)
(23 April 2012)

Subject: Pollution caused by military activities in areas surrounding the Quirra firing range

The experimental interforces firing range of Salto di Quirra, in Sardinia, has been in operation since 1956. All activities that take place within its perimeter are covered by military secrecy. A number of medical studies have found that residents living in the areas around the firing range suffer an abnormal percentage of haemolymphatic system tumours, especially leukaemia, with peaks exceeding 60% in the settlements closest to the range. Other examinations conducted by the University of Modena have revealed traces of heavy metal nanoparticles identical to those found in Italian military personnel who died of cancer after serving in Balkan regions. These numbers justify applying the term 'Quirra syndrome' to these phenomena.

Based on these tests, the Italian judiciary launched an investigation that ended on 25 March 2012. According to the accurate technical findings of the investigation, there is a connection between the high incidence of cancer in the area where the Salto di Quirra range is located and the military exercises and experiments carried out at that base. Indeed, the presence of thorium and cerium in excess of any threshold was detected, more specifically thorium in a percentage 35 times greater than its natural occurrence in the environment. According to the Public Prosecutor's Office, these two elements are found in the local area as a result of blasting activities that occur at the range, and which are extremely harmful to human health in such large amounts.

I submitted a question regarding this issue in January 2011. On that occasion, the Commission assured me that, should the conditions outside the Salto di Quirra military site lead to a breach of European laws protecting human health, it would ask the Italian authorities to take the necessary measures to remedy the serious situation. In view of the above:

1. Can the Commission confirm whether the fundamental right of citizens to health, including that of the environment, have been violated?

2. Should this be the case, will the Commission ask the Italian authorities to take the necessary measures, in particular to clean up the land in question and to impose penalties on those who have produced and/or concealed the serious impact of the military pollution caused by the presence of the Salto di Quirra firing range in this area, in accordance with the European 'polluter pays' principle?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(19 July 2012)

Directive 2004/35/EC on environmental liability with regard to the prevention and remedying of environmental damage ([1]) (ELD — Environmental Liability Directive) aims at preventing and remedying environmental damage, based on the polluter-pays principle. Environmental damage is defined as damage to protected species and natural habitats, damage to water and damage to land. Land damage is defined as any land contamination that creates a significant risk of human health being adversely affected as a result of the direct or indirect introduction, in, on or under land, of substances, preparations, organisms or micro-organisms.

Military activities are not covered by occupational activities dangerous to the environment listed in Annex III to the ELD which fall under strict liability. Moreover, the ELD excludes expressly activities 'the main purpose of which is to serve national defence or international security'. Therefore, the Environmental Liability Directive is not applicable to the pollution caused by military activities in areas surrounding the Quirra firing range.

Regarding the fundamental rights issues raised by the Honourable Member, the Commission would like to recall that the EU does not have general competency in the area of fundamental rights. The European Commission is not empowered to assess whether the fundamental rights have been respected by a Member State when the alleged breach of fundamental rights is not linked with the application of EC law. As the matter referred to by the Honourable Member is not covered by the EC law, it is for Member States alone to ensure that their obligations regarding fundamental rights — as resulting from international agreements and from their internal legislation — are respected.

([1]) OJ L 143, 30.4.2004.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004170/12
aan de Commissie
Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE)
(23 april 2012)

Betreft: Richtlijn 2000/84/EG betreffende de zomertijd

Naar aanleiding van de recente omschakeling naar het zomeruur, voerde het consumentenprogramma „Peeters en Pichal" van Radio 1 (Vlaamse openbare omroep) een internetpeiling uit. Aan de peiling namen 81 781 respondenten deel. 76,4 % sprak zich uit tegen de omschakeling. 54,5 % wilde permanent het zomeruur behouden, 21,9 % het winteruur ([1]).

In die context graag volgende vragen aan de Commissie:

1. Heeft de Commissie plannen om Richtlijn 2000/84/EG betreffende de zomertijd aan te passen? Zo ja, waarom en op welke termijn? Zo neen, waarom niet?

2. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van gelijkaardige opiniepeilingen of studies in andere EU-lidstaten waarin een belangrijk deel van de bevolking zich uitspreekt tegen de tijdsomschakeling? Zo ja, welke en met welke resultaten? Hoe evalueert de Commissie deze resultaten?

3. Hoe werd Richtlijn 2000/84/EG omgezet in de EU-27?

Antwoord van de heer Kallas namens de Commissie
(29 mei 2012)

1. Overeenkomstig artikel 5 van richtlijn 2000/84/EG van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 19 januari 2001 betreffende de zomertijd ([2]) heeft de Commissie in 2007 verslag uitgebracht over de gevolgen van deze richtlijn op de volksgezondheid, de verkeersveiligheid en het energieverbruik. In het verslag wordt geconcludeerd dat de huidige regeling in de lidstaten van de EU geen aanleiding tot bezorgdheid heeft gegeven. Geen enkele lidstaat heeft na publicatie van dit verslag gevraagd om de huidige regeling aan te passen. Er zijn geen aanwijzingen dat de situatie is gewijzigd. De Commissie is daarom van mening dat de regeling die in de richtlijn voor de zomertijd is vastgelegd nog steeds adequaat is. Voor de goede werking van de interne markt is het belangrijk dat alle lidstaten hetzelfde tijdschema voor de zomertijd toepassen. De belangrijkste doelstelling van de richtlijn is immers de coördinatie van de nationale vervoersdienstregelingen.

2. Om op uw vraag over opiniepeilingen in te gaan: er is recentelijk weinig onderzoek naar dit onderwerp gedaan. Het gevoerde onderzoek is niet altijd even representatief en de resultaten ervan lopen uiteen. Op basis van deze peilingen kunnen er daarom geen conclusies voor de EU als geheel worden getrokken.

3. In de richtlijn is bepaald dat de tijd in maart en oktober wordt omgezet en de lidstaten hebben dat vastgelegd in bindende nationale regelgeving. In alle 27 lidstaten wordt de zomertijd gebruikt.

([1]) Zie http://www.radio1.be/content/de-grootste-poll-van-vlaanderen-wat-met-zomeruur.
([2]) PB L 31 van 2.2.2001, blz. 21.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004170/12
to the Commission
Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE)
(23 April 2012)

Subject: Directive 2000/84/EC on summer-time arrangements

Following the recent changeover to summer time, the consumer affairs programme 'Peeters en Pichal' [Peeters and Pichal] on *Radio 1* (a Flemish public broadcasting company channel) conducted an online poll. A total of 81 781 respondents took part in the poll. Of these, 76.4% were against the changeover. Another 54.5% wanted to stay permanently on summer time and 21.9% on winter time ([1]).

In view of this, I would like to ask the Commission the following questions:

1. Does the Commission intend to update Directive 2000/84/EC on summer-time arrangements? If so, why and when? If not, why not?

2. Is the Commission aware of similar opinion polls or studies in other EU Member States, in which a substantial proportion of the population is against the time change? If so, what polls and what are the results? How does the Commission evaluate these results?

3. How has Directive 2000/84/EC been implemented in the EU-27?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(29 May 2012)

1. In application of Article 5 of Directive 2000/84/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 January 2001 on summer-time arrangements ([2]), the Commission presented in 2007 a report on the impact of the provisions of this directive on health, road safety and energy consumption The report concluded that the current arrangements have not constituted any subject of concern in the Member States of the EU. No Member State has asked for a modification of the current arrangements following the publication of this report. Since there are no indications that the situation has changed the Commission believes that the summer time arrangements as established by the directive remain suitable. It is important in particular to maintain the harmonisation of the timetable for the implementation of the summer-time period to ensure a proper functioning of the internal market, and in particular the coordination of national transport timetables, which constitutes the essential objective of the directive.

2. As regards opinion polls, only a very small number of surveys have been undertaken recently on this subject. The degree of representativeness and the results of the surveys vary. These polls therefore do not allow conclusions for the EU as a whole.

3. The directive has been implemented by Member States through binding national rules providing for the clock change foreseen under the directive in March and October. All 27 Member States apply summertime.

([1]) See http://www.radio1.be/content/de-grootste-poll-van-vlaanderen-wat-met-zomeruur.
([2]) OJ L 31, 2.2.2001, p. 21-22.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004171/12
aan de Commissie
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(23 april 2012)

Betreft: Nieuwe Franse verplichting m.b.t. alcoholtesters in de wagen

Door een nieuwe Franse wet van 28 februari 2012 zullen alle automobilisten vanaf 1 juli 2012 verplicht worden om een ongebruikte alcoholtester bij zich te hebben in hun voertuig. Met deze alcoholtesters kan een bestuurder bij twijfel zelf controleren of hij al dan niet zijn voertuig mag besturen. Deze regelgeving geldt niet alleen voor Fransen, maar ook voor alle buitenlanders, inclusief burgers die in Frankrijk op vakantie zijn of enkel op doorreis zijn. Tevens moeten deze alcoholtesters voorzien zijn van de vermelding „CE" (Conformité Européenne) of „NF" (Norme Française).

De Commissie heeft in haar antwoord op vraag E-002110/2012 aangegeven dat ze deze nieuwe regeling aan een inhoudelijk onderzoek onderwerpt en de Franse autoriteiten indien nodig om verduidelijking zal vragen.

Is de Commissie het ermee eens dat deze nieuwe regelgeving het vrije verkeer van personen in de Europese Unie kan belemmeren?

Zo ja, meent de Commissie dat deze maatregel gerechtvaardigd is en de proportionaliteitstoets doorstaat?

Heeft ze hierover al contact gehad met de Franse autoriteiten?

Denkt zij dit onderzoek op korte termijn te kunnen afronden?

Antwoord van de heer Kallas namens de Commissie
(23 mei 2012)

De Commissie heeft haar onderzoek van de wetsbepalingen waarnaar het geachte Parlementslid verwijst, nog niet afgerond. In afwachting daarvan heeft zij met betrekking tot deze bepalingen contact opgenomen met de Franse autoriteiten en wacht zij hun antwoord af.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004171/12
to the Commission
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(23 April 2012)

Subject: New French obligation regarding breathalysers in cars

In accordance with a new French law dated 28 February 2012, from 1 July 2012 all drivers will be required to carry an unused breathalyser in their vehicles. These breathalysers enable drivers who may have doubts about their ability to drive a vehicle to check whether or not they may do so. This legislation applies not only to French nationals, but also to all foreigners, including citizens in France on holiday or simply in transit. These breathalysers also have to bear the marks 'CE' (Conformité Européenne) or 'NF' (Norme Française).

In its reply to Question E-002110/2012, the Commission indicated that it is examining the content of these legal provisions and will get in contact with the French authorities for clarification if this is necessary.

Does the Commission agree that this new legislation could impede the free movement of persons in the European Union?

If so, is the Commission of the opinion that this measure is justified and can withstand the proportionality test?

Has the Commission already been in contact with the French authorities on this matter?

Does it believe that it can complete this examination soon?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(23 May 2012)

The Commission has not yet completed the examination of the legal provisions referred to by the Honourable Member. In the meantime, the Commission has contacted the French authorities in relation to these provisions and is waiting for their answer.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004172/12
aan de Commissie
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(23 april 2012)

Betreft: Verstoring van de werking van de interne markt door gebruik van nationale keurmerken

Met het CE-conformiteitsmerkteken kunnen producenten aan de consument duidelijk maken dat hun product in overeenstemming is met de geharmoniseerde voorschriften van de Europese Unie. Dit is belangrijk voor zowel producenten als consumenten. De CE-markering garandeert de producenten de erkenning van de conformiteit van hun product op de hele interne markt en beschermt de gezondheid en veiligheid van de consument.

Het behalen van de CE-markering is inmiddels verplicht voor een reeks goederen die onder de „Nieuwe Aanpak"-richtlijnen vallen. De procedure om ze te behalen kan voor bedrijven wel hoge kosten met zich meebrengen en deze wegen op lange termijn niet op tegen de voordelen. In bepaalde sectoren handhaven lidstaten echter nationale keurmerken. Het behalen van deze keurmerken is voor buitenlandse bedrijven, veelal kmo's, duur en omslachtig. Zij lijken de concurrentie op de interne markt te verstoren en regionale en nationale markten af te schermen van buitenlandse producten.

In de sector van de opslag en behandeling van vervuilende stoffen eist, bijvoorbeeld, Frankrijk van bedrijven die een CE-markering kunnen voorleggen voor hun waterzuiveringsinstallatie het behalen van een bijkomende keuring („agrément"). In Nederland bestaat het gelijkaardige KIWA-keurmerk voor opslagtanks van brandstoffen.

Acht de Commissie dergelijke nationale keurmerken in overeenstemming met de concurrentieregels van de interne markt?

Welke oplossingen overweegt de Commissie voor de conflicten tussen de CE-markering en bepaalde nationale keurmerken?

Antwoord van de heer Tajani namens de Commissie
(7 juni 2012)

De CE-markering is de enige markering die erop wijst dat een product in overeenstemming is met de harmonisatiewetgeving van de Europese Unie. Andere markeringen mogen echter worden gebruikt mits zij vrijwillig zijn, bijdragen tot de verbetering van de bescherming van de algemene belangen en niet in strijd zijn met of verwarring veroorzaken met betrekking tot de CE-markering. Veel van deze keurmerken zijn particuliere keurmerken.

Met name voor bouwproducten wordt in artikel 8, lid 3, van Verordening (EU) nr. 305/2011 het aanbrengen van andere merktekens op een bouwproduct dat is voorzien van de CE-markering, duidelijk beperkt.

Voorts gaf de Commissie onlangs opdracht tot een studie om onder meer de verenigbaarheid van aanvullende merktekens met de CE-markering en de effecten ervan op de interne markt voor bouwproducten te onderzoeken.

Indien de keurmerken waarnaar het geachte Parlementslid verwijst, echter zijn vastgesteld in de wetgeving van een lidstaat of worden beheerd door een openbare instantie, verzoekt de Commissie het geachte Parlementslid om meer informatie over de vermeende gevallen, zodat zij kan bepalen of er sprake is van een inbreuk op het EU-recht.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004172/12
to the Commission
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(23 April 2012)

Subject: Distortion of the working of the single European market by the use of national quality marks

With the CE quality mark, manufacturers can make clear to consumers that their product is compliant with the harmonised requirements of the European Union. This is important for both manufacturers and consumers. The CE mark is a guarantee to manufacturers that the compliance of their product will be recognised throughout the single market and it protects consumers' health and safety.

Obtaining the CE mark has now become mandatory for a series of products that fall within the New Approach directives. The procedure for obtaining it can incur high costs for companies, but in the long run these do not outweigh the advantages. In certain sectors, however, Member States maintain their own national quality marks. Obtaining these marks can be expensive and time-consuming for foreign companies, particularly SMEs. They appear to distort competition in the internal market and to protect regional and national markets from foreign products.

In the sector dealing with the storage and treatment of pollutants, France, for instance, requires companies that hold a CE mark for their water purification plant to obtain an additional approval ('agrément'). In the Netherlands, there is the equivalent KIWA mark for fuel storage tanks.

Does the Commission consider such national quality marks to be compatible with the competition rules of the single European market?

What solutions to the conflicts between the CE mark and certain national quality marks is the Commission considering?

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

The CE marking is the only marking that may indicate that a product is in conformity with harmonisation legislation of the European Union. However, other markings may be used as long as they are voluntary, help to improve the protection of public interests and do not contradict, or cause confusion in relation to, the CE marking. Many of these quality marks are private.

Concerning construction products in particular, Art 8(3) of Regulation (EU) 305/2011 clearly restricts the affixing of other marks to a construction product which bears the CE marking.

Furthermore, the Commission recently ordered a study to examine, *inter alia*, the compatibility of additional marks with the CE marking and their effects on the internal market for construction products.

If, however, the quality marks to which the Honourable Member refers are established by the law of a Member State or managed by a public body, the Commission would like to invite the Honourable Member to provide it with more details of the alleged cases so that it can establish whether it constitutes an infringement of EC law.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004173/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(23 de abril de 2012)

Assunto: Definição de setores estratégicos a nível europeu

Tendo em conta que:

— A Comissão Europeia apresentou um novo pacote de medidas que visam criar mais oportunidades de emprego a nível europeu, considerando que é fundamental adotar uma estratégia que reforce o emprego e a dimensão social da governação da UE;

— O novo pacote em causa tem como objetivos (1) reforçar as respetivas políticas de emprego, (2) proceder a reformas para tornar os mercados de trabalho mais dinâmicos e inclusivos, (3) criar um mercado de trabalho genuíno e (4) estabelecer uma coordenação e supervisão reforçada das políticas de emprego a nível europeu, em consonância com a governação económica;

— Segundo o Presidente da Comissão Europeia, «a economia verde e os setores da saúde e das novas tecnologias irão criar mais de 20 milhões de empregos nos próximos anos. Os Estados-Membros têm de aproveitar estas oportunidades, mobilizar os recursos existentes e estimular os respetivos mercados de trabalho em estreita cooperação com os parceiros sociais»;

— A União Europeia define, assim, os setores da economia verde, da saúde e das telecomunicações como aqueles que poderão ter mais potencial no futuro, orientando as políticas de emprego para estas três áreas específicas da atividade económica;

— Existem vários outros setores estratégicos que têm vindo a assumir uma grande preponderância em cada Estado-Membro, sendo evidente a aposta realizada em diversos setores, como é o caso dos sapatos italianos, do mobiliário sueco, dos telemóveis finlandeses e do vinho francês;

— A Comissão Europeia está empenhada em estabelecer uma nova agenda europeia na área do crescimento económico e da geração de emprego, incentivando os Estados-Membros a adotarem medidas que visem estimular a contratação ou o apoio ao empreendedorismo;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Quais os motivos que levaram a Comissão a definir os setores da economia verde, da saúde e das telecomunicações como os principais setores de futuro em detrimento de outros com enorme potencial?

2. Está a Comissão a ponderar lançar um estudo estratégico sobre os setores em que cada Estado-Membro deverá apostar, por forma a ter uma política europeia setorial e de elevada especialização, que permitirá obter um maior valor acrescentado e uma maior competitividade à escala global?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(14 de junho de 2012)

1. Os setores da economia hipocarbónica e eficiente em termos de utilização dos recursos («empregos verdes»), da saúde e social («empregos brancos»), e da economia digital («empregos TIC») foram identificados no quadro do Semestre Europeu como aqueles onde se verifica o maior potencial de emprego e onde serão criados milhões de postos de trabalho até 2020. A Comissão remete o Senhor Deputado para a Análise Anual do Crescimento de 2012, de 23 de novembro de 2011, e para os documentos de trabalho que acompanham o pacote do emprego ([1]).

2. No decurso de 2012, a Comissão irá lançar o exercício de avaliação das necessidades de competências na UE (Panorama das Competências da UE) no que respeita a todos os setores da economia. A Comissão avaliará a possibilidade de explorar a ideia sugerida pelo Senhor Deputado assim que este novo instrumento tenha sido experimentado. Além disso, a Comissão sublinha que cabe às regiões e aos Estados-Membros a prossecução de uma estratégia de especialização inteligente, a identificação das vantagens concorrenciais individuais, a definição das prioridades estratégicas e a maximização do potencial de desenvolvimento do conhecimento.

([1]) COM(2012)173 final, SWD(2012)92 final, SWD(2012)93 final, SWD(2012)96 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004173/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(23 April 2012)

Subject: Identifying strategic sectors at EU level

The Commission has submitted a new package of measures to create more job opportunities at EU level, considering it essential to adopt a strategy to boost employment and consolidate the social dimension of EU governance.

The new package aims to (1) strengthen employment policies, (2) reform labour markets to make them more dynamic and inclusive, (3) create a genuine labour market and (4) enhance employment policy coordination and monitoring at EU level, in line with economic governance.

According to the Commission President, 'the green economy, the health and new technology sectors will create more than 20 million jobs in the years to come. Member States need to seize these opportunities, mobilise existing resources and stimulate their labour market in close cooperation with the social partners'.

The European Union thus considers the green economy, health and telecommunications to be the sectors which could offer the greatest potential for the future and is focusing employment policies on these three specific areas of economic activity.

Other strategic sectors have become predominant in individual Member States; Italian shoes, Swedish furniture, Finnish mobile phones and French wine are examples of industries in which investment has manifestly borne fruit.

The Commission is committed to laying down a new European agenda on economic growth and job creation, and is encouraging Member States to adopt measures to stimulate recruitment and support for entrepreneurship.

1. Why has the Commission identified the green economy, health and telecommunications as the main sectors of the future while ignoring others with huge potential?

2. Will it carry out a strategic study on the sectors in which individual Member States should invest in order to establish a highly specialised sector-based European policy, resulting in greater added value and increased global competitiveness?

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

1. The low-carbon and resource efficient economy ('green jobs'), health and social sectors ('white jobs') and the digital economy ('ICT jobs') are sectors that were identified within the framework of the European Semester as having the highest employment potential and where millions of jobs openings will materialise between now and 2020. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the 2012 Annual Growth Survey of 23 November 2011 and to the Staff Working Documents accompanying the Employment Package. ([1])

2. The Commission will in the course of 2012 launch the EU Skills Panorama with the aim to monitor skills needs in the EU with regard to all sectors of the economy. The Commission will consider exploring the idea suggested by the Honourable Member once this new instrument will have been tried. The Commission also highlights that it is up to the regions and Member States to pursue a strategy of smart specialisation, to identify individual competitive advantages, set strategic priorities and maximise the knowledge-based development potential.

([1]) COM(2012) 173 final, SWD(2012) 92 final, SWD(2012) 93 final, SWD(2012) 96 final.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004174/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(23 de abril de 2012)

Assunto: Decisão do governo argentino de expropriar a empresa YPF

Considerando que:

— A UE tenta renegociar o acordo comercial com o Mercosul, que a Argentina integra;

— O relacionamento entre os países democráticos deve assentar no cumprimento de regras comuns aos Estados de Direito, que lhe conferem, para além do mais, a necessária previsibilidade;

— A recente decisão do governo argentino de expropriar 51 % da empresa YPF, detida pela empresa REPSOL no país, viola estas regras de forma inaceitável e grosseira;

— A mesma decisão não pode deixar de merecer uma forte reação sancionatória por parte das instituições europeias;

Pergunto à Comissão:

Quais as consequências da referida decisão do governo argentino, a propósito da pretendida renegociação do acordo comercial entre a UE e o Mercosul?

Resposta dada por Karel De Gucht em nome da Comissão
(25 de maio de 2012)

A Comissão está extremamente preocupada com as medidas protecionistas recentemente adotadas pela Argentina, em especial a decisão de nacionalizar a participação de 51 % da Repsol na YPF. A Comissão já reagiu vigorosamente, incluindo através do Presidente Barroso, de uma carta do Comissário responsável pelo Comércio, Karel De Gucht, dirigida ao Ministro argentino dos Negócios Estrangeiros, Hector Timerman, e de uma declaração da Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente, instando a Argentina a respeitar os seus compromissos internacionais. A Comissão informou a Argentina que manteria em aberto todas as opções possíveis para resolver este problema, tanto a nível multilateral como bilateral. Devido ao clima criado pela decisão argentina, foi igualmente decidido adiar o Comité Misto UE-Argentina inicialmente previsto para 19 e 20 de abril de 2012.

No que diz respeito ao impacto que a medida poderá ter nos negociações UE-Mercosul, recorde-se, em primeiro lugar, que a Comissão não negocia com a Argentina a nível bilateral, mas sim com o Mercosul como região. Não obstante, a Comissão considera que esta medida parece incompatível com o espírito subjacente a essa negociação e que é fundamental manter um clima de confiança entre as partes na negociação se quisermos que a referida negociação seja concluída. Esta mensagem foi transmitida à Argentina.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004174/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(23 April 2012)

Subject: Argentine government decision to expropriate YPF

The EU is seeking to renegotiate the trade agreement with Mercosur, of which Argentina is a member.

The relationship between democratic countries must be built on compliance with the common rules of states governed by the rule of law, in order, above all, to provide the necessary predictability.

The Argentine Government's recent decision to expropriate 51% of YPF, an Argentine-based subsidiary of Repsol, grossly and unacceptably violates those rules.

This decision must be met with tough sanctions by the European institutions.

What are the implications of the Argentine Government's decision for the attempt to renegotiate the trade agreement between the EU and Mercosur?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(25 May 2012)

The Commission is extremely concerned by the protectionist measures recently taken by Argentina, in particular the decision to nationalise the 51% stake of Repsol in YPF. The Commission has already reacted strongly, including through President Barroso, a letter from Trade Commissioner Karel De Gucht to the Argentinean Minister of Foreign Affairs Hector Timerman and a statement from the High Representative/Vice-President, and has urged Argentina to respect its international commitments. The Commission informed Argentina that it would keep open all possible options to address this matter at the multilateral as well as at the bilateral level. Due to the climate created by the Argentinean decision, it was also decided to postpone the EU-Argentina Joint committee initially foreseen for 19-20 April 2012.

Regarding the impact that this measure could have on EU-Mercosur negotiations, it should first be recalled that the Commission does not negotiate with Argentina bilaterally but with Mercosur as a region. The Commission is nevertheless of the opinion that this measure appears inconsistent with the spirit underpinning this negotiation and that it is crucial to maintain a climate of trust and confidence between the negotiating parties if we want this negotiation to be concluded. This message has been conveyed to Argentina.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004175/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(23 de abril de 2012)

Assunto: Decisão do governo argentino de expropriar a empresa YPF — II

Considerando que:

— O relacionamento entre os países democráticos deve assentar no cumprimento de regras comuns aos Estados de Direito, que lhe conferem, para além do mais, a necessária previsibilidade;

— A recente decisão do governo argentino de expropriar 51 % da empresa YPF, detida pela empresa REPSOL no país, viola estas regras de forma inaceitável e grosseira;

— A mesma decisão não pode deixar de merecer uma forte reação sancionatória por parte das instituições europeias;

Pergunto à Comissão:

Quais as sanções previstas pela Comissão em razão daquela decisão de expropriação?

Resposta dada por Karel De Gucht em nome da Comissão
(5 de junho de 2012)

A Comissão está muito preocupada com as medidas protecionistas tomadas pela Argentina recentemente, sobretudo com a decisão de nacionalizar a participação de 51 % da Repsol na empresa YPF.

A Comissão comunicou rapidamente a sua posição através dos canais diplomáticos e políticos, bem como dos meios de comunicação social. A Comissão instou a Argentina a respeitar os seus compromissos internacionais, designadamente através das observações do Presidente da Comissão Europeia, Durão Barroso, e de uma carta do Comissário do Comércio, Karel De Gucht, ao ministro argentino dos Negócios Estrangeiros, Hector Timerman. O Alto Representante/Vice-Presidente emitiu também uma declaração. A Comissão informou a Argentina que manteria em aberto todas as opções possíveis para resolver este problema, tanto a nível multilateral como bilateral. Devido ao clima criado pela decisão argentina, foi igualmente decidido adiar o Comité Misto UE-Argentina inicialmente previsto para 19 e 20 de abril de 2012.

Atualmente não existe entre a UE e a Argentina qualquer instrumento jurídico que preveja uma proteção contra as expropriações ilegais. O quadro jurídico aplicável neste caso é o tratado bilateral de proteção dos investimentos (BIT) entre a Espanha e a Argentina. Nele se prevê a possibilidade de o investidor recorrer à arbitragem internacional. A Comissão espera que possa vir a ser encontrada uma solução aceitável por todas as partes interessadas, em conformidade com as normas jurídicas consagradas no referido instrumento.

À luz da Resolução do Parlamento sobre esta matéria, a Comissão está a analisar todos os instrumentos políticos ao seu dispor. Quaisquer outras providências subsequentes em relação à Argentina devem ser tomadas em conformidade com a legislação da UE e os seus compromissos internacionais.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004175/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(23 April 2012)

Subject: Argentine government decision to expropriate YPF — II

The relationship between democratic countries must be built on compliance with the common rules of states governed by the rule of law, in order, above all, to provide the necessary predictability.

The Argentine Government's recent decision to expropriate 51% of YPF, an Argentine-based subsidiary of Repsol, grossly and unacceptably violates those rules.

This decision must be met with tough sanctions by the European institutions.

What sanctions will the Commission impose on account of the decision to expropriate YPF?

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

The Commission is very concerned by the Argentinean protectionist measures taken in the recent past, and by the decision of nationalising the 51% stake of Repsol in the YPF company in particular.

The Commission has reacted promptly through diplomatic and political channels, as well as in the media. The Commission urged Argentina to respect its international commitments, notably via comments for President Barroso and a letter from Trade Commissioner Karel De Gucht to the Argentinean Minister of Foreign Affairs Hector Timerman. The High Representative/Vice-President also issued a statement. The Commission informed Argentina that it would keep open all possible options to address this matter at multilateral as well as at bilateral level. Due to the climate created by the Argentinean decision, it was also decided to postpone the EU-Argentina Joint committee initially foreseen for 19-20 April 2012.

There is currently no EU-Argentina legal instrument providing for protection against unlawful expropriation. The applicable legal framework for this case is the Bilateral Investment Protection Treaty (BIT) that Spain has concluded with Argentina. It allows for the possibility for the investor to resort to international arbitration. The Commission hopes that a solution acceptable to all interested parties can still be found in accordance with the legal standards enshrined in this instrument.

In the light of the Parliament's Resolution on this matter the Commission is analysing all available policy tools. Any further steps vis-à-vis Argentina would need to be taken in compliance with the EU legislation and in line with the EU's international commitments.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004176/12
adresată Comisiei
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(23 aprilie 2012)

Subiect: Propunerea de program „Erasmus pentru toți”

Comisia Europeană a prezentat în noiembrie 2011 propunerea sa pentru noul program destinat educației, formării, tineretului și sportului, numit „Erasmus pentru toți”.

În pofida unui buget mărit și a unui accent semnificativ pus pe educație, noul program a fost întâmpinat și cu o serie de critici de unele organizații de studenți. Acestea au vizat în principal caracterul deficitar al propunerii în domenii cum ar fi educația informală, învățarea interactivă de la egal la egal, sprijinirea participării active și implicării tinerilor în viața democratică.

Cum răspunde Comisia preocupărilor ridicate de organizațiile de studenți?

Cum intenționează Comisia să implice toți actorii interesați (asociații studențești, personal academic, organizații de tineret) în dialogul pe tema programului „Erasmus pentru toți”, precum și în elaborarea altor programe în domeniu?

Răspuns dat de dna Vassiliou în numele Comisiei
(9 iulie 2012)

Activitățile pregătitoare pentru propunerea „Erasmus pentru toți” au implicat consultări ample cu numeroase părți interesate din domeniul tineretului, inclusiv o consultare publică online, care a reunit aproape 7 000 de contribuții. Comisia a consultat în mod direct părțile interesate, inclusiv ONG-urile din domeniul tineretului, antreprenoriatul din rândul tinerilor și organizațiile de angajatori, precum și autoritățile naționale din țările care participă la programul „Tineretul în acțiune”.

Educația nonformală și cea informală, schimburile de tineret, participarea civică și implicarea tineretului în viața democratică se numără printre obiectivele propunerii „Erasmus pentru toți”. Motivul pentru care Comisia propune integrarea învățării formale, informale și nonformale este că, în urma acestei măsuri, fiecare dintre aceste elemente devine mai puternic. Organizațiile de tineret își vor păstra pe deplin specificitatea și activitatea lor va ocupa un loc firesc alături de toate celelalte forme de schimb și cooperare în domeniul educației și al formării. Astfel, acțiunile adresate în mod specific tineretului se vor dezvolta pe picior de egalitate cu restul programului și vor începe să se bucure de recunoașterea mai amplă pe care o merită. Înlăturarea obstacolelor artificiale dintre diversele sectoare de educație și formare reprezintă un mesaj politic puternic, pe care Parlamentul European l-a exprimat în repetate rânduri.

De la adoptarea propunerii, Comisia a continuat să interacționeze cu toate părțile interesate, ceea ce i-a permis să explice motivele care stau la baza propunerii și să răspundă la întrebări, și va menține acest dialog cu toate părțile interesate pe tot parcursul procesului.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004176/12
to the Commission
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(23 April 2012)

Subject: Erasmus for All programme proposal

In November 2011, the Commission presented its proposal for a new programme for education, training, youth, and sport known as Erasmus for All.

Despite an increased budget and a significant emphasis placed on education, the new programme was met with a series of criticisms from some student organisations. These were aimed mainly at the shortcomings of the proposal in areas such as informal education, interactive peer learning, support for active participation and youth involvement in democratic life.

How does the Commission respond to the concerns raised by the student organisations?

How does the Commission intend to involve all the interested parties (students' associations, academic personnel, youth organisations) in the dialogue on the Erasmus for All programme, and other development programmes in this area?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(9 July 2012)

Preparatory work for the 'Erasmus for All' proposal involved extensive consultation with numerous stakeholders in the youth field, including an online public consultation, which gathered almost 7.000 contributions. The Commission directly consulted stakeholders, including youth NGOs, youth entrepreneurship and employers organisations, and the national authorities of the countries participating in the 'Youth in Action' programme.

Non-formal and informal education, youth exchanges, civic participation and youth involvement in democratic life are all amongst the objectives of the 'Erasmus for All' proposal. If the Commission is proposing to integrate formal, in-formal and non-formal learning, it is because each of those elements emerges stronger as a result. Youth groups will fully retain their specificity, and their work will take its natural place alongside all the other forms of exchange and cooperation in education and training. Thus, actions specifically for youth will develop on an equal footing with the rest of the programme, and start to enjoy the broader recognition they deserve. Dismantling the artificial barriers between the various education and training sectors is a strong political message, and one that the European Parliament has voiced time and again.

Since the adoption of the proposal, the Commission has continued to engage with all stakeholders, allowing it to explain the rationale of the proposal and respond to questions, and will maintain this dialogue with all stakeholders throughout the process.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004177/12
à la Commission
Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE)
(23 avril 2012)

Objet: Reprise des activités pétrolières dans le Parc national Virunga classé à l'Unesco en République Démocratique du Congo

Alors qu'en mars 2011, sous la pression de l'Unesco, le Premier ministre de RDC et le Directeur Général de l'Unesco avaient signé conjointement une déclaration mettant fin aux activités pétrolières dans cette zone, certaines compagnies pétrolières continuent à faire pression sur le gouvernement de la RDC pour continuer les activités de prospections pétrolières, notamment la compagnie britannique SOCO, qui a déjà obtenu la possibilité d'explorer la zone par voie aérienne en septembre 2011.

Quelles mesures compte prendre la Commission afin de s'opposer à l'exploitation pétrolière dans le Parc national de Virunga, qui menace les derniers gorilles existants, et dans les sites classés au patrimoine de l'Unesco, et plus généralement, comment empêcher que des activités pétrolières irresponsables et préjudiciables prennent le pas sur la conservation de la nature et sur le développement durable?

Quelles mesures la Commission prévoit-elle de prendre afin d'empêcher les entreprises européennes d'alimenter les conflits concernant les ressources, afin de s'assurer que sera au moins respectée la directive de l'OCDE concernant les multinationales? En particulier, quelles sont les intentions de la Commission vis-à-vis du chapitre des directives de l'OCDE portant sur les conflits minéraux, chapitre qui certes n'inclut pas le pétrole, mais l'on sait que le pétrole présente le même potentiel conflictuel, comme on peut le voir dans l'Est de la RDC? Que prévoit-elle de faire contre les compagnies européennes qui ne respectent pas les lois nationales et les règlements dans les pays où elles sont implantées? Plus généralement, quelles sont les prochaines étapes qu'envisage la Commission pour améliorer de façon significative les standards de la gouvernance d'entreprise en matière de respect de l'environnement et des règles sociales, puisque l'on voit combien la mise en œuvre des directives sur une base volontaire demeure très loin d'être efficace?

Réponse donnée par M. De Gucht au nom de la Commission
(12 juin 2012)

Au sujet des initiatives concernant le Parc national de Virunga au Congo, la Commission renvoie à la réponse à la question parlementaire 4659/2012 (Belet).

La Commission attend que les entreprises de l'UE assument la responsabilité de leur impact sur la société, en établissant des processus visant à intégrer les considérations relatives aux droits sociaux, environnementaux, éthiques et humains dans leur activité et leur stratégie, en conformité également avec les normes internationales en matière de comportement des entreprises ([1]).

Dans la communication sur les matières premières, la Commission a proposé d'«examiner comment accroître la transparence dans l'ensemble de la chaîne d'approvisionnement et de remédier, en collaboration avec les grands partenaires commerciaux, aux situations dans lesquelles les revenus tirés des industries extractives servent à financer des guerres ou des conflits internes».

La Commission préconise un plus grand soutien et un plus grand recours aux principes directeurs pour les entreprises multinationales de l'OCDE, qui ont été récemment renforcés pour inclure aussi le devoir de diligence concernant la gestion responsable de la chaîne d'approvisionnement. Le «guide de l'OCDE sur le devoir de diligence pour des chaînes d'approvisionnement responsables en minerais provenant de zones de conflit ou à haut risque» développe les recommandations destinées au secteur minier.

Ce guide — qui par définition n'est pas obligatoire — contenait à l'origine des compléments relatifs à l'étain, au tungstène et au tantale et il lui a été récemment ajouté un nouveau complément consacré à l'or. La Commission soutient l'élaboration d'un complément sur le pétrole à condition que l'industrie et les parties intéressées l'approuvent, comme cela a été le cas pour l'or.

([1]) COM(2011)681 final, «Responsabilité sociale des entreprises: une nouvelle stratégie de l'UE pour la période 2011-2014».

Cela dit, dans sa communication sur le commerce, la croissance et le développement, la Commission a proposé d'«étudier les moyens d'améliorer la transparence tout au long de la chaîne d'approvisionnement, y compris les aspects liés au devoir de diligence». Nous devrions être en mesure de commencer à y travailler dans les mois qui viennent.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004177/12
to the Commission
Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE)
(23 April 2012)

Subject: Resumption of oil companies' activities in the Unesco-listed Virunga National Park in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

Despite the fact that, in March 2011, under pressure from Unesco, the Prime Minister of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and the Director-General of Unesco jointly signed a declaration to put an end to oil prospection and extraction in this area, some oil companies are continuing to put pressure on the DRC government to continue oil prospecting activities, particularly the British company SOCO, which was given the opportunity of exploring the area by air in September 2011.

What measures does the Commission intend to take in order to oppose oil extraction in Virunga National Park, which poses a threat to the last remaining gorillas there, and in Unesco world heritage sites and, more generally, how does it intend to prevent irresponsible and detrimental oil prospection or extraction activities from taking priority over nature conservation and sustainable development?

What measures does the Commission intend to take in order to prevent European companies from aggravating conflicts over natural resources, so as to ensure, at a minimum, that the OECD guidelines for multinational enterprises will be respected? In particular, what are the Commission's intentions with regard to the chapter of OECD guidelines concerning conflict minerals, a chapter which does not include oil even though it has the same potential for causing conflict, as demonstrated in the east of the DRC? What action does the Commission intend to take against European companies which do not comply with the national laws and regulations of the countries in which they are located? More broadly, what are the next steps planned by the Commission to significantly improve corporate governance standards relating to the respect of the environment and rules concerning corporate social responsibility, as it is clear that enforcing the guidelines on a voluntary basis has not proved to be effective?

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

On initiatives in Congo's Virunga National Park, the Commission refers to the reply to Parliamentary Question 4659/2012 (Belet).

The Commission expects EU enterprises to take responsibility for their impacts on society, by establishing processes to integrate social, environmental, ethical and human rights concerns into their business operations and strategy, also in compliance with international standards of responsible business conduct ([1]).

In the communication on Raw Materials, the Commission proposed to 'examine ways to improve transparency throughout the supply chain and tackle in coordination with key trade partners situations where revenues from extractive industries are used to fund wars or internal conflicts'.

The Commission advocates greater support for and use of the OECD Guidelines for multinational enterprises, recently upgraded to also include due diligence on responsible supply chain management. The OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from Conflict-Affected and High Risk Areas, further develops recommendations for the mining sector.

This Guidance — which is by definition not compulsory — initially developed supplements for tin, tungsten and tantalum and recently added a new supplement on gold. The Commission would support the development of an oil supplement provided industry and stakeholders agree to it as it was the case for gold.

That said, in its communication on Trade, Growth and Development, the Commission proposed to 'explore ways of improving transparency throughout the supply chain, including aspects of due diligence.' We expect to be able to start work in the coming months.

([1]) COM(2011)681 final 'A renewed EU strategy 2011-14 for Corporate Social Responsibility'.