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 269 E/01)

Treść **Strona**

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006878/12
to the Commission
Nessa Childers (S&D)
(10 July 2012)

Subject: Excessive telephone charges

Is the Commission aware of the often-excessive hotel telephone charges in the EU?

Has the Commission any data on the costs of hotel telephone charges in the EU?

Will the Commission consider legislation to protect the consumer in this area?

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

The Commission is not aware that telephone charges represent a problem for hotel customers and does not have data on the alleged 'overcharging' practices.

At this point in time, the Commission does not consider that specific legislation to tackle this issue is needed. On a case by case basis, Article 102 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) can be applied to prohibit excessive pricing practices by hotel operators that are found to abuse their dominant position in the relevant product and geographic market.

It should also be noted that, when travelling, consumers increasingly use alternative means such as mobile phones and Internet based Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) services to avoid such charges. Prices caps for roaming calls, sms and data, as introduced by the successive Roaming regulations ([1]), also contribute to make it cheaper and easier for European travellers to keep in touch wherever they are in the European Union.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 717/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 June 2007 on roaming on public mobile telephone networks within the Community and amending Directive 2002/21/EC http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32007R0717:EN:NOT, Regulation (EC) No 544/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 June 2009 amending Regulation (EC) no 717/2007 on roaming on public mobile telephone networks within the community and Directive 2002/21/EC on a common regulatory framework for electronic communications networks and services http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:167:0012:0023:EN:PDF and Regulation (EU) No 531/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2012 on roaming on public mobile communications networks within the Union http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:172:0010:0035:EN:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006879/12
to the Commission
Nessa Childers (S&D)
(10 July 2012)

Subject: Cross-border football competition — EU Peace III funding

The Commission is asked whether EU Peace III funding (or other EU funding) may be made available in the case described below and, if so, what the procedure is for applying for such funding.

The FAI Schools Leinster Branch (Boys Section) coordinates the soccer activities of over 180 boys' schools throughout the Province of Leinster, Ireland, offering over 50 competitions each academic year for second-level students of all ages. The Secretary of the Leinster branch has recently been in touch with my office regarding a potential cross-border schools' soccer competition, in association with the NISFA, the Northern Ireland Schools' Football Association.

As you know, Northern Ireland has been, and still is, marked by sectarianism, often erupting into sectarian violence. Provisionally titled the 'Peace Cup', the competition is designed to bring together schools from different religious and cultural traditions in the border regions in a friendly, sports-based environment. The kernel of the idea is as follows:

— The competition would be organised on a regional basis, e.g., north Louth and south Armagh/Down, east Donegal and west Derry/west Tyrone, Monaghan and east Tyrone/west Armagh, Cavan and Fermanagh.

— The competition would be for students in their first year of second-level education (First Year in the Republic of Ireland, Year 8 in Northern Ireland).

— Schools would be divided into groups, with an equal split between the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland.

— Regional finals would be held in appropriate Irish League/League of Ireland grounds, e.g., Oriel Park, Dundalk/The Showgrounds, Newry, etc.

— Participating schools would bear none of the costs of the competition — all outlays for transport, teacher substitutions, match officials and ground hire would be covered, and school teams would be offered equipment, etc., as further incentive to participate.

The Secretary is now seeking assistance in funding this endeavour so that the costs to the schools can be kept to an absolute minimum, thereby encouraging their participation.

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(20 August 2012)

1. In line with the shared management principle used for cohesion policy, the Member States have primary responsibility for awarding funding to projects. The Special EU Programmes Body (SEUPB) is the responsible managing authority for PEACE III implementation. Information on funding opportunities and the specific selection criteria for projects are available on www.seupb.eu or by e-mail at info@seupb.eu.

Several projects involving sports are being funded under the current PEACE III programme. The Commission considers that sports related projects can be very successful in pursuing the objectives of the PEACE programme, namely by fostering social integration, building positive relations and by addressing issues of racism and sectarianism. The particular emphasis of the projects lies, for instance, on cross-community team-building, mixed workshops as well as on exploring diversity by playing and truly engaging with each other through the medium of football.

2. Since 1989 the EU has also contributed EUR 349 million to the work of the International Fund for Ireland (IFI). The Fund has supported several thousand projects across the island of Ireland, including sports related activities. Information on funding opportunities through the IFI is available on the Fund's website www.internationalfundforireland.com.

3. In addition, the Commission has been implementing Preparatory Actions in the field of sport since 2009. So far 40 international sport projects have received EU funding. The 2012 call for proposals was open till 31 July 2012; it is expected that a call for proposals will be organised also in 2013. An international network of partners from at least five Member States is required.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006880/12
to the Commission
Nessa Childers (S&D)
(10 July 2012)

Subject: Paternal rights

Does the Commission know if research into 'paternal rights' in custody cases at EU level has been undertaken using EU funding?

Does the Commission know if recognising and acknowledging the rights of fathers who have been the primary caregivers, working within the home while their partner worked outside it, is within the remit of the European Union?

If so, does the Commission know of any legislation which may exist to protect the paternal rights of fathers in particular and does not include reference to both parents together or to mothers alone?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(7 September 2012)

EU family law relating to children is limited to common rules on jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of existing judgments in another Member State. Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003 ([1]) ('the Brussels IIa regulation') is the main EC law instrument in this area. The granting of custody rights and the arrangements for their exercise are not governed by EC law but by national law. Under the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and the Treaty on European Union, the EU does not have the power to legislate in this area of family law.

In the area of freedom, security and justice, the EU facilitates access to justice based on the principle of mutual recognition of decisions in civil matters.

In accordance with Article 24 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union and the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, every child shall have the right to maintain on a regular basis a personal relationship and direct contact with both his or her parents, unless that is contrary to his or her interests. The Commission is committed to ensuring the respect of children's rights as granted by the Charter and in line with the UN Convention as long as the matter falls within the scope of application of EC law. The European Commission is not aware of the existence of any research on paternal rights in custody cases undertaken at EU level with EU funds.

([1]) OJ L 338, 23.12.2003, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006881/12
to the Commission
Nessa Childers (S&D)
(10 July 2012)

Subject: Anti-malarial medication

Does documentary evidence/data exist regarding the levels of use of Lariam, an anti-malarial medication, by individual Member States?

Does documentary evidence/data exist regarding the levels of use of Lariam, an anti-malarial medication, by the various European defence forces when overseas?

Have formal complaints been made about potential side-effects associated with this medication, ranging from headaches, gastrointestinal disturbances and fatigue? More serious effects include abnormal dreams, depression, suicidal behaviour and anxiety.

Can the Commission identify the correct procedure for submitting a petition at European level for the restriction/removal of this drug from the pharmaceutical market?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(24 August 2012)

Lariam is authorised by individual Member States. The Commission does not have any documentary evidence on the levels of use of Lariam in Member States nor by the European defence forces.

Potential side effects of medicinal products are mentioned in the summary of product characteristics that is intended for healthcare professionals and the patient information leaflet. The Commission has not received formal complaints about the potential side effects of Lariam.

The recent revision of the legislation with respect to pharmacovigilance activities ([1]) obliges the marketing authorisation holders to record and report all suspected adverse reactions to their medicinal products and they may be required to submit regular safety reports. Member States are obliged to record all suspected adverse reactions that occur on their territory and are reported to them by healthcare professionals or patients. The Member States in collaboration with the European Medicines Agency shall monitor the data related to the suspected adverse reactions to determine whether there is a change in the benefit-risk balance of a product.

The variation, suspension and withdrawal of a marketing authorisation of a medicinal product is subject to certain specific conditions specified in the EU legislation ([2]) ensuring the maintenance of a marketing authorisation as long as the existence of one of those conditions is not established. Procedurally, the competent authorities that granted the marketing authorisation are responsible for any variation, suspension or withdrawal of a marketing authorisation.

([1]) Directive 2010/84/EU (OJ L 348, 31.12.2010, p. 74) and Regulation (EU) No 1235/2010 (OJ L 348, 31.12.2010, p. 1).
([2]) Directive 2001/83/EC (OJ L 311, 28.11.2001, p. 67) and Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 (OJ L 136, 30.4.2004, p. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006882/12
to the Commission
Nessa Childers (S&D)
(10 July 2012)

Subject: Pre-trial detention in the EU

It is almost seven months since Parliament overwhelmingly supported a resolution to raise standards on the use of pre-trial detention in the EU.

Given the clear mandate that the Parliament has issued and the strong support of civil society and Member States, will the Commissioner state what actions the Commission has taken and will take in relation to pre-trial detention?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(22 August 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the answer to Written Question E-2438/2012 by Mr Stoyanov. The Commission cannot commit itself at this early stage. It should be stressed that issues related to detention conditions, pre-trial detention, alternatives to detention and the rehabilitation or social reintegration of ex-prisoners are primarily responsibilities incumbent upon Member States. From an initial analysis of the answers received, it appears that although a number of Member States supported the adoption of common standards at EU level for pre-trial detention (regarding obligatory and regular review), only very few of them were in favour of harmonising the maximum length of pre-trial detention. The Commission will publish the results of the Green Paper 'Strengthening mutual trust in the European judicial area — A Green Paper on the application of EU criminal justice legislation in the field of detention' in the coming weeks.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006883/12
to the Commission
Nessa Childers (S&D)
(10 July 2012)

Subject: Community theatre in underprivileged area of Ireland

I would like to ask the Commission about accessing European funding for a community theatre and facilities building in Arklow, Co. Wicklow.

Arklow is a hugely underprivileged area of my constituency and urgently needs these facilities.

A feasibility study carried out in 2008 found there was an urgent need for such a facility in Arklow. Since 2009, community activists have worked tirelessly to make it happen. On 18 May 2010 a working group came together and started the laborious task of bringing this project to fruition.

Arklow town council has now granted a site for the centre and the community activists are currently negotiating with Dermot Bannon (an architect who stars on RTE's (Raidió Teilifís Éireann) programme 'Room to Improve') to oversee the project.

The estimated cost of this project is EUR 2 000 000 to build and a further EUR 100 000 to fit out. These figures include solar panels. Various other environmental friendly options are also being discussed.

— What EU funding is this project currently eligible for and what steps can the project manager take to improve its eligibility for other possible sources of EU funding?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(4 September 2012)

The EU provides support to theatre and more generally the performing arts sector, through what is currently the Culture Programme.

However, the building of theatrical facilities or the restoration of sites is out of the scope of this programme. Cooperation projects between cultural operators working in the field of theatre can, however, be funded, if they fulfil the conditions for participation, further to a highly competitive selection process. Further information on the Culture programme can be found at the following website: http://ec.europa.eu/culture/index_en.htm.

Cultural operators interested in the Culture Programme are invited to contact the Cultural Contact point in their country. Cultural Contact Points have been established in the countries taking part in the Programme in order to promote and facilitate access to it. The list of those Contact Points is available here: http://ec.europa.eu/culture/annexes-culture/doc1232_en.htm.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006884/12
to the Commission
Nessa Childers (S&D)
(10 July 2012)

Subject: EU funding for young people

Can the Commission please list all the sources of EU funding that are available for young people (aged 15-25 years) to undertake training programmes?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(24 September 2012)

In year 2012 young people, aged 15-25 are eligible beneficiaries for training under the following Programmes and actions. The total of each budget line is the total voted amount. Some of these actions also support beneficiaries other than the aged 15-25 years.

Lifelong Learning Programme (15 02 22) — EUR 1110.47 million

The main source of EU funding for the training of young people is the Lifelong Learning Programme. The Leonardo da Vinci sub-programme is the core supporting tool for gaining skills, personal development and work experience in another European country for young people. Further information on facts and figures of the Leonardo da Vinci programme can be found online ([1]).

Erasmus Mundus (15 02 02) — EUR 105.6 million

Preparatory action to cover the costs of studies for persons specialising in the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) and for related economic activities and other educational modules including the functioning of the ENP Chair in the College of Europe (Natolin Campus) (15 02 33) — EUR 3.5 million

Youth in Action Programme (15 05 55) — EUR 139.6 million

The Youth in Action programme supports different measures in favour of young people in the field of non-formal learning. It is destined at young people between 13 and 30.

People Programme (15 07 77) — EUR 905.6 million

The MEDIA Training Programme supports exchanges and cooperation between higher education institutions, training organisations and partners from the audiovisual industry, contributing to the mobility of students and trainers in Europe, and facilitating the integration in the professional sector ([2]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/education/pub/pdf/vocational/leonardo0711_en.pdf
([2]) More information: http://ec.europa.eu/culture/media/programme/training/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006885/12
to the Commission
David Martin (S&D)
(10 July 2012)

Subject: Sustained attack on the human rights of Sikhs in India

Is the Commission aware of the claims that there is a systematic and sustained attack on the human rights of Sikhs across India and especially in the state of Punjab?

What evidence has been presented to the Commission and what action is being proposed in order to respond to these attacks?

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

The EU Delegation in Delhi is regularly monitoring acts of impunity, of religious intolerance, and of discrimination against minority groups in India. The EU's concerns in this regard are systematically expressed during the local annual EU-India Human Rights Dialogue and international fora such as the UN Human Rights Council, where India recently went through its Universal Periodic Review.

Furthermore, the EU Delegation and Member States missions in Delhi are in contact with local and European interlocutors in a number of Indian states in order to be regularly updated on the situation of minorities. They are also closely following developments on rights awareness, police reform, and legislation such as the still-awaited Communal Violence Prevention Bill, and take these matters up regularly with the Indian authorities.

Ensuring respect for human rights in sensitive security contexts remains a priority for the EU, and it strongly condemns the use of torture in any form and presses for prompt and fair delivery of justice wherever this may be needed.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006886/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(10 Ιουλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Κόστος των υπηρεσιών που παρέχονται από το Γραφείο Εναρμόνισης της Εσωτερικής Αγοράς (OHIM)

Το Γραφείο Εναρμόνισης της Εσωτερικής Αγοράς (OHIM) είναι ένας ευρωπαϊκός οργανισμός, που εδρεύει στο Αλικάντε της Ισπανίας με την αποστολή να διαχειρίζεται τα συστήματα κοινοτικού σήματος και κοινοτικού σχεδίου ή υποδείγματος.

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη ότι, ως ευρωπαϊκή υπηρεσία, το Γραφείο Εναρμόνισης της Εσωτερικής Αγοράς εποπτεύεται από την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή, η Επιτροπή ερωτάται:

1. Ποιο είναι το κόστος για το Γραφείο ανά σχέδιο και ανά σήμα που έχει εξεταστεί, καταχωρηθεί και/ή εκδοθεί; Ποιοι είναι οι παράγοντες που καθορίζουν αυτό το κόστος;

2. Ποια είναι τα έσοδα που εισπράττονται από το Γραφείο για τις υπηρεσίες αυτές ανά σχέδιο και ανά σήμα;

Απάντηση του κ. Barnier εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(22 Αυγούστου 2012)

Επί του παρόντος, το Γραφείο Εναρμόνισης της Εσωτερικής Αγοράς (ΓΕΕΑ) δεν διαθέτει αναλυτικό λογιστικό σύστημα. Ωστόσο, το 2010 πραγματοποιήθηκε ειδικός συνολικός υπολογισμός σε σχέση με τα έσοδα και τα έξοδα, ο οποίος στηρίχθηκε στα στοιχεία της εκτέλεσης του προϋπολογισμού που ελήφθησαν από τους Ετήσιους Λογαριασμούς 2010. Τα αποτελέσματα του υπολογισμού αυτού ήταν τα εξής:

1. Το κόστος για το ΓΕΕΑ ανέρχεται σε 1 233 ευρώ ανά αίτηση καταχώρισης κοινοτικού σήματος και σε 87 ευρώ ανά κοινοτικό σχέδιο. Το κόστος αυτό περιλαμβάνει τόσο το άμεσο κόστος όσο και τα γενικά έξοδα. Τα στοιχεία υπολογίστηκαν λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τις δαπάνες που αφορούν το προσωπικό (45 %), τα κτίρια (9 %), την πληροφορική (14 %), τις μεταφράσεις (18 %) και άλλες έννοιες που σχετίζονται με τους τίτλους II και III (δαπάνες λειτουργίας και ειδικές δαπάνες, αντίστοιχα) (14 %).

2. Τα έσοδα του ΓΕΕΑ ανέρχονται σε 1 107 ευρώ ανά αίτηση καταχώρισης κοινοτικού σήματος και σε 254 ευρώ ανά κοινοτικό σχέδιο.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006886/12
to the Commission
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(10 July 2012)

Subject: Cost of the services provided by the Office for Harmonisation in the internal market (OHIM)

The Office for Harmonisation in the internal market (OHIM) is a European agency, based in Alicante in Spain, which is responsible for managing the Community trade mark and Community design registration systems.

Given that, as a European agency, the OHIM is supervised by the Commission, the Commission is asked to answer the following:

1. What are the OHIM's costs per design and per trade mark examined, registered and/or issued? What factors determine these costs?

2. What revenue is collected by the Office for these services per design and per trade mark?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(22 August 2012)

At present, the Office does not have an analytical accountancy. However, a special global calculation in relation to revenue and costs was made in 2010 on the basis of budget execution figures taken from the 2010 Annual Accounts. The results of this calculation were as follows:

1. The OHIM cost per Community trade mark application amounted to EUR 1,233 and per Community design to EUR 87. These costs include both direct costs and overheads. They were calculated taking into account the costs related to staff (45%), building (9%), IT (14%), translations (18%) and to other concepts related to title II and III (operating and specific expenditure, respectively) (14%).

2. The OHIM revenue per Community trade mark application amounted to EUR 1,107 and per Community design to EUR 254.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006887/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(10 Ιουλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Αποτελεσματικότητα των ερευνητικών πόρων της OLAF

Σύμφωνα με τις μέχρι σήμερα διαθέσιμες πληροφορίες σε επίπεδο Γενικής Διεύθυνσης Περιφερειακής Πολιτικής, η Ευρωπαϊκή Υπηρεσία Καταπολέμησης της Απάτης (OLAF) πραγματοποίησε από το 2001 43 εξωτερικές έρευνες στην Ισπανία για το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης (ΕΤΠΑ) και το Ταμείο Συνοχής. Ενδεικτικά, από αυτές τις υποθέσεις:

— 34 περιπτώσεις έκλεισαν χωρίς δημοσιονομική επίπτωση και

— 5 περιπτώσεις περατώθηκαν με δημοσιονομικό αντίκτυπο ή είναι υπό παρακολούθηση από την Επιτροπή.

Λαμβάνοντας αυτά τα δεδομένα υπόψη:

1. κρίνουν η Επιτροπή και η OLAF τη χρήση των ερευνητικών πόρων της OLAF ως ικανοποιητική όσον αφορά τις οικονομικές επιπτώσεις και σε σχέση με τον αριθμό των περιπτώσεων που ερευνήθηκαν στην Ισπανία και σε άλλα κράτη μέλη;

2. αν δεν την κρίνουν ως ικανοποιητική, ποιες ενέργειες προτίθενται να λάβουν προκειμένου να βελτιώσουν την ερευνητική αποτελεσματικότητα του Γραφείου;

Απάντηση του κ. Šemeta εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(24 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Τα συνολικά ποσά που έχουν ανατηθεί από την Επιτροπή από την εποχή της σύστασης της OLAF, πέραν των ερευνών της OLAF στο ΕΤΠΑ και στο Ταμείο Συνοχής σχετικά με την Ισπανία, αντιπροσωπεύουν πάνω από 31 εκατομμύρια ευρώ. Η OLAF ολοκλήρωσε 41 έρευνες και υποθέσεις συντονισμού στο συγκεκριμένο τομέα ([1]) όσον αφορά την Ισπανία. Η Επιτροπή είναι κατά συνέπεια της άποψης ότι οι πόροι της OLAF για έρευνες έχουν χρησιμοποιηθεί συνολικά με οικονομικά αποδοτικό τρόπο, προστατεύοντας έτσι αποτελεσματικά τα οικονομικά συμφέροντα της ΕΕ και των φορολογούμενων τόσο στην Ισπανία όσο και στα άλλα κράτη μέλη.

Πράγματι, σε συνολική κλίμακα, το 2011, οι έρευνες της OLAF κατέληξαν στην ανάκτηση 691 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ για τον προϋπολογισμό της ΕΕ και σε ποινές φυλάκισης ανερχόμενες συνολικά σε 511 έτη, οι οποίες επιβλήθηκαν (από τα εθνικά δικαστήρια) σε άτομα για τα οποία εκδόθηκε καταδικαστική απόφαση ([2]). Ο Γενικός Διευθυντής της OLAF διατύπωσε, το 2011, 175 συστάσεις –κυρίως δικαστικές και οικονομικές — για την ανάγκη ανάληψης δράσης εκ μέρους των αρμοδίων αρχών ([3]) σε 108 (52 %) από τις περατωθείσες υποθέσεις ([4]).

Για να βελτιώσει περαιτέρω την αποτελεσματικότητά της, η OLAF προέβη πρόσφατα σε εσωτερική αναδιοργάνωση, η οποία οδήγησε σε σαφέστερη τώρα κατανομή των αρμοδιοτήτων. Ενώ ο συνολικός αριθμός του προσωπικού της OLAF παρέμεινε ίδιος, ο αριθμός του ασχολούμενου με έρευνες προσωπικού αυξήθηκε. Επιπλέον, σύμφωνα με την εσωτερική αναδιοργάνωση, καθιερώθηκαν νέες διαδικασίες έρευνας ([5]) για να επιτευχθεί ακόμα μεγαλύτερη εστίαση του ερευνητικού έργου της Υπηρεσίας και να μειωθεί η διάρκεια των ερευνών. Χορηγείται προτεραιότητα στις αποφάσεις έναρξης ερευνών, σύμφωνα με τις προτεραιότητες της πολιτικής της OLAF ([6]).

([1]) Οι 41 υποθέσεις περιλαμβάνουν 29 περατωθείσες και 12 εκκρεμείς υποθέσεις. Στις 9 από αυτές τις περατωθείσες υποθέσεις, η OLAF εξέδωσε 12 συστάσεις, κυρίως οικονομικές και δικαστικές. 20 άλλες υποθέσεις περατώθηκαν χωρίς συστάσεις.

([2]) Βλέπε την ετήσια έκθεση OLAF για το 2011 και το δελτίο τύπου της: http://ec.europa.eu/anti_fraud/media-corner/press-releases/press-releases/2012/20120703_01_el.htm.

([3]) Θεσμικά και λοιπά όργανα, και οργανισμοί ΕΕ ή αρμόδιες αρχές των κρατών μελών.

([4]) Για περαιτέρω στοιχεία, το Αξιότιμο Μέλος μπορεί να ανατρέξει στην ετήσια έκθεση της OLAF για το 2011 και ειδικότερα στη συνοπτική της παρουσίαση.

([5]) Αυτές οι νέες διαδικασίες περιλαμβάνουν ιδιαίτερα τη δημιουργία μιας Μονάδας αφιερωμένης στην αξιολόγηση των πληροφοριών που λαμβάνονται από την OLAF και στην επιλογή νέων υποθέσεων.

([6]) Οι προτεραιότητες της ακολουθούμενης πολιτικής στον τομέα των ερευνών λαμβάνουν υπόψη κριτήρια όπως η αναλογικότητα, η αποτελεσματική χρήση των μέσων έρευνας, η προστιθέμενη αξία μιας έρευνας της OLAF, ορισμένοι ειδικοί στόχοι πολιτικής προσδιοριζόμενοι από τον Γενικό Διευθυντή για σχετικούς τομείς και/ή γεωγραφικές περιοχές (βάσει προβληματισμών/προτεραιοτήτων που εκφράζονται από τα ευρωπαϊκά όργανα και των αποτελεσμάτων των αναλύσεων κινδύνου της ίδιας της OLAF, καθώς και βάσει των πληροφοριών των κρατών μελών) και ο πιθανός οικονομικός αντίκτυπος της υπόθεσης. Για περισσότερες λεπτομέρειες: http://ec.europa.eu/anti_fraud/documents/ipp_for_amp_en.pdf.

Η αναθεώρηση του κανονισμού 1073/1999 ([7]) η οποία συνεχίζεται ([8]), θα βελτιώσει περαιτέρω την αποδοτικότητα, την αποτελεσματικότητα και την υποχρέωση λογοδοσίας της Υπηρεσίας, ενώ ταυτόχρονα θα διασφαλίσει την ανεξαρτησία της κατά τη διεξαγωγή των ερευνών.

([7]) Βλέπε δελτίο Τύπου της Επιτροπής για τη μεταρρύθμιση της OLAF: http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/11/321&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EL&guiLanguage=el.

([8]) Το COREPER ενέκρινε πρόσφατα ένα νομοθετικό συμβιβαστικό κείμενο μετά από άτυπες τριμερείς συζητήσεις μεταξύ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, του Συμβουλίου και της Επιτροπής. Βλέπε DOC, N° 12735/12 + Add 1 της 20ής Ιουλίου 2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006887/12
to the Commission
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(10 July 2012)

Subject: Effectiveness of OLAF's investigative resources

According to the information available at DG Regional Policy level, the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) has, since 2001, carried out 43 external investigations in Spain for the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and the Cohesion Fund. Of these cases:

— 34 are closed with no financial impact, and

— 5 are closed with financial impact or are being followed up by the Commission.

In the light of the above:

1. do the Commission and OLAF consider that OLAF's investigative resources are being used in a satisfactory manner as regards their financial impact and the number of cases investigated in Spain and in other Member States?

2. if not, what measures do they intend to take in order to improve the Office's investigative effectiveness?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(24 September 2012)

The total amounts recovered by the Commission since the creation of OLAF, further to OLAF investigations into the ERDF and the Cohesion Fund involving Spain represent more than EUR 31 million. OLAF carried 41 investigations and coordination cases in this field ([1]) concerning Spain. The Commission is therefore of the opinion that OLAF's investigative resources have been used in an overall cost effective manner, thereby efficiently protecting the financial interests of the EU and its taxpayers both in Spain and in the other Member States.

Indeed, on a global scale, in 2011, OLAF investigations resulted in EUR 691 million being recovered to the EU Budget and 511 years of prison sentences imposed (by national courts) on individuals convicted ([2]). OLAF's Director-General made, in 2011, 175 recommendations -mainly judicial and financial — for action to be taken by the competent authorities ([3]) in 108 (52%) of the closed cases ([4]).

In order to improve further its effectiveness OLAF recently implemented an internal reorganisation whereby responsibilities are now more clearly allocated. While the total number of OLAF staff has remained equal at that time, the number of staff dedicated to investigations has been increased. Furthermore, under the internal reorganisation, new investigative procedures ([5]) have been introduced to achieve even greater focus of the investigative work of the Office and reduce the duration of investigations. Decisions to open investigations are prioritised in accordance with OLAF's policy priorities ([6]).

The revision of Regulation 1073/1999 ([7]) which is still ongoing ([8]), will further improve the efficiency, effectiveness and accountability of the Office while safeguarding its investigative independence.

([1]) The 41 cases comprise 29 closed cases and 12 ongoing cases. In 9 of the cases closed, OLAF issued 12 recommendations, mainly financial and judicial; 20 other cases were closed without recommendations.

([2]) See the Annual OLAF Report for 2011 and its press release: http://ec.europa.eu/anti_fraud/media-corner/press-releases/press-releases/2012/20120703_01_en.htm

([3]) EU institutions, bodies, offices, agencies or the competent authorities of Member States.

([4]) For further figures, the Honourable Member may refer to the 2011 Annual OLAF Report and its executive summary in particular.

([5]) These new procedures include in particular the creation of a Unit dedicated to assessing the information received by OLAF and selecting new cases.

([6]) The Investigations Policy Priorities take into account criteria such as proportionality, efficient use of the investigative resources, the added value of an OLAF investigation, some special policy objectives defined by the Director-General for relevant sectors and/or geographical areas (based on concerns/priorities expressed by the European institutions and on the outcome of OLAF's own risk analyses, based also on information from Member States) and the possible financial impact of the case. For further details: http://ec.europa.eu/anti_fraud/documents/ipp_for_amp_en.pdf

([7]) See the Commission press release on the Reform of OLAF: http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/11/321&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en

([8]) The Coreper recently endorsed a legislative compromise text following informal trilogue discussions between the EP, the Council and the Commission. See DOC, No 12735/12 + Add 1 of July 20, 2012.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-006897/12
a Bizottság számára
Kovács Béla (NI)
(2012. július 11.)

Tárgy: A véleménynyilvánítás szabadsága az EU-ban

Az Európai Unió egyik és egyben legtöbbet hangoztatott alappillére a demokrácia. A demokrácia legalapvetőbb eleme a szólásszabadság, a szabad véleménynyilvánítás.

Értesültem róla, hogy tagországi szinten törvényelőkészítő munka folyik abból a célból, hogy büntethetővé tegyék az olyan nyilvános megszólalásokat, melyek az Európai Unió szükségességével ellentétes nézeteknek adnak hangot.

Vajon az ilyen tartalmú törvénykezés összeegyeztethető-e az EU elveivel és jogszabályaival?

Viviane Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2012. szeptember 3.)

A Bizottságnak nincs tudomása olyan nemzeti jogszabály létezéséről, amelynek célja az EU-ellenes nyilatkozatok büntetése, és uniós szinten sem tervezi ilyen jogszabály kidolgozását.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006897/12
to the Commission
Béla Kovács (NI)
(11 July 2012)

Subject: Freedom of opinion and expression in the EU

Democracy is one of the basic, most often talked-about pillars of the European Union. Its most fundamental principle is freedom of opinion and expression.

I have been informed that work is being conducted on drafting legislation at Member State level to enable public statements expressing views against the need for the EU to be punishable as an offence.

Is such legislation compatible with the principles and laws of the EU?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(3 September 2012)

The Commission is not aware of any national legislation aimed at punishing statements against the EU, nor is preparing projects for such legislation at European level.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-006898/12
a Bizottság számára
Kovács Béla (NI)
(2012. július 11.)

Tárgy: GMO-s szójából takarmány

Az Európai Unió egyik legfontosabb alapelve az emberek egészségének védelme.

Ugyanakkor az amerikai kontinens országaiból nagy mennyiségben importálnak európai országok takarmányozási céllal GMO-s szóját és más terményeket.

Ma már tudományosan megerősített, hogy így az állatok húsát fogyasztó emberekbe is bekerülnek olyan komponensek, melyeknek az egészségre és az emberi genetikai állományra gyakorolt közép- és hosszú távú hatásai még nem ismeretesek.

Elfogadható-e a jelen gyakorlat, amely kizárólag üzleti érdekek érvényesülése érdekében felmérhetetlen kockázatoknak teszi ki nemcsak az egyes emberek egészségét, de az emberiség genetikai örökítőanyagának stabilitását is?

John Dalli válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2012. augusztus 29.)

A géntechnológiával módosított szervezetekre vonatkozó uniós jogalkotás az egyik legszigorúbb a világon. A géntechnológiával módosított szervezetekre vonatkozó uniós engedélyezési rendszer átlátható, tudományos tényeken alapul, és biztosítja, hogy az Európai Unióban engedélyezett, géntechnológiával módosított szervezetek biztonságosak az emberi és állati egészség, valamint a környezet szempontjából. Mielőtt a géntechnológiával módosított termékek forgalombahozatali engedélyt kapnának, az Európai Élelmiszerbiztonsági Hatóság (EFSA) szigorú biztonsági vizsgálatán kell megfelelniük.

A géntechnológiával módosított takarmányokkal etetett állatokból származó termékek tekintetében (azt követően, hogy a Bizottsághoz petíció érkezett az ilyen termékek címkézése érdekekében) a Bizottság felkérte az EFSA-t, hogy nyilvánítson véleményt e címkézés szükségességéről. A rendelkezésre álló tudományos bizonyítékok alapján az EFSA arra a következtetésre jutott, hogy a jelenlegi címkézési szabályozás megváltoztatását nem támasztják alá tudományos indokok.

A Bizottság ezért nem tekintette szükségesnek azt, hogy az E-1794/10 sz. írásbeli kérdésben ([1]) említett jogi felülvizsgálat keretében módosítsa a géntechnológiával módosított takarmányokkal etetett állatokból származó vagy ilyen állatot tartalmazó élelmiszerek címkézésére vonatkozó szabályozást.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006898/12
to the Commission
Béla Kovács (NI)
(11 July 2012)

Subject: Feed produced from GM soya

One of the most important principles of the European Union is protecting human health.

However, European countries are importing from the American continent large quantities of GM soya and other agricultural products for use in animal feed.

It has already been scientifically proven that constituents of such feed whose medium— and long-term impact on health and on the human genome are as yet unknown enter the human organism via meat from animals fed on it.

Is the current practice acceptable whereby, purely to promote business interests, not only the health of individual human beings but the very stability of the human genome is being exposed to incalculable risks?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(29 August 2012)

EU legislation on GMOs is considered as one of the strictest in the world. The EU authorisation system for GMOs is transparent, science-based and ensures that GMOs authorised in the EU are safe for animal and human health and for the environment following a case by case analysis. In order for a GM product to be authorised for placing on the market, it must undergo a rigorous safety assessment by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA).

With regard to products derived from animals fed with GM feed (following a petition asking for the labelling of such products), the Commission asked EFSA to give its opinion on the need to label such products. After a thorough analysis of the existing scientific evidence, EFSA concluded that there is no scientific basis to justify a modification of the current labelling regime.

For this reason the Commission did not see a need to amend the rules on labelling of food consisting of or containing products originating from animals fed on GMO in the context of the legal review as referred to in Written Question E-1794/10 ([1]).

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

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-006899/12
a Bizottság számára
Kovács Béla (NI)
(2012. július 11.)

Tárgy: Közüzemi szolgáltatók alapdíjai

Egyes EU-s tagállamokban manapság általánosan elterjedt gyakorlat a közszolgáltatói számlázásban, hogy a tényleges, mért fogyasztáson alapuló díjakon kívül havi fix összegű, jelentős mértékű rendelkezésre állási díjat számítanak fel, alapdíj megnevezéssel.

Korábban, 10–20 ével ezelőtt ezen áram-, gáz-, víz-, fűtés- stb. szolgáltatók jogelődjei csak a mért fogyasztások alapján számláztak.

A jelenlegi rendszer olyan, mintha a gyalogosnak fizetnie kellene busz- vagy taxialapdíjat, csak azért, mert azok a rendelkezésére állnak.

Az Európai Parlament és a Tanács 2006/2004/EK számon rendeletet fogadott el a fogyasztókkal szembeni tisztességtelen kereskedelmi gyakorlat tilalmáról.

Van-e lehetőség az adott rendelet alapján egységes EU-s fellépésre az ilyen módszerrel a ténylegesen valamely szolgáltatást egy adott időszakban igénybe nem vevő állampolgárokon nyerészkedő szolgáltatók megrendszabályozására, megbüntetésére?

Viviane Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2012. szeptember 19.)

A villamosenergia-, gáz és vízszolgáltatók nemcsak változó, az értékesített mennyiségtől függő, hanem a forgalomtól független, fix költségeket is viselnek. A fix és változó elemeket egyaránt tartalmazó díjak ezt a költségszerkezetet tükrözik, és önmagukban nem utalnak versenyproblémák vagy tisztességtelen kereskedelmi gyakorlat jelenlétére.

A villamosenergia- és gázpiaci szabályozási keretrendszer a tisztességtelen kereskedelmi gyakorlatok ellen védő több fogyasztóvédelmi szabályt tartalmaz ([1]).

Emellett mindegyik piacon védi a háztartásokat a fogyasztókkal szemben folytatott tisztességtelen kereskedelmi gyakorlatokat tiltó uniós szabályozás, nevezetesen a tisztességtelen kereskedelmi gyakorlatokról szóló 2005/29/EK irányelv ([2]).

Az irányelv megköveteli a kereskedőktől, hogy a szakmai gondosság szabályainak megfelelően járjanak el, és ne torzítsák a fogyasztók gazdasági magatartását azáltal, hogy olyan ügyletekben való részvételre bírják rá, amelyben egyébként nem vettek volna részt. Jóllehet a vállalkozások az Unióban elv szerint szabadon határozhatják meg árpolitikájukat, az irányelv arra kötelezi őket, hogy a fogyasztókat megfelelő módon és időben tájékoztassák bármely általuk értékesített szolgáltatás áráról és a vele kapcsolatban alkalmazott összes egyéb díjról.

A tisztelt képviselő által említett 2006/2004/EK rendelet ([3]) a nemzeti végrehajtó hatóságokat uniós hálózatba szervezi, és meghatározza az uniós fogyasztóvédelmi jogszabályok, például a tisztességtelen kereskedelmi gyakorlatokról szóló irányelv határokon átnyúló megsértése elleni küzdelem terén folytatott együttműködésük kereteit.

([1]) Lásd a villamos energia belső piacára, illetőleg a földgáz belső piacára vonatkozó közös szabályokról rendelkező 2009/72/EK és 2009/73/EK irányelveket.
([2]) HL L 149., 2005.6.11., 22. o.
([3]) A fogyasztóvédelmi együttműködésről szóló 2006/2004/EK rendelet (HL L 364., 2004.12.9., 1. o.).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006899/12
to the Commission
Béla Kovács (NI)
(11 July 2012)

Subject: Basic fees of utilities providers

In certain Member States it is now common practice, when utilities providers give invoices, for a considerable availability fee — known as a basic fee — to be added as a fixed amount to the cost of actual, metered consumption.

In the past — 10-20 years ago — the predecessors of these electricity, water, heating, etc. providers invoiced solely on the basis of metered consumption.

With the current system it is as if pedestrians had to pay basic fees for buses and taxis just because they exist.

Parliament and the Council adopted a regulation (2006/2004/EC) on prohibiting unfair commercial practices to the detriment of consumers.

Is it possible, on the basis of the regulation in question, for coherent action to be taken at EU level to bring to heel or penalise service-providers who profiteer in this way from people who do not actually make use of a service over a given period?

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

Electricity gas and water providers face not only variable costs which depend on the sold quantities, but also fixed costs, which do not depend on the sold quantities. Tariffs including both a fixed and a variable element might therefore reflect this cost structure and do not seem to be in itself an indicator of competitive problems or unfair commercial practices.

The Regulatory framework for electricity and gas contains a number of consumer protection measures which countervail unfair commercial practises ([1]).

Moreover, households in all markets are protected by the European legislation prohibiting unfair commercial practices to the detriment of consumers, namely Directive 2005/29/EC on Unfair Commercial Practices ([2]).

The directive requires traders to operate in accordance with professional diligence and not to distort the economic behaviour of consumers by inducing them into transactions they would not have entered otherwise. While companies in the EU remain, in principle, free to decide their pricing policy, they are obliged under the directive to adequately and timely inform consumers about the price and all charges applicable to a service offered for sale.

Regulation (EC) No 2006/2004 ([3]) referred to by the Honourable Member, links national enforcement authorities into an EU wide network and defines a framework for their cooperation to tackle cross-border infringements of EU consumer protection laws like the directive on Unfair Commercial Practices.

([1]) See Directives 2009/72/EC and 2009/73/EC on the common rules for the internal market in electricity and natural gas respectively.
([2]) OJ L 149, 11.6.2005, p. 22.
([3]) Regulation (EC) No 2006/2004 on consumer protection cooperation, OJ L 364, 9.12.2004, p. 1.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-006906/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(11 juillet 2012)

Objet: Accord international CETA et ses paragraphes ACTA

Le Parlement européen a durement sanctionné ACTA via un vote sans appel, la semaine passée. Dans le même temps, mes services ont analysé un accord commercial international censé lier à l'avenir le Canada et l'Union européenne et appelé CETA.

Quelle ne fut pas notre surprise de constater que des pans entiers du traité ACTA se retrouvent dans l'accord CETA (Canada-EU)!

Sans vouloir citer in extenso les passages, je prendrai juste des termes sur lesquels le Parlement européen avait tiqué lors de sa première lecture du traité ACTA, tels que *«fair process»* ou le terme, d'un flou absolu, *«commercial scale»* quand on parle de mesures civiles ou criminelles à prendre, etc.

Laissant aux juristes spécialisés en la matière le soin d'aller dans les détails, je vous pose une double question.

Elle se veut volontairement simple afin que ce dossier ne soit pas un dossier de technocrates, comme la Commission l'a voulu pour ACTA, mais une question à laquelle chaque citoyen puisse s'identifier:

1. Pourquoi un accord commercial international (CETA) qui devrait avoir pour but unique de promouvoir le commerce entre des nations incorpore, au sein de ses textes, des paragraphes modifiant nos lois domestiques/internes européennes en y réglementant, par exemple, notre droit d'auteur?

2. Pourquoi n'est-il pas tenu compte, pour la conclusion d'un tel accord, du vote sur ACTA du Parlement européen, qui a refusé les mêmes paragraphes litigieux présents dans l'accord CETA?

Réponse commune donnée par M. De Gucht au nom de la Commission
(24 août 2012)

1. Comme tous les accords commerciaux bilatéraux de l'UE, l'accord entre le Canada et l'UE (CETA) contiendra un chapitre sur les droits de propriété intellectuelle (DPI). Cela est important parce que l'UE et le Canada sont des économies fondées sur la connaissance qui ont besoin d'un régime efficace de protection de leurs actifs intellectuels. C'est pourquoi l'UE propose des règles pour traiter plusieurs problèmes importants qui ont été décelés dans le régime des DPI du Canada, notamment dans les domaines des droits d'auteur, des brevets, des indications géographiques et de la mise en œuvre. Cependant, le chapitre du CETA sur les DPI n'obligera pas l'UE à modifier sa législation, et il a été pris grand soin de veiller à ce qu'il soit compatible avec l'acquis de l'UE.

2. Les négociations sur le CETA ne sont pas achevées. Les derniers rapports parus dans les médias, qui laissent entendre que la Commission réintroduit ACTA par la petite porte, sont fondés sur une version du texte de négociation vieille de six mois. Ce texte remonte à une époque où ACTA venait d'être signé par l'UE et 22 États membres, avant que le Parlement européen ne l'ait rejeté. Comme tant l'UE que le Canada étaient alors engagés dans le processus de ratification d'ACTA, il n'est pas étonnant que certaines dispositions de cette version contenaient des formulations qui se trouvaient aussi dans ACTA. Les négociations ont progressé entre-temps et le texte de février ne représente plus fidèlement la situation actuelle.

La Commission respecte pleinement le vote du Parlement européen. Elle élabore ses positions de négociation de telle manière qu'elles soient cohérentes avec la politique de l'UE. Le chapitre du CETA sur les DPI est en cours de révision pour tenir compte de la position exprimée par le Parlement européen sur ACTA et la Commission continuera à informer entièrement et rapidement la commission INTA du Parlement européen sur les progrès accomplis dans les négociations.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-006990/12
do Komisji
Paweł Zalewski (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE) oraz Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE)
(12 lipca 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Postanowienia ACTA w innych umowach

W zeszłym tygodniu Parlament zdecydowaną większością głosów odrzucił zawarcie umowy ACTA, a tym samym wysłał wyraźny sygnał sprzeciwu wobec wszelkich podobnych regulacji prawnych.

W krótkim czasie, który minął od tego momentu, otrzymaliśmy niepokojące informacje, iż niektóre z istotnych i ostro krytykowanych fragmentów umowy ACTA (np. ogólne zobowiązania dotyczące egzekwowania praw, odszkodowania, sankcje karne, zasady odpowiedzialności pośredników oraz środki stosowane przy kontroli granicznej) mogą ponownie zaistnieć jako elementy włączone do CETA (umowa o handlu między UE i Kanadą), jak również potencjalnie do innych umów międzynarodowych, które Komisja zamierza zawrzeć w najbliższej przyszłości.

Jesteśmy całkowicie przekonani, iż Komisja w pełni szanuje stanowisko Parlamentu oraz nie zaangażowałaby się w jakąkolwiek procedurę ustawodawczą niezgodną z wolą obywateli, przekazaną Parlamentowi i przez niego wyrażoną. Czy Komisja mogłaby jednak skomentować tę kwestię i rozwiać przedstawione powyżej wątpliwości?

Wspólna odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Karela De Guchta w imieniu Komisji
(24 sierpnia 2012 r.)

1. Podobnie jak wszystkie dwustronne umowy o handlu zawierane przez UE, kompleksowa umowa gospodarczo-handlowa między Kanadą a UE (CETA) będzie zawierać rozdział dotyczący własności intelektualnej. Jest to ważne, ponieważ gospodarki UE i Kanady to gospodarki oparte na wiedzy, wymagające skutecznego systemu ochrony ich dóbr intelektualnych. Z tego powodu UE proponuje wprowadzenie przepisów regulujących pewne istotne kwestie określone w kanadyjskim systemie ochrony własności intelektualnej, a mianowicie w dziedzinie praw autorskich, patentów, oznaczeń geograficznych i egzekwowania. Rozdział CETA dotyczący praw własności intelektualnej nie będzie jednak wymagał od UE modyfikacji jej obowiązujących przepisów, i usilnie dąży się do zapewnienia jego zgodności z dorobkiem prawnym UE.

2. Nie zakończono jeszcze negocjacji CETA. Tekst negocjacyjny, na podstawie którego media donosiły niedawno, że Komisja wprowadza ACTA tylnymi drzwiami, został sporządzony sześć miesięcy temu. Powstał on po tym, jak UE i 22 państwa członkowskie podpisały ACTA, i jeszcze zanim Parlament Europejski ją odrzucił. Zważywszy na to, że UE i Kanada w tamtym okresie były w trakcie ratyfikacji ACTA, nie powinien dziwić fakt użycia w niektórych postanowieniach tej wersji tekstu sformułowań pochodzących z ACTA. Ponieważ negocjacje osiągnęły kolejny etap, tekst z lutego nie odzwierciedla już rzetelnie aktualnej sytuacji.

Komisja w pełni respektuje decyzję Parlamentu Europejskiego. Wypracowuje ona swoje stanowiska negocjacyjne tak, aby były one zgodne z polityką UE. Rozdział CETA dotyczący ochrony własności intelektualnej jest obecnie przedmiotem przeglądu w świetle stanowiska zajętego przez Parlament Europejski w kwestii ACTA, a Komisja będzie nadal wyczerpująco i szybko informować komisję INTA Parlamentu Europejskiego o postępach w negocjacjach.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006906/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(11 July 2012)

Subject: Canada-EU Trade Agreement (CETA) and its ACTA paragraphs

Last week the European Parliament severely condemned ACTA in a vote against which there is no appeal. At the same time, my staff have analysed an international trade agreement, CETA, which is intended to be concluded between Canada and the European Union.

Imagine our surprise when we found entire sections of the ACTA agreement reproduced in CETA!

Without wishing to cite at length the passages concerned, I shall merely pick out some terms to which the European Parliament took exception during its first reading of ACTA, such as 'fair process' or the extraordinarily vague 'commercial scale' with reference to civil or criminal measures to be taken, etc.

Leaving it to legal experts specialising in the field to go into the details, I wish to put two questions to the Commission.

They are deliberately simple, to ensure that this issue is not confined to the domain of technocrats, which was the Commission's aim with ACTA, but is one with which every citizen can identify.

1. Why does an international trade agreement (CETA) which should be designed purely to promote trade between nations include paragraphs modifying our European domestic/internal laws concerning, for example, our copyright system?

2. In concluding such an agreement, why has account not been taken of the European Parliament's vote on ACTA rejecting the same controversial paragraphs which are incorporated in CETA?

Question for written answer E-006990/12
to the Commission
Paweł Zalewski (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE) and Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE)
(12 July 2012)

Subject: ACTA clauses in post-ACTA agreements

Last week, Parliament rejected the ACTA agreement by a huge majority, thus sending out a very clear 'no go' signal regarding any such regulatory legislation.

In the short time that has passed since, we have already been alarmed by the prospect that several significant and heavily criticised parts of the ACTA agreement (i.e. general obligations on enforcement, damages, criminal sanctions, intermediary liability rules and border measures) are expected to 'live on' by being incorporated into CETA (the Canada/EU trade agreement) and, possibly, into other international agreements which the Commission plans to conclude in the near future.

Since we are absolutely convinced that the Commission fully respects the position of Parliament and would not indulge in any type of legislative exercise that would undermine the voice of the citizens, as transmitted to and expressed by Parliament, can the Commission comment on this issue and allay the worrying doubts indicated above?

Joint answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(24 August 2012)

1. As with all of the EU's bilateral trade agreements, the Canada-EU Trade Agreement (CETA) will contain a chapter on intellectual property (IPR). This is important because the EU and Canada are knowledge-based economies requiring an effective regime to protect their intellectual assets. For this reason, the EU is proposing rules to address several important issues that have been identified in Canada's IPR regime, namely in the area of copyright, patents, geographical indications and enforcement. However, the IPR chapter of CETA will not require the EU to modify its existing legislation, and great care is being taken to ensure that it is compatible with the EU acquis.

2. The CETA negotiations have not been concluded. Recent media reports relied upon a version of the negotiating text which is 6 months old to claim that the Commission is introducing ACTA through the back-door. That text stems from a time when ACTA had just been signed by the EU and 22 Member States and before the European Parliament denied its consent. As both the EU and Canada were in the process of ratifying ACTA at that time, it is not surprising that some provisions of that version used formulations also found in ACTA. Negotiations have now moved on and the February text no longer accurately represents the state of play.

The Commission fully respects the vote of the European Parliament. It develops its negotiating positions to ensure that they are coherent with EU policy. The IPR chapter of CETA is currently being reviewed in light of the position expressed by the European Parliament on ACTA and the Commission will continue to fully and rapidly inform the EP's INTA committee about progress in the negotiations.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007057/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Maria Eleni Koppa (S&D)
(13 Ιουλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Εκφοβισμός του ακαδημαϊκού κόσμου στην Τουρκία

Στις 25 Ιουνίου 2012 συνελήφθη ο Kemal Guruz, πρώην Πρόεδρος του Τουρκικού Συμβουλίου Ανώτατης Εκπαίδευσης και γνωστός υπερασπιστής της κοσμικότητας (secularism) στην εκπαίδευση.

Επίσημα κατηγορείται για συμμετοχή στο πραξικόπημα της 28ης Φεβρουαρίου 1997, ωστόσο μη κυβερνητικές οργανώσεις και ακαδημαϊκοί επιστήμονες εκφράζουν την πεποίθηση τους ότι η σύλληψη έχει πολιτικό περιεχόμενο, αποσκοπεί στον εκφοβισμό του ακαδημαϊκού κόσμου και αποτελεί μία ακόμη επίθεση κατά της ελευθερίας σκέψης και έκφρασης στην Τουρκία.

Καθώς στην Τουρκία εξακολουθεί να εφαρμόζεται η απαράδεκτη πρακτική της παρατεταμένης κράτησης πριν από τη δίκη, προτίθεται η Επιτροπή να μεσολαβήσει για την άμεση απελευθέρωση του Kemal Guruz και να παρακολουθήσει από κοντά την υπόθεσή του προκειμένου η σχετική δίκη να γίνει σύμφωνα με τα αναγνωρισμένα διεθνή πρότυπα;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(4 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση γνωρίζει την περίπτωση του κ. Gürüz και παρακολουθεί στενά τις δικαστικές υποθέσεις που αφορούν εικαζόμενες απόπειρες πραξικοπήματος. Η ΕΕ έχει επανειλημμένα υπογραμμίσει τη σημασία του πλήρους σεβασμού του δικαιώματος στην ελευθερία και στην ασφάλεια, του δικαιώματος δίκαιης δίκης και της ελευθερίας της έκφρασης, του συνέρχεσθαι και του συνεταιρίζεσθαι σύμφωνα με την Ευρωπαϊκή Σύμβαση Ανθρωπίνων Δικαιωμάτων και τη νομολογία του Ευρωπαϊκού Δικαστηρίου Ανθρωπίνων Δικαιωμάτων, για όλους τους εκκαλουμένους.

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή, ως φορέας αρμόδιος για την παρακολούθηση της συμμόρφωσης της Τουρκίας με τα πολιτικά κριτήρια της Κοπεγχάγης, θα συνεχίσει να παρακολουθεί τις εξελίξεις εκ του σύνεγγυς.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006909/12
alla Commissione
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(11 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Arresto di un eminente professore ad Ankara

Uno studioso eminente e laico e inflessibile è stato arrestato ad Ankara, in Turchia, il 25 giugno 2012. Il motivo del suo imprigionamento non è stato comunicato, ma si ritiene sia in rapporto con le indagini in corso nel paese nei confronti di quanti possono avere agito illegalmente per far cadere il governo ultraconservatore nel 1997.

Lo studioso è un docente in pensione della Middle East Technical University. Molti dei suoi ex colleghi e altri accademici dell'Università vedono nel suo imprigionamento un'azione per intimidire gli accademici che si oppongono alla crescente presenza dell'ideologia islamica in tutti gli aspetti della vita pubblica, poiché gran parte del lavoro del professore è stata dedicata a sostenere la separazione fra il sistema scolastico turco e l'influenza islamica. Egli è uno delle centinaia di ufficiali dell'esercito, educatori e giornalisti che sono stati arrestati di recente, presumibilmente come parte di una campagna dell'attuale governo turco conservatore.

I colleghi dello studioso chiedono la sua immediata liberazione dal carcere e un processo che soddisfi gli standard di equità internazionalmente riconosciuti.

La Commissione è invitata a rispondere alle seguenti domande:

1. È la Commissione a conoscenza dei diffusi arresti avvenuti in Turchia?

2. Reputa che gli arresti violino gli standard internazionali in materia di diritti umani?

3. Vi è motivo per credere che i processi non avranno luogo in modo equo?

4. Quali azioni dovrebbero essere eventualmente adottate in questo caso?

Risposta congiunta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(4 settembre 2012)

L'Unione europea è a conoscenza del caso del sig. Gürüz e segue con la massima attenzione i processi in corso su presunti tentativi di colpo di Stato. L'UE ha sottolineato in numerose occasioni l'importanza di rispettare pienamente il diritto alla libertà e alla sicurezza, il diritto a un processo equo per tutti gli imputati e la libertà di espressione, di riunione e di associazione, in linea con la Convenzione europea dei diritti dell'uomo e con la giurisprudenza della Corte europea dei diritti dell'uomo.

In quanto organo incaricato di verificare la conformità della Turchia con i criteri politici di Copenaghen, la Commissione europea continuerà a seguire gli sviluppi con la massima attenzione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006909/12
to the Commission
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(11 July 2012)

Subject: Arrest of distinguished professor in Ankara

A prominent scholar and unbending secularist was arrested in Ankara, Turkey, on 25 June 2012. The reason for his imprisonment was not disclosed but is believed to be in connection with the country's ongoing investigation into those who may have acted illegally to bring about the fall of the ultra-conservative government in 1997.

This scholar is a retired faculty member of the Middle East Technical University. Many of his former colleagues as well as other academics at the University see his detention as a move to intimidate those academics who oppose the growing presence of Islamic ideology in all aspects of public life, as much of the professor's work was dedicated to advocating the insulation of Turkish education from Islamic influence. He is one of hundreds of progressive military officials, educators, and journalists who have been arrested recently, allegedly as part of a campaign by Turkey's current, conservative government.

His colleagues are calling for his immediate release from prison and for a trial that meets internationally recognised standards for fairness.

The Commission is asked to answer the following:

1. Is the Commission aware of the widespread arrests being made in Turkey?

2. Does the Commission judge these arrests to be in violation of international standards for human rights?

3. Is there reason to believe that the trials will be conducted unfairly?

4. What action, if any, should be taken in this case?

Question for written answer E-007018/12
to the Commission
David Martin (S&D)
(12 July 2012)

Subject: Detention of Dr Kemal Gürüz

Will the Commission make urgent representations to the Turkish authorities regarding the detention of Dr Kemal Gürüz?

Question for written answer E-007057/12
to the Commission
Maria Eleni Koppa (S&D)
(13 July 2012)

Subject: Intimidation of the academic world in Turkey

On 25 June 2012 Kemal Gürüz, a former President of the Turkish Council of Higher Education and well-known defender of secularism (secularism) in education, was arrested.

Officially he is accused of involvement in the coup of 28 February 1997, but non-governmental organisations and academics are convinced that the arrest is politically motivated and is intended to intimidate the academic world and is one more attack on freedom of thought and expression in Turkey.

As Turkey continues the unacceptable practice of prolonged detention before trial, will the Commission intervene to secure the immediate release of Kemal Gürüz and closely follow his case to ensure that his trial is conducted in accordance with recognised international standards?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(4 September 2012)

The European Union is aware of the case of Mr Gürüz and is following closely ongoing court-cases into alleged coup attempts. The EU has underlined at many occasions the importance to fully respect the right to liberty and security, the right to a fair trial and the freedom of expression, of assembly and association in line with the European Convention on Human Rights and the case law of the European Court of Human Rights for all defendants.

The European Commission as the body responsible for monitoring Turkey's compliance with the Copenhagen political criteria will continue to follow developments closely.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006920/12
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(11 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Recortes injustos en las ayudas públicas al sector minero en España

Durante estos días, miles de mineros y mineras están protagonizando en España una encomiable y ejemplar lucha contra los injustos e ilegítimos recortes del Gobierno presidido por el conservador Mariano Rajoy en las ayudas que recibe el sector del carbón en España.

El Ministerio de Industria del Gobierno de España anunció el pasado mes de junio un recorte del 63 % de los fondos públicos destinados al sector de la minería para este año 2012, condenando al sector, tal y como denuncian los mineros y mineras movilizados, a la desaparición, y, con esto, a miles de familias asturianas, leonesas y aragonesas y a poblaciones enteras al desempleo y la pobreza.

Asimismo, el actual Gobierno de España incumple los acuerdos del Plan del Carbón vigente y el informe que presentó ante la Unión Europea a principios de año sobre este sector, lo que deslegitima los recortes y contradice lo establecido anteriormente por el Congreso de los Diputados respecto a las ayudas para 2012.

Y todo ello a pesar de lo que establece sobre este asunto el Reglamento del Consejo: la eliminación «gradual y progresiva hasta 2018» de las subvenciones que recibe el sector del carbón y la necesidad de construir paralelamente alternativas económicas eficaces para una transición de los trabajadores y trabajadoras ligados a este sector y de las actividades económicas dependientes del mismo. El recorte en las ayudas implementado por el Gobierno de España dista mucho de ser «gradual y progresivo» y, en gran manera, incumple el plan ordenado de cierre establecido por el Consejo.

— ¿Piensa investigar la Comisión el recorte drástico aprobado por el Gobierno de España respecto a las ayudas al sector del carbón?

— ¿No considera la Comisión que el Gobierno de España está incumpliendo lo establecido por el Reglamento respecto a la gradualidad y progresividad del fin de las subvenciones y la necesidad de respetar y establecer un plan ordenado de cierre que ofrezca alternativas reales y viables a los trabajadores y trabajadoras ligados al sector del carbón español?

— ¿Piensa solicitar la Comisión al Gobierno de España que respete el carácter gradual y progresivo del fin de las ayudas y se replantee el recorte del 63 % anunciado?

— ¿Considera la Comisión que esta eliminación drástica de buena parte de las ayudas, teniendo en cuenta las graves consecuencias económicas y sociales para miles de familias y comunidades enteras, es parte de la solución para salir de la crisis, como afirma el Gobierno español?

Respuesta del Sr. Almunia en nombre de la Comisión
(8 de noviembre de 2012)

Las autoridades españolas han notificado a la Comisión ayudas tanto de funcionamiento («ayudas al cierre») como ayudas por «costes excepcionales» (medioambientales y sociales) resultantes del cierre de minas de carbón y limitadas al periodo 2011-2012.

La notificación se basa en la Decisión del Consejo de 10 de diciembre de 2010, relativa a las ayudas estatales destinadas a facilitar el cierre de minas de carbón no competitivas («la Decisión del Consejo») ([1]), que, en la actualidad, constituye la base jurídica para la concesión de ayudas de funcionamiento al sector del carbón. La Decisión del Consejo establece el «cese ordenado de las actividades» de las unidades de producción, a fin de que queden cerradas definitivamente el 31 de diciembre de 2018.

Las medidas de acompañamiento de los cierres definitivos y los plazos para su aplicación deben ser fijados por las autoridades españolas ([2]). Un nuevo plan estratégico plurianual para el sector del carbón, previsto para finales de este año, podría ser el instrumento jurídico que pautara las medidas previstas.

([1]) DO L 336 de 21.12.2010, p. 24.
([2]) Estas podrían incluir, entre otros conceptos, trabajos preparatorios en materia de seguridad y medio ambiente necesarios para el cierre, obras de rehabilitación de antiguas zonas de extracción de carbón, así como medidas laborales y sociales relativas a la jubilación, la reinserción y la reconversión y adaptación de los trabajadores de la minería.

No obstante, la Decisión del Consejo no impone a los Estados miembros requisitos sobre el importe mínimo de ayuda que se conceda. La Decisión del Consejo solo impone determinados límites al importe máximo de la ayuda. En concreto, la ayuda no deberá superar, para cualquier año a partir de 2010, el importe de la ayuda de funcionamiento autorizada por la Comisión para el año 2010 y deberá seguir una tendencia descendente en comparación con la ayuda otorgada en 2011 ([3]).

Dentro de dichos límites, corresponde a los Estados miembros determinar el importe de la ayuda al cierre que se vaya a conceder, siempre que se cumplan las condiciones establecidas en la Decisión del Consejo. Por tanto, la Comisión no va a solicitar información sobre los recortes aplicados por las autoridades españolas ni investigará esta cuestión.

([3]) Véase la Decisión del Consejo, artículo 3, apartado 1, letra f): de la ayuda concedida en 2011, la reducción no deberá ser inferior al 25 % a más tardar a finales de 2013, al 40 % a más tardar a finales de 2015, al 60 % a más tardar a finales de 2016 y al 75 % a más tardar a finales de 2017.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006920/12
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(11 July 2012)

Subject: Unfair cuts in state aid to the mining sector in Spain

Right now, thousands of miners, both men and women, are engaged in a laudable and exemplary struggle against the unfair and illegal cuts in aid to Spain's coal mining sector being imposed by the conservative government of Mariano Rajoy.

In June 2012, the Spanish Ministry of Industry announced a 63 % cutback in this year's public funding for the mining sector. This situation, as the mobilised miners are protesting, will result in the demise of the sector and condemn thousands of Asturian, Leonese and Aragonese families and whole communities to unemployment and poverty.

The present Spanish Government is also breaking the agreements contained in the current Coal Plan and the report on the coal sector which it presented to the EU at the beginning of this year, which discredits the cuts, and its is contradicting the Spanish Congress of Deputies' previously established 2012 aid provisions.

All of this also contradicts the terms of the Council regulation concerning the gradual and progressive elimination of coal subsidies by 2018 and the need to create effective parallel economic alternatives for workers connected with the sector or with other areas of economic activity dependent on it. The reduction in aid being applied by the Spanish Government is far from being gradual or progressive and significantly fails to meet the terms of the Council's organised closure plan.

— Does the Commission intend to investigate the drastic cut in state aid to the coal sector approved by the Spanish Government?

— Does the Commission not consider that Spain is infringing the terms of the regulation with regard to ending subsidies in a gradual and progressive manner and the need to respect and establish an organised closure plan providing workers linked to the Spanish coal sector with real and viable employment alternatives?

— Does the Commission intend to ask the Spanish Government to respect the gradual and progressive elimination of subsidies and reconsider the 63 % cut which it has announced?

— Does the Commission consider that drastically eliminating a substantial part of this aid can really help to solve the crisis, as the Spanish Government claims, bearing in mind the serious economic and social implications for thousands of families and whole communities?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(8 November 2012)

The Spanish authorities have notified to the Commission aid covering both operating production aid ('closure aid') and aid for 'exceptional costs' (environment, social) arising from the closure of coal mines, and limited to the period 2011-2012.

The notification is based on Council decision of 10 December 2010 on state aid to facilitate the closure of uncompetitive coal mines ('the Council decision') ([1]), which currently serves as the legal basis for granting operating aid to the coal sector. The Council decision provides for the 'orderly winding down of activities' of the production units aided so that they are closed definitively by 31 December 2018.

The measures accompanying the definitive closures and the time frames for their implementation are to be identified by the Spanish authorities ([2]). A new multi-annual strategic plan for the coal sector expected by the end of this year could be the legal instrument that would map out the planned measures.

However, the Council decision does not impose on Member States any requirement on the minimum amount of aid to be granted. The Council decision only imposes certain limitations on the maximum amount of aid. In particular,

([1]) OJ L 336, 21.12.2010, p. 24.
([2]) This could include, among others, preparatory safety and environmental works necessary for closure, works for the rehabilitation of former coal mining sites, as well as envisaged labour market and social measures related to retirement, re-employment and re-skilling and adaptation of mining workers.

the aid must not exceed, for any year after 2010, the amount of operating aid approved by the Commission for the year 2010, and must follow a downward trend compared to aid granted in 2011 ([3]).

Within those limits, it is up to the Member States to determine the amount of closure aid to be granted, provided the conditions set out in the Council decision are met. Accordingly, the Commission is not requesting information on the cuts implemented by the Spanish authorities and will not investigate such an issue.

([3]) See the Council decision, Article 3(1) (f): By the end of 2013 the reduction must not be less than 25 %, by the end of 2015 not less than 40 %, by the end of 2016 not less than 60 % and by the end of 2017 not less than 75 % of the aid granted in 2011.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006923/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(11 Ιουλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Αξιοποίηση του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1535/2007 από την Ελλάδα για οικονομική ενίσχυση αγροτών που επλήγησαν από φυσικές καταστροφές

Σύμφωνα με απάντηση της Επιτροπής E-005449/2012 σε ερώτησή μου, αλλά και με βάση τους ευρωπαϊκούς κανονισμού, σε περίπτωση που μια χώρα επιθυμεί να αποζημιώσει τους γεωργούς της για απώλειες εισοδήματος που προκλήθηκαν από ζημιές στην παραγωγή, υπάρχει η δυνατότητα χορήγησης εθνικής στήριξης, η οποία πρέπει προηγουμένως να εγκριθεί από την Επιτροπή. Μια χώρα μέλος έχει επίσης τη δυνατότητα να χορηγήσει ενίσχυση που υπάγεται σε απαλλαγή κατά κατηγορία, εάν οι ενισχύσεις προορίζονται για ΜΜΕ, σύμφωνα με τις διατάξεις του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1857/2006 της Επιτροπής, η ενίσχυση ήσσονος σημασίας, σύμφωνα με τις διατάξεις του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1535/2007 της Επιτροπής (για την Ελλάδα είναι 7 500 ευρώ ανά δικαιούχο σε περίοδο τριών οικονομικών ετών, εντός των ορίων ενός εθνικού ανώτατου ποσού, το οποίο ανέρχεται για την Ελλάδα σε 75 382 500 ευρώ). Με δεδομένα τα παραπάνω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Μπορεί να μας παράσχει η Επιτροπή συγκριτικά στοιχεία των τριών τελευταίων ετών για τα κράτη μέλη που έχουν κάνει χρήση των διατάξεων του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1535/2007 για περιπτώσεις αποζημίωσης γεωργών για απώλειες εισοδήματος που προκλήθηκαν από ζημιές στην παραγωγή;

2. Ειδικά για την Ελλάδα, μπορεί να μας παράσχει πλήρη στοιχεία, για κάθε περίπτωση και τα ποσά που έχουν δοθεί σύμφωνα με τον ως άνω κανονισμό τα τρία τελευταία χρόνια;

Απάντηση του κ. Cioloş εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(16 Αυγούστου 2012)

1. Η Επιτροπή δεν είναι σε θέση να παράσχει συγκριτικά στοιχεία σχετικά με τις ενισχύσεις που χορηγούνται βάσει του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1535/2007 ([1]) για την αντιστάθμιση των απωλειών παραγωγής στα διάφορα κράτη μέλη (όπως η Ελλάδα), καθώς εναπόκειται στα τελευταία η ευθύνη της διαχείρισης του καθεστώτος ενισχύσεων ήσσονος σημασίας (*de minimis*) σε εθνικό επίπεδο, μεταξύ άλλων μέσω ενός μητρώου.

Η Επιτροπή, από την πλευρά της, μπορεί να ζητήσει εγγράφως πληροφορίες από τα κράτη μέλη, εφόσον κρίνει ότι τίθεται ζήτημα εξακρίβωσης της συμμόρφωσης με τους όρους του καθεστώτος.

2. Υπό το πρίσμα των ανωτέρω εκτιμήσεων, τα δεδομένα σχετικά με την Ελλάδα μπορούν να ληφθούν άμεσα από την ελληνική διοίκηση.

([1]) ΕΕ L 337 της 21.12.2007, σ. 35.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006923/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(11 July 2012)

Subject: Use of Regulation (EC) No 1535/2007 by Greece to provide financial support for farmers affected by natural disasters

According to the Commission's answer to my Question E-005449/2012, but also under the provisions of EU regulations, if a Member State wishes to compensate its farmers for loss of income caused by damage to production, there is the possibility of providing national support which must first be approved by the Commission. A Member State may also grant aid under a block exemption, if the aid is intended for an SME, under the provisions of Commission Regulation (EC) No 1857/2006, de minimis aid under the provisions of Commission Regulation (EC) No 1535/2007 (for Greece it is 7 500 euros per beneficiary over three financial years, within a national ceiling, which for Greece is 75 382 500 euros).

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Can it provide comparative data for the past three years for Member States that have made use of the provisions of Regulation (EC) No 1535/2007 to provide compensation to farmers for income losses caused by damage to production?

2. With regard to Greece in particular, can it provide full details for each case and the amounts paid under that regulation for the last three years?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(16 août 2012)

1. La Commission n'est pas en mesure de fournir des données comparatives sur les aides accordées au titre du règlement (CE) n° 1535/2007 ([1]) pour la compensation de pertes de production dans les divers États membres (y compris en Grèce), étant donné que c'est à ces derniers qu'il appartient de gérer le régime *de minimis* au niveau national, notamment au moyen d'un registre.

La Commission, de son côté, peut demander des informations par écrit aux États membres si elle estime qu'il y a lieu de vérifier le respect des conditions du régime.

2. Compte tenu de ces considérations, les données relatives à la Grèce peuvent être obtenues directement auprès de l'administration grecque.

([1]) JO L 337 du 21.12.2007, p. 35.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006926/12
alla Commissione
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(11 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Aiuti allo sviluppo per l'Afghanistan

Ai primi di luglio del 2012 i donatori internazionali hanno partecipato a una conferenza a Tokyo per discutere degli impegni di investimento in Afghanistan. I donatori hanno promesso 16 miliardi di dollari USA nell'arco dei prossimi quattro anni, richiedendo però l'attuazione di riforme per la lotta alla corruzione. Stando alle stime della banca centrale afghana, nel prossimo decennio, per sostenere la crescita economica saranno necessari almeno 6 miliardi di dollari USA all'anno di nuovi investimenti da parte di donatori stranieri.

Dal 2002 l'Afghanistan ha ricevuto circa 60 miliardi di dollari di aiuti civili. L'incontro, che ha visto la partecipazione dei rappresentanti di almeno 80 paesi e di organizzazioni di assistenza internazionali, tra cui la Banca mondiale e la Banca asiatica di sviluppo, è stato organizzato in vista del ritiro delle truppe della NATO entro la fine del 2014 e dell'imminente passaggio di consegne per la sicurezza agli ufficiali afghani.

Il Segretario di Stato statunitense Hillary Clinton ha sottolineato che è necessario agire con estrema decisione per promuovere riforme atte a combattere la corruzione, migliorare la governance, rafforzare lo Stato di diritto e favorire l'accesso alle opportunità economiche per tutti gli afgani, in particolare le donne. L'Afghanistan è uno dei dieci paesi più poveri al mondo, con una popolazione per tre quarti analfabeta e un reddito medio annuo di 350 dollari USA.

1. Qual è la posizione della Commissione sugli aiuti allo sviluppo per l'Afghanistan promessi dai donatori internazionali l'8 luglio?

2. A quanto ammontano i fondi stanziati dall'Unione europea per l'Afghanistan per i prossimi quattro anni e destinati alla lotta alla corruzione, al miglioramento della governance, al rafforzamento dello Stato di diritto e a un maggiore accesso alle opportunità economiche?

3. Come valuta la Commissione l'efficacia degli aiuti forniti dall'Unione europea all'Afghanistan dal 2002?

Risposta congiunta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione
(30 agosto 2012)

In occasione della conferenza di Tokyo dell'8 luglio 2012, la comunità internazionale (compresa l'UE) ha accettato di continuare a fornire un ingente sostegno a condizione che il governo dell'Afghanistan rinnovasse l'impegno a compiere progressi per quanto riguarda le principali riforme della governance politica ed economica e i diritti umani. La conferenza ha adottato un quadro di responsabilità reciproca per misurare e verificare i progressi compiuti rispetto agli impegni, che si basa sui criteri di una roadmap in materia di governance proposti dall'Unione europea (riforma elettorale, lotta alla corruzione, generazione di reddito e diritti umani).

La programmazione per il prossimo periodo (2014-2020) è in corso. L'UE stanzia attualmente 200 milioni di euro all'anno a favore dell'Afghanistan, destinando circa un terzo di questa somma alla governance (polizia, giustizia e pubblica amministrazione). L'Unione sostiene inoltre la crescita e l'accesso alle opportunità economiche a livello di sviluppo rurale, agricoltura e protezione sociale. Le assegnazioni post-2013 saranno decise in attesa dell'adozione del nuovo quadro finanziario pluriennale 2014-2020 da parte dei colegislatori.

L'UE applica diverse procedure di controllo, tra cui le relazioni, le valutazioni, le missioni di verifica e il dialogo politico. L'Unione assicura inoltre il monitoraggio della sua cooperazione allo sviluppo attraverso missioni incentrate sui risultati (10 progetti bilaterali monitorati in media ogni anno). Questi strumenti permettono alla Commissione di valutare l'efficacia dei suoi interventi in Afghanistan.

Nonostante il difficile contesto, gli aiuti erogati dall'Unione dal 2002 hanno dato risultati positivi. A titolo di esempio: il 65 % degli afghani vive a due ore di cammino da una struttura sanitaria; il tasso di mortalità dei bambini al di sotto dei cinque anni è sceso da 257 per 1 000 nati vivi nel 2000 a 161 nel 2008; è garantita l'irrigazione di 35 000 ettari di terreno, a favore di una popolazione agricola di 50 000 persone ([1]).

([1]) Per ulteriori informazioni sull'andamento della cooperazione UE in Afghanistan, la Commissione invita l'onorevole parlamentare a consultare il documento disponibile al seguente indirizzo:
http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/asia/country-cooperation/afghanistan/documents/eu_afghanistan_state-of-play_0712_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006926/12
to the Commission
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(11 July 2012)

Subject: Development aid to Afghanistan

In early July 2012, international donors attended a conference in Tokyo to discuss investment pledges for Afghanistan. Donors have promised USD 16 billion over the next four years, but have demanded that reforms to combat corruption be undertaken. The Afghan central bank has estimated that at least USD 6 billion a year in new investment from foreign donors will be needed to foster economic growth over the next decade.

Since 2002, Afghanistan has received nearly USD 60 billion in civilian aid. Representatives from at least eighty countries and international aid organisations, including the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank attended the meeting. It was organised because NATO-led combat troops are due to leave by the end of 2014, and Afghan officials will soon be in charge of security.

US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has stressed that aggressive action needs to take place to promote reforms to fight corruption, improve governance, strengthen the rule of law and increase access to economic opportunities for all Afghans, especially for women. Afghanistan is one of the world's ten poorest countries. Three quarters of the country's population is illiterate and the average person earns USD 350 a year.

1. What is the position of the Commission in relation to the development aid to Afghanistan pledged by international donors on 8 July?

2. How much funding has the EU earmarked in Afghanistan over the next four years for fighting corruption, improving governance, strengthening the rule of law and increasing access to economic opportunities?

3. What is the assessment of the Commission regarding the efficacy of EU aid given to Afghanistan since 2002?

Question for written answer E-007017/12
to the Commission
David Martin (S&D)
(12 July 2012)

Subject: Development assistance to Afghanistan

The Commission has confirmed it is to provide EUR 200 million a year in development assistance to Afghanistan. Before making this announcement, what assessment did the Commission carry out as to the effectiveness of the EUR 2 billion in assistance to Afghanistan which has already been provided by the European Union over the last 10 years?

Joint answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(30 August 2012)

At the Tokyo Conference on 8.7.2012 the international community (including the EU) agreed to continue to provide substantial support in exchange for a renewed commitment from the Government of Afghanistan to make progress on key political and economic governance reforms and human rights. The conference adopted a Mutual Accountability Framework to measure and monitor progress against commitments, based on criteria for a governance roadmap proposed by the EU, including electoral reform, anti-corruption, revenue generation and human rights.

The programming exercise for the next phase (2014-2020) is ongoing. The EU currently allocates EUR 200 million a year to Afghanistan, approximately one-third of which on governance (police, justice and public administration). The EU is also supporting growth and access to economic opportunities in the field of rural development, agriculture and social protection. Allocations beyond 2013 will be decided pending the adoption by the co-legislators of the new MFF 2014-2020.

The EU has various control procedures in place, including reporting, evaluations, verification missions, policy dialogue. Moreover, the EU ensures monitoring of its development cooperation through Results Oriented Missions (10 bilateral projects monitored on average per year). These tools allow the Commission to assess the effectiveness of its actions in Afghanistan.

Notwithstanding the difficult context, the EU aid since 2002 had positive results. For instance: 65 % of Afghans live within a two-hour walk of a health facility; under-five mortality rate has decreased from 257 per 1 000 live births in 2000 to 161 in 2008; irrigation is provided to 35 000 ha of land, serving an agricultural population of 50 000 people ([1]).

([1]) For further information, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the State of Play on EU Afghanistan Cooperation available on: http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/asia/country-cooperation/afghanistan/documents/eu_afghanistan_state-of-play_0712_en.pdf

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés P-006944/12
a Bizottság számára
Herczog Edit (S&D)
(2012. július 12.)

Tárgy: A csatlakozáskor vállalt célok teljesítésének elmaradása

Az Európai Unióhoz 2004-ben csatlakozott országok számára az eurózónához való csatlakozás nem választható lehetőség, hanem jogi kötelezettség: az Uniós csatlakozási szerződés aláírásával egyidejűleg ezek az országok kötelezettséget vállaltak az euró bevezetésére is, melynek csak a pontos időpontja nem rögzített. Ennek fényében — függetlenül az euró bevezetésének konkrét időpontjától — a nemzeti szintű gyakorlati felkészülés szigorú kötelezettségeket ró Magyarországra, amelyek technikai és szakmai feltételrendszereit az Európai Unió illetékes bizottsága rendszeresen ellenőrzi.

Kérdések:

— Mit tud a Bizottság abban az esetben tenni, ha egy tagállam kormánya következetesen olyan gazdaságpolitikai vagy költségvetés-politikai irányba tereli az országot, amellyel beláthatatlan idővel kitolja a csatlakozási szerződésben vállalt, euróhoz való csatlakozást?

— Amennyiben az eurózónához való csatlakozás egy jogi kötelesség, kötelezettségszegésnek nyilvánul-e az, ha egy tagállami kormány nem abban az irányban halad, amelyet a csatlakozási szerződésben vállalt?

— Véges-e ez az átmeneti időszak az euró bevezetésének konkrét időpontjáig?

Olli Rehn válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2012. augusztus 10.)

Az Európai Unió működéséről szóló szerződés (EUMSZ) GMU-val foglalkozó fejezete valóban előírja, hogy — a kívülmaradási záradékot alkalmazó Dánia és Egyesült Királyság kivételével — minden tagállam kötelezettséget vállal arra, hogy bevezeti az eurót, amint eléri az euróövezethez való, fenntartható konvergencia magas fokát.

Az EUMSZ azonban nem rendelkezik az euró bevezetésének ütemezéséről, és minden tagállamnak időt biztosít az euróövezethez való csatlakozáshoz szükséges előkészületek és kiigazítások megtételére. A gyakorlatban a tagállamok szabadon dönthetnek a konvergenciakritériumok teljesítéséhez vezető stratégiáról és annak ütemezéséről. Ugyanakkor az euró bevezetésére vonatkozó kötelezettségvállalás érvényben marad és nem tehető semmissé.

A 2012. májusi konvergenciajelentésben a Bizottság úgy ítélte meg, hogy Magyarország nem teljesíti az euró bevezetéséhez szükséges feltételeket, mivel az árstabilitásra, az államháztartásra, az árfolyamstabilitásra és a hosszú távú kamatlábakra vonatkozóan egyetlen kritériumot sem teljesített, és a magyar jogszabályok nem feleltek meg teljes egészében a Szerződés követelményeinek (lásd a lenti linket).

A Bizottság nem kényszeríti a tagállamokat arra, hogy az euró bevezetése kapcsán egy bizonyos stratégiát kövessenek. Nem szabad azonban alábecsülni az euró középtávú politikai stabilizáló szerepét. Ha az euró bevezetésének elhalasztását a konvergenciapályáról való kisiklásnak és/vagy a strukturális reformok akadályának tekintik, ez alááshatja a piaci bizalmat és árthat a gazdaságnak.

A 2010. és a 2012. évi konvergenciajelentés itt olvasható:
http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/convergence_reports_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006944/12
to the Commission
Edit Herczog (S&D)
(12 July 2012)

Subject: Failure to fulfil objectives set at the time of accession

Membership of the euro area is not an option for countries which joined the EU in 2004 but a legal obligation: on signing the Accession Treaties, they committed themselves to introducing the euro, although a specific date for this was not fixed. Irrespective of the exact date of the introduction of the euro, Hungary thus has a strict obligation to make preparations at national level, the technical arrangements of which are examined regularly by the relevant European Union committee.

— What action can the Commission take in the event of the government of a Member State imposing an economic and budgetary policy on the country which results in an indefinite postponement of its joining the euro area, to which it committed itself in the Accession Treaty?

— If joining the euro area is an obligation, does it qualify as a breach of obligation if the government of a Member State does not endeavour to implement what it committed itself to in the Accession Treaty?

— Is there a limit to this period leading to the exact date of introduction of the euro?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(10 August 2012)

The EMU chapter in the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU (TFEU) indeed prescribes that all Member States (except Denmark and the UK, in view of their opt-out clauses) are committed to adopt the euro as soon as they achieve a high degree of sustainable convergence towards the euro area.

However, the TFEU does not prescribe the timing of euro adoption and allows time for each Member State to make the necessary adjustment and preparations for euro area entry. In practice, it is up to the Member States to decide on the strategy and timing for meeting the convergence criteria. That said, the commitment to adopt the euro remains and cannot be reversed.

In the May 2012 Convergence Report, the Commission considered that Hungary did not fulfil the conditions for the adoption of the euro — as it fulfilled none of the criteria (on price stability, public finances, exchange rate stability, long-term interest rates) and legislation in Hungary was not fully compatible with the Treaty Requirements (see link below).

The Commission does not induce Member States to pursue any particular strategy on euro adoption. However, the role of the euro as medium-term policy anchor should not be underestimated. If a postponing the euro adoption is seen as derailing the convergence path and/or a drag on structural reforms, this could undermine market confidence and as a result harm the economy.

Link to The 2010/2012 Convergence Report:
http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/convergence_reports_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-006960/12
à Comissão
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(12 de Julho de 2012)

Assunto: Duplicação do número de trabalhadores a receberem salário mínimo em Portugal

Segundo as estatísticas da Segurança Social portuguesas relativamente ao ano de 2011, o número de trabalhadores portugueses que recebe o salário mínimo nacional duplicou em 4 anos, sendo que, em 2007, os trabalhadores que auferiam a retribuição mínima garantida não ultrapassavam os 5,5 % e, em final de abril de 2011, 10,9 % da população ativa auferia este rendimento. Estes dados significam que um em cada onze trabalhadores portugueses, ou seja, mais de 605 mil trabalhadores portugueses recebem apenas 485 euros, sendo o ordenado líquido de 431,65 euros. As mulheres constituem a maior parte dos trabalhadores que contam com esta retribuição mensal — 14,9 % são mulheres e 8,1 % são homens.

Na 4.ª avaliação da *troika* em Portugal, da qual a Comissão Europeia faz parte, no quadro do atual «memorando de entendimento» em Portugal, é referida a necessidade de levar a cabo «reformas institucionais que permitam às empresas maior flexibilidade para ajustarem os custos de trabalho e a produtividade», significando isto, na nossa opinião, a redução dos custos com o trabalho. A recomendação do Conselho Europeu relativa ao Programa Nacional de Reformas de 2012 de Portugal refere que será «importante adotar rapidamente reformas estruturais dos mercados do trabalho e da produção, a fim de reduzir os custos do trabalho». Face ao exposto, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que avaliação faz a Comissão do abaixamento dos níveis remuneratórios em Portugal?

2. Considera, no quadro da *troika* que integra, que os salários em Portugal devem ser mais baixos?

3. O que entende por «ajustamento entre os custos de trabalho e a produtividade»?

4. Considera que o valor de 485 euros corresponde à definição de «salário decente», tantas vezes referida em comunicações da Comissão?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(23 de Agosto de 2012)

1. O salário mínimo em Portugal cresceu, em média, 4,7 % ao ano entre 2007 e 2011. No mesmo período, a compensação por empregado cresceu, em média, 2 % ao ano. O forte aumento do salário mínimo, juntamente com o elevado número de desempregados, ajuda a explicar por que razão em 2011 havia mais trabalhadores com o salário mínimo do que em 2007.

2. Desde a adesão à moeda única, Portugal perdeu competitividade de custos em relação aos seus parceiros da Zona Euro. Enquanto os salários reais médios cresceram de acordo com a produtividade, os diferenciais de inflação fizeram os custos laborais unitários crescer muito mais rapidamente do que em muitos países da Zona Euro. A moderação salarial e as reformas tendentes a melhorar o funcionamento dos mercados do trabalho e dos produtos são elementos importantes para que Portugal recupere competitividade e absorva o desemprego.

3. A concordância dos salários reais com a produtividade a nível macroeconómico é condição incontornável para uma evolução salarial ordenada. A nível das empresas, é necessária flexibilidade salarial para as ajudar a responderem mais eficientemente à problemática da procura e a choques setoriais ou geográficos específicos.

4. A comparar com outros parceiros da Zona Euro, o nível do salário mínimo em Portugal, em percentagem do salário médio, é relativamente elevado. Para haver sustentabilidade, os níveis salariais mais altos têm de ser acompanhados de maiores ganhos de produtividade. O processo de reformas estruturais em curso, juntamente com os progressos na elevação dos níveis de qualificação académica dos trabalhadores portugueses, deverá contribuir para aumentar a produtividade e, desse modo, melhorar o nível de vida a médio prazo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006960/12
to the Commission
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(12 July 2012)

Subject: Doubling in the number of workers receiving the minimum wage in Portugal

According to statistics produced by the Portuguese social security service for 2011, the number of Portuguese workers receiving the national minimum wage has doubled in the past four years. In 2007, no more than 5.5 % of workers received the guaranteed minimum wage, whilst at the end of April 2011, 10.9 % of the active population was being paid the minimum wage. These figures mean that one in 11 Portuguese workers, i.e. more than 605 000 people, are receiving only EUR 485, the net salary being EUR 431.65. Most of the workers receiving this monthly wage are women, the rate for women standing at 14 % against 8.1 % for men.

The fourth assessment of Portugal within the framework of the current 'memorandum of understanding' produced by the troika, of which the Commission is part, refers to the need to carry out 'institutional reforms that give firms more flexibility in matching labour costs and productivity'. In our view, this will mean reducing labour costs. The Council recommendation on Portugal's 2012 national reform programme notes that it will be 'important to adopt rapidly additional structural reforms in the labour and product markets with a view to reducing labour costs'.

1. What is the Commission's assessment of the drop in wage levels in Portugal?

2. Does it believe, in the context of the troika of which it is part, that wages in Portugal should be lower?

3. What does it understand by the phrase 'matching labour costs and productivity'?

4. Does it believe that the sum of EUR 485 corresponds to the definition of a decent wage that so often appears in Commission communications?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(23 August 2012)

1. The minimum wage in Portugal grew by 4.7 % a year on average between 2007 and 2011. In the same period, compensation per employee grew by 2 % a year on average. The strong increase in the minimum wage, together with the high number of unemployed, helps explaining why more workers are covered by the minimum wage in 2011 than in 2007.

2. Since joining the single currency Portugal lost cost competitiveness in relation to its euro area partners. While real wages grew on average in line with productivity, inflation differentials made unit labour costs grow much faster than many euro area countries. Wage moderation together with reforms to improve the function of labour and product markets are important elements for Portugal to regain competitiveness and absorb unemployment.

3. Real wages in line with productivity at a macroeconomic level is a necessary condition for orderly wage developments. At firm level, wage flexibility is needed to help firms respond more efficiently to changes in demand and to sectoral or geographic specific shocks.

4. The level of the minimum wage in Portugal as a share of the average or median wage is relatively high when compared to other euro partners. To be sustainable, higher wage levels need to be accompanied by higher productivity gains. The structural reforms process being put in place together with progress in raising the education levels of the Portuguese workers are likely to contribute to increase productivity and thereby improve living standards over the medium term.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-006988/12
komissiolle
Mitro Repo (S&D)
(12. heinäkuuta 2012)

Aihe: Maisterintutkintoa suorittavien opiskelijoiden opintolainan takausjärjestelmä

Komissio on antanut asetusehdotuksen ”Yhteinen Erasmus” -ohjelman perustamisesta. ”Yhteinen Erasmus” on yleissivistävää ja ammatillista koulutusta, nuorisoa ja urheilua koskeva yhtenäinen ohjelma.

Komissio ehdottaa lisäksi, että perustetaan maisterintutkintoa suorittavien opiskelijoiden opintolainan takausjärjestelmä, jonka tarkoituksena on lisätä tutkintojen liikkuvuutta Euroopassa ja etenkin maisterintutkintoa suorittavien opiskelijoiden liikkuvuutta (asetuksen 7 artiklan 1 kohta ja 14 artiklan 3 kohta).

— Miten komissio aikoo varmistaa, että kaikkien osallistujamaiden opiskelijat voivat hyödyntää järjestelmää?

— Mitä sääntöjä olisi laadittava sitä maata varten, jossa opiskelijat hakevat lainaa?

— Mitä mekanismeja voidaan ottaa käyttöön sen varmistamiseksi, että opiskelijoilla on varaa lainan takaisinmaksuun riippumatta siitä, missä maassa he opiskelevat ja missä maassa he jatkossa työskentelevät?

— Mitä vaikutuksia järjestelmällä voi olla tutkinto-ohjelmien lukukausimaksuja koskeviin jäsenvaltioiden politiikkoihin tai institutionaalisiin politiikkoihin?

— Onko komissio punninnut sitä mahdollisuutta, että opiskelijoiden liikkuvuutta Euroopassa voitaisiin edistää paremmin korvaamalla tämä järjestelmä maisterintutkintoa suorittaville opiskelijoille tarkoitetuilla apurahoilla, mikä ei rasittaisi vastavalmistuneita lainoilla?

Androulla Vassilioun komission puolesta antama vastaus
(21. syyskuuta 2012)

Komission tarkoituksena on, että on Euroopan investointirahaston vastuulla yhdessä kaikkien osallistuvien maiden rahoituksenvälittäjien kanssa varmistaa mahdollisimman laaja maantieteellinen kattavuus. Asiasta saatiin positiivista palautetta rahoituksenvälittäjien kanssa ennen käyttöönottoa tehdystä kokeilusta.

Opiskelijat voivat esittää hakemuksen järjestelmässä toimivalle rahoituksenvälittäjälle kaikissa osallistuvissa maissa, vaikka yleensä he hakevat sitä joko kotimaassa tai vastaanottavassa maassa.

Maisterintutkinnon suorittaneilla on keskimäärin parempi ansiotaso kuin alemman korkeakoulututkinnon suorittaneilla ja näin ollen paremmat mahdollisuudet lainan takaisinmaksuun. Lisäksi järjestelmän tarjoama lainatakaus rajoitetaan niin, että vältetään liian suuret velkamäärät. Talousvaikeuksien varalta rahoitusvälittäjien on tarjottava markkinahintoja edullisempia lainoja, joihin sisältyy tarpeeksi pitkät maksuajat takaisinmaksun helpottamiseksi, mahdollisuus ”suoja-aikaan”, joka antaa tutkinnon suorittaneelle mahdollisuuden varmistaa työpaikka ennen takaisinmaksun alkua, sekä henkilökohtaisesta tilanteesta johtuva ”lyhennysvapaa”, jonka aikana takaisinmaksu voidaan jäädyttää.

Komissio katsoo, ettei järjestelmällä ole vaikutuksia jäsenmaiden tai laitosten päätöksiin lukukausimaksupolitiikasta. Politiikat perustuvat pikemminkin paikallisen koulutusjärjestelmän tarpeisiin kuin muutamiin muista EU-maista tuleviin opiskelijoihin.

Takausjärjestelmä rahoittaa lainan takuun 6–7-kertaisesti verrattuna EU:n esittämään takuumäärään. EU:n apurahajärjestelmä, joka tukisi täysipainoisesti tutkintojen liikkuvuutta, olisi joko liian kallis tai olisi varattava vain niin harvoille opiskelijoille, että sen systeemiset vaikutukset olisivat vähäiset.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006988/12
to the Commission
Mitro Repo (S&D)
(12 July 2012)

Subject: Masters Student Loan Guarantee Facility

The Commission has proposed a regulation establishing 'Erasmus for All', which will be the Single Programme in the field of Education, Training, Youth and Sport.

Furthermore, the Commission is proposing to create a Masters Student Loan Guarantee Facility with the aim of increasing degree mobility in Europe and in particular among Masters students (Articles 7(1)a and 14(3) of the regulation).

— How is the Commission planning to ensure that students in all participating countries have the opportunity to benefit from the scheme?

— What rules should be established regarding the country in which students apply for the loan?

— What mechanisms can be put in place to ensure that students are able to afford repayments irrespective of their country of study and country of future employment?

— What impact could the scheme have on Member States' or institutional policies regarding tuition fees for graduate programmes?

— Has the Commission considered the possibility that increasing degree mobility in Europe could be better achieved by replacing this scheme with scholarships for Masters students while not burdening new graduates with loans?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(21 September 2012)

The Commission intends that it will be the responsibility of the European Investment Fund, through its relations with financial intermediaries in all participating countries, to ensure maximum geographical coverage. Feedback from pre-market testing with financial intermediaries is positive in this respect.

Students may apply to a financial intermediary operating the scheme in any participating country, though it will be normal practice that they apply in either the home or the host country.

Masters graduates have higher earnings on average than graduates with only a first degree and so will generally be in a good position to make repayments. In addition, the guarantee offered by the scheme will be capped at a level to ensure that excessive levels of debt are avoided. Moreover, to provide safeguards against hardship, financial intermediaries must offer loans at better than market rates, with repayment periods that are long enough to allow for easier reimbursement, the possibility of a 'grace period', whereby graduates have an opportunity to secure a job before starting repayment, and 'payment holidays' where repayment can be frozen if personal circumstances necessitate.

The Commission believes that the scheme will have no impact on decisions by Member States or institutions on tuition fee policies. Such policies are dictated by the needs of the domestic education system rather than by the few students from other parts of the EU.

The guarantee facility will leverage loans to a value of between six and seven times the amount of the guarantee provided by the EU. A system of EU scholarships set at a level which could support full degree mobility would either be unaffordable or would need to be limited to so few students as to have limited systemic impact.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006992/12
an die Kommission
Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE), Werner Schulz (Verts/ALE), Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE), Corinne Lepage (ALDE) und Tarja Cronberg (Verts/ALE)
(12. Juli 2012)

Betrifft: Beteiligung des französischen Unternehmens Vinci am Autobahnprojekt durch den Wald von Chimki

Das französische Unternehmen Vinci steht an der Spitze eines Konsortiums mit dem Namen „North West Concession Company", das einen Konzessionsvertrag für den ersten Abschnitt einer Autobahn zwischen Moskau und St. Petersburg in Russland unterzeichnet hat. Die geplante Strecke verläuft durch den Wald von Chimki, einen der letzten noch existierenden Wälder von bedeutendem ökologischem Wert im Gebiet Moskau. Gegen diese Streckenführung hat sich dort entschiedener Widerstand formiert.

Im Jahr 2011 kam das namhafte Netzwerk nichtstaatlicher Organisationen „CEE Bankwatch" in seiner Untersuchung ([1]) zu dem Ergebnis, dass die North West Concession Company auf einem komplexen Geflecht von Offshore-Gesellschaften und Steueroasen beruht. Der Verdacht einer möglichen Korruptionsaffäre wird dadurch erhärtet, dass die Regierung Russlands den Status des Waldes von Chimki rechtswidrig änderte, um den geplanten Streckenverlauf zu ermöglichen. Da dieser nahezu einhellig nicht als der Streckenverlauf gilt, scheinen nicht öffentliche, sondern private Interessen hinsichtlich der Immobilienentwicklung sowie Gefälligkeiten gegenüber den beteiligten engen Vertrauten von Präsident Wladimir Putin ausschlaggebend für die Entscheidung gewesen zu sein.

Gleichzeitig ist es zu schwerwiegenden Menschrechtsverletzungen gekommen. Örtliche Aktivisten, die sich an friedlichen Protesten mit dem Ziel einer Veränderung des Streckenverlaufs beteiligten, waren Bedrohungen und körperlicher Gewalt durch die Polizei ausgesetzt.

— Ist der Kommission die Beteiligung des französischen Unternehmens an diesem umstrittenen Projekt bekannt?

— Welche Schlussfolgerungen zieht die Kommission aus dem Bericht von Bankwatch?

— Verstößt die Mitwirkung von Vinci an diesem Projekt gegen geltende EU-Rechtsvorschriften?

— Beabsichtigt die Kommission, im Hinblick auf die Mitwirkung von Vinci an diesem Projekt Maßnahmen einzuleiten?

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

Die EU verfolgt die Entwicklungen im Zusammenhang mit dem Wald von Chimki und der Bewegung für dessen Schutz sehr aufmerksam und weiß daher von der Beteiligung des von den Herren und Frauen Abgeordneten genannten Unternehmens an diesem Projekt.

Sie hat den Bericht von „CEE Bankwatch" zur Kenntnis genommen, ist allerdings nicht in der Lage, daraus spezifische Schlüsse zu ziehen. Korruptionsvorwürfe müssen an die nationalen Behörden gerichtet werden. In diesem Zusammenhang sei darauf hingewiesen, dass sich sowohl die EBWE als auch die EIB bereits 2010 aus diesem Projekt zurückzogen.

Die EU wird weiterhin Maßnahmen ergreifen, um die Korruptionsbekämpfung in Russland zu unterstützen. Ein erstes Expertentreffen EU-Russland zum Thema Korruptionsbekämpfung fand im Dezember 2011 in Moskau statt. Die EU hat die Absicht, auf diesem ersten Treffen aufzubauen und im Herbst ein breiter angelegtes Seminar unter Beteiligung der Zivilgesellschaft, einschließlich Vertreter der Bewegung für den Schutz des Waldes von Chimki, zu veranstalten. Weitere Korruptionsbekämpfungsmaßnahmen sind im Rahmen der zwischen der EU und Russland geschlossenen Partnerschaft für Modernisierung vorgesehen.

Die EU hat ihre Sorgen über die Menschenrechtsverletzungen im Zusammenhang mit dem Schutz des Waldes von Chimki und über die allgemeine Lage in Bezug auf die Rede- und Versammlungsfreiheit in Russland bereits zum Ausdruck gebracht. Dieses Thema wurde beim jüngsten EU-Russland-Gipfel in St. Petersburg erörtert. Bei den jüngsten Konsultationen über Menschenrechte am 20. Juli wurde auch auf spezifische Fragen der Rechtsstaatlichkeit näher eingegangen.

Die EU-Delegation in Moskau pflegt enge und regelmäßige Kontakte mit den russischen Behörden und der Bewegung für den Schutz des Waldes von Chimki in Bezug auf Entwicklungen in dieser Angelegenheit.

([1]) http://bankwatch.org/documents/Vinci_oligarchs_taxhavens_Khimki.pdf

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006992/12
à la Commission
Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE), Werner Schulz (Verts/ALE), Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE), Corinne Lepage (ALDE) et Tarja Cronberg (Verts/ALE)
(12 juillet 2012)

Objet: Participation de l'entreprise française Vinci au projet d'autoroute qui traverse la forêt de Khimki

L'entreprise française Vinci est le chef de file d'un consortium connu sous le nom de North West Concession Company, qui a signé un contrat de concession de travaux pour le premier tronçon d'une autoroute reliant Moscou à Saint-Pétersbourg en Russie. Le parcours de cette route traverse la forêt de Khimki, une des dernières forêts revêtant une valeur environnementale importante dans la région de Moscou. Une forte opposition locale s'est élevée contre ce tracé.

En 2011, une enquête menée par CEE Bankwatch, un réseau d'ONG bien connu ([1]), a montré que la North West Concession Company se compose d'un entrelacs complexe d'entités délocalisées et de paradis fiscaux. Les soupçons de corruption se sont confirmés du fait que le gouvernement russe a modifié le statut de la forêt de Khimki de manière illégale afin de permettre le tracé choisi. Alors qu'il est reconnu que ce tracé ne soit pas le plus avantageux, il semble que des intérêts privés dans le secteur de la promotion immobilière et des faveurs accordées aux parties impliquées ayant des liens étroits avec le président Vladimir Poutine aient motivé cette décision, bien plus que la défense de l'intérêt public.

Parallèlement, de graves violations des Droits de l'homme ont été observées. Des militants locaux participant à des campagnes pacifiques visant à faire modifier le tracé de la route ont subi des menaces et des violences physiques de la part de la police.

— La Commission a-t-elle connaissance de l'implication de cette entreprise française dans ce projet controversé?

— Quelles conclusions la Commission tire-t-elle du rapport de Bankwatch?

— Les activités de Vinci dans le cadre de ce projet enfreignent-elles la législation de l'Union?

— La Commission prévoit-elle de prendre des mesures concernant les activités de Vinci dans ce projet?

Réponse donnée par la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante Ashton, au nom de la Commission
(28 août 2012)

L'UE suit l'évolution concernant la forêt de Khimki et son mouvement de défense de très près et a donc connaissance de l'implication de l'entreprise citée par les Honorables parlementaires dans ce projet.

L'UE a pris acte du rapport de CEE Bankwatch mais n'est pas en mesure d'en tirer des conclusions spécifiques. Les allégations de corruption doivent être adressées aux autorités nationales. Dans ce contexte, il convient de rappeler que la BERD et la BEI se sont toutes les deux retirées du projet en 2010.

L'UE continuera de poursuivre ses activités afin de soutenir la lutte contre la corruption en Russie. Une première réunion d'experts anti-corruption UE-Russie s'est tenue en décembre 2011 à Moscou. L'UE entend donner suite à cette première réunion et organiser un séminaire de portée plus générale en automne à Bruxelles avec la participation de la société civile, y compris celle du mouvement de défense de la forêt de Khimki. De nouvelles actions contre la corruption sont prévues dans le cadre du partenariat pour la modernisation UE-Russie.

L'UE a également soulevé des inquiétudes concernant la violation des Droits de l'homme dans le cadre de l'évolution en matière de défense de la forêt de Khimki, ainsi que de la situation générale concernant la liberté d'expression et de réunion en Russie. Cette question a fait l'objet de discussions lors du dernier sommet UE-Russie à St Petersbourg. Les questions d'État de droit ont elles aussi été abordées de manière plus détaillée durant les dernières consultations sur les Droits de l'homme qui ont eu lieu le 20 juillet.

La délégation de l'UE à Moscou est en contact étroit et régulier avec les autorités russes et le mouvement de défense de Khimki au sujet de l'évolution de la situation de la forêt de Khimki.

([1]) http://bankwatch.org/documents/Vinci_oligarchs_taxhavens_Khimki.pdf

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-006992/12
komissiolle
Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE), Werner Schulz (Verts/ALE), Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE), Corinne Lepage (ALDE) ja Tarja Cronberg (Verts/ALE)
(12. heinäkuuta 2012)

Aihe: Ranskalaisen Vinci-yhtiön osallistuminen Khimkin moottoritiehankkeeseen

Ranskalainen Vinci-yhtiö johtaa Severo-Zapadnaja Kontsessionnaja Kompanija -ryhmittymää, joka on tehnyt Venäjällä toimilupasopimuksen Moskovan ja Pietarin välisen moottoritien ensimmäisen osuuden rakennuttamisesta. Tie on suunniteltu kulkemaan halki Himkin metsän, joka on yksi Moskovan alueen harvoista jäljellä olevista metsistä, joilla on huomattavaa ympäristöllistä arvoa. Paikalliset vastustavat tätä reititystä voimakkaasti.

Vuonna 2011 tunnetun kansalaisjärjestöverkoston CEE Bankwatchin tekemässä tutkimuksessa ([1]) kävi ilmi, että Severo-Zapadnaja Kontsessionnaja Kompanija koostuu offshore-yhtiöiden ja veroparatiisien monimutkaisesta verkostosta. Korruptioepäilyille on saatu näyttöä, sillä Venäjän hallitus muutti laittomasti Himkin metsän statusta, jotta valittu reitti voitaisiin sallia. Yleisesti ollaan sitä mieltä, ettei reitti ole järkevin mahdollinen, mutta ilmeisesti päätöksen taustalla olivat yleisen edun sijaan henkilökohtaiset edut rakennuttamisalalla ja presidentti Vladimir Putinin lähipiirin suosiminen.

On tapahtunut myös vakavia ihmisoikeusloukkauksia: reitin muuttamisen puolesta rauhanomaiseen kampanjointiin osallistuneet paikalliset aktivistit ovat joutuneet poliisin uhkausten ja fyysisen väkivallan kohteeksi.

— Onko komissio tietoinen kyseisen ranskalaisen yhtiön osallistumisesta tähän kiisteltyyn hankkeeseen?

— Mitä johtopäätöksiä komissio tekee Bankwatchin tutkimuksen pohjalta?

— Rikkooko Vincin toiminta hankkeessa voimassa olevaa EU:n lainsäädäntöä?

— Aikooko komissio puuttua Vincin toimintaan hankkeessa?

Catherine Ashtonin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(28. elokuuta 2012)

EU seuraa Himkin metsäalueeseen liittyviä tapahtumia ja tiehanketta vastustavaa ympäristöliikettä erittäin tiiviisti. Se on tietoinen arvoisten parlamentinjäsenten mainitseman yhtiön osallistumisesta hankkeeseen.

EU on pannut merkille CEE Bankwatchin tutkimuksen, mutta ei voi tehdä sen perusteella erityisiä päätelmiä. Korruptioepäilyistä on ilmoitettava kansallisille viranomaisille. On syytä huomata, että sekä EBRD että EIP vetäytyivät tästä hankkeesta vuonna 2010.

EU tukee jatkossakin korruption torjumista Venäjällä. Ensimmäinen EU:n ja Venäjän välinen korruptiontorjunnan asiantuntijoiden kokous pidettiin joulukuussa 2011 Moskovassa. EU aikoo toteuttaa jatkotoimia ensimmäisen kokouksen jälkeen ja järjestää Brysselissä syksyllä laajemman seminaarin, johon osallistuu kansalaisjärjestöjä ja myös Himkin ympäristöliikkeen edustajia. Muita korruptiontorjuntatoimia on suunniteltu toteutettavaksi EU:n ja Venäjän modernisaatiokumppanuuden yhteydessä.

EU on myös ilmaissut huolensa Himkin ympäristöliikkeeseen liittyvien tapahtumien yhteydessä esiintyneistä ihmisoikeusloukkauksista sekä yleisestä sanan- ja kokoontumisvapaustilanteesta Venäjällä. Asiasta keskusteltiin viimeisimmässä EU:n ja Venäjän huippukokouksessa Pietarissa. Oikeusvaltioperiaatetta koskevia kysymyksiä käsiteltiin yksityiskohtaisemmin viimeisimmässä ihmisoikeuksia koskevassa kuulemisessa, joka järjestettiin 20. heinäkuuta.

Moskovassa toimiva EU:n edustusto pitää Himkin tapahtumissa tiiviisti yhteyttä sekä Venäjän viranomaisiin että Himkin ympäristöliikkeen edustajiin.

([1]) Ks. http://bankwatch.org/documents/Vinci_oligarchs_taxhavens_Khimki.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006992/12
to the Commission
Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE), Werner Schulz (Verts/ALE), Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE), Corinne Lepage (ALDE) and Tarja Cronberg (Verts/ALE)
(12 July 2012)

Subject: Involvement of the French company Vinci in Khimki motorway project

The French company Vinci is the leader of a consortium known as the North West Concession Company, which has signed a concession contract for the first section of a motorway between Moscow and St Petersburg in Russia. The road is routed though the Khimki Forest, one of the last remaining forests of important environmental value in the Moscow region. There is a strong local opposition to this route.

In 2011, an investigation carried out by the well-known NGO network CEE Bankwatch ([1]) showed that the North West Concession Company is made up of a complex web of offshore entities and tax havens. Suspicions of corruption have been vindicated by the fact that the Russian government changed the status of the Khimki forest illegally to allow for the chosen route. While it has been widely recognised that the route is not the most advantageous, private interests in property development and favours to those involved with close ties to President Vladimir Putin appear to have been behind the decision, rather than public interests.

At the same time, there have been serious human rights abuses. Local activists involved in peaceful campaigning to change the routing have encountered threats and physical violence by the police.

— Is the Commission aware of the involvement of this French company in this controversial project?

— What conclusions does the Commission draw from the Bankwatch report?

— Do the activities of Vinci in this project violate existing EU legislation?

— Does the Commission plan to take action with regard to Vinci's activities in this project?

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

The EU is following the developments concerning the Khimki Forest and its defence movement very closely and is therefore aware of the involvement of the company mentioned by the Honourable Members in this project.

The EU has taken note of the CEE Bankwatch Report but is not in a position to draw specific conclusions from it. Allegations of corruption must be addressed to the national authorities. In this context, it should be noted that both the EBRD and the EIB withdrew from this project in 2010.

The EU will continue to pursue activities to support the fight against corruption in Russia. A first EU-Russia anti-corruption expert meeting took place in December 2011 in Moscow. The EU intends to follow up on this first meeting and organise a broader seminar in autumn in Brussels with the involvement of civil society, including the Khimki Forest defence movement. Further anti-corruption activities are foreseen in the context of the EU-Russia Partnership for Modernisation.

The EU has also been raising concerns over the human rights abuses in the context of the developments relating to the Khimki forest defense, as well as the general situation with regard to the freedom of speech and assembly in Russia. This has been discussed at the last EU-Russia Summit in St Petersburg. Rule of law questions have also been addressed in greater detail at the last Human Rights consultations taking place on 20 July.

The EU Delegation in Moscow is in close and regular contact on the developments in the Khimki Forest case with both the Russian authorities and the Khimki defense movement.

([1]) http://bankwatch.org/documents/Vinci_oligarchs_taxhavens_Khimki.pdf

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007004/12
a la Comisión
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(12 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Proyecto de construcción de la presa «Salto de Suarna»

En 1951 se concedió un permiso para la construcción de una presa en los ríos Navia y Suarna. El proyecto para dicha presa, conocida como «Salto del Navia», y que iba a afectar a los municipios de Fonsagrada y Navia de Suarna en Lugo (Galicia) e Ibias (Asturias), fue modificado un total de ocho veces, enfrentándose a la oposición de diversos movimientos vecinales de la zona y de colectivos ecologistas.

El proyecto fue rechazado unánimemente por el Parlamento de Galicia en mayo de 2010 a instancias de una propuesta de mi grupo político, el Bloque Nacionalista Galego. Además, el Ministerio de Medio Ambiente de España paralizó el octavo intento de construir la presa por parte de la empresa concesionaria (Saltos del Navia, propiedad de Endesa e Hidroeléctrica del Cantábrico).

El emplazamiento en el que estaba prevista su construcción está incluido en la Red Natura 2000, dentro del Lugar de Importancia Comunitaria (LIC) ES1120001 Ancares-Courel. También está reconocido como Reserva de la Biosfera por la Unesco.

La Asociación para la Defensa Ecológica de Galicia (ADEGA) pidió la retirada definitiva de la concesión, ya que, según el informe del Ministerio de Medio Ambiente de España, no cumple con los requisitos de impacto ambiental.

— ¿Está la Comisión al tanto de esta situación?

— ¿Instará la Comisión a las instituciones competentes a que se revoque de manera definitiva el proyecto hidroeléctrico en un espacio protegido por la Red Natura 2000?

— ¿Prevé la Comisión establecer algún reglamento relativo a la sobreexplotación energética de recursos naturales, teniendo en cuenta que el río Navia, por ejemplo, ya cuenta con tres instalaciones de aprovechamiento hidroeléctrico en su curso?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(22 de agosto de 2012)

La Comisión está al corriente de la publicación en el *Boletín Oficial del Estado* ([1]) de la declaración de impacto ambiental (DIA) del proyecto «Modificación de características de la concesión otorgada para derivar agua de río Navia, términos municipales de Ibias (Asturias), Fonsagrada y Navia de Suarna (Lugo)». No obstante, la Comisión no posee información sobre los detalles de este proyecto ni sobre el proceso seguido para la emisión de esa declaración medioambiental, en la cual se considera que el proyecto tendrá repercusiones negativas en el medio ambiente.

La Comisión recuerda que la responsabilidad de garantizar el cumplimiento de la Directiva 92/43/CEE ([2]) de hábitats incumbe en primer lugar a los Estados miembros y que estos son los encargados de poner en vigor las disposiciones jurídicas, reglamentarias y administrativas necesarias con ese fin.

La Comisión no tiene previsto por el momento formular normas específicas sobre la sobrexplotación de los recursos naturales para la producción de energía. Instrumentos como la evaluación estratégica del impacto ambiental con arreglo a la Directiva 2001/42/CE ([3]), la evaluación de impacto ambiental con arreglo a la Directiva 85/337/CEE ([4]) y la evaluación adecuada de los planes y proyectos exigida en virtud de las disposiciones de la Directiva de hábitats ofrecen un marco coherente para el examen de los efectos de las instalaciones hidroeléctricas en el curso de los ríos.

([1]) BOE n° 160 de 5.7.2012.
([2]) Directiva 92/43/CEE del Consejo, de 21 de mayo de 1992, relativa a la conservación de los hábitats naturales y de la fauna y flora silvestres (DO L 206 de 22.7.1992).
([3]) Directiva 2001/42/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 27 de junio de 2001, relativa a la evaluación de los efectos de determinados planes y programas en el medio ambiente (DO L 197 de 21.7.2001).
([4]) Directiva 85/337/CEE, de 27 de junio de 1985, a la evaluación de las repercusiones de determinados proyectos públicos y privados sobre el medio ambiente (DO L 175 de 5.7.1985), modificada por las Directivas 97/11/CE y 2003/35/CE.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007004/12
à Comissão
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(12 de julho de 2012)

Assunto: Projeto de construção da barragem «Salto de Suarna»

Em 1951, foi outorgada uma concessão para construir uma barragem nos rios Navia e Suarna. A construção, conhecida como «Salto do Navia», foi projetada um total de 8 vezes, encontrando com a oposição de diversos movimentos de vizinhos da zona e de coletivos ecologistas. O projeto afetaria os municípios da Fonsagrada, Navia de Suarna (Lugo, Galiza) e Ibias (Astúrias).

Este projeto foi recusado por unanimidade pelo Parlamento da Galiza em maio de 2010, a instâncias de uma proposição do meu grupo político, o Bloco Nacionalista Galego. Ademais, a oitava tentativa para realizar a barragem por parte da sociedade concessionária (Saltos do Navia, propriedade de Endesa e Hidrocantábrico) foi suspensa pelo Ministério do Ambiente do Estado espanhol.

O espaço onde estaria prevista a sua construção está incluído na Rede Natura 2000, dentro do Sítio de Interesse Comunitário (SIC) ES1120001 de Os Ancares — O Courel. Também está reconhecido como Reserva da Biosfera pela Unesco.

A Associação para a Defesa Ecológica da Galiza (ADEGA) pediu que esta concessão fosse retirada definitivamente, já que não cumpre os requisitos de impacto ambiental, segundo o relatório do Ministério do Ambiente de Espanha.

— Conhece a Comissão esta situação?

— Instará a Comissão as instituições competentes a fim de que seja revogado definitivamente o projeto hidroelétrico num espaço protegido pela Rede Natura 2000?

— Prevê a Comissão o estabelecimento de um regulamento relativo à sobre-exploração energética de recursos naturais, tendo em conta que o rio Navia, por exemplo, já conta com 3 aproveitamentos hidroelétricos no seu curso?

Resposta dada por Janez Potočnik em nome da Comissão
(22 de agosto de 2012)

A Comissão está ao corrente de que o Jornal Oficial espanhol ([1]) publicou uma declaração negativa sobre a avaliação de impacto ambiental (DIA) relativa ao projeto «*Modificación de características de la concesión otorgada para derivar agua de río Navia, términos municipales de Ibias (Asturias), Fonsagrada y Navia de Suarna (Lugo)*». Contudo, a Comissão não dispõe de informações sobre os pormenores do referido projeto, nem sobre o nem o processo seguido para emitir este tipo de declaração ambiental, que considera que o projeto terá impactos ambientais negativos.

A Comissão gostaria de recordar que a responsabilidade de assegurar a conformidade com a Diretiva 92/43/CEE ([2]) *Habitats* incumbe, em primeiro lugar, aos Estados-Membros, que têm a responsabilidade de aplicar as disposições legislativas, regulamentares e administrativas necessárias para esse efeito.

Atualmente, a Comissão não tem planos para desenvolver normas específicas sobre a sobre-exploração dos recursos naturais para produzir energia. Os instrumentos existentes, como a avaliação estratégica do impacto ambiental nos termos da Diretiva 2001/42/CE ([3]), a avaliação de impacto ambiental ao abrigo da Diretiva 85/337/CEE ([4]) e a avaliação adequada dos planos e projetos necessários ao abrigo da Diretiva *Habitats*, constituem um enquadramento coerente para a avaliação dos impactos de instalações hidroelétricas ao longo de cursos fluviais.

([1]) BOE n.° 160 de 5.7.2012.
([2]) Diretiva 92/43/CEE do Conselho, de 21 de Maio de 1992, relativa à preservação dos habitats naturais e da fauna e da flora selvagens. JO L 206 de 22.7.1992.
([3]) Directiva 2001/42/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 27 de junho de 2001, relativa à avaliação dos efeitos de determinados planos e programas no ambiente, JO L 197 de 21.7.2001.
([4]) Directiva 85/337/CEE do Conselho, de 27 de junho de 1985, relativa à avaliação dos efeitos de determinados projetos públicos e privados no ambiente projetos privados no ambiente, JO L 175 de 5.7.1985, com a redação que lhe foi dada pelas Diretivas 97/11/CE e 2003/35/CE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007004/12
to the Commission
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(12 July 2012)

Subject: 'Salto de Suarna' dam construction project

In 1951 a permit was granted to construct a dam on the rivers Navia and Suarna. The dam, known as the 'Salto de Navia', has been planned a total of eight times but has met with opposition from various local residents' groups and environmental associations. The project would affect the municipalities of Fonsagrada, Navia de Suarna (Lugo, Galicia) and Ibias (Asturias).

The project was unanimously rejected by the Galician Parliament in May 2010 on a proposal from my political group, the Galician Nationalist Bloc. Moreover, the eighth attempt to build the dam by the company holding the permit (Saltos de Navia, owned by Endesa and Hidrocantábrico) has been suspended by the Spanish Environment Ministry.

The planned site figures in the Natura 2000 network and forms part of the site of Community importance (SCI) ES1120001, Os Ancares — O Courel. It has also been designated a Unesco biosphere reserve.

The Galician environmental organisation 'Associação para a Defesa Ecológica da Galiza' (ADEGA) has called for the permit to be withdrawn permanently since, according to the Spanish Environment Ministry's report, it does not meet the environmental impact requirements.

— Is the Commission aware of this situation?

— Will the Commission urge the competent institutions definitively to cancel the above hydroelectric project on a site protected by the Natura 2000 network?

— Is the Commission planning to draw up rules on the overexploitation of natural resources for energy, bearing in mind that there are already three hydroelectric installations along the course of the river Navia, for example?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(22 August 2012)

The Commission is aware of the publication in the Spanish Official Journal ([1]) of the negative environmental impact statement (DIA) for the project 'Modificación de características de la concesión otorgada para derivar agua de río Navia, términos municipales de Ibias (Asturias), Fonsagrada y Navia de Suarna (Lugo)'. The Commission however does neither possess information on the details of this project nor on the process followed in order to issue such environmental statement, which considers that the project will have negative environmental impacts.

The Commission would like to recall that the responsibility to ensure compliance with the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC ([2]) lies primarily with Member States and that they are responsible for bringing into force relevant laws, regulations and administrative provisions to ensure this.

The Commission does not currently plan to develop specific rules on the overexploitation of natural resources for energy production. Instruments like the strategic environmental impact assessment under Directive 2001/42/EC ([3]), the environmental impact assessment under Directive 85/337/EEC ([4]) and the appropriate assessment of plans and projects required under the provisions of the Habitats Directive offer a coherent framework for the consideration of impacts from hydroelectric installations along river courses.

([1]) BOE No 160. 5.7.2012.
([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]) Council Directive 85/337/EEC of 27 June 1985 on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment, OJ L 175, 5.7.1985, as amended by Directives 97/11/EC and 2003/35/EC.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-007020/12
komissiolle
Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE)
(12. heinäkuuta 2012)

Aihe: Vihreän talouden työpaikat

Ilmastotoimista vastaava komission jäsen Connie Hedegaard korosti komission työllisyyspakettia koskevissa kommenteissaan, että mikäli EU ei nopeuta vihreää taloutta koskevia toimiaan, vaarana on, että se menettää huomattavan mahdollisuuden luoda laadukkaita työpaikkoja, ja ilmoitti, että tämä on komissiolta suora kehotus ryhtyä toimiin.

— Voiko komissio kertoa, millä tavalla se tuli päätelmään, jonka mukaan miljoonia ”vihreitä työpaikkoja” voidaan luoda vuoteen 2020 mennessä?

— Millaisia selvityksiä komissio on tehnyt ja millaisia muiden järjestöjen tekemiä selvityksiä tähän on käytetty?

— Millaisia arviointiperusteita käyttämällä komissio tuli uusien ”vihreiden työpaikkojen” lukumäärää koskevaan päätelmään?

— Onko komissio selvittänyt kuinka monia nykyisiä työpaikkoja voitaisiin muuttaa ”vihreiksi työpaikoiksi” ja millaisia taloudellisia vaikutuksia sillä saattaisi olla EU:n teollisuuteen?

— Millaisia arviointiperusteita käytettiin esimerkiksi energiatehokkuustoimenpiteitä, tärkeiden raaka-aineiden kierrätystä, uusiutuvaa energiaa ja ympäristöveroja koskevien yksityiskohtaisten lukujen laskemisen perustana?

László Andorin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(4. syyskuuta 2012)

Vihreä talous tarjoaa runsaasti mahdollisuuksia luoda uusia ja säilyttää jo olemassa olevia työpaikkoja teollisuudenaloilla, joilla kilpailu kovenee nopeasti globalisoituvilla markkinoilla. Tällaisia teollisuudenaloja ovat esimerkiksi liikenne ja energialaitteiden valmistus. Uusiutuvien energialähteiden alan työvoima on Euroopassa kasvanut vain viidessä vuodessa 320 000 työntekijällä ([1]). Ekoteollisuuden välittömien työpaikkojen määrä kasvoi talouskriisistä huolimatta 2,4 miljoonasta (vuonna 2000) 3 miljoonaan (vuonna 2008). Määrän on ennustettu kasvavan edelleen 3,4 miljoonaan vuonna 2012 ([2]).

Komissio haluaisi hyödyntää kaikkia talouden viherryttämisen tarjoamia työllisyysmahdollisuuksia. Työllisyyden kasvun kannalta potentiaalisimpia osa-alueita ovat muun muassa resurssi- ja energiatehokkuuden lisäämiseen tähtäävät toimenpiteet, uusiutuvat energialähteet ja energiaverotus, hiilijalanjäljen hinnoittelu, jätteen käsittely sekä kierrätys. Se, missä määrin tätä potentiaalia onnistutaan hyödyntämään, riippuu EU:n kyvystä olla johtavassa roolissa vähähiilisen energiateknologian kehittämisessä. EU voi saavuttaa tämän aseman lisäämällä alan koulutusta, tutkimusta ja kehitystä sekä yrittäjyyttä, mutta myös luomalla sijoittamiselle suotuisat taloudelliset olosuhteet.

Komissio ja sen virastot ovat toteuttaneet useita tutkimuksia talouden viherryttämisen työllisyysvaikutuksista sekä itsenäisesti että yhteistyössä kansainvälisten järjestöjen, kuten ILO:n ja OECD:n kanssa ([3]). Oman analyysinsä lisäksi komissio seuraa tiiviisti muiden sidosryhmien suorittamia tutkimuksia. Komissio pyytääkin arvoisaa parlamentin jäsentä tutustumaan osoitteessa http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/index_en.htm asiaankuuluviin vaikutustenarviointia koskeviin asiakirjoihin, joissa kuvaillaan yksityiskohtaisesti, kuinka poliittisten aloitteiden potentiaalinen työllisyysvaikutus on laskettu.

([1]) KOM(2011) 112 lopullinen.

([2]) Ecorys (2012), The number of jobs dependent on environment and resource efficiency improvements, Euroopan komission ympäristöasioiden pääosastolle tehty tutkimus, saatavilla osoitteessa: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/enveco/jobs/pdf/jobs.pdf

([3]) Tutkimukset mainitaan komission yksiköiden valmisteluasiakirjassa Exploiting the employment potential of green growth, SWD (2012) 92 lopullinen, saatavilla osoitteessa: ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=7621&langId=en; ja niihin kuuluvat esimerkiksi seuraavat tutkimukset: Studies on sustainability issues – green jobs, trade and labour (2011), saatavilla osoitteessa: http://ec.europa.eu/social/keyDocuments.jsp?policyArea=&type=0&country=0&year=0&advSearchKey=tacklingclimatechange&mode=advancedSubmit&langId=fi; The jobs potential of a shift towards a low-carbon economy (2012), saatavilla osoitteessa: http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/61/8/50503551.pdf; Towards a greener economy: the social dimensions (2011), saatavilla osoitteessa: http://www.ilo.org/global/publications/ilo-bookstore/order-online/books/WCMS_168163/lang--en/index.htm; Green jobs and social impacts – komission ympäristöasioiden pääosaston luettelo tutkimuksista, saatavilla osoitteessa: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/enveco/overviewstudies.htm#3

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007020/12
to the Commission
Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE)
(12 July 2012)

Subject: Green economy jobs

Connie Hedegaard, European Commissioner for Climate Action, commented on the Commission's Employment Package as follows: 'If Europe does not step up its green economy efforts, we risk losing an immense source of quality jobs. This is the very clear message from the European Commission today'.

— Could the Commission state how it reached the conclusion that millions of 'green jobs' can be created by 2020?

— What studies have been conducted by the Commission itself, and what studies by other organisations have been used?

— What criteria did the Commission use in reaching its conclusion on the number of new 'green jobs'?

— Has the Commission conducted studies on how many existing jobs could be converted into 'green jobs' and on what the economic consequences of that might be for industry in the EU?

— What criteria were used as the basis for calculating the specific figures with regard to, for example, energy efficiency measures, the recycling of key materials, renewable energy and environmental taxes?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(4 September 2012)

The green economy sectors provide ample opportunities to create new jobs as well as to preserve existing ones in manufacturing industries such as transport and energy equipment which are facing increased competition in a rapidly globalising market. In just five years, the renewable industry in Europe increased its work force with 320 000 ([1]). Despite the current crisis, direct jobs in 'eco-industries' have grown from 2.4 million in 2000 to 3.0 million in 2008 and are forecasted to reach 3.4 million in 2012 ([2]).

The Commission would like to exploit the full employment potential linked to the greening of the economy, coming from e.g. resource and energy efficiency measures, renewable energy and energy taxation, carbon pricing, waste management and recycling. To what extent this job potential will be realised depends on the EU's ability to lead in the development of low-carbon technologies through increased education, training, R & D and entrepreneurship as well as favourable economic conditions for investments.

The Commission and its agencies have conducted several studies on the implications of the greening of economy on the employment, also in the cooperation with international organisations such as ILO and OECD ([3]). Next to its own analysis, the Commission is also closely following research done by other stakeholders. For the details on the ways to calculate the specific figures on the potential employment gains of those policy initiatives, the Commission would like to invite the Honourable Member to consult the relevant Impact Assessment documents available at http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/index_en.htm

---

([1]) COM(2011)112 final.

([2]) Ecorys (2012), The number of jobs dependent on environment and resource efficiency improvements, Study for European Commission, Directorate General for Environment, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/enveco/jobs/pdf/jobs.pdf

([3]) These are mentioned in the Commission Staff Working document Exploiting the employment potential of green growth, SWD (2012) 92final, available at: ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=7621&langId=en; and include for instance: Studies on sustainability issues — green jobs, trade and labour (2011), available at: http://ec.europa.eu/social/keyDocuments.jsp?policyArea=&type=0&country=0&year=0&advSearchKey=tacklingclimatechange&mode=advancedSubmit&langId=en; The jobs potential of a shift towards a low-carbon economy (2012), available at: http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/61/8/50503551.pdf; Towards a greener economy: the social dimensions (2011), available at: http://www.ilo.org/global/publications/ilo-bookstore/order-online/books/WCMS_168163/lang--en/index.htm; Green jobs and social impacts — list of studies by Commission's General Directorate for Environment, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/enveco/overviewstudies.htm#3

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-007033/12
komissiolle
Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE)
(12. heinäkuuta 2012)

Aihe: Rikkipäästödirektiivin säästämät ihmishenget

Laivojen rikkipäästöjä koskevan uuden direktiivin väitetään säästävän ”kymmeniä tuhansia ihmishenkiä”. Luku on peräisin ainakin komission käyttämän AEA-konsulttiyhtiön raportista, joka on luettavissa internetissä osoitteessa: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/air/transport/pdf/CBA_of_S.pdf.

Tämä tutkimus on kuitenkin saanut kritiikkiä ”terveysmallistaan”, joka määrittelee tilastomatemaattisen yhteyden ilman rikkipitoisuuden ja hengitystieinfektioiden välillä. Tilaston sanotaan olevan ajoilta, jolloin ilman rikkipitoisuus oli keskimäärin viisi kertaa ja paikallisesti yli sata kertaa suurempi kuin tänään. Joidenkin tutkijoiden mielestä tämän päivän pienillä rikkidioksidipitoisuuksilla tuskin enää on minkäänlaista vaikutusta ihmisten terveyteen.

AEA:n raportissa puhutaan myös ”leviämismallista”, jolla lasketaan, miten paljon rikkidirektiivi vähentää ilman rikkidioksidipitoisuutta. Kun ”leviämismallin” tuloksia syötetään ”terveysmalliin”, saadaan tulokseksi kyseinen kymmenien tuhansien ihmishenkien pelastus.

Mitä muita rikkidirektiivin ympäristö- ja terveysvaikutuksia koskevia tutkimuksia komissio on käyttänyt?

Onko komissiolla myös esittää tarkkoja taloudellisia lukuja rikkidirektiivin avulla saavutettavista hyödyistä niin terveyden kuin ympäristön osalta ja onko niitä vastaavasti verrattu teollisuuden ja työllisyyden valtaviin taloudellisiin uhkakuviin?

Janez Potočnikin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(17. elokuuta 2012)

Komission ehdotus direktiivin 1999/32/EY muuttamisesta meriliikenteessä käytettävien polttoaineiden rikkipitoisuuden osalta ([1]) perustuu sitoumukseen, jonka useimmat EU:n jäsenvaltiot tekivät vuonna 2008, kun ne hyväksyivät Kansainvälisen merenkulkujärjestön (IMO) MARPOL-yleissopimuksen liitteen VI.

Komission taloudellinen arviointi tästä kansainvälisestä sitoumuksesta ([2]) perustuu useisiin eri tutkimuksiin, jotka luetellaan arvioinnin liitteessä I. Tuloksia on analysoitu ja vertailtu sekä joidenkin tulosten poisjättämisen syyt on selitetty vaikutusten arvioinnissa.

Määritettäessä ehdotuksen terveyshyötyjä käytettiin Puhdasta ilmaa Euroopalle -ohjelman eli CAFE-ohjelman kustannus-hyötyanalyysimenetelmää. Menetelmä kehitettiin vuonna 2005 ilman pilaantumista koskevaa teemakohtaista strategiaa varten. Menetelmästä kuultiin laajalti eri sidosryhmiä ja sille tehtiin muodollinen vertaisarviointi. Määritetyt terveyshyödyt eivät johtuneet rikkidioksidin suorasta vaikutuksesta ihmisten terveyteen, sillä vaikutus on vähäinen tämänhetkisillä pitoisuuksilla, vaan pikemminkin rikkidioksidipitoisuuksien vaikutuksista terveyteen sekundaaristen hiukkaspäästöjen (PM2.5) muodostumisen vuoksi. Sekundääriset hiukkaspäästöt ovat tällä hetkellä merkittävä ja hyvin dokumentoitu terveysongelma EU:ssa. Analyysi on osoittanut, että jo pelkästään terveyshyödyt ylittävät kustannukset, joita aiheutuu tiukemmista rikkipitoisuuden raja-arvoista. Terveyshyödyt olisivat vähintään 3–13 euroa jokaista käytettyä euroa kohti ja EU:n rikkioksidipäästöjen valvonta-alueilla 5–25 euroa jokaista käytettyä euroa kohti riippuen siitä, onko vaatimukset täytetty käyttämällä vähärikkistä polttoainetta, joka on kallein vaihtoehto, vai päästönvähentämismenetelmiä, kuten puhdistuslaitteita, jotka ovat halvempia.

Komissio on tietoinen siitä, että teollisuus on huolissaan meriliikenteessä käytettävän vähärikkisen polttoaineen kustannuksista, ja se on julkaissut valmisteluasiakirjan ([3]), jossa esitetään toimenpiteitä, joiden tarkoituksena on auttaa teollisuutta täyttämään uudet vaatimukset.

([1]) KOM(2011) 439 lopullinen, http://ec.europa.eu/environment/air/transport/pdf/ships/com_2011_190_en.pdf
([2]) SEC(2011) 918 lopullinen, http://ec.europa.eu/environment/air/transport/pdf/ships/sec_2011_918_en.pdf
([3]) SEC(2011) 1052 lopullinen, http://ec.europa.eu/environment/air/transport/pdf/ships/sec_2011_1052.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007033/12
to the Commission
Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE)
(12 July 2012)

Subject: Lives saved by the Sulphur Emissions Directive

It is claimed that the new directive on sulphur emissions from ships will save 'tens of thousands of human lives'. The sole source for this figure is the report by the consultancy firm of AEA used by the Commission, which may be found on the Internet at http://ec.europa.eu/environment/air/transport/pdf/CBA_of_S.pdf

This study, however, has been criticised for its 'health model', which defines the statistical link between the sulphur content of the air and respiratory infections. The statistics are said to date to a time when the sulphur content of the air was on average five times, and locally over a hundred times, greater than today. According to some researchers today's small sulphur levels no longer have any perceptible effect on human health.

The AEA report also refers to the 'dispersion model', which calculates how much the Sulphur Directive will reduce the sulphur dioxide content of the air. When the results of the 'dispersion model' are fed into the 'health model', this yields the abovementioned figure of tens of thousands of lives saved.

What other studies on the environmental and health impact of the Sulphur Directive has the Commission used?

Can the Commission also produce precise economic figures on the potential benefits of the Sulphur Directive to health and the environment, and have these been properly compared with the enormous economic threats to industry and employment?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(17 August 2012)

The Commission's proposal to amend Directive 1999/32/EC as regards sulphur content in marine fuels ([1]) is a consequence of the commitment most EU Member States have made in 2008 by agreeing to Marpol Annex VI of the International Maritime Organisation (IMO).

The Commission's economic assessment of this international commitment ([2]) is based on several studies, listed in its Annex I. Their findings were analysed, compared and the reasons for discarding some studies' results were provided in the impact assessment.

In calculating the health benefits of the proposal, the Clean Air for Europe (CAFÉ) cost-benefit methodology was used. This methodology, developed and used for the 2005 Thematic Strategy on Air Pollution, was extensively consulted on with various stakeholders and was subject to formal peer review. The health benefits calculated were not due to the direct effect of SO_2 on human health, which indeed is limited at current ambient concentrations, but rather due to the impact of SO_2 concentrations on health via the formation of secondary particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$), which is a current, significant and well-documented health problem in the EU. The analysis has shown that health benefits alone would outweigh the costs of the stricter sulphur limits and would be at least EUR 3-EUR 13 for every euro spent, whilst for the EU SOx Emission Control Areas EUR 5-EUR 25 for every euro spent, depending on whether compliance is reached by using low sulphur fuel, the most expensive option, or emission abatement methods, such as scrubbers, which are cheaper.

Mindful of the industry's concerns about costs of the low sulphur marine fuel, the Commission has published a Staff Working Paper ([3]) outlining measures aiming to help the industry to comply with new requirements.

([1]) COM(2011)439 final, http://ec.europa.eu/environment/air/transport/pdf/ships/com_2011_190_en.pdf
([2]) SEC(2011)918 final, http://ec.europa.eu/environment/air/transport/pdf/ships/sec_2011_918_en.pdf
([3]) SEC(2011)1052 final, http://ec.europa.eu/environment/air/transport/pdf/ships/sec_2011_1052.pdf

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-007049/12
a Bizottság számára
Mészáros Alajos (PPE)
(2012. július 13.)

Tárgy: Anyakönyvi okiratokkal kapcsolatos, uniós polgárságból eredő jogosultságok sérelme

A Bizottság az anyakönyvvel kapcsolatos szlovák rendelkezések uniós joggal való összeegyeztethetőségére vonatkozóan elismerte (E-008365/2011) annak fontosságát, hogy az uniós jog védje a szabad mozgáshoz és tartózkodáshoz való jogukkal élő polgárokat, hogy azok ne kerüljenek hátrányos helyzetbe amiatt, hogy nevük nem azonos formában van bejegyezve. A Bizottság azonban nem állapította meg az uniós jog általunk hivatkozott sérelmét, többek között hivatkozva a szabályozás módosítására, valamint arra, hogy – álláspontja szerint – a szlovák hatóságok kérésre más nemzetiségűek számára az anyakönyvi kivonatot úgy állítják ki, hogy azon a név az ő anyanyelvén szerepeljen.

Álláspontunk szerint a Bíróság – többek között – a Garcia Avello ([1]) és a Malgožata Runevič-Vardyn/Łukasz Paweł Wardyn ([2]) ügyekben hozott ítéleteiben jelentős jogfejlődés következett be az uniós jogban az anyakönyvi okmányok tekintetében, ami bizonyos helyzetekben többet követel meg annál, hogy a polgárok neve azonos formában legyen bejegyezve az Európai Unió területén belül.

A hatályban lévő szlovák szabályozás a többszöri módosítás ellenére ([3]),valamint – a hozzánk érkezett panaszok alapján – az állandó közigazgatási gyakorlat ([4]) nem minden esetben teszi lehetővé az elhunyt hozzátartozók (nagyszülő) halotti anyakönyvi kivonatának kisebbségi nyelvi helyesírás és írásmód alapján történő kiadását. E tény alkalmas a kisebbségi név és helyesírási szabályok szerint anyakönyvezett, valamint hivatalos okmányaikban is így szereplő személyeknek jelentős magánjellegű, vagy szakmai kárt okozni, ugyanis a hivatalos nyelv (államnyelv) és a kisebbségi nyelv (anyanyelv) helyesírási és írásmódbeli szabályai alapján kiadott iratok egyértelműen különbözhetnek egymástól.

Nehézzé válik az érintett személyek számára – az okmányokban használt különbözőség miatt – a család egységének, valamint a fennálló rokoni kapcsolatoknak a bizonyítása, ebből következően pedig az elhunyt családtaggal kapcsolatos – más tagállamban történő – öröklési követelések vagy szerzői jogok érvényesíthetősége.

Tekintettel a fentiekre, változott-e a Bizottságnak az uniós jog sértésével kapcsolatos álláspontja?

Viviane Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2012. szeptember 7.)

Ahogyan azt a Bizottság az E-008365/2011 sz. írásbeli kérdésre adott válaszában ([5]) kifejtette, az EU joga biztosítja, hogy azon uniós polgárokat, akik a szabad mozgáshoz és tartózkodáshoz való jogukat gyakorolják, nem éri hátrány amiatt, mert nevük nem azonos formában szerepel a nyilvántartásokban az Európai Unión belül.

Attól eltekintve, hogy a tisztelt képviselő írásbeli választ igénylő kérdésében hivatkozott nagyszülők csakugyan gyakorolták-e a szabad mozgáshoz és tartózkodáshoz való jogukat és jogosultak-e az Európai Unió működéséről szóló szerződés 21. cikke szerinti védelemre, a Bizottság hangsúlyozza, hogy a Bíróság C-391/09 sz. *Runevič-Vardyn* ügyben hozott ítéletében megerősítette: az uniós polgárok szabad mozgáshoz való jogáról szóló uniós jogszabályt úgy kell értelmezni, hogy azzal nem ellentétes, ha az illetékes hatóságok megtagadják valamely anyakönyvi okmánynak a név kívánt alakban történő feltüntetésével való kibocsátását, feltéve hogy e megtagadás nem okoz jelentős adminisztratív, szakmai vagy magánjellegű hátrányt az érintett uniós polgároknak.

A Bizottságnak nem áll módjában annak értékelése, hogy a kibocsátás megtagadása ilyen jelentős hátránynak minősül-e. Az illetékes nemzeti bíróság feladata a hátrány súlyosságának értékelése az adott eset egyedi körülményeinek figyelembevételével ([6]).

([1]) Bíróság, C-148/02. sz. ügy.
([2]) Bíróság, C-391/09. sz. ügy, 72-76. pontok: a mindennapi élet megköveteli, hogy a családok képesek legyenek igazolni a tagjaik között fennálló kapcsolatot; ebben a Bíróság figyelembe veszi, hogy az eltérés tudatos döntés eredményének tekinthető-e. A Bíróság gyakorlata alapján sérülhet az uniós jog, ha egy család tagjai különbözőképpen vannak anyakönyvezve.
([3]) A 204/2011. sz. törvénnyel módosított 154/1994. sz. törvény 19. § (10) és (11) bekezdése a közvetett rokoni kapcsolat (például nagyszülő) esetére nem teszi lehetővé a kisebbségi okmányok kiadását.
([4]) A gyakorlat (0118130, 0154419 c. 6/2012) bizonyítja, hogy a nagyszülők neve a kiadott okmányokban csak államnyelven jelenik meg; Bartal helyett Bartalová, az Ede helyett Eduard, Bondor helyett Bondorová szerepel a kivonatokon.
([5]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=HU
([6]) Lásd a *Runevič-Vardyn* ügy 77. és 78. bekezdése.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007049/12
to the Commission
Alajos Mészáros (PPE)
(13 July 2012)

Subject: Breach of rights derived from EU citizenship in connection with civil registry documents

In its answer to my question concerning the compatibility of provisions on registers of births and deaths with European law (E-008365/2011) the Commission acknowledged the importance of EC law to protect citizens who have exercised their right to move and reside freely so they are not placed at a disadvantage because their names are not registered in identical form. However, the Commission did not establish whether the breach of EC law that we mentioned was in fact present, referring *inter alia* to the amendment of the law and to the fact that — in its opinion — the Slovak authorities should upon request issue civil registry documents to persons of different ethnicity with the name in the person's mother tongue.

In our view, the Court of Justice judgments in — among others — the Garcia Avello ([1]) and Malgožata Runevič-Vardyn/Łukasz Paweł Wardyn ([2]) cases led to an important legal development in EC law with regard to civil registry documents, whereby in certain circumstances more may be required than that citizens' names be registered in identical form within the territory of the EU.

Current Slovak legislation, in spite of repeated amendments ([3]), and — on the basis of the complaints we have received — current administrative practice ([4]), does not in all cases allow the deceased relations' (grandparents') death certificates to be issued in accordance with the spelling and writing conventions of the minority language. This fact is likely to cause significant private or professional disadvantage to people whose names appear in civil registries and official documents using the naming and spelling rules of the minority language, as the documents issued using the spelling and writing conventions of the official (state) language and the minority language (mother tongue) may differ perceptibly.

It becomes difficult for the people in question — because of the difference in the documents — to prove the unity of the family and existing family relationships, and thus to enforce inheritance claims or property rights in another Member State concerning deceased relatives.

In the light of the above, has the Commission's view changed concerning a breach of EC law?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(7 September 2012)

As the Commission has stated in its answer to Written Question E-008365/2011 ([5]), EC law ensures that EU citizens who have exercised their right to move and reside freely so they are not placed at a disadvantage because their names are not registered in identical form within the European Union.

Leaving aside whether the grandparents the Honourable Member refers to in his written question have exercised their right to move and reside freely and qualify for the protection under Article 21 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the Commission highlights that the ruling of the Court of Justice in Case C-391/09 *Runevič-Vardyn* confirmed that EC law on free movement of EU citizens must be interpreted as precluding the competent authorities from refusing to issue the civil status document with the name in the requested form only if that refusal would give rise to serious inconvenience at administrative, professional and private levels to individual EU citizens concerned.

The Commission is not in a position to assess whether the refusal at issue gives rise to such serious inconvenience. It would be up to the competent national court to evaluate the seriousness of the inconvenience taking into account the particular circumstances of the case ([6]).

([1]) ECR, Case C-148/02.
([2]) ECR, Case C-391/09, grounds 72-76. It is a need of everyday life that families should be able to provide evidence of the links between different family members; here the Court highlights the question whether the difference may be regarded as the result of a deliberate decision. In line with the Court's practice, it would be a breach of EC law if the members of a single family were entered differently in the civil registry.
([3]) Section 19(10) and (11) of Law No 154/1994 as amended by Law No 204/2011, in the case of an indirect family relationship (e.g. grandparents) does not permit the issuance of minority [language] documents.
([4]) Practice (0118130, 0154419 c. 6/2012) shows that the grandparents' name appears in the published documents only in the state language: Bartalová appears in the extracts instead of Bartal, Eduard for Ede, Bondorová for Bondor.
([5]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN .
([6]) See case *Runevič-Vardyn*, par. 77 and 78.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007060/12
to the Commission
Andrew Henry William Brons (NI)
(13 July 2012)

Subject: Asylum and Migration Fund

In the proposed regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the Asylum and Migration Fund, the following words appear:

'The Stockholm programme recognises both the opportunities and challenges posed by increased mobility of persons, and underlines that well-managed migration can be beneficial to all stakeholders. The European Council equally recognised that, in the context of the important demographic challenges that the Union will face in the future with an increased demand for labour, flexible migration policies will make an important contribution to the Union's economic development and performance in the longer term.'

In the proposed regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing, as part of the Internal Security Fund, the instrument for financial support for external borders and visa, the following words appear:

'Such Union actions include studies and pilot projects to further the policy and its application, measures or arrangements in third countries addressing migratory pressures from those countries in the interest of an optimal management of migration flows into the Union and an efficient organisation of the related tasks at external borders and consulates.'

1. How many migrants does the Commission envisage the Union will require in the years to 2020, 2020-2030 and 2030-2050, and how has it arrived at these numbers?

2. What working papers has the Commission produced with respect to migratory flows into the Union?

3. Given the oppressive regimes that operate in Africa and the Middle and Far East, is the Commission encouraging migration from any particular region(s) as part of its strategy?

4. If the Commission has not calculated the inflows it envisages into the Union in the aforementioned periods, will it kindly explain this omission?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(6 September 2012)

The Treaty on the Functioning of the EU has conferred on the Union the task to develop a common immigration policy aimed at ensuring efficient management of migration flows and fair treatment of third-country nationals residing legally in Member States. Member States determine the number of economic migrants they admit.

The EU-27 population is projected to continue to grow older, with the share of the population aged 65 years and over rising from 17 % in 2008 to 30 % in 2060. In turn, the ratio between working people and pensioners will change from 4 to 1 today, to 2 to 1 in 2060. These figures are based on the Commission's 2012 Ageing report ([1]) and Eurostat's Population Projections scenario (EUROPOP2010) ([2]). The Commission does not set immigration targets in response these statistics, but believes that migration can continue to be an important part of efforts to address the challenge of labour shortages, notably in the context of the EU's ageing population.

The Commission publishes an Annual Report on Migration and Asylum. On 1 June, the 3rd edition was presented. For data on migratory flows, we would refer the Member in particular to the statistical annex to the Commission Staff Working Document which accompanies the Annual Report ([3]).

The EU Global Approach to Migration and Mobility ([4]) defines how the European Union intends to organise its dialogue and cooperation with non-EU countries in this area. In terms of geographical priorities specific attention is given to the countries in the EU neighbourhood, as well as to other strategic partners.

The Commission does not set quota for immigration. The Member States determine volumes of admission of third-country nationals coming from third countries to their territory in order to seek work.

([1]) Provisional version available at: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2012/pdf/ee-2012-2_en.pdf
([2]) For more information on the EUROPOP2010 scenario, please see: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Population_projections
([3]) COM(2012) 139 final; COM(2012) 250 final.
([4]) See Council conclusions of 29 May 2012 on the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility, available at: http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/12/st09/st09417.en12.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007062/12
to the Commission
Andrew Henry William Brons (NI)
(13 July 2012)

Subject: Expansion of the EU

Paragraph 105 of the 18-month programme of the Council of 17 June 2011 ([1]), prepared by the future Polish, Danish and Cypriot Presidencies, refers to 'financing customs cooperation between the European Commission, Member States, candidate countries and potential candidate countries'.

Will the Commission kindly list the candidate countries and potential candidate countries it envisages might join the EU within the next 20 years should they fulfil the relevant requirements?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(4 September 2012)

The enlargement process currently encompasses Iceland, Turkey and the western Balkans. Croatia has the status of an acceding country and will join the European Union on 1 July 2013, following ratification of its Accession Treaty by all Member States. Accession negotiations with Turkey, Iceland and Montenegro are ongoing. The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Serbia have the status of candidate countries, but accession negotiations have not yet been opened. Albania, which already applied for EU membership, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Kosovo ([2]) are potential candidates.

There are no timelines for candidate countries or potential candidates to join the EU. Every country aspiring accession according to Article 49 TEU has to meet the conditions laid down by the European Council, in particular the criteria defined in Copenhagen in 1993. As set out in the conclusions of the European Council meeting of June 2006, also the EU's capacity to integrate new members needs to be taken into account.

([1]) Council document 11447/11.
([2]) 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.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007063/12
to the Council
Andrew Henry William Brons (NI)
(13 July 2012)

Subject: Muslim ritual slaughter

Paragraph 186 of the 18-month programme of the Council prepared by the future Polish, Danish and Cypriot Presidencies ([1]) states that 'Shark finning remains a sensitive issue and the revision to the existing Regulation will be examined'.

Clearly, there is a well-understood issue here, relating to animal cruelty.

Will the Council seek action to end the barbaric practice of halal ritual slaughter, which is spreading throughout Europe and which involves the appalling suffering of animals for religious reasons?

Reply
(8 October 2012)

The Council refers the Honourable Member to Recital 18 of Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 of 24 September 2009 on the protection of animals at the time of killing ([2]), which states as follows:

'Derogation from stunning in case of religious slaughter taking place in slaughterhouses was granted by Directive 93/119/EC. Since Community provisions applicable to religious slaughter have been transposed differently depending on national contexts and considering that national rules take into account dimensions that go beyond the purpose of this regulation, it is important that derogation from stunning animals prior to slaughter should be maintained, leaving, however, a certain level of subsidiarity to each Member State. As a consequence, this regulation respects the freedom of religion and the right to manifest religion or belief in worship, teaching, practice and observance, as enshrined in Article 10 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.'

Article 4(4) of the regulation provides that in the case of animals subject to particular methods of slaughter prescribed by religious rites, the requirements on stunning shall not apply provided that the slaughter takes place in a slaughterhouse. Article 26 contains provisions governing the maintenance or introduction of stricter rules by Member States at national level.

([1]) Council document 11447/11.
([2]) OJ L 303, 18.11.2009. This regulation will apply from 1 January 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007064/12
to the Commission
Andrew Henry William Brons (NI)
(13 July 2012)

Subject: Muslim ritual slaughter

Paragraph 186 of the 18-month programme of the Council prepared by the future Polish, Danish and Cypriot Presidencies ([1]) states that 'Shark finning remains a sensitive issue and the revision to the existing Regulation will be examined'.

Clearly, there is a well-understood issue here, relating to animal cruelty.

Will the Commission seek action to end the barbaric practice of halal ritual slaughter, which is spreading throughout Europe and which involves the appalling suffering of animals for religious reasons?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(21 August 2012)

The Commission would like to refer to its reply to E-003775/2012 ([2]) on the same issue.

([1]) Council document 11447/11.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007065/12
a la Comisión
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE), Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE), Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE) y Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE)
(13 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Insuficiencia de personal para el nuevo servicio dedicado al asilo en Grecia debido a la congelación de la contratación en el sector público

En la nota de la Comisión al Consejo de marzo de 2012 relativa a la aplicación del Plan de acción nacional de Grecia en materia de asilo y migración y de asuntos relacionados con las fronteras y el retorno ([1]) se hace referencia a un problema persistente: una falta de personal en el nuevo servicio dedicado al asilo que impide su adecuado funcionamiento, de forma que se acumulan las solicitudes de asilo y se entorpece el progreso general en la aplicación del Plan de acción griego.

La Comisión recomienda que se intensifiquen los esfuerzos para hacer frente a los retos relacionados con la falta de personal a los que todavía se enfrentan los servicios administrativos pertinentes, que al parecer necesitan unos 700 empleados, si bien solo se han cubierto 50 vacantes. Asimismo, la congelación de la contratación en el sector público impide que Grecia cubra esos puestos, ya que las normas de saneamiento fiscal impuestas por la UE no permiten a las autoridades griegas contratar a nuevo personal.

En vista de lo anterior, se pregunta a la Comisión lo siguiente:

— En opinión de la Comisión, ¿cuál es el impacto de las medidas de austeridad sobre Plan de acción de Grecia en materia de asilo y sobre las dificultades a las que se enfrentan las autoridades griegas para su aplicación?

— ¿Cómo prevé la Comisión superar la contradicción arriba mencionada?

— ¿Qué soluciones creativas puede recomendar la Comisión?

Respuesta de la Sra. Malmström en nombre de la Comisión
(6 de septiembre de 2012)

La Comisión entiende los esfuerzos realizados por Grecia para cumplir los requisitos de las necesarias medidas de consolidación fiscal. En el contexto del programa, Grecia se ha comprometido a una exhaustiva reforma de su administración pública, incluida una evaluación general de las necesidades de personal con el fin de optimizar la utilización de los recursos humanos existentes, por ejemplo por medio de la movilidad.

Puesto que la mayoría de los perfiles requeridos se encuentran suficientemente dentro de la administración pública, el servicio dedicado al asilo puede contratar a los candidatos adecuados mediante transferencias o destinos procedentes de otros organismos públicos. Cuando se necesiten perfiles específicos, se permiten nuevas contrataciones dentro de unos límites. El Ministerio de la Reforma Administrativa, que está al frente de la reforma, y el servicio dedicado al asilo trabajan conjuntamente, apoyados por la Comisión Europea, para facilitar transferencias, cambios de destino y, cuando sea necesario, nuevas contrataciones.

La Comisión Europea recomienda que el servicio dedicado al asilo aproveche al máximo las posibilidades que brinda la Ley griega 3907/2011 para subcontratar tareas que no impliquen la toma de decisiones. La Comisión está dispuesta a estudiar posibilidades de asistencia financiera con este fin.

([1]) http://aditus.org.mt/aditus/Documents/NotetotheCouncilGreekActionPlan(060612).pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007065/12
an die Kommission
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE), Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE), Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE) und Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE)
(13. Juli 2012)

Betrifft: Personalmangel im neuen griechischen Asyldienst aufgrund des Einstellungsstopps im öffentlichen Sektor

In dem Vermerk der Kommission an den Rat von März 2012 über die Umsetzung des griechischen Aktionsplans zu Fragen der Migration, des Asyls, der Grenzen und der Rückführung ([1]) wird auf ein anhaltendes Problem hingewiesen, das im Personalmangel des neuen Asyldienstes besteht, der das reibungslose Funktionieren dieses Dienstes unmöglich macht, wodurch der Rückstau anhängiger Asylanträge zunimmt und der allgemeine Fortschritt bei der Umsetzung des griechischen Aktionsplans erschwert wird.

Die Kommission empfiehlt, die Bemühungen zu intensivieren, um der nach wie vor angespannten Personalsituation in den betreffenden Verwaltungsdienststellen abzuhelfen, die Angaben zufolge rund 700 Mitarbeiter benötigen, bislang jedoch nur 50 Stellen besetzen konnten. Gleichzeitig kann Griechenland die Stellen aufgrund eines Einstellungsstopps im öffentlichen Dienst nicht besetzen, da die EU-Vorgaben für die Haushaltskonsolidierung den griechischen Behörden die Einstellung neuer Kräfte nicht erlauben.

Vor diesem Hintergrund wird die Kommission gebeten, folgende Fragen zu beantworten:

— Inwiefern wirken sich die Sparmaßnahmen nach ihrer Ansicht auf den asylpolitischen Aktionsplan Griechenlands und die Schwierigkeiten der griechischen Behörden bei der Umsetzung dieses Plans aus?

— Wie lässt sich der oben dargestellte Widerspruch nach Auffassung der Kommission lösen?

— Welche kreativen Lösungen schlägt die Kommission vor?

Antwort von Frau Malmström im Namen der Kommission
(6. September 2012)

Die Kommission erkennt die Anstrengungen Griechenlands an, um den Vorgaben der gebotenen finanzpolitischen Konsolidierungsmaßnahmen zu entsprechen. Im Rahmen des Programms hat sich Griechenland zu einer durchgreifenden Reform der öffentlichen Verwaltung verpflichtet, die auch eine umfassende Bewertung des Personalbedarfs einbezieht, um die vorhandenen Humanressourcen, beispielsweise durch Mobilität, optimal einzusetzen.

Da die benötigten Kompetenzen in der öffentlichen Verwaltung in großer Zahl verfügbar sind, können geeignete Kandidaten für den Asyldienst im Wege der Umsetzung und Abstellung von anderen Behörden gefunden werden. Bei besonderen Anforderungsprofilen können in begrenztem Maße Neueinstellungen vorgenommen werden. Das Ministerium für Verwaltungsreform, das bei den Reformbemühungen federführend agiert, und der Asyldienst arbeiten mit Unterstützung der Europäischen Kommission zusammen, um Umsetzungen, Abstellungen und erforderlichenfalls Neueinstellungen zu erleichtern.

Die Europäische Kommission empfiehlt dem Asyldienst, die durch das griechische Gesetz Nr. 3907/2011 gebotenen Möglichkeiten optimal zu nutzen und Aufgaben ohne Entscheidungsbefugnis auszulagern. Sie ist bereit zu prüfen, ob hierfür eine finanzielle Unterstützung gewährt werden kann.

([1]) http://aditus.org.mt/aditus/Documents/NotetotheCouncilGreekActionPlan(060612).pdf

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007065/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE), Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE), Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE) και Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE)
(13 Ιουλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Ανεπαρκής στελέχωση της νέας ελληνικής υπηρεσίας ασύλου λόγω παγώματος των προσλήψεων στο δημόσιο τομέα

Η ανακοίνωση της Επιτροπής προς το Συμβούλιο, του Μαρτίου του 2012, με τίτλο «Εφαρμογή του ελληνικού σχεδίου δράσης για τη μετανάστευση και το άσυλο, καθώς και για ζητήματα συνόρων και επαναπροώθησης» ([1]) αναδεικνύει το επίμονο πρόβλημα ανεπαρκούς στελέχωσης της νέας υπηρεσίας ασύλου, η οποία καθιστά αδύνατη την επαρκή λειτουργία της υπηρεσίας αυτής, οδηγώντας με αυτόν τον τρόπο στην αύξηση του όγκου των εκκρεμών αιτήσεων ασύλου και δυσχεραίνοντας τη γενική πρόοδο της εφαρμογής του ελληνικού σχεδίου δράσης.

Η Επιτροπή συνιστά την ένταση των προσπαθειών για την αντιμετώπιση των προκλήσεων στελέχωσης που εξακολουθούν να επηρεάζουν τις σχετικές διοικητικές υπηρεσίες, οι οποίες όπως αναφέρεται χρειάζονται περίπου 700 υπαλλήλους, εκ των οποίων έχουν προσληφθεί μόλις 50. Παράλληλα, λόγω του παγώματος προσλήψεων στον δημόσιο τομέα, η Ελλάδα δεν είναι σε θέση να καλύψει τις θέσεις, καθώς οι κανόνες δημοσιονομικής εξυγίανσης που έχουν επιβληθεί από την ΕΕ δεν επιτρέπουν στις ελληνικές αρχές να προσλάβουν νέο προσωπικό.

Κατά συνέπεια, ζητείται από την Επιτροπή να απαντήσει στις παρακάτω ερωτήσεις:

— σε ποιο βαθμό, κατά τη γνώμη της, τα μέτρα λιτότητας επηρεάζουν το ελληνικό πρόγραμμα δράσης για το άσυλο και σχετίζονται με τις δυσκολίες που αντιμετωπίζουν οι ελληνικές αρχές κατά την εφαρμογή του;

— πώς θεωρεί η Επιτροπή ότι μπορεί να επιλυθεί η παραπάνω αντίφαση;

— ποιες δημιουργικές λύσεις μπορεί να προτείνει η Επιτροπή;

Απάντηση της κας Malmström εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(6 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή κατανοεί τις προσπάθειες που καταβάλλει η Ελλάδα προκειμένου να συμμορφωθεί με τις απαιτήσεις των αναγκαίων μέτρων δημοσιονομικής εξυγίανσης. Στο πλαίσιο του προγράμματος, η Ελλάδα δεσμεύτηκε να προβεί σε ριζική μεταρρύθμιση της δημόσιας διοίκησης, η οποία προϋποθέτει τη γενική αξιολόγηση των αναγκών της σε προσωπικό, με στόχο τη βελτιστοποίηση της χρησιμοποίησης των υφιστάμενων ανθρώπινων πόρων, λόγου χάρη με τη θέσπιση μέτρων κινητικότητας.

Δεδομένου ότι τα ζητούμενα επαγγελματικά προσόντα συναντώνται ευρέως στη δημόσια διοίκηση, η Υπηρεσία Ασύλου μπορεί να προσλάβει τους κατάλληλους υποψηφίους μέσω μεταθέσεων και αποσπάσεων από άλλους φορείς του δημοσίου. Στις περιπτώσεις που απαιτούνται ειδικά προσόντα, επιτρέπονται νέες προσλήψεις εντός καθορισμένων ορίων. Το Υπουργείο Διοικητικής Μεταρρύθμισης, το οποίο ηγείται των μεταρρυθμίσεων, εργάζεται μαζί με την Υπηρεσία Ασύλου, με την υποστήριξη της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής, ώστε να διευκολύνουν τις μεταθέσεις και αποσπάσεις προσωπικού και, εφόσον χρειάζεται, την πρόσληψη νέων υπαλλήλων.

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή συνιστά στην Υπηρεσία Ασύλου να αξιοποιήσει όσο μπορεί καλύτερα τις δυνατότητες που παρέχει ο ελληνικός νόμος 3907/2011 και να προβεί σε εξωτερική ανάθεση των καθηκόντων που δεν συνεπάγονται λήψη αποφάσεων. Η Επιτροπή είναι έτοιμη να διερευνήσει τις δυνατότητες οικονομικής βοήθειας για τον σκοπό αυτό.

([1]) http://aditus.org.mt/aditus/Documents/NotetotheCouncilGreekActionPlan(060612).pdf

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007065/12
à la Commission
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE), Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE), Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE) et Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE)
(13 juillet 2012)

Objet: Déficit en personnel dans les nouveaux services d'asile grecs en raison du gel des embauches dans le secteur public

Dans sa note de mars 2012 relative à la mise en œuvre du plan d'action grec en matière de migration, d'asile, de frontières et de retour ([1]) adressée au Conseil, la Commission relève un problème récurrent, à savoir le manque d'effectifs au sein des nouveaux services d'asile qui empêche le bon fonctionnement de ces derniers. Cette situation accroit le nombre de demandes d'asile en suspens et entrave l'application du plan d'action grec.

La Commission recommande de tout mettre en œuvre pour répondre aux problèmes de manque de personnel rencontrés par les services administratifs concernés, qui n'ont engagé que 50 personnes pour les quelque 700 postes que ces services auraient à pourvoir. Par ailleurs, le gel des embauches dans le secteur public empêche la Grèce de répondre à ces besoins, étant donné que l'assainissement budgétaire imposé par l'Union européenne ne permet pas aux autorités grecques d'engager du personnel nouveau.

Compte tenu de ce qui précède, la Commission pourrait-elle répondre aux questions suivantes:

— Selon la Commission, quel est l'impact des mesures d'austérité sur le plan d'action grec en matière d'asile et sur les difficultés rencontrées par les autorités grecques dans la mise en œuvre de ce plan?

— Comment la Commission envisage-t-elle de résoudre la contradiction exposée ci-dessus?

— Quelles solutions innovantes la Commission peut-elle mettre en avant?

Réponse donnée par Mme Malmström au nom de la Commission
(6 septembre 2012)

La Commission est bien consciente des efforts fournis par la Grèce pour satisfaire aux exigences des mesures d'assainissement budgétaire nécessaires. Dans le cadre de ce programme, la Grèce s'est engagée à procéder à une réforme en profondeur de son administration publique, qui passe notamment par une évaluation générale de ses besoins en personnel, de façon à optimaliser l'utilisation des ressources humaines existantes, notamment grâce à la mobilité.

La plupart des profils requis étant largement disponibles au sein de l'administration publique, le service d'asile peut recruter des candidats appropriés en faisant appel au personnel d'autres organismes publics, par des transferts et des détachements. Lorsque des profils spécifiques sont requis, de nouveaux recrutements sont autorisés dans certaines limites. À la tête des efforts de réforme, le ministère de la réforme administrative collabore avec le service d'asile, avec le soutien de la Commission européenne, pour faciliter les transferts, les détachements de personnel et, au besoin, le recrutement de nouveaux membres du personnel.

La Commission européenne recommande que le service d'asile exploite au mieux les possibilités offertes par la loi grecque 3907/2011 aux fins de l'externalisation de tâches ne relevant pas de la prise de décision. La Commission est prête à envisager la possibilité d'une aide financière à cet effet.

([1]) http://aditus.org.mt/aditus/Documents/NotetotheCouncilGreekActionPlan(060612).pdf

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007065/12
à Comissão
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE), Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE), Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE) e Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE)
(13 de julho de 2012)

Assunto: Carências ao nível dos recursos humanos dos novos serviços gregos de asilo devido ao congelamento das contratações no setor público

A nota da Comissão ao Conselho, de março de 2012, intitulada «Implementation of the Greek Action Plan on Migration and Asylum, and on Borders and Return issues» ([1]) salienta o problema persistente das carências ao nível dos recursos humanos dos novos serviços de asilo, que impossibilitam o funcionamento adequado destes serviços, provocando, por conseguinte, uma acumulação do número de pedidos de asilo pendentes e dificultando o progresso global da execução do plano de ação grego.

A Comissão recomenda um aumento dos esforços para dar resposta aos desafios enfrentados pelos serviços administrativos pertinentes, onde apenas 50 vagas foram preenchidas, quando são considerados necessários 700 funcionários. Por outro lado, o congelamento das contratações no setor público não permite que a Grécia preencha as vagas, uma vez que as regras de consolidação orçamental impostas pela UE impedem as autoridades gregas de contratar novo pessoal.

Considerando os aspetos anteriores, pede-se à Comissão que responda às seguintes questões:

— Na opinião da Comissão, até que ponto têm as medidas de austeridade impacto no plano de ação grego sobre o asilo e nas dificuldades de execução enfrentadas pelas autoridades gregas?

— De que forma tenciona a Comissão resolver a contradição acima referida?

— Que soluções inovadoras recomenda a Comissão?

Resposta dada por Cecilia Malmström em nome da Comissão
(6 de setembro de 2012)

A Comissão reconhece os esforços envidados pela Grécia para cumprir os requisitos das medidas de consolidação orçamental necessárias. No contexto do programa, a Grécia comprometeu-se a realizar uma reforma profunda da sua administração pública, incluindo uma avaliação global das necessidades de pessoal com vista a otimizar a utilização dos recursos humanos existentes, por exemplo, através da mobilidade.

Uma vez que, na sua maioria, os perfis exigidos estão, em geral, disponíveis no âmbito da administração pública, o Serviço de Asilo pode contratar candidatos adequados através de transferências e destacamentos de outros organismos públicos. Nos casos em que são necessários perfis específicos são permitidos novos recrutamentos dentro dos limites autorizados. O Ministério da Reforma Administrativa, que lidera o processo de reforma, e o Serviço de Asilo estão a trabalhar em conjunto, apoiados pela Comissão Europeia, para facilitar as transferências e destacamentos e, quando necessário, efetuar novos recrutamentos.

A Comissão Europeia recomenda que o Serviço de Asilo maximize as possibilidades oferecidas pela Lei grega 3907/2011 para externalizar as tarefas que não sejam de caráter decisório. A Comissão está disposta a explorar a possibilidade de consagrar assistência financeira para o efeito.

([1]) (http://aditus.org.mt/aditus/Documents/NotetotheCouncilGreekActionPlan(060612).pdf).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007065/12
to the Commission
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE), Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE), Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE) and Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE)
(13 July 2012)

Subject: Staffing deficiencies in new Greek asylum service owing to freeze on public-sector hiring

The Commission's March 2012 note to the Council entitled 'Implementation of the Greek Action Plan on Migration and Asylum, and on Borders and Return issues' ([1]) raises the persistent problem of staffing deficiencies in the new asylum service, which are making it impossible for this service to function adequately, thus increasing the backlog of pending asylum applications and rendering general progress on the implementation of the Greek Action Plan difficult.

The Commission recommends that efforts be intensified in order to address the staffing challenges still facing the relevant administrative services, which reportedly need some 700 staff, of which only 50 positions have been covered. At the same time, a hiring freeze in the public sector is preventing Greece from filling the posts, as EU-imposed fiscal consolidation rules prevent the Greek authorities from hiring new talent.

In view of the above, the Commission is kindly asked to answer the following questions:

— to what extent, in its opinion, are the austerity measures having an impact on the Greek asylum action plan and the Greek authorities' difficulties in implementing it?

— how does the Commission envisage overcoming the above contradiction?

— what creative solutions can the Commission recommend?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(6 September 2012)

The Commission understands the efforts made by Greece to comply with the requirements of the necessary fiscal consolidation measures. In the context of the programme, Greece has committed to a thorough reform of its public administration, including a general evaluation of staff needs with a view to to optimise the use of existing human resources, such as through mobility.

Since most of the required profiles are broadly available within the public administration, the Asylum Service can hire appropriate candidates through transfers and secondments from other public bodies. Where specific profiles are necessary, new recruitment is allowed within limits. The Ministry of Administrative Reform, which is leading the reform effort, and the Asylum Service are working together, supported by the European Commission, to facilitate transfers, secondments and where needed, new recruitment.

The European Commission recommends that the Asylum Service makes the best use of possibilities provided by the Greek law 3907/2011 to outsource non-decision making tasks. It is ready to explore possibilities for financial assistance to this end.

([1]) http://aditus.org.mt/aditus/Documents/NotetotheCouncilGreekActionPlan(060612).pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007066/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Edward McMillan-Scott (ALDE)
(13 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — EU funding of illegal Israeli settlements

What assessment has the EEAS made of the level of funding allocated through EU programmes in the last five years to businesses and other entities based in Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territories?

Is it legal under EU procurement guidelines for a Member State to specify in the tender document that any products supplied as part of the contract must exclude produce from illegal Israeli settlements?

Is it legal under EU procurement guidelines for a Member State to specify in the tender document that companies operating in Israeli settlements can be excluded from contracts?

Question for written answer E-007165/12
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: EU funding of Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territories

What assessment has the Commission made of the level of funding allocated through EU programmes in the last five years to businesses and other entities based in Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territories?

Question for written answer E-007166/12
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: EU procurement and the Occupied Territories

In reply to Written Question E-007464/2011 on the framework programme of research activities carried out in Israeli settlements established in occupied territory, the Commission stated that it 'is not aware of any provision of EC law that obliges it not to fund activities under an FP7 project carried out in Israeli settlements that have been established in occupied territories'.

However, in an opinion submitted by James Crawford, Professor of International Law at Cambridge University (UK), there do not appear to be any EC laws which could be breached by a Member State taking the decision to ban the import of settlement produce on public policy grounds. The opinion asserts that by executing such a ban on trade with settlements, the EU would not be in breach of its World Trade Organisation obligations because, as a matter of international law, the occupied West Bank and Gaza cannot be considered to be Israel's territory.

1. Is the Commission aware of this legal opinion and does it intend to alter any EU policies as a result?

2. Is it legal under EU procurement guidelines for a Member State to specify in the tender document that any products supplied as part of the contract must exclude produce from illegal Israeli settlements?

3. Is it legal under EU procurement guidelines for a Member State to specify in the tender document that companies operating in Israeli settlements can be excluded from contracts?

Question for written answer E-007210/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Jill Evans (Verts/ALE) and Alyn Smith (Verts/ALE)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — EU funding to Israeli settlements

1. What assessment has the Vice-President/High Representative made of the level of funding allocated through EU programmes in the last five years to businesses and other entities based in Israeli settlements in the occupied Palestinian territories?

2. Is it legal under EU procurement guidelines for a Member State to specify in the tender document that any products supplied as part of the contract must exclude produce from illegal Israeli settlements?

3. Is it legal under EU procurement guidelines for a Member State to specify in the tender document that companies operating in Israeli settlements can be excluded from contracts?

Question for written answer E-007239/12
to the Commission
Chris Davies (ALDE)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: EU funding for Israeli businesses in the occupied Palestinian territories

What assessment has the Commission made of the level of funding paid out through EU programmes over the last five years to Israeli businesses and other entities located in Israeli settlements in the occupied Palestinian territories?

Question for written answer E-007240/12
to the Commission
Chris Davies (ALDE)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: EU guidelines on goods from the occupied Palestinian territories

UK Foreign Office Minister Alistair Burt told the British House of Commons on 11 June 2012 that ongoing work at EU level includes the preparation of 'measures to ensure that settlement produce does not enter the EU duty-free, under the EU-Israel Association Agreement, and steps to ensure that EU-wide guidelines are issued to make sure that settlement products are not incorrectly labelled as Israeli produce, in violation of EU consumer protection regulations'.

Can the Commission confirm the accuracy of this statement?

If so, when did the Commission commence work on identifying the necessary measures and guidelines, and when does it intend to come forward with specific proposals relating to these two matters?

Question for written answer E-007241/12
to the Commission
Chris Davies (ALDE)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: EU procurement rules and the occupied Palestinian territories

Are there any restrictions under EC law that would prevent a Member State seeking to purchase goods or services from specifying that no contract will be awarded to an organisation in any way associated, directly or indirectly, with business activities taking place within illegal Israel settlements on occupied Palestinian territory?

Question for written answer E-007242/12
to the Commission
Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: EU funding for illegal Israeli settlements

1. What assessment has the Commission made of the level of funding allocated through EU programmes in the last five years to businesses and other entities based in Israeli settlements in the occupied Palestinian territories?

2. Is it legal under EU procurement guidelines for a Member State to specify in the tender document that any products supplied as part of the contract must exclude produce from illegal Israeli settlements?

3. Is it legal under EU procurement guidelines for a Member State to specify in the tender document that companies operating in Israeli settlements can be excluded from contracts?

Question for written answer E-007362/12
to the Commission
Linda McAvan (S&D)
(23 July 2012)

Subject: EU funding for Israeli companies in the occupied Palestinian territories and goods produced in Israeli settlements

On behalf of a constituent, I would like to raise the following questions with regard to EU funding for companies based in the occupied Palestinian territories and goods produced in Israeli settlements entering the EU market.

1. What assessment has the Commission made of the level of funding allocated through EU programmes in the last five years to businesses and other entities based in Israeli settlements in the occupied Palestinian territories?

2. Is it legal under EU procurement guidelines for a Member State to specify in the tender document that any products supplied as part of the contract must exclude produce from illegal Israeli settlements?

3. Is it legal under EU procurement guidelines for a Member State to specify in the tender document that companies operating in Israeli settlements can be excluded from contracts?

Question for written answer E-007422/12
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(24 July 2012)

Subject: Funding for entities in Israeli settlements through EU programmes

What assessment has the Commission made of the level of funding provided through EU programmes in the last five years to businesses and other entities based in Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territories?

Joint answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(26 September 2012)

The Council for Foreign Affairs of the European Union confirmed in its conclusions of 14 May 2011 the Union's view that Israeli settlements in the occupied territories are illegal and cannot be regarded as a part of the territory of Israel. Therefore, goods produced in these settlements by Israeli companies cannot be regarded as goods originating in Israel. The market access commitments undertaken by the EU vis-à-vis Israel under the Agreement on Government Procurement do not apply to such goods.

There is currently no embargo or sanctions regime in force that would oblige EU procuring entities to reject bids involving goods and services originating from Israeli settlements in the occupied Palestinian territory.

There is generally no provision under the EU procurement directives obliging procuring entities to reject bids consisting of goods or services to which EU market access commitments do not apply. However, Directive 2004/17/EC (Utilities Directive) explicitly allows procuring entities to reject a bid composed of more than 50% of foreign goods that are not covered by the EU's international commitments.

Commission proposals on the reform of the Public Procurement Directive ([1]) are currently under discussion at Council and the European Parliament. The Commission is not in a position to prejudge the outcome of this legislative procedure.

Furthermore, the abovementioned Council conclusions clearly indicate that the EU will not recognise any changes to the pre-1967 borders including with regard to Jerusalem. Consequently, all activities implemented within EU-funded programmes should exclusively take place within those recognised borders.

([1]) The proposals on the reform of the Public Procurement Directives can be found at http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/publicprocurement/modernising_rules/reform_proposals_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007067/12
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(13 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Istruzione e disabilità

Una recente relazione pubblicata a cura della Commissione europea sottolinea come nonostante l'impegno degli Stati membri a promuovere un'istruzione inclusiva, i bambini con bisogni educativi specifici e gli adulti disabili si trovano ancora in situazione svantaggiata.

Nella relazione si evidenzia, tra l'altro, che mancano dati comparativi transeuropei sul numero di studenti disabili nell'istruzione superiore o sugli handicap e i risultati di coloro che si trovano nell'istruzione superiore, nonché dati aggiornati e affidabili sul numero di disabili occupati nei diversi Stati membri dell'UE.

Inoltre, le statistiche che riguardano la Bulgaria e l'Italia si riferiscono al 2008.

Nell'ultimo trimestre 2012 sarà pubblicato un documento di lavoro sulla parità dell'istruzione nella formazione e un capitolo sarà dedicato all'istruzione inclusiva.

Può la Commissione far sapere se procederà alla raccolta e all'analisi dei dati ad oggi mancanti?

Risposta di Androulla Vassiliou a nome della Commissione
(27 agosto 2012)

La Commissione è perfettamente consapevole degli svantaggi che subiscono nel settore dell'istruzione i ragazzi con bisogni educativi specifici e gli adulti disabili in molti Stati membri. La Commissione sostiene con fermezza l'istruzione inclusiva nell'ambito delle sue competenze, le quali però nel campo dell'istruzione sono limitate. Per tale ragione spetta agli Stati membri agire a favore dell'istruzione inclusiva.

Una recente relazione pubblicata a cura della NESSE ([1]) ed intitolata «*Education and Disability/Special Needs: Policies and Practices in Education, Training and Employment to Students with Disabilities and Special Educational Needs in the EU*» (maggio 2012), presenta utili informazioni ed esempi di buone pratiche a favore di un'istruzione inclusiva negli Stati membri. La relativa scarsità di dati comparativi europei sul numero di studenti disabili nell'istruzione superiore, sui loro risultati o sul tipo di handicap è un problema cui si deve ancora porre rimedio. Si sono tuttavia registrati notevoli miglioramenti in molti Stati membri grazie al lavoro dell'Agenzia europea per lo sviluppo dell'istruzione per studenti disabili (Odense, Danimarca) e di alcune ONG. In particolare, se è vero che le statistiche per la Bulgaria, l'Italia e alcuni altri Stati membri sono ancora carenti, la Commissione aiuta però tali Stati membri a perseguire i loro obiettivi in questo campo. L'esperienza e gli orientamenti in materia di bisogni specifici dell'*Agenzia europea per lo sviluppo dell'istruzione per studenti disabili* sono in questo contesto estremamente preziosi. La Commissione metterà a disposizione del pubblico tutte le informazioni pertinenti non appena possibile.

([1]) Rete di esperti nelle scienze sociali dell'istruzione e della formazione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007067/12
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(13 July 2012)

Subject: Education and disability

A recent report published by the Commission points out that despite the efforts of Member States to promote inclusive education, children with special education needs and adults with disabilities are still at a disadvantage.

The report highlights, *inter alia*, that there is a lack of comparative trans-European data on the number of disabled students in higher education or on the types of disabilities and the results of those in higher education, not to mention reliable, updated information on the number of disabled people employed in individual EU Member States.

Moreover, the statistics for Bulgaria and Italy refer to 2008.

In the last quarter of 2012 a working paper will be published on equality in education and training and a section will be devoted to inclusive education.

Can the Commission say whether it will begin collecting and analysing the data that is missing to date?

Answer given by Mrs Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(27 August 2012)

The Commission is well aware of the disadvantages suffered in the field of education by children with special education needs and adults with disabilities in many Member States. While the Commission strongly supports inclusive education within its remit, the Commission's limited competences in the field of education mean that it is up to the Member States to act in order to achieve a more inclusive education.

A recently released NESSE ([1]) report, 'Education and Disability/Special Needs: Policies and Practices in Education, Training and Employment to Students with Disabilities and Special Educational Needs in the EU' (May 2012), presents useful information and examples of good practices in effective inclusive education practices for Member States. The relative scarcity of comparative cross-European data on the number and educational outcomes of disabled students in higher education or on the types of disabilities remains a challenge. However, there have been substantial improvements in many Member States, thanks to the work of the European Special Needs Agency (Odense, Denmark) and a number of NGOs. In particular, while statistics for Bulgaria, Italy and some other Member States are still lacking the Commission is helping these Member States reach their objectives in this field. The expertise and guidance of the European Special Needs Agency is extremely valuable in this respect. The Commission will make all information available to the general public, as soon as possible.

([1]) Network of Experts in Social Sciences of Education and Training.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007068/12
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(16 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: VP/HR — Persecución ideológica y política del Gobierno golpista de Paraguay contra los trabajadores públicos: despidos en la televisión pública

El pasado 24 de junio, en una nueva maniobra antidemocrática que sigue la estela del golpe de Estado en Honduras, de la intentona golpista en Ecuador o de los movimientos desestabilizadores en Bolivia, Fernando Lugo, Presidente electo de la República de Paraguay, sufrió un golpe constitucional que supuso su derrocamiento y la instauración de un nuevo gobierno ilegítimo con Federico Franco a la cabeza.

Transcurridas varias semanas, y tal y como denuncian numerosos sindicatos, asociaciones y los propios implicados, el Gobierno golpista de facto ha iniciado una campaña de persecución ideológica y política contra los trabajadores públicos en varias instituciones.

Así, a pesar de las declaraciones del presidente golpista y del ministro de facto de comunicación, Martín Sannemann, asegurando que respetarían los acuerdos firmados y los compromisos asumidos hasta su ilegítima llegada al poder, han sido despedidos por motivaciones de índole política e ideológica, sin sumario administrativo ni notificación alguna por ausencias o mal desempleo de sus funciones, decenas de trabajadores públicos.

Entre ellos se encuentran cerca de una veintena de periodistas de la Televisión Pública paraguaya: la coordinadora del Área de Formación y Capacitación de la Dirección General de Comunicación para el Desarrollo, Fátima Allende, Angélica Agüero, del Área de Comunicación de la Presidencia, Daniela Candia, responsable del programa Mediterráneo, miembros de la Secretaría de Información y Comunicación como Fátima Rodríguez y periodistas como Gilda Espínola, Lourdes Fernández, Carlos Foncklara, Roque González, Carlos Troya o Rafael Urzúa.

Considerando que la Unión Europea afirma defender y promover los derechos humanos y la libertad de expresión en sus relaciones exteriores,

¿Está informada la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante sobre la persecución política e ideológica que ha iniciado el gobierno golpista de Paraguay?

¿Piensa la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante mostrar públicamente su preocupación por este ataque contra los derechos humanos y la libertad de expresión?

Respuesta de la Alta Representante/Vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(7 de septiembre de 2012)

Los Derechos Humanos, incluida la libertad de expresión, constituyen un pilar básico de la política exterior de la UE y el SEAE está siguiendo de cerca la situación de los derechos humanos en Paraguay. La Alta Representante/Vicepresidenta ha seguido atentamente el derrocamiento de Fernando Lugo y la toma de posesión de Federico Franco. Unas horas después de los acontecimientos, la Sra. Ashton expresó su preocupación y recalcó la importancia de respetar la voluntad del pueblo paraguayo.

Algunos Jefes de Misión de la Unión Europea han establecido consultas en Asunción con interlocutores diversos en Paraguay, como a políticos de todo signo y con organizaciones de la sociedad civil, con el fin de escuchar sus opiniones y preocupaciones acerca de los sucesos políticos y la situación actual del país.

La Delegación de la UE está supervisando los cambios producidos en el personal del sector público y de los medios de comunicación, así como la forma e impacto de dichos cambios. Todo ello se tendrá en cuenta a la hora de preparar la estrategia de la UE para los derechos humanos en Paraguay, actualmente en fase de preparación. La Alta Representante/Vicepresidenta también espera con interés la lectura del informe sobre la reciente visita de seis Diputados del Parlamento Europeo a Paraguay y su análisis de la situación de los derechos humanos sobre el terreno.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007068/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Ideological and political persecution of public sector workers by the illegitimate Paraguayan government: dismissals at the public television network

The elected President of the Republic of Paraguay, Fernando Lugo, was overthrown in a constitutional coup on 24 June 2012, in an antidemocratic move in the wake of the coup d'état in Honduras, attempted coup in Ecuador and the protests that have undermined public order in Bolivia. A new illegitimate government, under Federico Franco, was subsequently established.

A number of weeks have now passed and many trade unions, associations and the individuals affected are reporting that the de facto government formed after the coup has begun a campaign of ideological and political persecution against public sector workers in various institutions.

Both the president of the coup government and the de facto minister of communication, Martín Sannemann, said that they would respect the agreements signed and commitments made prior to their illegitimate arrival in power. However, dozens of public sector workers have been dismissed on political and ideological grounds. None of the dismissals were the result of proper disciplinary action and nobody was informed that they had lost their jobs because of absences from work or unsatisfactory performance of their duties.

Almost 20 of those dismissed were journalists working for the Paraguayan Televisión Pública network, and included Fátima Allende, coordinator of the training section of the Department of Communication for Development, Angélica Agüero, from the Presidency Communication Section, Daniela Candia, head of the Mediterranean programme, members of the Secretariat for Information and Communication, such as Fátima Rodríguez, and journalists such as Gilda Espínola, Lourdes Fernández, Carlos Foncklara, Roque González, Carlos Troya and Rafael Urzúa.

The EU claims to defend and promote human rights and freedom of expression in its external relations.

In view of this, is the Vice-President/High Representative aware that the Paraguayan government set up following the coup has begun a campaign of political and ideological persecution?

Does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to express publicly her concern at this attack on human rights and freedom of expression?

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

Human Rights, including freedom of expression, are a cornerstone of EU foreign policy and the EEAS is closely following the human rights situation in Paraguay. The HR/VP has attentively followed the impeachment of Fernando Lugo and the inauguration of Federico Franco. A few hours after the events, she expressed her concern and underlined the importance of respecting the democratic will of the Paraguayan people.

EU Heads of Mission in Asuncion have undertaken consultations with a wide range of stakeholders in Paraguay, including politicians from all sides of the spectrum and civil society organisations, to listen to their opinions and concerns about the political events and the current situation in the country.

The EU Delegation monitors the changes of staff in public sector and media institutions and the pattern and impact of these changes. This will be taken into consideration in the drafting of the EU Human Rights strategy for Paraguay currently under preparation. The HR/VP is also looking forward to reading the report of the recent visit of 6 MEPs to Paraguay and the analysis they made of the human rights situation on the ground.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-007069/12
til Kommissionen
Dan Jørgensen (S&D)
(16. juli 2012)

Om: Den offentlige høringsproces vedrørende forordning (EF) nr. 998/2003 og direktiv 92/65/EØF

Forud for revisionen af forordning (EF) nr. 998/2003 og direktiv 92/65/EØF arrangerede Kommissionen en offentlig høring. I foråret 2012 adspurgte dyrevelfærdsorganisation Europetnet (EPN) sine medlemmer i 23 EU-medlemsstater om, hvorvidt de havde kendskab til høringen i forbindelse med revisionen af forordning (EF) nr. 998/2003 og direktiv 92/65/EØF. Tilsyneladende var det eneste medlem, der havde hørt om denne høring, den danske medlemsorganisation (Dansk Hunderegister).

Jeg har desuden fået at vide, at formanden for EPN på to europæiske konferencer om dyrevelfærd i EU i Bruxelles den 12.-13. og 19.-20. juni med deltagelse af DG Sanco spurgte repræsentanter fra DG Sanco om antallet af modtagne svar / kommentarer. Der blev ikke givet noget svar fra repræsentanten fra DG Sanco.

1. Jeg vil derfor gerne spørge, hvor mange svar / kommentarer Kommissionen modtog i forbindelse med revisionen af forordning (EF) nr. 998/2003 og direktiv 92/65/EØF?

2. Ser Kommissionen i et demokratisk perspektiv høringsprocessen i forbindelse med revisionen af forordning (EF) nr. 998/2003 og direktiv 92/65/EØF som en høringsproces, der lever op til idealerne for inddragelse af de interesserede parter?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af John Dalli
(10. september 2012)

Kommissionen har ikke afholdt nogen offentlig høring i forbindelse med den foreslåede revision af Europa-Parlamentets og Rådets forordning (EF) nr. 998/2003 ([1]) og af Rådets direktiv 92/65/EØF ([2]).

Men på mødet i Den Rådgivende Komité for Dyresundhed under Den Rådgivende Gruppe for Fødevarekæden, Dyresundhed og Plantesundhed den 17. februar 2012 ([3]) fremlagde Kommissionen oplysninger om kommende lovgivningsinitiativer, herunder revision af forordning (EF) nr. 998/2003 ([4]) og ændring af direktiv 92/65/EØF ([5]).

Det vigtigste mål for revisionen af forordning (EF) nr. 998/2003 var at tilpasse forordningen til artikel 290 og artikel 291 i traktaten om Den Europæiske Unions funktionsmåde efter Kommissionens forpligtelseserklæring i 2010 ([6]) og at sikre, at borgerne forstår den nye forordning bedre, og at denne gennemføres og håndhæves korrekt og konsekvent af de kompetente myndigheder og er formuleret i overensstemmelse med de aktuelle regler for udformning af EU-lovgivningen.

Derfor mente Kommissionen, at det ikke var nødvendigt med en særlig høring af de interesserede parter i forbindelse med dette spørgsmål.

([1]) EUT L 146 af 13.6.2003, s. 1.
([2]) EFT L 268 af 14.9.1992, s. 54.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/health_consumer/dgs_consultations/docs/ag/summary_ahac_17022012_en.pdf
([4]) Vedtaget den 5. marts 2012 under referencen (KOM(2012)0089 endelig).
([5]) Vedtaget den 5. marts 2012 under referencen (KOM(2012)0090 endelig).
([6]) Erklæring knyttet som bilag til Europa-Parlamentets og Rådets forordning (EU) nr. 438/2010 om ændring af forordning (EF) nr. 998/2003.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007069/12
to the Commission
Dan Jørgensen (S&D)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: Public hearing process in relation to Regulation (EC) No 998/2003 and Directive 92/65/EEC

The Commission arranged a public hearing in relation to the proposed revision of Regulation (EC) No 998/2003 and Directive 92/65/EEC. In the spring of 2012 the animal welfare organisation Europetnet (EPN) asked its members in 23 EU Member States whether they were aware of the hearing in relation to the revision of Regulation (EC) No 998/2003 and Directive 92/65/EEC. Apparently, the only member who had heard about this hearing was the Danish member organisation (the Danish Dog Register).

I have furthermore been told that at two European conferences on animal welfare in the EU, held in Brussels on 12-13 and 19-20 June with participation from DG SANCO, the president of EPN asked representatives from DG SANCO about the number of answers/comments received. No answer was given by the DG SANCO representative.

1. I would therefore like to ask how many answers/comments has the Commission received in relation to the revision of Regulation (EC) No 998/2003 and Directive 92/65/EEC?

2. From a democratic perspective, does the Commission regard the hearing process in relation to the revision of Regulation (EC) No 998/2003 and Directive 92/65/EEC as one that lives up to the ideals of involvement of the interested parties?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(10 September 2012)

The Commission has not arranged any public hearing in relation to the proposed revision of Regulation (EC) No 998/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council ([1]) and of Council Directive 92/65/EEC ([2]).

However, at the meeting of the Animal Health Advisory Committee of the Advisory Group on the Food Chain, Animal Health and Plant Health of 17 February 2012 ([3]) the Commission provided information on upcoming legislative initiatives, including the review of Regulation (EC) No 998/2003 ([4]) and the amendment to Directive 92/65/EEC ([5]).

The main objective of the review of Regulation (EC) No 998/2003 was to align that regulation to Articles 290 and 291 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union following the 2010 Commission's commitment ([6]) and to ensure that the new Regulation is better understood by citizens as well as correctly and consistently implemented and enforced by the competent authorities, while worded in accordance with the current Union legislative drafting rules.

For that reason, the Commission considered that no particular consultation of interested parties was necessary in respect of the matter.

([1]) OJ L 146, 13.6.2003, p. 1.
([2]) OJ L 268, 14.9.1992, p. 54.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/health_consumer/dgs_consultations/docs/ag/summary_ahac_17022012_en.pdf
([4]) Adopted on 5 March 2012 under the reference [COM(2012) 89 final].
([5]) Adopted on 5 March 2012 under the reference [COM(2012) 90 final].
([6]) Statement annexed to Regulation (EU) No 438/2010 of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EC) No 998/2003.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-007070/12
lill-Kummissjoni
David Casa (PPE)
(16 ta' Lulju 2012)

Suġġett: Il-Montenegro

Fil-laqgħa tal-Kunsill Ewropew f'Ġunju 2012, inbdew in-negozjati tal-adeżjoni mal-Montenegro. Madankollu, ġie espress tħassib dwar il-livelli ta' korruzzjoni u tal-kriminalità organizzata fil-pajjiż.

Sitwazzjoni simili kienet teżisti meta r-Rumanija u l-Bulgarija ssieħbu fl-Unjoni Ewropea fl-2007. Mal-adeżjoni, iż-żewġ pajjiżi kien għad fadlilhom jagħmlu progress fir-rigward tal-korruzzjoni, il-kriminalità organizzata u r-riforma tas-sistema ġudizzjarja. Fl-ambitu tal-Mekkaniżmu ta' Kooperazzjoni u Verifika, il-Kummissjoni tippubblika rapporti regolari dwar il-progress li jsir f'kull pajjiż fl-oqsma msemmija aktar "il fuq.

Ħames snin wara l-adeżjoni ta" dawn iż-żewġ pajjiżi fl-UE, dan il-mekkaniżmu għadu hemm. Rapporti riċenti jiġbdu l-attenzjoni għall-fatt illi t-tnejn li huma għandhom bżonn jagħmlu sforz akbar sabiex jintlaħqu l-istandards stabbiliti mill-UE.

Fid-dawl ta' dan il-proċess twil, kif beħsiebha l-Kummissjoni tipprevjeni li jirriżulta xenarju simili fil-każ tal-Montenegro, u x'miżuri tista' tieħu sabiex tħaffef il-proċess ta' riforma fil-pajjiż, biex tgħinu jilħaq l-istandards rikjesti mill-UE?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Füle f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(21 ta' Awwissu 2012)

Il-Qafas tan-Negozjar jipprovdi l-għodod it-tajba għan-negozjati tal-adeżjoni li ġejjin mal-Montenegro. Huwa jittraduċi l-approċċ il-ġdid fir-rigward tal-kapitoli 23 (Ġudikatura u drittijiet fundamentali) u 24 (Ġustizzja, libertà u sigurtà), proposti mill-Kummissjoni u approvati mill-Kunsill Ewropew ta' Diċembru 2011. Fuq il-bażi tal-esperjenza tal-ħames tkabbir u n-negozjati mal-Kroazja, dan l-approċċ jipprevedi ftuħ bikri ta' dawn il-kapitoli sabiex ikun possibbli ankrar sod tar-riformi fil-qasam tal-istat tad-dritt. Huwa essenzjali għall-progress fin-negozjati li l-Montenegro jibni rekord sod ta' implimentazzjoni, speċjalment fil-ġlieda kontra l-korruzzjoni u l-kriminalità organizzata.

Rapporti ta' stħarriġ li għandhom jitħejjew mill-Kummissjoni għal dawn il-kapitoli se jipprovdu gwida sostanzjali, inkluż dwar il-kompiti li għandhom jiġu indirizzati fil-pjanijiet ta' azzjoni li għandhom jiġu adottati mill-awtoritajiet tal-Montenegro, li se jikkostitwixxu l-punti ta' riferiment inizjali.

Skont il-Konklużjonijiet tal-Kunsill tas-26 ta' Ġunju 2012, il-Kummissjoni ser tkompli tenfasizza l-oqsma ta' tħassib identifikati fir-rapport tagħha tar-rebbiegħa, speċjalment l-indipendenza tal-ġudikatura, il-ġlieda kontra l-korruzzjoni u l-kriminalità organizzata.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007070/12
to the Commission
David Casa (PPE)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: Montenegro

At the European Council meeting in June 2012, accession negotiations were initiated with Montenegro. However, concern has been expressed over the levels of corruption and organised crime in the country.

A similar situation existed when Romania and Bulgaria joined the European Union in 2007. On accession, both countries still had progress to make with regard to corruption, organised crime and judicial reform. Under the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism, the Commission issues regular reports on the progress made in each country in the abovementioned areas.

Five years after the two countries' accession to the EU, the mechanism is still in place. Recent reports point to the fact that both need to make further efforts in order to meet the standards set by the EU.

In the light of this lengthy process, how does the Commission intend to prevent a similar scenario from arising in the case of Montenegro, and what measures can it take in order to speed up the reform process in the country, helping it meet the standards required by the EU?

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

The negotiating framework provides the right tools for the forthcoming accession negotiations with Montenegro. It translates the new approach as regards chapters 23 (Judiciary and fundamental rights) and 24 (Justice, freedom and security), proposed by the Commission and endorsed by the December 2011 European Council. Based on the experience of the fifth enlargement and the negotiations with Croatia, this approach foresees early opening of these chapters to allow for the firm anchoring of reforms in the area of rule of law. It is essential for progress in negotiations that Montenegro builds a solid track record of implementation, especially in the fight against corruption and organised crime.

Screening reports to be prepared by the Commission for these chapters will provide substantial guidance, including on the tasks to be addressed in the action plans to be adopted by the Montenegrin authorities, which will constitute the opening benchmarks.

In line with the Council conclusions of 26 June 2012, the Commission will continue to put focus on the areas of concern identified in its Spring report, especially the independence of the judiciary, the fight against corruption and organised crime.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-007071/12
lill-Kummissjoni (Viċi President / Rappreżentant Għoli)
David Casa (PPE)
(16 ta' Lulju 2012)

Suġġett: VP/HR — Is-sanzjonijiet kontra ż-żejt Iranjan

Fl-1 ta' Lulju 2012 daħlu fis-seħħ sanzjonijiet tal-UE li jipprojbixxu l-importazzjoni, ix-xiri u t-trasport ta' żejt Iranjan. Madankollu, l-awtoritajiet Svizzeri ddeċidew li ma jsegwux is-sanzjonijiet tal-UE billi jeskludu projbizzjoni tal-kummerċ taż-żejt Iranjan mis-set ta' miżuri tagħhom.

— B'liema mod il-Viċi President / ir-Rappreżentant Għoli tistenna li din id-deċiżjoni jkollha impatt fuq l-effettività tas-sanzjonijiet imposti mill-Unjoni Ewropea u l-prospett li jiġi solvut l-imblokk rigward il-programm nukleari tal-Iran?

— Il-Viċi President / ir-Rappreżentant Għoli tanticipa xi implikazzjonijiet ta' dan il-pass fir-rigward tar-relazzjonijiet futuri Svizzera-UE?

Tweġiba mogħtija mir-Rappreżentanta Għolja/il-Viċi President Ashton f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(17 ta' Settembru 2012)

Fl-1 ta' Lulju 2012 ġie fi tmienu l-perjodu ta' tranżizzjoni li kien jipperemetti li jibqgħu għaddejjin il-kuntratti eżistenti relatati mal-importazzjoni, ix-xiri jew it-trasport taż-żejt Iranjan. L-UE se tagħmel ħidma biex pajjiżi terzi li wkoll esprimew tħassib dwar il-programm nukleari tal-Iran, u li għandhom il-possibbiltà li jirreaġixxu skont il-ħtiġijiet speċifiċi tagħhom, jallinjaw ruħhom mal-pożizzjoni tagħha. Fost dawn il-pajjiżi hemm l-Isvizzera.

L-UE għadha tinsab għaddejja b'kuntatti mal-awtoritajiet Svizzeri dwar il-programm nukleari tal-Iran, u dwar materji oħra.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007071/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
David Casa (PPE)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Iranian oil sanctions

On 1 July 2012 EU sanctions came into force, banning the import, purchase or transport of Iranian oil. However, Swiss authorities decided not to match EU sanctions by excluding a ban on trading in Iranian oil from their own set of measures.

— In what way does the Vice-President/High Representative expect this decision to impact upon the effectiveness of the sanctions imposed by the European Union and the prospect of resolving the deadlock over Iran's nuclear programme?

— Does the Vice-President/High Representative anticipate any implications of this move for EU-Swiss relations in the future?

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

On 1 July 2012 the transition period allowing for the continuation of existing contracts relating to the import, purchase or transport of Iranian oil came to an end. The EU will seek alignment with its measures from third countries such as Switzerland, who have also expressed concern about Iran's nuclear programme, and which are able to respond according to their specific needs.

The EU remains in contact with the Swiss authorities over Iran's nuclear programme and other issues.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-007072/12
lill-Kummissjoni
David Casa (PPE)
(16 ta' Lulju 2012)

Suġġett: L-eżami tal-Mekkaniżmu Ewropew ta' Stabbiltà (MES) minn qorti Ġermaniża

Wara li l-leġiżlaturi Ġermaniżi approvaw il-Mekkaniżmu Ewropew ta' Stabbiltà (MES) f'Ġunju 2012, il-President, Joachim Gauck, talab deċiżjoni mill-Qorti Kostituzzjonali Ġermaniża qabel ma jiffirma biex isir liġi.

Il-Qorti issa ħabbret li l-eżami jista' jkun li jeċċedi l-kalendarju li kien antiċipat inizjalment, ħaġa li twassal għal dewmien konsiderevoli fid-deċiżjoni tagħha. Dan jista' jkollu konsegwenzi sinifikanti fl-indirizzar tal-kriżi fiż-żona tal-euro.

Il-Kummissjoni tantiċipa xi distorsjonijiet ekonomiċi fiż-żona tal-euro bħala riżultat ta' dan id-dewmien, u, jekk iva, b'liema mod beħsiebha tibbilanċja kwalunkwe inċertezzi fis-suq fil-perjodu interim?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Rehn f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(29 ta' Awwissu 2012)

Il-Mekkaniżmu Ewropew ta' Stabbiltà (MES) se jkollu rwol ewlieni biex jiżgura stabbiltà finanzjarja fiż-żona tal-ewro, u konsegwentement fl-UE kollha kemm hi, billi jappoġġa l-Istati Membri taż-żona tal-euro li jkunu f'diffikultà. Il-Kummissjoni tirrispetta bi sħiħ il-proċeduri leġiżlattivi u legali meħtieġa għar-ratifika tat-Trattat dwar il-MES fl-Istati Membri. Sakemm id-dewmien biex jiġi stabbilit il-MES jibqa' limitat, il-Faċilità Ewropea ta' Stabbiltà Finanzjarja (EFSF) għad għandha l-kapaċità tindirizza l-ħtiġijiet ta' assistenza finanzjarja potenzjali fiż-żmien medju.

Barra minn hekk, iż-żona tal-euro qed issegwi politika komprensiva biex tindirizza l-kriżi, ittaffi d-distorsjonijiet, u ġġib lura l-fiduċja fis-suq. L-istrateġija se tinkorpora erba' pilastri essenzjali: qafas finanzjarju integrat, qafas baġitarju integrat, qafas ta' politika ekonomika integrat, u leġittimità demokratika u kontabilità msaħħa.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007072/12
to the Commission
David Casa (PPE)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: Examination of the European Stability Mechanism (ESM) by a German court

After German lawmakers approved the European Stability Mechanism (ESM) in June 2012, the President, Joachim Gauck, requested a ruling by Germany's Constitutional Court before signing it into law.

The Court has now announced that its examination could exceed the time-frame initially anticipated, which would considerably delay its ruling. This may have significant consequences for the handling of the crisis in the eurozone.

Does the Commission anticipate any economic distortions in the eurozone as a result of this delay, and, if so, in what way does it intend to balance out any uncertainties on the market in the interim period?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(29 August 2012)

The European Stability Mechanism (ESM) will have a key role to play in ensuring financial stability in the euro area, and consequently the EU as a whole, by providing support to euro area Member States in difficulties. The Commission fully respects the legislative and legal procedures required in ratifying the ESM Treaty in the Member States. As long as a delay in establishing the ESM remains limited, the European Financial Stability Facility (EFSF) still has the capacity to address potential financial assistance needs in the interim.

Furthermore, the euro area is pursuing a comprehensive policy response to address the crisis, alleviate distortions, and restore market confidence. The strategy will incorporate four essential building blocks: an integrated financial framework, an integrated budgetary framework, an integrated economic policy framework and strengthened democratic legitimacy and accountability.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007073/12
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), Kyriacos Triantaphyllides (GUE/NGL) y Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(16 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: VP/HR — Fin de las detenciones administrativas arbitrarias de palestinos por parte de Israel y mejora de las condiciones de las personas encarceladas — Akram Rikhawi: en peligro de muerte inminente tras 83 días en huelga de hambre

Akram Rikhawi, preso palestino, lleva 83 días en huelga de hambre y su vida corre peligro. Rikhawi padece varias enfermedades crónicas: diabetes, asma, osteoporosis, problemas renales, deterioro de la vista, colesterol elevado e inmunodeficiencia. Debido a estas afecciones preexistentes, la huelga de hambre de Rikhawi ha debilitado su organismo, y ya hace un mes su estado de salud era muy frágil. Actualmente se encuentra en coma y está empeorando rápidamente. Rikhawi lleva en huelga de hambre desde el 12 de abril de 2012 en protesta contra la decisión por la que se rechazó su petición de libertad anticipada basada en su estado de salud y sus circunstancias sociales (tiene 8 hijos biológicos y 5 adoptados). Solicitó la libertad anticipada por primera vez en 2010 y, más recientemente, el 5 de junio de 2012. Todos los presos tienen derecho a pedir la libertad anticipada cuando han cumplido dos tercios de su pena. Estos factores no se tuvieron en cuenta cuando se trató su caso.

Según varias organizaciones de derechos humanos, la tasa de condenas de los tribunales militares israelíes alcanza casi el 100 % (un informe de 2010 del Tribunal Militar israelí confirma que el 99,74 % de los acusados acaban siendo condenados). Rikhawi, detenido por las fuerzas de ocupación israelíes en 2004, fue condenado por un tribunal militar a 9 años de prisión.

El 6 de junio de 2012, un médico informó de que Rikhawi se encontraba en peligro de muerte y debía ser hospitalizado inmediatamente. El centro médico del Servicio Penitenciario de Israel (SPI) no es un hospital y no cuenta con los medios necesarios para tratar la degradación de la condición física y los efectos de una huelga de hambre a largo plazo. A pesar de la gravedad del estado de Rikhawi, el 14 de junio un tribunal de distrito israelí desestimó el recurso de la organización Physicians for Human Rights-Israel (PHR-I) para que fuera trasladado a un hospital civil.

Habida cuenta del Acuerdo de Asociación entre la UE e Israel, especialmente su artículo 2, que consagra la obligación de respetar los derechos humanos y los principios democráticos fundamentales en sus relaciones exteriores y asuntos internos, se pide a la Comisión que responda a las siguientes preguntas:

— ¿Dispone la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante de más información sobre el estado de Akram Rikhawi y las condiciones de su encarcelamiento?

— ¿Ha entablado contacto la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante con el Gobierno israelí para exigir que envíe a Akram a un hospital civil y permita que lo examinen médicos independientes? Si no lo ha hecho, ¿tiene previsto hacerlo?

— ¿Ha solicitado la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante al Gobierno israelí que ponga fin a sus detenciones administrativas arbitrarias de palestinos y mejore las condiciones de los encarcelados?

— ¿Ha considerado la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante la posibilidad de visitar a los presos palestinos para observar el trato que reciben por parte de Israel?

Respuesta de la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(17 de agosto de 2012)

La Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta tiene conocimiento de que, a raíz de un acuerdo alcanzado con el servicio de prisiones sobre el adelanto de la fecha de su liberación, Akram Rikhawi puso fin a su huelga de hambre el 23 de julio de 2012.

La UE ha planteado a menudo a las autoridades israelíes la cuestión de las personas en huelga de hambre y les recuerda periódicamente la necesidad de que cumplan sus obligaciones internacionales en relación con las condiciones de detención de los presos palestinos. En una declaración de ámbito local hecha pública el 8 de mayo de 2012, la UE solicitó al Gobierno israelí que prestase toda la asistencia médica necesaria a las personas en huelga de hambre.

Recientemente, con motivo del Consejo de Asociación UE-Israel del 24 de julio de 2012, la UE subrayó una vez más su preocupación por el abuso que Israel hace de las detenciones administrativas. La Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta también ha efectuado una serie de declaraciones similares durante 2012.

En el marco de la Cuarta Convención de Ginebra, el Comité Internacional de la Cruz Roja tiene el mandato de visitar a los presos palestinos para examinar el trato que Israel les dispensa.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007073/12
προς την Επιτροπή (Αντιπρόεδρος/Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), Kyriacos Triantaphyllides (GUE/NGL) και Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(16 Ιουλίου 2012)

Θέμα: VP/HR — Τερματισμός των αυθαίρετων διοικητικών κρατήσεων παλαιστινίων εκ μέρους του Ισραήλ και βελτίωση των συνθηκών φυλάκισης: ο Akram Rikhawi, σε απεργία πείνας εδώ και 83 ημέρες και η ζωή του απειλείται άμεσα

Ο Akram Rikhawi, Παλαιστίνιος κρατούμενος είναι σε απεργία πείνας εδώ και 83 ημέρες και η ζωή του διατρέχει άμεσο κίνδυνο. Ο Rikhawi πάσχει από διάφορες χρόνιες ασθένειες: διαβήτη, άσθμα, οστεοπόρωση, νεφροπάθειες, φλεγμονή του κρυσταλοειδούς φακού, υψηλή χοληστερίνη και ανεπάρκεια του ανοσοποιητικού συστήματος. Λόγω των συνθηκών αυτών που προϋπήρχαν, η απεργία πείνας του Rikhawi έχει εξασθενίσει το σώμα του, και ήδη πριν από ένα μήνα βρισκόταν σε ιδιαίτερα εύθραυστη κατάσταση. Τώρα πλέον είναι σε κώμα και η κατάστασή του επιδεινώνεται ραγδαία. Ο Rikhawi ξεκίνησε την απεργία πείνας στις 12 Απριλίου διαμαρτυρόμενος για το γεγονός ότι δεν είχε εγκριθεί η πρόωρη απελευθέρωσή του με βάση το ιατρικό ιστορικό του και κοινωνικές περιστάσεις. (Έχει 8 βιολογικά και 5 υιοθετημένα παιδιά). Έχει υποβάλει δύο αιτήσεις για πρόωρη απελευθέρωση: το 2010 και στις 5 Ιουνίου 2012. Κάθε κρατούμενος δικαιούται να ζητήσει να εξετασθεί το ενδεχόμενο πρόωρης απελευθέρωσής του όταν έχει εκπληρώσει τουλάχιστον τα δύο τρίτα της ποινής του. Σε όλες τις συζητήσεις, οι παράγοντες αυτοί αγνοήθηκαν.

Σύμφωνα με πληροφορίες πολλών ΜΚΟ προασπιστών των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων, οι καταδικαστικές αποφάσεις των ισραηλινών στρατιωτικών δικαστηρίων ανέρχονται περίπου στο 100 %: 99,74 % των ατόμων που προσάγονται ενώπιον των δικαστηρίων αυτών καταδικάζονται (έκθεση ισραηλινού στρατιωτικού δικαστηρίου το 2010), ο δε Rikhawi, μετά τη σύλληψή του από ισραηλινές δυνάμεις κατοχής το 2004, καταδικάσθηκε σε 9 ετών φυλάκιση από στρατιωτικό δικαστήριο.

Στις 6 Ιουνίου, ένας γιατρός ανέφερε ότι ο Rikhawi είχε άμεση ανάγκη νοσοκομειακής περίθαλψης δεδομένου ότι η ζωή του διέτρεχε άμεσο κίνδυνο. Το Ιατρικό Κέντρο των Ισραηλινών Φυλακών δεν αποτελεί νοσοκομείο και δεν είναι επαρκώς εξοπλισμένο για την αντιμετώπιση της σωματικής εξασθένισης και των συνεπειών της μακράς απεργίας πείνας. Ωστόσο, στις 14 Ιουνίου, το Ισραηλινό Περιφερειακό Δικαστήριο απέρριψε την αίτηση ιατρικής ανθρωπιστικής δράσης για τη μεταφορά του σε μη στρατιωτικό νοσοκομείο παρά την κρίσιμη κατάστασή του.

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τη Συμφωνία Σύνδεσης ΕΕ-Ισραήλ, και ιδίως το δεύτερο άρθρο της που υποχρεώνει αμφότερα τα μέρη να σέβονται τα δικαιώματα του ανθρώπου και τις βασικές δημοκρατικές αρχές στους τομείς εξωτερικής και εσωτερικής πολιτικής τους,

— Έχει ενημερωθεί περαιτέρω η Αντιπρόεδρος της Επιτροπής/Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος για την κατάσταση και τις συνθήκες φυλάκισης του Akram Rikhawi;

— Έχει επικοινωνήσει η Αντιπρόεδρος/Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος με την Ισραηλινή Κυβέρνηση, ή προτίθεται να έρθει σε επαφή μαζί της, για να ζητήσει τη μεταφορά του Akram σε μη στρατιωτικό νοσοκομείο και να επιτρέψει να τον επισκεφθούν ανεξάρτητοι ιατροί;

— Έχει ζητήσει η Αντιπρόεδρος/Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος από την Ισραηλινή Κυβέρνηση να θέσει τέρμα στις αυθαίρετες διοικητικές κρατήσεις Παλαιστινίων και να βελτιώσει τις συνθήκες φυλάκισης;

— Έχει εξετάσει η Αντιπρόεδρος/Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος το ενδεχόμενο να επισκεφθεί τους παλαιστίνιους κρατούμενους προκειμένου να εξετάσει τον τρόπο μεταχείρισής τους από το Ισραήλ;

Απάντηση της Ύπατης Εκπροσώπου/Αντιπροέδρου Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(17 Αυγούστου 2012)

Εξ όσων γνωρίζει η ΥΕ/ΑΠ, ο Akram Rikhawi τερμάτισε την απεργία πείνας του στις 23 Ιουλίου 2012, έπειτα από συμφωνία που επετεύχθη με τις σωφρονιστικές αρχές του Ισραήλ για την αποφυλάκισή του σε σύντομο χρονικό διάστημα.

Η ΕΕ έχει θέσει επανειλημμένως το ζήτημα των απεργών πείνας κατά τις επαφές της με τις αρχές του Ισραήλ. Η ΕΕ καλεί τακτικά το Ισραήλ να συμμορφωθεί με τις διεθνείς του υποχρεώσεις όσον αφορά τις συνθήκες κράτησης παλαιστίνιων φυλακισμένων. Με τοπική δήλωση της ΕΕ, η οποία εξεδόθη στις 8 Μαΐου 2012, η ΕΕ ζήτησε από την κυβέρνηση του Ισραήλ να προσφέρει κάθε αναγκαία ιατρική φροντίδα προς τους απεργούς πείνας.

Όλως προσφάτως, κατά το συμβούλιο σύνδεσης ΕΕ-Ισραήλ της 24ης Ιουλίου 2012, η ΕΕ υπογράμμισε γι' άλλη μια φορά την ανησυχία της για την υπέρμετρη προσφυγή των αρχών του Ισραήλ στο μέτρο της διοικητικής κράτησης. Η ΥΕ/ΑΠ πραγματοποίησε επίσης σειρά παρόμοιων δηλώσεων κατά τη διάρκεια του 2012.

Βάσει της τέταρτης Σύμβασης της Γενεύης, η Διεθνής Επιτροπή του Ερυθρού Σταυρού έχει καθήκον να επισκέπτεται παλαιστίνιους κρατουμένους και να ελέγχει τον τρόπο αντιμετώπισής τους από το Ισραήλ.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007073/12
à la Commission (Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), Kyriacos Triantaphyllides (GUE/NGL) et Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(16 juillet 2012)

Objet: VP/HR — Arrêt de la détention arbitraire de Palestiniens par Israël et amélioration des conditions de vie des détenus — Akram Rikhawi: 83 jours en grève de la faim, vie en réel danger

Akram Rikhawi, détenu palestinien, en est à son 83e jour de grève de la faim et sa vie est en réel danger. M. Rikhawi souffre de plusieurs pathologies chroniques: diabète, asthme, ostéoporose, insuffisance rénale, perte de vision, hypercholestérolémie et immunodéficience. En raison de ces pathologies, dont il souffrait déjà avant sa détention, son organisme s'est trouvé très affaibli par la grève de la faim; il y a un mois de cela, il se trouvait déjà dans un état de santé critique. M. Rikhawi est actuellement dans le coma et son état se détériore rapidement. Il a entamé sa grève de la faim le 12 avril 2012 pour protester contre la décision lui refusant une libération anticipée en raison de son état de santé et de sa situation sociale (il a huit enfants biologiques et cinq enfants adoptifs). Il a déjà introduit à deux reprises une demande de libération anticipée, en 2010 et le 5 juin 2012. Tout détenu a le droit d'introduire une telle demande à condition d'avoir effectué les deux tiers de sa peine. Ces éléments n'ont jamais été pris en considération.

Selon diverses organisations de défense des Droits de l'homme, les tribunaux israéliens ont un taux de condamnation de près de 100 % (un rapport du tribunal militaire israélien daté de 2010 confirme que 99,74 % des prévenus sont condamnés). M. Rikhawi, arrêté par les forces d'occupation israéliennes en 2004, a été condamné à neuf ans d'emprisonnement par un tribunal militaire.

Le 6 juin 2012, un médecin annonçait que Rikhawi devait être hospitalisé d'urgence car sa vie était en réel danger. Le centre médical du service pénitentiaire israélien (IPS) n'est pas un hôpital et ne dispose pas de l'équipement nécessaire pour traiter la détérioration de l'état de santé et les autres conséquences d'une grève de la faim prolongée. Or, en dépit de l'état critique de M. Rikhawi, une cour israélienne a rejeté le 14 juin l'appel interjeté par l'organisation Médecins pour les Droits de l'homme-Israël (PHR-I) visant à obtenir le transfert de M. Rikhawi dans un hôpital civil.

Compte tenu de l'accord d'association UE-Israël, et en particulier de son article 2, qui consacre l'obligation de respecter les Droits de l'homme et les principes démocratiques fondamentaux dans leurs politiques internes et internationales, la Commission est invitée à répondre aux questions suivantes:

— la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante est-elle en possession d'informations complémentaires concernant la situation d'Akram Rikhawi et ses conditions de détention?

— la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante a-t-elle contacté le gouvernement israélien pour exiger que M. Rikhawi soit transféré dans un hôpital civil et autorisé à recevoir la visite de médecins indépendants? Si ce n'est pas le cas, a-t-elle l'intention de le faire?

— la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante a-t-elle exigé que le gouvernement israélien mette fin à la détention arbitraire de Palestiniens et améliore les conditions de vie des détenus?

— la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante a-t-elle envisagé la possibilité de rendre visite aux détenus palestiniens afin d'examiner le traitement réservé à ceux-ci par Israël?

Réponse donnée par la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante Ashton au nom de la Commission
(17 août 2012)

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante croit savoir que, suite à un accord passé avec le service pénitentiaire israélien au sujet de sa libération anticipée, Akram Rikhawi a mis un terme à sa grève de la faim le 23 juillet 2012.

L'UE a soulevé à de nombreuses reprises le problème des grévistes de la faim avec les autorités israéliennes. L'UE appelle régulièrement Israël à respecter ses obligations internationales en ce qui concerne les conditions de détention des prisonniers palestiniens. Dans une déclaration locale du 8 mai 2012, l'UE a demandé au gouvernement israélien d'offrir toute l'aide médicale nécessaire aux détenus en grève de la faim.

Très récemment, lors du conseil d'association UE-Israël du 24 juillet 2012, l'UE a une nouvelle fois souligné son inquiétude face au recours excessif que fait Israël à la détention administrative. La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante a également fait un certain nombre de déclarations similaires durant l'année 2012.

En vertu de la quatrième convention de Genève, le Comité international de la Croix-Rouge est habilité à rendre visite aux détenus palestiniens afin d'examiner le traitement réservé à ceux-ci par Israël.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007073/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), Kyriacos Triantaphyllides (GUE/NGL) and Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Ending arbitrary administrative detentions of Palestinians by Israel and improving conditions for imprisoned persons — Akram Rikhawi: 83 days on hunger strike, life at imminent risk

Akram Rikhawi, a Palestinian prisoner, has been on hunger strike for 83 days and is at imminent risk of dying. Rikhawi suffers from various chronic conditions: diabetes, asthma, osteoporosis, kidney problems, deterioration of his eyesight, high cholesterol and immune deficiency. Due to these pre-existing conditions, Rikhawi's hunger strike has weakened his body, and already a month ago he was in very fragile health. He is now in a coma and his condition is deteriorating fast. Rikhawi went on hunger strike on 12 April 2012 to protest against a decision denying him early release on the basis of his medical condition and social circumstances (he has eight biological and five adoptive children.) He has requested early release twice, in 2010 and on 5 June 2012. All prisoners are entitled to ask for early release once they have served two-thirds of their sentence. In all discussions, these factors were disregarded.

According to several human rights organisations, Israeli military courts have a conviction rate of almost 100% (a 2010 report of the Israeli Military Court confirms that 99.74% of those charged are convicted). Rikhawi, arrested by Israeli occupation forces in 2004, was sentenced by a military court to nine years' imprisonment.

On 6 June 2012, a doctor reported that Rikhawi needed immediate hospitalisation as he was at immediate risk of death. The Israeli Prison Service (IPS) medical centre is not a hospital, and it is not properly equipped to handle the physical deterioration and effects of a long-term hunger strike. Despite Rikhawi's critical condition, however, on 14 June an Israeli district court rejected an appeal from the organisation Physicians for Human Rights-Israel (PHR-I) to have him transferred to a civilian hospital.

Taking into account the EU-Israel Association Agreement, and especially its Article 2, which enshrines the obligation to respect human rights and basic democratic principles in the conduct of foreign and internal affairs, the Commission is invited to answer the following:

— Is the Vice-President/High Representative in possession of further information concerning the situation of Akram Rikhawi and the conditions of his imprisonment?

— Has the Vice-President/High Representative contacted the Israeli Government to demand that it move Akram to a civilian hospital and allow independent doctors to visit him? If not, does she intend to do so?

— Has the Vice-President/High Representative demanded that the Israeli Government put an end to its arbitrary administrative detentions of Palestinians and improve conditions for those imprisoned?

— Has the Vice-President/High Representative considered the possibility of visiting the Palestinian prisoners in order to examine Israel's treatment of them?

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

The HR/VP understands that, following an agreement reached with the Israeli prison service on an early date for his release, Akram Rikhawi ended his hunger strike on 23 July 2012.

The EU has frequently raised the issue of hunger strikers with the Israeli authorities. The EU regularly calls on Israel to uphold its international obligations with regards to the conditions of detention of Palestinian prisoners. In a local EU statement issued on 8 May 2012 the EU requested the Government of Israel to make available all necessary medical assistance for those on hunger strike.

Most recently, at the EU-Israel Association Council on 24 July 2012 the EU once again underlined its concern about the excessive recourse by Israel to administrative detention. The HR/VP has also made a number of similar statements during 2012.

Under the Fourth Geneva Convention the International Committee of the Red Cross has the mandate to carry out visits to Palestinian prisoners to examine Israel's treatment of them.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007074/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(16 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Freno automatico salvavita

Ogni anno in Europa si registrano decine di migliaia di incidenti stradali, causati per lo più da distrazione o errori di calcolo della distanza di sicurezza.

Secondo studi recenti sui nuovi dispositivi elettronici in grado di aumentare la sicurezza stradale condotti dall'Euro Ncap, l'ente europeo che conduce crash test sui nuovi modelli in commercio, si evidenzia l'affidabilità dell'«AEB» (Autonomous Emergency Braking). Questo freno automatico d'emergenza è costituito di un radar o di una telecamera collegati con i freni per mezzo di una rete di sensori, i quali intervengono sul pedale del freno nel caso il conducente non abbia avvertito il pericolo d'impatto imminente con un ostacolo che si trovi davanti a sé.

Tuttavia, il 79 % dei veicoli in vendita non dispone dell'AEB e, inoltre, le poche case automobilistiche che lo offrono come optional utilizzano sigle diverse che potrebbero confondere i consumatori europei.

— È la Commissione a conoscenza dell'esistenza del dispositivo AEB?

— Considera essa l'AEB un valido strumento per ridurre l'alto numero di incidenti dovuti alla disattenzione dei conducenti?

— Prevede essa di intervenire con azioni a favore dell'introduzione obbligatoria di questo radar in tutti i modelli di autoveicoli?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(31 agosto 2012)

La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-011477/2011 delle onorevoli Esther de Lange e Corien Wortmann-Kool ([1]) in cui sono descritte in modo dettagliato le iniziative prese dalla Commissione allo scopo di introdurre dispositivi avanzati di frenata d'emergenza.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/it/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007074/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: Automatic life-saving brake

Every year in Europe there are tens of thousands of road accidents, mostly caused by distraction or miscalculation of safe distances.

According to recent studies on new electronic devices capable of increasing road safety, conducted by Euro NCAP, the European body that conducts crash tests on new models entering the market, AEB (Autonomous Emergency Braking) is an extremely reliable device. This automatic emergency brake consists of a radar or camera connected to a car's brakes by a network of sensors, which act on the brake pedal in cases where drivers do not notice that they are about to collide with an obstacle in front of them.

However, 79% of vehicles on sale are not fitted with AEB and, moreover, the few car manufacturers that offer it as an option use different acronyms that might confuse European consumers.

— Is the Commission aware of the existence of AEB?

— Does it believe that AEB could be a valuable tool in reducing the high number of accidents due to driver carelessness?

— Will it take action to encourage the compulsory installation of this radar system in all types of cars?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(31 August 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member its answer to Written Question E-011477/2011 by Mevr. Esther de Lange and Mevr. Corien Wortmann-Kool ([1]), in which the actions undertaken by the Commission to introduce advanced emergency braking systems are described in detail.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007075/12
to the Commission
Claude Moraes (S&D)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: European legislation on tobacco products

The Commission was originally scheduled to release its proposal for a review of the Tobacco Products Directive in 2011. However, owing to various problems with the public consultation process and the impact assessment, the proposal has been continually delayed.

1. If there is any further delay in releasing the draft directive, we will not have enough time to approve it before the end of the current mandate in 2014. In view of the urgent nature of this situation, can the Commission give an assurance that it will release the draft directive this year?

2. A common criticism of standardised tobacco packaging is that it will lead to an increase in counterfeiting and smuggling. Can the Commission confirm that, in the event that standardised packaging is introduced in the European Union, trademarks will continue to be protected in accordance with the full extent of European trademark law?

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

The European Commission has the intention to adopt a proposal to revise the Tobacco Products Directive 2001/37/EC ([1]) by the end of 2012.

In this context, the Commission is currently considering several options regarding regulating the packaging and labelling of tobacco products. The Commission has not, at this stage, taken a final position on this matter.

([1]) Directive 2001/37/EC of Parliament and of the Council of 5 June 2001 on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States concerning the manufacture, presentation and sale of tobacco products — Commission statement, OJ L 194, 18.7.2001.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007076/12
an die Kommission
Chris Davies (ALDE), Alexandra Thein (ALDE) und Ivo Vajgl (ALDE)
(16. Juli 2012)

Betrifft: Israel, die besetzten Gebiete und die Regeln für die Beteiligung an Horizont 2020

Nach den Regeln zur Beteiligung am Siebten Rahmenprogramm (RP7) und an den vorherigen Rahmenprogrammen war die Kommission verpflichtet, die Beteiligung von nach innerstaatlichem israelischen Recht in den von Israel besetzten Gebieten gegründeten Einrichtungen nicht zu genehmigen, da es sich bei diesen Einrichtungen nicht um Rechtspersonen handelt, die nach dem an ihrem Sitz geltenden innerstaatlichen Recht gegründet wurden ([1]). Diese Verpflichtung wurde offenbar mit der Streichung der Passage „die nach dem an ihrem Sitz geltenden innerstaatlichen Recht […] gegründet worden ist" aus der Begriffsbestimmung „Rechtsperson" in den von der Kommission vorgeschlagenen Regeln von Horizont 2020 für die Beteiligung aufgehoben.

Würden nach innerstaatlichem israelischem Recht in den seit 1967 von Israel besetzten Gebieten gegründete Einrichtungen nach der vereinfachten Definition einer „Rechtsperson", die in dem Entwurf einer Regelung für die Beteiligung an Horizont 2020 festgelegt wurde, als „Rechtspersonen" gelten?

Würden sie damit die Möglichkeit erhalten, an den Programmen und Projekten von Horizont 2020 teilzunehmen?

Wird die Kommission daher nicht länger verpflichtet sein, die Beteiligung solcher Einrichtungen nicht zu genehmigen?

Unter früheren Rahmenprogrammen und unter dem 7. RP hat die Kommission Aktivitäten in den israelischen Siedlungen genehmigt und finanziert ([2]). Sie hat erklärt, ihr sei keine Bestimmung im EU-Recht bekannt, nach der sie verpflichtet sei, solche Aktivitäten nicht zu finanzieren ([3]). Trifft es zu, dass die von der Kommission vorgeschlagenen Regeln für die Beteiligung an Horizont 2020 sie ebenfalls in dieser Hinsicht nicht verpflichten?

Antwort von Frau Geoghegan-Quinn im Namen der Kommission
(2. Oktober 2012)

Auch wenn der Verweis auf den Niederlassungsort aus der Definition der „Rechtsperson" gestrichen wurde, wurde er in anderen wichtigen Bestimmungen wie den Mindestteilnahmebedingungen für Rechtspersonen und in den Finanzierungsartikeln beibehalten. In diesem Sinne führt das Rahmenprogramm für Forschung und Innovation „Horizont 2020" den Ansatz des Siebten Forschungsrahmenprogramms (RP7) fort.

Die RP7-Vorschriften enthalten keine Anforderungen in Bezug auf den Ort, an dem die Forschung stattfinden sollte.

Die Kommission bestätigt ihre in früheren Anfragen eingenommene Haltung (Anfragen 9280 und 9975 aus dem Jahr 2011), der zufolge die Kommission die EU-Politik in jeder Hinsicht respektiert, die die israelische Hoheit über die Westbank, einschließlich Ost-Jerusalem, den Gazastreifen und die Golan-Höhen nicht anerkennt. Sie handelt dementsprechend unter Anerkennung aller Tätigkeiten, die bilaterale oder regionale Kooperationsprogramme — auch mit Israel — einschließen. Die Kommission beabsichtigt, für alle Generaldirektionen und Agenturen, die an einer potenziellen Zusammenarbeit mit Israel beteiligt sind, ein Erinnerungsschreiben zur EU-Politik zusammen mit präzisen operationellen Leitlinien zu veröffentlichen. Diese Leitlinien werden für das „Horizont 2020"-Programm vorliegen.

([1]) Artikel 2: „Begriffsbestimmungen … 1) ‚Rechtsperson' ist eine natürliche Person oder eine juristische Person, die nach dem an ihrem Sitz geltenden innerstaatlichen Recht, nach Gemeinschaftsrecht oder nach internationalem Recht gegründet worden ist".

([2]) Im Zusammenhang mit einem solchen Fall gab die Kommission die nachfolgende Erklärung ab: „Bei den Ahava Dead Sea Laboratories handelt es sich um eine Einrichtung, die offiziell innerhalb der Grenzen des international anerkannten Staates Israel gegründet wurde. Auch wenn die Teilnahme an die Bedingung geknüpft ist, dass eine Körperschaft ihren Sitz in einem bestimmten Gebiet hat, ist der Begünstigte nicht verpflichtet, die geförderten Forschungsaktivitäten am Ort seiner Niederlassung auszuführen. Daher konnten und können die Ahava Dead Sea Laboratories an den oben genannten Rahmenprogrammen teilnehmen und Mittel erhalten". — Antwort vom 19. Juli 2011 auf die schriftliche Anfrage P-006190/2011.

([3]) „Schließlich ist der Kommission keine Bestimmung des Gemeinschaftsrechts bekannt, nach der sie verpflichtet ist, keine Aktivitäten zu finanzieren, die im Rahmen eines 7. RP-Projekts in israelischen Siedlungen durchgeführt werden, die in den besetzten Gebietet errichtet wurden". — Antwort vom 26. August 2011 auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-007464/2011.

(Slovenska različica)

Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-007076/12
za Komisijo
Chris Davies (ALDE), Alexandra Thein (ALDE) in Ivo Vajgl (ALDE)
(16. julij 2012)

Zadeva: Izrael, zasedena ozemlja in pravila za sodelovanje v programu Obzorje 2020

Pravila za sodelovanje v sklopu sedmega okvirnega programa in prejšnjih okvirnih programov so Komisijo prisilila, da ni dovolila sodelovanja subjektom, ustanovljenim v skladu z izraelskim nacionalnim pravom na ozemljih, ki jih je zasedal Izrael, saj niso bili pravni subjekti, ustanovljeni v skladu s pravom države, kjer imajo sedež ([1]). Zdi se, da te omejitve ni več, saj je bilo iz opredelitve pravnih subjektov v pravilih za sodelovanje v programu Obzorje 2020, ki jih je predlagala Komisija, črtano besedilo „ustanovljeno v skladu z zakonodajo države, kjer ima sedež".

Ali bi subjekti, ustanovljeni v skladu z izraelskim nacionalnim pravom na ozemljih, ki jih Izrael zaseda od leta 1967, lahko veljali za pravne subjekte po poenostavljeni opredelitvi pravnih subjektov iz osnutka pravil za sodelovanje v programu Obzorje 2020, ki jih predlaga Komisija?

Bi bili torej primerni za sodelovanje v načrtih in projektih programa Obzorje 2020?

Komisija torej ne bo več prisiljena, da tem subjektom ne dovoli sodelovati?

Komisija je v okviru prejšnjih okvirnih programov ter sedmega okvirnega programa odobrila in financirala dejavnosti v izraelskih naseljih ([2]). Dejala je, da ne pozna določbe prava EU, ki bi jo obvezovala k nefinanciranju takih dejavnosti ([3]). Ali drži, da je pravila za sodelovanje v programu Obzorje 2020, kot jih je predlagala Komisija, prav tako ne obvezujejo k temu?

Odgovor gospe Geoghegan-Quinn v imenu Komisije
(2. oktober 2012)

Čeprav je bila navedba sedeža izključena iz opredelitve „pravnega subjekta", se ohranja v drugih pomembnih določbah, kot so minimalni pogoji za udeležbo pravnih subjektov in členi o financiranju. Okvirni program Obzorje 2020 v tem smislu nadaljuje pristop sedmega okvirnega programa.

Pravila za udeležbo sedmega okvirnega programa ne vsebujejo zahtev glede kraja, kjer bi se morale opravljati raziskave.

Komisija potrjuje stališče iz predhodnih odgovorov (vprašanji 9280 in 9975 iz leta 2011), da popolnoma spoštuje politiko EU, ki ne priznava izraelske suverenosti na Zahodnem bregu, vključno z vzhodnim Jeruzalemom, Gazo in Golansko planoto, ter zato deluje ob upoštevanju vseh dejavnosti, ki vključujejo dvostranske in regionalne programe sodelovanja z Izraelom. Komisija namerava za vse generalne direktorate in agencije, ki so vključeni v morebitno sodelovanje z Izraelom, izdati opomnik glede politike EU skupaj z natančnimi operativnimi smernicami o tej zadevi. Te smernice bodo pripravljene za program Obzorje 2020.

([1]) Člen 2: „Opredelitev pojmov 1) ‚pravni subjekt' pomeni fizično osebo ali pravno osebo, ustanovljeno v skladu z zakonodajo države, kjer ima sedež, zakonodajo Skupnosti ali mednarodnim pravom.".

([2]) V enem takem primeru je Komisija dala tako obrazložitev: „Ahava Dead Sea Laboratories je subjekt, ki ima formalni sedež znotraj meja mednarodno priznane države Izrael. Pogoj za sodelovanje, ki je ta, da ima subjekt sedež na določenem ozemlju, ne pomeni, da mora upravičenec opravljati svojo raziskovalno dejavnost tam, kjer ima sedež. Posledično lahko subjekt Ahava Dead Sea Laboratories sodelujejo v zgornjem okvirnem programu in iz njega prejmejo sredstva." – Odgovor z dne 19. julija 2011 na vprašanje za pisni odgovor P-006190/2011.

([3]) „Končno, Komisija ne ve za nobeno določbo prava ES, ki bi jo silila v to, da ne financira dejavnosti v okviru projekta iz sedmega okvirnega programa, ki se odvijajo v izraelskih naseljih na zasedenih ozemljih." – Odgovor z dne 26. avgusta 2011 na vprašanje za pisni odgovor P-007464/2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007076/12
to the Commission
Chris Davies (ALDE), Alexandra Thein (ALDE) and Ivo Vajgl (ALDE)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: Israel, the occupied territories and rules for participation in Horizon 2020

The rules for participation under the Seventh Framework Programme (FP7) and previous framework programmes obliged the Commission not to authorise the participation of entities established under Israel's national law in the territories occupied by Israel since they were not legal entities created under the national law of their place of establishment ([1]). This obligation appears to have been removed with the deletion of the phrase 'created under the national law of its place of establishment' from the definition of a 'legal entity' in the Horizon 2020 rules for participation proposed by the Commission.

Would entities established under Israel's national law in the territories occupied by Israel since 1967 qualify as 'legal entities' according to the simplified definition of a 'legal entity' incorporated in the draft rules for participation in Horizon 2020 proposed by the Commission?

Would they therefore be eligible to participate in Horizon 2020 programmes and projects?

Will the Commission therefore no longer be obliged not to authorise the participation of such entities?

Under previous framework programmes, and under FP7, the Commission has approved and funded activities carried out in Israeli settlements ([2]). It has said that it knows of no provision of EC law that obliges it not to fund such activities ([3]). Is it true that the rules for participation for Horizon 2020 as proposed by the Commission also place no such obligation on it?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(2 October 2012)

Although the reference to the place of establishment was eliminated from the 'legal entity' definition, it has been maintained in other important provisions such as the minimum conditions for participation of legal entities and funding articles. In this sense, the Horizon 2020 Framework Programme continues the seventh framework programme (FP7) approach.

The FP7 Rules for participation do not contain requirements as regards the place where research should be carried out.

The Commission confirms the position it has set out in earlier replies (questions 9280 and 9975 of 2011), that the Commission fully respects EU policy which does not recognise Israeli sovereignty over the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, the Gaza Strip and the Golan Heights, and acts in consequence with respect to all activities involving bilateral or regional cooperation programmes involving Israel. It intends to issue a reminder of EU policy together with precise operational guidance on this matter, to all Directorates-General and agencies involved in potential cooperation with Israel. These guidelines will be in place for the Horizon 2020 programme.

([1]) Article 2: 'Definitions. 1) "legal entity" means any natural person, or any legal person created under the national law of its place of establishment, or under Community law or international law'.

([2]) With regard to one such case, the Commission offered the following explanation: <QT.START>'</QT.START>Ahava Dead Sea Laboratories is an entity that is formally established within the borders of the internationally recognised State of Israel. The participation condition of being established in a certain territory does not oblige a beneficiary to carry out the funded research in the place of its establishment. Consequently, Ahava Dead Sea Laboratories were and are eligible for participation and funding under the above Framework Programmes.<QT.END>'</QT.END> — Answer of 19 July 2011 to Written Question P-006190/2011.

([3]) <QT.START>'</QT.START>Finally, the Commission is not aware of any provision of EC law that obliges it not to fund activities under an FP7 project carried out in Israeli settlements that have been established in occupied territories.<QT.END>'</QT.END> — Answer of 26 August 2011 to Written Question E-007464/2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007077/12
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: Regulation (EU) No 1177/2010

Regulation (EU) No 1177/2010 establishes rules for the rights of passengers when travelling by sea and inland waterway transport. It includes obligations and rights for persons with reduced mobility.

I understand that for safety reasons cruise line operators request that passengers with reduced mobility do not store or park their mobility scooters on the floor of their cabins, as this could inhibit access or egress. Nonetheless, some mobility scooters are foldable and can be easily stowed.

Some cruise ship operators — such as P&O Cruises — apparently cite Regulation (EU) No 1177/2010 as now preventing them from allowing any mobility scooter to be stowed in a passenger cabin, including folding scooters that can be packed and folded into cupboards away from the floor area. Such measures restrict cabins and access for disabled passengers.

1. Is the Commission aware of such restrictions imposed by cruise or ferry operators?

2. Does the Commission believe such restrictions to be within the spirit of the legislation?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(24 August 2012)

1. The Commission is not aware of the restrictions imposed by cruise or ferry operators and mentioned by the Honourable Member.

Regulation (EU) No 1177/2010 of the European Parliament and of the Council, of 24 November 2010, concerning the rights of passengers when travelling by sea and inland waterway ([1]), will apply from 18 December 2012. Therefore cruise or ferry operators cannot justify currently the alleged practice on the basis of this regulation.

2. Such restrictions do not seem to be within the spirit of Regulation (EU) No 1177/2010. It cannot nevertheless be excluded that in specific cases they are imposed in order to meet safety requirements established by international or national law or by the competent authorities or because of the design of the ship. As from 18 December 2012, disabled persons and persons with reduced mobility are encouraged to notify the carrier, at the time of reservation or advance purchase of the ticket, of their specific needs with regard to accommodation or services required, in accordance with Article 11(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1177/2010. Carriers shall ensure that the assistance is provided in such a way that disabled persons and persons with reduced mobility are able to embark, disembark and travel on the ship. Such assistance shall, if possible, be adapted to their individual needs as specified in Annex III of the regulation.

([1]) OJ L 334, 17.12.2010, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007078/12
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: Legal services and the single market

Clients should be able to engage the legal services of a lawyer of their own choice. However, in some circumstances it can be difficult for individuals or businesses to switch legal service provider. In some jurisdictions it appears lawyers may demand apparently arbitrary fees before a client's file is released to another lawyer, thus stifling consumer choice.

1. Is the Commission aware of problems with regard to clients being able to switch their legal service provider?

2. What initiatives, if any, is the Commission considering to further open up the legal services market?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(3 September 2012)

The Commission is aware of some requirements at national level that may have to be fulfilled before a client can switch to a new legal service provider. However, the Commission does not at this stage have a general overview of the situation in all Member States. Any national rules in this area would need to comply with EC law. By way of example, if such national practice was based on a regulatory requirement, it may be covered by the Services Directive ([1]), in particular the provisions requiring Member States not to make access to or exercise of a service subject to any requirements which do not respect the principles of non-discrimination, necessity and proportionality. However, the Commission has not received any complaints regarding this matter.

More generally regarding the further opening up of the single market in legal services, the Commission has recently adopted a communication on the implementation of the Services Directive ([2]), in which further actions are outlined in order to deliver the full benefits of the directive, with special focus on business services.

Finally, in a broader context the Commission's services have commissioned a wide-ranging evaluation of the legal framework for the free movement of lawyers ([3]). The results of the evaluation should be available by the end of 2012 and will inform the Commission's policy initiatives in the coming years.

([1]) Directive 2006/123/EC.
([2]) COM(2012) 261 final.
([3]) In particular Directive 77/249/EEC and Directive 98/5/EC facilitating the establishment and the provision of services of lawyers in the single market.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007079/12
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: Small claims courts

The European small claims procedure established by Regulation (EC) No 861/2007 has helped improve access to justice by simplifying cross-border small claims litigation in civil and commercial matters and reducing costs. It offers an alternative procedure for claims under EUR 2 000 in cross-border disputes.

Nonetheless, for residents of some Member States, where small claims have no cross-border element, there is no quick and effective small claims court system, meaning that they must engage in lengthy and expensive litigation even for minor claims.

1. Is the Commission aware of this problem?

2. What steps is it taking to encourage all Member States to adopt small claims courts in order to allow swift and cost-effective dispute resolution for individuals and businesses across the EU?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(5 September 2012)

The Honourable Member might be aware that the Commission has no jurisdiction to deal with civil procedures that are not of cross-border character. According to the information provided to the Commission by the Member States, and published on the website of the European Judicial Network in civil and commercial matters ([1]), a majority of the Member States provides for certain simplifications in the civil proceedings for claims under certain threshold, although their national systems may differ very much.

The Commission promotes and supports all measures facilitating access to justice. Besides judicial redress, reference should be made to the recent initiatives on Alternative Dispute Resolution for consumer disputes ([2]). The Commission promotes the European Small Claims Procedure and believes that this successful procedure may also be an inspiration for Governments to offer similar benefits in domestic cases. The Commission, together with the European Judicial Network in civil and commercial matters, will publish a practice guide on the European Small Claims Procedure this autumn. New IT tools facilitating the use of this procedure are already available in the European e-Justice Portal ([3]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/civiljustice/index_en.htm
([2]) COM(2011)793, 29.11.2011.
([3]) https://e-justice.europa.eu/home.do?action=home.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007080/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Eviction and demolition of Palestinian village of Susya

The Palestinian village of Susya, in the South Hebron Hills, has existed for centuries and is now home to six Bedouin family compounds. The Israeli Government has indicated that the compounds (which house around 200 people), along with the kindergarten, clinic and a renewable solar power system, are to be demolished. The residents are to be evicted.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of these eviction and demolition notices?

2. What representations are being made to the Israelis regarding the demolition of property and displacement of residents?

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

The HR/VP is aware of the situation in the village of Susiya in the Southern Hebron hills, and is following developments closely.

In a local statement issued on 15 June 2012, the EU mission in Jerusalem voiced concern over the humanitarian impact and political implications of the recent demolition orders for the village's 50 residential shelters.

EU mission representatives met with representatives of the village council and were briefed about recent developments which have increased the risk of forced displacement for the village's population. They toured the village which is located very close to the Susiya settlement and a military base.

Following this fact finding exercise, EU concerns have been raised at the most senior level in bilateral meetings with representatives of the Government of Israel.

The EU has called on Israel to meet its obligations regarding the living conditions of the Palestinian population in Area C, including by halting the forced transfer of population and demolition of Palestinian housing and infrastructure, simplifying administrative procedures to obtain building permits for Palestinians, ensuring access to water and addressing humanitarian needs, including in the conclusions of the Foreign Affairs Council in May 2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007081/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Hilal Mammadov

Hilal Mammadov is an Azerbaijani journalist and human rights activist who has criticised his country's authoritarian government for its treatment of minorities. He is the chief editor of the Baku-based newspaper *Tolyshi Sado*, which is the only newspaper in Azerbaijan printed in the minority Talysh language.

Azerbaijani authorities have charged Mr Mammadov with spying for neighbouring Iran and inciting public unrest. Mr Mammadov's predecessor as editor of the same paper, Novruzali Mammadov, was sentenced to 10 years in jail in 2008, also on charges of spying for Iran. He was moved to a hospital shortly after being jailed and died in August 2009.

Many journalists appear to have been jailed in Azerbaijan on charges that some human rights activists suggest are fabricated.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of Mr Mammadov's arrest and detention?

2. What representations have officials made to the Azerbaijani authorities reading Mr Mammadov's arrest?

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

The Commission is fully aware of the overall situation of human rights in Azerbaijan and of the case of Hilal Mammadov in particular.

The ENP Progress Report issued on 15 May 2012 clearly reflects the EU's principal concerns in the field of human rights, and the areas where Azerbaijan needs to work harder to meet its own commitments in the framework of both the Eastern Partnership and the Council of Europe. It is now for the Azerbaijani authorities to respond to the observations and recommendations made in that report. .

In the particular case of Hilal Mammadov, attempts to secure relevant information are hampered by the fact that the charges against Mr Mammadov have been deemed to be confidential. While it is true that activists believe that charges in similar cases are often fabricated, it is very difficult in the current context to assess evidence and come to a reliable, independent opinion. The HR/VP has asked to be kept closely informed of developments, and the EU Delegation in Baku is actively monitoring the situation.

Access to justice and the existence of an independent judiciary are key to Azerbaijan's reform process and the EU has already put in place support programmes in this direction.

The EU has repeatedly raised and will continue to address human rights issues with the authorities, including specific cases. The EU plans to raise these issues in the upcoming EU-Azerbaijan Cooperation Committee and Council scheduled in October and December respectively, and at the EU-Azerbaijan Sub-Committee meeting on Human Rights, due to take place in November in Baku.

The EU will continue to monitor the situation in the framework of the Eastern Partnership and will try to constructively engage with Azerbaijan to improve its human rights record.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007082/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Violence towards Palestinians near Nablus

In recent months there has been a series of disturbances in the village of Asira al-Qibliya, near Nablus in the occupied Palestinian territories. Reports suggest that the village residents were attacked by settlers from the Yitzhar settlement. The violence included a Palestinian farmer being shot. Further reports indicate subsequent attacks by the Yitzhar settlers on other Palestinian villages in the Nablus area.

What information does the Vice-President/High Representative have about the events that have unfolded in Asira al-Qibliya, and what action is being taken to urge the Israeli authorities to stop the violence perpetrated by its citizens towards Palestinians near Nablus?

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

The HR/VP is following the situation closely and on 14 May 2012, the EU expressed its deep concern regarding settler extremism and incitement by settlers in the West Bank. The EU condemns continuous settler violence and deliberate provocations against Palestinian civilians. It calls on the government of Israel to bring the perpetrators to justice and to comply with its obligations under international law.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-007083/12
aan de Commissie
Bastiaan Belder (EFD)
(16 juli 2012)

Betreft: Het Spaanse Tax Lease-systeem

1. Op 2 juli 2012 schreef de heer Almunia namens de Commissie in antwoord op mijn vraag E-004075/2012 dat Spanje op 30 mei 2012 een nieuwe regeling voor het Spaanse Tax Lease-systeem formeel heeft aangemeld. Wil de Commissie het Europees Parlement informeren over de kenmerken van de nieuwe regeling zoals Spanje deze voorstelt?

2. Is de Commissie bereid een formeel onderzoek te starten en derde partijen de gelegenheid te geven om geraadpleegd te worden voordat een goedkeuring of afkeuring zal plaatsvinden? Een vervanging van het systeem kan immers grote gevolgen hebben voor concurrerende scheepsbouwers in de Europese Unie die jarenlang een concurrentienadeel ondervonden van het huidige systeem. Zij hebben er belang bij dat het nieuwe systeem niet ook ongeoorloofde staatssteun vormt en de mededinging in de interne markt verstoort.

3. Binnen welke termijn verwacht de Commissie uitsluitsel te kunnen geven over de goedkeuring dan wel afkeuring van de aangemelde regeling?

Antwoord van de heer Almunia namens de Commissie
(3 september 2012)

De maatregel werd op 30 mei 2012 door Spanje aangemeld om goedkeuring van de Commissie te krijgen en aan alle mogelijke begunstigden rechtszekerheid te verschaffen. De Commissie heeft de Spaanse autoriteiten om aanvullende informatie verzocht en zal de maatregel aan de geldende staatssteunregels toetsen.

In deze context kan de Commissie het geachte Parlementslid verzekeren dat, indien zij tot de conclusie komt dat er sprake is van staatssteun en indien zij, tegelijkertijd, twijfel heeft over de verenigbaarheid van de maatregel met de interne markt, zij een formeel onderzoek zal instellen en belanghebbende derden zal uitnodigen hun opmerkingen over haar beoordeling van de regeling kenbaar te maken.

Als de Commissie echter tot de conclusie komt dat de nieuwe maatregel duidelijk een algemene maatregel is of dat deze duidelijk in overeenstemming is met de geldende regels, dan zal zij geen formeel onderzoek instellen.

Wanneer alle nodige gegevens zijn verstrekt, moet de Commissie binnen twee maanden een formeel besluit vaststellen.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007083/12
to the Commission
Bastiaan Belder (EFD)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: The Spanish tax lease scheme

1. On 2 July 2012, Mr Almunia wrote on behalf of the Commission, in reply to my Question E-004075/2012, that Spain had formally notified a new Spanish tax lease scheme on 30 May 2012. Will the Commission inform the European Parliament of the features of the new scheme which Spain envisages?

2. Will the Commission launch a formal investigation and give third parties the opportunity to be consulted before approving or rejecting the scheme? Replacement of the scheme could have a major impact on competing shipbuilders in the European Union who for many years were placed at a competitive disadvantage by the existing scheme. It is in their interest that the new scheme should not likewise constitute unlawful state aid and distort competition on the internal market.

3. Within what period does the Commission expect to be able to communicate whether the notified scheme has been approved or rejected?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(3 September 2012)

The measure was notified by Spain on 30 May 2012 for the purpose of getting the Commission's approval and providing legal certainty to all potential beneficiaries. The Commission requested additional information from the Spanish authorities and will assess the measure in the light of the applicable state aid rules.

In that context, the Commission can assure the Honourable Member that if it concludes that the measure is tantamount to state aid and if, at the same time, it has doubts as to the compatibility of the measure with the internal market, it will open a formal investigation and call upon interested third parties to comment on its assessment of the scheme.

However, if the Commission comes to the conclusion that the new measure is clearly a general measure or that it is clearly compatible with the applicable rules, it will not open a formal investigation. .

Once all the necessary information has been supplied, the Commission must adopt a formal decision within two months.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007084/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE) y Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(16 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Flexibilización del objetivo de déficit autonómico

Recientemente la Comisión Europea ha aceptado, conjuntamente con el Euro grupo, flexibilizar el objetivo de déficit para el Estado español hasta el 6,3 % para el año 2012, aún manteniendo el objetivo del 3 % para 2014. Esta cifra es un punto mayor que la anteriormente acordada.

Actualmente, el objetivo de déficit para el Gobierno central es del 3,5 % y para las autonomías del 1,5 %. Hay que tener en cuenta que son las autonomías las que tienen la responsabilidad por el 80 % del gasto en sanidad, educación y bienestar y por lo tanto las que tienen un impacto mayor sobre el día a día de los ciudadanos. Además, su presupuesto depende de transferencias del Gobierno central, que recauda todos los grandes impuestos.

Asimismo, por ejemplo, la Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña ya ha realizado ajustes por valor de miles de millones de euros, tanto en 2011 como en 2012, y se corre el riesgo de poner en peligro la cohesión social.

¿No cree la Comisión que el cambio en los objetivos de déficit para 2012 debería ser ajustado de modo equitativo entre las distintas administraciones?

¿No cree la Comisión que es de una importancia fundamental marcar objetivos realistas para aquellas administraciones responsables del mantenimiento del Estado del Bienestar?

Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión
(29 de agosto de 2012)

El reparto del ajuste presupuestario entre los distintos niveles de la administración es un asunto que solo se decide nacionalmente.

La Comisión está de acuerdo en que es fundamental establecer objetivos realistas, aunque ambiciosos. La última Recomendación del procedimiento de déficit excesivo para España contempla un año adicional para la corrección de su déficit excesivo (2014 en vez de 2013) y fija nuevos objetivos intermedios de déficit del 6,3 % del PIB en 2012, del 4,5 % del PIB en 2013 y del 2,8 % del PIB en 2014. Según la recomendación, España dispone de tres meses para la adopción de medidas eficaces.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007084/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE) and Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: Loosening deficit targets for Spain's autonomous communities

The Commission recently decided, together with the Eurogroup, to raise Spain's debt target to 6.3% for 2012 — one percentage point higher than originally agreed — although the objective of 3% for 2014 was maintained.

Spain's central government's deficit target is currently 3.5% and that of the autonomous communities is 1.5%. It should, however, be noted that the autonomous communities are responsible for 80% of expenditure of healthcare, education and welfare, and therefore have a huge impact on the daily lives of the public. The autonomous communities' budgets are also dependent on transfers from central government, which collects all major taxes.

For example, the Autonomous Community of Catalonia has already made cuts worth billions of euros in both 2011 and 2012, to a point where it risks jeopardising social cohesion.

Does the Commission not think that this loosening of debt targets should be spread more evenly between the Spain's various levels of government?

Does the Commission not think that it is crucial to set realistic targets, so that the various authorities involved can maintain the welfare state?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(29 August 2012)

The distribution of the fiscal adjustment between different levels of government is an issue to be decided solely at national level.

The Commission agrees that it is crucial to set realistic, albeit ambitious, targets. The latest EDP recommendation addressed to Spain, allows for an additional year to correct the excessive deficit (by 2014, instead of 2013), setting new intermediate deficit targets of 6.3% of GDP, 4.5% of GDP and 2.8% of GDP in 2012, 2013 and 2014, respectively. According to the recommendation, Spain has three months to take effective action.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-007092/12
до Комисията
Антония Първанова (ALDE) и Glenis Willmott (S&D)
(16 юли 2012 г.)

Относно: Стратегията относно алкохола

Алкохолът е рисков фактор номер едно в световен мащаб за влошено здравословно състояние и преждевременна смърт сред хората във възрастова група 25-29 г., които представляват основната част от населението в трудоспособна възраст. Тревожно е, че Европа е регионът с най-висока консумация на алкохол в света (12.5 литра на глава от населението), а според оценките на вредите от алкохола в ЕС се дължат 7 % от случаите на влошено здравословно състояние и ранна смърт.

Обаче настоящата стратегия на ЕС за оказване на подкрепа на държавите-членки за намаляване на вредите от алкохола приключва през тази година.

— Възнамерява ли Комисията да поднови тази стратегия и да изработи нова многогодишна политическа рамка за оказване на подкрепа на държавите-членки за намаляване на вредите от алкохола?

— Ако това е така, би ли могла Комисията да изложи плановете си за бъдещата стратегия на ЕС относно алкохола?

Отговор, даден от г-н Дали от името на Комисията
(30 август 2012 г.)

Комисията любезно приканва почитаемите членове на Европейския парламент да се запознаят с отговора ѝ на отправеното до нея питане (№ E-2252/2012 ([1])), в който се посочва, че в момента тече оценка на изпълнението на Стратегията за борба с алкохолизма, чието начало бе поставено през 2006 г. Очаква се резултатите от тази оценка да послужат за основа при планирането на следващите стъпки, които ще трябва да се предприемат в тази област. Освен това Комисията би желала да постави на Вашето внимание и отговора си на отправеното до нея питане (№ E-5605/2012), в който тя се позова на протичащия в момента процес на обстоен анализ съвместно с държавите членки с цел набелязване на още действия на равнището на ЕС в отговор на предизвикателствата, свързвани с хроничните заболявания, и с оглед на рисковите фактори, водещи до появата на тези заболявания, в т.ч. злоупотребата с алкохол.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bWQ%2bE-2012-002252%2b0%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2f%2fEN&language=EN.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007092/12
to the Commission
Antonyia Parvanova (ALDE) and Glenis Willmott (S&D)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: Alcohol strategy

Alcohol is the world's number one risk for ill health and premature death amongst the 25-59 age group, the core of the working-age population. Alarmingly, Europe is the heaviest-drinking region of the world (12.5 litres per capita), and it has been estimated that alcohol-related harm in the EU accounts for over 7 % of all ill health and early deaths.

However, the current EU strategy to support Member States in reducing alcohol-related harm is coming to an end this year.

— Does the Commission intend to renew this strategy and to set out a new multiannual policy framework to support Member States in reducing alcohol-related harm?

— If so, could the Commission outline its plans for the future EU alcohol strategy?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(30 August 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Members to its answer to E-2252/2012 ([1]) which indicates that an evaluation of the implementation of the alcohol strategy launched in 2006 is currently ongoing, and will feed into considerations on the next steps to take in this area. Moreover, the Commission would refer to its answer to E-5605/2012[1] in which it referred to the ongoing reflection process with the Member States to identify further action at EU level in addressing chronic diseases and its risk factors including alcohol abuse.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bWQ%2bE-2012-002252%2b0%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2f%2fEN&language=EN.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007110/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(16 de Julho de 2012)

Assunto: Crise política na Ucrânia

Considerando que:

— o Ucraniano é língua oficial da Ucrânia, com 46 milhões de habitantes;

— o Parlamento adota uma lei que dá ao Russo estatuto de língua regional;

— a promoção da língua russa a língua oficial das regiões onde já é predominantemente falada fará com que a mesma seja usada nos serviços públicos, como hospitais, tribunais e escolas;

— a aprovação da referida lei decorreu numa altura em que o partido no poder está em queda nas sondagens, iniciando uma crise política, com o ameaçar da convocação das eleições legislativas antecipadas e a demissão do Presidente do Parlamento.

Pergunto à Comissão:

1. Tem conhecimento da situação descrita?

2. Constituirá a aprovação da referida lei uma ameaça à soberania da Ucrânia e aos 20 anos de independência, desde a separação da União Soviética?

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

A AR/VP tem pleno conhecimento da situação política na Ucrânia e continua a sublinhar a importância de garantir que as alterações políticas se realizem de acordo com normas democráticas.

A delegação da UE em Kiev está a acompanhar a evolução dos acontecimentos relacionados com a lei sobre os princípios da política em matéria de língua oficial na Ucrânia. Apesar das lacunas processuais, nomeadamente durante a adoção da lei no Verkhovna Rada, a lei foi assinada pelo Presidente do Parlamento em 31 de julho de 2012 e posteriormente pelo Presidente Yanukovich em 8 de agosto de 2012. Entretanto, entrou em vigor e é já aplicada em várias regiões da Ucrânia. O Presidente criou um grupo trabalho para melhorar a lei, prevendo-se resultados para o final de setembro.

A AR/VP considera que um texto desse tipo devia ter sido adotado com base num debate nacional inclusivo e adequado, e na sequência de um amplo consenso. Em termos mais gerais, a AR/VP apelou às autoridades ucranianas no sentido de garantirem a não existência de violações ao direito da liberdade de reunião, nomeadamente no contexto da discussão sobre este projeto de lei.

A AR/VP toma igualmente nota de que foi apresentado à Comissão Venice (CV) do Conselho da Europa para a apresentação de observações um anterior projeto de lei sobre línguas. A CV apelou nomeadamente «a um equilíbrio justo entre a proteção dos direitos das minorias, por um lado, e a preservação da língua oficial enquanto instrumento de integração na sociedade, por outro». Assinalou igualmente que «em última instância, cabe ao legislador ucraniano decidir sobre esta importante questão». Uma avaliação pós-assinatura efetuada pelo Conselho da Europa/CV permitiria clarificar a conformidade da lei com as normas estabelecidas (mais concretamente normas decorrentes da Carta Europeia das Línguas Regionais ou Minoritárias).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007110/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: Political crisis in Ukraine

Ukrainian is the official language of Ukraine, which has 46 million inhabitants. The Ukrainian Parliament has now adopted a law giving Russian the status of a regional language. Russian's promotion to an official language in regions which are already predominantly Russian-speaking will mean that Russian will be used in public services such as hospitals, courts and schools. The adoption of this law comes at a time when the governing party is trailing in the opinion polls, sparking a political crisis with the threat of early parliamentary elections and the resignation of the Speaker of the Ukrainian Parliament.

1. Is the Commission aware of this situation?

2. Will the adoption of this law pose a threat to Ukraine's sovereignty and its 20 years of independence since breaking away from the Soviet Union?

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

The HR/VP is fully aware of the political situation in Ukraine and continues to stress the importance of ensuring that political changes take place according to democratic standards.

The EU Delegation in Kyiv is following developments related to the law on the principles of the state language policy of Ukraine. Despite procedural short comings, notably during the adoption of the law in the Verkhovna Rada, it was signed by the Speaker on 31 July 2012 and subsequently by President Yanukovich on 8 August 2012. In the meantime, it entered into force and is applied already in several regions in Ukraine. The President has initiated a working group to improve the law and the results are expected at the end of September.

The HR/VP takes the view that such a text should have been adopted on the basis of a proper inclusive domestic debate and with a broad consensus. More generally, the HR/VP has called on the Ukrainian authorities to ensure that, there are no violations to the right to freedom of assembly, including in the context of the discussion on this draft law.

The HR/VP also takes note that a previous draft law on languages was submitted to the Council of Europe's Venice Commission (VC) for comments. Among others, the VC called for 'a fair balance between the protection of the rights of minorities, on the one hand, and the preservation of the State language as a tool for integration within society, on the other hand'. It also noted that 'it ultimately is for the Ukrainian legislator to decide on this important matter'. A post-signature assessment by the Council of Europe/VC would clarify the compliance of the law with the established standards (more concretely standards stemming from the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages).

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007111/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(16 de julho de 2012)

Assunto: Scooter «verde»

É concebida em Portugal uma *scooter* que se distingue de todas as outras pelos materiais que a compõe.

É veículo de duas rodas, com um motor elétrico e uma estrutura de aço inox não necessitando de pintura. O aço é ainda revestido por cortiça e um tecido impermeável.

Segundo revela a imprensa portuguesa, este projeto está à procura de financiamento para o lançamento da primeira série do veículo. Esta *scooter* «verde» deve chegar ao mercado no final de 2013.

Pergunto à Comissão:

1. Tem conhecimento deste novo produto, que revela evidentes vantagens ambientais?

2. Justifica-se ou não o incremento e o apoio de produções equivalentes na UE?

Resposta dada por Antonio Tajani em nome da Comissão
(19 de outubro de 2012)

A Comissão está bem ciente da tendência geral que se traduz num grande número de projetos industriais relativos a veículos não poluentes, incluindo veículos de duas rodas elétricos, bem como das vantagens que poderiam ter no plano ambiental. As iniciativas desta índole estão no cerne da estratégia da UE para veículos não poluentes e energeticamente eficientes([1]), adotada em 28 de abril de 2010. Nesta comunicação, a Comissão estabelece as diferentes medidas a adotar para promover o desenvolvimento de veículos não poluentes. O apoio à investigação e à inovação foi um dos domínios de ação propostos. A estratégia está a ser aplicada sem problemas, tal como salientado nos dois relatórios anuais (datando o último de dezembro de 2011([2])), sob a forma de documento de trabalho dos serviços da Comissão.

Os veículos de duas rodas elétricos foram também incluídos no âmbito do Grupo de Alto Nível CARS 21 para a competitividade e o crescimento sustentável da indústria automóvel. Este grupo adotou o seu relatório final em 6 de junho de 2012. A Comissão está atualmente a preparar uma comunicação com vista a apresentar os resultados do grupo CARS 21 ao Conselho e ao Parlamento Europeu, e a propor um plano de ação para o setor. Além disso, estão a ser elaboradas orientações em matéria de incentivos financeiros para os veículos não poluentes e energeticamente eficientes. Ambos os documentos devem ser adotados até finais de 2012.

([1]) COM(2010)186 final de 28.4.2010.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/automotive/files/pagesbackground/competitiveness/sec-2011-1617_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007111/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: 'Green' scooter

A scooter is being designed in Portugal that differs from all other scooters owing to the materials used in its manufacture.

It is a two-wheeled vehicle with an electric motor and a stainless steel structure that does not require paint. The steel is covered by a layer of cork and waterproof fabric.

The Portuguese press has reported that the project is seeking financing to launch the first series of the vehicle. This 'green' scooter is scheduled to arrive on the market at the end of 2013.

1. Is the Commission aware of this new product that offers clear environmental advantages?

2. Are there valid reasons to boost and support similar products in the EU?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(19 October 2012)

The Commission is well aware of the general trend consisting of a great number of industrial projects developing clean vehicles, including electrically powered two-wheelers, and the environmental benefits these could bring. Such initiatives were the focus of the EU strategy for clean and energy efficient vehicles ([1]), adopted on 28 April 2010. In this communication, the Commission set out the different measures to be taken to support the development of clean vehicles. Support for Research and innovation was one of the proposed areas for action. The implementation of the strategy is progressing smoothly, as highlighted by the two annual reports (the latest in December 2011 ([2])) in the form of a Commission Staff Working Document.

Powered two-wheelers were also included in the scope of the CARS 21 High Level Group on the competitiveness and sustainable growth on the automotive industry. This group adopted its Final Report on 6 June 2012. The Commission is currently preparing a communication in order to present the outcome of CARS 21 to the Council and the European Parliament and propose an Action Plan for the sector. Also, guidelines for financial incentives for clean and energy-efficient vehicles are being prepared. Both documents should be adopted before the end of 2012.

([1]) COM(2010)186 final, 28.04.2010.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/automotive/files/pagesbackground/competitiveness/sec-2011-1617_en.pdf

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007112/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(16 de Julho de 2012)

Assunto: Crise política na Roménia

Considerando que a aceitação pelo Parlamento romeno de uma proposta de suspensão do Presidente da Roménia, afastando-o de funções durante um mês, com o objetivo de a maioria centro-esquerda organizar um referendo para a destituição do Presidente;

Considerando que, recentemente, o Governo de centro-esquerda afastou os líderes das duas Câmaras do Parlamento, demitiu o Provedor de Justiça e aprovou uma alteração que limita as competências do Tribunal Constitucional, retirando-lhe a prerrogativa de este se pronunciar sobre as decisões do Parlamento;

Considerando que o Primeiro-ministro foi alvo de uma queixa apresentada pelos juízes do Tribunal Constitucional da Roménia junto do Conselho Europeu, por se recusar a cumprir uma deliberação;

Pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que avaliação faz da atual crise política na Roménia?

2. Não considera que a independência do poder judicial e das próprias instituições, a separação dos poderes e o funcionamento da Democracia estão a ser postos em causa?

Resposta conjunta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão
(14 de setembro de 2012)

A Comissão remete o Senhor Deputado para a resposta que deu à pergunta escrita P-006729/2012 ([1]).

Em 10 de agosto, o Presidente José Manuel Barroso escreveu ao Primeiro-Ministro romeno Victor Ponta, manifestando uma série de preocupações sobre a evolução política e institucional na Roménia no pós-referendo de 29 de julho ([2]).

Em 21 de agosto, a Comissão reagiu à decisão do Tribunal Constitucional romeno de 29 de julho, apelando as forças políticas no sentido de respeitarem os valores europeus, atuarem com responsabilidade e trabalharem de forma construtiva para ultrapassar as divisões salvaguardando os interesses da Roménia ([3]).

([1]) Disponível em: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/12/621&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en
([3]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/12/626&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-007534/12
adresată Comisiei
Norica Nicolai (ALDE)
(1 august 2012)

Subiect: Legislația europeană referitoare la referendumul din România

Având în vedere articolul 4 din Tratatul privind Uniunea Europeană,

Având în vedere Codul de bune practici privind referendumurile, adoptat de Comisia de la Veneția, Secțiunea III, articolul 7, „Cvorum",

Având în vedere faptul că, în România, votul nu este obligatoriu,

Având în vedere faptul că legislația română în materie de referendumuri a fost schimbată anterior, în 2007 și, din nou, în 2010,

Având în vedere principiul egalității în fața legii,

Având în vedere declarațiile Comisiei referitoare la România,

Având în vedere Raportul privind Mecanismul de cooperare și verificare (MCV) referitor la România, publicat de către Comisie în iulie 2012,

Având în vedere faptul că 46,24% din alegătorii români cu drept de vot (cu alte cuvinte, 8 459 053 de persoane) au participat la un referendum în care au hotărât printr-o largă majoritate (87,2%) că Președintele ar trebui demis din funcție (7 403 836 de persoane au votat „Da"),

Având în vedere definiția de bază a democrației, și anume, o formă de guvernământ în care toți cetățenii adulți au un cuvânt egal de spus în deciziile care le afectează existența,

Poate Comisia preciza:

1. de ce a stipulat că la referendumul pentru demiterea Președintelui României a fost necesară o participare de 50% plus unu din totalul alegătorilor cu drept de vot pentru ca acesta să fie valid, având în vedere că acest lucru nu constituie nici o cerință a principiilor democratice internaționale de bază, nici un principiu legislativ consacrat în România;

2. pe ce s-au bazat criticile sale la adresa încercărilor Guvernului României de a modifica Legea referendumului din 2010 pentru a o aduce la forma sa din 2007, ținând seama de faptul că, prin modificările din 2010, România a devenit una din cele trei țări din întreaga Europă în care este necesară o participare la vot de 50% plus unu din alegători pentru ca referendumul să fie validat;

3. cum pot fi justificate criticile aduse României, ținând seama de principiul egalității conform tratatelor și de faptul că actualul guvern a încercat să modifice legea pentru ca aceasta să reflecte o practică majoritară în cadrul Uniunii Europene?

Răspuns comun dat de dna Reding în numele Comisiei
(14 septembrie 2012)

Comisia Europeană ar dori să aducă în atenția distinsului membru răspunsul său la întrebarea scrisă P-006729/2012 ([1]).

La 10 august, Președintele Barroso i-a scris prim-ministrului român Ponta pentru a-și exprima o serie de îngrijorări cu privire la evoluțiile instituționale și politice din România ca urmare a referendumului din 29 iulie ([2]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/ro/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/12/621&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en

La 21 august, Comisia a reacționat la decizia Curții Constituționale a României cu privire la referendumul din 29 iulie și a invitat toate forțele politice să respecte valorile europene, să acționeze cu responsabilitate și să colaboreze în mod constructiv, în interesul României, pentru depășirea scindărilor ([3]).

([3]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/12/626&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007112/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: Political crisis in Romania

The Romanian Parliament has approved a proposal to suspend the country's President for a month so as to enable the centre-left majority to hold a referendum on his impeachment.

The centre-left Government has recently sacked the speakers of both houses of Parliament, dismissed the Ombudsman, and adopted an amendment curtailing the powers of the Constitutional Court, thus denying it the right to rule on Parliament's decisions.

The Prime Minister is the subject of a complaint which the Constitutional Court judges have lodged with the Council of Europe on account of his refusal to comply with a ruling.

1. What is the Commission's assessment of the current political crisis in Romania?

2. Does the Commission not consider that the independence of the judiciary and the institutions, the separation of powers, and the functioning of democracy are being placed in jeopardy?

Question for written answer E-007534/12
to the Commission
Norica Nicolai (ALDE)
(1 August 2012)

Subject: European legislation regarding the Romanian referendum

Having regard to Article 4 of the Treaty on European Union,

Having regard to the Code of Good Practice on Referendums adopted by the Venice Commission, Section III, Article 7, 'Quorum',

Having regard to the fact that voting is not compulsory in Romania,

Having regard to the fact that the legislation on referendums in Romania has been changed before, in 2007 and then again in 2010,

Having regard to the principle of equality in law,

Having regard to the Commission's statements concerning Romania,

Having regard to the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism (CVM) Report on Romania published by the Commission in July 2012,

Having regard to the fact that 46.24 % of the registered Romanian electorate (i.e. 8 459 053 people) participated in a referendum in which they decided by a large majority (87.52 %) that the President should be removed from office (7 403 836 people therefore voted 'Yes'),

Having regard to the basic definition of democracy, i.e. as a form of government whereby all adult citizens have an equal say in the decisions that affect their lives,

Can the Commission state:

1. why it stipulated that the referendum on the dismissal of the Romanian president required a turnout of 50 % plus one of total registered voters in order to be valid, when this is neither a requirement of basic international democratic principles nor an established legislative principle in Romania;

2. on what it based its criticism of the Romanian Government's attempts to change the 2010 referendum law back to its 2007 form, as the 2010 changes made Romania one of only three countries in the whole of Europe requiring a turnout of 50 % of voters plus one for the validation of a referendum;

3. how its criticism of Romania can be justified, given the principle of equality under the Treaties and given that the current government has tried to change the law in order for it to reflect majority practice in the European Union?

Joint answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(14 September 2012)

Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its reply to Written Question P-006729/2012 ([1]).

On 10 August President Barroso wrote to Romanian Prime Minister Ponta expressing a number of concerns about the institutional and political developments in Romania in the aftermath of the 29 July referendum ([2]).

On 21 August the Commission reacted to the Romanian Constitutional Court decision on 29 July calling on all Political forces to respect European values, to act with responsibility and to work constructively in overcoming divisions in Romania's best interest ([3]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/12/621&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en.
([3]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/12/626&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007117/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(16 de julho de 2012)

Assunto: Desemprego em Portugal

Considerando que:

Segundo dados da OCDE, Portugal perdeu cerca de 500 000 postos de trabalho nos últimos quatro anos;

Com as medidas restritivas e de austeridade que têm sido implementadas pelo Governo, este cenário tem vindo a agravar-se;

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Estão previstas para Portugal, em coordenação com o Governo, medidas que possam criar incentivos à economia para começar a reduzir o número de desempregados, e ao mesmo tempo reiniciar um processo de crescimento da economia?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(12 de setembro de 2012)

Todas as reformas do mercado de trabalho estabelecidas no programa relativo a Portugal visam criar condições propícias à retoma do crescimento económico e combater o desemprego, devendo ser aplicadas com base num amplo consenso social.

O novo Código do Trabalho, entrado em vigor a 1 de agosto de 2012, define o novo quadro jurídico. Inclui um alinhamento das indemnizações por despedimento para os atuais trabalhadores pelas dos novos contratados, uma flexibilização da definição de despedimentos individual por justa causa, uma maior flexibilidade do horário laboral e uma maior margem de negociação coletiva a nível das empresas. Além disso, foi adotado um novo regime de seguro de desemprego e, nos próximos meses, o Governo deverá apresentar uma proposta de revisão do mecanismo para alargar os acordos coletivos.

Foram entretanto adotadas várias medidas para promover o emprego, tais como a iniciativa *Impulso jovem* ([1]).

As políticas ativas do mercado de trabalho constituem igualmente uma parte importante das reformas do mercado de trabalho, nomeadamente através do plano *Estímulo 2012*([2]), que teve início em fevereiro de 2012, e do programa *Vida Ativa*([3]).

Por último, o programa também prevê uma série de medidas no domínio da educação, a fim de melhorar a qualidade do ensino no país.

([1]) O Governo lançou um programa no montante de 344 milhões de euros para combater o desemprego entre os jovens. Pretende abranger 90 000 jovens desempregados, através de estágios, programas de formação, empreendedorismo e apoio financeiro às PME. Além disso, foi decidida uma redução orientada das contribuições para a segurança social com o intuito de facilitar o acesso dos jovens ao mercado de trabalho.

([2]) Estas iniciativas visam reestruturar os serviços de emprego e implementam um regime de subsídio salarial para os desempregados inscritos nos centros de emprego há mais de 6 meses, tendo já colocado mais de 2000 desempregados no mercado de trabalho.

([3]) O plano prevê formação de curta duração no prazo de 45 dias após a inscrição nos centros de emprego. Além disso, os desempregados inscritos há mais de 6 meses terão direito, em determinadas condições, a acumular, durante um certo período de tempo, o subsídio de desemprego com um emprego a tempo inteiro, se aceitarem uma oferta de emprego com remuneração inferior ao subsídio de desemprego.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007117/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: Unemployment in Portugal

According to OECD figures, approximately 500 000 jobs have been lost in Portugal in the last four years.

The cuts and austerity measures being implemented by the Government have been making matters worse.

Will measures be put in place for Portugal, in coordination with its Government, with a view to creating incentives to start reducing the number of unemployed while bringing about a return to growth?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(12 September 2012)

All labour market reforms set in the Programme for Portugal are aimed at setting the right conditions to resume economic growth and to tackle unemployment. They are intended to be implemented under broad social consensus.

The revised Labour Code that entered into force on 1 August 2012 sets the new legal framework. It includes an alignment of severance payments of current employees with those of new hires, an easing of the definition of individual fair dismissals, an increase in the flexibility of working time, and a larger scope for collective bargaining at firm level. In addition, a new unemployment insurance system has been adopted and a revision of the mechanism for extending collective agreements should be proposed by the Government in the coming months.

In the meantime, a number of measures have been taken to foster employment, such as *Impulso Jovem* ([1]).

Active Labour Market Policies are also a relevant part of the labour market reforms, i.e. the plan *Estímulo 2012* which started in February 2012 ([2]) and the programme *Vida Ativa* ([3]).

Lastly, the Programme also sets a number of measures in the area of Education to improve the educational standards of the country.

([1]) A programme amounting to EUR 344 million has been launched by the Government to tackle youth unemployment. It aims to reach 90 000 young unemployed through traineeships, training programmes, entrepreneurships and financial support to SMEs. In addition, a targeted reduction in social security contributions was decided in order to facilitate the access of young people to the labour market.

([2]) The plans aims to restructure the PES and implements a wage subsidy scheme for unemployed registered with PES for more than 6 months. It has already placed more than 2000 unemployed into the labour market.

([3]) The plan provides short-term training, within 45 days after registration with PES. In addition, the unemployed registered with PES for more than 6 months will be entitled, under specific circumstances, to accumulate unemployment benefits with full time work during a certain period of time if they accept a job offer below the unemployment benefits. .

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007124/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(16 de julho de 2012)

Assunto: Importância da Língua Portuguesa enquanto língua universal

Considerando que:

— O respeito da diversidade cultural e linguística da UE encontra-se consagrado no artigo 3.° do TUE e nos artigos 24.° e 165.° do TFU, bem como na Carta de Direitos Fundamentais no seu artigo 22.°;

— Não obstante, verdade é que, por razões históricas, algumas línguas europeias são faladas em muitos outros países terceiros, em todos os continentes e constituem um importante elo entre os povos e nações de diferentes regiões do mundo, estabelecendo uma comunicação direta com essas regiões;

— O Português é atualmente a terceira língua europeia mais falada em todo o mundo e em todos os continentes;

— O Português é a 1.ª língua mais falada no Hemisfério Sul;

— As Línguas Europeias devem ser valorizadas não apenas em termos do número de falantes dentro da UE, mas também em termo do número de falantes no mundo;

— Justamente, e pelo que vem sendo exposto, a Resolução do PE de 8 de abril de 2003 reconhece o Português como a terceira «Língua Europeia de comunicação universal», falada em todos os Continentes;

— Com cerca de 230 milhões de falantes, é língua oficial de Angola, Brasil, Cabo Verde, Guiné-Bissau, Moçambique, Portugal e São Tomé e Príncipe. É também uma das línguas oficiais da Guiné Equatorial, Timor-Leste e Macau;

— Estranhamente, o sítio eletrónico de missão de observação de eleições da UE([1]) não apresenta versão em Língua Portuguesa. O referido sítio eletrónico apresenta versões em Finlandês, Húngaro e Romeno, línguas minoritárias em termos de número de falantes em todo o mundo.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Como justifica a inexistência de uma versão do sítio eletrónico de missão de observação das eleições da UE em Português?

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

Todos os documentos oficiais elaborados pelos serviços da Comissão e pelo Serviço Europeu para a Ação Externa relativamente às eleições em Timor-Leste foram redigidos em português e inglês, o mesmo acontecendo em relação ao conteúdo do sítio Web da Missão de Observação Eleitoral da UE (MOE)([1]) no que diz respeito às eleições acima referidas.

O relatório final da MOE da UE em Timor-Leste, que será partilhado com as autoridades, será redigido em português, inglês e tétum.

([1]) http://www.eueom.eu/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007124/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: Importance of Portuguese as a world language

Respect for the EU's cultural and linguistic diversity is enshrined in Article 3 TEU and Articles 24 and 165 TFEU, as well as Article 22 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights.

Nevertheless, for historical reasons, there are some European languages which are also spoken in many other third countries across all the continents and represent an important link between peoples and nations in different parts of the world, providing a direct means of communication with those regions.

Portuguese is currently the third most widely spoken European language across the world and in all the continents. Furthermore, it is the most widely spoken language in the southern hemisphere.

European languages should be valued in terms not only of the number of speakers in the EU but also the number of speakers across the world. Parliament's resolution of 8 April 2003 rightly recognises Portuguese as Europe's third most important world language that is spoken in all continents.

With around 230 million speakers, it is the official language of Angola, Brazil, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Portugal and São Tomé and Principe. It is also one of the official languages of Equatorial Guinea, East Timor and Macau.

Strangely, the EU election observation mission website ([1]) does not offer a Portuguese language version. It does however offer versions in Finnish, Hungarian and Romanian, which are minority languages in terms of the number of speakers across the world.

How does the Commission explain the absence of a Portuguese language version of the EU election observation mission website?

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

All official documents prepared by Commission services and the European External Action Service concerning elections in Timor-Leste were produced in Portuguese and English and the same holds for the content of the EU Election Observation Mission (EOM) website (http://www.eueom.eu/) on the abovementioned elections.

The final report of the EU EOM to Timor-Leste, which will be shared with the authorities, will be produced in Portuguese, English and Tetum.

([1]) http://www.eueom.eu/.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-007126/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(16 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Deroga per la vinificazione di prosecco e spumante

In base al regolamento (CE) 607/2009 (art. 6, par. 4) non è possibile effettuare la spumantizzazione e la frizzantatura di vini spumanti e di vini frizzanti al di fuori delle regioni a indicazione geografica.

Può la Commissione far sapere se nell'ambito del regolamento comunitario può prevedere una deroga affinché possano mantenere la dicitura Igp i vini frizzanti e i vini spumanti che vengono presi in carico dall'azienda di trasformazione anche al di fuori della regione ad indicazione geografica entro il 31 dicembre 2012 per effettuare i procedimenti di spumantizzazione o frizzantatura che potranno avvenire anche successivamente al 31 dicembre 2012?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(8 agosto 2012)

L'articolo 6, paragrafo 4, del regolamento (CE) n. 607/2009 ([1]) prevede diverse deroghe, in particolare «purché lo preveda il disciplinare di produzione, un prodotto a […] indicazione geografica protetta può essere vinificato in una zona nelle immediate vicinanze della zona geografica delimitata, oppure in una zona situata nella stessa unità amministrativa o in un'unità amministrativa limitrofa, in conformità alle disposizioni nazionali […]».

Conformemente a queste disposizioni, i vini spumanti e i vini frizzanti la cui lavorazione è effettuata in parte in una zona nelle immediate vicinanze della zona geografica delimitata, oppure in una zona situata nella stessa unità amministrativa o in un'unità amministrativa limitrofa possono conservare l'indicazione geografica protetta, purché lo preveda il disciplinare di produzione in questione. Il disciplinare di produzione e la decisione nazionale di approvazione che lo Stato membro trasmette alla Commissione consentono di verificare le condizioni pertinenti di produzione del vino con l'indicazione geografica protetta interessata, come indicato nell'articolo 118 quater del regolamento (CE) n. 1234/2007 ([2]).

Infine, la Commissione desidera precisare che la deroga prevista nel secondo comma dell'articolo 6, paragrafo 4, si applica fino al 31 dicembre 2012 e si riferisce alla lavorazione dei vini a indicazione geografica protetta al di là delle immediate vicinanze della zona geografica delimitata.

([1]) GU L 193 del 24.7.2009, pag. 60.
([2]) GU L 299 del 16.11.2007, pag. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007126/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: Derogation for making prosecco and spumante sparkling wines

Under Regulation (EC) 607/2009 (Article 6, paragraph 4) sparkling wines and semi-sparkling wines must not be carbonated outside the protected geographical indication region.

Can the Commission say whether it can grant an exemption (derogation) under this EU regulation so that sparkling and semi-sparkling wines that are taken over, by 31 December 2012, by processing firms outside the indicated geographical region (for the purpose of carbonating the wines even after 31 December 2012) may retain their PGI status?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(8 August 2012)

Article 6(4) of Regulation (EC) No 607/2009 ([1]) provides different derogations and in particular that, if 'the product specification so provides, a product with a protected […] geographical indication (PGI) may be made into wine either in an area in the immediate proximity of the demarcated area concerned or in an area located within the same administrative unit or within a neighbouring administrative unit, in conformity with national rules […]'.

In accordance with these rules, sparkling and semi-sparkling wines for which some processing is made in an area in the immediate proximity of the demarcated area concerned or in an area located within the same administrative unit or within a neighbouring administrative unit may retain their PGI status, if such possibility is provided for by the product specification concerned. The product specification and the national decision of approval communicated by the Member State to the Commission shall enable the verification of the relevant conditions of production of the wine with the protected geographical indication concerned, as referred to in Article 118c of Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 ([2]).

Finally, the Commission would like to clarify that the derogation provided for in the second subparagraph of Article 6(4) applies until 31 December 2012 and refers to the processing of PGI wines beyond the immediate proximity of the demarcated area.

([1]) OJ L 193, 24.7.2009, p. 60-139.
([2]) OJ L 299, 16.11.2007, p. 1-149.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007143/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(16 Ιουλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Κόστος συγχρηματοδοτούμενων έργων ΚΕΛ Ψυττάλειας και ΚΕΛ Θριασίου πεδίου

Με συγχρηματοδότηση από την ΕΕ, έχει κατασκευαστεί σταδιακά και σε τρεις κυρίως φάσεις το Κέντρο Επεξεργασίας Λυμάτων (ΚΕΛ) της Ψυττάλειας, που επεξεργάζεται τα λύματα της Αττικής. Το έργο αποτελεί ένα από τα μεγαλύτερα του είδους. Λειτουργεί από το 1994 και κατασκευάσθηκε σταδιακά σε τρεις κυρίως φάσεις, που περιλάμβαναν την Α' Φάση έργων (1994), την Β' Φάση έργων (2004) και την Γ' Φάση έργων με την κατασκευή της μονάδας θερμικής ξήρανσης ιλύος (2007).

Στα πλαίσια του ΚΕΛ Ψυττάλειας, κατασκευάστηκαν και οι εξής μονάδες: μονάδα προεπεξεργασίας λυμάτων στη νήσο Σαλαμίνα (2002), δύο μονάδες συμπαραγωγής ηλεκτρικής και θερμικής ενέργειας (ΣΗΘΕ) με καύση βιοαερίου (2001 και 2009) και μία μονάδα ΣΗΘΕ με καύση φυσικού αερίου (2009).

Επίσης έχει κατασκευαστεί με συγχρηματοδότηση το Κέντρο Επεξεργασίας Λυμάτων του Θριασίου Πεδίου, το οποίο βρίσκεται σε φάση ολοκλήρωσης από το 2010 αλλά δεν έχει ακόμα παραδοθεί.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή: πόσο στοίχισε το καθένα από τα παραπάνω έργα (ΚΕΛ Ψυττάλειας και ΚΕΛ Θριασίου Πεδίου); Ποιο το ποσό που δόθηκε για το καθένα από πόρους της ΕΕ και ποιο από εθνικούς ή άλλους πόρους;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(31 Αυγούστου 2012)

Το Κέντρο Επεξεργασίας Λυμάτων της Ψυτάλλειας (ΚΕΛΨ) χρηματοδοτήθηκε σε τρεις φάσεις:

Φάση Ι: το κόστος κατασκευής του ΚΕΛΨ ανήλθε σε 80 εκατομμύρια δραχμές (τιμές 1994) και το έργο συγχρηματοδοτήθηκε από το προσωρινό χρηματοδοτικό μέσο συνοχής.

Φάση ΙΙ: για το έργο του Ταμείου Συνοχής «Ψυτάλλεια ΚΕΛΨ — φάση Β» εγκρίθηκε προϋπολογισμός ύψους 171 εκατ. ευρώ και η συμμετοχή του Ταμείου Συνοχής ήταν 135 εκατ. ευρώ.

Φάση ΙΙΙ: για το έργο του Ταμείου Συνοχής «Μονάδα ξήρανσης ιλύος Ψυταλλείας», η Επιτροπή ενέκρινε προϋπολογισμό ύψους 39 εκατ. ευρώ, ενώ η χρηματοδοτική συνδρομή του Ταμείου Συνοχής ανήλθε στα 29 εκατ. ευρώ.

Το έργο στο Θριάσιο Πεδίο εγκρίθηκε σε δύο φάσεις:

Η πρώτη αφορούσε την κατασκευή ενός σταθμού καθαρισμού λυμάτων και το κύριο αποχετευτικό δίκτυο. Ο συνολικός προϋπολογισμός ανήλθε στα 55 εκατ. ευρώ, ενώ η συνδρομή του Ταμείου Συνοχής ήταν 25 εκατ. ευρώ.

Η δεύτερη φάση αφορούσε την κατασκευή του δευτερεύοντος δικτύου αποχέτευσης. Ο συνολικός προϋπολογισμός ανήλθε σε 53 εκατ. ευρώ, ενώ η συνδρομή του Ταμείου Συνοχής ανήλθε στα 40 εκατ. ευρώ.

Οι δαπάνες για τα δύο έργα ήταν επιλέξιμες έως τις 31 Δεκεμβρίου 2011 και τα έγγραφα που αφορούν το κλείσιμο της παρέμβασης αναμένεται να υποβληθούν στην Επιτροπή έως το τέλος του Ιουνίου 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007143/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: Cost of the co-funded Psyttalia and Thiasian Plain waste water treatment plants

The Psyttalia waste water treatment plant, which treats the sewage of Attica, was constructed gradually in three main phases, with EU co-funding. The project is one of the largest of its kind. It began working in 1994 and comprised: Phase I projects (1994), Phase II project (2004) and Phase III projects with the construction of the thermal sludge drying unit (2007).

As part of the Psyttalia waste water treatment plant, the following units were also constructed: a sewage pre-treatment plant on Salamis island (2002), two biogas-fired electricity and thermal energy cogeneration plants (2001 and 2009) and one gas-fired cogeneration plant (2009).

The Thiasian Plain waste water treatment plant was also constructed with co-funding. It was completed in 2010 but has not yet been delivered.

Will the Commission say: how much did each of these projects (Psyttalia and Thiasian Plain waste water treatment plants) cost? How much was allocated to each project in EU funds and how much in national and other funds?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(31 August 2012)

The Psytallia Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP) was funded in three phases:

Phase I: the cost of building the WWTP itself was 80 million drachmas (1994 prices) and the project was co-financed by the Temporary Cohesion Financial Instrument.

Phase II: the Cohesion fund project 'Psytalia WWTP-phase b' approved a budget of EUR 171 million corresponding to a EUR 135 million Cohesion Fund contribution.

Phase III: for the Cohesion fund project 'Psytalia sludge drying unit', the Commission approved a budget of EUR 39 million corresponding to EUR 29 million Cohesion Fund financial assistance.

The Thriacian project was approved in two phases:

The first concerned the construction of a WWTP and the primary sewage network. The total budget was EUR 55 million corresponding to a EUR 25 million Cohesion Fund contribution. The second element concerned the construction of the secondary sewage network. The total budget was EUR 53 million corresponding to a EUR 40 million Cohesion Fund contribution.

Expenditure for both projects was eligible until 31 December 2011, and the closure documents are expected to be submitted to the Commission by the end of June 2013.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007145/12
a la Comisión
Inés Ayala Sender (S&D) y Georges Bach (PPE)
(16 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Transposición de la Directiva sobre infracciones de tráfico transfronterizas

La Directiva 2011/82/UE pretende facilitar el intercambio transfronterizo de información sobre infracciones de tráfico en materia de seguridad vial

La mejora de la seguridad vial constituye uno de los objetivos centrales de la política de transportes de la Unión. Un elemento importante de esta política es la aplicación coherente de las sanciones por infracciones de tráfico cometidas en la Unión que supongan un peligro considerable para la seguridad vial. La nueva Directiva 2011/82/UE garantizará que también se lleve a cabo una investigación en los casos de infracciones de tráfico en materia de seguridad vial cometidas por conductores no residentes. Este nuevo instrumento servirá para subsanar una carencia importante en la cadena de aplicación de la ley al facilitar el intercambio de información necesario para completar los esfuerzos de la policía y otras autoridades competentes dirigidos a garantizar el pleno cumplimiento de la ley de tráfico y mejorar la seguridad vial. Una vez que la nueva Directiva entre en vigor, también contribuirá a reducir el número de muertes anuales en las carreteras europeas (actualmente, 30 100).

La Comisión recibió con satisfacción el acuerdo alcanzado entre los legisladores sobre este expediente, pero el 25 de enero de 2012 decidió impugnar su base jurídica ante el Tribunal de Justicia, puesto que considera que el artículo 91, apartado 1, letra c), del Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea, sobre transporte, es el pertinente para legislar en materia de seguridad vial (aunque solicitó expresamente al Tribunal que se mantuviesen los efectos de la legislación hasta que se aprobase una nueva directiva con la base jurídica correcta). Tras dicha impugnación, nos preocupa que algunos Estados miembros pudieran mostrarse menos proclives a prepararse para la aplicación de la Directiva.

1. ¿Qué medidas tomará la Comisión contra los Estados miembros que no respeten la fecha límite del 7 de noviembre de 2013 para la transposición de la Directiva?

2. ¿Qué apoyo adicional proporcionará la Comisión a los Estados miembros para ayudarlos a prepararse para la aplicación de la Directiva?

3. Con arreglo al artículo 8 de la Directiva 2011/82/UE, los Estados miembros y la Comisión tendrán ahora la obligación legal de ofrecer a los usuarios de la red viaria no residentes la información necesaria acerca de las normas aplicables en los distintos Estados miembros. ¿Qué mecanismos establecerá la Comisión para informar a los ciudadanos de la UE sobre la aplicación de la Directiva?

Respuesta del Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión
(29 de agosto de 2012)

1. Como guardiana del Tratado, la Comisión tomará las disposiciones necesarias para garantizar la incorporación de la Directiva sobre aplicación transfronteriza ([1]), si procede, mediante la aplicación del procedimiento previsto en el artículo 258 del Tratado.

2. La Comisión ha creado un grupo de expertos sobre dicha aplicación, con el fin de apoyar la sanción de infracciones de tráfico en materia de seguridad vial. En su reunión de 20 de julio de 2012, el grupo debatió sobre distintas cuestiones operativas relacionadas con la incorporación de la Directiva.

3. La Comisión ha pedido a los Estados miembros que faciliten, antes del 15 de septiembre de 2012, información sobre las normas vigentes en el ámbito cubierto por la Directiva sobre aplicación transfronteriza. La información facilitada por los Estados miembros se publicará, a continuación, en un capítulo *ad hoc* en el sitio dedicado a la seguridad vial europea en Internet (http://ec.europa.eu/roadsafety).

([1]) Directiva 2011/82/UE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 25 de octubre de 2011, por la que se facilita el intercambio transfronterizo de información sobre infracciones de tráfico en materia de seguridad vial (DO L 288 de 5.11.2011, pp. 1 a 15).

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007145/12
à la Commission
Inés Ayala Sender (S&D) et Georges Bach (PPE)
(16 juillet 2012)

Objet: Transposition de la directive 2011/82/UE facilitant l'échange transfrontalier d'informations concernant les infractions en matière de sécurité routière

L'amélioration de la sécurité routière est un objectif central de la politique des transports de l'Union. Un des éléments importants de cette politique est l'application cohérente de sanctions pour les infractions routières commises dans l'Union qui menacent gravement la sécurité routière. La nouvelle directive 2011/82/UE facilitant l'échange transfrontalier d'informations concernant les infractions en matière de sécurité routière garantira que l'enquête relative aux infractions en matière de sécurité routière s'appliquera également aux conducteurs non-résidents. Ce nouvel instrument comblera une lacune importante dans le processus de mise en œuvre, permettant ainsi l'échange d'informations nécessaires pour compléter les efforts déployés par la police et les forces de l'ordre afin de parvenir au plein respect du code de la route et améliorer la sécurité routière. Une fois que la nouvelle directive sera entrée en vigueur, elle contribuera également à réduire le nombre de morts sur les routes européennes, qui s'élève à 30 100 par an.

La Commission s'est félicitée de l'accord intervenu entre les législateurs concernant ce dossier mais elle a décidé, le 25 janvier 2012, de contester la base juridique devant la Cour de Justice car elle estime que l'article 91, paragraphe 1, du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne, relatif au transport est l'article qui doit être pris en compte pour légiférer dans le domaine de la sécurité routière (bien qu'elle ait demandé explicitement à la Cour de veiller à ce que les effets de l'acte soient maintenus jusqu'à ce qu'un nouvel acte soit adopté sur la base juridique pertinente). À la suite de cette contestation, nous craignons que certains États membres puissent être moins enclins à se préparer pour la mise en œuvre de cette directive.

1. Quelles mesures la Commission prendra-t-elle contre les États membres s'ils ne respectent pas la date butoir du 7 novembre 2013 pour la mise en œuvre de la directive?

2. Quel soutien supplémentaire la Commission accorde-t-elle aux États membres en vue de la mise en œuvre de cette directive?

3. En vertu de l'article 8 de la directive 2011/82/UE, les États membres et la Commission auront désormais l'obligation juridique de fournir aux usagers de la route non-résidents les informations sur les règles applicables dans les divers pays de l'Union européenne. Quelles structures la Commission met-elle en place afin de communiquer au sujet de l'application de cette directive avec les citoyens de l'UE?

Réponse donnée par M. Kallas au nom de la Commission
(29 août 2012)

1. La Commission, en tant que gardienne du Traité, prendra toutes les mesures nécessaires pour s'assurer de la transposition de la directive relative à l'application transfrontalière de la législation (([1])), en appliquant le cas échéant la procédure prévue à l'article 258 du Traité.

2. La Commission a constitué un groupe d'experts sur la mise en œuvre afin de favoriser le plein respect de la législation en matière d'infractions à la sécurité routière. Lors de sa réunion du 20 juillet 2012, le groupe s'est penché sur plusieurs questions opérationnelles relatives à la transposition de la directive.

3. La Commission a prié les États membres de lui procurer pour le 15 septembre 2012 au plus tard des informations sur la législation déjà en vigueur dans les domaines couverts par la directive relative à l'application transfrontalière de la législation. Les informations fournies par les États membres seront ensuite publiées sur le site internet pour la sécurité routière européenne (http://ec.europa.eu/roadsafety), dans une section spécifique.

([1]) Directive 2011/82/UE du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 25 octobre 2011 facilitant l'échange transfrontalier d'informations concernant les infractions en matière de sécurité routière (JO L 288 du 5.11.2011, p. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007145/12
to the Commission
Inés Ayala Sender (S&D) and Georges Bach (PPE)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: Transposition of directive on cross-border traffic offences

Directive 2011/82/EU aims to facilitate the cross-border exchange of information on road-safety-related traffic offences.

Improving road safety is a prime objective of the Union's transport policy. An important element of this policy is the consistent enforcement of sanctions for road traffic offences committed in the Union which considerably jeopardise road safety. The new Directive 2011/82/EU will ensure that the investigation of road-safety-related traffic offences also applies to non-resident drivers. This new instrument will fill an important gap in the enforcement chain, thus enabling the exchange of information needed to follow through the efforts of police and enforcement authorities to achieve full compliance with traffic law and improve road safety. Once the new directive is in place, it will also make a contribution to reducing the 30 100 deaths on Europe's roads each year.

The Commission welcomed the agreement reached between the legislators on this file, but decided on 25 January 2012 to challenge the legal basis before the Court of Justice, as it considers that Article 91(1)(c) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, on transport, is the correct article for legislating on road safety (although it explicitly requested to the Court that the effects of the legislation be maintained until a new directive has been adopted with the correct legal basis). Following this action, we are concerned that some Member States may be less likely to prepare for the directive's implementation.

1. What action will the Commission take if Member States do not meet the deadline of 7 November 2013 for the transposition of the directive?

2. What further support is the Commission giving to support the Member States in preparing for the directive's implementation?

3. Under Article 8 of Directive 2011/82/EU, Member States and the Commission will now have a legal duty to inform non-resident road users about existing rules in the different Member States. What arrangements is the Commission putting in place to communicate with EU citizens about the application of the directive?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(29 August 2012)

1. The Commission as the guardian of the Treaty will undertake the necessary steps to ensure the transposition of the Cross-border Enforcement Directive ([1]), if applicable by applying the procedure of Article 258 of the Treaty.

2. The Commission has established an Expert Group on Enforcement to support the enforcement of road safety related traffic offences. During its meeting of 20 July 2012, the group discussed several operational issues in relation to the transposition of the directive.

3. The Commission requested the Member States to provide by 15 September 2012 the information on the rules in force in the field covered by the Cross-border Enforcement Directive. The information from the Member States will then be published in a dedicated section of the European Road Safety website (http://ec.europa.eu/roadsafety).

([1]) Directive 2011/82/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2011 facilitating the cross-border exchange of information on road safety related traffic offences (OJ L 288, 5.11.2011, p. 1-15).

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-007160/12
a Bizottság számára (Alelnök/főképviselő)
Gay Mitchell (PPE), Phil Prendergast (S&D), Gál Kinga (PPE), Bauer Edit (PPE), Sógor Csaba (PPE), Gyürk András (PPE), Schöpflin György (PPE), Tőkés László (PPE), Surján László (PPE), Bagó Zoltán (PPE), Szájer József (PPE), Hankiss Ágnes (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Marian Harkin (ALDE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Liam Aylward (ALDE), Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Nessa Childers (S&D) és Emer Costello (S&D)
(2012. július 16.)

Tárgy: VP/HR — uniós állampolgárok meggyilkolása és fogva tartása Bolíviában

1. Meg tudná-e azt az alelnök/főképviselő mondani, hogy miként fogja tisztségéből adódó lehetőségeit használva biztosítani a teljes körű és független vizsgálat lefolytatását Michael Dwyer halálának körülményeire vonatkozóan, akit 2009 áprilisában a bolíviai biztonsági hatóságok a bolíviai Santa Cruzban lelőttek, és meghalt?

2. Továbbá tudná-e az alelnök/főképviselő biztosítani a méltányos bánásmódhoz — ideértve vádemelés esetén a tisztességes eljáráshoz — való jogot egy bolíviai fogvatartottért, Tóásó Elődért, akit 2009. április 16-án letartóztattak, és azóta is fogva tartanak — megsértve ezzel az előzetes letartóztatás 36 hónapban maximalizált időtartamát –, és akit még nem állítottak bíróság elé?

Catherine Ashton főképviselő/alelnök válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2012. szeptember 3.)

Az EKSZ az alábbi parlamenti kérdésekre adott írásbeli válaszaiban kifejezett álláspontjára kívánja emlékeztetni a tisztelt képviselőket: P-3345/2009 (Olajos Péter EP képviselő), 001/2010 (Gál Kinga EP képviselő), valamint E-2726/10 (Alan Kelly EP képviselő).

Az EKSZ kiemelt figyelemmel kíséri Michael Dwyer ügyét, és a legmagasabb szinten — többek között a bolíviai külügyminiszterrel Brüsszelben és La Pazban (márciusban, illetve júniusban) sorra került találkozó során — is felvetette a problémát. A főképviselő/alelnök szolgálatai hangsúlyozták a gyors, pártatlan és mindenre kiterjedő nyomozás szükségességét.

Az EKSZ Dwyer úr ügyéhez hasonlóan Tóásó Előd elhúzódó eljárása iránt is rendkívüli figyelmet tanúsított. Ezt a kérdést is felvetette a fent említett kétoldalú találkozók során, és kitartott amellett, hogy a szabályszerű eljárás elveinek és az emberi jogoknak megfelelő tisztességes eljárás lefolytatására van szükség. Az EKSZ újra felveti majd a kérdést és hangsúlyozza álláspontját a bolíviai hatóságokkal a legmagasabb diplomáciai szinten sorra kerülő jövőbeni találkozói alkalmával, és különösen a bolíviai külügyminiszter októberben esedékes brüsszeli látogatása során.

Továbbá az EKSZ kapcsolatban áll az ENSZ Emberi Jogok Főbiztosának bolíviai hivatalával és az ENSZ önkényes fogva tartásokkal foglalkozó különleges előadójával.

Ahogyan eddig is, az EKSZ La Paz-i küldöttsége a hatáskörén belül továbbra is logisztikai támogatást nyújt a magyar hatóságoknak, amennyiben kérik.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007160/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Gay Mitchell (PPE), Phil Prendergast (S&D), Kinga Gál (PPE), Edit Bauer (PPE), Csaba Sógor (PPE), András Gyürk (PPE), György Schöpflin (PPE), László Tőkés (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), József Szájer (PPE), Ágnes Hankiss (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Marian Harkin (ALDE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Liam Aylward (ALDE), Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Nessa Childers (S&D) and Emer Costello (S&D)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Killing and detention of EU citizens in Bolivia

1. Could the Vice-President/High Representative indicate how she will use her position to ensure that a full independent inquiry is conducted into the death of Michael Dwyer, who was shot and killed by Bolivian security authorities in Santa Cruz, Bolivia, in April 2009?

2. Moreover, could the Vice-President/High Representative ensure fair treatment, including a fair trial if charges are brought, for a prisoner in Bolivia, Előd Tóásó, who was arrested on 16 April 2009 and has been kept in custody since, in breach of the 36-month limit on pre-trial detention, and has not yet been put on trial?

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

The EEAS would like to refer MEPs to the position expressed in the written answers to parliamentary questions: P-3345/2009 (MEP Peter Olajos); 001/2010 (MEP Kinga Gal); and E-2726/10 (MEP Alan Kelly).

The EEAS has been following closely Mr Dwyer's case and has raised the matter at highest level including meetings in Brussels and in La Paz (March and June respectively) with the Bolivian Foreign Minister. The services of the HR/VP have insisted on the need to ensure a prompt, impartial and thorough investigation.

As with Mr Dwyer's case, the EEAS has been very closely following Mr Tóásó's delayed trial, has raised the topic in the same bi-lateral contacts previously mentioned, and has insisted on the need to ensure a fair trial according to the principles of due process and human rights. The EEAS will again raise the topic and underline its position in its future contacts with the Bolivian authorities at the highest diplomatic level and in particular during the forthcoming visit of the Bolivian Foreign Minister to Brussels in October.

Moreover, the EEAS is in contact with the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in Bolivia and the UN special rapporteur on arbitrary detentions.

The EEAS Delegation in La Paz will continue to provide logistical support to the Hungarian authorities if requested and within its competences, as it has been doing so the past.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007161/12
à la Commission
Constance Le Grip (PPE), Tokia Saïfi (PPE) et Jean-Marie Cavada (PPE)
(16 juillet 2012)

Objet: Protection de la diversité des expressions culturelles dans le cadre des relations transatlantiques — Secteur audiovisuel

Lors d'une réunion en marge du sommet du G20 de Los Cabos, le 19 juin dernier, les dirigeants américain et européens ont confirmé l'élan donné aux futures négociations d'un accord de libre-échange entre l'Union européenne et les États-Unis.

1. Bien que ces négociations n'en soient encore qu'à un stade liminaire, la Commission pense-t-elle qu'elles pourraient concerner le secteur culturel et en particulier, au vu de leur poids dans l'économie américaine, les secteurs de l'audiovisuel et du cinéma?

2. Dans l'affirmative, et dans la mesure où les États-Unis ne sont pas partie à la Convention de l'Unesco sur la protection et la promotion de la diversité des expressions culturelles de 2005, par quels moyens la Commission entend-elle garantir le respect de ses dispositions?

Réponse donnée par M. De Gucht au nom de la Commission
(5 septembre 2012)

Le processus entamé par le groupe de travail de haut niveau entre l'UE et les États-Unis continue de bien avancer, un rapport intermédiaire ayant été diffusé le 19 juin 2012. Le groupe effectue actuellement une étude et une analyse de diverses options afin de déterminer comment accroître les investissements et les échanges bilatéraux. Il reste à définir la forme d'une éventuelle initiative ainsi qu'à décider s'il convient de lancer officiellement des négociations et, le cas échéant, à quelle date.

À ce stade relativement précoce des discussions avec les États-Unis, il s'agit surtout de déterminer les objectifs et les principes généraux qui sont susceptibles de se traduire en avantages supplémentaires notables au bénéfice des relations commerciales transatlantiques, plutôt que de se concentrer sur des sujets spécifiques dans des secteurs particuliers comme les services culturels ou audiovisuels. Il n'est pas prévu que les délibérations actuelles au sein du groupe de travail de haut niveau dans le domaine des services atteignent un tel niveau de détail.

La Commission est tout à fait consciente du rôle que joue le secteur audiovisuel au sein de l'UE et du fait que les États membres sont particulièrement attachés au droit de conserver, d'adopter et de mettre en œuvre les politiques et mesures qu'ils jugent appropriées pour la protection et la promotion de la diversité des expressions culturelles sur leur territoire. La Commission continuera à veiller à ce que ces droits soient protégés dans le contexte de tout accord éventuellement conclu avec les États-Unis.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007161/12
to the Commission
Constance Le Grip (PPE), Tokia Saïfi (PPE) and Jean-Marie Cavada (PPE)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: Protecting the diversity of cultural expressions in the context of transatlantic relations — the audiovisual sector

On 19 June 2012, at a meeting held alongside the G20 Summit in Los Cabos, the US President and European leaders reiterated their commitment to forthcoming negotiations on a free trade agreement between the EU and the United States.

1. Although the negotiations are still only at a very early stage, does the Commission think that they will include discussions on the cultural sector and, in particular, in view of their importance to the American economy, the audiovisual and film sectors?

2. If so, and given the fact that the United States is not party to the 2005 Unesco Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, what does the Commission intend to do to ensure that its provisions are observed?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(5 September 2012)

The High Level Working Group process between the EU and the US continues to make good progress with an interim report having been issued on 19 June 2012. The process is currently exploring and analysing various options on how to increase bilateral trade and investment; A decision on the format of any potential initiative and if and when to formally launch possible negotiations has yet to be taken.

At this relatively early stage of discussions with the US, the emphasis has been placed on identifying general principles and objectives which have the potential to generate significant additional benefits for transatlantic trade relations, rather than on specific issues in individual sectors such as cultural or audiovisual services. It is not anticipated that the ongoing deliberations of the HLWG in the area of services are likely to reach such a level of detail.

The Commission is well aware of the role of the audiovisual sector within the EU and the importance attached by EU Member States to retaining the right to maintain, adopt and implement the policies and measures that they deem appropriate for the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions on their territory. The Commission will continue to ensure that such rights are protected in any possible agreement with the United States.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007162/12
à la Commission
Constance Le Grip (PPE), Tokia Saïfi (PPE) et Jean-Marie Cavada (PPE)
(16 juillet 2012)

Objet: Protection de la diversité des expressions culturelles dans le cadre de l'accord UE-Canada

Les négociations de l'accord de libre-échange approfondi et complet entre l'Union européenne et le Canada pourraient, selon les vœux du commissaire européen au commerce, aboutir d'ici la fin de l'année.

1. À ce stade avancé des négociations, la Commission peut-elle indiquer si les biens et services culturels figurent dans les domaines couverts par le futur accord?

2. Dans l'affirmative, la Commission et le Canada se sont-ils assurés du respect des engagements qu'ils ont pris en adhérant (pour l'UE) ou en acceptant (pour le Canada) la Convention de l'Unesco sur la protection et la promotion de la diversité des expressions culturelles de 2005? Par quels moyens?

3. De manière plus générale, la Commission envisage-t-elle toujours d'adopter un document de stratégie concernant son approche des négociations de protocoles d'accords en matière de coopération culturelle? Si oui, quand la Commission pense-t-elle pouvoir le présenter? A-t-elle considéré la possibilité d'organiser une consultation publique en vue de le préparer?

Réponse donnée par M. De Gucht au nom de la Commission
(1er octobre 2012)

La Convention 2005 de l'Unesco sur la protection et la promotion de la diversité des expressions culturelles souligne l'importance, pour les gouvernements, de conserver la possibilité d'élaborer et de mettre en œuvre des politiques de protection et de promotion de la diversité des expressions culturelles.

Le Canada et l'UE ont ratifié la Convention et conviennent de renforcer la complémentarité entre la Convention et le futur accord économique et commercial global UE-Canada (AECG).

Néanmoins, l'UE et le Canada ont des points de vue différents en ce qui concerne les services culturels que le Canada définit de manière très large puisqu'il inclut dans ces services les activités génériques non culturelles (par exemple, la diffusion et l'édition), une conception que ne partage pas l'UE. La pratique établie du Canada qui consiste à exclure du champ d'application des accords commerciaux tous les biens et services culturels reviendrait à soustraire ceux-ci à l'application des règles en matière de propriété intellectuelle et de protection des investissements énoncées dans l'AECG.

Si aucune d'entre elles n'a l'intention de libéraliser les services audiovisuels, les parties sont convenues de formuler leurs propres réserves spécifiques en ce qui concerne les services culturels qu'elles souhaitent exclure de l'accord. Les discussions à ce sujet devraient avoir lieu en septembre. La Commission continuera d'informer régulièrement le Parlement européen des avancées des négociations.

Enfin, la Commission a présenté en 2010 un document de travail sur la négociation des protocoles de coopération culturelle dans les accords commerciaux de l'UE aux groupes compétents du Conseil, et elle prévoit d'organiser prochainement une réunion publique avec la société civile pour présenter l'approche générale sous-tendant ces protocoles, tout en se tenant à la disposition du Parlement européen pour une présentation similaire.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007162/12
to the Commission
Constance Le Grip (PPE), Tokia Saïfi (PPE) and Jean-Marie Cavada (PPE)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: Protecting the diversity of cultural expressions in the EU-Canada Free Trade Agreement

The EU Commissioner for Trade has expressed the hope that the negotiations on the EU-Canada Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement will be concluded by the end of the year.

1. At this advanced stage in the negotiations, could the Commission indicate whether or not the future agreement will cover cultural goods and services?

2. If so, what steps have the Commission and Canada taken to ensure that the commitments they made when they ratified (the EU) and accepted (Canada) the 2005 Unesco Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions are being fulfilled? What steps have been taken in this regard?

3. More generally, does the Commission still intend to adopt a strategy paper on its approach to negotiations on protocols to cultural cooperation agreements? If so, when will it be in a position to present the paper? Has it considered the possibility of organising a public consultation to inform the drafting of the paper?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(1 October 2012)

The 2005 Unesco Convention on the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions stresses the importance for governments to retain the possibility to develop and implement policies for the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions.

Both Canada and the EU ratified the Convention and agree to enhance complementarity between the Convention and the future EU-Canada Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA).

Nonetheless, the EU and Canada hold different views with regard to cultural services, which Canada considers in a very broad manner, including non-cultural related generic activities (e.g. distribution, printing), a view not shared by the EU. Canada's past practice to exclude all cultural goods and services from the scope of trade agreements would remove them from the application of the Intellectual Property and investment protection disciplines of the CETA.

While neither Party intends to liberalise audiovisual services, the Parties have agreed to define their own specific reservations for those cultural services they wish to exclude. Discussions on such reservations are likely to take place in September. The Commission will continue to report regularly to the European Parliament on the progress of the negotiations.

Finally, the Commission presented a working document on the negotiation of Protocols of Cultural Cooperation in EU trade agreements in 2010 to relevant working parties of the Council and is now planning a public meeting with civil society in the near future to present the general approach behind such Protocols, while remaining at the disposal of the European Parliament for a similar presentation.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007168/12
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(16 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Intenso traffico illegale di cuccioli di cane provenienti dall'Europa dell'est, con particolare riferimento all'Ungheria, alla Repubblica Ceca e alla Slovacchia destinati all'Italia

In Italia il fenomeno relativo all'importazione di cuccioli di cani e gatti dall'Europa dell'est viene documentato da tempo da diverse associazioni animaliste italiane. ([1])

Nonostante l'inasprimento delle sanzioni, detto traffico continua a persistere e ciò a discapito di numerosissimi cuccioli che a causa dell'esigua età muoiono durante trasporti inadeguati o per malattie virali, letali per quell'età.

Soltanto negli ultimi mesi, ci sono stati numerosi interventi da parte delle forze di polizia italiane, mediante i quali sono stati posti sotto sequestro giudiziario centinaia di cuccioli introdotti illegalmente in Italia ([2]).

Ad esempio, lo scorso febbraio sono stati sequestrati ben 479 cuccioli a Palmanova (UD) e altri 72 a Piacenza d'Adige (PD), tutti provenienti dall'Ungheria e appartenenti alle razze San Bernardo, Alano, Labrador, Cavalier King, Chihuahua, Pincher, Yorkshire Terrier, Spitz, Akita Inu, Husky, Shar Pei e altre.

I reati più frequentemente evidenziati sono il falso documentale, in quanto sui passaporti europei sono state rilevate anche firme false di presunti veterinari d'oltralpe, oltre che certificazioni vaccinali contraffatte ed una palese discrepanza fra l'età dichiarata e quella riscontrata in vivo sui cuccioli fermati.

Tale business si configura come attività economica estremamente lucrosa, il cui valore è stimato in Italia in circa 300 milioni di euro l'anno; pertanto l'illegalità di tale traffico ha ricadute negative anche sulla fiscalità, trattandosi di commerci sommersi.

Considerando che la provenienza del succitato traffico illecito è prevalentemente originario di paesi quali l'Ungheria, la Repubblica Ceca e la Repubblica Slovacca, si chiede:

1. La Commissione è al corrente di questo fenomeno in Italia?

2. Quali iniziative intende prendere affinché gli Stati membri facciano rispettare il regolamento (CE) n. 998/2003, con maggiore attenzione verso l'obbligatoria profilassi antirabbica?

3. Non sarebbe utile predisporre una banca dati europea inerente al censimento degli allevamenti con particolare attenzione a quelli degli Stati membri succitati, con funzioni specifiche di verifica del benessere animale oltre che di tracciabilità fiscale degli stessi, conformemente alla «Strategia dell'Unione europea per la protezione ed il benessere degli animali 2012-2015» approvata dal Parlamento il 4 luglio 2012?

Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(3 settembre 2012)

Per quanto riguarda la questione del traffico illegale di animali domestici, la Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alle sue risposte alle precedenti interrogazioni scritte E-004525/2008, E-003787/2009, E-006868/2010, E-002270/2011, E-003343/2011, E-006602/2011, E-006808/2011 ed E-002142/2012 ([3]).

Riguardo alla questione dell'istituzione di una banca dati europea in cui siano registrati gli allevamenti per poter verificare il benessere degli animali e la loro tracciabilità da un punto di vista fiscale, la Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alle sue risposte alle precedenti interrogazioni scritte P-002142/2012 ed E-004656/2012([3]).

([1]) Cfr. Animalisti Italiani, LAV, ENPA e OIPA.
([2]) «La tratta e le sofferenze dei cuccioli nati nell'Est e venduti come italiani. Cosa cambia con l'introduzione del reato di traffico illecito», Dossier LAV — 2011. www.lav.it.
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007168/12
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(16 July 2012)

Subject: Heavy illegal trafficking of puppies from Eastern Europe to Italy, with particular reference to Hungary, the Czech Republic and Slovakia

In Italy the importation of puppy dogs and kittens from Eastern Europe has long been documented by several Italian animal rights organisations ([1]).

Despite the tightening of sanctions, the trafficking continues, at the expense of many puppies which, due to their young age, die because of inappropriate transport conditions or from viral diseases, which are lethal at that age.

In recent months alone the Italian police forces have intervened on several occasions, seizing hundreds of puppies that had been smuggled into Italy ([2]).

For example, in February 2012 as many as 479 puppies were seized in Palmanova (UD), in addition to 72 in Piacenza d'Adige (PD). All were from Hungary and of the breeds Saint Bernard, Great Dane, Labrador, Cavalier King Charles Spaniel, Chihuahua, Pincher, Yorkshire Terrier, Spitz, Akita Inu, Husky, Shar Pei, amongst others.

The crimes most frequently committed were the forgery of documents (fake signatures of alleged veterinarians from other countries were found on EU passports), in addition to counterfeit vaccine certificates and obvious discrepancies between the animals' declared age and the real age of the puppies seized.

This business is an extremely lucrative one, the value of which is estimated in Italy to be around EUR 300 million a year. This illegal trade is therefore also having a negative impact on taxes, given that it is undeclared.

Given that the above illegal trafficking is mainly from countries such as Hungary, the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Is it aware of this phenomenon in Italy?

2. What steps will it take to ensure that Member States enforce compliance with Regulation (EC) No 998/2003, paying more attention to the mandatory rabies vaccination?

3. Would it not be useful to set up a European database in order to register breeding farms — with a particular focus on the Member States mentioned above — with the specific role of verifying not only animal welfare but also animal traceability from a fiscal point of view, in accordance with the 'EU Strategy for the Protection and Welfare of Animals 2012-2015' adopted by Parliament on 4 July 2012?

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

With respect to the issue of illegal trade in pet animals the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its replies to previous Written Questions E-004525/2008, E-003787/2009, E-006868/2010, E-002270/2011, E-003343/2011, E-006602/2011, E-006808/2011 and E-002142/2012 ([3]).

With respect to the issue of the setting up of a European database registering breeding farms in order to verify animal welfare and animal traceability from a fiscal point of view the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its replies to the previous Written Question P-002142/2012 and E-004656/2012 ([3]).

([1]) Cfr. Italian animal welfare associations LAV, ENPA and OIPA.
([2]) (Unofficial translation) 'The trafficking in and suffering of puppies born in Eastern Europe and sold in Italy. What will change now that illegal trafficking has become an offence', LAV dossier, 2011 — www.lav.it
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-007169/12
à la Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(17 juillet 2012)

Objet: Crédits gratuits de carbone pour des centrales fantômes en Pologne

Le système communautaire d'échange de quotas d'émission (SCEQE), mis au point par l'Union européenne, est la pierre angulaire de la stratégie européenne pour réduire les émissions de gaz à effet de serre de façon optimale d'un point de vue coût/efficacité.

À partir de 2013, la vente aux enchères de quotas deviendra le principe de base d'allocation des quotas et remplacera l'actuel système (attribution gratuite par le gouvernement de la grande majorité des quotas).

Le secteur de la production d'électricité devra en principe acheter tous ses quotas d'émission, étant donné que l'expérience a montré que les centrales électriques ont pu transmettre à leurs clients le coût des quotas d'émission alors même que ces quotas leur étaient alloués gratuitement.

Cependant, certains États membres auront la possibilité de déroger temporairement à cette règle pour des centrales électriques existantes. Une règle appelée «10 quater» épargnera donc jusqu'à 2020 les centrales dont le «processus d'investissement» a «physiquement commencé» avant le 31 décembre 2008.

En Pologne, 187 installations sont concernées par cette dérogation. La somme totale des crédits gratuits demandés s'élève à 7 milliards d'euros.

Euractiv Bruxelles a mené une enquête afin de déterminer l'existence des centrales pour lesquelles des dérogations ont été introduites en Pologne. À titre d'exemple, le gouvernement polonais a demandé des crédits gratuits à hauteur de 33 millions d'euros pour sa centrale au charbon de Leczna, située près de la frontière ukrainienne. Cette centrale était décrite comme «en travaux». Arrivés sur place, les journalistes d'Euractiv ont constaté qu'à l'emplacement supposé de la centrale il n'y avait que prairies, champs et chemins forestiers. Aucun bâtiment, aucune installation et aucun signe d'activité n'était visible aux coordonnées transmises. Douze autres «centrales fantômes» pourraient avoir été identifiées en Pologne.

— La Commission peut-elle m'indiquer si ces dérogations ont été octroyées à la suite d'une enquête approfondie sur place ou uniquement sur base des dossiers transmis par les autorités polonaises. La liste des centrales électriques exemptées a-t-elle été établie sans que les critères d'éligibilité ne soient vérifiés?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Hedegaard au nom de la Commission
(8 août 2012)

Conformément à l'article 10 *quater* de la directive 2003/87/CE ([1]), les installations peuvent bénéficier d'une allocation de quotas à titre gratuit, même si elles ne sont pas encore en service, à condition que leur «processus d'investissement ait physiquement commencé» avant la fin de l'année 2008. L'évaluation visant à déterminer si certaines installations peuvent bénéficier d'une allocation à titre gratuit a été effectuée sur la base des documents présentés par la Pologne. Dès lors que l'admissibilité d'une installation était dûment établie par ces documents, la Commission n'avait aucun motif juridique de contester cette admissibilité dans sa décision du 13 juillet 2012 ([2]) concernant la demande présentée par la Pologne en application de l'article 10 *quater* de la directive précitée.

Les installations en question ne se verront toutefois accorder une allocation à titre gratuit que lorsqu'elles seront entrées en service.

Dans ce contexte, il convient également de noter que, lorsque la Commission avait de bonnes raisons de penser qu'un investissement donné était identique à une installation jugée admissible au bénéfice de l'allocation de quotas d'émission à titre gratuit, elle a rejeté l'investissement correspondant. L'investissement rejeté ne peut en conséquence pas être financé par l'allocation à titre gratuit obtenue grâce à la dérogation. Pour pouvoir effectivement bénéficier de l'allocation, l'exploitant devra financer un autre investissement de modernisation prévu dans la demande.

([1]) Directive 2003/87/CE du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 13 octobre 2003 établissant un système d'échange de quotas d'émission de gaz à effet de serre dans la Communauté et modifiant la directive 96/61/CE du Conseil (JO L 275 du 25.10.2003).

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/ets/auctioning/derogation/docs/comm_dec_2012_4609_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007169/12
to the Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(17 July 2012)

Subject: Free carbon credits for Poland's 'phantom power plants'

The European Union Emissions Trading System (EU ETS) is the cornerstone of Europe's strategy to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the most cost-effective manner.

From 2013, the auctioning of quotas will become the basic method of quota allocation and will replace the current system in which the majority of quotas are allocated for free by governments.

The electricity generation sector will in theory have to buy all of its emission quotas. Yet, experience has shown that power plants have been able to pass the costs of emission quotas on to their customers even when those quotas were allocated to them for free.

However, certain Member States will be able to derogate temporarily from this rule for their existing power plants. As a result, what is termed the '10c rule' will spare power plants where the 'investment process was physically initiated' before 31 December 2008.

This derogation affects 187 facilities in Poland. The total value of free credits applied for is EUR 7 billion.

EurActiv Brussels conducted an investigation in order to determine whether the Polish plants for which the derogations had been introduced actually existed. For example, the Polish Government applied for free credits worth EUR 33 million for its coal power plant in Łęczna, which is located close to the Ukrainian border. This plant was described as being 'under construction'. However, having arrived at the location, the EurActiv journalists found that the supposed site of the plant contained nothing but grass, fields and forest paths. There were no buildings, no facilities and no visible signs of activity at the given coordinates. Twelve other 'phantom plants' might have been identified in Poland.

— Can the Commission say whether these derogations were granted following a thorough in-situ investigation, or only on the basis of documents submitted by the Polish authorities? Was the list of exempted power plants drawn up without a check on the eligibility criteria?

Answer given by Mme Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(8 August 2012)

According to Article 10c of Directive 2003/87/EC ([1]), installations are eligible for free allocation, even if they are not in operation yet, provided their 'investment process was physically initiated' before end-2008. The assessment whether individual installations are eligible for free allocation was carried out on the basis of documents submitted by Poland. Where these documents provided the necessary evidence that a certain installation is eligible, the Commission did not have any legal grounds to reject the eligibility of the installation in its Decision of 13 July 2012 ([2]) concerning the Polish application pursuant to Article 10c of the abovementioned Directive.

Such installations will, however, get free allocation only when they start operating.

In this context, it should also be noted that where the Commission had justified reasons to assume that a certain investment is identical with an installation found eligible for free allocation, it rejected the corresponding investment. As a consequence, the investment cannot be funded by the free allocation available from the derogation. The operator will have to finance another modernisation investment included in the application in order to actually receive the allocation.

([1]) Directive 2003/87/EC of the Parliament and of the Council of 13 October 2003 establishing a scheme for greenhouse gas emission allowance trading within the Community and amending Council Directive 96/61/EC, OJ L 275, 25.10.2003.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/ets/auctioning/derogation/docs/comm_dec_2012_4609_en.pdf

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007184/12
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE) y Marije Cornelissen (Verts/ALE)
(17 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Seguro de desempleo y libre circulación

El viernes 13 de julio, el Gobierno español firmó el Real Decreto-ley ([1]) en el que se recogen las últimas medidas de austeridad derivadas de las recomendaciones específicas del Consejo a este país ([2]).

En dicho Decreto se señala lo siguiente:

El Real Decreto 1369/2006, de 24 de noviembre, por el que se regula el programa de renta activa de inserción para desempleados con especiales necesidades económicas y dificultad para encontrar empleo, se modifica en los términos siguientes:

Uno. Se añaden dos párrafos a la letra b) del apartado 1 del artículo 2 que quedan redactados en los términos siguientes:

«Durante la inscripción como demandante de empleo a que se refiere el párrafo anterior deberá buscarse activamente empleo, sin haber rechazado oferta de empleo adecuada ni haberse negado a participar, salvo causa justificada, en acciones de promoción, formación o reconversión profesionales u otras para incrementar la ocupabilidad. La salida al extranjero, por cualquier motivo o duración, interrumpe la inscripción como demandante de empleo a estos efectos.

En los supuestos en que se interrumpa la demanda de empleo, se exigirá un periodo de 12 meses interrumpido desde la nueva inscripción.»

1. ¿Podría señalar la Comisión si tiene conocimiento de estos hechos?

2. ¿Podría indicar la Comisión si dicho Decreto viola el artículo 64 del Reglamento (CE) n° 883/2004 que permite a los demandantes de empleo conservar su derecho a las prestaciones de desempleo durante al menos tres meses? En caso afirmativo, ¿qué medidas tiene intención de adoptar la Comisión para poner fin urgentemente a esta violación de la legislación de la UE?

3. En el contexto de la dramática situación que se registra en España en materia de desempleo, ¿qué medidas tiene previsto adoptar la Comisión para velar por que el derecho a la libre circulación de los trabajadores no se vea comprometido por la adopción de las medidas de saneamiento presupuestario?

Respuesta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(17 de agosto de 2012)

1. La Comisión ha tomado nota de las modificaciones introducidas en el Real Decreto 369/2006 y tiene previsto abrir una investigación.

2. La exportación de las prestaciones de desempleo está sujeta a una serie de condiciones establecidas, en particular, en el artículo 64 del Reglamento (CE) n° 883/2004 ([3]). El requisito de estar presente y disponible para el empleo en el territorio del Estado miembro que abona las prestaciones de desempleo está generalmente justificado de acuerdo con la legislación de la UE. Sin embargo, la Comisión considera que las disposiciones nacionales no pueden ser desproporcionadas respecto al objetivo de la legislación nacional y las disposiciones de la UE, a saber, la reinserción en el mercado de trabajo y la movilidad laboral transfronteriza. Una medida puede ser desproporcionada si, por ejemplo, incluso un día de ausencia del territorio de un Estado miembro para asistir a una entrevista de trabajo en el extranjero da lugar a la interrupción de la inscripción de la persona como demandante de empleo.

3. La Comisión enviará un escrito de investigación a las autoridades españolas con carácter de urgencia. Asimismo, pedirá información sobre el efecto de la nueva disposición en la capacidad de los demandantes de empleo para obtener la exportación de las prestaciones de desempleo de acuerdo con el artículo 64 del Reglamento (CE) n° 883/2004, que requiere una autorización antes de abandonar el territorio del Estado miembro competente.

([1]) http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2012/07/14/pdfs/BOE-A-2012-9364.pdf
([2]) http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/es/12/st11/st11273.es12.pdf
([3]) Reglamento (CE) n° 883/2004 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 29 de abril de 2004, sobre la coordinación de los sistemas de seguridad social (DO L 166 de 30.4.2004, p. 1).

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007184/12
aan de Commissie
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE) en Marije Cornelissen (Verts/ALE)
(17 juli 2012)

Betreft: Werkloosheidsuitkeringen en vrij verkeer

Op vrijdag 13 juli heeft de Spaanse regering, naar aanleiding van de landenspecifieke aanbevelingen van de Raad ([1]), het Koninklijk Besluit ([2]) ondertekend dat dient ter uitvoering van de recentste bezuinigingsmaatregelen.

In het Besluit staat het volgende:

„Het Koninklijk Besluit 1369/2006 van 24 november, waarin het programma van „actief herintredingsinkomen" voor werklozen met speciale economische behoeften en moeilijkheden bij het vinden van werk wordt geregeld, wordt als volgt gewijzigd:

1. Twee leden worden toegevoegd aan letter b) van afdeling 1 van artikel 2. Zij luiden als volgt: „Gedurende de registratie als werkzoekende, zoals bedoeld in het vorige lid, moet actief naar werk worden gezocht, zonder dat een geschikte werkaanbieding wordt afgewezen of deelname aan activiteiten voor professionele bevordering, opleiding, heroriëntatie of andere activiteiten ter verbetering van de inzetbaarheid zonder gerechtvaardigde redenen wordt geweigerd. Wanneer men naar het buitenland gaat, ongeacht de reden of duur, wordt de registratie als werkzoekende onderbroken. In gevallen waarin de registratie als werkzoekende is onderbroken, is een ononderbroken periode van twaalf maanden na de nieuwe registratie vereist.""

— Is de Commissie op de hoogte van dit feit?

— Maakt dit Besluit inbreuk op artikel 64, van Verordening (EG) nr. 883/2004, die werkzoekenden het recht geeft op het behouden van een werkloosheidsuitkering voor ten minste drie maanden? Zo ja, welke actie zal de Commissie ondernemen om met spoed een eind te maken aan de inbreuk op de EU-wetgeving?

— Welke actie zal de Commissie, in het licht van de dramatische werkloosheidssituatie in Spanje, ondernemen om ervoor te zorgen dat het recht op vrij verkeer van werknemers niet in gevaar wordt gebracht door enige begrotingsconsolidatiemaatregelen?

Antwoord van de heer Andor namens de Commissie
(17 augustus 2012)

1. De Commissie is op de hoogte van de wijzigingen van Koninklijk Besluit 369/2006 en is van plan een onderzoek te starten.

2. De uitvoer van werkloosheidsuitkeringen is onderworpen aan een reeks voorwaarden die met name in artikel 64 van Verordening (EG) nr. 883/2004 ([3]) zijn vastgesteld. De eis om op het grondgebied van de lidstaat die de werkloosheidsuitkeringen uitbetaalt, aanwezig en voor werk beschikbaar te zijn, strookt over het algemeen met de EU-wetgeving. De Commissie vindt echter dat nationale bepalingen in verhouding moeten staan tot de doelstellingen van de nationale en EU-wetgeving, namelijk de reïntegratie op de arbeidsmarkt en de bevordering van grensoverschrijdende arbeidsmobiliteit. Maatregelen kunnen onevenredig zijn, bijvoorbeeld wanneer de registratie als werkzoekende wordt onderbroken omdat de werkzoekende één dag het grondgebied van een lidstaat heeft verlaten voor een sollicitatiegesprek in het buitenland.

3. De Commissie zal de Spaanse autoriteiten zo snel mogelijk om opheldering vragen. Zij zal ook onderzoeken welk effect de nieuwe bepaling heeft op de mogelijkheid om werkloosheidsuitkeringen uit hoofde van artikel 64 van Verordening (EG) nr. 883/2004 te exporteren, waarvoor een voorafgaande toestemming vereist is alvorens het grondgebied van de bevoegde lidstaat te verlaten.

([1]) http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/nl/12/st11/st11273.nl12.pdf
([2]) http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2012/07/14/pdfs/BOE-A-2012-9364.pdf
([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, blz. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007184/12
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE) and Marije Cornelissen (Verts/ALE)
(17 July 2012)

Subject: Unemployment benefits and free movement

On Friday 13 July 2012 the Spanish Government has the Royal Decree ([1]) implementing the latest austerity measures following the country-specific recommendations of the Council ([2]).

The decree states that:

'The Royal Decree 1369/2006, of 24 November, regulating the programme of "active reinsertion income" for unemployed persons with special economic needs and difficulties to find work, shall be modified as follows:

1. Two paragraphs shall be added to letter b) of Section 1 of Article 2, which reads as follows: "During a person's registration as a job-seeker referred to in the previous paragraph, he or she must actively seek employment without rejecting an adequate job offer or refusing to participate, except for justified reasons, in activities aimed at professional promotion, training or reorientation or other activities to improve employability. Going abroad, for any reason or duration, interrupts such registration as a job-seeker. Where job-seeker registration is interrupted, an uninterrupted 12-month period will be required after the new registration".'

— Is the Commission aware of this wording?

— Does the decree breach Article 64 of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004, gives job-seekers the right to retain unemployment benefits for at least three months? If so, what action will the Commission take to put an end to this breach of EC law as a matter of urgency?

— In view of the dramatic unemployment situation in Spain, what action will the Commission take to ensure that the right to free movement of workers is not compromised by any of the fiscal consolidation measures?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(17 August 2012)

1. The Commission has noted the modifications made to Royal Decree 1369/2006 and intends to launch an investigation.

2. Export of unemployment benefits is subject to a set of conditions set out notably in Article 64 of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 ([3]). The requirement to be present and available for employment in the territory of the Member State paying the unemployment benefits is generally justified under EC law. Nevertheless, the Commission considers that national provisions cannot be disproportionate to the aim pursued by the national legislation and EU provisions, namely to ensure reintegration into the labour market and cross-border labour mobility. A measure can be disproportionate where, for example, even one day of absence from the territory of a Member State in order to attend a job interview abroad would interrupt an individual's registration as a job-seeker.

3. The Commission will send an investigation to the Spanish authorities as a matter of urgency. It will also inquire about the effect of the new provision on a jobseekers' ability to obtain an export of unemployment benefits under Article 64 of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004, which requires prior-authorisation before leaving the territory of the competent Member State.

([1]) http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2012/07/14/pdfs/BOE-A-2012-9364.pdf
([2]) http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/12/st11/st11273.en12.pdf
([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, p. 1.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris P-007194/12
adresată Consiliului
Silvia-Adriana Țicău (S&D)
(18 iulie 2012)

Subiect: Președinția cipriotă a UE— Ridicarea barierelor pentru lucrătorii români și bulgari

Libertatea de circulație a persoanelor constituie una dintre libertățile fundamentale garantate de tratate, aceasta incluzând dreptul cetățenilor UE de a trăi și de a lucra în alt stat membru.

Președinția cipriotă a Consiliului UE și-a propus ca pe perioada mandatului său să continue eforturile pentru a face posibilă extinderea cu succes a spațiului Schengen pentru a include România și Bulgaria. De asemenea, Președinția a menționat în programul său de lucru că va sprijini consolidarea dimensiunii sociale a unei economii europene integrate în piața unică, va promova creșterea economică și crearea de locuri de muncă generatoare de creștere economică.

Aș dori să întreb președinția cipriotă a Consiliului, care sunt măsurile concrete pe care le are în vedere pentru asigurarea liberei circulații a forței de muncă în cadrul UE, și în special pentru ridicarea barierelor privind lucrătorii români și bulgari?

Răspuns
(22 octombrie 2012)

Libertatea de circulație a persoanelor constituie una dintre libertățile fundamentale garantate de tratat și de legislația secundară. Aceasta include dreptul cetățenilor UE de a trăi și de a lucra în alt stat membru.

Consiliul reamintește răspunsul său anterior din martie 2012 la întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris P-000174/12 prin care a arătat că, în ceea ce privește restricțiile temporare prevăzute de tratatele de aderare, trebuie amintit faptul că este la latitudinea fiecărui stat membru al UE-25 care aplică încă restricții în urma aderării din 2007 să evalueze impactul asupra propriei piețe a forței de muncă și să decidă în ceea ce privește continuarea sau diminuarea restricțiilor rămase. Tratatele de aderare nu conferă Consiliului sau Președinției competența de a lua inițiativa în vederea extinderii accesului lucrătorilor români și bulgari la piețele forței de muncă ale statelor membre. Cu toate acestea, Consiliul a invitat statele membre care continuă să aplice restricții în temeiul măsurilor tranzitorii prevăzute în tratatele de aderare să ridice restricțiile în cea de a treia etapă, dacă nu se poate determina că există perturbări grave ale piețelor forței de muncă ale statelor membre în cauză sau amenințarea unor astfel de perturbări ([1]).

Majoritatea statelor membre care au menținut restricțiile și-au simplificat procedurile sau au redus restricțiile în privința unor sectoare/profesii. În orice caz, restricțiile în cea de a treia etapă a măsurilor tranzitorii se pot aplica până la 31 decembrie 2013 ([2]).

Nu există nicio legătură între întrebarea adresată de distinsa deputată și extinderea spațiului Schengen, întrucât acesta din urmă se referă la controalele la frontieră și nu la libera circulație a lucrătorilor.

([1]) 6480/09.
([2]) http//ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=508&langId=en.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007194/12
to the Council
Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: Cyprus Presidency of the EU — Lifting barriers for Romanian and Bulgarian workers

Freedom of movement for citizens is one of the fundamental rights guaranteed by the Treaties; it includes the right of EU citizens to live and work in other Member States.

The Cyprus Presidency of the EU has announced that it intends to continue efforts during its term of office to make possible the successful enlargement of the Schengen Area to include Romania and Bulgaria. It also states in its work programme that it will support the consolidation of the social dimension of an integrated European economy in the single market, foster economic growth and promote the creation of jobs generated by a growing economy.

Can the Cyprus Presidency of the Council say what specific measures it intends to take to guarantee freedom of movement for workers in the EU, and in particular to lift the barriers for Romanian and Bulgarian workers?

Reply
(22 October 2012)

Freedom of movement for persons is one of the fundamental freedoms guaranteed by the Treaty and the secondary legislation. This includes the right of EU citizens to live and work in another Member State.

The Council recalls its previous reply of March 2012 to Written Question P-000174/12 in which it explained that, as for the temporary restrictions provided by the Accession Treaties, it is to be recalled that it is up to each EU-25 Member State still applying restrictions following the 2007 accession to assess the impact on its labour markets and to decide whether to continue or to ease the remaining restrictions. Accession treaties do not give a power to the Council or the Presidency to take the initiative in order to spread the access to the labour markets of Member States to Romanian and Bulgarian workers. However, the Council has invited those Member States that continue to apply restrictions under the transitional arrangements set out in the accession treaties to lift restrictions in the third phase if serious disturbances to the labour markets of the Member States concerned, or a threat thereof, cannot be established ([1]).

Most of the Member States that have maintained restrictions have simplified their procedures or have reduced restrictions in some sectors/professions. In any case, restrictions in the third phase of the transitional arrangements may apply until 31 December 2013 at the latest ([2]).

There is no connection between the question raised by the Honourable Member and the enlargement of the Schengen Area, because the latter deals with border controls and not with movement of workers.

([1]) 6480/09.
([2]) http//ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=508&langId=en.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007195/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(18 Ιουλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Αντικοινωνική μείωση των δικαιούχων του επιδόματος ανεργίας από 1.1.2013 στην Ελλάδα

Η ανεργία στην Ελλάδα, σύμφωνα με την τελευταία μέτρηση της Ελληνικής Στατιστικής Αρχής (ΕΛ.ΣΤΑΤ.) για το Α' Τρίμηνο του 2012, αγγίζει το 22,6 % με τους μακροχρόνια ανέργους να αποτελούν το 56,5 %. Η αδυναμία δημιουργίας νέων θέσεων εργασίας σε συνδυασμό με τη ραγδαία αύξηση των απολύσεων καθιστά το επίδομα ανεργίας ως το βασικότερο εργαλείο επιβίωσης για εκατοντάδες χιλιάδες συμπολίτες μας που αδυνατούν να επανενταχθούν στην αγορά εργασίας και ιδιαίτερα υπό καθεστώς μόνιμης απασχόλησης. Από την 1η Ιανουαρίου 2013 όμως προβλέπεται ο επαναπροσδιορισμός των κριτηρίων για τη λήψη του επιδόματος ανεργίας με την επιβολή μεγίστου ορίου ημερησίων επιδομάτων που δεν θα πρέπει να ξεπερνούν τα 450 —και 400 από 1η/1/2014— σε βάθος τετραετίας. Με δεδομένη την παρατεταμένη αστάθεια και ανασφάλεια της ελληνικής αγοράς εργασίας αλλά και του ότι ένα μεγάλο μέρος του εργατικού δυναμικού της χώρας εργάζεται με όρους εποχιακής απασχόλησης (π.χ. σε Τουριστικές Επιχειρήσεις), μια τέτοια εξέλιξη θα αποκλείσει από το επίδομα ανεργίας εκατοντάδες χιλιάδες δικαιούχους οδηγώντας τους σε καταστάσεις φτώχειας ή ακόμη και ανέχειας. Σε αυτό το πλαίσιο ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Αποδέχεται το γεγονός ότι σε μια περίοδο που αυξάνονται δραματικά οι άνεργοι περικόπτονται οι δικαιούχοι του επιδόματος ανεργίας, το οποίο για τη μεγάλη πλειοψηφία των ανέργων και των οικογενειών τους αποτελεί το τελευταίο «ανάχωμα» πριν την εξαθλίωση;

2. Πόσο συμβατό είναι το συγκεκριμένο μέτρο με τους διακηρυγμένους στόχους της Στρατηγικής «Ευρώπη 2020» για μείωση της φτώχειας και του κοινωνικού αποκλεισμού;

3. Προτίθεται η Επιτροπή, ως μέλος και της Τρόικας, να υποστηρίξει ενδεχόμενη προσπάθεια της Ελληνικής Κυβέρνησης για την τροποποίηση ή κατάργηση του εν λόγω μέτρου;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(18 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

1. Η ανεργία είναι πολύ υψηλή και απαιτούνται περαιτέρω προσπάθειες για να περιοριστούν οι οικονομικές δυσχέρειες των ανέργων. Για τον λόγο αυτό, στο πλαίσιο των μέτρων δημοσιονομικής εξυγίανσης που έλαβε τα τελευταία έτη η ελληνική κυβέρνηση για την επίτευξη σταθερότητας των δημόσιων οικονομικών δεν επιβλήθηκαν σημαντικές μειώσεις στα επιδόματα ανεργίας, με στόχο τη διατήρηση των συστημάτων κοινωνικής ασφάλειας για όσο το δυνατόν μεγαλύτερο χρονικό διάστημα.

2. Στο πλαίσιο της στρατηγικής «Ευρώπη 2020», το Συμβούλιο εξέδωσε σύσταση προς την Ελλάδα στις 10 Ιουλίου 2012 σύμφωνα με την οποία η Ελλάδα θα πρέπει να εφαρμόσει τα μέτρα που προβλέπονται στην απόφαση 2011/734/ΕΕ, όπως τροποποιήθηκε στις 8 Νοεμβρίου 2011 και στις 13 Μαρτίου 2012, και το Μνημόνιο συμφωνίας (ΜΣ) για τους Ειδικούς Όρους της Οικονομικής Πολιτικής, που υπογράφηκε στις 14 Μαρτίου 2012. Τα βασικά μέτρα στο πλαίσιο του ΜΣ έχουν ως στόχο την επίτευξη οικονομικής και δημοσιονομικής σταθερότητας που είναι αναγκαίες για την ανάπτυξη και την απασχόληση, τη βελτίωση της λειτουργίας της αγοράς εργασίας και της αγοράς προϊόντων, καθώς και την αντιμετώπιση των κοινωνικών επιπτώσεων της τρέχουσας προσαρμογής που είναι αναγκαία για να ξεπεραστούν οι δυσκολίες τις οποίες αντιμετωπίζει η ελληνική οικονομία. Το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου παρακαλείται να ανατρέξει στη λεπτομερή ανάλυση σχετικά με την πρόοδο για την επίτευξη των στόχων της Ευρώπης του 2020 ([1]).

3. Η Επιτροπή ανησυχεί για το υψηλό ποσοστό ανεργίας. Η Επιτροπή θα θεωρούσε σκόπιμη τη λήψη μέτρων με στόχο την παροχή εισοδήματος σε αυτούς που πλήττονται σοβαρότερα από την ανεργία, εφόσον τα μέτρα αυτά είναι συμβατά με τους ευρύτερους στόχους του προγράμματος προσαρμογής, και ειδικότερα την πορεία της δημοσιονομικής εξυγίανσης που συμφωνήθηκε με τις ελληνικές αρχές. Η Επιτροπή στηρίζει θερμά την καλύτερη στόχευση των δαπανών για την παροχή βοήθειας στους απόρους και σε αυτούς που πλήττονται σοβαρότερα από την κρίση και την οικονομική προσαρμογή, σύμφωνα με τους στόχους για την απασχόληση και την κοινωνική ένταξη της στρατηγικής «Ευρώπη 2020».

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/europe-2020-in-your-country/ellada/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007195/12
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: Antisocial measure to cut numbers of unemployment benefit recipients in Greece from 1 January 2013

According to the latest figures issued by the Greek Statistical Authority (ELSTAT.) for the first quarter of 2012, unemployment in Greece is running at 22.6 %, with the long-term unemployed accounting for 56.5 % of that figure. The inability to create new jobs, in conjunction with the rapid increase in redundancies, makes unemployment benefit the main means of survival for hundreds of thousands of our fellow citizens who are unable to reintegrate into the labour market and in particular find permanent jobs. From 1 January 2013, however, the criteria for receiving unemployment benefit will be redefined through the imposition of a maximum limit of daily allowances which may not exceed 450 initially and 400 from 1 January 2014 over any four-year period. Given the prolonged instability and insecurity of the Greek labour market and the fact that much of the country's workforce is in seasonal employment (e.g. in tourism businesses), such a development would deprive hundreds of thousands of unemployment benefit recipients of their benefits, reducing them to poverty or even destitution.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Does it accept the fact that at a time when the number of unemployed is increasing dramatically, the number of persons entitled to unemployment benefit is being cut, even though for the vast majority of the unemployed and their families this is all that stands between them and destitution?

2. How compatible is this measure with the declared objectives of the 'Europe 2020' Strategy to reduce poverty and social exclusion?

3. In its capacity also as a member of the Troika, will it support efforts by the Greek Government to amend or repeal the measure in question?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(18 September 2012)

1. Unemployment is very high and efforts are needed to contain the hardship of the jobless. That is why the fiscal consolidation measures taken in recent years by the Greek Government to regain the sustainability of the public finances have largely spared unemployment benefits from reductions, aiming to preserve social safety nets as far as possible.

2. Under the Europe 2020 strategy, the Council issued a recommendation to Greece on 10 July 2012 to implement the measures laid down in Decision 2011/734/EU, as amended on 8 November 2011 and 13 March 2012, and the memorandum of understanding (MoU) on Specific Economic Policy Conditionality, which was signed on 14 March 2012. Key measures within the MoU aim at regaining economic and budgetary stability, which are needed for growth and jobs; at ameliorating the functioning of product and labour markets; and, at addressing the social consequences of the ongoing adjustment necessary to overcome the difficulties which the Greek economy is facing. The Honourable Member is kindly referred to the detailed analysis on progress towards Europe 2020 goals ([1]) .

3. High unemployment in Greece is a major concern for the Commission. The Commission would welcome further measures to help those hardest hit by joblessness as far as they are consistent with the broader objectives of the adjustment programme, notably the path for fiscal consolidation agreed with the Greek authorities. The Commission strongly supports a better targeting of spending to help the neediest and those hardest hit by the crisis and the economic adjustment, in line with the employment and social inclusion objectives of the EU 2020 strategy

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/europe-2020-in-your-country/ellada/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007200/12
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: Animal welfare and electronic identification (EID) for sheep

Since the introduction of electronic identification (EID) for sheep, farming organisations and individual farmers have increasingly communicated their negative experience concerning the impact of this practice on the health and welfare of the animals. It is reported that the incidence of welfare problems and infection caused by EID tags can be anything up to 50%, with serious animal welfare implications that are contrary to all good farming practice.

1. Is the Commission aware of the serious animal welfare problems that have arisen as a result of the additional EID tagging of sheep which was imposed by the Commission despite the many objections of the Member States, members of Parliament's Committee on Agriculture, and farming organisations?

2. What measures does the Commission propose to take to address the animal health and welfare problems caused by EID tagging?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(30 August 2012)

As a general principle, Council Directive 98/58/EC ([1]) on the protection of animals kept for farming purposes requires that Member States ensure that owners or keepers of animals take all reasonable steps to ensure the welfare of animals under their care and to ensure that those animals are not caused any unnecessary pain, suffering or injury.

As regards the animal welfare impact of the application of electronic identifiers for sheep and goats, a wide range of identifiers can be authorised by the Member States in the framework of Council Regulation (EC) No 21/2004 ([2]), such as a ruminal bolus, electronic ear-tags of different shape and weight, etc.

Member States are responsible for choosing those identifiers which should best adapt to their needs. The Commission is aware that in some Member States some problems have been identified with certain sheep breeds in relation with some specific identifiers and the authorities are taking measures to reduce those problems.

Finally, although Council Regulation (EC) No 21/2004 does not specify the professional qualifications of persons who install electronic devices into animal bodies, Member States must ensure that any person responsible for the identification of animals has received instruction and guidance on the relevant provisions contained in this regulation, and that appropriate training courses are available.

([1]) OJ L 221, 8.8.1998, p. 23-27.
([2]) Council Regulation (EC) No 21/2004 of 17 December 2003 establishing a system for the identification and registration of ovine and caprine animals and amending Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 and Directives 92/102/EEC and 64/432/EEC, OJ L 5, 9.1.2004.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007207/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(18. Juli 2012)

Betrifft: Xenophobie in Griechenland

Laut einem Bericht von Human Rights Watch vom 10. Juli 2012 nimmt in Griechenland Xenophobie immer mehr zu.

Seit 2000 wird Griechenland als „Tor" in die Europäische Union angesehen: (Illegale) Asylsuchende und Migranten aus Asien und Afrika versuchen auf diesem Wege in die EU zu kommen. Bis zu 300 Migranten pro Tag sollen die Grenze Griechenlands passieren.

Die Wirtschaftskrise, Migranten und Asylanten haben allerdings die Demografie Athens stark verändert, und so ändern sich auch die Einstellung und das Sozialverhalten der Bevölkerung.

1. Wie gedenkt die Kommission, die Grenze Griechenlands (besser) zu schützen, so dass diese gegen illegale Migranten und Asylanten geschützt ist?

2. Was gedenkt die Kommission zu tun, um die in Griechenland lebenden Asylanten und Migranten besser vor der immer größer werdenden Xenophobie zu schützen?

Antwort von Frau Malmström im Namen der Kommission
(24. September 2012)

Die Kommission verurteilt uneingeschränkt alle fremdenfeindlichen und rassistischen Handlungen.

1. Die Grenzsicherung liegt in der gemeinsamen Verantwortung der EU und der Mitgliedstaaten. Die Mitgliedstaaten sind für die Kontrolle der Außengrenzen nach Maßgabe der Rechtsvorschriften und Normen der EU zuständig. Die Kommission übernimmt Überwachungs- und Unterstützungsaufgaben, um einen angemessenen Schutz der Außengrenzen sicherzustellen und gleichzeitig zu gewährleisten, dass sowohl die Rechte von Personen, die Anspruch auf internationalen Schutz haben, als auch der Grundsatz der Nichtzurückweisung (non-refoulement) in vollem Umfang gewahrt bleiben.

Die Kommission unterstützt Griechenland bei der Umsetzung des Außengrenzenfonds ([1]). Mit Blick auf die operative Unterstützung hat die Frontex-Agentur außerdem seit Anfang 2011 zusammen mit den griechischen Grenzschutzbehörden mehrere gemeinsame Einsätze entlang der griechischen Außengrenzen durchgeführt ([2]), um die Grenzkontrolle zu verschärfen.

2. Gemäß dem Rahmenbeschluss 2008/913/JI sind die Mitgliedstaaten verpflichtet, die vorsätzliche öffentliche Aufstachelung zu Gewalt oder Hass gegen eine nach den Kriterien der Rasse, Hautfarbe, Religion, Abstammung oder nationalen oder ethnischen Herkunft definierte Gruppe von Personen oder gegen ein Mitglied einer solchen Gruppe unter Strafe zu stellen ([3]). Es ist Sache der nationalen Behörden einschließlich der Gerichte, nach den näheren Umständen und dem jeweiligen Kontext zu entscheiden, ob eine konkrete Situation eine Aufstachelung zu Gewalt oder Hass aufgrund der vorgenannten Kriterien darstellt. Darüber hinaus ist das Recht auf Gleichbehandlung und Nichtdiskriminierung in einer Reihe von EU-Rechtsakten verankert ([4]).

([1]) Griechenland zählt zu den Hauptbegünstigten dieses Fonds.
([2]) Die sogenannte Operation Poseidon.
([3]) Rahmenbeschluss 2008/913/JI des Rates vom 28. November 2008 zur strafrechtlichen Bekämpfung bestimmter Formen und Ausdrucksweisen von Rassismus und Fremdenfeindlichkeit, ABl. L 328 vom 6.12.2008.
([4]) Gemäß den EU-Richtlinien über die legale Zuwanderung haben Drittstaatsangehörige Anspruch darauf, bei den Arbeitsbedingungen, der beruflichen Bildung sowie dem Zugang zu Waren und Dienstleistungen für die Öffentlichkeit wie Staatsangehörige des Aufnahmemitgliedstaates behandelt zu werden (Richtlinie 2003/109/EG des Rates betreffend die Rechtsstellung der langfristig aufenthaltsberechtigten Drittstaatsangehörigen; Richtlinie 2003/86/EG des Rates betreffend das Recht auf Familienzusammenführung; Richtlinie 2004/114/EG des Rates über die Bedingungen für die Zulassung von Drittstaatsangehörigen zur Absolvierung eines Studiums oder zur Teilnahme an einem Schüleraustausch, einer unbezahlten Ausbildungsmaßnahme oder einem Freiwilligendienst; Richtlinie 2005/71/EG des Rates über ein besonderes Zulassungsverfahren für Drittstaatsangehörige zum Zwecke der wissenschaftlichen Forschung; Richtlinie 2009/50/EG des Rates über die Bedingungen für die Einreise und den Aufenthalt von Drittstaatsangehörigen zur Ausübung einer hochqualifizierten Beschäftigung). Außerdem gelangen für Migranten aus Drittstaaten die Richtlinien 2000/43/EG und 2000/78/EG zur Anwendung, die Benachteiligungen aus Gründen der Rasse, der ethnischen Herkunft und der Religion verbieten.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007207/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: Xenophobia in Greece

According to a report by Human Rights Watch of 10 July 2012, xenophobia in Greece is on the rise.

Since 2000 Greece has been seen as a 'gateway' to the European Union: (illegal) asylum-seekers and immigrants from Asia and Africa try to enter the EU by this route. Up to 300 immigrants are reported to be crossing the Greek borders every day.

The economic crisis and the presence of immigrants and of asylum-seekers have, however, dramatically altered the demographic situation in Athens, and this in turn is changing the social attitudes and behaviour of the population.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. How does it intend to protect the borders of Greece (better) against illegal immigrants and asylum-seekers?

2. What steps will it take in order better to protect asylum-seekers and immigrants living in Greece from the growing xenophobia?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(24 September 2012)

The Commission condemns all acts of xenophobia and racism.

1. Border management is a shared responsibility between the EU and Member States. Member States are responsible for external borders control within the EU legal framework and standards. The Commission monitors and assists them to ensure that external borders are adequately managed, whilst safeguarding that rights of persons deserving international protection are fully respected as well as the principle of non-refoulement.

The Commission is assisting Greece in the implementation of the External Borders Fund ([1]). Furthermore, with regard to operational support, the Frontex Agency has launched since early 2011 together with the Greek border control authorities several joint operations along the Greek external borders ([2]) in order to increase the level of border control.

2. Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA obliges Member States to penalise the intentional public incitement to violence or hatred directed against groups or members of such groups defined by reference to race, colour, religion, descent or national or ethnic origin ([3]). It is for national authorities, including courts, to investigate concrete situations and to determine, according to the surrounding circumstances and context, whether they represent incitement to violence or hatred based on the abovementioned grounds. In addition, the right to equal treatment and non-discrimination is enshrined in a number of EU legal texts ([4]).

([1]) Greece is a major beneficiary of this Fund.
([2]) The so-called Poseidon operations.
([3]) Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA of 28 November 2008 on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law, OJ L 328, 6.12.2008.
([4]) Under the EU legal migration Directives third-country nationals have the right to equal treatment as compared to nationals of the host Member State, in areas such as working conditions, vocational training and access to goods and services available to the public (Council Directive 2003/109/EC concerning the status of third-country nationals who are long-term residents; Council Directive 2003/86/EC on the right to family reunification; Council Directive 2004/114/EC on the conditions of admission of third-country nationals for the purposes of studies, pupil exchange, unremunerated training or voluntary service; Council Directive 2005/71/EC on a specific procedure for admitting third-country nationals for the purposes of scientific research; Council Directive 2009/50/EC on the conditions of entry and residence of third-country nationals for the purposes of highly qualified employment). Furthermore, third-country national migrants are covered by Directives 2000/43/EC and 2000/78/EC which prohibit discrimination on grounds of race, ethnic origin and religion.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007213/12
to the Commission
Alyn Smith (Verts/ALE)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: Europeaid

Activists for fair trade have claimed that the purchasing practices of supermarkets are damaging to the environment and to living standards of food production workers, particularly in less affluent nations outside of the EU. The reduction in workers' rights and standards of living impacts on all of us and runs counter to the development and cooperation aims of Europeaid.

1. What actions has Europeaid taken to mitigate the effects of the supermarkets' buying practices?

2. Can the Commission confirm what actions are planned in order to ensure that the buying practices of supermarkets do not threaten to undermine the work of Europeaid?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(5 September 2012)

European retailers are increasingly aware of the role they must play and the responsibilities they must shoulder in promoting sustainable development and alleviating poverty.

This new business environment may provide developing world suppliers, particularly small producers, with new opportunities in distinct market niches which foster environmentally friendly and socially responsible production methods.

The Commission has for many years provided support to small agricultural producers, through its national and regional aid for trade (including fair trade) programmes and its agricultural projects, aimed at increasing their production capacity and facilitating their integration into international trade flows. Part of that aid was aimed at strengthening the bodies at the national and regional levels (and the capacity of those bodies) which ensure the compliance of export goods with the public and private standards in force in international markets. For the ACP countries, for instance, there is the Pesticides Initiative Programme (PIP), for which the 10th EDF ([1]) provides funding of EUR 32.5 million. Under this programme a dialogue has been continued with those who set public and private standards in the EU market to raise their awareness so as to ensure that their decisions take account of the potential impact on the fruit and vegetable sectors of developing countries and do not constitute additional obstacles to producers. Upstream, the PIP provides technical assistance and is enhancing the capacity of the whole of the fruit and vegetable sectors of ACP countries, so that they are able to adapt and meet market expectations appropriately.

The Commission also assists countries in taking advantage of the opportunities provided by European ecolabels.

([1]) European Development Fund.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007214/12
to the Commission
Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE) and Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: Humanitarian impact of the takeover of Palestinian water springs by Israeli settlers

The United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs — occupied Palestinian territory has reported that there are approximately 56 water springs in the West Bank.

It is reported that 30 of these springs have been taken over completely by Israeli settlers, while up to 26 are at risk of settler occupation.

At least 84 % of the springs affected by settler activities are located on land recognised by the Israeli Civil Administration (ICA) as privately owned by Palestinians, and virtually all of the springs affected by settler activities are, or were in the past, used by Palestinians for irrigation, watering of livestock and/or domestic water consumption.

1. Can the Commission verify if the water sources in the West Bank are in fact under control of the Israeli authorities and/or under Israeli settler control?

2. What measures has the Commission taken to ensure that there is access to clean water for irrigation, watering of livestock and/or domestic water consumption in this area?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(11 September 2012)

The Commission is closely following the developments on the ground in the occupied Palestinian territory (oPt) through the Office of the EU Representative in East Jerusalem. UN Agencies and international financial institutions are key sources of information.

In March 2012 UNOCHA reported on the humanitarian impact of the takeover by Israeli settlers of Palestinian water springs, most of which are located in the Area C of the West Bank. These water springs are vital for life for communities not connected to the water network.

In the Foreign Affairs Council Conclusions on the Middle East Peace Process of 14 May 2012 the EU reiterated its position on the illegality of the Israeli settlements in the oPt. The EU also called upon Israel to meet its obligations regarding the living conditions of the Palestinian population in Area C, including by 'ensuring access to water and addressing humanitarian needs'.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007217/12
aan de Commissie
Marije Cornelissen (Verts/ALE) en Tanja Fajon (S&D)
(18 juli 2012)

Betreft: Volkstelling in Bosnië en Herzegovina

Het feit dat Bosnië en Herzegovina een wet op volkstellingen heeft aangenomen — één van de vereisten in het kader van het uitbreidingsproces — is op zichzelf lovenswaardig. Het maatschappelijk middenveld is evenwel niet bij het opstellen van de wet betrokken geweest en er zijn ook problemen met de uitvoering van de wet. Zo hebben sommige vragen in het formulier van de volkstelling betrekking op gevoelige kwesties, hetgeen betekent dat de antwoorden gebruikt zouden kunnen worden om de etnische oorsprong van burgers vast te stellen (ook indien zij dit niet willen).

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van het burgerinitiatief in Bosnië en Herzegovina (dat wordt gesteund door de Public Internatio.a. Law and Policy Group), en met name van de bezorgdheid bij de organisatoren daarvan en het feit dat men vraagtekens plaatst bij de vorm en de procedure van de volkstelling 2013?

2. Zo ja, wat onderneemt de Commissie om iets aan deze bezorgdheid te doen? Het betreft in het bijzonder de onderstaande punten:

— de onvoldoende betrokkenheid van het maatschappelijk middenveld bij de ontwikkeling van en het overleg over de wet op volkstellingen, de vragen in het volkstellingsformulier en de volkstellingsprocedures;

— vragen 23, 2. en 25, waarbij met name de laatste zeer gevoelig ligt, aangezien het een verplichte vraag over de moedertaal is, waarmee mensen gedwongen worden hun etniciteit kenbaar te maken. Het is niet mogelijk te antwoorden dat Servisch, Kroatisch én Bosnisch de moedertaal zijn, of de vraag helemaal onbeantwoord te laten. Deze vragen zijn geen Eurostatvereiste;

— de eis van het maatschappelijk middenveld om betrokken te worden bij het proefproject met betrekking tot de volkstelling (dat in het najaar van 2012 begint), in het kader waarvan besluiten zullen worden genomen over opleiding, logistiek, de keuze van de locaties, enz.

3. Wat gaat de Commissie doen indien de autoriteiten van Bosnië en Herzegovina niet bereid zijn daadwerkelijk te luisteren naar de bezwaren tegen de vragen in het formulier van de volkstelling?

4. Gaat de Commissie het e.a.uatieverslag over de volkstelling van de internationale waarnemingsmissie openbaar maken?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(11 oktober 2012)

De Commissie is zich ervan bewust dat bepaalde vragen van de volkstelling in Bosnië en Herzegovina gevoelig liggen. Zij volgt aandachtig de verschillende stappen in de voorbereiding op de volkstelling, voornamelijk in het kader van het internationaal monitoringbureau (IMO). Dit garandeert dat het voorbereidingsproces van de volkstelling volgens Europese en internationale normen wordt uitgevoerd.

Het door de geachte Parlementsleden gesignaleerde probleem van de gevoelige vragen werd door de volkstellingexperts van de Commissie en het IMO doorverwezen naar de ministerraad van Bosnië en Herzegovina. Vervolgens is de vragenlijst door de autoriteiten aangepast, voo.a. wat betreft de vragen over taal en etnische oorsprong. De vragen zijn nu minder gesloten: er zijn meerdere antwoorden en er kan een geschreven antwoord worden toegevoegd. Er kunnen voortaan twee moedertalen worden opgegeven. De adviezen van het IMO zullen al worden toegepast tijdens de proeftelling in oktober. Het verloop daarvan zal aandachtig worden geobserveerd.

De stuurgroep van het IMO richtte op 19 september 2012 alle adviezen rechtstreeks tot de ministerraad en de Parlementaire Vergadering van Bosnië en Herzegovina. De Commissie is ervan overtuigd dat Bosnië en Herzegovina de raad van het IMO verder in acht zal nemen. Of de Europese en internationale normen worden nageleefd, wordt ook besproken tijdens de vaste vergaderingen onder de interim-overeenkomst tussen de EU en Bosnië en Herzegovina.

De Commissie zal de dialoog met het maatschappelijk middenveld voortzetten, ook via de EU-delegatie. De autoriteiten is gevraagd beter samen te werken met het maatschappelijk middenveld.

De missieverslagen van het IMO worden overhandigd aan de ministerraad. De autoriteiten van Bosnië en Herzegovina zullen de eerste twee verslagen publiceren op de website van het bureau voor statistiek van Bosnië en Herzegovina.

(Slovenska različica)

Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-007217/12
za Komisijo
Marije Cornelissen (Verts/ALE) in Tanja Fajon (S&D)
(18. julij 2012)

Zadeva: Popis prebivalstva v Bosni in Hercegovini

Sprejetje zakona o popisu prebivalstva v Bosni in Hercegovini (BIH), zakon je med zahtevanimi pogoji v širitvenem procesu, je treba pozdraviti. Vendar v pripravo zakona ni bila vključena civilna družba in tudi v zvezi z izvajanjem zakona obstajajo nekateri problemi. Tako se na primer vprašanja, postavljena v popisu, dotikajo občutljivih zadev, ki bi se lahko uporabile za določanje etnične pripadnosti prebivalcev, tudi če se ti ne želijo opredeliti kot pripadniki določene etnične skupine.

1, Ali je Komisija seznanjena s pomisleki, ki jih je civilna iniciativa ob podpori Skupine za mednarodno javno pravo in politiko (Public International Law and Policy Group) izrazila o obliki in postopku popisa prebivalstva, ki se bo izvajal v letu 2013?

2, Če je odgovor pritrdilen, kaj namerava Komisija storiti v zvezi s temi pomisleki? Ti se nanašajo na naslednje zadeve:

— nezadostno vključevanje civilne družbe oz. pomanjkanje ustrezne javne razprave v zvezi z zakonom o popisu prebivalstva ter vprašanji in postopki popisa;

— vprašanja 23, 24 in 25, med katerimi je zlasti sporno zadnje, saj je to vprašanje o „maternem jeziku“, na katerega je obvezno odgovoriti in ki tako od prebivalcev zahteva etnično opredeljevanje. V odgovoru ni mogoče navesti vseh treh, srbskega, hrvaškega in bosanskega jezika, kot maternih jezikov ali ne odgovoriti na vprašanje; ta vprašanja niso med zahtevami Eurostata;

— zahteva civilne družbe po sodelovanju v pilotskem načrtu popisa prebivalstva, ki se bo začel pripravljati jeseni 2012 in bo določil usposabljanje, logistiko, izbiro lokacij idr.

3, Kaj bo Komisija storila, če oblasti BIH ne bodo pripravljene upoštevati glavnih ugovorov v zvezi z vprašanji v popisu?

4, Ali bo Komisija omogočila, da bodo poročila mednarodne opazovalne misije o oceni popisa javno dostopna?

Odgovor g. Füle v imenu Komisije
(11. oktober 2012)

Komisija se zaveda občutljivosti vprašanj iz popisa v Bosni in Hercegovini (BIH). Pozorno spremlja vsak korak pri pripravi popisa, zlasti v okviru mednarodne opazovalne misije. S tem je zagotovljeno, da se postopek priprave popisa izvaja v skladu z evropskimi in mednarodnimi standardi.

Komisija in strokovnjaki mednarodne opazovalne misije na področju popisovanja so vprašanje poslancev o odgovorih na občutljiva vprašanja predložili za Svet (only in the heading) ministrov BIH. Državni organi so vprašalnik naknadno prilagodili. Navedene prilagoditve se zlasti nanašajo na vprašanje o jezikih in etnični pripadnosti. Vprašanja so zdaj bolj odprtega tipa, in sicer je možnih več odgovorov, vključijo pa se lahko tudi pisni odgovori. Navedeta se lahko dva materna jezika. Priporočila mednarodne opazovalne misije se bodo oktobra že uporabljala za pilotni popis. Ta postopek bo predmet natančnih opazovanj.

Skupina za upravljanje mednarodne opazovalne misije je 19. septembra 2012 vsa priporočila predložila neposredno za Svet (only in the heading) ministrov in parlamentarni skupščini BIH. Komisija je prepričana, da bodo državni organi v BIH še naprej upoštevali nasvete mednarodne opazovalne misije. Spoštovanje standardov EU in mednarodnih standardov se spremlja tudi na rednih srečanjih v okviru začasnega sporazuma med EU in BIH.

Komisija bo, tudi preko delegacije EU, še naprej sodelovala v dialogu s civilno družbo. Državni organi so bili pozvani, naj okrepijo sodelovanje.

Poročila mednarodne opazovalne misije se predložijo za Svet (only in the heading) ministrov. Državni organi v BIH so sklenili, da prvi dve poročili objavijo na spletni strani statističnega urada BIH.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007217/12
to the Commission
Marije Cornelissen (Verts/ALE) and Tanja Fajon (S&D)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: Census in Bosnia and Herzegovina

The fact that a census law — a requirement in the enlargement process — has been adopted in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) is in itself recommendable. However, civil society was not involved in the drafting of the law and there are some problems with its implementation. The proposed census' questions, for instance, include sensitive issues that might be used to determine the ethnic origin of citizens, even if they do not wish to be labelled as belonging to a particular ethnic group.

1. Is the Commission aware of the concerns of the civic initiative in BiH, supported by the Public International Law and Policy Group, which is questioning the form and procedure of the 2013 census?

2. If so, what is the Commission doing to address these concerns? Specifically, the following:

— the lack of involvement of civil society in, or proper public consultation about, the census law, the census questions and the census procedures;

— Questions 23, 24 and 25, the last of these being particularly problematic as it is a mandatory question about people's 'mother tongue', obliging them to label themselves ethnically. It is not possible to reply that Serbian, Croatian and Bosnian are all your mother tongue, or to leave the question open; these questions are not a Eurostat requirement;

— civil society's demand to be involved in the pilot census plan, which begins in the autumn of 2012, determining training, logistics, site selection, etc.

3. What will the Commission do if the BiH authorities are not willing to address the main objections to the census questions?

4. Will the Commission make the International Monitoring Mission's assessment reports on the census public?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(11 October 2012)

The Commission is aware of the sensitivity of the census questions in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH). It closely follows every step in the census preparation, above all in the framework of the International Monitoring Operation (IMO). This ensures that the process of preparation of the census is implemented according to EU and international standards.

The Commission and the IMO census experts referred the issue raised by the Honourable Members on answers to sensitive questions to the Council of Ministers of BiH. An adjustment to the questionnaire was subsequently introduced by the authorities. This applies in particular to the question on languages and ethnic affiliations. They are now more open, i.e. by multiple answers with the option to include written responses. Two mother tongues can be declared. The IMO recommendations will apply already to the pilot census in October. The process will be carefully observed.

The Management Group of the IMO addressed all recommendations on 19 September 2012 directly to the Council of Ministers and the Parliamentary Assembly of BiH. The Commission is confident that BiH will continue to follow the IMO advice. The respect of EU and international standards is also monitored in the regular meetings under the Interim Agreement (IA) between the EU and BiH.

The Commission, including through the EU Delegation, will continue to engage in a dialogue with the civil society. The authorities have been asked to enhance cooperation with them.

The IMO's mission reports are handed over to the Council of Ministers. The authorities of BiH have decided to make the first two reports public on the website of the BiH Statistical Agency.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007218/12
alla Commissione
Giancarlo Scottà (EFD)
(18 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Scarsa leggibilità delle etichette dell'olio d'oliva

Il regolamento (CE) n. 182/2009 prevede l'obbligo di indicare in etichetta la provenienza delle olive utilizzate nella produzione dell'olio extra vergine e dell'olio vergine di oliva.

Spesso questa indicazione non è leggibile a causa della posizione o del carattere utilizzato. Considerato che la maggior parte degli oli commercializzati sono prodotti con miscele di olive italiane, comunitarie e non comunitarie, la mancata trasparenza genera sleale concorrenza. Ne consegue che i produttori agricoli che utilizzano solo olive italiane hanno guadagni inferiori rispetto a chi utilizza miscele comunitarie e non comunitarie senza dichiararlo in etichetta. Ciò danneggia anche i consumatori che non vengono correttamente informati sulla provenienza del prodotto.

La necessità di sostenere il settore dell'olio di oliva emerge anche dalla proposta di regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio recante organizzazione comune dei mercati dei prodotti agricoli — regolamento OCM unica (non ancora approvato), a proposito della quale il relatore suggerisce, tra l'altro, di finanziare azioni per la diffusione di informazioni a cura delle organizzazioni di operatori.

1. Quali misure intende adottare la Commissione affinché le norme tutelino effettivamente i consumatori e la reale concorrenza tra i produttori?

2. Come intende essa agire affinché vengano garantite l'autenticità del prodotto e la trasparenza delle informazioni?

Risposta data da Dacian Çiolos a nome della Commissione
(30 agosto 2012)

Il regolamento di esecuzione (UE) n. 29/2012 ([1]) relativo alle norme di commercializzazione dell'olio d'oliva prevede all'articolo 4 l'obbligo di designazione dell'origine sull'etichetta dell'olio extra vergine di oliva e dell'olio di oliva vergine. Nel caso specifico di oli d'oliva originari di uno Stato membro o di un paese terzo, deve figurare un riferimento a tale Stato membro, all'Unione o al paese terzo a seconda del caso. La designazione dell'origine che menziona uno Stato membro o l'Unione corrisponde alla zona geografica nella quale le olive sono state raccolte e in cui è situato il frantoio nel quale è stato estratto l'olio.

Spetta agli Stati membri adottare le misure necessarie, comprese quelle concernenti il regime di sanzioni, per assicurare l'osservanza del summenzionato regolamento. In seguito a domanda di verifica, lo Stato membro provvede al prelievo di campioni, verifica la veridicità delle indicazioni figuranti sull'etichetta contestata e adotta eventualmente le misure necessarie.

Inoltre, a margine della riunione del Consiglio Agricoltura del 18 giugno 2012, il membro della Commissione responsabile dell'agricoltura e dello sviluppo rurale ha presentato ai ministri interessati un piano d'azione per il settore dell'olio d'oliva ([2]). Tale piano d'azione, che è stato trasmesso anche al Parlamento, prevede un rafforzamento dei controlli e delle sanzioni nonché una standardizzazione delle comunicazioni degli Stati membri sulla natura delle irregolarità accertate e le sanzioni applicate. Per quanto riguarda l'etichettatura e le norme di commercializzazione, si prevede di migliorare la visualizzazione (dimensioni dei caratteri) e la posizione delle informazioni (campo visivo).

La Commissione ha inoltre l'intenzione di rafforzare la promozione dell'immagine di marca dell'olio d'oliva europeo e informare meglio il consumatore.

([1]) GU L 12 del 14.1.2012, pag. 14.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/olive-oil/index_fr.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007218/12
to the Commission
Giancarlo Scottà (EFD)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: Lack of clarity on olive oil labels

Regulation (EC) No 182/2009 provides for the compulsory indication on the label of the origin of olives used in the production of extra virgin and virgin olive oil.

Often this information can scarcely be read due to its position or the font used. Considering that most oils on the market are produced with mixtures of Italian, EU and non-EU olives, this lack of transparency creates unfair competition. As a result, farmers who use only Italian olives have lower earnings than those who use mixtures of EU and non-EU olives without declaring it on the label. This is also bad for consumers, who are not properly informed about the origin of the product.

The need to support the olive oil sector is also apparent from the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and Council establishing a common market for agricultural products — Single CMO Regulation (not yet adopted), in which the rapporteur suggests, amongst other things, that measures be financed for the dissemination of information by operator organisations.

1. What measures will the Commission take to ensure that the rules actually protect consumers and promote genuine competition between producers?

2. What action will it take to ensure that the authenticity of the product and transparency of information are guaranteed?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Çiolos au nom de la Commission
(30 août 2012)

Le règlement d'exécution (UE) n° 29/2012 ([1]) relatif aux normes de commercialisation de l'huile d'olive établit dans son article 4 un régime obligatoire de désignation de l'origine sur l'étiquetage des huiles d'olive vierge extra et vierge. Dans le cas précis des huiles d'olive originaires d'un État membre ou d'un pays tiers, une référence à cet État membre, à l'Union ou au pays tiers selon le cas doit être mentionnée. L'origine de l'huile mentionnant un État membre ou l'Union correspond à la zone géographique où les olives ont été récoltées et où se situe le moulin dans lequel l'huile a été extraite des olives.

Il incombe aux États membres de prendre les mesures nécessaires y compris les sanctions pour assurer le respect du règlement susvisé. En cas de demande de vérification, l'État membre prélève des échantillons, vérifie la véracité des mentions de l'étiquetage mises en cause et prend éventuellement les mesures qui s'imposent.

En plus, à la marge de la réunion du Conseil Agriculture du 18 juin 2012, le Membre de la Commission responsable pour l'Agriculture et le Développement Rural a présenté aux ministres concernés un plan d'action sur le secteur de l'huile d'olive ([2]). Ce plan d'action qui a été envoyé aussi au Parlement, prévoit un renforcement des contrôles et des sanctions ainsi qu'une standardisation des communications des États membres sur la nature des irrégularités constatées et les sanctions appliquées. Au niveau de l'étiquetage et des normes de commercialisation, il est notamment prévu d'améliorer l'affichage (taille des caractères) et de mieux positionner l'information (champ visuel).

La Commission a aussi l'intention de renforcer la promotion de l'image de marque de l'huile d'olive européenne et mieux informer le consommateur.

([1]) JO L 12 du 14.1.2012, pp. 14-21.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/olive-oil/index_fr.htm

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007229/12
à la Commission
Robert Rochefort (ALDE)
(18 juillet 2012)

Objet: Plateforme pour identifier et discuter des bonnes pratiques en matière de politiques industrielles

Face à la crise économique que nous traversons, les initiatives pour relancer la croissance dans l'UE sont primordiales. Or, selon la Commission européenne ([1]), un emploi du secteur privé sur quatre dans l'UE se trouve dans l'industrie manufacturière et au moins un autre emploi sur quatre dans les services connexes qui sont tributaires de l'industrie comme fournisseurs ou comme clients. En outre, la Commission souligne que 80 % des efforts de recherche et développement du secteur privé sont à mettre sur le compte de l'industrie. Compte tenu de l'importance de ce secteur dans l'économie européenne, il est nécessaire que les États membres mettent en œuvre des politiques industrielles ambitieuses, cohérentes et coordonnées, pour relancer la croissance.

Dans la communication d'octobre 2011 intitulée «Politique industrielle: renforcer la compétitivité», la Commission s'est engagée ([2]) à créer une plateforme permettant d'identifier et de discuter des bonnes pratiques visant à favoriser la croissance à travers les politiques industrielles.

1. La Commission peut-elle indiquer si cette plateforme a déjà été mise en place et, dans l'affirmative, en préciser la composition?

2. La Commission peut-elle aussi indiquer si elle prévoit de rendre compte des activités de cette plateforme, par exemple à travers la publication de rapports réguliers?

Réponse donnée par M. Tajani au nom de la Commission
(30 août 2012)

La communication de 2011 intitulée «Politique industrielle: renforcer la compétitivité» comprenait l'engagement de recenser et d'examiner les bonnes pratiques en matière de promotion de la croissance. Par conséquent, la Commission a mis sur pied des échanges de bonnes pratiques et invité les États membres à y participer. Les résultats de ces projets recensant les bonnes pratiques sont examinés par le groupe «politique d'entreprise» ([3]).

Après avoir mené des discussions avec les représentants des États membres, la Commission a défini une première série de thèmes pertinents en matière de compétitivité industrielle. Le premier projet d'échange de bonnes pratiques mettait l'accent sur des politiques favorisant le déploiement de technologies clés génériques, sur la base des travaux d'un groupe d'experts gouvernementaux et non gouvernementaux provenant des États membres participants. Les résultats du projet ont été présentés et examinés lors d'un séminaire organisé en juin 2012, en présence d'un public professionnel élargi, au terme duquel la Commission a publié le rapport final ([4]). Un autre projet d'échange de bonnes pratiques a été examiné en mars 2012 par le groupe «politique d'entreprise», qui s'est employé à envisager des politiques visant à faciliter l'accès au financement.

Le travail sur les bonnes pratiques se poursuit et la Commission prépare deux autres projets, le premier sur le recensement des moyens envisageables pour stimuler la croissance et l'emploi dans le secteur du tourisme, le second sur les bonnes politiques favorisant les investissements directs à l'étranger. D'autres échanges sont prévus pour 2013-2014.

([1]) Communication du 7 octobre 2010 intitulée «Une politique industrielle intégrée à l'ère de la mondialisation — Mettre la compétitivité et le développement durable sur le devant de la scène».
([2]) Communication du 14 octobre 2011 intitulée «Politique industrielle: renforcer la compétitivité».
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/epg/index_en.htm
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/ict/files/kets/ex_of_practice_ket_final_report_en.pdf; http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/ict/key_technologies/index_fr.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007229/12
to the Commission
Robert Rochefort (ALDE)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: Forum for identifying and discussing good industrial policy practices

The current economic crisis makes initiatives to relaunch growth in the EU crucial. According to the Commission ([1]), one in four jobs in the private sector in the European Union is in manufacturing industry, and at least another one in four is in associated services that depend on industry as a supplier or as a client. Moreover, the Commission points out that 80 % of all private sector research and development efforts are undertaken in industry. Given the size of this sector in the European economy, the Member States need to pursue ambitious, coherent and coordinated industrial policies in order to relaunch growth.

In its October 2011 Communication entitled 'Industrial Policy: Reinforcing Competitiveness' ([2]), the Commission undertook to establish a permanent forum for identifying and discussing good practices in promoting growth through industrial policies.

1. Could the Commission indicate whether this forum has already been established? And if so, what is its composition?

2. Could the Commission also indicate whether it plans to report on the forum's activities, for instance by publishing regular reports?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(30 August 2012)

The 2011 Communication entitled 'Industrial Policy: Reinforcing Competitiveness' included a commitment to identify and discuss good policy practices in promoting growth. Consequently, the Commission has initiated exchanges of good practice and invited Member States to participate in these exchanges. The results of these projects identifying good practices are discussed at the Enterprise Policy Group ([3]).

After discussions with Member State representatives, the Commission identified an initial set of topics relevant to industrial competitiveness. The first project of exchanging good practice focused on policies promoting the deployment of key enabling technologies, building on the work of an expert group that comprised governmental and non-governmental experts from the participating Member States. The project results were presented and discussed with a larger professional audience at a seminar in June 2012, after which the Commission published the final report ([4]). Another good practice project was discussed at the Enterprise Policy Group in March 2012, looking at policies to facilitate access to finance.

The work on good practices continues, and the Commission is preparing two additional projects, the first on identifying good ways to stimulate growth and jobs in the tourism sector; and the second on good policies promoting foreign direct investment. Further exchanges are foreseen for 2013-2014.

([1]) Communication of 7 October 2010 entitled: 'An Integrated Industrial Policy for the Globalisation Era — Putting Competitiveness and Sustainability at Centre Stage'.
([2]) Communication of 14 October 2011 entitled: 'Industrial Policy: Reinforcing Competitiveness'.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/epg/index_en.htm
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/ict/files/kets/ex_of_practice_ket_final_report_en.pdf; http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/ict/key_technologies/index_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007230/12
alla Commissione
Patrizia Toia (S&D)
(18 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Linea ferroviaria Rho-Gallarate

Nella risposta all'interrogazione sul progetto di ampliamento della linea ferroviaria Rho-Gallarate, del 22.2.2011, la Commissione specificava di aver ricevuto informazioni dalle autorità italiane in merito all'osservanza della direttiva sulla valutazione di impatto ambientale (VIA) e della direttiva Habitat per il progetto ferroviario di cui trattasi.

Il Tribunale Amministrativo Regionale per la Lombardia con sentenza del 9.7.2012 ha accolto il ricorso 1359 del 2011 annullando la deliberazione CIPE n. 33 del 13 maggio 2010, «non avendo la commissione tecnica di verifica dell'impatto ambientale tenuto in minimo conto che la soluzione del quadruplicamento della linea ferroviaria era stata addirittura esclusa in sede di progettazione preliminare, in quanto ritenuta eccessivamente impattante sul contesto urbanistico della zona; avendo la stessa commissione affermato apoditticamente che l'impatto in termini di vibrazioni e rumore viene neutralizzato dagli interventi di mitigazione previsti nel progetto definitivo, esprimendo in tal modo giudizi che avrebbero richiesto un più adeguato approfondimento, ed anticipando in sostanza le valutazioni che avrebbero dovuto essere rese in esito al rinnovo della procedura di valutazione di impatto ambientale». Ne consegue dunque che su questo progetto che produrrà impatti significativi sull'ambiente sono state riscontrate anomalie nell'effettuazione della VIA ai sensi della direttiva 85/337/CEE del Consiglio e non sono state valutate le conseguenze potenziali delle attività umane all'interno e nei dintorni del sito Natura 2000 OASI WWF (Bosco di Vanzago) per accertarsi che le specie e gli habitat siano opportunamente protetti ai sensi della direttiva 92/43/CEE del Consiglio (direttiva Habitat).

La Commissione ha deciso pertanto di non finanziare, nell'ambito della verifica annuale 2011 TEN-T, il progetto di ampliamento della suddetta linea ferroviaria.

Quali iniziative intende intraprendere la Commissione per assicurare che lo Stato italiano rispetti la normativa comunitaria sulla valutazione d`impatto ambientale e la direttiva Habitat a fronte del comprovato tentativo di eluderne l'effettiva applicazione?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(6 settembre 2012)

La Commissione prende atto della recente sentenza del tribunale amministrativo regionale della Lombardia. Non rientra nel ruolo istituzionale della Commissione formulare osservazioni in merito ai procedimenti giudiziari negli Stati membri. Tuttavia la Commissione prenderà contatto con le autorità italiane competenti in materia ambientale al fine di comprendere in tutti i suoi aspetti la rilevanza della sentenza del 9 luglio 2012 ai fini della procedura di valutazione di impatto ambientale ([1]) della linea ferroviaria in questione. In seguito sarà fornita una risposta complementare all'onorevole parlamentare.

Nella risposta della Commissione del 22 febbraio 2011 all'interrogazione scritta E-7402/10 dell'onorevole parlamentare ([2]), la Commissione ha indicato che, secondo le informazioni trasmesse dalle autorità italiane, il bosco di Vanzago era stato oggetto di un'opportuna valutazione (prevista dalla direttiva Habitat ([3])) il 30 ottobre 2003.

Sulla base delle norme applicabili per la costruzione della rete transeuropea dei trasporti (TEN-T) e del contributo finanziario dell'Unione in questo settore ([4]), possono beneficiare di un sostegno finanziario a titolo del programma TEN-T soltanto i progetti realizzati in conformità alle pertinenti normative e politiche dell'Unione, in particolare in materia di tutela ambientale.

([1]) GU L 26 del 28.1.2012.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/it/parliamentary-questions.html
([3]) GU L 206 del 22.7.1992.
([4]) In particolare, l'articolo 8 della decisione n. 661/2010/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 7 luglio 2010, sugli orientamenti dell'Unione per lo sviluppo della rete transeuropea dei trasporti, GU L 204 del 5.8.2010, nonché l'art. 12 del regolamento (CE) n. 680/2007 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 20 giugno 2007, che stabilisce i principi generali per la concessione di un contributo finanziario della Comunità nel settore delle reti transeuropee dei trasporti e dell'energia, GU L 162 del 22.6.2007.

Risposta complementare di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(8 febbraio 2013)

La Commissione, in data 21 dicembre 2012, ha ricevuto informazioni da parte delle autorità italiane dalle quali risulta che presso il Consiglio di Stato è in corso un procedimento contro la sentenza emessa dal Tribunale amministrativo regionale della Lombardia il 9 luglio 2012.

In queste circostanze possiamo soltanto ribadire, come indicato nella risposta precedente a questa interrogazione scritta, che non è opportuno che la Commissione formuli osservazioni in merito a procedimenti giudiziari in corso negli Stati membri.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007230/12
to the Commission
Patrizia Toia (S&D)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: Rho-Gallarate railway line

In its reply of 22 February 2011 to the written question on the planned extension of the Rho-Gallarate railway line, the Commission specified that it had received information from the Italian authorities on compliance with the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) directive and the Habitats Directive for the railway project in question.

In a judgment of 9 July 2012, the Lombardy Regional Administrative Court accepted appeal No 1359 of 2011 and annulled Resolution No 33 of 13 May 2010 by the CIPE (Interministerial Economic Planning Committee) on the grounds that the technical committee that had assessed the environmental impact of the project had taken no account of the fact that the quadrupling of the railway line had actually been ruled out at the preliminary planning stage, as it had been deemed to have an excessive impact on local urban surroundings; the committee itself had apodictically affirmed that the impact in terms of vibration and noise would be neutralised by the mitigation measures included in the final project. The committee thus expressed opinions that would have called for further, more appropriate research and essentially anticipated the assessments that should have been made under the new environmental impact assessment procedure.

Accordingly, irregularities in the implementation of the EIA under Council Directive 85/337/EEC have been identified in relation to this project that will have a significant impact on the environment. Furthermore, the potential consequences of human activities in and around the Natura 2000 WWF sanctuary (Vanzago Forest) have not been evaluated, with a view to ensuring that species and habitats are being appropriately protected under Council Directive 92/43/EEC (Habitats Directive).

The Commission, therefore, in its TEN-T 2011 annual review, decided not to finance the proposed railway line extension.

What action will the Commission take to ensure that the Italian Government complies with EU legislation on environmental impact assessments and with the Habitats Directive, given its proven attempt to avoid implementing such legislation?

Preliminary answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(6 September 2012)

The Commission takes note of the recent judgment of the Lombardy Regional Administrative Court. It is not the institutional role of the Commission to comment on legal procedures in Member States. However, it will contact the competent environmental authorities in Italy in order to obtain a better understanding of the relevance of the judgment of 9 July 2012 for the Environmental Impact Assessment ([1]) procedure of the railway line in question. Subsequently, a supplementary reply will be provided to the Honourable Member.

In the Commission's reply of 22 February 2011 to Written Question E-7402/10 by the Honourable Member ([2]), the Commission indicated that based on information provided from the Italian authorities an Appropriate Assessment (required by the Habitats Directive ([3])) on the Vanzago Forest was carried out on 30 October 2003.

In line with the applicable provisions for the development of the trans-European transport network (TEN-T) and the Community financial aid in this field ([4]), only projects which are carried out in conformity with the relevant Union legislation and policies, in particular relating to the protection of the environment, can receive financial support from the TEN-T programme.

([1]) OJ L 26, 28.1.2012.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([3]) OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.
([4]) In particular Article 8 of Decision No 661/2010/EU, Decision No 661/2010/EU of the Parliament and of the Council of 7 July 2010 on Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network, OJ L 204, 5.8.2010, as well as Article 12 of Regulation (EC) No 680/2007 of the Parliament and of the Council of 20 June 2007 laying down general rules for the granting of Community financial aid in the field of the trans-European transport and energy networks, OJ L 162, 22.6.2007.

Supplementary answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(8 February 2013)

The Commission has received information from the Italian authorities on 21 December 2012 indicating that there are proceedings pending before the Council of State against the judgment issued by the Lombardy Regional Administrative Court of 9 July 2012.

In these circumstances, it can only be reiterated that, as stated in the previous answer provided to this written question, it is not appropriate for the Commission to comment on legal procedures in Member States.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007251/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(18. Juli 2012)

Betrifft: Internetkriminalität

Laut der jüngsten Eurobarometer-Umfrage sind 74 % der Internetnutzer in Europa der Ansicht, dass die Gefahr, Opfer von Internetkriminalität zu werden, 2011 gestiegen ist.

1. Welche wirtschaftlichen und kulturellen Vorteile hat die digitale Wirtschaft für Europa, für die einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten und insbesondere für Österreich?

2. Auf welche Weise kann die Kommission die Sicherheit personenbezogener Daten und bei Online-Zahlungen erhöhen? Auf welche Weise kann sie gegen Online-Betrug vorgehen? Wie kann sie die Bürger in der EU über die Gefahren des Internet informieren?

3. Welchen Beitrag zur Lösung aller oben genannten Fragen kann die Europäische Strategie für Internetsicherheit leisten, und wie kann sie Maßnahmen für den Schutz der Infrastruktur und gegen Internetkriminalität umfassen?

Antwort von Frau Malmström im Namen der Kommission
(26. September 2012)

Wie schon in der Digitalen Agenda für Europa ([1]) betont wurde, ist das „digitale Ökosystem" zu einem wichtigen Faktor für das Wirtschaftswachstum und das Gemeinwohl in Europa geworden. So wurden 2011 an die 14 % des Umsatzes von EU-Unternehmen mit mindestens 10 Beschäftigten mit E-Commerce erwirtschaftet (14 % in Österreich) ([2]). 35 % der EU-Unternehmen kauften online ein (59 % in Österreich) und 15 % verkaufen online (15 % in Österreich). Es wird geschätzt, dass die digitale Wirtschaft in den letzten 5 Jahren 21 % des BIP-Wachstums der entwickelten Länder ([3]) ausgemacht hat.

Die Kommission beabsichtigt die Sicherheit von Online-Diensten durch eine Reihe von Maßnahmen zu fördern, die in der europäischen Strategie für Cyber-Sicherheit enthalten sind, die von der Kommission zusammen mit dem Europäischen Auswärtigen Dienst entwickelt wird. Die Hauptziele der Strategie werden in der Antwort zur parlamentarischen Anfrage E-007442/2012 ([4]) erläutert. Die für Ihre Fragen relevanten Elemente der Strategie beinhalten einen Legislativvorschlag zur Netz- und Informationssicherheit, die Entwicklung eines Binnenmarktes für Produkte/Dienstleistungen für Cyber-Sicherheit, die Unterstützung von Prävention und Reaktion auf Cyber-Kriminalität, den Ausbau von Sensibilisierungskampagnen und Cyber-Sicherheitstraining sowie die Förderung von F&E-Investitionen.

Im Einzelnen kann der Legislativvorschlag von privaten Interessengruppen, einschließlich von Anbietern von Internetdiensten, fordern, ihre Netzwerke und Informationssysteme abzusichern und schwerwiegende Vorfälle zu melden. Diese Fragen sind derzeit Gegenstand einer öffentlichen Anhörung ([5]).

Die Fähigkeit der EU zur Bekämpfung der Cyberkriminalität, einschließlich des Online-Betrugs, soll vom Europäischen Zentrum zur Bekämpfung der Cyberkriminalität (EC3) innerhalb von Europol unterstützt werden, das im Januar 2013 gegründet wird und über eine erhöhte Kapazität zur Informationsverarbeitung verfügen sowie die Mitgliedstaaten zusätzlich unterstützen und Instrumente zum Aufspüren von Verbrechen entwickeln soll.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0245:FIN:DE:PDF.
([2]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Information_society_statistics.
([3]) http://ww1.mckinsey.com/mgi/publications/Internet_matters/pdfs/MGI_Internet_matters_full_report.pdf
([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/de/parliamentary-questions.html
([5]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/12/818&format=HTML&aged=0&language=DE&guiLanguage=en.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007251/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: Cybercrime

74% of European Internet users consider that the risk of becoming a victim of cybercrime increased in 2011, according the new Eurobarometer survey.

1. What are the economic and cultural benefits of the digital economy for Europe, for individual Member States and in particular for Austria?

2. How can the Commission promote security of personal information and online payments? How can it eliminate online fraud? How can it inform EU citizens about the dangers of the Internet?

3. How can the European Strategy for Cyber Security help to resolve all the aforementioned issues, and how can it cover measures addressing infrastructure protection and cybercrime?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(26 September 2012)

As highlighted in the Digital Agenda for Europe ([1]), the digital ecosystem has become essential to economic growth and societal welfare in Europe. For instance, in 2011, e-commerce accounted for around 14% of sales among EU firms with at least 10 employees (14% in Austria) ([2]); 35% of EU enterprises purchased online (59% in Austria) and 15% sold online (15% in Austria). It is estimated that the Internet economy generated 21% of the GDP growth in the last five years in mature countries ([3]).

The Commission intends to promote the security of online services via a number of actions integrated in the European Strategy for Cyber Security that the Commission is devising together with the European External Action Service. The main goals of the strategy were provided in the reply to EP Question E-007442/2012 ([4]). The elements of the strategy relevant for the current question would include a legislative proposal on Network and Information Security, the development of an EU internal market for cyber security products/services, the support to the prevention of and response to cybercrime, the promotion of awareness raising campaigns and cyber security training, and the fostering of R & D investments.

In particular, the legislative proposal may require private stakeholders, including those providing Internet services, to secure their networks and information systems and to report significant incidents. These issues are currently the subject of a public consultation ([5]).

The EU's capacity to tackle cybercrime, including online fraud, will be bolstered by the creation of a European Cybercrime Centre (EC3) within Europol in January 2013 with increased capabilities to process information, provide operational support to Member States, and to develop tools to detect crimes.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0245:FIN:EN:PDF.
([2]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Information_society_statistics.
([3]) http://ww1.mckinsey.com/mgi/publications/Internet_matters/pdfs/MGI_Internet_matters_full_report.pdf
([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([5]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/12/818&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en).

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007252/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(18. Juli 2012)

Betrifft: Skandal aufgrund der Manipulation des „Libor" durch internationale Banken

Gegenwärtig berichten die internationalen Medien über einen mutmaßlichen Manipulationsskandal, in den internationale Großbanken verwickelt sein sollen, die angeblich inkorrekte „Libor"-Werte gemeldet haben. Der Libor (London Interbank Offered Rate) ist die Grundlage des Zinssatzes für Darlehen zwischen den Banken. Er dient ebenfalls als Grundlage für die Berechnung der Zinsen von Hypothekendarlehen, die die Bürger zur Finanzierung eines neuen Eigenheims aufnehmen. Somit könnte der Manipulationsskandal negative Auswirkungen für Tausende von Menschen überall in der EU haben.

1. Haben die Kommission bzw. ihre Dienststellen, Einrichtungen oder Agenturen Kenntnis von etwaigen Unregelmäßigkeiten oder möglichen Unregelmäßigkeiten im Zusammenhang mit dem Libor gehabt bzw. sind ihr entsprechende Informationen zugetragen worden?

2. Der Libor ist die Grundlage für Finanzgeschäfte im Wert von 360 Milliarden US-Dollar, und jede Änderung hat weitreichende wirtschaftliche Auswirkungen. Welche Art von Maßnahmen wird die Kommission durchführen, um zu gewährleisten, dass sich ein Fall wie dieser nicht wiederholt bzw. nicht wieder eintreten kann?

3. Beabsichtigt die Kommission, EU-Bürger, die aufgrund der Manipulation des Libor negative wirtschaftliche Auswirkungen hinnehmen mussten, finanziell zu unterstützen?

Antwort von Herrn Barnier im Namen der Kommission
(28. August 2012)

Die zuständigen nationalen Behörden haben zu prüfen, ob Banken durch die Manipulation des LIBOR gegen EU-Rechtsvorschriften für Finanzdienstleistungen oder nationale Vorschriften verstoßen haben. Diese Untersuchungen laufen derzeit, und die Kommission verfolgt die Entwicklungen sehr genau.

Die Kommission untersucht seit Oktober 2011 aus der Sicht des EU-Wettbewerbsrechts mehrere mutmaßliche Kartellabsprachen, die Benchmarks wie EURIBOR und LIBOR und den Handel mit Derivaten betreffen. Diese Ermittlungen dauern noch an. Es ist Aufgabe der Kommission, die EU-Kartellvorschriften, insbesondere Artikel 101 AEUV, durchzusetzen und erforderlichenfalls Sanktionen zu verhängen.

Die Folgen einer Manipulation des LIBOR könnten erheblich sein, da er für die Berechnung des Preises zahlreicher Finanzinstrumente, Transaktionen und Darlehen sowohl in Europa als auch weltweit zugrunde gelegt wird. Die Kommission hat daher unverzüglich reagiert und eine geänderte Fassung ihrer Vorschläge für eine Verordnung ([1]) und eine Richtlinie ([2]) über Marktmissbrauch angenommen mit dem Ziel, Manipulationen von Benchmarks wie des LIBOR unionsweit offiziell zu verbieten und unter Strafe zu stellen.

Darüber hinaus prüft die Kommission in Zusammenarbeit mit den zuständigen Behörden, der Europäischen Zentralbank und ihren internationalen Partnern, welche weiteren Maßnahmen hinsichtlich einer umfassenderen Regulierung der Benchmarks erforderlich sind. Das Europäische Parlament wird über die diesbezüglichen Fortschritte auf dem Laufenden gehalten.

([1]) Geänderter Vorschlag für eine Verordnung über Insider-Geschäfte und Marktmanipulation (KOM(2012)XXX).
([2]) Geänderter Vorschlag für eine Richtlinie über strafrechtliche Sanktionen für Insider-Geschäfte und Marktmanipulation (KOM(2012)XXX).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007252/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: Scandal involving manipulation of 'Libor' values by international banks

International media are currently reporting an alleged scandal involving manipulation by large international banks, which are alleged to have reported false 'Libor' values. The Libor (London Interbank Offered Rate) is the basis for the interest rate offered for inter-bank loans. It is also the basis for the calculation of interest rates on the mortgages people take out to finance new homes. The manipulation scandal could therefore have a negative impact on thousands of people throughout the EU.

1. Has the Commission, or any of its services, offices or agencies, been aware of or informed about any irregularities or possible irregularities with regard to the Libor, at any time?

2. The Libor is the basis for financial transactions totalling USD 360 billion, and any alteration has far-reaching economic effects. What kind of measures will the Commission implement to ensure that a case like this does not, and cannot, arise again?

3. Does the Commission intend to provide financial support for EU citizens who have suffered adverse economic effects as a result of the manipulation of the Libor?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(28 August 2012)

It is for the competent national authorities to investigate whether banks breached EU financial services or national legislation through the manipulation of LIBOR. These investigations are currently ongoing and the Commission is following the developments closely.

From the perspective of EU competition law, the Commission started investigating in October 2011 several possible cartel arrangements involving benchmarks including EURIBOR and LIBOR and trading in related derivatives. These investigations are ongoing. It is the Commission's responsibility to enforce EU antitrust rules, in particular Article 101 TFEU, including imposing sanctions as necessary.

The impact of any manipulation of LIBOR could be considerable since it is used to determine the price of many financial instruments, transactions and loans, both in Europe and worldwide. The Commission has therefore acted promptly by adopting amended proposals for a regulation ([1]) and for a directive ([2]) on market abuse, to clearly prohibit and criminalise throughout the Union the manipulation of benchmarks such as LIBOR.

In addition the Commission, in cooperation with competent authorities, the European Central Bank and its international partners, is investigating what further action is required in relation to the regulation of benchmarks more broadly. The European Parliament will be kept informed of progress.

([1]) Amended proposal for a regulation on insider dealing and market manipulation, COM(2012)XXX.
([2]) Amended proposal for a directive on criminal sanctions for insider dealing and market manipulation, COM(2012)xxx.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007253/12
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Proyecto de Red Eléctrica Española (tramo Sentmenat-Santa Coloma de Gramenet)

Red Eléctrica Española ha presentado el proyecto de cambiar el cableado de 220 kV por un trazado de 400 kV en la línea transportadora de energía eléctrica (a una distancia de menos de 100 m de núcleos habitados) en el tramo Sentmenat-Santa Coloma de Gramenet y la construcción de una nueva subestación transformadora en esta última ciudad (a una distancia de 150 metros de núcleos habitados). La afectación medioambiental del trazado de las líneas existentes de 200 kV no es nula y tampoco lo será una vez convertidas a 400 kV. Substituir una línea aérea de 220 kV por una de 400 kV altera las condiciones radioeléctricas y medioambientales; entre otras consecuencias, supone la consolidación de un corredor eléctrico aéreo de alta tensión de entrada al área metropolitana de Barcelona, el aumento de los niveles de los campos electromagnéticos, la creación de nuevos tendidos, torres, etc. En este caso, se ha vulnerado absolutamente la soberanía territorial (no se ha informado a los municipios) y no se han valorado ni los impactos ya existentes ni los que producirá la creación de la nueva línea; entre otros aspectos, no nos consta que se haya encargado ningún estudio de impacto ambiental y radioeléctrico.

Parte de los terrenos por donde transcurrirá la línea de muy alta tensión forman parte del Parque de la Serralada de Marina, incluido en la red de parques promovidos por la Diputación de Barcelona, y que se encuentran regulados por el Plan especial de protección y mejora del sector sud de la Serra de Marina, de Badalona, Montcada i Reixac, Santa Coloma de Gramenet y Tiana. El plan especial citado califica las zonas atravesadas por las líneas eléctricas como zonas de alto interés ecológico y paisajístico (ZIEP) y como zonas de interés natural (ZN).

1. ¿Tiene constancia la Comisión de dicho proyecto?

2. ¿Considera la Comisión que Red Eléctrica Española está cumpliendo las recomendaciones y precauciones respecto al medio ambiente y la salud de las personas en el marco de la construcción de las líneas de muy alta tensión?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(1 de octubre de 2012)

La Comisión no tiene conocimiento del proyecto mencionado por Su Señoría relativo a la mejora de una línea de energía eléctrica en el área metropolitana de Barcelona.

Debe observarse que, en función de las características del proyecto, podría ser aplicable la Directiva 2011/92/UE del Consejo ([1]) (conocida como la Directiva sobre la evaluación de impacto ambiental, o Directiva EIA).

El procedimiento de la Directiva EIA garantiza la detección y evaluación de las consecuencias ambientales de los proyectos antes de ser autorizados por la autoridad competente. Los ciudadanos pueden dar su opinión y deben tenerse en cuenta todas las consultas. También debe informarse a los ciudadanos del contenido de la autorización de los proyectos.

A fin de conocer los detalles del asunto, la Comisión ha solicitado a las autoridades españolas competentes información relativa al cumplimiento de las disposiciones del Derecho medioambiental de la UE.

En lo que se refiere a los posibles efectos de las líneas eléctricas de alta tensión sobre la salud humana, el artículo 168 del Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea no confiere a la Unión facultades que permitan a la Comisión legislar, y deja a las autoridades de los Estados miembros la responsabilidad de proteger a los ciudadanos. Según la información de que dispone la Comisión, España no cuenta con legislación nacional relativa a la exposición de los ciudadanos a los campos eléctricos y magnéticos creados por las líneas eléctricas de alta tensión (50 hercios), pero algunos gobiernos regionales prohíben la construcción de nuevas líneas eléctricas a proximidad de viviendas, escuelas y espacios públicos.

([1]) DO L 26 de 28.1.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007253/12
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: Plans submitted by Red Eléctrica Española (Sentmenat-Santa Coloma de Gramenet power line)

The electric company Red Eléctrica Española has submitted plans to upgrade a section of power lines (passing less than 100 metres from residential areas) between Sentmenat and Santa Coloma de Gramenet from 220 kV to 400 kV, and to build a new transformer substation near Santa Coloma de Gramenet (less than 150 metres from residential areas). The environmental impact of the existing lines is already substantial, and increasing the voltage will do nothing to improve matters: replacing overhead 220-kV lines with 400-kV lines will generate more radio frequency radiation and harm the environment. The plans notably involve consolidating a high-voltage overhead power corridor stretching to the Barcelona conurbation, creating increased magnetic fields and building new sections of cabling and pylons. This project is a clear breach of territorial sovereignty (since the municipalities affected were not informed of the project), furthermore, the environmental impact of neither the existing installation nor of the planned construction of the new line has been measured, as we have been unable to find any trace of an electrical environmental impact assessment.

The very-high voltage line also encroaches on the Park of Serralada de Marina, part of the network of parks drawn up by Barcelona Provincial Council, and covered by the action plan to protect and improve the southern Sierra de la Marina mountains, Badalona, Montcada i Reixac, Santa Coloma de Gramenet and Tiana. This plan classes certain areas crossed by the power lines as areas of ecological and landscape interest and others as areas of natural interest.

1. Is the Commission area of this project?

2. Does the Commission consider Red Eléctrica Española to be complying with the applicable rules and taking the requisite precautions concerning the environment and human health in constructing these very-high voltage power lines?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(1 October 2012)

The Commission is not aware of the project raised by the Honourable Member, concerning the upgrading of an electrical power line in the metropolitan area of Barcelona, Spain.

It should be noted that, depending on the characteristics of the project, the provisions of Directive 2011/92/EU ([1]) (known as the Environmental Impact Assessment or EIA Directive) could be applicable to this case.

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

In order to know the details of the case, the Commission has requested information from the competent Spanish authorities concerning compliance with the relevant requirements under EU environmental law.

Regarding the possible effects of high-voltage power lines on human health, Article 168 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union confers no powers to the Union which would enable the Commission to legislate and leaves Member-States authorities the responsibility to protect the public. To the Commission's knowledge, Spain has no federal legislation for exposure of the general public to electric and magnetic fields from high-voltage power lines (50 hertz), but some regional governments prohibit construction of new power lines near homes, schools and public spaces.

([1]) OJ L 26, 28.1.2012.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007254/12
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Ratificación del MEDE y sus efectos en España e Italia

Dada la incertidumbre reinante en el mercado de obligaciones español a pesar de la anterior entrega de fondos acordada para la recapitalización de la banca por valor de cien mil millones de euros que serán transferidos al MEDE una vez que entre en vigor. Considerando especialmente que su diferencial ha llegado hasta los 560 pb (17.7.2012) y la nueva actualización de *World Economic Outlook Update* ([1]) del FMI da la previsión de un crecimiento económico negativo para España equivalente a —1.5 % del PIB para 2012 y —0.6 % del PIB para 2013.

Considerando también la dramática situación económica de Italia, donde el diferencial es de unos 500 pb y el FMI también pronostica un crecimiento negativo de —1.9 % GDP y —0,3 % para los próximos dos años.

En ambos países, los mercados están teniendo un desempeño negativo especialmente después de las medidas de enorme austeridad anunciadas por el Presidente Rajoy (65 mil millones de euros) y el Presidente Monti (26 mil millones de euros)

Dado que el Tribunal Constitucional alemán anunció que adoptaría su resolución sobre la constitucionalidad o no del MEDE el 12 de septiembre ([2]). Además, Estonia, Italia y Malta todavía no han ratificado el MEDE.

1. ¿Está la Comisión, particularmente los miembros de la zona euro, considerando la posibilidad de una minoría de bloqueo para el MEDE? ¿Cómo piensa avanzar la Comisión hacia una Unión Bancaria sin este paso previo fundamental? ¿Está considerando la Comisión directamente una propuesta de modificar el mandato del BCE y permitirle actuar como prestamista de último recurso?

2. ¿Cuáles son las propuestas de la Comisión para reducir los diferenciales español e italiano? ¿Está considerando la Comisión un cambio radical para las medidas de austeridad propuestas hacia un crecimiento que permita a las economías española e italiana obtener la confianza de los mercados?

3. ¿Va a revisar la Comisión las recomendaciones específicas por país y los objetivos de deuda y déficit para España e Italia en el Semestre Europeo a la vista del nuevo informe del FMI?

Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión
(11 de septiembre de 2012)

1. El rechazo de un Tratado es siempre, por desgracia, una posibilidad, aunque ahora únicamente la falta de ratificación del Tratado del MEDE por Alemania podría bloquear todavía su entrada en vigor. El establecimiento del MEDE no es estrictamente un requisito para crear una Unión Bancaria. La Comisión no tiene previsto proponer modificaciones de las disposiciones del Tratado que rigen el Banco Central Europeo.

2. Para ayudar a Italia y España a recuperar la confianza del mercado, las medidas de la UE deben complementarse con las medidas nacionales apropiadas. En consonancia con las recomendaciones recibidas en el marco del semestre europeo, Italia debe seguir haciendo frente con determinación al doble reto de una deuda pública muy elevada y un crecimiento estructuralmente débil. Con respecto a España, ha propuesto una ampliación de un año del plazo de corrección del déficit excesivo, que ha sido aprobada por el Consejo. El 30 de mayo de 2012, la Comisión publicó su evaluación del programa nacional de reforma y del programa de estabilidad españoles de 2012 e instó a España a aplicar reformas estructurales que impulsaran el crecimiento económico.

3. La Comisión vigilará estrechamente la aplicación por los Gobiernos italiano y español de las recomendaciones específicas hechas a cada uno de esos países.

La plena aplicación de la ambiciosa estrategia de saneamiento presupuestario ya puesta en marcha por el Gobierno italiano desde el 10 de mayo de 2012 permitirá corregir el déficit excesivo en 2012 y alcanzar un superávit primario considerable para 2013.

([1]) http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2012/update/02/index.htm
([2]) http://www.spiegel.de/wirtschaft/verfassungsgericht-spricht-urteil-zum-euro-rettungsfonds-im-september-a-844642.html

Los objetivos presupuestarios españoles son los que se han presentado recientemente como parte del procedimiento de déficit excesivo, que incluye la prórroga de un año. La concesión de un año adicional requiere la consecución de objetivos intermedios de déficit global: 6,3 % del PIB en 2012, 4,5 % del PIB en 2013 y 2,8 % del PIB en 2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007254/12
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: Ratification of the European Stability Mechanism and effects in Spain and Italy

There continues to be uncertainty in the Spanish bonds market despite the previously agreed EUR 100 billion bail-out for banking recapitalisation which will be transferred to the European Stability Mechanism (ESM) once it enters into force. Spain's spread has risen to 560 basis points (as at 17 July 2012), while the new IMF World Economic Outlook Update ([1]) has forecast negative economic growth for Spain of -1.5% GDP for 2012 and -0.6% of GDP for 2013.

Italy's economic situation is also very serious: its spread stands at around EUR 500 basis points, with the IMF forecasting negative growth of -1.9% of GDP in 2012 and -0.3% of GDP in 2013.

In both countries, the markets are performing badly, especially following the extensive austerity measures announced by President Rajoy (EUR 65 billion) and President Monti (EUR 26 billion).

Germany's constitutional court has announced that it will decide on 12 September 2012 whether or the ESM is constitutional ([2]). Moreover, Italy, Malta and Estonia have not yet ratified the ESM.

1. Have the Commission and the members of the eurozone considered the possibility that a blocking minority will be reached in relation to the ESM? How will the Commission move towards a banking union without this fundamental step? Is the Commission considering a proposal to change the European Central Bank's mandate directly in order to allow it to act as a lender of last resort?

2. What are the Commission's proposals with a view to reducing the Spanish and Italian spreads? Is the Commission considering a radical change from proposals for austerity measures towards proposals for growth that will allow the Spanish and Italian economies to gain the markets' confidence?

3. Will the Commission review the country-specific recommendations and the debt and deficit goals for Spain and Italy as part of the European Semester, in view of the new IMF report?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(11 September 2012)

1. The rejection of a Treaty is always an unfortunate possibility, although currently only non-ratification by Germany could still block the entry into force of the ESM Treaty. The establishment of the ESM is not strictly a requirement for establishing a Banking Union. The Commission does not plan to propose amendments to the Treaty provisions governing the European Central Bank.

2. To help Italy and Spain regain market confidence, the EU level actions need to be complemented by appropriate national actions. In line with the recommendations received in the context of the European Semester, Italy needs to continue tackling with determination its twin challenges of a very high public debt and structurally weak growth. Concerning Spain, an extension of the excessive deficit correction deadline by one year has been proposed by the Commission and adopted by the Council. On 30 May 2012, the Commission published its assessment of the Spanish 2012 national reform programme and stability programme and invited Spain to implement structural reforms supporting economic growth.

3. The Commission will closely monitor the implementation by the Italian and Spanish Government of the country-specific recommendations.

The full implementation of the ambitious fiscal consolidation strategy already enacted by the Italian Government since 10 May 2012 will allow correcting the excessive deficit in 2012 and achieving a sizeable primary surplus by 2013.

([1]) http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2012/update/02/index.htm
([2]) http://www.spiegel.de/wirtschaft/verfassungsgericht-spricht-urteil-zum-euro-rettungsfonds-im-september-a-844642.html

The Spanish fiscal targets are the ones recently presented as part of the excessive deficit procedure, which includes the 1-year extension. Granting an additional year requires the attainment of intermediate headline deficit targets: 6.3% of GDP for 2012, 4.5% of GDP for 2013, and 2.8% of GDP for 2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007255/12
to the Commission
David Martin (S&D)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: Kalydeco (ivacaftor) drug for treatment of cystic fibrosis

On 24 May 2012 the European Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use (CHMP) issued a positive opinion by consensus recommending approval of Kalydeco (ivacaftor) for the treatment of people suffering from cystic fibrosis. The Commission is now reviewing this decision before the product is authorised to be marketed in the EU. The Summary of Opinion indicates that the Commission decision should be issued 67 days later. Would the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Will the decision be taken in 67 days or 67 'working days'?

2. Will the decision be delayed by the summer recess?

3. Did Kalydeco have orphan drug status and should it therefore have been dealt with in 30 working days?

Question for written answer E-007346/12
to the Commission
Alyn Smith (Verts/ALE)
(20 July 2012)

Subject: Ivacaftor product licence

On 24 May 2012 the European Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use (CHMP) issued a positive opinion ([1]) in respect of a new drug for the treatment of cystic fibrosis called ivacaftor (brand name Kalydeco). The Summary of Opinion indicates that the Commission decision on granting a product licence or marketing authorisation should be issued 67 days later.

1. However, given that ivacaftor is an orphan drug, could the Commission clarify whether or not this decision should in fact be made within 30 working days of the positive opinion? If not, could the Commission explain why not?

2. Finally, could the Commission confirm when the final decision will be made regarding the granting of a product licence or marketing authorisation?

Joint answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(27 August 2012)

The Commission Decision C(2012)5349 ([2]) for the marketing authorisation for Kalydeco (ivacaftor) was adopted on 23 July 2012.

The Commission decisions for marketing authorisation of EU centrally authorised medicinal products was taken in accordance with Article 10 of Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 ([3]) and within the period of 67 calendar days referred to by the honourable Member.

The period of 30 days in accordance with Article 5(8) of the Orphan Regulation (EC) No 141/2000 ([4]) to which the Honourable Member also refers, relates to the procedure for designation of a medicinal product as an orphan medicinal product and not to the granting of a marketing authorisation.

([1]) EMA/CHMP/311973/2012.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/html/h782.htm
([3]) OJ L 136, 30.4.2004.
([4]) OJ L 18, 22.1.2000.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007256/12
to the Commission
Chris Davies (ALDE)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: Israel's planned destruction of EU-funded projects

On 12 June 2012 the Israeli authorities issued a demolition order for a further 50 structures in the Palestinian village of Susiya, near Hebron, on land illegally occupied by Israel. Some 350 people are at risk of displacement.

It has been claimed that the structures to be demolished include a health clinic established by CARE International and the Palestinian Medical Relief Society with funding from DG ECHO, two water cisterns built with funding from DG ECHO, and a dairy production facility funded by the Polish Foreign Ministry.

1. What action is the Commission taking to protect assets funded with money from EU citizens and from the EU budget?

2. In its view, what sanctions does should be imposed on Israel in the light of the latter's disregard for EU assets and international law?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(30 August 2012)

The EU is aware of the situation in the village of Susiya in the Southern Hebron hills, and is following developments closely.

In a local statement issued on 15 June 2012, European Union diplomats voiced their concern over the humanitarian impact and political implications of the recent demolition orders for the village's 50 residential shelters.

A group of EU diplomats met with representatives of the village council and were briefed about recent developments which have increased the risk of forced displacement for the village's population. The diplomats toured the village which is located very close to the Susiya settlement and a military base.

Following this fact finding exercise, EU concerns have been raised at senior level in bilateral meetings with representatives of the Government of Israel. The EU has called on Israel to meet its obligations regarding the living conditions of the Palestinian population in Area C, including by halting the forced transfer of population and demolition of Palestinian housing and infrastructure, simplifying administrative procedures to obtain building permits for Palestinians, ensuring access to water and addressing humanitarian needs, including in the Conclusions of the Foreign Affairs Council in May 2012.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-007257/12
до Съвета
Michael Cashman (S&D), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Антония Първанова (ALDE) и Véronique Mathieu (PPE)
(18 юли 2012 г.)

Относно: Водеща роля на ЕС на международните срещи на високо равнище по въпросите на сексуалното и репродуктивно здраве и права

В заключенията на Съвета за ролята на ЕС в областта на здравето в световен мащаб (10 май 2010 г.) се изразява съгласие с това, че Съюзът трябва да играе централна роля за ускоряване на напредъка в борбата с глобалните предизвикателства пред здравето и да съдейства за по-добро управление на световно равнище на свързаните със здравето споразумения в областта на околната среда. Освен това в него се посочва, че ще бъде отделено особено внимание на четирите основни предизвикателства в областта на здравето, като се признава, че едно от тях е сексуалното и репродуктивно здраве.

Въпреки това споразумение ЕС не зае ясна позиция за включване на репродуктивното здраве и репродуктивните права в заключителния документ, приет на срещата „Рио+20: бъдещето, което желаем".

Би ли могъл Съветът да обясни:

1. Защо ЕС не пое водеща роля в преговорите „Рио+20" в съответствие със заключенията на Съвета относно здравето в световен мащаб, за да гарантира, че сексуалното и репродуктивно здраве и права ще бъдат включени като основен въпрос в целия текст на окончателното споразумение?

В светлината на предстоящите преговори относно бъдещето на международната конференция за населението и развитието през 2014 г., Целите на хилядолетието за развитие и 20-годишния преглед на прилагането на Декларацията от Пекин и Платформата за действие през 2015 г.:

2. По какъв начин ще гарантира Съветът, че ЕС е в състояние да заеме ясна позиция в подкрепа на сексуалното и репродуктивно здраве и права?

3. По какъв начин ще се гарантира участието на Европейския парламент при формулирането на тази позиция?

4. Ще бъде ли обсъждан въпросът за обща позиция относно сексуалното и репродуктивно здраве и права?

Отговор
(19 ноември 2012 г.)

През последните години Съветът прие напредничави позиции относно здравето като цяло, и по-конкретно относно сексуалното и репродуктивното здраве и права.

Съветът последователно застъпва становището, че здравните системи следва да обръщат специално внимание на равенството между половете и на нуждите и правата на жените, включително на борбата с насилието, основано на пола. Припомняйки приложимите международни инструменти, Съветът многократно е признавал правото на жените да упражняват контрол и да вземат свободно и отговорно решения по въпроси, свързани с тяхното сексуално и репродуктивно здраве.

През 2007 г. Съветът категорично потвърди връзката между политиките и програмите относно ХИВ/СПИН и политиките и услугите, свързани със сексуалното и репродуктивното здраве и права, и взаимозависимостта им с въпроси от общ характер в областта на общественото здраве, развитието и правата на човека, съгласно договореното от международната общност като глобално усилие за постигането на Целите на хилядолетието за развитие.

Тези важни елементи бяха в основата на преговорната позиция на ЕС в процеса „Рио+20" още от самото начало до приемането на заключителния документ „Бъдещето, което искаме", одобрен от 66-ата сесия на Общото събрание на ООН на 11 септември 2012 г.

Безспорно договореното в „Рио+20" е компромис. ЕС работеше упорито от дълго време за постигането на по-амбициозни резултати. Въпреки това параграфи 145 и 146 от документа „Бъдещето, което искаме" действително отразяват основните елементи и референции, които бяха определени като важни за ЕС и неговите държави членки при подготовката в Съвета.

Съветът ще продължи да застъпва ясна позиция спрямо сексуалното и репродуктивното здраве и права, както го е правил в миналото при важни събития, напр. в рамката на Споразумението за партньорство АКТБ—ЕС или в контекста на диалога ЕС—САЩ по въпросите на развитието, в който за сътрудничеството ЕС—САЩ на място в редица пилотни държави партньори свързаните с ЦХР здравни въпроси се определят като приоритетни.

На 23 юли 2012 г. Съветът прие приоритетите на ЕС за 67-ото Общо събрание на ООН, като заяви, че ЕС продължава да се ангажира с цялостното изпълнение на Декларацията и програмата за действие от Кайро на МКНР и на Декларацията и платформата за действие от Пекин. ЕС ще отдели особено внимание на равенството между половете и на правото на жените и мъжете да упражняват контрол и да вземат свободно и отговорно решения по въпросите, свързани с тяхното сексуално и репродуктивно здраве. За тази цел ЕС ще работи активно, за да се гарантира, че здравните системи предоставят информация и здравни услуги съобразно сексуалните и репродуктивните нужди на жените, тъй като това е от съществено значение за правата на жените, равенството между половете и овластяването на жените.

Тези елементи ще са в основата на бъдещата работа на Съвета относно подготовката и разработването на общи позиции на ЕС относно здравето като цяло, и по-конкретно относно сексуалното и репродуктивното здраве и права с оглед на бъдещите преговорни процеси, като прегледа на ЦХР през 2013 г., последващите действие във връзка с Международната конференция по въпросите на населението и развитието след 2014 г. и прегледа на прилагането на Декларацията и платформата за действие от Пекин през 2015 г.

Съветът следи отблизо обсъжданията в Европейския парламент по този и други имащи отношение въпроси и взема надлежно предвид приетите от Парламента резолюции.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007257/12
an den Rat
Michael Cashman (S&D), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Antonyia Parvanova (ALDE) und Véronique Mathieu (PPE)
(18. Juli 2012)

Betrifft: Führende Rolle der EU bei internationalen Gipfeln zum Thema sexuelle und reproduktive Gesundheit und Rechte

In den Schlussfolgerungen des Rates vom 10. Mai 2010 zur Rolle der EU in der globalen Gesundheitspolitik wird darauf hingewiesen, dass der Union eine maßgebliche Rolle dabei zukommt, die Bewältigung der globalen Herausforderungen im Gesundheitsbereich schneller voranzubringen und für eine bessere globale Regelung gesundheitsrelevanter Umweltabkommen einzutreten. Ferner wird darauf hingewiesen, dass den vier zentralen Herausforderungen im Bereich der Gesundheit, zu denen die sexuelle und reproduktive Gesundheit gezählt wird, besondere Aufmerksamkeit gewidmet wird.

Trotz dieser Vereinbarung hat sich die EU nicht klar dafür ausgesprochen, dass das Thema reproduktive Gesundheit und Rechte als Schlüsselthema in das Abschlussdokument mit dem Titel „Rio+20: die Zukunft, die wir wollen" aufgenommen wird.

1. Kann der Rat erklären, warum die EU keine führende Rolle bei den Rio+20-Verhandlungen übernommen hat, wie es den Schlussfolgerungen des Rates zur globalen Gesundheitspolitik entsprochen hätte, um sicherzustellen, dass das Thema sexuelle und reproduktive Gesundheit und Rechte durchgehend als Schlüsselthema in das Schlussabkommen aufgenommen wird?

Vor dem Hintergrund der bevorstehenden Verhandlungen über die Zukunft der Internationalen Konferenz über Bevölkerung und Entwicklung im Jahr 2014, die Millenniums-Entwicklungsziele und die für 2015 geplante Zwanzigjahresüberprüfung der Durchführung der Erklärung und Aktionsplattform von Peking wird der Rat gebeten, folgende Fragen zu beantworten:

2. Wie wird der Rat sicherstellen, dass die EU in der Lage ist, einen klaren Standpunkt im Sinne der Förderung der sexuellen und reproduktiven Gesundheit und Rechte einzunehmen?

3. Wie wird die Einbeziehung des Parlaments in die Formulierung dieses Standpunkts sichergestellt werden?

4. Wird die Veröffentlichung eines Gemeinsamen Standpunkts zum Thema sexuelle und reproduktive Gesundheit und Rechte erörtert werden?

Antwort
(19. November 2012)

In den letzten Jahren hat der Rat progressive Standpunkte hinsichtlich einer globalen Gesundheitspolitik im Allgemeinen sowie der sexuellen und reproduktiven Gesundheit und Rechte im Besonderen eingenommen.

Der Rat hat konsequent die Ansicht vertreten, dass Gesundheitssysteme der Gleichstellung sowie den Bedürfnissen und den Rechten von Frauen — einschließlich der Bekämpfung von geschlechtsbezogener Gewalt — besondere Aufmerksamkeit widmen sollten. Der Rat hat mehrfach unter Verweis auf die einschlägigen internationalen Instrumente das Recht der Frauen anerkannt, hinsichtlich ihrer sexuellen und reproduktiven Gesundheit selbstbestimmt zu handeln sowie frei und verantwortlich zu entscheiden.

2007 hat der Rat die Verknüpfung zwischen Maßnahmen und Programmen bezüglich HIV/AIDS und Maßnahmen und Diensten bezüglich der sexuellen und reproduktiven Gesundheit und damit verbundener Rechte (SRHR) sowie ihren Zusammenhang mit allgemeineren Fragen der öffentlichen Gesundheit, der Entwicklung und der Menschenrechte im Sinne der von der internationalen Gemeinschaft vereinbarten globalen Anstrengung zum Erreichen der Milleniums-Entwicklungsziele (MDG) ausdrücklich bekräftigt.

Diese unverzichtbaren Elemente lagen der Verhandlungsposition zugrunde, die die EU während des gesamten Rio+20-Prozesses — vom ersten Tag bis hin zur Annahme des auf der 66. Tagung der Generalversammlung der Vereinten Nationen am 11. September 2012 gebilligten Abschlussdokuments „Die Zukunft, die wir wollen" — vertreten hat.

Das Ergebnis des Rio+20-Prozesses stellt eindeutig einen Kompromiss dar. Die EU hatte lange und unnachgiebig auf ein ehrgeizigeres Ergebnis hingewirkt. Die Absätze 145 und 146 des Abschlussdokuments „Die Zukunft, die wir wollen“ enthalten dennoch die Kernelemente und wesentlichen Referenzen, die während der Vorbereitungen im Rat als bedeutend für die EU und ihre Mitgliedstaaten hervorgehoben worden waren.

Der Rat wird weiterhin einen klaren Standpunkt in Bezug auf sexuelle und reproduktive Gesundheit und damit verbundene Rechte einnehmen, so wie er dies auch in der Vergangenheit bei wichtigen Zusammenkünften getan hat, beispielsweise im Rahmen des AKP-EU-Partnerschaftsabkommens oder des EU-US-Dialogs über Entwicklung, bei dem MDG-relevante Gesundheitsfragen im Hin-blick auf die praktische Zusammenarbeit von EU und USA in einer Reihe von Pilot-Partnerländern im Vordergrund stehen.

Am 23. Juli 2012 nahm der Rat die Prioritäten der EU für die 67. Tagung der Generalversammlung der Vereinten Nationen an und erklärte, dass die EU weiterhin für die uneingeschränkte Umsetzung der Erklärung und des Aktionsprogramms der Internationalen Konferenz über Bevölkerung und Entwicklung (ICPD) von Kairo sowie der Erklärung und Aktionsplattform von Beijing eintrete. Die EU wird der Gleichstellung der Geschlechter und dem Recht von Frauen und Männern auf selbstbestimmtes Handeln sowie freie und verantwortliche Entscheidung in Bezug auf Angelegenheiten, die ihre sexuelle und reproduktive Gesundheit betreffen, besondere Aufmerksamkeit widmen. Die EU wird deshalb konsequent dafür sorgen, dass die Gesundheitssysteme Informationen und Gesundheitsdienste bereitstellen, mit denen auf die Bedürfnisse von Frauen hinsichtlich ihrer sexuellen und reproduktiven Gesundheit eingegangen wird, da dies für die Rechte, die Gleichstellung und die Teilhabe von Frauen von entscheidender Bedeutung ist.

Diese Elemente werden in künftige Beratungen des Rates über die Ausarbeitung und Entwicklung von Gemeinsamen Standpunkten der EU zur globalen Gesundheitspolitik im Allgemeinen sowie zur sexuellen und reproduktiven Gesundheit und damit verbundenen Rechten im Besonderen einfließen, insbesondere im Vorfeld kommender Verhandlungsprozesse wie der Überprüfung der Millenniums-Entwicklungsziele im Jahr 2013, dem Follow-up der Internationalen Konferenz über Bevölkerung und Entwicklung über 2014 hinaus und der Überprüfung der Umsetzung der Erklärung und Aktionsplattform von Beijing im Jahr 2015.

Der Rat verfolgt aufmerksam die Beratungen des Europäischen Parlaments zu diesem Thema und zu damit verbundenen Fragen und nimmt auch seine Entschließungen zur Kenntnis.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007257/12
au Conseil
Michael Cashman (S&D), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Antonyia Parvanova (ALDE) et Véronique Mathieu (PPE)
(18 juillet 2012)

Objet: Rôle de chef de file de l'Union européenne lors des sommets internationaux en ce qui concerne la santé et les droits en matière de sexualité et de procréation

Les conclusions du Conseil du 10 mai 2010 sur le rôle de l'Union européenne dans le domaine de la santé mondiale établissent que l'Union a un rôle central à jouer pour permettre des avancées plus rapides en ce qui concerne les enjeux sanitaires mondiaux et pour promouvoir une meilleure gouvernance mondiale en matière d'accords environnementaux relatifs à la santé. Elles précisent également qu'une attention particulière doit être portée aux quatre principaux problèmes sanitaires, la santé en matière de sexualité et de procréation étant spécifiquement retenue comme l'un d'entre eux.

En dépit de ces déclarations, l'Union n'est pas parvenue à prendre clairement position pour que la santé et les droits reproductifs figurent parmi les points déterminants du document final intitulé «L'avenir que nous voulons», adopté lors de la conférence Rio + 20.

1. Le Conseil peut-il expliquer pourquoi l'Union, lors des négociations de Rio + 20, n'a pas joué un rôle prépondérant, dans le droit fil des conclusions du Conseil en matière de santé mondiale, pour faire en sorte que la santé et les droits sexuels et reproductifs soient repris en tant qu'élément essentiel dans l'accord final?

Compte tenu des prochaines négociations concernant l'avenir de la Conférence internationale sur la population et le développement en 2014, des objectifs du Millénaire pour le développement et de l'évaluation des vingt années de mise en œuvre de la Déclaration et du Programme d'action de Pékin, prévue pour 2015, le Conseil est invité à répondre aux questions suivantes:

2. Comment le Conseil entend-il veiller à ce que l'Union soit en mesure d'adopter une position sans équivoque en faveur de la santé et des droits sexuels et reproductifs?

3. De quelle manière le Parlement sera-t-il associé à l'élaboration de cette position?

4. La publication d'une position commune concernant la santé et les droits en matière de sexualité et de procréation fera-t-elle l'objet d'un débat?

Réponse
(19 novembre 2012)

Au cours de ces dernières années, le Conseil a adopté des positions progressistes en ce qui concerne la santé au niveau mondial en général et la santé et les droits en matière de sexualité et de procréation en particulier.

Le Conseil n'a cessé de faire valoir que les systèmes de santé devraient accorder une attention particulière à l'égalité entre les hommes et les femmes, ainsi qu'aux besoins et aux droits des femmes, notamment en matière de lutte contre la violence à caractère sexiste. Rappelant les instruments internationaux qui existent en la matière, le Conseil a, à de nombreuses reprises, reconnu le droit des femmes à avoir la maîtrise des questions qui concernent leur santé en matière de sexualité et de procréation et à en décider librement et en connaissance de cause.

En 2007, le Conseil a rappelé avec insistance le lien existant entre les politiques et programmes en matière de lutte contre le VIH/sida et les politiques et services dans le domaine de la santé et des droits en matière de sexualité et de procréation, et leurs corrélations avec des questions plus générales de santé publique, de développement et de Droits de l'homme, dont la communauté internationale a estimé qu'il s'inscrivait dans le cadre d'un effort planétaire en faveur de la réalisation des objectifs du Millénaire pour le développement (OMD).

Ces éléments essentiels ont sous-tendu la position de négociation de l'UE tout au long du processus Rio+20, depuis le premier jour et jusqu'à l'adoption du document final intitulé «L'avenir que nous voulons», qui a été approuvé le 11 septembre 2012 lors de la 66e session de l'Assemblée générale des Nations unies.

Les résultats de la conférence Rio+20 constituent à l'évidence un compromis. L'UE avait œuvré sans relâche et avec détermination pour parvenir à un résultat plus ambitieux. Les points 145 et 146 du document «L'avenir que nous

voulons» contiennent néanmoins les principaux éléments et références dont l'importance avait été mise en avant par l'UE et ses États membres lors des préparatifs de la conférence au sein du Conseil.

Le Conseil continuera à adopter une position claire concernant la santé et les droits en matière de sexualité et de procréation, comme il l'a fait par le passé lors d'événements majeurs ainsi que dans le cadre de l'accord de partenariat ACP-UE par exemple, ou dans le cadre du dialogue UE-États-Unis sur le développement, qui accorde la priorité aux questions de santé liées aux OMD pour ce qui est de la coopération UE-États-Unis sur le terrain dans un certain nombre de pays partenaires pilotes.

Le 23 juillet 2012, le Conseil a adopté les priorités de l'UE pour UNGA 67, déclarant que l'UE demeurait attachée à la mise en œuvre intégrale de la Conférence internationale sur la population et le développement (CIPD)/de la Déclaration et du programme d'action du Caire et de la Déclaration et du programme d'action de Pékin. L'UE accordera une attention particulière à l'égalité entre les hommes et les femmes et au droit des femmes et des hommes à avoir la maîtrise des questions qui concernent leur santé en matière de sexualité et de procréation et à en décider librement et en connaissance de cause. À cet effet, elle veillera activement à ce que les systèmes de santé fournissent des informations et des services de santé qui répondent aux besoins des femmes en matière de sexualité et de procréation, cette question revêtant une importance capitale pour les droits des femmes, l'égalité entre les sexes et l'autonomisation des femmes.

Ces éléments serviront de base aux travaux futurs menés au sein du Conseil en vue de la préparation et de l'élaboration de positions communes de l'UE concernant la santé au niveau mondial en général et la santé et les droits en matière de sexualité et de procréation en particulier, dans la perspective des prochains processus de négociation tels que l'examen des OMD en 2013, la suite donnée à la Conférence internationale sur la population et le développement au-delà de 2014 et l'examen de la mise en œuvre de la Déclaration et du programme d'action de Pékin en 2015.

Le Conseil suit de près les discussions menées par le Parlement européen sur ce sujet et sur les questions connexes, et prend bonne note des résolutions adoptées par le Parlement.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007257/12
aan de Raad
Michael Cashman (S&D), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Antonyia Parvanova (ALDE) en Véronique Mathieu (PPE)
(18 juli 2012)

Betreft: Voortrekkersrol van de EU op internationale topconferenties over seksuele en reproductieve gezondheid en rechten

In zijn conclusies van 10 mei 2010 over de rol van de EU ten aanzien van de volksgezondheid in de wereld is de Raad het erover eens dat voor de Unie een centrale rol is weggelegd in het bespoedigen van vooruitgang betreffende wereldwijde gezondheidsproblemen en het ijveren voor een beter mondiaal beheer van milieuovereenkomsten die relevant zijn voor de gezondheid. Tevens wordt erin verklaard dat bijzondere aandacht zal worden besteed aan de vier belangrijkste gezondheidsuitdagingen, waarvan seksuele en reproductieve gezondheid er één wordt genoemd.

Ondanks deze overeenkomst nam de EU geen duidelijk standpunt in om reproductieve gezondheid en rechten als een cruciaal gegeven op te nemen in het slotdocument dat werd aangenomen op de conferentie „Rio+20: De toekomst die we willen".

1. Kan de Raad aangeven waarom de EU tijdens de Rio+20-onderhandelingen, overeenkomstig de conclusies van de Raad ten aanzien van de volksgezondheid in de wereld, niet het voortouw heeft genomen om ervoor te zorgen dat seksuele en reproductieve gezondheid en rechten als een cruciaal gegeven werden opgenomen in de slotovereenkomst?

In het licht van de komende onderhandelingen over de toekomst van de internationale conferentie over bevolking en ontwikkeling in 2014, de millenniumdoelstellingen voor ontwikkeling en de in 2015 geplande e.a.uatie na 20 jaar van de uitvoering van de Verklaring van Peking en het bijbehorende actieprogramma, wordt de Raad verzocht de volgende vragen te beantwoorden:

2. Hoe zal de Raad ervoor zorgen dat de EU in staat is een duidelijk standpunt ten gunste van seksuele en reproductieve gezondheid en rechten in te nemen?

3. Hoe zal worden gegarandeerd dat het Parlement bij de formulering van dat standpunt wordt betrokken?

4. Zal de publicatie van een gemeenschappelijk standpunt inzake seksuele en reproductieve gezondheid en rechten worden besproken?

Antwoord
(19 november 2012)

De afgelopen jaren heeft de Raad progressieve standpunten ingenomen ten aanzien van de wereld-wijde gezondheid in het algemeen en seksuele en reproductieve gezondheid en rechten (SRHR) in het bijzonder.

De Raad heeft er steeds op gehamerd dat in het kader van gezondheidsstelsels bijzondere aandacht moet worden geschonken aan gendergelijkheid en aan de behoeften en rechten van vrouwen, met inbegrip van de bestrijding van op gender gebaseerd geweld. Onder verwijzing naar de relevante internationale instrumenten heeft de Raad talloze malen het recht van vrouwen erkend om zeggen-schap te hebben over zaken die hun seksuele en reproductieve gezondheid aangaan en daar vrijelijk en op verantwoordelijke wijze over te beslissen.

In 2007 heeft de Raad opnieuw sterk de nadruk gelegd op het verband tussen het beleid en de programma's inzake hiv/aids enerzijds, en het beleid en de diensten inzake seksuele en reproductieve gezondheid en rechten (SRHR) anderzijds, alsmede op hun verwevenheid met ruimere onderwerpen op het gebied van volksgezondheid, ontwikkeling en mensenrechten, waarvan de internationale gemeenschap is overeengekomen dat zij het terrein vormen voor een mondiale inspanning ter verwezenlijking van de millenniumdoelstellingen voor ontwikkeling.

Deze essentiële elementen vormden de basis van het onderhandelingsstandpunt van de EU gedurende het gehele Rio+20-proces, van de eerste dag tot de aanneming van het slotdocument „The future we want", dat op 11 september 2012 is goedgekeurd door de 66e zitting van de Algemene Vergadering van de Verenigde Naties.

Uiteraard vormen de resultaten van Rio+20 een compromis. De EU heeft langdurig en met grote inzet gestreefd naar een ambitieuzer resultaat. In de punten 145 en 146 van „The future we want" is niettemin plaats ingeruimd voor de essentiële elementen en verwijzingen die door de EU en haar lidstaten tijdens de voorbereidingen in de Raad als belangrijk waren aangemerkt.

Ook in de toekomst zal de Raad zich op het stuk van SRHR ondubbelzinnig opstellen, zoals hij dat in het verleden reeds heeft gedaan bij belangrijke gebeurtenissen, alsmede bijvoorbeeld in het kader van ACS-EU-partnerschapsovereenkomsten of in het kader van de EU-VS-dialoog over ontwikkeling, waarin met voorrang in een aantal partnerlanden bij wijze van proef ter plaatse MDG-gerelateerde gezondheidsproblemen voor de samenwerking tussen de EU en de VS worden aangepakt.

Op 23 juli 2012 heeft de Raad de EU-prioriteiten voor AVVN 67 bepaald, waarbij hij verklaarde dat de EU zich blijft inzetten voor de volledige uitvoering van de Internationale Conferentie over Bevolking en Ontwikkeling (International Conference on Population and Development, ICPD) (verklaring en actieprogramma van Caïro) en de verklaring en het actieplatform van Peking. De EU zal speciaal oog hebben voor gendergelijkheid, en voor de zeggenschap van vrouwen en mannen over zaken die hun seksuele en reproductieve gezondheid aangaan, en het recht daarover in vrijheid en verantwoordelijkheid te beslissen. Te dien einde zal de EU er met voortvarendheid voor zorgen dat in de gezondheidszorg informatie en diensten worden verstrekt die voldoen aan de seksuele en reproductieve behoeften van vrouwen, omdat dit voor hen van cruciaal belang is om hun rechten te kunnen laten gelden, gendergelijkheid te verwerven en voor zichzelf te kunnen opkomen.

Op basis van deze elementen zal de Raad verder werken aan de opstelling en ontwikkeling van gemeenschappelijke EU-standpunten over wereldwijde gezondheid in het algemeen en over seksuele en reproductieve gezondheid en rechten in het bijzonder, ter voorbereiding van komende onderhandelingen zoals de MDG-toetsing in 2013, de follow-up van de Internationale Conferentie over Bevolking en Ontwikkeling na 2014 en de evaluatie van de uitvoering van de verklaring en het actieplatform van Peking in 2015.

De Raad volgt de discussies hierover en over aanverwante zaken in het EP met aandacht en neemt tevens goede nota van diens resoluties.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-007257/12
neuvostolle
Michael Cashman (S&D), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Antonyia Parvanova (ALDE) ja Véronique Mathieu (PPE)
(18. heinäkuuta 2012)

Aihe: EU:n johtava asema seksuaali- ja lisääntymisterveyttä ja seksuaali- ja lisääntymisoikeuksia koskevissa kansainvälissä konferensseissa

Toukokuun 10. päivänä 2010 annetuissa EU:ta ja globaalia terveyttä koskevissa neuvoston päätelmissä todetaan, että EU:lla on keskeinen tehtävä maailmanlaajuisia terveyshaasteita koskevan kehityksen vauhdittamisessa ja että EU kannattaa terveyden kannalta olennaisten ympäristösopimusten maailmanlaajuisen hallinnoinnin parantamista. Päätelmissä todetaan myös, että erityistä huomiota kiinnitetään neljään tärkeimpään terveyshaasteeseen, joista yksi koskee seksuaali- ja lisääntymisterveyttä.

Mainitusta kannasta huolimatta EU ei kannattanut seksuaali- ja lisääntymisterveyden sisällyttämistä olennaisena tekijänä konferenssin loppuasiakirjaan, jonka otsikko oli "Rio+20: Tulevaisuus, jota tavoittelemme".

Voiko komissio ilmoittaa, miksi EU ei toiminut johtoasemassa Rio+20 -neuvotteluissa neuvoston globaalia terveyttä koskevien päätelmien mukaisesti, jotta EU olisi voinut varmistaa, että seksuaali- ja lisääntymisterveys ja seksuaali- ja lisääntymisoikeudet sisällytetään olennaisena tekijänä loppuasiakirjaan läpäisyperiaatteen mukaisesti?

Ottaen huomioon, että vuonna 2014 järjestetään väestö- ja kehityskonferenssi ja että vuonna 2015 laaditaan tarkistuskertomus "Pekingin julistuksen ja toimintaohjelma – 20 vuotta myöhemmin", ja ottaen huomioon vuosituhannen kehitystavoitteet:

1. Miten neuvosto aikoo varmistaa, että EU pystyy esittämään seksuaali- ja lisääntymisterveyttä ja seksuaali- ja lisääntymisoikeuksia tukevan selkeän kannan?

2. Miten varmistetaan parlamentin osallistuminen mainitun kannan muotoiluun?

3. Aiotaanko seksuaali- ja lisääntymisterveyttä ja seksuaali- ja lisääntymisoikeuksia koskevan yhteisen kannan julkistamisesta keskustella?

Vastaus
(19. marraskuuta 2012)

Neuvosto on viime vuosina esittänyt edistyksellisiä kannanottoja globaalista terveydestä yleensä ja erityisesti seksuaali- ja lisääntymisterveydestä.

Neuvosto on johdonmukaisesti kannattanut näkemystä, että terveydenhuoltojärjestelmissä tulisi kiinnittää erityistä huomiota sukupuolten tasa-arvoon ja naisten tarpeisiin ja oikeuksiin, sukupuoleen perustuvan väkivallan torjunta mukaan luettuna. Neuvosto on moneen otteeseen palauttanut mieleen asiaan liittyvät kansainväliset välineet ja tunnustanut naisten oikeuden saada hallita omaan seksuaali- ja lisääntymisterveyteensä liittyviä asioita ja päättää niistä vapaasti ja vastuullisesti.

Neuvosto painotti vuonna 2007 voimakkaasti hiv/aids-politiikkojen ja -ohjelmien sekä seksuaali- ja lisääntymisterveyttä ja -oikeuksia koskevien politiikkojen ja palvelujen välistä yhteyttä ja niiden suhdetta laajempiin kansanterveys-, kehitys- ja ihmisoikeusongelmiin. Kansainvälinen yhteisö on vahvistanut tämän sopimalla maailmanlaajuisista ponnisteluista vuosituhannen kehitystavoitteiden saavuttamiseksi.

Nämä keskeiset tekijät olivat EU:n neuvottelukannan lähtökohtana koko Rio+20-prosessin ajan, alusta aina loppuasiakirjan "Tulevaisuus, jota tavoittelemme" antamiseen. YK:n yleiskokous hyväksyi loppuasiakirjan 66. istunnossaan 11. syyskuuta 2012.

Rio+20-konferenssin tulos on eittämättä kompromissi. EU oli tehnyt pitkään ja paljon työtä kunnianhimoisemman tuloksen saavuttamiseksi. Loppuasiakirjan "Tulevaisuus, jota tavoittelemme" kohdissa 145 ja 146 on kuitenkin otettu huomioon ne keskeiset asiat ja maininnat, joita oli neuvostossa tehdyn valmistelutyön aikana painotettu EU:lle ja sen jäsenvaltioille tärkeinä.

Kuten aiemminkin, neuvosto aikoo myös jatkossa ottaa selkeästi kantaa seksuaali- ja lisääntymisterveysasioihin niin tärkeissä tilaisuuksissa kuin esimerkiksi AKT–EU-kumppanuussopimuksen puitteissa ja kehitysyhteistyötä käsittelevässä EU:n ja Yhdysvaltain vuoropuhelussa, jossa vuosituhannen kehitystavoitteisiin liittyvät terveyshaasteet on nostettu EU:n ja Yhdysvaltain kenttätason yhteistyön ensisijaiseksi kohteeksi muutamissa kokeiluluonteisesti mukana olevissa kumppanimaissa.

Neuvosto hyväksyi 23. heinäkuuta 2012 EU:n painopisteet YK:n yleiskokouksen 67. istuntoa varten. Niiden mukaan EU sitoutuu edelleen siihen, että kansainvälisen väestö- ja kehityskonferenssin Kairon julistus ja toimintaohjelma sekä Pekingin julistus ja toimintaohjelma pannaan kokonaisuudessaan täytäntöön. EU kiinnittää erityistä huomiota sukupuolten tasa-arvoon ja naisten ja miesten oikeuteen määrätä ja päättää vapaasti ja vastuullisesti seksuaali- ja lisääntymisterveyteensä liittyvistä asioista. Tätä varten EU toimii aktiivisesti varmistaakseen, että terveydenhuoltojärjestelmät tarjoavat naisten seksuaali- ja lisääntymisterveyden edellyttämiä tieto- ja terveyspalveluita, sillä se on ratkaisevaa naisten oikeuksien, sukupuolten tasa-arvon ja naisten aseman vahvistamisen kannalta.

Nämä tekijät muodostavat pohjan neuvoston tulevalle työlle, jossa valmistellaan ja muokataan EU:n yhteisiä kantoja globaalista terveydestä yleensä ja erityisesti seksuaali- ja lisääntymisterveydestä ennen tulevia neuvotteluprosesseja, joita ovat muun muassa vuosituhannen kehitystavoitteiden tarkistus vuonna 2013, kansainvälisen väestö- ja kehityskonferenssin jatkotoimet vuoden 2014 jälkeen ja Pekingin julistuksen ja toimintaohjelman täytäntöönpanon arviointi vuonna 2015.

Neuvosto seuraa tiiviisti Euroopan parlamentissa tästä asiasta ja siihen liittyvistä aiheista käytäviä keskusteluja ja panee myös merkille parlamentin päätöslauselmat.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007257/12
to the Council
Michael Cashman (S&D), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Antonyia Parvanova (ALDE) and Véronique Mathieu (PPE)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: EU leadership in international summits on sexual and reproductive health and rights

In the Council's conclusions of 10 May 2010 on the EU's role in global health, it is agreed that the Union has a central role to play in accelerating progress on global health challenges and the advocacy of better global governance of health-relevant environmental agreements. It is also stated that particular attention will be devoted to the four main health challenges, one of which is specified as sexual and reproductive health.

Despite this agreement, the EU did not take a clear stand in favour of integrating reproductive health and rights as a key issue in the outcome document adopted at the conference entitled 'Rio+20: The Future We Want'.

— Can the Council explain why the EU did not, in line with the Council conclusions on global health, take a leading role in the Rio+20 negotiations in order to ensure that sexual and reproductive health and rights were integrated as a key issue throughout the final agreement?

In the light of the upcoming negotiations on the future of the international Conference on Population and Development in 2014, the Millennium Development Goals, and the 20-year review of the implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action planned for 2015:

1. How will the Council ensure that the EU is able to take a clear stance in support of sexual and reproductive health and rights?

2. How will the involvement of Parliament in the formulation of this position be ensured?

3. Will the publication of a common position on sexual and reproductive health and rights be debated?

Reply
(19 November 2012)

Over the past years, the Council has adopted progressive positions regarding global health in general and sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR) in particular.

The Council has consistently promoted the view that health systems should pay special attention to gender equality and women's needs and rights, including combating gender-based violence. Recalling relevant international instruments, the Council has on numerous occasions recognised the right of women to have control over, and decide freely and responsibly on matters related to their sexual and reproductive health.

In 2007 the Council strongly reaffirmed the linkage between HIV/AIDS policies and programmes and sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR) policies and services, and their inter-relationships with broader issues of public health, development and human rights, as agreed by the international community as a global effort towards the achievement of the MDGs.

These essential elements underpinned the EU negotiating position throughout the Rio+20 process, from day one until the adoption of the outcome document 'The Future We Want', which was endorsed by the 66th Session of the UN General Assembly on 11 September 2012.

Clearly, the outcome of Rio+20 represents a compromise. The EU had worked long and hard for a more ambitious result. However paragraphs 145 and 146 of 'The Future we want' do reflect the key elements and references that had been highlighted as important for the EU and its Member States during preparations in the Council.

The Council will continue to ensure a clear stance regarding SRHR, as it has done in the past at major events as well as in the framework of the ACP-EU Partnership agreement for instance, or in the context of the EU-US Dialogue on Development, which prioritises MDG-related health issues for EU-US cooperation on the ground in a number of pilot partner countries.

On 23 July 2012, the Council adopted the EU priorities for UNGA 67, stating that the EU remains committed to the full implementation of the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD)/Cairo Declaration and Programme of Action and the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action. The EU will pay special attention to gender equality and the right of women and men to have control over and decide freely and responsibly on matters related to their sexual and reproductive health. To this end, the EU will work actively to ensure that health systems provide information and health services addressing the sexual and reproductive needs of women, as this is crucial for women's rights, gender equality and women's empowerment.

These elements will inform future work in the Council regarding the preparation and development of common EU positions on global health in general and on SRHR in particular ahead of upcoming negotiation processes such as the MDG Review in 2013, the follow-up to the International Conference on Population and Development beyond 2014, and the review of the implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for action in 2015.

The Council follows closely the discussions in the EP on this and related issues and also takes good note of its resolutions.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-007258/12
до Комисията
Michael Cashman (S&D), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Антония Първанова (ALDE) и Véronique Mathieu (PPE)
(18 юли 2012 г.)

Относно: Финансиране от ЕС в областта на сексуалното и репродуктивно здраве и права и на срещата на високо равнище по въпросите семейното планиране

Европейският консенсус за развитие (2005 г.) се позовава конкретно на сексуалното и репродуктивно здраве и права, посочени в Програмата за действие на Международната конференция за населението и развитието. Освен това в заключенията на Съвета относно ролята на ЕС в областта на здравето в световен мащаб се посочва, че едно от четирите основни предизвикателства, свързани със здравето, е сексуалното и репродуктивно здраве. По различни поводи, по-конкретно в доклада, озаглавен „Напредък към постигане на Целите на хилядолетието за развитие“, приет през юни 2010 г., Парламентът изрази своята подкрепа за инвестиране в сексуалното и репродуктивно здраве и права (СРЗП).

По време на срещата на високо равнище на 11 юли 2012 г. членът на Европейската комисия Пиебалгс обяви пакет от 23 милиона евро за семейно планиране.

В съобщението на Комисията относно Програмата за промяна, обаче, липсваше подобно ясно позоваване на СРЗП. В допълнение, в предложението на Комисията за регламент на Европейския парламент и на Съвета за създаване на финансов инструмент за сътрудничеството за развитие сексуалното и репродуктивно здраве и права се споменават само като подтема в рубрика „Здраве“ в рамките на категорията „Човешко развитие“ на тематичната програма.

Предвид значението на СРЗП за ЕС, както се посочва в различни основни политически документи, приети от трите институции на ЕС, по какъв начин, освен даденото на Срещата на високо равнище по въпросите на семейното планиране обещание, ще гарантира Комисията трайна подкрепа за СРЗП в рамките на новия Инструмент за развитие за сътрудничество и Европейския фонд за развитие?

Отговор, даден от г-н Пиебалгс от името на Комисията
(6 септември 2012 г.)

Комисията разглежда предоставянето на услуги в областта на сексуалното и репродуктивното здраве (СРЗ) като основна част от всяка здравна система и поради това то имплицитно се съдържа в подкрепата на ЕС за сектора на здравеопазването. Макар да е все още рано да се навлиза в подробности относно помощта за развитие за периода 2014-2020 г., в очакване на решенията на Съвета и на Парламента относно предложенията на Комисията за новите външни инструменти тя се ангажира да продължи подкрепата за постигане на социално приобщаване и човешко развитие (сред тях е здравеопазването и следователно СРЗ), като това е отразено в програмата за промяна. Комисията възнамерява да разгледа този въпрос като една от възможните сфери на концентрация в планирането по ИСР и 11-ия ЕФР за периода 2014-2020 г.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007258/12
an die Kommission
Michael Cashman (S&D), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Antonyia Parvanova (ALDE) und Véronique Mathieu (PPE)
(18. Juli 2012)

Betrifft: EU-Mittel für sexuelle und reproduktive Gesundheit und Rechte und der Gipfel zur Familienplanung (11. Juli 2012)

Im Europäischen Konsens zur Entwicklungspolitik (2005) wird speziell auf die sexuelle und reproduktive Gesundheit und die entsprechenden Rechte hingewiesen, wie im Aktionsprogramm der Internationalen Konferenz über Bevölkerung und Entwicklung festgelegt. Darüber hinaus wird in den Schlussfolgerungen des Rates zur Rolle der EU in der globalen Gesundheitspolitik (2010) darauf verwiesen, dass eine der vier Hauptherausforderungen im Bereich der Gesundheit die sexuelle und reproduktive Gesundheit ist. Bei diversen Gelegenheiten hat das Parlament seine Unterstützung für Investitionen in sexuelle und reproduktive Gesundheit und Rechte zum Ausdruck gebracht, besonders in dem Bericht über die Fortschritte im Hinblick auf die Verwirklichung der Millenniums-Entwicklungsziele, der im Juni 2010 angenommen wurde.

Auf dem Gipfel vom 11. Juli 2012 zur Familienplanung hat Kommissionsmitglied Piebalgs ein Paket in Höhe von 23 Mio. EUR für die Familienplanung in Aussicht gestellt.

In der Mitteilung der Kommission über eine Agenda für den Wandel fehlte jedoch ein solcher Verweis auf sexuelle und reproduktive Gesundheit und Rechte. Außerdem wird in dem Vorschlag der Kommission für eine Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zur Schaffung eines Finanzierungsinstruments für die Entwicklungszusammenarbeit nur in einem Unterpunkt zur Rubrik Gesundheit im Rahmen der Kategorie „Menschliche Entwicklung" des thematischen Programms auf sexuelle und reproduktive Gesundheit und Rechte verwiesen.

Wie will die Kommission angesichts der Bedeutung, die die EU der sexuellen und reproduktiven Gesundheit und den entsprechenden Rechten beimisst, was in mehreren, von den drei Institutionen der EU angenommenen Dokumenten betont wurde, über den Gipfel zur Familienplanung hinaus gewährleisten, dass die sexuelle und reproduktive Gesundheit und die entsprechenden Rechte in dem neuen Instrument für Entwicklungszusammenarbeit und den neuen EEF auf Dauer unterstützt werden?

Antwort von Herrn Piebalgs im Namen der Kommission
(6. September 2012)

Für die Kommission ist die Bereitstellung von Dienstleistungen im Bereich der sexuellen und reproduktiven Gesundheit ein wesentlicher Bestandteil eines jeden Gesundheitssystems und damit implizit auch Gegenstand der EU-Unterstützung im Gesundheitssektor. Es ist zu früh, um sich zu Details der Entwicklungshilfe im Zeitraum 2014-2020 zu äußern, solange der Rat und das Parlament noch nicht über die Kommissionsvorschläge für die neuen Außenhilfeinstrumente entschieden haben. Doch engagiert sich die Kommission — wie in der Agenda für den Wandel dargelegt — für die weitere Förderung der sozialen Inklusion und der menschlichen Entwicklung (wozu das Thema Gesundheit und damit auch die sexuelle und reproduktive Gesundheit gehören) und beabsichtigt, diesen Bereich bei der Programmierung im Rahmen des DCI und des 11. EEF für den Zeitraum 2014-2020 zu einem der möglichen Schwerpunkte zu machen.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007258/12
aan de Commissie
Michael Cashman (S&D), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Antonyia Parvanova (ALDE) en Véronique Mathieu (PPE)
(18 juli 2012)

Betreft: EU-financiering voor seksuele en reproductieve gezondheid en rechten en de top over gezinsplanning (11 juli 2012)

In de Europese consensus inzake ontwikkeling (2005) wordt concreet melding gemaakt van seksuele en reproductieve gezondheid en rechten, zoals uiteengezet in het actieprogramma van de Internationale Conferentie over Bevolking en Ontwikkeling. Verder luiden de conclusies van de Raad over de rol van de EU in de volksgezondheid in de wereld (2010) dat een van de vier grootste uitdagingen op gezondheidsvlak seksuele en reproductieve gezondheid is. Bij diverse gelegenheden heeft het Parlement aangegeven investeringen in seksuele en reproductieve gezondheid en rechten (SRHR) te steunen, met name in het verslag „Vooruitgang bij de verwezenlijking van de millenniumdoelstellingen", dat in juni 2010 was aangenomen.

Tijdens de top over gezinsplanning van 11 juli 2012 kondigde commissaris Piebalgs een pakket van 23 miljoen euro voor gezinsplanning aan.

In de mededeling van de Commissie over de agenda voor verandering ontbrak deze duidelijke verwijzing naar SRHR echter. Bovendien wordt in het Commissievoorstel voor een verordening van het Europees Parlement en de Raad tot invoering van een financieringsinstrument voor ontwikkelingssamenwerking alleen naar seksuele en reproductieve gezondheid en rechten verwezen als onderdeel van het onderwerp „Gezondheid" binnen de categorie „Menselijke ontwikkeling" van het thematische programma.

Hoe zal de Commissie, gezien het belang van SRHR voor de EU dat ook wordt onderkend in verscheidene belangrijke beleidsdocumenten die zijn aangenomen door de drie EU-instellingen, naast de toezegging op de top over gezinsplanning haar steun voor SRHR in het kader van het nieuwe DCI en EOF voortzetten?

Antwoord van de heer Piebalgs namens de Commissie
(6 september 2012)

Volgens de Commissie zijn seksuele en reproductieve gezondheidsdiensten een essentieel onderdeel van elk gezondheidsstelsel en maken deze daarom impliciet deel uit van de EU-steunverlening in de gezondheidssector. Hoewel het voorbarig is om in detail te treden over de ontwikkelingshulp voor de periode 2014-2020, heeft de Commissie zich ertoe verbonden om, in afwachting van beslissingen van de Raad en het Parlement over de voorstellen van de Commissie voor de nieuwe externe instrumenten, de steunverlening voor maatschappelijke integratie en menselijke ontwikkeling (waartoe gezondheid en dus ook seksuele en reproductieve gezondheidsdiensten behoren) voort te zetten, zoals beschreven in de agenda voor verandering. Daarnaast heeft de Commissie het voornemen dit als een van de mogelijke concentratiesectoren te behandelen bij de programmering voor de periode 2014-2020 in het kader van het DCI en het 11e EOF.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-007258/12
komissiolle
Michael Cashman (S&D), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Antonyia Parvanova (ALDE) ja Véronique Mathieu (PPE)
(18. heinäkuuta 2012)

Aihe: Seksuaali- ja lisääntymisterveyden ja niihin liittyvien oikeuksien edistämiseksi myönnettävä EU-rahoitus ja perhesuunnittelua käsitellyt huippukokous (11.7.2012)

Kehityspolitiikkaa koskevassa eurooppalaisessa konsensuksessa vuodelta 2005 mainitaan erityisesti seksuaali- ja lisääntymisterveys ja niihin liittyvät oikeudet niin kuin ne on määritelty kansainvälisen väestö- ja kehityskonferenssin toimintaohjelmassa. Lisäksi EU:sta ja globaalista terveydestä vuonna 2010 annettujen neuvoston päätelmien mukaan seksuaali- ja lisääntymisterveys on yksi terveyden alan neljästä päähaasteesta. Parlamentti on useaan kertaan ilmaissut tukevansa seksuaali- ja lisääntymisterveyden ja niihin liittyvien oikeuksien edistämistä, esimerkiksi vuosituhannen kehitystavoitteiden saavuttamista käsittelevässä kertomuksessa, joka hyväksyttiin kesäkuussa 2010.

Perhesuunnittelua käsitelleessä huippukokouksessa 11. heinäkuuta 2012 komission jäsen Piebalgs ilmoitti perhesuunnittelulle myönnettävästä 23 miljoonan euron rahoituspaketista.

Muutossuunnitelmaa koskevassa komission tiedonannossa ei kuitenkaan viitattu selvästi seksuaali- ja lisääntymisterveyteen ja niihin liittyviin oikeuksiin. Komission ehdotuksessa parlamentin ja neuvoston asetukseksi kehitysyhteistyön rahoitusvälineen perustamisesta puolestaan viitataan seksuaali- ja lisääntymisterveyteen ja niihin liittyviin oikeuksiin ainoastaan temaattisen ohjelman inhimillistä kehitystä käsittelevässä osiossa, terveyttä yleisesti käsittelevän kohdan alaisuudessa.

Kun otetaan huomioon, kuinka tärkeitä seksuaali- ja lisääntymisterveys ja niihin liittyvät oikeudet kolmen EU:n toimielimen hyväksymien keskeisten politiikka-asiakirjojen mukaan ovat EU:lle, miten komissio aikoo varmistaa – perhesuunnittelua käsitelleessä huippukokouksessa tehdyn lupauksen lisäksi – seksuaali- ja lisääntymisterveyden ja niihin liittyvien oikeuksien jatkuvan tukemisen kehitysyhteistyön rahoitusvälineen ja Euroopan kehitysrahaston puitteissa?

Andris Piebalgsin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(6. syyskuuta 2012)

Komissio katsoo, että seksuaali- ja lisääntymisterveyspalvelut ovat terveydenhuoltojärjestelmien olennainen osa, ja sen vuoksi EU tukee niitä selkeästi. Neuvosto ja Euroopan parlamentti eivät ole vielä antaneet päätöstä uusia ulkoisia välineitä koskevasta komission ehdotuksesta ja sen vuoksi on vielä liian aikaista tarkastella vuosien 2014–2020 kehitysapua. Komissio on kuitenkin sitoutunut antamaan edelleen tukea sosiaalisen osallisuuden ja inhimillisen kehityksen (johon kuuluu terveys ja siten seksuaali- ja lisääntymisterveys) edistämiseksi muutosohjelman mukaisesti. Komissio aikoo myös tarkastella tätä kysymystä yhtenä kehitysyhteistyön rahoitusvälineen ja vuosia 2014–2020 koskevan 11. EKR:n mukaisten ohjelmien mahdollisena painopistealueena.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007258/12
to the Commission
Michael Cashman (S&D), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Antonyia Parvanova (ALDE) and Véronique Mathieu (PPE)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: EU funding for sexual and reproductive health and rights and the Family Planning Summit (11 July 2012)

The European Consensus on Development (2005) makes specific reference to sexual and reproductive health and rights, as set out in Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development. Furthermore, the Council conclusions on the EU's role in global health (2010) state that one of the four main health challenges is sexual and reproductive health. On various occasions, Parliament has expressed its support for investing in sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR), notably in the report entitled 'Progress towards achieving the Millennium Development Goals', adopted in June 2010.

During the Family Planning Summit of 11 July 2012, Commissioner Piebalgs announced a EUR 23 million package for family planning.

However, the Commission Communication on the Agenda for Change lacked such clear reference to SRHR. In addition, the Commission proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a financing instrument for development cooperation only refers to sexual and reproductive health and rights as a sub-theme under 'Health', within the 'Human Development' category of the thematic programme.

Given the importance of SRHR for the EU, as stated in various key policy documents adopted by the three EU institutions, how will the Commission ensure, beyond the Family Planning Summit pledge, continued support to SRHR within the new DCI and EDF frameworks?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(6 September 2012)

For the Commission, provision of sexual and reproductive health (SRH) services is an essential part of any health system and thereby an implicit part of EU support in the health sector. While it is premature to enter into any details regarding 2014-2020 development assistance, pending decisions by the Council and Parliament on the Commission's proposals for the new external instruments, the Commission has committed itself to continued support for social inclusion and human development (which includes health and therefore SRH), as expressed in the Agenda for Change, and intends to treat this as one of the possible sectors of concentration in programming under the DCI and the 11th EDF for the period 2014-2020.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007259/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(18 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Economie emergenti e misure protezionistiche

Secondo l'ultimo rapporto della Commissione in tema di protezionismo («Ninth Report on Potentially Trade Restrictive Measures» September 2011-May 2012), negli ultimi otto mesi sono state adottate nel mondo 123 nuove restrizioni agli scambi commerciali. In particolare, sono le economie emergenti le più inclini a metter in atto misure che falsano il commercio internazionale, con lo scopo di mettere al riparo i propri mercati dalla concorrenza mondiale. In molti paesi, tra cui Brasile, Cina, India, Sudafrica e Ucraina, i governi hanno inoltre introdotto piani di sostegno per promuovere settori industriali specifici. In più, sempre secondo il Rapporto, preoccupano le nuove misure restrittive riguardanti gli appalti pubblici, i servizi e gli investimenti — in particolare in Cina — che discriminano de facto le compagnie straniere.

Allarma in modo particolare il comportamento della Russia che, nonostante l'ingresso nell'OMC, risulta essere il paese che più di frequente utilizza restrizioni di questo tipo, non agendo dunque in conformità con gli obblighi imposti ai membri. Tra i paesi che stanno attuando misure protezionistiche, la Cina era già stata oggetto nel maggio di quest'anno di una risoluzione del Parlamento europeo, «UE e Cina: squilibrio commerciale?», in cui si evidenziava lo squilibrio a favore della Cina nel commercio bilaterale e l'esistenza di numerose barriere tariffarie e non tariffarie che ostacolano l'accesso al mercato cinese.

In una congiuntura economica molto difficile, il commercio rappresenta per l'Europa una fonte importante di crescita. Da questa prospettiva, le economie emergenti, in particolare quelle che hanno aderito all'OMC come Russia e Cina, con il loro peso economico crescente hanno un ruolo centrale nel sostenere la crescita economica mondiale operando in modo responsabile, mantenendo aperti gli scambi commerciali e agendo lealmente sul mercato nel rispetto delle regole della concorrenza.

Alla luce di queste osservazioni, come intende agire la Commissione e quali mezzi ha concretamente a disposizione per contrastare tali misure protezionistiche?

Facendo riferimento alla risoluzione del Parlamento europeo «UE e Cina: squilibrio commerciale?», intende essa realizzare nel prossimo futuro, così come proposto nel testo approvato dal Parlamento europeo, uno strumento europeo volto a garantire reciprocità per quanto riguarda l'apertura dei mercati degli appalti pubblici? Quali misure intende adottare per agevolare e sostenere l'accesso delle PMI europee ai mercati delle economie emergenti, che sono prioritarie per la ripresa economica europea?

Risposta di Karel De Gucht a nome della Commissione
(11 settembre 2012)

Come indicato nella comunicazione del 2010 dal titolo Commercio, crescita e affari mondiali ([1]), la Commissione alterna un'attività di negoziato ad attività messa in esecuzione per combattere le barriere che sono di fronte alle imprese della UE sui mercati esteri. Per rispondere al crescente ricorso a misure protezionistiche nelle economie emergenti, la Commissione si serve di contatti tecnici, politici e diplomatici, tra cui dialoghi e vertici ad alto livello, cooperazione in campo normativo, discussioni in seno ai comitati dell'OMC, cooperazione con paesi che condividono gli stessi principi e negoziati bilaterali, nel quadro della nuova Strategia di accesso al mercato basata sul partenariato con gli Stati membri e la Comunità delle imprese UE. Se necessario, la Commissione è anche pronta a impugnare le misure che violano gli impegni dell'OMC o gli impegni bilaterali attraverso i meccanismi di risoluzione delle controversie. La Commissione ha recentemente pubblicato la sua seconda relazione annuale sugli ostacoli agli scambi e agli investimenti con 6 partner strategici con la quale dimostra che tale strategia comincia a dare risultati. Il documento di lavoro dei servizi della Commissione su le Fonti esterne della crescita ([2]) fa il punto sullo stato attuale dei negoziati sugli accordi di libero scambio con i partner strategici. In data 21 marzo 2012, La Commissione ha inoltre adottato la proposta di uno Strumento d'appalto ([3]). Senza essere finalizzata fin dall'inizio a nessun specifico paese terzo, l'iniziativa mira ad accrescere l'influenza dell'UE nei negoziati internazionali per ottenere un'ulteriore apertura dei mercati degli appalti pubblici al di fuori della UE. Essa è attualmente all'esame del Consiglio e del Parlamento. La comunicazione della Commissione del 2011 «Piccole imprese, grande mondo» ([4]) individua azioni globali volte ad aiutare le PMI a espandere le loro attività al di fuori della UE per beneficiare di mercati esteri in rapida crescita.

([1]) COM(2010)612 def.
([2]) http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2012/july/tradoc_149807.pdf
([3]) COM(2012)124 def.
([4]) COM(2011)702 def.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007259/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: Emerging economies and protectionist measures

The 'Ninth Report on Potentially Trade Restrictive Measures: September 2011 — May 2012', the Commission's most recent report on protectionism, states that 123 new restrictions on trade were adopted around the world in the eight months prior to its publication. The emerging economies in particular, seeking to protect their own markets from global competition, are the countries most likely to bring in measures that distort international trade. Moreover, governments in a number of countries, including Brazil, China, India, South Africa and Ukraine, have introduced plans to support and promote specific industrial sectors. The report is also concerned about restrictive new measures on public procurement, services and investment — in China in particular — which are de facto discriminatory against foreign companies.

Russia's behaviour is particularly worrying. Despite now being a member of the WTO, this is the country which most often resorts to these kinds of restrictions, failing therefore to act in accordance with the obligations imposed on WTO members. In May of this year, another of the countries implementing protectionist measures, China, was the subject of a European Parliament resolution entitled 'EU and China: unbalanced trade?' that drew attention to the imbalance in bilateral trade in China's favour and to the existence of numerous tariff and non-tariff barriers to the Chinese market.

In the current very difficult economic situation, trade represents an important source of growth for Europe. Viewed from this perspective, their growing economic weight gives the emerging economies, and especially those that have joined the WTO such as Russia and China, a key role in responsibly supporting global economic growth by keeping trade relations open and acting fairly in regard to competition rules on the world market.

In light of these observations, what steps does the Commission intend to take and what specific means does it have at its disposal to counter these protectionist measures?

With reference to Parliament's resolution on 'EU and China: unbalanced trade?', will the Commission develop in the near future, as proposed in the aforementioned resolution, an EU instrument to ensure reciprocity as regards openness in public procurement markets? What measures will it adopt to facilitate and support the EU's SMEs in their access to markets in the emerging economies, their being a priority for the EU's economic recovery?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(11 September 2012)

As set out in the 2010 Trade, Growth and World Affairs Communication ([1]) the Commission combines a negotiating agenda with enforcement activities to tackle barriers EU companies face in foreign markets. Responding to the rising protectionist measures in emerging economies, the Commission is pursuing technical, political and diplomatic contacts including high level dialogues and summits, regulatory cooperation, discussions in the committees of the WTO, cooperation with like-minded countries and bilateral negotiations under the renewed Market Access Strategy based on a partnership with Member States and the EU business community. When necessary, the Commission is also ready to challenge measures violating WTO or bilateral commitments through dispute settlement. The Commission recently released its second annual Report on Trade and Investment Barriers in six strategic partners which demonstrated that this strategy is delivering results. The Commission's staff working paper on External Sources of Growth ([2]) provides a report about ongoing FTA negotations with strategic partners. The Commission also adopted on 21 March 2012 a proposal for a Procurement Instrument ([3]). Without targeting any specific third country from the start, the initative is aimed at increasing the EU leverage in international negotiations to secure further opening of public procurement markets outside the EU. It is currently discussed in the Council and the Parliament. The 2011 Commission Communication 'Small Business, Big World' ([4]) sets out comprehensive actions aiming at assisting SMEs to expand their business outside the EU to benefit from fast growing foreign markets.

([1]) COM(2010)612 final.
([2]) http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2012/july/tradoc_149807.pdf
([3]) COM(2012)124 final.
([4]) COM(2011)702 final.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007260/12
aan de Commissie
Cornelis de Jong (GUE/NGL)
(18 juli 2012)

Betreft: Het functioneren van de Europese medezeggenschap (EOR) — Richtlijn 2009/38/EG

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van het feit dat veel EOR-en nog altijd niet compleet zijn? Wat is de Commissie van plan hieraan te doen?

2a. Welke rechtsmiddelen heeft een EOR ter beschikking als het van mening is dat een besluit transnationaal is terwijl het ondernemingsbestuur de tegengestelde mening is toegedaan? Hoe kan de beoogde bedoeling om een EOR invloed te geven op transnationale besluiten worden verbeterd?

2b. In bepaalde gevallen heeft een EOR recht op informatie en dialoog, maar wat zijn de bemiddelings- en beroepsmogelijkheden die een EOR ter beschikking heeft als een bedrijf dit weigert? Is de Commissie bereid te onderzoeken of dit onderwerp onderdeel dient te zijn van een herziening van de richtlijn?

3. In een aantal wereldwijd opererende ondernemingen met hoofdkantoor buiten Europa worden belangrijke beslissingen niet in Europa genomen. Daardoor lijkt de invloed van EOR-en en lokale OR-en (information & consultation procedures) vaak een wassen neus te worden. Op welke wijze kan de invloed van (Europese) OR-en op dit soort beslissingen worden verbeterd, zoals bedoeld in de Europese voornemens daaromtrent?

4. In een aantal multinationals wordt voor de medezeggenschap op Europees niveau nog steeds gebruik gemaakt van de zogenaamde artikel-13-overeenkomsten. Op welke wijze kan de invloed van werknemers op Europees niveau in artikel-13-ondernemingen worden verbeterd en aangepast in de richting van de normale overeenkomsten?

5. Welke acties onderneemt de Commissie om het illegaal gebruik van het aanwijzen van het management van de onderneming van de werknemersvertegenwoordigers in de EOR te stoppen?

6. De kosten voor werkzaamheden van EOR-en zijn voor ondernemingen. Dit leidt soms echter tot het weigeren om bijv. deskundigen in te schakelen wanneer de EOR bij ingewikkelde vraagstukken wordt betrokken. Op welke wijze kan deze praktijk worden verbeterd en in lijn gebracht met de huidige wet- en regelgeving voor EOR-en?

Antwoord van de heer Andor namens de Commissie
(5 september 2012)

Het is de taak van de bevoegde nationale autoriteiten toezicht te houden op de correcte toepassing van Richtlijn 2009/38/EG ([1]). De Commissie bevordert de sociale dialoog ([2]). Het verslag van de informele groep van deskundigen ([3]) betreffende de toepassing van de richtlijn behandelt een aantal thema's die in de vragen aan de Commissie aan bod zijn gekomen.

1. Indien dit het geval is, kunnen de betrokken partijen de zaak voor de nationale rechterlijke instanties brengen.

2a/2b. Transnationale kwesties worden nu door specifieke bepalingen ([4]) nauwkeuriger gedefinieerd. De beschikbare rechtsmiddelen zijn afhankelijk van het nationale stelsel. Sancties moeten effectief en afschrikkend zijn en in verhouding staan tot de ernst van de overtreding ([5]).

De Commissie houdt bovendien in haar uitvoeringsverslag ([6]) rekening met alle gebieden waarop zich problemen hebben voorgedaan.

([1]) Richtlijn 2009/38/EG van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 6 mei 2009 inzake de instelling van een Europese ondernemingsraad of van een procedure in ondernemingen of concerns met een communautaire dimensie ter informatie en raadpleging van de werknemers (Herschikking), PB L 122 van 16.5.2009, blz. 28.
([2]) Bijvoorbeeld door innovatieve maatregelen en projecten op het gebied van voorlichting en raadpleging te steunen.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=707&langId=en & intPageId=211 — zie rubriek „Implementation".
([4]) Overweging 16 en artikel 1, lid 4, van de herschikte richtlijn.
([5]) Overweging 36 van de herschikte richtlijn.
([6]) Het verslag van de Commissie betreffende de tenuitvoerlegging van de richtlijn moet uiterlijk op 5 juni 2016 worden ingediend. De Commissie heeft bovendien opdracht gegeven voor een studie over de mechanismen van buitengerechtelijke beslechting van transnationale arbeidsgeschillen, waarvan de resultaten in het voorjaar van 2013 worden verwacht.

3. De richtlijn is van toepassing ongeacht of het hoofdbestuur al dan niet op het grondgebied van de EU is gevestigd ([7]). Indien dit niet het geval is, bepaalt artikel 4, lid 2, wie als vertegenwoordiger van het hoofdbestuur zal worden beschouwd. Het oprichten van mondiale ondernemingsraden bij mondiaal opererende ondernemingen en het invoeren van innovatieve instrumenten voor de sociale dialoog ([8]) zijn op dat gebied veelbelovende hulpmiddelen. De Commissie zal deze ontwikkelingen verder op de voet volgen ([9]).

4. De bijzondere regels voor overeenkomsten krachtens artikel 13 van Richtlijn 94/45/EG ([10])blijven volgens de herschikte richtlijn van toepassing. Dergelijke overeenkomsten kunnen in beginsel slechts worden herzien wanneer zij verstrijken of wanneer aan de voorwaarden van artikel 13 van de herschikte richtlijn is voldaan.

5. Het is de taak van de nationale rechtbanken om deze illegale praktijken vast te stellen.

6. De middelen van een Europese ondernemingsraad zijn in principe een onderdeel van de inhoud van de overeenkomst. De lidstaten kunnen echter budgettaire voorschriften vaststellen waarmee de middelen kunnen worden beperkt tot de kosten van inschakeling van één deskundige ([11]).

([7]) Artikel 11 van de herschikte richtlijn.
([8]) Zoals het sluiten van internationale kaderovereenkomsten.
([9]) Bijvoorbeeld in het kader van haar database inzake transnationale bedrijfsakkoorden (http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=978&langId=en) en via haar samenwerking met de IAO.
([10]) Onverminderd artikel 13 sluit artikel 14 van de herschikte richtlijn deze overeenkomsten uit haar toepassingsgebied uit.
([11]) Artikel 6, onder f), van de herschikte richtlijn en alinea 6 van de subsidiaire voorschriften in bijlage I.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007260/12
to the Commission
Cornelis de Jong (GUE/NGL)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: The functioning of European workers' participation (European works councils) — Directive 2009/38/EC

1. Is the Commission aware that many European works councils are still not complete? What will the Commission do about this?

2a. What legal remedies are available to a European works council if it considers a decision to be transnational but the business's managements is of the opposite opinion? How can the aim of giving a European works council influence over transnational decisions be achieved more effectively?

2b. In certain cases, a European works council has a right to information and dialogue, but what arbitration and appeal procedures are available to a European works council if a business denies it that right? Will the Commission assess whether this subject ought to be examined as part of a review of the directive?

3. In a number of undertakings operating worldwide which have their head offices outside Europe, important decisions are not taken in Europe. As a result, the influence of European works councils and local works councils (information and consultation procedures) often does not seem to amount to much. How can the influence of European (and other) works councils over such decisions be improved, as envisaged in European plans on the subject?

4. In a number of multinationals, so-called Article 13 agreements are still used for participation at European level. How can the influence of employees at European level in Article 13 undertakings be improved and aligned more with what is provided for in normal agreements?

5. What action will the Commission take to halt the illegal practice whereby businesses' management appoints the employees' representatives on European works councils?

6. Undertakings are required to bear the costs of the work of European works councils. However, this sometimes results in a refusal, for example, to consult experts when European works councils are considering complex issues. How can this practice be improved and brought into line with existing legislation and regulations on European works councils?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(5 September 2012)

It is for the competent national authorities to ensure that the legislation transposing Directive 2009/38/EC ([1]) is correctly applied. The Commission promotes social dialogue ([2]). The report of the informal expert group ([3]) on the implementation of the directive addresses a number of issues raised in the questions put to the Commission.

1. Should this happen, the parties concerned may bring the matter before national courts.

2a/2b. Specific provisions ([4]) now define transnational matters more precisely. Remedies to be taken depend on the national system. Sanctions must be effective, dissuasive and proportionate to the seriousness of the offence ([5]).

Moreover, in its implementation report, the Commission will consider all areas where difficulties have arisen ([6]).

([1]) Directive 2009/38/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 May 2009 on the establishment of a European Works Council or a procedure in Community-scale undertakings and Community-scale groups of undertakings for the purposes of informing and consulting employees (Recast), OJ L 122, 16.5.2009, p. 28.
([2]) For example, by providing support to innovative measures and projects on information and consultation.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=707&langId=en&intPageId=211 — see under heading 'Implementation'.
([4]) Recital 16 and Article 1(4) of the recast directive.
([5]) Recital 36 of the recast directive.
([6]) The Commission's report on the implementation of the directive is due by 5 June 2016. In addition, it has commissioned a study on out of court settlement mechanisms in transnational labour disputes, whose results are expected for spring 2013.

3. The directive applies regardless of whether the central management is situated within EU territory ([7]). Where this is not the case, Article 4(2) clarifies who shall be regarded as central management. The setting up of global works councils in globally operating enterprises and innovative instruments of social dialogue ([8]) are promising tools in this regard. The Commission will continue to monitor these developments ([9]).

4. The recast directive continues the application of special rules for agreements falling under Article 13 of Directive 94/45/EC ([10]). Agreements of this kind can in principle only be revised upon their expiry or when the conditions under Article 13 of the recast directive are met.

5. It is incumbent on the national courts to state the illegality of these practices.

6. The resources of a European Works Council are in principle part of the content of the agreement. However, Member States may lay down budgetary rules which may in particular limit funding to cover one expert only ([11]).

([7]) Article 11 of the recast directive.
([8]) Such as the conclusion of International Framework Agreements.
([9]) For example in the context of its database on transnational company agreements (http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=978&langId=en) and in its cooperation with the ILO.
([10]) Article 14 of the recast directive exempts those agreements from its scope, except for Article 13.
([11]) Article 6(f) of the recast directive and paragraph 6 of the Subsidiary Requirements contained in its Annex I.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007261/12
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(18 de julho de 2012)

Assunto: Situação das refinarias a tempo inteiro na UE face à escassez de matéria-prima

O atual quadro legislativo para o setor do açúcar, elaborado em 2005, preconizou a renúncia de uma quantidade significativa de quota de beterraba sacarina e a redução do preço de referência. O abastecimento do mercado seria garantido graças à maior liberalização do regime de importações.

Neste novo quadro, foi atribuída às refinarias a tempo inteiro (RTI) uma ajuda transitória para que se pudessem adaptar ao processo de reestruturação da indústria açucareira. Deste modo, foi reconhecida a importância do setor refinador para o equilíbrio do mercado açucareiro europeu. Em consequência, as RTI implementaram ações de melhoria da sua capacidade de refinação, contando com um aumento do fluxo de importações de ramas para refinação. A realidade foi, todavia, bem diferente. Por razões conjunturais e estruturais, as importações esperadas não chegaram para as necessidades de abastecimento das RTI. A UE abasteceu-se recorrendo a importações extraordinárias, a custos exorbitantes para os refinadores.

Em Portugal, onde o setor refinador emprega cerca de 600 pessoas, a atribuição da ajuda transitória teve como consequência direta a reestruturação das refinarias, melhorando desta forma a sua competitividade. No entanto, dada a falta de matéria-prima, os melhoramentos efetuados não foram rentabilizados, o que tem acarretado sérios prejuízos para o setor.

Face ao exposto e tendo em conta a persistência desta situação, solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Perante a manifesta insuficiência das medidas até agora adotadas, pensa a Comissão alterar a abordagem que tem vindo a seguir? Que medidas vai adotar para garantir às RTI a matéria-prima de que carecem?

2. Perante a insuficiência do abastecimento a partir das origens preferenciais (países LDC e ACP), não considera necessário garantir às RTI o acesso a matéria-prima proveniente de outros exportadores em iguais condições?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(24 de agosto de 2012)

Desde 2006, graças a vários importantes investimentos, a capacidade de refinação de cana-de-açúcar na Europa passou para mais do dobro, ou seja, de 1,89 milhões de toneladas, antes da reforma, para cerca de 4,2 milhões de toneladas. Muitas refinarias têm conseguido garantir a matéria-prima de que, obviamente, precisam para utilizar esta nova capacidade de refinação, mas nem todas, o que dá origem a uma situação de excesso de capacidade. Algumas delas investiram nos países PMD e ACP para asseguram, efetivamente, a sua produção de açúcar de cana.

Durante o mesmo período, a UE também aumentou as importações de açúcar, em especial de açúcar em bruto para refinação. Já em 2011, as importações mundiais para o mercado da UE atingiram níveis históricos superiores a 4 milhões de toneladas, o que representa uma subida de mais de 1 milhão de toneladas, em comparação com 2006. As importações preferenciais de açúcar a partir de países APE(EPA)–TMA(EBA) (ou seja, abrangidos pelos acordos de parceria económica e pela iniciativa «Tudo menos armas») cifraram-se em 1,8 milhões de toneladas, a maior quantidade de sempre, comparativamente aos 1,57 milhões de toneladas de 2004/2005.

O principal objetivo da política da União Europeia no setor do açúcar é garantir uma oferta suficiente no mercado. O balanço referente ao açúcar revela que as existências para a campanha de 2011/2012 se cifram em 2,6 milhões de toneladas no final do exercício. Esta situação é considerada suficiente e não exige, nesta fase, importações suplementares com direitos niveladores reduzidos.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007261/12
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: Situation of full-time sugar refineries in the EU — shortage of raw material

The current legislative framework for the sugar sector, drawn up in 2005, provided for significant cuts to the sugar beet quota and a reduction in the reference price. Supplies to the market would be guaranteed through further liberalisation of the import regime.

Under this new framework, full-time refineries were granted transitional aid to enable them to adapt to the restructuring process in the sugar industry, thereby recognising the important role played by the refining sector in balancing the European sugar market. Consequently, full-time refineries implemented measures to improve their refining capacity in expectation of increased imports of sugar cane. In fact, they are faced with a very different situation. For cyclical and structural reasons, the anticipated imports that were to meet the refineries' supply needs did not arrive. The EU has been securing supplies through extraordinary imports, at exorbitant costs for refiners.

In Portugal, where the refining sector employs around 600 people, the direct consequence of transitional aid was the restructuring of refineries, which have become more competitive. However, given the lack of raw material, it has not been possible to gain any benefits from the improvements made, and this has caused serious harm to the sector.

In the light of the above, and bearing in mind that this is a persistent problem, can the Commission provide the following information:

1. Given that the measures taken to date are clearly inadequate, will the Commission change its approach? What steps will it take to ensure that full-time refineries have the raw material they need?

2. Given that supplies from preferential origins (LDC and ACP countries) are inadequate, does the Commission not consider it necessary to guarantee that full-time refineries have access to raw material from other exporters on the same terms?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(24 August 2012)

Since 2006 several major investments have more than doubled cane refining capacity in Europe from 1 890 000 tonnes before the reform to around 4 200 000 tonnes. Many refiners have been successful in securing the raw material they obviously need to use this new refining capacity, but not all, leading to overcapacity. Some have invested in LDC and ACP countries to actually own cane sugar production.

During the same period, the EU has also increased sugar imports especially of raw sugar for refining. Already in calendar year 2011, worldwide imports into the EU market reached the unprecedented level of more than 4 million tonnes, up by more than 1 million tonnes compared with 2006. Preferential sugar imports from EPA-EBA countries in 2010/2011 were 1.8 million tonnes, the highest level ever, compared with 1.57 million tonnes in 2004/2005.

The main objective of the EU sugar policy is to guarantee a sufficient supply of the market. The sugar balance sheet shows an ending stock for the campaign 2011/2012 of 2.6 million tonnes. This is regarded as sufficient and would not call for additional imports at reduced levy at this stage.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007262/12
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(18 de julho de 2012)

Assunto: Renegociação do Quadro de Referência Estratégico Nacional (QREN) e tempo médio de pagamento das verbas

Em Portugal, são diversos os agentes económicos, as organizações sociais e as autarquias que se referem aos efeitos negativos da suspensão de inúmeros projetos financiados ao abrigo do Quadro de Referência Estratégico Nacional (QREN), bem como da indefinição relativamente ao futuro deste instrumento.

Assim, tendo em conta as notícias que dão conta da entrega, esta semana, pelo Governo português, da proposta de reprogramação à Comissão Europeia, solicitamos que nos informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Que verbas do QREN foram até à data renegociadas pelo Governo português junto da Comissão?

2. A que programas e projetos foram retiradas verbas? Qual o destino dessas verbas?

3. Que propostas tem a Comissão para atenuar o problema dos elevados tempos médios de pagamento das verbas do QREN de que se queixam inúmeros agentes e que inviabiliza muitos projetos, sobretudo no atual contexto de forte contração do crédito?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(3 de setembro de 2012)

Em 16 e 17 de julho, a Comissão recebeu das autoridades portuguesas as propostas de reprogramação dos programas nacionais e regionais no âmbito do Quadro de Referência Estratégico Nacional para 2007/2013.

Trata-se de propostas para uma série transferências entre programas financiados pelo FEDER, com 70 milhões de euros transferidos de três programas regionais para o programa de competitividade nacional e uma transferência de 10 milhões de euros do FEDER para o FSE, em prol da Madeira. Depois de ter analisado todas as propostas admissíveis, a Comissão começou a examinar o conteúdo das propostas propriamente dito. O exercício de reprogramação está, pois, atualmente a ser avaliado, estando prevista a adoção de uma decisão no outono de 2012. Até à data, não houve negociações com as autoridades portuguesas, uma vez que se trata de uma fase de apreciação preliminar das propostas.

A Comissão está igualmente a acompanhar atentamente a questão dos atrasos nos pagamentos, chamando regularmente a atenção das autoridades portuguesas para a necessidade de cumprirem as disposições pertinentes sobre esta matéria.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007262/12
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: Renegotiation of Portugal's national strategic reference framework (NSRF) and average payment time

In Portugal, various economic players, social organisations, and local authorities are drawing attention to the damage being caused by the suspension of many projects financed under the national strategic reference framework (NSRF) and the uncertainty about its future.

According to news reports, the Portuguese Government has this week submitted the reprogramming proposal to the Commission. That being the case:

1. Which NSRF funds have to date been renegotiated by the Portuguese Government with the Commission?

2. From which programmes and projects has funding been withdrawn? How will those funds now be used?

3. What proposals does the Commission have to reduce the problem of long average payment times for NSRF funds, which is giving rise to numerous complaints from stakeholders and rendering many projects impracticable, especially now that there is such a tight credit squeeze?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(3 September 2012)

On 16 and 17 July, the Commission received the proposals for the reprogramming of the national and regional programmes under the 2007-2013 National Strategic Reference Framework from the Portuguese authorities.

These include proposals for a series of transfers across ERDF funded programmes with EUR 70 million transferred from 3 regional programmes to the national Competitiveness programme, and a transfer of EUR 10 million from ERDF to ESF for Madeira. After having considered all proposals admissible, the Commission has started to examine the content of the proposals themselves. The whole reprogramming exercise is therefore currently under assessment and a decision is expected in the autumn of 2012. There has been no negotiation with the Portuguese authorities so far, as the proposals are still in the initial examination phase.

The Commission is also following closely the issue on payment delays and regularly reminds the Portuguese authorities of the need to comply with the relevant regulations on this matter.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007263/12
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(18 de julho de 2012)

Assunto: Iniciativa «Bairros Críticos» e projeto «Vale Construir o Futuro»

Em 2005, a iniciativa «Bairros Críticos» foi encarada como uma possibilidade de dar continuidade ao trabalho que a Câmara Municipal da Moita vinha desenvolvendo na freguesia do Vale da Amoreira, possibilitando a realização de projetos tidos como fundamentais e que há muito esperavam concretização. Entre estes projetos contam-se: a reabilitação do edificado; a requalificação de espaços exteriores e de estabelecimentos de ensino; a construção de um pavilhão gimnodesportivo; a melhoria das acessibilidades à freguesia. Tendo em conta a exiguidade dos recursos inicialmente afetos ao Plano de Ação da Iniciativa «Bairros Críticos» (já que o Mecanismo Financeiro do Espaço Económico Europeu assegurou apenas uma pequena parte das exigências financeiras totais), a Câmara Municipal da Moita, em conjunto com catorze parceiros, entre os quais o Instituto da Habitação e da Reabilitação Urbana (IHRU), apresentou uma candidatura no âmbito do PORLisboa — «Vale Construir o Futuro» — Parcerias para a Regeneração Urbana de Bairros Críticos. O contrato de financiamento assinado para o projeto «Vale Construir o Futuro», em janeiro de 2010, estabelecia um investimento global de 8 020 769,54 euros, comparticipado em 4 550 000 euros por fundos comunitários, a realizar até final de 2012.

Recentemente, a decisão do Governo português, através do IHRU, de pôr fim à iniciativa «Bairros Críticos» veio pôr em causa todos os projetos, ações e investimentos previstos, incluindo os associados ao projeto «Vale Construir o Futuro». Tudo isto sucede numa freguesia que carece das intervenções supracitadas e na qual se elevam a níveis preocupantes o desemprego, a pobreza e a exclusão social.

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

1. Foram os fundos comunitários afetos ao projeto «Vale Construir o Futuro» reafetados a qualquer outra finalidade? Se sim, qual? Em caso negativo, que sucederá a estas verbas, caso as mesmas não sejam aplicadas nas ações associadas a este projeto? Qual o prazo para a execução das mesmas?

2. Qual a percentagem de cofinanciamento comunitário atualmente aplicada a projetos como os supracitados?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(12 de setembro de 2012)

Segundo a informação fornecida pelas autoridades regionais, o protocolo celebrado em 19 de janeiro de 2010 relativo ao programa de ação «Vale Construir o Futuro» inclui 14 parceiros, correspondendo a um plano de investimento total de 8 milhões de euros.

1. O projeto está em curso de implementação, após terem sido operados ajustamentos nos termos técnicos e financeiros. Atualmente, há dez projetos a serem realizados.

2. A taxa média de cofinanciamento para este tipo de projeto é 65 %, podendo ascender a 80 % em função da disponibilidade de fundos e da relevância dos projetos, em consonância com os objetivos específicos do programa «POR Lisboa».

3. Para mais informações, a Comissão sugere ao Sr. Deputado que contacte diretamente a autoridade de gestão do programa «POR Lisboa» 2007/2013, no seguinte endereço:

Comissão de Coordenação e Desenvolvimento Regional de Lisboa e Vale do Tejo, CCDR-LVT
Rua de Artilharia Um, 33, 1269-145 Lisboa — Portugal, Tel.: +351.213 847 902, Endereço eletrónico: presidência@ccdr-lvt.pt, www.ccdr-lvt.pt

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007263/12
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: 'Bairros Críticos' initiative and 'Vale Construir o Futuro' project

In 2005 the 'Bairros Críticos' (Critical Districts) initiative was viewed as a means of continuing the work which Moita Municipal Council had been pursuing in the parish of Vale da Amoreira, paving the way for the long-awaited implementation of what were considered essential projects, including the rehabilitation of buildings, the upgrading of open spaces and education establishments, the construction of a sports hall, and the improvement of access routes to the parish. Given the modest scale of the resources initially allocated to the 'Bairros Críticos' action plan (the European Economic Area Financial Mechanism having covered only a small proportion of the total financing needs), Moita Municipal Council, together with 14 partners, including the Instituto da Habitação e da Reabilitação Urbana (IHRU — Institute of Housing and Urban Renewal), submitted an application under the PORLisboa operational programme concerning a project entitled 'Vale Construir o Futuro' (It's worth building the future) centring on partnerships for the urban renewal of critical districts. Under the financing contract signed in January 2010, the total investment, to be made by the end of 2012, is EUR 8 020 769.54, of which the EU is to contribute EUR 4 550 000.

The decision of the Portuguese Government, represented by the IHRU, to abandon the 'Bairros Críticos' initiative has lately cast doubt on all of the planned projects, activities, and investment, including those connected with the 'Vale Construir o Futuro' project. This is happening to a parish which needs the abovementioned assistance and in which unemployment, poverty, and social exclusion are rising to alarming proportions.

1. Have the EU funds allocated to the 'Vale Construir o Futuro' project been reallocated for any other purpose? If so, how are they to be used? If not, what will happen to this money, assuming that it is not spent on project activities? Within what time-frame are these to be implemented?

2. What is the current EU co-financing rate for projects of the type described above?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(12 September 2012)

According to the information provided by the regional authorities, the protocol concluded on 19 January 2010 for the action programme 'Vale Construir o Futuro' included 14 partners, corresponding to a planned total investment of EUR 8 million.

1. The project is under implementation, following adjustments both in technical and financial terms. Currently there are 10 projects under implementation.

2. The average co-financing rate for this type of project is 65%. However, it can go up to 80%, depending on the availability of funds and the relevance of the projects, according to the specific objectives of the 'POR Lisboa' Programme.

3. For more information, the Commission suggests that the Honourable Member contact directly the managing authority in charge of the 'POR Lisboa' 2007-2013 programme, at the following address:

'Comissão de Coordenação e Desenvolvimento Regional de Lisboa e Vale do Tejo, CCDR-LVT'
Rua Artilharia Um, 33, 1269-145 Lisboa — Portugal, Tel.: +351.213 847 902, Email: presidência@ccdr-lvt.pt, www.ccdr-lvt.pt

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007264/12
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(18 de julho de 2012)

Assunto: Consequências sociais da aplicação do programa FMI-UE — fome e deficiente acesso a cuidados de saúde

Numa visita recente à freguesia do Vale da Amoreira, no concelho da Moita, pude testemunhar uma degradação súbita e preocupante da situação social. Numa zona já marcada por inúmeros problemas sociais, as consequências da aplicação do programa FMI-UE estão a agravar significativamente todos estes problemas. Nas escolas da freguesia (como, por exemplo, a Escola Secundária da Baixa da Banheira) a pobreza cresce de forma galopante entre a população escolar. Os professores relatam inúmeras situações de crianças e de jovens que passam fome, nomeadamente de crianças e jovens cujas únicas refeições diárias são as (poucas) que tomam na escola — situação com inevitáveis reflexos ao nível do insucesso escolar. Sucedem-se também os casos de exclusão ou deficiente acesso aos cuidados médicos, com reflexos no aumento da incidência de doenças que se julgavam erradicadas, como é o caso da tuberculose.

Em face do exposto, tendo em conta a sua qualidade de membro da troika responsável pelo programa FMI-UE, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Está a Comissão a par das supramencionadas consequências da aplicação do seu programa?

2. Foi a evolução da situação social em Portugal, e em especial nas zonas mais desfavorecidas, tida em conta na avaliação feita à aplicação do programa? Em concreto, foi o aumento da fome entre a população portuguesa tida em conta nessa avaliação? E a degradação da saúde dos portugueses (em especial, o aumento da incidência de doenças como a tuberculose)? Serão estes fatores tidos em conta em futuras avaliações?

3. Que medidas tem previstas a Comissão para lidar com situações como a descrita?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(12 de setembro de 2012)

A Comissão está extremamente atenta à situação económica e social em Portugal. Graças às suas avaliações periódicas, acompanha a execução e o impacto das políticas acordadas com o Governo português ao abrigo do programa de assistência. Um dos objetivos consiste em atenuar o impacto social negativo decorrente da crise económica, abordando simultaneamente os desequilíbrios orçamentais e estruturais. Por exemplo, os aumentos de impostos e as reformas da segurança social destinam-se a minimizar o impacto negativo nos grupos com rendimentos mais baixos. A eliminação de benefícios fiscais para grupos com rendimentos mais elevados reduziu os elementos regressivos do sistema fiscal e segurança social, que já existiam antes do programa.

Quanto ao acesso aos cuidados de saúde, o programa visa, especificamente, melhorar a eficiência e eficácia do sistema de saúde. Estão em curso reformas importantes que abordam problemas estruturais e melhoram a eficiência e a equidade do financiamento dos cuidados de saúde e da sua prestação. Por exemplo, a redução do preço dos medicamentos, a eliminação dos entraves jurídicos à entrada dos genéricos, as alterações ao regime de preços de referência, a redução da margem de lucro das farmácias e a prescrição por substância ativa reduziu as despesas dos doentes com os medicamentos. Tem-se verificado um aumento do limiar de rendimento e do número de pessoas isentas de comparticipação. Um melhor acompanhamento e registos eletrónicos dos doentes podem aumentar a segurança dos pacientes e o acesso aos cuidados de saúde. Um conjunto de medidas visa continuar a desenvolver os serviços de cuidados primários que são o primeiro patamar no acesso ao sistema de saúde. A execução eficaz destas reformas permitirá obter resultados positivos no futuro.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007264/12
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: Social consequences of implementing the IMF-EU programme — hunger and inadequate access to healthcare

During a recent visit to Vale da Amoreira, in the district of Moita, I witnessed a sudden and worrying deterioration in the social situation. In an area already marked by a whole range of social problems, the consequences of implementing the IMF-EU programme are exacerbating all these problems significantly. Child poverty at local schools (the secondary school at Baixa da Banheira, for example) is increasing dramatically. Teachers describe countless situations where children and teenagers are going hungry, in particular children and teenagers whose only daily food is the (little) they receive at school. This situation has inevitable repercussions on school underachievement. There are also cases of people being excluded from or having inadequate access to healthcare, reflected in the rising occurrence of diseases that were considered to have been eradicated, such as tuberculosis.

In the light of the above, and bearing in mind that the Commission is a member of the troika responsible for the IMF-EU programme, can it answer the following questions:

1. Is the Commission aware of these consequences of its programme's implementation?

2. Were developments in the social situation in Portugal, particularly in the most deprived areas, taken into account when the programme's implementation was assessed? Specifically, did this assessment take account of growing levels of hunger among the Portuguese population and the deterioration in their health (in particular the increased incidence of diseases such as tuberculosis)? Will these factors be taken into account in future assessments?

3. What measures will the Commission take to tackle situations such as the one described above?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(12 September 2012)

The Commission is extremely attentive to the economic and the social situation in Portugal. Through its regular reviews, monitors the implementation of the policies agreed with the Portuguese Government under the Programme and their impact. One of the Programme's goals is to mitigate the negative social impact that results from the economic crisis, while at the same time addressing fiscal and structural imbalances. For example, tax increases and benefit reforms were designed to minimise the negative impact on lowest income groups. The elimination of tax benefits in highest income groups has reduced regressive elements of the tax and benefit system, which were in place prior to the Programme.

In what regards healthcare access, the Programme specifically aims at improving efficiency and effectiveness in the healthcare system. Important reforms are being implemented which address structural problems and improve efficiency and the equity of healthcare financing and delivery. For example, the reduction in the prices of medicines, the removal of legal barriers to the entry of generics, changes to the reference price system, reduction of pharmacies' profit margin and the prescription by active substance have reduced patients' expenditure with medicines. There has been an increase in the income threshold and in the number of people that are exempted from co-payments. Better monitoring and electronic patient records can improve patient safety and access to care. One set of measures aims to further develop primary care services which are the first point of access of a health system. Through effective implementation of these reforms, positive outcomes will be visible in future.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007265/12
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(18 de julho de 2012)

Assunto: Apoio a associações de imigrantes — programa de ajuda alimentar

Numa reunião recente com associações de imigrantes da freguesia do Vale da Amoreira, no concelho da Moita, pude testemunhar a importante função social desempenhada por estas associações, particularmente relevante num momento de profunda crise económica e social, como aquele que se vive em Portugal.

A Associação de Cabo-verdianos, por exemplo, é responsável pela prestação de apoio alimentar a mais de 1 000 pessoas. A continuidade desta ajuda, prestada ao abrigo de um protocolo com a Segurança Social, está todavia em risco, devido à suspensão dos pagamentos desde há 5 meses. De acordo com os responsáveis desta associação, a ajuda era prestada através do programa de ajuda alimentar da UE.

A Associação de Angolanos vem desenvolvendo uma intensa intervenção junto da comunidade mais jovem, através da formação em áreas como a dança, a música e as artes plásticas. Esta formação é assegurada, em regime de voluntariado, pelos responsáveis da associação.

Solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Que programas e medidas comunitárias poderão apoiar a ação destas associações?

2. Qual o ponto de situação relativamente ao programa de ajuda alimentar da UE? Como se podem justificar os atrasos acima mencionados na canalização das ajudas para as organizações que intervêm no terreno?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(29 de agosto de 2012)

O Fundo Social Europeu (FSE) investe em medidas em favor do emprego, da educação e da inclusão social em todos os Estados-Membros.

O programa de auxílio às pessoas mais carenciadas assegura apoio alimentar nos Estados-Membros que o solicitam. Esta ajuda é efetivada por autoridades nacionais designadas, em conformidade com os programas acordados com a Comissão. A nível da Comissão, não se registam atrasos na implementação.

A Comissão está consciente da importância da ajuda alimentar e das medidas de assistência relacionadas para mitigar situações de pobreza e exclusão social que afetam determinadas pessoas, bem como da relevante função social que as organizações da sociedade civil desempenham neste contexto, essencialmente numa base de voluntariado. Na sua comunicação relativa ao Quadro Financeiro Plurianual 2014/2020 e nas propostas legislativas que lhe estão associadas, a Comissão previu um orçamento de 2,5 mil milhões de euros a afetar a um programa de ajuda às pessoas mais carenciadas e está atualmente a trabalhar para definir, entre várias opções, o melhor formato possível, tendo em conta os pontos de vista do Conselho, do Parlamento Europeu e das partes interessadas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007265/12
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: Support for immigrants' associations — food aid programme

At a recent meeting with immigrants' associations in the parish of Vale da Amoreira, in the municipality of Moita, I was able to see for myself that they perform a vital social function, particularly important in a crisis as dire as the one which Portugal is now undergoing.

The Cape Verdeans' association, for example, distributes food aid to over 1 000 people. The flow of aid, however, which is covered by an arrangement with the Social Security Institute, is now in jeopardy because payments stopped five months ago. According to senior officials of the association, the aid used to be provided under the EU food aid programme.

The Angolans' association has been actively involved with younger members of the community and organising training in dance, music, the plastic arts, and other fields. The training is provided on a voluntary basis by the association's leaders.

1. Which EU programmes and measures could be employed to support the activities of these associations?

2. What is the state of play regarding the EU food aid programme? Why is it that delays have occurred, as mentioned above, in the delivery of aid to organisations working on the ground?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(29 August 2012)

The European Social Fund (ESF) invests in employment, education and social inclusion measures in all Member States.

The programme for aid to the Most Deprived People (MDP) makes food aid available in those Member States that apply for it. The actual implementation is done by designated national authorities in accordance with programmes agreed on with the Commission. At the level of the Commission there are no delays in implementation.

The Commission is aware of the importance of food aid and related assistance to alleviate the situation of people who find themselves in poverty or social exclusion, as well as of the important social function fulfilled in this respect by civil society organisations, predominantly on the basis of voluntary work. The Commission has foreseen in the communication on the Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-2020 and in its related legislative proposals a EUR 2.5 billion budget for a new programme of aid for the most deprived people and is currently working on the options for its possible design, taking into account the views of the Council, European Parliament and stakeholders.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007266/12
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(18 de julho de 2012)

Assunto: Desenvolvimento da aquacultura biológica e controlo da composição de rações importadas

1. Que avaliação faz a Comissão do desenvolvimento da aquacultura biológica na UE desde a existência de legislação específica que enquadra esta atividade?

2. Tendo em conta as dificuldades referidas por diversos produtores — ao nível da disponibilidade de cereais e rações biológicos, da disponibilidade de alevins biológicos, por exemplo —, de que forma estão estes problemas a ser considerados pela Comissão e que medidas estão previstas para lhes fazer face, tendo em vista o desenvolvimento da aquacultura biológica nos diversos Estados-Membros?

3. Solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre os mecanismos previstos para controlar a composição das rações e cereais importados, nomeadamente dos EUA, tendo em conta as disposições legais existentes na UE a este respeito.

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(11 de setembro de 2012)

Relativamente à evolução da piscicultura biológica, a Comissão não dispõe ainda de informações suficientes que lhe permitam responder à pergunta, porquanto a legislação específica ([1]) aplicável a esta atividade entrou em vigor apenas em julho de 2010.

Quanto às alegadas dificuldades enfrentadas pelos produtores do setor da aquicultura biológica em assegurar o acesso a cereais, rações e alevins biológicos, elas serão examinadas e debatidas com as autoridades competentes dos Estados-Membros no intuito de avaliar a situação. Se esses meios se não encontrarem disponíveis sob forma biológica, a Comissão pode, em conformidade com o disposto no artigo 37.°, n.° 2, e nas condições estabelecidas no artigo 22.°, n.° 2, alínea b), do Regulamento (CE) n.° 834/2007 ([2]), providenciar no sentido da adoção de normas de produção excecionais destinadas a assegurar o acesso a rações e outros meios de produção em exploração. Essas exceções serão mantidas a um nível mínimo e, se se justificar, limitadas temporalmente.

Desde a entrada em vigor do reconhecimento das normas de produção biológica e do sistema de controlo dos Estados Unidos como equivalentes aos da União Europeia, em 1 de junho de 2012 ([3]), os cereais e rações biológicos cultivados e produzidos nos Estados Unidos ou importados para esse país e certificados como conformes com o programa biológico nacional dos EUA podem ser colocados no mercado da UE como produtos biológicos sem necessidade de certificação suplementar à legislação biológica da UE. Uma vez que a composição desses cereais e rações está sujeita a controlo através de um sistema reconhecido como equivalente ao da UE, tão-pouco é necessário um controlo suplementar.

([1]) Regulamento (CE) n.° 710/2009 da Comissão, de 5 de agosto de 2009 que altera o Regulamento (CE) n.° 889/2008, que estabelece normas de execução do Regulamento (CE) n.° 834/2007 do Conselho, no que respeita à produção aquícola biológica de animais e de algas marinhas.

([2]) Regulamento (CE) n.° 834/2007 do Conselho, de 28 de junho de 2007, relativo à produção biológica e à rotulagem dos produtos biológicos e que revoga o Regulamento (CEE) n.° 2092/91.

([3]) Regulamento (CE) n.° 1235/2008 da Comissão, de 8 de dezembro de 2008, que estabelece normas de execução do Regulamento (CE) n.° 834/2007 do Conselho no que respeita ao regime de importação de produtos biológicos de países terceiros (JO L 334 de 12.12.2008, p. 25), alterado pelo Regulamento de Execução (UE) n.° 126/2012 da Comissão, de 14 de fevereiro de 2012, que altera o Regulamento (CE) n.° 889/2008 no que respeita a provas documentais e que altera o Regulamento (CE) n.° 1235/2008 no que respeita ao regime de importação de produtos biológicos provenientes dos Estados Unidos da América (JO L 41 de 15.2.2012, p. 5) e pelo Regulamento de Execução (UE) n.° 508/2012 da Comissão, de 20 de junho de 2012, que altera o Regulamento (CE) n.° 1235/2008 que estabelece normas de execução do Regulamento (CE) n.° 834/2007 do Conselho no que respeita ao regime de importação de produtos biológicos de países terceiros (JO L 162 de 21.6.2012, p. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007266/12
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: Development of organic fish farming and controls applied to the composition of imported fish feed

1. How does the Commission assess the development of organic fish farming since the introduction of specific legislation covering this activity?

2. A number of producers report difficulties when it comes, for example, to the availability of organic cereals and feeds and of organic fish fry, how does the Commission view these problems and what measures are proposed to remedy them in light of the development of aquaculture in several Member States?

3. Can the Commission provide information on the existing mechanisms for monitoring the composition of imported feeds and cereals, particularly those from the United States, bearing in mind the existence of EU legislation in this field?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(11 September 2012)

As regards the development of organic fish farming, the Commission does not yet have sufficient information to be able to answer the question since the specific legislation ([1]) covering this activity only entered into force in July 2010.

Regarding the alleged difficulties encountered specifically by organic aquaculture producers to ensure access to organic cereals, feeds and organic fish fry, such difficulties will be examined and discussed with the competent authorities of Member States in order to evaluate the situation. If such inputs are not available in organic form, the Commission may, in accordance with the procedures referred to in Article 37(2) and the conditions set out in Article 22(2)b) of Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 ([2]), provide for the granting of exceptional production rules in order to ensure access to feed and other farm inputs. Such exceptions shall be kept to a minimum and where appropriate be limited in time.

Since the entry into force of the recognition of the United States' organic production rules and control system as equivalent to those in the European Union (EU) on 1 June 2012 ([3]), organic feed and organic cereals grown in the United States or imported into the United States and certified as complying with the U.S. National Organic Program (NOP) can be placed onto the EU market as organic products and do not require additional certification to EU organic legislation. As the composition of such organic feed and cereals is subject to monitoring by a control system recognised as equivalent to that of the EU, no additional monitoring is required.

([1]) Commission Regulation (EC) No 710/2009 of 5 August 2009 amending Regulation (EC) No 889/2008 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007, as regards laying down detailed rules on organic aquaculture animal and seaweed production.

([2]) Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91.

([3]) Commission Regulation (EC) No 1235/2008 of 8 December 2008 laying down detailed rules for implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 as regards the arrangements for imports of organic products from third countries (OJ L 334, 12.12.2008, p. 25.) as amended by Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 126/2012 of 14 February 2012 amending Regulation (EC) No 889/2008 as regards documentary evidence and amending Regulation (EC) No 1235/2008 as regards the arrangements for imports of organic products from the United States of America (OJ L 41, 15.2.2012, p. 5) and as amended by Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 508/2012 of 20 June 2012 amending Regulation (EC) No 1235/2008 laying down detailed rules for implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 as regards the arrangements for imports of organic products from third countries (OJ L 162, 21.6.2012, p. 1), Regulation (EU) 126/2012 and 508/2012.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007267/12
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(18 de julho de 2012)

Assunto: Utilização de produtos farmacêuticos na aquacultura

A Associação Portuguesa de Aquacultores (APA) veio recentemente alertar para um conjunto de constrangimentos ao normal e desejável desenvolvimento da atividade aquícola. Entre estes, está o problema das autorizações para utilização de produtos farmacêuticos. A APA tem vindo a propor que todos os produtos farmacêuticos/veterinários que estejam registados num qualquer país da UE possam ser utilizados pelos produtores de outros Estados-Membros, de modo a que países com pequena produção, como Portugal, não percam competitividade no acesso a estes produtos, face aos produtores de outros países. A APA tem vindo também a apontar os elevados custos com registos e a elevada burocracia que decorre da situação atual.

— Face ao exposto, solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre que medidas estão previstas, ao nível da UE, para simplificar o processo de autorização para a utilização de produtos farmacêuticos na aquacultura.

Resposta dada por John Dalli em nome da Comissão
(12 de setembro de 2012)

A Comissão planeia apresentar propostas, em 2013, para a revisão do enquadramento jurídico relativo aos medicamentos veterinários. Os principais objetivos dessa revisão consistem em aumentar a disponibilidade dos medicamentos veterinários, reduzir os encargos para as empresas e reforçar o funcionamento do mercado interno para medicamentos veterinários.

Aquando da elaboração das suas propostas, a Comissão irá estudar possíveis opções para simplificar o procedimento de autorização para obter uma autorização de comercialização, a fim de aumentar a disponibilidade dos medicamentos veterinários, em particular no que respeita a «espécies menores», como o peixe, preservando simultaneamente um elevado nível de segurança dos animais tratados e dos consumidores dos produtos emanados dessas espécies.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007267/12
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: Use of pharmaceutical products in aquaculture

The Portuguese Aquaculture Association (*Associação Portuguesa de Aquacultores* — APA) has recently drawn attention to a series of obstacles to the normal and desirable development of aquaculture activities. One of these is the problem of obtaining authorisation for the use of pharmaceutical products. The APA proposes that producers in any Member State should be able to use any pharmaceutical or veterinary product registered in any other Member State, so that countries with a smaller production such as Portugal do not face a competitive disadvantage when accessing these products. The APA has also indicated the high cost of registration and the excessive bureaucracy attached to the present situation.

— In light of the above, can the Commission say what measures could be taken at EU level to simplify the authorisation procedure for the use of pharmaceutical products in aquaculture?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(12 September 2012)

The Commission plans to present proposals for a revision of the legal framework for veterinary medicines in 2013. The main objectives of this revision will be to increase the availability of veterinary medicinal products, reduce the administrative burden on enterprises and improve the functioning of the internal market for veterinary medicinal products.

When preparing its proposals, the Commission will consider possible options to simplify the authorisation procedure to obtain a marketing authorisation in order to increase the availability of veterinary medicinal products, in particular for 'minor species' such as fish, while preserving a high level of safety of treated animals and of the consumers of produce originating from them.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007268/12
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(18 de julho de 2012)

Assunto: Candidaturas aos concursos do Serviço Europeu de Seleção de Pessoal (EPSO)

Fomos recentemente contactados por um cidadão português que nos transmitiu informações relativas a um concurso do Serviço Europeu de Seleção de Pessoal (EPSO), merecedoras de questionamento.

Após leitura e análise de um aviso de abertura de concurso, este cidadão resolveu concorrer ao mesmo, preenchendo para o efeito o boletim de candidatura e anexando o respetivo Curriculum Vitae (CV). Passados alguns dias, recebeu uma mensagem de que a sua candidatura tinha sido validada e que em breve receberia mais informação sobre o processo. Passados cento e três dias, surge a informação de que teria sido eliminado do concurso, sendo a justificação a de que não cumpriu um dos pontos do aviso de abertura, relativo à obrigatoriedade de preencher o boletim de candidatura numa das seguintes três línguas: Inglês, Francês ou Alemão.

Em face do exposto, perguntamos à Comissão:

1. Qual a justificação para se limitar o preenchimento de um boletim de candidatura a estas três línguas?

2. Qual a justificação para ser este um critério de eliminação de candidatos, independentemente do preenchimento pelos candidatos dos requisitos exigidos relativos ao CV e experiência profissional?

Resposta dada por Maroš Šefčovič em nome da Comissão
(17 de agosto de 2012)

O EPSO tem dado passos muito significativos no sentido de uma maior utilização de todas as línguas oficiais da UE no contexto do seu programa de desenvolvimento — nomeadamente, ao disponibilizar em 23 línguas uma grande parte do respetivo sítio na Internet, bem como os anúncios de concursos e o guia para os candidatos a concursos. Fazendo prova do empenhamento das instituições da UE em matéria de qualidade e de multilinguismo, uma parte fundamental do processo de avaliação, em 2011, foi igualmente realizada nas 23 línguas oficiais da UE e, pela primeira vez, os candidatos tiveram a possibilidade de efetuar os testes de raciocínio verbal, numérico e abstrato na respetiva língua principal.

Pede-se aos candidatos que utilizem uma segunda língua (de entre o inglês, francês ou alemão) aquando da passagem pelo centro de avaliação, em parte por razões práticas, mas também por ser importante testar a capacidade dos candidatos em se exprimirem num contexto que se aproxima da realidade com que se confrontarão no trabalho.

Por conseguinte, para garantir que todos os textos gerais e toda a comunicação entre os candidatos e o EPSO são claramente entendidos por ambas as partes, apenas o inglês, francês e alemão são utilizados nos convites para os vários testes e na correspondência entre candidatos e o EPSO. Assim, os candidatos são convidados a preencher o boletim de candidatura numa dessas três línguas, como previsto no manual de candidatura *on-line* publicado juntamente com cada anúncio de concurso, e no guia dos concursos.

Por último, dado os boletins de candidatura serem tratados por um comité de seleção independente nomeado para cada concurso, não se pode garantir que cada comité cubra todas as línguas. Por conseguinte, e a fim de garantir uma igualdade de tratamento entre candidatos, só podem ser tomadas em consideração as candidaturas apresentadas numa dessas três línguas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007268/12
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: Applications for competitions organised by the European Personnel Selection Office (EPSO)

A Portuguese citizen recently wrote to us about a competition organised by the European Personnel Selection Office (EPSO). The information that he supplied raises several questions.

After reading and studying the notice of competition, the person concerned decided to enter. He filled in the application form, to which he attached his CV. A few days later he received a message that his application had been validated and further details of the procedure would be sent to him shortly. No fewer than 103 days after that, he was informed that he had been eliminated from the competition because he had failed to comply with one of the points in the notice, namely the requirement to complete the application form in one of the following three languages: English, French, or German.

1. Why is it that only the above three languages may be used to complete an application form?

2. Why should this be considered a criterion for eliminating candidates, whether or not their CV and professional experience satisfy the requirements?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(17 August 2012)

EPSO has taken very significant steps towards the greater use of all official EU languages in the context of its Development Programme — notably by making a large part of its website available in 23 languages, as well as the Notices of Competition and the Guide to open competitions for candidates. Demonstrating the EU institutions' commitment to quality and multilingualism, in 2011 a key part of the assessment process was also delivered in the 23 official EU languages, and for the first time, applicants were able to sit verbal, numerical and abstract reasoning tests in their main language.

Candidates are required to take the assessment centre in their second language (one of English, French or German) partly for practical reasons, but also because it is important to test the ability of candidates to perform in an environment that closely matches the reality they would face in the job.

Hence, to ensure that all general texts and all communication between the candidates and EPSO are clearly understood on both sides, only English, French or German are used for the invitations to the various tests and correspondence between candidates and EPSO. In this context, candidates are required to fill in the registration form in one of these three languages, as stipulated in the Online Application Manual published with each Notice of Competition and the Guide to open competitions.

Finally, given that application forms are treated by an independent Selection Board nominated for each individual open competition, it can not be assured that each Board covers all languages. Therefore, and in order to ensure equality of treatment with respect to candidates, only applications submitted in one of these three languages may be taken into account.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-007269/12
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(18. juli 2012)

Om: Anvendelsen af medlemsstaternes sprog i EU

Ifølge Dansk Sprognævn blev der på kun tre procent af Kommissionens møder i 2011 og kun en fjerdedel af møderne i EU's Ministerråd i 2011 tolket til eller fra dansk. Det fik i december generaldirektørerne for Kommissionens og Europa-Parlamentets tolketjenester til under et besøg i København at advare om, at den danske tolketjeneste er i fare for at blive nedlagt som følge af manglende efterspørgsel. Gamle og ellers livskraftige sprog som dansk risikerer i stigende grad at blive marginaliseret i fjerne og stadig mere uoverskuelige overnationale konstruktioner som Den Europæiske Union, en udvikling som beklageligvis for nylig blev fremmet ved, at det danske formandskab under Europa-Parlamentets seneste samling til stor fortørnelse for den danske befolkning fravalgte at kommunikere på sit eget modersmål.

Kan Kommissionen i den forbindelse oplyse,

1. om den finder det rimeligt, at de mindre nationers egenart og distinkte kulturelle særtræk, for eksempel sproget, i stigende grad bliver undergravet og marginaliseret?

2. om den agter at opfordre medlemsstaternes regeringer og parlamenter til at respektere deres eget sprog for således at værne om den enkelte nations kendetegn og dermed styrke den kulturelle mangfoldighed i Den Europæiske Union?

3. om den vil drage omsorg for, at der vil blive tilvejebragt økonomiske ressourcer til at bevare de mindre medlemsstaters sprog gennem tolke- og oversættelsestjenester?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Androulla Vassiliou
(7. september 2012)

Europa-Kommissionens politik for flersprogethed er baseret på artikel 3 i traktaten om Den Europæiske Union, hvori det fastsættes, at Unionen »respekterer medlemsstaternes rige kulturelle og sproglige mangfoldighed og sikrer, at den europæiske kulturarv beskyttes og udvikles«. Aktiviteterne på dette område omfatter fremme af sprogindlæring og sproglig mangfoldighed, navnlig gennem uddannelsesprogrammer, samt oversættelse og tolkning til og fra alle EU's officielle sprog.

I henhold til samme traktats artikel 5 »handler Unionen kun inden for rammerne af de beføjelser, som medlemsstaterne har tildelt den i traktaterne, med henblik på at opfylde de mål, der er fastsat heri«. Medlemsstaterne er ansvarlige for deres egen interne sprogpolitik. Det er ikke Europa-Kommissionens rolle at fortælle medlemsstaterne, hvordan de bør beskytte de sprog, der tales af deres borgere.

Kommissionen anvender princippet om lige behandling af EU's officielle sprog og sondrer ikke efter deres status i overensstemmelse med forordning nr. 1/1958. I den forbindelse vil Europa-Kommissionen fortsat understøtte sine oversættelses- og tolketjenester og sikre, at der er tilstrækkelige ressourcer til rådighed til at dække institutionens behov, i overensstemmelse med sin politik for flersprogethed og princippet om effektiv udnyttelse af ressourcerne.

Det bør endvidere bemærkes, at det i forbindelse med tolkning ved møder i Rådet er op til de enkelte medlemsstater at vurdere, om der er behov for tolkning på møderne. GD for Tolkning stiller herefter tolkning til rådighed i overensstemmelse med de anmodninger, det modtager fra Rådets Generalsekretariat.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007269/12
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: Use of Member States' language in the EU

According to the Danish Language Committee of the Danish Ministry of Culture (*Dansk Sprognævn*), at only 3% of the Commission's meetings in 2011, and only a quarter of the meetings in the Council of Ministers of the EU in 2011, was there interpretation from or into Danish. This led the Directors-General of the Commission and European Parliament interpreting services, during a visit to Copenhagen in December, to warn that the Danish interpreting service is in danger of being closed down owing to lack of demand. Old and yet vigorous languages like Danish are increasingly at risk of being marginalised in distant and ever more unmanageable supranational constructs such as the EU, a development which was regrettably reinforced recently when the Danish Presidency of the Council at the last part-session of the European Parliament, to the great indignation of the Danish people, decided against communicating in their mother tongue.

In this connection, can the Commission answer the following:

1. Does it consider it reasonable that the specific nature and distinctive cultural features of the smaller nations, such as their language, are increasingly undermined and marginalised?

2. Does it intend to call on the governments and parliaments of the Member States to respect their own languages and thus protect the distinctive features of the individual nation so as to enhance cultural diversity in the European Union?

3. Will it ensure that financial resources are made available to protect the languages of the smaller Member States by means of interpretation and translation services?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(7 September 2012)

The Commission's multilingualism policy is based on Article 3 of the Treaty on European Union, which states that the Union 'shall respect its rich cultural and linguistic diversity, and shall ensure that Europe's cultural heritage is safeguarded and enhanced.' Activities in this field encompass promotion of language learning and linguistic diversity, in particular through the programmes for education and training, as well as translation and interpretation in and from all the official languages of the European Union.

According to Article 5 of the same treaty, 'the Union shall act only within the limits of the competences conferred upon it by the Member States in the Treaties to attain the objectives set out therein.' Member States are responsible for their own internal language policy. It is not the role of the European Commission to tell Member States how they should protect the languages spoken by their citizens.

The Commission applies the principle of equal treatment of the official languages of the European Union and does not make any distinction in their status in accordance with Regulation no. 1/1958. In this respect, the European Commission will continue to support its translation and interpretation services, ensuring that sufficient resources are available to meet the needs of the institution in line with its policy of multilingualism and the principle of efficient use of resources.

It should furthermore be noted that with regard to interpretation in meetings held in the Council, it is up to each member state to decide on its own interpretation needs for meetings; DG interpretation then provides interpretation in line with the requests that it receives from the Council General Secretariat.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-007271/12
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(18. juli 2012)

Om: Eurokrisens systemiske karakter

De tyske vismænd — Sachverständigenrat — har i en særrapport af 5. juli 2012 fastslået ([1]), at de hidtil iværksatte økonomiske og monetære foranstaltninger til redning af den fælles valuta, euroen, er af temporær karakter, og at de dermed ikke tager højde for, at den nuværende krise i eurozonen først og fremmest er af systemisk karakter. Således kan de nuværende foranstaltninger ikke langsigtet løse eksempelvis gælds- og vækstproblemerne i de kriseramte lande. Der er ifølge de tyske vismænd tale om en ond spiral bestående af bankkrise, alvorlige statsgældsproblemer og makroøkonomiske problemer, som griber ind i hinanden og låser landene fast.

De tyske vismænd opfordrer eurozonens lande til at lade langt skrappere og klarere regler være betingelse for en rekapitalisering og genopretning af de kriseramte økonomier — altså at der indføres en langt strengere kontrol med, at reglerne overholdes. Ligeledes opfordrer formanden for tysk industri til en øjeblikkelig standsning af yderligere hjælp til nødstedte lande.

Deler Kommissionen konklusionerne hos de tyske vismænd, og er det også Kommissionens opfattelse, at de nuværende hjælpemekanismer i bedste fald er uden nogen langsigtet virkning, i værste fald er direkte kontraproduktive i forhold til at afhjælp den nuværende krises systemiske karakter?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Olli Rehn
(30. august 2012)

Kommissionen har offentliggjort sin egen analyse af den krise, som euroområdet befinder sig i og anfører, at det bl.a. er ØMU'ens ufuldstændige institutionelle struktur, der gør det vanskeligt at håndtere og løse krisen. Kommissionen har ved adskillige lejligheder advaret mod de negative gensidige påvirkninger mellem vækstudsigter, bankernes balancer og statsgæld, der fører til en tillidskrise af systemisk karakter ([2]). Den er også kommet med sine bud på, hvordan krisen løses. Der er behov for en reform af den finansielle regulering og tilsyn i EU, en kritisk gennemgang af EU's og euroområdets økonomiske styring og mekanismer for ydelse af finansiel støtte, som er underkastet streng konditionalitet, for euroområdets medlemsstater. Kommissionens formand har fremført, at det vil være nødvendigt med større integration inden for budgetpolitikker og økonomiske politikker for at komme ud af krisen. Senest har Kommissionen fremlagt et lovgivningsforslag om bankers genopretning og sanering ([3]), der kan være et skridt på vejen mod en integreret finansiel ramme for den fremtidige ØMU. Idéen fik på EU-topmødet i juni 2012 opbakning fra stats- og regeringscheferne, som også tilsluttede sig opfordringen til at indføre en tættere ØMU. Det Europæiske Råd anmodede om en konkret og tidsbegrænset køreplan for oprettelse af en egentlig Økonomisk og Monetær Union, som skal være afsluttet ved udgangen af 2012, og som Kommissionen skal bidrage til. Det tyske råd af økonomiske eksperter fremlægger i sit svar på topmødets konklusioner dets synspunkter vedrørende en lang række spørgsmål i relation til kriseløsning. Kommissionen har nævnt nogle af synspunkterne i nogle af sine publikationer ([4]), herunder forslaget om en gældsindfrielsesfond, og bifalder sådanne bidrag i den igangværende debat. Som udgangspunkt undlader Kommissionen generelt at drøfte, evaluere eller støtte konkrete synspunkter, der kommer til udtryk uden for institutionerne.

([1]) Der henvises til artiklen »Wirtschaftsweise: Fortbestand der Währung gefährdet« i Handelsblatt af 6. juli 2012, hvorfra der også linkes til de tyske vismænds rapport »Nach dem EU-Gipfel: Zeit für langfristige Lösungen nutzen«.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/ags2012_annex2_en.pdf
([3]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/12/416&.
([4]) Henvisning til grønbog om mulighederne for fælles udstedelse af stabilitetsobligationer: http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/green_paper_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007271/12
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: Systemic nature of the euro crisis

In a special report of 5 July 2012, the German Council of Economic Experts ([1]) stated that the economic and monetary measures employed so far to rescue the common currency, the euro, are temporary in nature and thus do not take account of the fact that the current crisis in the euro area is primarily systemic in nature. That being so, the present measures cannot in the long term resolve debt and growth problems in the crisis-hit countries, for example. According to the German experts, these countries are paralysed by a vicious spiral of interlocking factors consisting of bank crisis, severe sovereign debt problems and macroeconomic problems.

The German experts call on the euro area countries to make the recapitalisation and reconstruction of the crisis-hit economies conditional on much tougher and clearer rules — in other words, for the introduction of much stricter control over compliance with the rules. Similarly the chairman of the Federation of German Industry is calling for a temporary halt to further aid to countries in distress.

Does the Commission agree with the conclusions of the German Council of Economic Experts, and does it also take the view that the current rescue mechanisms are at best ineffective in the long term, and at worst directly counter-productive with a view to tackling the systemic nature of the current crisis?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(30 August 2012)

The Commission has presented its own analyses of the crisis causes faced by the euro area, one of which is the incomplete institutional setup of EMU, which renders the task of crisis management and resolution more difficult. It has repeatedly warned of negative feedback loops between growth prospects, banks' balance sheets and sovereign debt, leading to a systemic crisis of confidence ([2]). It also presented proposals in response: a reform of financial regulation and supervision in the EU, an overhaul of the EU's and the euro area's economic governance, and the creation of mechanisms to provide financial assistance, against strict conditionality to euro area Member States, if needed. The President of the Commission has stated that more integration will be needed in the area of budgetary and economic policies to overcome this crisis. Most recently, the Commission has made a legislative proposal for bank recovery and resolution ([3]) that could be a stepping stone towards an integrated financial framework in a future EMU, a vision which has been endorsed by the Heads of State and Government at the June 2012 summit, who also endorsed its call for a deeper EMU. The European Council asked for a specific and time-bound roadmap to the creation of a genuine EMU, to be worked out by end-2012 and to which the Commission will contribute. In its reaction to the summit conclusions, the German Council of Economic Experts is presenting views on a wide range of issues relating to crisis resolution. To some of them, such as the proposal for a debt redemption fund, the Commission has made reference in its own publications ([4]) and welcomes such contributions to the ongoing debate. However, the Commission doesn't generally discuss, evaluate or endorse specific views expressed by outside institutions.

([1]) See article 'Wirtschaftsweise: Fortbestand der Währung gefährdet', Handelsblatt, 6 July 2012, where there is also a link to the German Council of Economic Experts' report 'Nach dem EU-Gipfel: Zeit für langfristige Lösungen nutzen' (http://www.sachverstaendigenrat-wirtschaft.de/fileadmin/dateiablage/download/pressemitteilungen/pressemitteilung_07_2012.pdf . An English version will be released before the end of July 2012).

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/ags2012_annex2_en.pdf

([3]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/12/416&.

([4]) Reference to Green Paper on the feasibility of the common issuance of stability bonds: http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/green_paper_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007272/12
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: Child exploitation in sport

A recent study indicates that thousands of young players are being conned and illegally trafficked from Africa to Europe by trafficking rings offering the promise of football careers. Few of these children make it through or have trials at all and in many cases they end up staying on in their destination country, isolated from friends, family and support. The French organisation *Foot Solidaire*, which works to protect young footballers from exploitation, has said that it is dealing with at least 20 new cases of this nature every week. Furthermore, it has been reported that a licensed agent was offering 14— and 15-year-old footballers for sale for GBP 25 000.

1. In light of these findings, can the Commission outline what measures it has in place in relation to the protection of underage players and players trafficked from outside the EU?

2. What action has the Commission taken in conjunction with football organisations to ensure that young players are not trafficked and exploited?

3. What does the Commission intend to do, in terms of taking action or legislating, to protect these children who are entering the EU illegally?

4. How does the Commission intend to force football's governing bodies and major football clubs to face up to their responsibilities in this area?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(13 September 2012)

The Commission notes with concern such developments and shares concerns related to trafficking in human beings and international sports events. In fact, Council conclusions of 27-28 April 2006 ([1]) recognised this phenomenon and proposed a series of measures to enhance cooperation among Member States to respond. In response to this, the Expert Group on trafficking of the Commission issued an opinion recommending certain measures, including awareness-raising activities.

Furthermore, the Commission and the UEFA have established contacts regarding any developments on trafficking in human beings connected to the Olympic Games and the Euro Championships 2012.

Directive 2011/36/EU on trafficking in human beings is victims centred, as well as human rights and gender sensitive and further recognises that children victims of trafficking are particularly vulnerable to trafficking and thus, special protection measures based on the child's best interest must be taken.

Furthermore, the Commission has recently adopted the EU Strategy towards the Eradication of Trafficking in Human Beings ([2]), which stresses, just as the directive does, the vulnerability of children. It proposes developing a best practice model for the role of guardians and/or legal representation of the child victims and guidelines on child protection systems, and calls on Member States to strengthen such systems. Also in 2014, it will launch EU-wide awareness-raising activities targeting specific vulnerable groups and situations such as major sporting events. Finally, the Commission also funds projects specifically on awareness raising that can be found on the EU anti-trafficking website ([3]).

([1]) Council conclusions on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings on the basis of the EU Action Plan and including trafficking in connection with major international events 8885/06.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/entity.action?id=714114c7-cd42-46cf-85eb-c09d042c7181
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/index.action?breadCrumbReset=true

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007273/12
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: Capture, storage and distribution of water in the EU

Since April 2012 there has been above-average rainfall across western Europe, while at the same time there have been mass shortages of potable water supplies in the UK and Germany; we must therefore question our ability to capture, store and distribute ground water efficiently. It was the wettest June in the UK since 1860; Ireland's June rainfall was between 135 % and 286 % of the annual monthly average.

In Portugal heavy rain has failed to replenish reservoirs used to produce hydroelectricity, meaning a drop in output, which also coincided with a drop in wind energy output, leading to a massive increase in imports of electricity.

According to the Second UN World Water Development Report, if present levels of consumption continue, two thirds of the global population will live in areas of water stress by 2025. The OECD recently said that giant reforms aimed at increasing efficiency in the way water is used around the world are needed in order to avert serious shortages in the next decades. The level of water supply can have massive knock-on effects for people across the Union.

In London, all irrigation systems at the Olympic Park for the 2012 Games use only water from non-potable sources, thereby utilising a limited resource more efficiently.

In this regard, what research, innovation and development measures is the Commission supporting with a view to capturing, storing and distributing water more efficiently in order to provide a constant and more stable supply of water and improve water security?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(18 September 2012)

In line with the Europe 2020 strategy, the Commission's proposal for the framework Programme for Research and Innovation 'Horizon 2020' ([1]) has a focus on societal challenges facing the EU society. These challenges address notably water security through improved water management, efficiency, supply and eco-innovative solutions to close the water cycle. Horizon 2020 will extend efforts in water research done in FP6 ([2]) and FP7 ([3]) to better deal with water management aspects in Europe. Other opportunities for innovation projects exist under the cohesion and structural funds.

The water scarcity and droughts EU policy ([4]) laid down a water hierarchy where priority should first be given to demand management and water efficiency, then to alternative water supply options. The forthcoming Commission communication on 'Blueprint to Safeguard Europe's Water Resources' will consider policy gaps and options to fully integrate water quantity issues into the overall policy framework.

In addition, the Commission has launched a European Innovation Partnership (EIP) ([5]) on Water which aims to support and facilitate the development of innovative solutions to deal with water-related challenges and bring those solutions to the market.

Moreover, the Member States, with support of the Commission, have initiated a Joint Programming Initiative ([6]) to increase cooperation between national research programmes addressing the challenge of achieving sustainable water systems for a sustainable economy in Europe and abroad.

([1]) COM(2011) 811, 30.11.2011.
([2]) Sixth Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP6, 2002-2006).
([3]) Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013).
([4]) COM(2007) 414, 18.7.2007. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council addressing the challenge of water scarcity and droughts in the European Union.
([5]) COM(2012) 216 final. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the European Innovation Partnership on Water.
([6]) C(2011)7403, 27.10.2011: Commission recommendation on the research joint programming initiative 'Water Challenges for a Changing World'.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007274/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Geoffrey Van Orden (ECR)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — EU financial support for Palestinian Authority security forces — Gaza police salaries

The EU provides significant financial assistance to the Palestinian Authority (PA), including funds for the payment of official salaries. Some 30 000 nominally PA civil police remain in Gaza, where they have either joined the Hamas police or are redundant. How many of these salaries are paid from funds provided by the EU and what is the total cost?

Question for written answer E-007275/12
to the Commission
Geoffrey Van Orden (ECR)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: EU financial and practical support for Palestinian Authority security forces

For many years the EU has provided financial and practical support for the security forces of the Palestinian Authority (PA). Is this support now limited to the civil police, or are other organisations (such as the Preventive Security Force and the General Intelligence Force) also receiving support?

How much funding has been provided since 1994 in support for the security forces of the PA?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(5 September 2012)

The EU does not contribute to the salaries of any of the Palestinian police forces, whether in the West Bank or in the Gaza Strip.

Aid to the security forces of the PA is indeed limited to support for the civil police. This has not taken the form of direct financial support.

There are however a number of infrastructure projects which have been financed by the EU which have provided indirect support to the civil police. The construction of the Nablus Muqata (EU contribution EUR 4.26 million) and Support to the Police Training Facility in Jericho (EUR 3.25 million), as well as a supervision contract for the ongoing construction of the Jenin Muqata (EUR 0.35 million) fall into this category.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007276/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Geoffrey Van Orden (ECR)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — EUBAM Rafah

The EU continues to fund EUBAM Rafah. How much has this mission cost each year since its inception?

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

According to the relevant Council Decisions, the overall financial reference amount intended to cover the expenditure related to EUBAM Rafah since its inception on 25 November 2005 until the beginning of the ongoing mandate period on 30 June 2012 was EUR 22 540 000. This overall reference amount represents a yearly average of around EUR 3 415 000, including for the period 25 November 2005 to 17 June 2007 during which the Mission was conducting operations at the Rafah Crossing Point and enabled, by providing the third party presence, the crossing from the Gaza Strip to Egypt of almost 460 000 passengers.

It is to be noted that, upon decision of the Council, the mission was co-located with the EU Delegation in Tel-Aviv and its size was reduced to a Head of Mission and three international staff as of 1 July 2012. While the mandate of the mission remains unchanged, the new structure entails a significantly lower financial reference amount for the current one-year mandate period (EUR 980 000 for the period 1 July 2012-30 June 2013) which marks a decrease of more than 70% in annual allocation as compared to previous years.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007277/12
do Komisji
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(18 lipca 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wyrok dla białoruskiego księgarza

10 lipca Aleś Jaudacha został skazany na rok ograniczenia wolności za sprzedaż białoruskich książek przez Internet. Zgodnie z wyrokiem Jaudasze nie będzie wolno opuszczać miejsca zamieszkania, a na jego majątek został nałożony areszt. Ma ponadto zapłacić państwu 57 mln rubli.

Najprawdopodobniej tak surowa kara została wymierzona mężczyźnie za sprzedaż książki „Młodofrontowcy" poświęconej działaczom opozycyjnej organizacji młodzieżowej Młody Front. Sąd uznał to za prowadzenie nielegalnej działalności gospodarczej i kazał zniszczyć 30 egzemplarzy. Jaudacha rozprowadzał również utwory nielubianego przez obecne władze Wasila Bykaua.

Nie ma wątpliwości, że sprawa ta jest motywowana polityczne, a białoruskie władze starają się ukarać Jaudachę za propagowanie niewygodnej dla nich literatury.

— W związku z tym zwracam się z zapytaniem, czy Komisja ma zamiar podjąć interwencję w sprawie wyroku dla Alesia Jaudachy i wyrazić stanowczy sprzeciw wobec prześladowania przez białoruskie władze działaczy i aktywistów w tym kraju?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(11 września 2012 r.)

UE wielokrotnie wyrażała zaniepokojenie ciągłymi prześladowaniami społeczeństwa obywatelskiego, opozycji politycznej i niezależnych mediów, do jakich dochodzi na Białorusi od czasów wyborów prezydenckich dnia 19 grudnia 2010 r. Szykanowanie krytyków reżimu i nakładane na nich ograniczenia są częścią ogólnego klimatu represji, jaki panuje obecnie na Białorusi. W ocenie UE wolność wypowiedzi i informacji są w tej chwili na Białorusi poważnie ograniczone. W świetle powyższych faktów Komisji oraz Wysokiej Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącej dobrze znana jest sprawa Alesia Jaudachy, której dotyczy pismo Pana Posła.

UE potępiała i nadal będzie czynnie potępiać represyjną politykę władz Białorusi. Aby utrzymać presję polityczną, UE przyjęła środki ograniczające wobec osób odpowiedzialnych za prześladowania społeczeństwa obywatelskiego, niezależnych mediów i opozycji politycznej.

Komisja oraz Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca będą zdecydowanie korzystać ze wszystkich dostępnych im środków, aby doprowadzić do pozytywnych zmian na Białorusi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007277/12
to the Commission
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(18 July 2012)

Subject: Sentencing of a Belarusian bookseller

On 10 July 2012, Ales Yaudakh was sentenced to one year's imprisonment for selling Belarusian books over the Internet. Under the terms of the sentence, Mr Yaudakh will not be allowed to leave his place of residence. Furthermore, his property has been distrained and he is required to pay a BYR 57 million fine to the state.

It seems highly likely that Mr Yaudakh received such a severe sentence in view of the fact that he was selling a book entitled '*Маладафронтаўцы*' (Members of the Young Front), which is dedicated to the activists of the youth opposition movement 'the Young Front'. The court ruled that this constituted illegal business activities and ordered 50 copies of the book to be destroyed. Mr Yaudakh also distributed works written by Vasil Bykau, who is unpopular with the current government.

There is no doubt that the case is politically motivated and that the Belarusian authorities are seeking to punish Ales Yaudakh for disseminating literature of which they do not approve.

In this connection, does the Commission intend to take action in response to thesentencing of Ales Yaudakh and express its resolute opposition to the repression of activists by the Belarusian authorities?

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

The EU has, on numerous occasions, expressed its concern about the continued crackdown on civil society, the political opposition and the independent media after the 19 December 2010 Presidential elections in Belarus. The restrictions on and harassement of regime critics are part of the overall atmosphere of repression that is currently prevailing in Belarus. In the EU's assessment, freedom of speech and of information are at present seriously curtailed in Belarus. In this context, the Commission and the HR/VP are well aware of the case of Ales Yaudakh, referred to by the Honourable Member.

The EU has been and will continue to be active in condemning the repressive policies of the Belarusian authorities. To maintain political pressure, the EU has adopted restrictive measures towards those responsible for the crackdown on civil society, independent media and political opposition.

The Commission and the HR/VP remain committed to using all tools at their disposal to bring about positive change in Belarus.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007279/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE)
(19 Ιουλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Δηλώσεις Βρετανού Πρωθυπουργού για κλείσιμο των συνόρων της χώρας του για πολίτες κρατών του ευρωπαϊκού νότου

Στις αρχές Ιουλίου 2012, δημοσίευμα της διαδικτυακής πύλης «euobserver.com» με τίτλο «Η Μεγάλη Βρετανία είναι έτοιμη να κλείσει στα σύνορά της στους Έλληνες», αναφέρει ότι το Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο προετοιμάζεται για ενδεχόμενο κλείσιμο των συνόρων του στους Έλληνες, αλλά και σε πολίτες άλλων χωρών του Ευρωπαϊκού Νότου που αντιμετωπίζουν την κρίση χρέους της ευρωζώνης, σε περίπτωση «εξαιρετικών περιστάσεων και γεγονότων».

Επιπλέον, ο Βρετανός Πρωθυπουργός δήλωσε στην Επιτροπή Εσωτερικών Υποθέσεων του Βρετανικού Κοινοβουλίου ότι, αν χρειαστεί, θα περιορίσει το δικαίωμα των Ελλήνων πολιτών να ταξιδεύουν στην Βρετανία προκειμένου να αποθαρρυνθούν πρόσθετα μεταναστευτικά ρεύματα και έτσι να προασπιστεί η οικονομία της χώρας του και το τραπεζικό της σύστημα.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Είναι δυνατοί οι εν λόγω περιορισμοί;

— Συνάδουν οι θέσεις αυτές του Βρετανού Πρωθυπουργού με τις θεμελιώδεις αρχές, τη φιλοσοφία και το σκοπό της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης; Αντικατοπτρίζουν τον ορισμό της ΕΕ, όπως αυτός αναφέρεται στη Συνθήκη της Λισαβόνας, δηλαδή ότι η ΕΕ αποτελεί «χώρο ελευθερίας, ασφάλειας και δικαιοσύνης»;

— Πιστεύει ότι το μονομερές κλείσιμο των συνόρων ενός κράτους μέλους προς πολίτες ενός άλλου κράτους μέλους παραβιάζει τις αρχές και τις αξίες στις οποίες στηρίζεται όλο το ευρωπαϊκό οικοδόμημα, δηλαδή «το σεβασμό της ανθρώπινης αξιοπρέπειας, της ελευθερίας, της δημοκρατίας, της ισότητας, του κράτους δικαίου, καθώς και το σεβασμό των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων»;

Απάντηση της κας Reding εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(31 Αυγούστου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος στην απάντησή της στην γραπτή ερώτηση αριθ. E-006784/2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007279/12
to the Commission
Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE)
(19 July 2012)

Subject: Statements by the British Prime Minister about closing the UK's borders to citizens of southern European countries

In early July 2012, the Internet portal 'euobserver.com' carried an article entitled 'UK prepared to seal border against Greeks' stating that the UK is preparing for possible closure of its borders to Greeks, but also to citizens of other southern European countries caught up in the eurozone debt crisis, should exceptional circumstances and events occur.

Moreover, the British Prime Minister told the British Parliament's Home Affairs Committee that, if necessary, he would restrict the right of Greek citizens to enter the UK in order to discourage additional migration and thus protect the country's economy and banking system.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

— Are such restrictions possible?

— Are the positions adopted by the British Prime Minister compatible with the fundamental principles, philosophy and purpose of the European Union? Do they reflect the definition of the EU found in the Lisbon Treaty, namely 'an area of freedom, security and justice'?

— Does it believe that the unilateral closure of the borders of one Member State to nationals of another Member State violates the principles and values underpinning the whole European project, namely 'respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights'?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(31 August 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-006784/2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007280/12
to the Commission
Roger Helmer (EFD)
(19 July 2012)

Subject: Maltese utility company ARMS Ltd

The Commission will be aware that freedom of movement of persons is one of the fundamental principles of EC law. This implies that all the Member States' institutions and all companies operating in the European Union are obliged to treat other Member States' nationals who reside in any given country as they treat their own nationals.

ARMS Ltd, a Maltese private limited liability company jointly owned by the Enemalta Corporation and the Water Services Corporation, is charging non-Maltese EU citizens — including a British constituent of mine who has been living in Malta since 2008 — a higher price for energy, around 30-40% more than that paid by Maltese citizens. ARMS have threatened suspension of services to those who have refused to pay this increased amount while also advising them that their bills will not be backdated.

Does the Commission agree with me that this is a clear breach of EC law that should be investigated?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(28 August 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-005545/2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007281/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(19 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Siria: guerra civile e repressione cristiana

Secondo le dichiarazioni della Croce Rossa Internazionale in Siria è ormai guerra civile. Gli scontri fra ribelli e esercito regolare imperversano nella capitale e in molte zone del paese. Oltre alla tragedia umanitaria che la popolazione siriana sta vivendo, vi è anche lo spettro della persecuzione religiosa. La popolazione cristiana nel paese rappresenta il 10 % del totale e con questo conflitto l'equilibrio religioso prima stabile si è rotto: gli estremisti islamici stanno già colpendo pesantemente i cristiani presenti sul territorio, ad Hama in 20 000 sono stati espulsi, ad Homs in 100 000 hanno subito la stessa sorte, nel resto del paese chi può, temendo una svolta di stampo estremista, sta tentando di lasciare il paese.

1. Che passi concreti sta facendo l'Unione Europea per cercare di ricomporre la situazione siriana?

2. Ritiene essa che in Siria esista effettivamente il rischio di una svolta estremista islamica?

3. Che cosa intende fare la Commissione per tutelare e sostenere la minoranza cristiana siriana?

Risposta congiunta di Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(4 settembre 2012)

L'Unione europea condivide le preoccupazioni dell'onorevole parlamentare per la situazione umanitaria della popolazione siriana, compresa la minoranza cristiana.

Nei messaggi destinati sia al regime che ai gruppi dell'opposizione, l'UE ha sempre ribadito il suo invito a far rispettare i principi della libertà di religione e di credo e ad evitare le divisioni tra diverse fazioni ed etnie. Nell'ultimo Consiglio «Affari esteri» del 23 luglio 2012, l'UE ha inoltre messo in guardia da un'ulteriore militarizzazione del conflitto e dalla violenza settaria, che non può che aggravare le sofferenze in Siria e rischia di avere un impatto drammatico sulla regione. Inoltre, l'UE ha esortato a più riprese l'opposizione siriana a raggiungere un accordo su una serie di principi per costruire una nuova Siria, in cui tutti i cittadini possano godere di pari diritti, a prescindere dalle loro appartenenze, etnie o convinzioni personali.

L'UE continua a esortare il regime siriano a porre immediatamente fine alle uccisioni di civili, ritirare le truppe siriane dalle città assediate e consentire una transizione pacifica. La situazione dei diritti umani e le violazioni del diritto internazionale umanitario in Siria restano motivo di grave preoccupazione. Continuiamo a sostenere la commissione internazionale indipendente d'inchiesta sulla Siria e le indagini da essa condotte sulle presunte violazioni dei diritti umani internazionali al fine di consegnare alla giustizia i responsabili di tali violazioni. Tutti devono rispettare il diritto internazionale umanitario.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007370/12
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD) oraz Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(23 lipca 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Sytuacja chrześcijan w Syrii

W ostatnich miesiącach nastąpiła eskalacja brutalnej przemocy wobec chrześcijan zamieszkujących Syrię. Ponad 9 tysięcy chrześcijan z miasta Quasayr musiało opuścić swoje domy po ultimatum miejscowego dowódcy zbrojnej opozycji. Jak donoszą media po fakcie uzbrojona grupa włamała się i sprofanowała greckokatolicki kościół św. Eliasza. O los chrześcijan, stanowiących ponad 10 % mieszkańców Syrii, obawia się również stolica apostolska w Watykanie, która poinformował o zniszczeniu oraz złupieniu kościołów w Um Al Zinar oraz Bustan al-Diwan (Homs) i wypędzeniu kilkudziesięciu tysięcy chrześcijańskich mieszkańców miasta. W czasie kontrataku sił rządowych ponad 63 chrześcijan zostało wykorzystanych przez siły rebeliantów, jako żywe tarcze.

Niepokojące stają się również, coraz częściej pojawiające się informacje o kolejnych atakach dokonywanych na tle religijnym przez coraz mocniej zradykalizowane oddziały islamskich rebeliantów.

1. Jakie kroki podejmuje Europejska Służba Działań Zewnętrznych, aby wspomóc chrześcijan w Syrii?

2. Czy podczas spotkań z przedstawicielami syryjskiej opozycji poruszany jest temat wolności religijnej oraz poszanowania dla chrześcijańskich wspólnot religijnych zamieszkujących teren Syrii?

3. Jak Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel ocenia coraz częstsze doniesienia dotyczące radykalizacji islamskiej opozycji oraz motywowanych religijnie ataków na chrześcijańskie obiekty kultu oraz samych wierzących?

4. Czy ESDZ zamierza warunkować pomoc dla opozycji syryjskiej od pozyskania gwarancji ochrony chrześcijan i ich praw w przypadku powstania nowego rządu w Syrii?

Wspólna odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton
w imieniu Komisji
(4 września 2012 r.)

Unia Europejska podziela troskę szanownej Pani Posłanki dotyczącą sytuacji humanitarnej ludności Syrii, w tym mniejszości chrześcijańskiej.

W swoich komunikatach skierowanych zarówno do obecnego reżimu, jak i do grup opozycyjnych, UE stale ponawiała apel o przestrzeganie zasad wolności wyznania i przekonań oraz o wystrzeganie się podziałów na tle religijnym i etnicznym. Podczas ostatniego posiedzenia Rady do Spraw Zagranicznych dnia 23 lipca 2012 r. UE ponownie ostrzegała przed dalszą militaryzacją konfliktu i eskalacją przemocy na tle religijnym, które mogą przysporzyć Syrii jedynie dalszych cierpień i które mogą być tragiczne w skutkach dla całego regionu. UE również wielokrotnie apelowała do syryjskiej opozycji o kompromis w sprawie zasad, na których będzie budowana nowa Syria, w której wszyscy obywatele będą mogli korzystać z równych praw, niezależnie od swoich przekonań politycznych, przynależności etnicznej i wyznania.

UE nieustannie wzywa reżim syryjski do natychmiastowego zaprzestania zabijania ludności cywilnej, do wycofania armii syryjskiej z obleganych wiosek i miast oraz do umożliwienia pokojowej transformacji. Pozostajemy głęboko zaniepokojeni sytuacją dotyczącą praw człowieka oraz doniesieniami o przypadkach naruszania międzynarodowego prawa humanitarnego w Syrii. Nieustannie wspieramy prace niezależnej międzynarodowej komisji śledczej ds. Syrii oraz jej dochodzenia w kwestii domniemanych naruszeń międzynarodowych praw człowieka w celu pociągnięcia do odpowiedzialności osób stojących za tymi naruszeniami. Międzynarodowe prawo humanitarne musi być respektowane przez wszystkich.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007281/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(19 July 2012)

Subject: Syria: civil war and persecution of Christians

According to statements made by the International Red Cross, a civil war is now raging in Syria and the clashes between rebels and the regular army have spread to the capital and many other parts of the country. The humanitarian tragedy which the Syrian population is experiencing is now being matched by the threat of religious persecution. Christians make up 10 % of the Syrian population and the good inter-faith relations which existed previously in the country have been destroyed by the current conflict. Christians in Syria are already suffering at the hands of Islamic extremists: in Hama 20 000 have been expelled from the town, in Homs 100 000 have met the same fate and in the remainder of the country anyone who can is trying to leave Syria before the extremists take power.

1. What practical steps is the EU taking in an attempt to resolve the situation in Syria?

2. Does the Commission feel that there is a real danger of Islamic extremists coming to power in Syria?

3. What action does the Commission intend to take to protect and support the Christian minority in Syria?

Question for written answer E-007370/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD) and Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(23 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Situation of Christians in Syria

The last few months have seen an escalation in brutal violence directed against Syria's Christian communities. More than 9 000 Christians from the town of al-Qusayr were forced to abandon their homes after a local leader of the armed opposition issued them with an ultimatum. According to media reports, an armed group then broke into and desecrated the Greek Catholic Church of Saint Elias. The Vatican is also concerned by the fate of Syria's Christians, who make up more than 10 % of the country's population, and it has released information on the destruction and looting of churches in Um al-Zennar and Bustan al-Diwan (Homs) and the expulsion of more than 10 000 Christian inhabitants from the city of Homs. During a counterattack carried out by government forces, more than 63 Christians were used as human shields by the rebels.

Another cause for concern are the ever more frequent reports of religiously motivated attacks carried out by units of increasingly radicalised Islamic rebels.

1. What steps is the European External Action Service taking to assist Christians in Syria?

2. Has the issue of freedom of religion and respect for Christian religious communities in Syria been raised during meetings with representatives of the Syrian opposition?

3. How does the Vice-President/High Representative assess the increasingly frequent reports concerning the radicalisation of the Islamic opposition and religiously motivated attacks on Christian places of worship and believers themselves?

4. Does the EEAS intend to make the provision of aid for the Syrian opposition conditional upon gaining assurances that Christians and their rights will be protected under a new Syrian Government?

Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(4 September 2012)

The EU shares the Honourable Member's concern over the humanitarian plight of the Syrian population, including the Christian minority.

In its messages both to the regime and the opposition groups, the EU has continuously reiterated its call to uphold the principles of freedom of religion and belief and to refrain from sectarian and ethnic division. In the latest Foreign

Affairs Council of 23 July 2012, the EU again warned against further militarisation of the conflict and sectarian violence, which can only bring further suffering to Syria and risks having a tragic impact on the region. The EU has also repeatedly urged the Syrian opposition to agree on a set of principles for working towards a new Syria where all citizens enjoy equal rights regardless of their affiliations, ethnicities or beliefs.

The EU continues to urge the Syrian regime to end immediately the killing of civilians, withdraw the Syrian army from besieged towns and cities and to allow for a peaceful transition. We remain deeply concerned about the human rights situation and breaches of international humanitarian law in Syria. We continue to support the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on Syria and its investigations into alleged violations of international human rights with a view to holding to account those responsible for such violations. International humanitarian law must be respected by all.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007282/12
aan de Commissie
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(19 juli 2012)

Betreft: Wederzijdse erkenning Europees rijbewijs

In artikel 6, lid 3, van Richtlijn 2006/126/EG betreffende het rijbewijs is bepaald dat de lidstaten voor het verkeer op hun grondgebied de eigenaars van een rijbewijs van categorie B mogen toelaten om te rijden met motorrijwielen van categorie A1. Deze bepaling is echter alleen van toepassing op het eigen grondgebied van de lidstaat en op het rijbewijs wordt niet vermeld dat de houder deze voertuigen mag besturen. Een gelijkaardige bepaling was reeds opgenomen in artikel 5, lid 3, van Richtlijn 91/439/EEG betreffende het rijbewijs.

Voor bestuurders van motorrijwielen van categorie A1 blijft er niettemin onduidelijkheid bestaan over deze specifieke bepaling.

1. Indien zowel land 1 als land 2 een rijbewijs van categorie B gelijkwaardig hebben verklaard voor motorrijwielen van categorie A1, is het dan toegestaan aan een bestuurder met rijbewijs B uitgegeven in land 1 om met een voertuig van categorie A1 te rijden in land 2?

2. Indien dit niet geval is, acht de Commissie dan niet dat dit in strijd is met het beginsel van „wederzijdse erkenning"?

Antwoord van de heer Kallas namens de Commissie
(11 september 2012)

Richtlijn 2006/126/EG betreffende het rijbewijs ([1]) voorziet in een uitzondering op grond waarvan lidstaten kunnen toestaan dat houders van een rijbewijs van categorie B op motorrijwielen van categorie A1 rijden. De wetgever heeft wel uitdrukkelijk bepaald dat de gelijkwaardigheid alleen geldt op het grondgebied van de lidstaat die deze gelijkwaardigheid toepast.

Een lidstaat kan dus een rijbewijs B afgeven en toestaan dat de houder daarvan ook op voertuigen van categorie A1 rijdt; de richtlijn verbiedt deze lidstaat niet om deze gelijkwaardigheid ook te laten gelden voor houders van een rijbewijs B dat is afgegeven in andere lidstaten die dezelfde gelijkwaardigheid toepassen.

Het beginsel van wederzijdse erkenning kan niet worden toegepast op een uitzondering die het Europees Parlement en de Raad hebben beperkt tot het grondgebied van een lidstaat.

([1]) PB L 403 van 30.12.2006, blz. 18.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007282/12
to the Commission
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(19 July 2012)

Subject: Mutual recognition of European driving licences

Article 6(3) of Directive 2006/126/EC on driving licences lays down that, for driving on their territory, Member States may stipulate that category B licences are equivalent to category A1 motorcycle licences. However, this clause applies only within the Member State's own territory, and it is not stated on the driving licence that the holder is permitted to ride such motorcycles. A similar provision was already contained in Article 5(3) of Directive 91/439/EEC on driving licences.

This specific provision nonetheless continues to give rise to uncertainties for riders of category A1 motorcycles.

1. If both country 1 and country 2 have declared a category B licence equivalent for category A1 motorcycles, is a rider with licence B issued in country 1 then permitted to ride a category A1 motorcycle in country 2?

2. If not, does this not breach the principle of 'mutual recognition'?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(11 September 2012)

Under Directive 2006/126/EC on driving licences ([1]) an exception is provided to allow Member States to introduce a rule whereby holders of a B driving licence are allowed to ride A1 motorcycles. The legislator, however, has explicitly stipulated that the equivalence is only valid in the territory of a Member State that applies this equivalence.

Nevertheless, the directive does not prohibit a Member State which allows the holder of a category B licence it has issued to ride an A1 vehicle on its territory to extend the benefit of such equivalence to holders of a B licence issued by other Member States which apply a similar equivalence.

The 'mutual recognition' principle cannot apply to such derogation that the European Parliament and the Council have limited exclusively to the territory of a Member State.

([1]) OJ L 403, 30.12.2006, p. 18.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007283/12
a la Comisión
Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE)
(19 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Análisis de impacto del Acuerdo con Mauritania respecto a la actividad económica en Canarias

Entre el 24 y el 26 de julio se celebrará la séptima y puede que última ronda de negociaciones con Mauritania. Las condiciones técnicas que se están negociando, y en concreto la obligación de repostaje y desembarques en puertos mauritanos, serían catastróficas para la economía de Canarias, que es, además, una región ultra-periférica que requiere un tratamiento especial otorgado por el Tratado en virtud de su artículo 349, justificado por sus condiciones particulares de lejanía, insularidad y dependencia económica de determinados productos.

Los puertos canarios han desempeñado un papel clave en el tráfico de pesca, especialmente por las importaciones de los caladeros africanos, y en especial de Mauritania. En términos económicos se trata de una actividad que genera ingresos por un valor de 40 millones de euros anuales en los puertos canarios y da empleo a 2 750 trabajadores relacionados directamente con el sector y a 20 000 en la estiba, que se perderían íntegramente con los términos actuales del Acuerdo y serían muy difícil de reinsertar en el mercado laboral por su alto grado de especialización. El valor de las exportaciones de pesca para Canarias en el último ejercicio (2011) se situó en 115,3 millones de euros, a los que hay que sumar los envíos al resto del territorio español.

En una reunión de empresarios canarios con la Comisaria Damanaki, ésta transmitió su intención de tener en cuenta las preocupaciones de Canarias, así como de evaluar el impacto del Acuerdo pesquero para dicha región.

1. ¿Hasta qué punto ha considerado la Comisión, en el proceso de negociación del Acuerdo de pesca con Mauritania, el impacto económico sobre la actividad en las islas en caso de aprobación de las condiciones técnicas hasta ahora acordadas?

2. ¿Cómo tiene previsto, en su caso, paliar el impacto del establecimiento de dichas condiciones técnicas (por ejemplo, permitir un porcentaje de los desembarques en puertos canarios)?

Respuesta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(27 de septiembre de 2012)

La Comisión Europea es consciente de la importancia que el Acuerdo de asociación en el sector pesquero con Mauritania reviste para la Comunidad Autónoma de las Islas Canarias.

La Comisión Europea ha negociado un Protocolo atendiendo al excedente disponible y al derecho de Mauritania, de conformidad con la Convención de las Naciones Unidas sobre el Derecho del Mar, a determinar la magnitud de las posibilidades de pesca excedentarias a disposición de socios extranjeros.

En lo que respecta a las condiciones técnicas del nuevo Protocolo, cabe subrayar que, con independencia de los desembarques obligatorios que se realicen en el puerto mauritano de Nouadhibou, no existen en ese puerto instalaciones de transformación. Dicho de otro modo, incluso si se desembarcan en Mauritania capturas de especies demersales, es de prever que dichas capturas se embarquen nuevamente y se expidan, bien directamente por avión, bien mediante transporte por carretera, a su destino final, o se lleven a Las Palmas para su ulterior transformación. Por otra parte, por lo que se refiere al sector de la gamba, no habrá obligación de efectuar desembarques en agosto ni septiembre (en virtud de la excepción concedida por Mauritania durante los meses más cálidos), ni tampoco durante la última marea, al abandonar la zona económica exclusiva (ZEE) de Mauritania.

El transbordo obligatorio de las capturas de especies pelágicas (salvedad hecha de la última marea de los buques) está exclusivamente motivado por consideraciones de control. Al igual que en el caso de la pesca demersal, no existen instalaciones de transformación para las capturas de la flota pelágica en Mauritania.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007283/12
to the Commission
Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE)
(19 July 2012)

Subject: Analysis of the impact the Agreement with Mauritania will have on economic activity in the Canary Islands

The seventh and possibly last round of negotiations with Mauritania will be held on 24 to 26 July 2012. The technical conditions being negotiated, and specifically the requirement to refuel and offload in Mauritanian ports, will be catastrophic for the economy of the Canary Islands. The Canary Islands form, moreover, an outermost region entitled to special treatment under Article 349 of the Treaty on account of their special characteristics of remoteness, insularity and economic dependence on a few specific products.

The Canary Islands' ports have played a key role in the fisheries trade, especially for imports from African fishing grounds and from Mauritania in particular. In economic terms, fishing is worth EUR 40 million per year in income to ports in the Canary Islands. It provides jobs directly connected to the fisheries sector for 2 750 people, with another 20 000 employed as stevedores. All these jobs would be lost under the current terms of the Agreement and it would be very difficult to find new jobs for these people due to their high level of specialisation. Fisheries exports in the last financial year (2011) were worth EUR 115.3 million to the Canary Islands, to which should be added the value of shipments to the rest of Spain.

In a meeting with businessmen and women from the Canary Islands, Commissioner Damanaki said that she would take the Canary Islands' concerns into account and would assess the impact the Fisheries Agreement would have on the region.

1. To what extent has the Commission taken into account in its negotiations on the Fisheries Agreement with Mauritania the economic impact the technical conditions as they stand at present will have on work in the islands?

2. How does the Commission plan to alleviate the impact these technical conditions will have should they come into force (by, for example, allowing a percentage of the catches to be offloaded in Canary Island ports)?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(27 September 2012)

The European Commission is well aware of the importance of the Fisheries Partnership Agreement with Mauritania for the Canary Islands region.

The European Commission has negotiated a Protocol taking into account the available surplus and the right of Mauritania, in line with United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, to determine the amount of its surplus of fishing opportunities which is available to foreign partners.

Concerning the technical conditions of the new Protocol, it has to be underlined that regardless of the mandatory landings in the Mauritanian port of Nouadhibou, there are no processing facilities on the spot. In other words, even if demersal catches are landed in Mauritania, it can be expected that they will be re-loaded and shipped either directly by plane or by lorry to the final destination or brought to Las Palmas for further processing. On top of that, the shrimp industry will not have to land in August and September (by way of derogation granted by Mauritania for the hottest months) as well as during the last trip, when leaving the Mauritanian Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ).

Mandatory transhipments (with the derogation granted to the last trip) of the pelagic catches are motivated solely by concerns of control. As in the case of demersal fishery, there are no processing facilities for the pelagic fleet in Mauritania.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007284/12
a la Comisión
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(19 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Extorsión a empresarios europeos en Marruecos

En las últimas semanas he recibido varias comunicaciones de empresarios españoles que muestran una grave preocupación por la escalada de agresiones y problemas que vienen sufriendo algunas empresas europeas radicadas en Marruecos por parte de las autoridades de aquel país. Los últimos problemas han afectado especialmente a firmas relacionadas con la transformación del pescado y la construcción. La preocupación es tal que se ha constituido una asociación de empresas afectadas por la extorsión en Marruecos (AAEM) que ha desplegado ya varias actividades y solicitado entrevistas con las autoridades españolas para denunciar su situación.

A la vista de los datos expuestos,

1. ¿Tiene constancia la Comisión de la existencia de problemas de extorsión pública y/o privada de la que son víctimas empresas europeas radicadas en Marruecos?

2. ¿Conoce la Comisión la existencia de asociaciones de empresarios constituidas expresamente para hacer frente a esta problemática y, en caso afirmativo, considera de interés intercambiar información con ellas?

3. ¿Considera las prácticas que denuncian estos empresarios compatibles con el estatus especial que vincula el reino de Marruecos a la Unión Europea?

Respuesta del Comisario Füle en nombre de la Comisión
(25 de octubre de 2012)

La Comisión está al corriente de algunos casos de extorsión entre particulares en Marruecos, pero desconoce que se hayan producido casos en los que estén implicadas las autoridades públicas. La Comisión y el EEAS (Servicio Europeo de Acción Exterior) siguen estos acontecimientos muy de cerca, (como también lo hace, en particular, la Delegación de la UE en Rabat), siempre dispuestos a atender los problemas específicos a los que se enfrenta la comunidad empresarial europea en terceros países, incluido Marruecos.

Las relaciones UE-Marruecos se rigen por el Acuerdo de Asociación que entró en vigor en marzo de 2000 y por el Plan de Acción de 2005, que establece un conjunto global de prioridades, así como por el Documento Conjunto del año 2008 sobre un estatuto avanzado. En este contexto, la UE se compromete a mejorar aún más el clima empresarial en el propio Marruecos y en las relaciones con los operadores económicos europeos y a luchar contra posibles conductas indebidas por parte de particulares en su actividad empresarial. Asuntos como los presentados por Su Señoría también pueden plantearse a Marruecos en los órganos creados por el Acuerdo de Asociación. Se insta a los Estados miembros a que aporten pruebas a la Comisión.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007284/12
to the Commission
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(19 July 2012)

Subject: Extortion of European business people in Morocco

In recent weeks I have been contacted on several occasions by Spanish business people who have expressed serious concern at the increasingly aggressive behaviour of the Moroccan authorities towards some European companies based in Morocco. Companies in the fish processing and construction sectors are the latest to have been targeted. Concern is such that an association of businesses suffering extortion in Morocco (AAEM) has been set up. It has already begun to take action and has requested talks with the Spanish authorities.

1. Is the Commission aware of the attempts by authorities and/or private individuals to extort money from European companies based in Morocco?

2. Is it aware that associations of business people have been set up specifically to address these problems? If so, would it consider holding talks with them?

3. Does it consider the practices denounced by these business people to be in keeping with the special status afforded to the Kingdom of Morocco by the European Union?

Answer given by Commissioner Füle on behalf of the Commission
(25 October 2012)

The Commission is aware of some cases of extortion among private individuals in Morocco but not of such cases related to public authorities. This is closely followed by the Commission and the EEAS, in particular the EU Delegation in Rabat, who are always willing to listen to specific problems the European business community is facing in third countries including in Morocco.

EU-Morocco relations are governed by the Association Agreement that entered into force in March 2000, the 2005 Action Plan which sets out a comprehensive set of priorites as well as the 2008 Joint Document on the advanced status. In this context, the EU is committed to further improve the business climate in Morocco itself and in relations with European economic operators and to fight against possible misconduct of individuals when doing business. Issues such as those raised by the Honourable Member can also be raised with Morocco in the framework of the bodies set up by the Association Agreement. Member States are encouraged to bring forward evidence to the Commission.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007285/12
an die Kommission
Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)
(19. Juli 2012)

Betrifft: Bürgeranfrage: Umsetzung von Rahmenbeschluss 2005/214/JI in Italien

Diese Anfrage wird auf Wunsch über das lokale Bürgerbüro Martin Ehrenhausers in Wien im Namen eines Wählers eingebracht.

1. Hat Italien den Rahmenbeschluss 2005/214/JI über die Anwendung des Grundsatzes der gegenseitigen Anerkennung von Geldstrafen und Geldbußen bereits in nationales Recht umgesetzt? Wenn nicht, warum nicht?

2. Können österreichische Behörden italienische Geldstrafen oder Geldbußen ohne die nationale Umsetzung in italienisches Recht vollstrecken?

3. Falls Italien den Rahmenbeschluss 2005/214/JI noch immer nicht umgesetzt hat — kann rückwirkend vollstreckt werden? Wenn ja, bis zu welchem Stichtag?

4. Ist der Kommission bekannt, ob italienische Behörden Daten von italienischen Verkehrssündern an die österreichischen Behörden bekannt geben und anschließend auch eine Vollstreckung vornehmen?

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 um eine Beantwortung der einzelnen Fragen unter Angabe der jeweiligen Nummerierung.

Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(6. September 2012)

1. Nach den neuesten Informationen hat Italien den Rahmenbeschluss 2005/214/JI noch nicht umgesetzt ([1]). Gemäß dem geltenden Vertrag und bis zum Ablauf der Umsetzungsfrist, die 2014 endet, hat die Kommission keinerlei Befugnis, gegen Mitgliedstaaten ein Vertragsverletzungsverfahren wegen Nicht-Umsetzung eines EU-Rechtsaktes in einem Bereich einzuleiten, der vormals dem sogenannten dritten Pfeiler zugeordnet war. Der Kommission ist nicht bekannt, aus welchen Gründen Italien dieses EU-Instrument nicht umgesetzt hat.

2. Der Rahmenbeschluss 2005/214/JI verlangt keine Gegenseitigkeit. In anderen Worten, als Vollstreckungsstaat ist Österreich, das den Rahmenbeschluss am 1. Juli 2007 umgesetzt hat, ab diesem Zeitpunkt verpflichtet, die von einem anderen Mitgliedstaat verhängte Geldstrafe und Geldbuße zu vollstrecken, selbst wenn Letzterer das Rechtsinstrument noch nicht umgesetzt hat, sofern keine Gründe für die Versagung der Anerkennung oder der Vollstreckung (Artikel 7) geltend gemacht werden.

3. Siehe Antwort auf Frage 2.

4. Der Kommission liegen keine diesbezüglichen Informationen vor.

([1]) Siehe öffentliches Dokumentenregister des Rates: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/documents/access-to-council-documents-public-register; Dokumentennummer 9015/12.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007285/12
to the Commission
Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)
(19 July 2012)

Subject: Citizen's question: transposition of Framework Decision 2005/214/JHA in Italy

I have been asked to table this question on behalf of one of my constituents who approached me via my local MEP's surgery in Vienna:

1. Has Italy yet transposed Council Framework Decision 2005/214/JHA on the application of the principle of mutual recognition to financial penalties into national law? If not, why not?

2. May Austrian authorities execute Italian financial penalties if the decision has not been transposed into Italian law?

3. If Italy has still not yet transposed Framework Decision 2005/214/JHA, is it possible for execution to take place retroactively? If so, what is the cut-off date?

4. Does the Commission know whether the Italian authorities transmit to the Austrian authorities data concerning Italian traffic offenders in Austria and subsequently execute the penalties imposed?

To reduce administrative burdens, these questions have been combined into a single question and the individual questions each given a number. The questioner has requested that the answers to each question be numbered accordingly.

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(6 September 2012)

1. According to the latest information provided, Italy has not transposed the framework Decision 2005/214/JHA ([1]). Under the present Treaty and until the end of the transition period expiring end of 2014, the Commission has no powers to launch infringement procedures against Member States for non-transposition of EC law adopted in matters covered by the former so-called '3rd pillar'. The Commission is not aware of the reasons for which Italy has not implemented this EU instrument.

2. The framework Decision 2005/214/JHA does not require reciprocity, in other words, Austria, as executing Member State, which implemented the framework Decision on 1 July 2007 is, after that date, bound to enforce the penalty issued by any Member State, even if the latter has not yet transposed the instrument, unless any ground of non-recognition or non-execution (Article 7) is invoked.

3. Not applicable, see answer to Q2.

4. The Commission does not possess this information.

([1]) See Council Public register http://www.consilium.europa.eu/documents/access-to-council-documents-public-register, document number 9015/12.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007286/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(19. Juli 2012)

Betrifft: Integration der Roma in Österreich

In einer Mitteilung vom 21. Mail 2012 forderte die Kommission die Mitgliedstaaten auf, ihre nationalen Strategien zur Verbesserung der wirtschaftlichen und gesellschaftlichen Integration der zehn bis zwölf Millionen Roma in Europa umzusetzen. Die meisten Mitgliedstaaten haben spezifische Maßnahmen vorgelegt, mit denen die vereinbarten Ziele erreicht werden sollen, und einige dieser Maßnahmen gelten als Beispiele bewährter Verfahren.

1. Wie kann die Kommission eine enge Zusammenarbeit mit den nationalen Regierungen und zwischen den Regierungen der Mitgliedstaaten sicherstellen, um deren politische Strategien zu verbessern und wirksamer zu machen? Wie kann dies mit der österreichischen Regierung umgesetzt werden?

2. Die Integration der Roma ist für die Regierungen kein einfaches Thema. Wie kann die Kommission sie unterstützen?

3. Was kann die Kommission tun, um Diskriminierung aus Gründen der ethnischen Herkunft in Europa zu verringern?

4. Hat die Kommission bereits „Roma-Vermittler" geschult?

Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(22. August 2012)

Die Kommission unterstützt die Mitgliedstaaten bei der Umsetzung ihrer nationalen Strategien zur Integration der Roma, wie im Abschnitt „Zukunftsaussichten" der Mitteilung aus dem Jahre 2012 ([1]) erläutert. So wird ein Netz der nationalen Kontaktstellen aller EU-Mitgliedstaaten eingerichtet, damit diese einander über die Ergebnisse ihrer Maßnahmen informieren und die Umsetzung ihrer Strategien gegenseitig prüfen können. Gleichzeitig werden detaillierte Ergebnisse, die sich aus der Bewertung der nationalen Strategien durch die Kommission ergeben, im bilateralen Rahmen mit den Mitgliedstaaten ausgetauscht, so dass den Schlussfolgerungen Rechnung getragen werden kann. Außerdem hat die Kommission bei den länderspezifischen Empfehlungen für jene Länder, in denen die Roma eine bedeutende Minderheit bilden, besonderes Augenmerk auf die Integration dieser Gruppe gelegt. 2013 wird die Kommission über die erzielten Fortschritte Bericht erstatten.

Zur Bekämpfung der Diskriminierung aufgrund der ethnischen Herkunft stehen sowohl rechtliche als auch politische Instrumente zur Verfügung. Die Richtlinie 2000/43/EG ([2]) zur Anwendung des Gleichbehandlungsgrundsatzes ohne Unterschied der Rasse oder der ethnischen Herkunft verbietet in mehreren Bereichen die Diskriminierung aus Gründen der Rasse oder der ethnischen Herkunft. Die Kommission überwacht, ob in allen Mitgliedstaaten eine korrekte Umsetzung erfolgt, und wird 2013 darüber Bericht erstatten. Was insbesondere die Belange der Roma angeht, so hat die Kommission die Mitgliedstaaten aufgefordert, Diskriminierung entschlossen zu bekämpfen und sicherzustellen, dass die Bestimmungen zum Verbot von Diskriminierung in ihrem Gebiet wirkungsvoll durchgesetzt werden.

In den Jahren 2011 und 2012 haben die Kommission und der Europarat gemeinsam ein Trainingsprogramm für Roma-Mediatoren im Bildungs-, Kultur- und Gesundheitswesen (ROMED-Programm) finanziert und verwaltet. Das Ziel des Programms besteht darin, tausend Roma-Mediatoren hauptsächlich in Mitgliedstaaten mit einem hohen Roma-Bevölkerungsanteil auszubilden. Ein zweites Mediatorenprogramm mit ähnlicher Finanzausstattung und Zielsetzung ist für 2013/2014 geplant.

([1]) KOM(2012)226.
([2]) Richtlinie 2000/43/EG des Rates vom 29. Juni 2000 zur Anwendung des Gleichbehandlungsgrundsatzes ohne Unterschied der Rasse oder der ethnischen Herkunft, ABl. L 180 vom 19.7.2000, S. 22.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007286/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(19 July 2012)

Subject: Roma integration in Austria

In a communication of 21 May 2012, the Commission called upon Member States to implement their national strategies to improve the economic and social integration of Europe's 10 to 12 million Roma citizens. Most Member States have presented specific measures for achieving the agreed goals and some of these measures are held up as best practice examples.

1. How can the Commission work closely with national governments and between Member State governments to improve their policies to make them more effective? How can it be done with the Austrian Government?

2. Roma integration is not an easy issue for governments to tackle. How can the Commission provide its support?

3. How can the Commission reduce discrimination on grounds of ethnic origin in Europe?

4. Has the Commission to date trained Roma mediators?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(22 August 2012)

The Commission supports the Member States in the implementation of their national Roma integration strategies (NRISs) as indicated by the 'way forward' in its communication of 2012 ([1]). A network of the national Roma contact points of all EU Member States has been set up to exchange the results of their measures and to peer-review the implementation of their strategies. In parallel, the detailed findings from the Commission's assessment of the NRISs will be shared bilaterally with the Member States aiming at taking its recommendations into account. Moreover, the Commission paid special attention to the Roma integration in the Country Specific Recommendations for those countries where the size of this minority group is significant. The Commission will report on progress in 2013.

There are both legal and political tools to combat discrimination based on ethnic origin. Directive 2000/43/EC ([2]) on Racial Equality prohibits discrimination on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin in a number of areas. The Commission monitors its correct implementation in all the Member States and will report on its application in 2013. Concerning specifically the Roma, the Commission has invited Member States to fight discrimination convincingly, including by ensuring that anti-discrimination legislation is effectively enforced in their territories.

In 2011-2012 the Commission and the Council of Europe jointly funded and managed an action for training of Roma mediators in education, culture and health (ROMED Programme). The objective has been to train 1 000 Roma mediators mainly in Member States with a high Roma population. A second mediation programme with similar budget and objectives is envisaged for 2013-2014.

([1]) COM(2012) 226.
([2]) Council Directive 2000/43/EC of 29 June 2000 implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin, OJ L 180, 19.7.2000, p. 22.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007310/12
à la Commission (Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante)
Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE), Nicole Kiil-Nielsen (Verts/ALE) et Malika Benarab-Attou (Verts/ALE)
(19 juillet 2012)

Objet: VP/HR — Question complémentaire dans le prolongement de la réponse à la question écrite E-002248/2012

Dans le prolongement de sa réponse à la question écrite E-002248/2012, la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante pourrait-elle répondre aux questions suivantes?

1. Quelle analyse fait-elle de la pratique de la détention administrative (c'est-à-dire sans procès ou mise en accusation officielle) sur une période supérieure à une année alors qu'aucune information relative aux motifs de détention n'est communiquée au détenu ou à son avocat(e).

2. Au paragraphe 11 de sa résolution du 5 juillet 2012 ([1]), le Parlement a demandé "[…] la fin de la détention administrative sans mise en accusation officielle ni procès, pratiquée par les autorités israéliennes contre les Palestiniens […]". Quelle analyse la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante fait-elle quant à la portée de ce paragraphe précis de la résolution susmentionnée, notamment à la lumière de l'article 36 du traité sur l'Union européenne?

3. Le 6 juin 2012, Amnesty International a publié un rapport intitulé «En mal de justice: Des Palestiniens détenus sans jugement par Israël» ([2]) La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante pourrait-elle faire part de son analyse concernant les conclusions de ce rapport, en particulier les chapitres 4 et 5 de celui-ci?

4. La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante pourrait-elle répondre de manière précise à la recommandation contenue dans ce rapport, adressée à la communauté internationale, appelant à «faire pression sur les autorités israéliennes afin qu'elles mettent fin à la pratique de la détention administrative»?

5. La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante pense-t-elle que tous les cas de détention administrative en Israël sont conformes au droit international humanitaire? Dans la négative, pourrait-elle alors expliquer pourquoi elle n'a pas condamné un seul cas de détention administrative de la part des autorités israéliennes, notamment les cas avérés mentionnés dans le rapport d'Amnesty International ci-dessus?

À la lumière de l'article 230 du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne, la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante est priée de considérer séparément chacune des questions ci-dessus et d'y répondre de la même manière.

Réponse donnée par la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante Ashton au nom de la Commission
(4 septembre 2012)

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante prend note de la résolution du Parlement européen du 5 juillet 2012, en particulier de sa demande de fin de la détention administrative sans mise en accusation officielle ni procès. La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante partage les préoccupations exprimées à l'égard de ces formes de détention.

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante a exprimé son inquiétude concernant le recours excessif par Israël à la détention administrative à de nombreuses reprises récemment, y compris dans ses réponses aux questions parlementaires. La détention administrative devrait demeurer une mesure exceptionnelle. Conformément au droit humanitaire international, chaque détenu devrait être informé des raisons de sa détention et avoir accès à un mécanisme de contrôle dûment approuvé, quels que soient les fondements judiciaires de la détention administrative.

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante et ses services ont systématiquement soulevé la question de la détention administrative avec Israël dans le cadre des relations bilatérales avec l'UE, afin de faire part de leurs préoccupations concernant les pratiques israéliennes.

([1]) Textes adoptés de cette date, P7_TA(2012)0298.
([2]) http://www.amnesty.org/en/news/israel-injustice-and-secrecy-surrounding-administrative-detention-2012-06-01.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007310/12
aan de Commissie (Vicevoorzitter — Hoge Vertegenwoordiger)
Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE), Nicole Kiil-Nielsen (Verts/ALE) en Malika Benarab-Attou (Verts/ALE)
(19 juli 2012)

Betreft: VP/HR — Vervolgvraag n.a.v. het antwoord op vraag E-002248/2012

Ten vervolge op het antwoord van de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger op schriftelijke vraag E-002248/2012 verzoek ik de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger de volgende vragen te beantwoorden:

1. Wat vindt zij van een administratieve detentie (d.w.z. zonder proces of formele aanklacht) die meer dan een jaar duurt en waarbij de gedetineerde of zijn advocaat geen informatie krijgt over de redenen voor de detentie?

2. In paragraaf 11 van zijn resolutie van 5 juli 2012 ([1]) vroeg het Parlement „dat een einde wordt gemaakt aan de praktijk van administratieve hechtenis, waarbij Palestijnen zonder formele beschuldiging of proces worden vastgehouden door de Israëlische autoriteiten […]". Welk belang hecht de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger aan deze paragraaf in bovengenoemde resolutie, met name in het licht van artikel 36 van het Verdrag betreffende de Europese Unie?

3. Op 6 juni 2012 publiceerde Amnesty International het verslag „Starved of Justice: Palestinians detained without trial by Israel" ([2]). Wat vindt de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger van de conclusies van dit verslag, in het bijzonder de hoofdstukken 4 en 5?

4. Kan de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger specifiek antwoorden op de in dit verslag geformuleerde aanbeveling aan de internationale gemeenschap om „pressie uit te oefenen de Israëlische autoriteiten om de praktijk van administratieve detentie te beëindigen"?

5. Is de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger van mening dat alle gevallen van administratieve detentie in Israël in overeenstemming zijn met het internationaal humanitair recht? Zo niet, kan zij uitleggen waarom zij geen enkel geval van administratieve detentie door de Israëlische autoriteiten heeft veroordeeld, ook niet de gedocumenteerde gevallen die in bovengenoemd verslag van Amnesty International worden vermeld?

In het licht van artikel 230 van het Verdrag betreffende de werking van de Europese Unie wordt de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger verzocht elk van bovenstaande vragen afzonderlijk te beantwoorden.

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(4 september 2012)

De hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter (hv/vv) neemt nota van de resolutie van het Europees Parlement van 5 juli 2012, en in het bijzonder van de oproep om een einde te maken aan de praktijk van administratieve detentie zonder formele beschuldiging of proces. De hv/vv deelt de ongerustheid over dergelijke vormen van detentie.

Recent heeft de hv/vv verschillende keren, onder meer in haar antwoorden op parlementaire vragen, haar bezorgdheid geuit over het buitensporige gebruik van administratieve detentie door Israël. Administratieve detentie moet een uitzonderingsmaatregel blijven. Conform het geldende internationaal humanitair recht moeten alle gedetineerden in kennis worden gesteld van de redenen voor hun detentie en toegang hebben tot een naar behoren bekrachtigde herzieningsprocedure, ongeacht de rechtsgrondslag waarop de administratieve detentie is gebaseerd.

De hv/vv en haar diensten hebben de kwestie van de administratieve detentie in het kader van de bilaterale betrekkingen van de EU systematisch bij Israël ter sprake gebracht en zo hun bezorgdheid over de Israëlische praktijken uitgedrukt.

([1]) P7_TA(2012)0298.
([2]) http://www.amnesty.org/en/news/israel-injustice-and-secrecy-surrounding-administrative-detention-2012-06-01.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007310/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE), Nicole Kiil-Nielsen (Verts/ALE) and Malika Benarab-Attou (Verts/ALE)
(19 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Follow-up to reply to Written Question E-002248/2012

As a follow-up question to the reply from the Vice-President/High Representative to Written Question E-002248/2012, could the VP/HR please answer the following questions?

1. What is her assessment of the practice of administrative detention (i.e. without trial or formal charge) exceeding a period of one year where no information is shared with the detainee or his or her lawyer as regards the grounds for detention?

2. In paragraph 11 of its resolution of 5 July 2012 ([1]), Parliament called for '(…) an end to the administrative detention without formal charge or trial of Palestinians by Israeli authorities (…)'. Could the VP/HR indicate her assessment of the significance of this specific paragraph in the aforementioned resolution, especially in the light of Article 36 of the Treaty on European Union?

3. On 6 June 2012 Amnesty International published a report entitled 'Starved of Justice: Palestinians detained without trial by Israel' ([2]). Could the VP/HR give her assessment of the findings of this report, in particular Chapters 4 and 5 thereof?

4. Could the VP/HR respond specifically to the recommendation in this report, addressed to the international community, to 'pressure the Israeli authorities to end the practice of administrative detention'?

5. Could the VP/HR say whether she believes that all cases of administrative detention in Israel are in line with international humanitarian law? If not, could she then explain why she has not condemned any cases of administrative detention by the Israeli authorities, including the documented cases referred to in the aforementioned Amnesty International report?

In the light of Article 230 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the VP/HR is asked to regard each of the above questions as separate, and to answer them as such.

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

The HR/VP takes note of the European Parliament resolution of 5 July 2012, in particular its call for an end to administrative detention without formal charge or trial. The HR/VP shares the concerns expressed with regard to such forms of detention.

The HR/VP has expressed her concern at the excessive recourse by Israel to administrative detention on a number of recent occasions, including in her replies to Parliamentary Questions. Administrative detention should remain an exceptional measure. In line with applicable International Humanitarian Law, all detainees should be informed of the reasons for their detention and have access to a properly sanctioned review mechanism, regardless of the legal grounds on which administrative detention is based.

The HR/VP and her Services have systematically raised the question of administrative detention with Israel in the framework of the EU's bi-lateral relations to express concern at Israeli practices.

([1]) P7_TA(2012)0298.
([2]) http://www.amnesty.org/en/news/israel-injustice-and-secrecy-surrounding-administrative-detention-2012-06-01

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007312/12
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(19 July 2012)

Subject: Anti-tobacco measures in cars

Tobacco use is one of the main risk factors for a number of chronic diseases, including cancer, lung diseases and cardiovascular diseases. According to the World Health Organisation (WHO), tobacco kills nearly six million people each year, more than 5 million of whom are users and ex-users and more than 600 000 of whom are non-smokers exposed to second-hand smoke. The WHO predicts that unless urgent action is taken, the annual death toll could rise to more than eight million by 2030.

1. What measures has the Commission taken to educate and make European citizens aware of the risks and effects of tobacco use?

2. Currently in Ireland there is an initiative to ban smoking in cars that are transporting children under the age of 16. The initiative suggests that this could be achieved by car manufactures placing an anti-smoking device in their cars. Would the Commission support such an initiative?

3. Can the Commission clarify whether it has plans to introduce a similar Europe-wide initiative?

4. According to the WHO, tobacco caused 100 million deaths in the 20th century. It predicts that if the current trends continue, it will cause up to one billion deaths in the 21st century. Does the Commission plan to make funding available for research and development of projects that promote the prevention of tobacco-related deaths and illnesses?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(5 September 2012)

The Commission is engaged in EU-wide awareness raising campaigns ([1]) to draw citizens' attention to the dangers of tobacco use, and to encourage smokers to quit.

The Council Recommendation on smoke-free environments from 2009 ([2]) calls on Member States to fully protect their citizens from exposure to tobacco smoke by the end of 2012, with a particular emphasis on the dangers of second-hand tobacco smoke for children. The implementation of this recommendation falls under the exclusive responsibility of Member States. The Commission supports its full implementation, *inter alia* through a network of national focal points on tobacco control, and will report on Member States' progress in this regard.

At this stage there are no concrete plans to introduce technical means in cars that detect smoking activities in cars that transport children.

Innovative projects promoting health development in the area of tobacco control can receive EU funding from the Health Programme, and the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7) ([3]). Research related to tobacco and smoking funded under FP7 tackle the wider determinants of smoking and understanding of the effects of lifestyles, including smoking, on diseases. Examples of projects include SILNE ([4]), DEMETRIQ ([5]), CHANCES ([6]) and PPACTE ([7]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/tobacco/ex_smokers_are_unstoppable/index_en.htm
([2]) Council Recommendation of 30 November 2009 on smoke-free enviroments (OJ C 296, 5.12.2009, p. 4.).
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/fp7/index_en.cfm.
([4]) SILNE — Developing methodologies to reduce inequalities in the determinants of health (01/2012-12/2014) http://www.ensp.org/node/738.
([5]) DEMETRIQ — Developing methodologies to reduce inequalities in the determinants of health (01/2012-12/2014) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/102459_en.html.
([6]) CHANCES — Consortium on Health and Ageing Network of Cohorts in Europe and the United States (02/2010-01/2015) http://www.chancesfp7.eu/index.html.
([7]) PPACTE — Pricing Policies and Control of Tobacco in Europe (02/2009-04/2013) http://www.ppacte.eu/.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-007313/12
komissiolle
Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE)
(19. heinäkuuta 2012)

Aihe: Eläinten suojelusta kuljetusten aikana annetun neuvoston asetuksen (EY) N:o 1/2005 tarkistaminen

Kaksi aikaisempaa eläinten hyvinvoinnista vastannutta komissaaria Markos Kyprianou ja Androulla Vassiliou ovat tunnustaneet selkeästi, että voimassa olevia eläinten kuljetusta koskevia säännöksiä on tarkistettava erityisesti kuljetusaikojen ja vähimmäistilojen osalta.

Komisaari Kyprianou ilmoitti, että ”eläinkuljetusten keston suhteen komissio aikoo ehdottaa neuvostolle ja parlamentille kuljetusdirektiivin tarkistamista (…) parhaiden saatavilla olevien tieteellisten todisteiden perusteella”. ([1]) Komissaari Vassiliou mainitsi ”mahdollisuuden aikaistaa (…) eläinten suojelusta kuljetusten aikana annetun asetuksen tarkistamista koskevaa ehdotusta (…). Viimeksi mainittu koskee kuljetusaikoja ja vähimmäistiloja eläinten kuljetuksen yhteydessä.” ([2])

1. Minkä uuden tiedon perustella nykyinen eläinten hyvinvoinnista vastaava komissaari John Dalli katsoo – toisin kuin kaksi aikaisempaa komissaaria – että nyttemmin ei ole mitään tarvetta tarkistaa asetusta (EY) N:o 1/2005?

2. Miten komissio voi tyytyä ehdottamaan ”hyvän käytännön ohjeistoja” sen sijaan, että lainsäädäntöä muutetaan siten, että se vastaa uutta tieteellistä näyttöä – ottaen huomioon, että hyvän käytännön ohjeistot eivät ole oikeudellisesti sitovia, minkä vuoksi niiden täytäntöönpanon valvonta ei ole mahdollista.

3. Kokemukset ovat osoittaneet vuosien aikana, että voimassa olevien säädösten täytäntöönpano ei sellaisenaan ole johtanut tyydyttäviin tuloksiin. Kaksi aikaisempaa komissaaria ovat tunnustaneet mainitun tosiasian. Minkä perustella komissio nyttemmin katsoo, että pitkäaikaiset ongelmat voidaan ratkaista yksinomaan täytäntöönpanon valvonnalla parlamentin ja yli miljoonan EU:n kansalaisen pyytämää kahdeksan tunnin enimmäiskuljetusaikaa käyttöön ottamatta?

John Dallin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(18. syyskuuta 2012)

Komissio laati vuonna 2011 kertomuksen ([3]) eläinten suojelusta kuljetuksen aikana annetun asetuksen (EY) N:o 1/2005 ([4]) vaikutuksista kyseisen asetuksen 32 artiklan mukaisesti. Kertomuksessa otettiin huomioon sekä saatavilla ollut tieteellinen näyttö ([5]) että eläinkuljetuksia koskevan asetuksen sosiaalis-taloudelliset vaikutukset. ([6])

Kertomuksessa myönnettiin, että eläinten hyvinvointia kuljetuksen aikana tulisi kehittää, ja täytäntöönpanon valvontaa pidettiin keskeisenä asiana. Tämän tuloksena komissio päätyi siihen, että täytäntöönpanon valvonta olisi asetettava etusijalle, eikä pitänyt järkevänä rajoittavampien sääntöjen ehdottamista, jos jo vuosia voimassa olleitakaan ei noudateta riittävästi. Komissio tulee näin ollen keskittymään EU:n jäsenvaltioiden kanssa käytännön välineiden kehittämiseen parantaakseen täytäntöönpanon valvontaa. Kysymyksessä esiin otettu ohjeasiakirja on yksi komission kertomuksessa luetelluista tätä varten tarkoitetuista toimista.

([1]) Yhteinen vastaus kirjallisiin kysymyksiin E-6503/07, E-6608/07 ja E-6535/07.
([2]) Vastaus kirjalliseen kysymykseen E-2067/2008.
([3]) KOM(2011) 700 lopullinen.
([4]) EUVL L 3, 5.1.2005, s.1.
([5]) Eläinten terveyttä ja hyvinvointia käsittelevä Euroopan elintarviketurvallisuusviranomaisen lautakunta (AHAW): Tieteellinen lausunto eläinten hyvinvoinnista kuljetuksen aikana. EFSA Journal 2011;9(1):1966. [125 s.] doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2011.1966.
([6]) Kertomuksen yksityiskohtia sekä taustatietoja on saatavilla: http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/financing/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007313/12
to the Commission
Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE)
(19 July 2012)

Subject: Revision of Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport

The previous two Commissioners responsible for animal welfare, Markos Kyprianou and Androulla Vassiliou, clearly acknowledged the need for a revision of the existing rules on animal transport, in particular as regards transport times and space allowances.

Commissioner Kyprianou said that: 'In relation to the duration of animal transport, the Commission envisages to propose a revision of the Transport Regulation to the Council and Parliament (…) on travelling times and space allowances for the different species, to bring them into line with the available scientific knowledge.' ([1]) Commissioner Vasiliou mentioned 'the possibility of bringing forward (…) a proposal to revise the Animal Transport Regulation (…). This work is focused on maximum travelling times and the space allowed for animals during transport.' ([2])

1. On the basis of what new information has the current Commissioner responsible for animal welfare, John Dalli, affirmed — in contrast to the previous two Commissioners — that there is no longer any need for a revision of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005?

2. How can the Commission be satisfied with proposing 'guides to good practices' instead of changing the legislation in order to bring it in line with new scientific evidence — bearing in mind that 'guides to good practices' are not legally binding and thus not enforceable?

3. Experience over many years has shown that enforcement of the current and previous legislation alone has not led to satisfactory results. The previous two Commissioners have acknowledged this fact. What makes the Commission think that it will now be possible to solve the long-standing problems by means of enforcement alone, without introducing a maximum eight-hour journey limit, as already requested by Parliament and by more than a million EU citizens?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(18 September 2012)

In accordance with the article 32 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport ([3]) the Commission adopted in 2011 a report ([4]) on the impact of the regulation. The report took into account the available scientific evidence ([5]) as well as the socioeconomic implications of the regulation on animal transport ([6]).

The report acknowledged that there is room for improvement of the welfare situation of animals during transports and enforcement was identified as a major issue. As a result the Commission drew the conclusion that priority should be given to enforcement and hence considered that there is no point in proposing more restrictive rules if the ones already in force for years are not sufficiently respected. The Commission will therefore concentrate its effort on working together with the Member States on practical tools to increase the level of enforcement. The guidance document referred to in the question is one of the actions listed in the Commission's report designed for that purpose.

([1]) Joint answer to Written Questions E-6503/07, E-6608/07 and E-6535/07.
([2]) Answer to Written Question E-2067/2008.
([3]) OJ L 3, 5.1.2005, p. 1.
([4]) COM(2011) 700 final.
([5]) EFSA Panel on Animal Health and Welfare (AHAW); Scientific Opinion concerning the welfare of animals during transport. EFSA Journal 2011;9(1):1966.[125 pp.].doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2011.1966.
([6]) Details and background information of this report are available at: http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/transport/index_en.htm

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007322/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(20 Ιουλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Αθέμιτη χρήση περιβαλλοντικών κονδυλίων της ΕΕ στη Βουλγαρία

Από το 2007, το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης και το Ταμείο Συνοχής της ΕΕ χρηματοδοτούν προγράμματα προστασίας της φύσης και έργα υποδομής στο πλαίσιο του βουλγαρικού επιχειρησιακού προγράμματος «Περιβάλλον 2007-2013». Η χρηματοδότηση για την προστασία της φύσης χορηγείται κατά κύριο λόγο για δραστηριότητες που συνδέονται με τη διατήρηση, συντήρηση και αποκατάσταση πολύτιμων οικότοπων και ειδών ευρωπαϊκής σημασίας στο πλαίσιο του «Natura 2000». Ωστόσο, η περιορισμένη διαφάνεια που χαρακτηρίζει το επιχειρησιακό πρόγραμμα οδηγεί στην έγκριση προτάσεων έργων που δεν συμμορφώνονται με τους κανόνες χρηματοδότησης της ΕΕ.

Για παράδειγμα, το 2012, το Υπουργείο Περιβάλλοντος και Υδάτων της Βουλγαρίας ενέκρινε ([1]) τη χρηματοδότηση περιβαλλοντικών έργων που υποβλήθηκαν από τους δήμους του Ετροπόλε ([2]) και της Σαπάρεβα Μπάνια ([3]), τα οποία σύμφωνα με καταγγελίες περιλαμβάνουν συγκαλυμμένη χρηματοδότηση ιδιωτικών οικονομικών δραστηριοτήτων κατά παράβαση των κανόνων περί χρηματοδότησης και κρατικών ενισχύσεων της ΕΕ ([4]).

1. Το έργο που υποβλήθηκε από το δήμο του Ετροπόλε προορίζεται για χρηματοδότηση της αποκατάστασης του πληθυσμού δύο θηρευόμενων ειδών τα οποία δεν υπόκεινται σε προστασία σε κάποια περιοχή Natura 2000 κοντά στο δήμο — το κόκκινο ελάφι (Cervus elaphus), ένα δημοφιλές είδος θηράματος που δεν περιλαμβάνεται σε κανένα από τα Παραρτήματα της Οδηγίας 92/43 και ο αγριόκουρκος (Tetrao urogallus). Στην πραγματικότητα, το ένα τρίτο της περιοχής του δήμου του Ετροπόλε ανήκει στην περιοχή θήρας «Ελέν» ([5]) («Ελέν» σημαίνει κόκκινο ελάφι στα βουλγαρικά), όπου το κύριο θηρευόμενο είδος είναι το κόκκινο ελάφι.

2. Το έργο που υποβλήθηκε από τον δήμο της Σαπάρεβα Μπάνια προορίζεται για τη χρηματοδότηση επιστημονικής οικολογικής έρευνας, την αξιολόγηση της δυναμικότητας τουριστικών περιοχών και την ανάπτυξη ενός σχεδίου τουριστικής διαχείρισης για τον δήμο, στο πλαίσιο της προετοιμασίας ενός γενικού χωροταξικού σχεδίου για τον δήμο, με την προοπτική κατασκευής ιδιωτικού χιονοδρομικού κέντρου και τουριστικών οικισμών. Με τον τρόπο αυτόν, η χρηματοδότηση της ΕΕ για το περιβάλλον θα χρησιμοποιηθεί καταχρηστικά για τη μείωση των δαπανών για τις περιβαλλοντικές εκτιμήσεις (ΕΠΕ/ΣΠΕ) που απαιτούνται εκ του νόμου για ιδιωτικά έργα και σχέδια ανάπτυξης.

Γνωρίζει η Επιτροπή τις καταγγελίες για αθέμιτη χρήση των περιβαλλοντικών κονδυλίων της ΕΕ για τη χρηματοδότηση ιδιωτικών οικονομικών δραστηριοτήτων, κατά παράβαση των κανόνων της ΕΕ περί χρηματοδότησης και κρατικών ενισχύσεων;

Ποια μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει η Επιτροπή προκειμένου να εξασφαλίσει τη συμμόρφωση της Βουλγαρίας με τους κανόνες της ΕΕ περί χρηματοδότησης και κρατικών ενισχύσεων;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(25 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή έχει επίγνωση των δύο περιπτώσεων κατάχρησης κονδυλίων στο πλαίσιο του βουλγαρικού επιχειρησιακού προγράμματος για το περιβάλλον για την περίοδο 2007-2013. Κατόπιν παραλαβής των πρώτων σειρών εξηγήσεων από τις βουλγαρικές αρχές τον Αύγουστο του 2012, η Επιτροπή ζήτησε από τις βουλγαρικές αρχές να διερευνήσουν τα έργα προκειμένου να καθορίσουν την αξιοπιστία και στη συμμόρφωσή τους με την αρχή της χρηστής δημοσιονομικής διαχείρισης. Η Επιτροπή συνέστησε στη Βουλγαρία να μην πιστοποιήσει καμία δαπάνη στο πλαίσιο των εν λόγω έργων για τη διάρκεια αυτών των ερευνών.

([1]) http://ope.moew.government.bg/uf//projects/List-beneficiaries_Bio-BG_05.pdf
([2]) http://etropolebg.com/joomla/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=1089&Itemid=80
([3]) http://saparevabanya.bg/pages/pid/278/Новини/Подписан-е-проект-Опазване-на-биологичното-разнообразие-и-смекчаване-на-неблагоприятните-екологични-въздействия-от-развитието-на-туризма-в-Община-Сапарева-баня.html
([4]) Ένας γενικός κανόνας χρηματοδότησης της ΕΕ είναι ότι «οι δραστηριότητες στο πλαίσιο των έργων του Επιχειρησιακού Προγράμματος Περιβάλλον δεν θα πρέπει να οδηγούν στη δημιουργία συνθηκών επίτευξης κέρδους από τη μετέπειτα χρήση ή εκμετάλλευση των οικότοπων, των ειδών ή των εγκαταστάσεων».
([5]) Η περιοχή θήρας «Ελέν» (http://www.elen-hunting.com/) αποτελεί μια κορυφαία μονάδα διαχείρισης θηραμάτων, η οποία ανήκει στον Εμίλ Ντιμιτρόφ, μέλος του δημοτικού συμβουλίου του Ετροπόλε μεταξύ 2007-2009 και αντιπροέδρου σήμερα της εθνικής κοινοβουλευτικής επιτροπής γεωργίας και δασοκομίας.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007322/12
to the Commission
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(20 July 2012)

Subject: Misuse of EU environmental funds in Bulgaria

Since 2007, the European Fund for Regional Development and the Cohesion Fund have been financing nature protection and infrastructure projects under the Bulgarian operational programme Environment 2007-13. The funding for nature protection is allocated mainly to activities connected with the conservation, maintenance and restoration of valuable habitats and species of European importance under Natura 2000. However, the low level of transparency characterising the operational programme is leading to the approval of project proposals which are not in compliance with EU funding rules.

For instance, in 2012 the Bulgarian Ministry of Environment and Waters approved ([1]) the financing of environmental projects submitted by the municipalities of Etropole ([2]) and Sapareva Banya, ([3]) which allegedly include hidden financing of private economic activities in violation of EU funding and state aid rules ([4]).

1. The project submitted by the municipality of Etropole will finance the repopulation of two hunting species which are not subject to protection at any Natura 2000 site in the vicinity of the municipality — the red deer (*Cervus elaphus*), a popular game species which is not listed in any of the annexes to Directive 92/43, and the capercaillie (*Tetrao urogallus*). As a matter of fact, one third of the territory of the municipality of Etropole belongs to the 'Elen' hunting area ([5]) ('Elen' means red deer in Bulgarian), where the main hunting species is the red deer.

2. The project submitted by the municipality of Sapareva Banya aims to finance scientific ecological research, assessment of the carrying capacity of tourist zones, and the development of a tourist management plan for the municipality, as part of the preparation of a general spatial plan for the municipality with a view to developing a private ski area and tourist villages. In this way, EU financing for the environment will be misused in order to reduce the costs of the environmental assessments (EIA/SEA) legally required for private projects and development plans.

Is the Commission aware of the alleged misuse of EU environmental funds for the financing of private economic activities, in violation of the EU funding and state aid rules?

What measures will the Commission take to ensure that Bulgaria complies with the EU's funding and state aid rules?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(25 September 2012)

The Commission is aware of the two cases of alleged misuse of funds under the Bulgarian 2007-2013 operational programme for Environment. Following the receipt of a first series of explanations from the Bulgarian authorities in August 2012, the Commission asked the Bulgarian authorities to investigate the projects with a view to determine their regularity and compliance with the principle of sound financial management. The Commission has advised Bulgaria not to certify any expenditure from the projects in question for the duration of these investigations.

([1]) http://ope.moew.government.bg/uf//projects/List-beneficiaries_Bio-BG_05.pdf
([2]) http://etropolebg.com/joomla/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=1089&Itemid=80
([3]) http://saparevabanya.bg/pages/pid/278/Новини/Подписан-е-проект-„Опазване-на-биологичното-разнообразие-и-смекчаване-на-неблагоприятните-екологични-въздействия-от-развитието-на-туризма-в-Община-Сапарева-баня.html
([4]) A general rule of EU funding is that 'the activities under the OPE projects may not lead to the creation of conditions for profit generation by the subsequent usage or exploitation of the habitat, species or facility'.
([5]) The 'Elen' hunting area (http://www.elen-hunting.com/) is a first-class game management unit, privately owned by Emil Dimitrov, a member of the municipal council of Etropole in 2007-2009 and today a Vice-Chair of the national parliamentary committee on agriculture and forestry.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-007374/12
adresată Comisiei
Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE)
(23 iulie 2012)

Subiect: Parteneriatele public-private în perspectiva modernizării achizițiilor publice

Comisia Europeană a prezentat prin Propunerea de directivă a Parlamentului European și a Consiliului privind achizițiile publice, COM(2011)0896, necesitatea de modernizare a achizițiilor publice, având ca obiective complementare creșterea eficienței cheltuielilor publice și facilitarea utilizării achizițiilor publice de către autoritățile contractante.

Parteneriatele de tip public-privat (PPP) sunt vitale pentru ca Uniunea Europeană să poată realiza investițiile necesare în anumite domenii, cum ar fi infrastructura și sectorul serviciilor.

1. Având în vedere faptul că ultimele propuneri ale Comisiei referitoare la achizițiile publice nu conțin informații cu privire la acest tip de parteneriat, ce măsuri va lua Comisia pentru stabilirea unui cadru coerent la nivelul UE pentru PPP?

2. Având în vedere că procedura de dialog competitiv, procedura recomandată în cazul PPP, este o procedură cu care multe autorități contractante nu sunt suficient de familiarizate, are în vedere Comisia reglementarea mai în detaliu a acestei proceduri și eventual o comunicare care să conțină o detaliere sau exemple practice?

Răspuns dat de dl. Barnier în numele Comisiei
(3 septembrie 2012)

Comisia este pe deplin conștientă de importanța și potențialul parteneriatelor public-privat (PPP). În comunicarea sa din 19 noiembrie 2009 privind dezvoltarea parteneriatelor public-privat ([1]), Comisia europeană a anunțat, printre alte măsuri, clarificarea și adaptarea cadrului juridic, în special în domeniul achizițiilor publice. Pachetul de propuneri legislative din 20 decembrie 2011 constituie o dovadă a punerii în aplicare a acestui angajament.

În acest pachet, Comisia a propus o simplificare și o modernizare a normelor privind contractele de achiziții publice, în special prin intermediul dezvoltării procedurii concurențiale cu negociere, al extinderii domeniului de aplicare a dialogului competitiv și al creării unei noi proceduri de parteneriat pentru inovare.

Propunerea privind concesiunile are ca obiectiv îmbunătățirea securității juridice a acestor contracte și facilitarea încheierii lor. Printre altele, propunerea urmărește, prin intermediul obligației de publicare a anunțurilor de concesiune în JOUE și de respectare a unui minimum de cerințe procedurale, să permită întreprinderilor europene să organizeze licitații pentru proiecte de concesiune și în alte state membre, cu asigurarea transparenței și a egalității tratamentului.

Comisia a publicat o fișă explicativă cu privire la acest subiect, care poate fi consultată la adresa: http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/publicprocurement/docs/explan-notes/classic-dir-dialogue_fr.pdf

În sfârșit, Comisia remarcă faptul că EPEC (European PPP Expertise Centre — Centrul European de Expertiză în domeniul PPP) a publicat un raport referitor la practicile sectorului public din UE privind atribuirea contractelor de parteneriat public-privat și utilizarea dialogului competitiv: http://www.eib.org/epec/resources/epec-procurement-and-cd-public.pdf

([1]) COM(2009) 615 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007374/12
to the Commission
Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE)
(23 July 2012)

Subject: Public-private partnerships for the updating of public procurement

In its proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on public procurement, COM(2011)0896, the Commission underlines the need to update public procurement with a view to rationalising public expenditure and facilitating the use of public procurement procedures by public authorities.

Public-private partnerships (PPPs) are vital in enabling the European Union to make the necessary investment in appropriate areas such as infrastructure and services.

1. Given the lack of information regarding such partnerships in the Commission's most recent proposals regarding public procurement, what measures will it take to establish coherent EU framework provisions governing PPPs?

2. Given that many contracting authorities are insufficiently familiar with the competitive dialogue procedure recommended with regard to PPPs, does the Commission intend to regulate this procedure more closely and possibly forward detailed information or practical examples?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission
(3 septembre 2012)

La Commission est pleinement consciente de l'importance et du potentiel des partenariats public-privé (PPP). Dans sa communication du 19 novembre 2009 concernant le développement des PPP ([1]), la Commission européenne a annoncé, parmi des autres mesures, la clarification et l'adaptation du cadre juridique, notamment dans le domaine de la commande publique. Le paquet de propositions législatives du 20 décembre 2011 témoigne de la mise en œuvre de cet engagement.

Dans ce paquet, la Commission a proposé une simplification et modernisation des règles sur les marchés publics, en particulier par le biais du développement de la procédure concurrentielle avec négociation, de l'extension du champ d'application du dialogue compétitif, et de la création d'une nouvelle procédure de partenariat pour l'innovation.

La proposition sur les concessions a pour objectif d'améliorer la sécurité juridique de ces contrats et de faciliter leur conclusion. En outre, la proposition vise, à travers l'obligation de publication des avis de concession dans le JOUE et le respect d'un minimum d'exigences procédurales, à permettre aux entreprises européennes de soumissionner pour des projets de concessions dans d'autres États membres, tout en assurant la transparence et l'égalité de traitement.

La Commission a publié une fiche explicative à ce sujet, à consulter sur le site web:
http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/publicprocurement/docs/explan-notes/classic-dir-dialogue_fr.pdf

Finalement, la Commission observe que l'EPEC a publié un rapport concernant des pratiques du secteur public de l'UE sur la passation des marchés de PPP et l'utilisation du dialogue compétitif:
http://www.eib.org/epec/resources/epec-procurement-and-cd-public.pdf

([1]) COM(2009)615 finale.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007390/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(23 juillet 2012)

Objet: Le cas Kokopelli c/Baumaux: la biodiversité des plantes en réel danger

La Commission n'ignore pas la récente position de la Cour de Justice de l'Union européenne saisie par la Cour d'appel de Nancy, à propos de l'impossibilité pour l'association Kokopelli de commercialiser des semences non cataloguées officiellement. Cette position s'inscrit dans une logique productiviste et ignore l'opportunité de pouvoir bénéficier de semences de plantes variées et anciennes.

1. La Commission est-elle consciente que cette dérive nuit gravement à la biodiversité que par ailleurs elle déclare vouloir protéger?

2. La Commission a-t-elle listé les conséquences d'une telle position qui va faire jurisprudence?

3. La Commission estime-t-elle nécessaire de revoir le prescrit de la directive concernée?

Réponse donnée par M. Dalli au nom de la Commission
(3 septembre 2012)

1. La Commission est consciente du fait que le nombre d'espèces sur lesquelles repose la sécurité alimentaire de l'homme a diminué au cours du siècle dernier et que l'érosion génétique se poursuit, principalement en raison du fait que la culture de nouvelles variétés se concentre de plus en plus sur un nombre limité de cultures d'importance mondiale. La Commission reconnaît donc l'importance de maintenir et de développer une plus large base génétique pour les végétaux cultivés. La législation de l'UE sur la commercialisation des matériels de reproduction végétale combine la garantie de l'approvisionnement en denrées alimentaires par des matériels de reproduction végétale de haute qualité avec la protection de la diversité génétique des végétaux cultivés.

2. L'arrêt de la Cour de justice sur une question préjudicielle concernant la validité de quatre directives de l'UE, posée par la Cour d'appel de Nancy (France), confirme l'efficacité juridique de cette législation. L'application nationale des directives de la Commission sur les variétés de conservation ([1]) et sur les variétés «amateurs» de légumes ([2]) a, jusqu'à présent, donné lieu à l'inscription de quelque 570 variétés aux catalogues communs des variétés des espèces agricoles et de légumes dans un délai inférieur à 18 mois. La Commission est convaincue que le nombre d'inscriptions de ces variétés continuera à croître.

3. Après une évaluation approfondie, la Commission est en train d'achever la révision de la législation de l'UE sur la commercialisation des matériels de reproduction végétale, y compris de la législation sur les variétés de conservation et les variétés «amateurs» de légumes.

([1]) Directive 2008/62/CE de la Commission du 20 juin 2008 introduisant certaines dérogations pour l'admission des races primitives et variétés agricoles naturellement adaptées aux conditions locales et régionales et menacées d'érosion génétique, et pour la commercialisation de semences et de plants de pommes de terre de ces races primitives et variétés (texte présentant de l'intérêt pour l'EEE) (JO L 162 du 21.6.2008, pp. 13-19).

([2]) Directive 2009/145/CE de la Commission du 26 novembre 2009 introduisant certaines dérogations pour l'admission des races primitives et variétés de légumes traditionnellement cultivées dans des localités et régions spécifiques et menacées d'érosion génétique, et des variétés de légumes sans valeur intrinsèque pour la production commerciale mais créées en vue de répondre à des conditions de culture particulières, ainsi que pour la commercialisation de semences de ces races primitives et variétés (texte présentant de l'intérêt pour l'EEE) (JO L 312 du 27.11.2009, pp. 44-54).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007390/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(23 July 2012)

Subject: The Kokopelli v Baumaux case: plant biodiversity in real danger

The Commission will be aware of the position recently adopted by the Court of Justice of the European Union in the case brought before it by the Nancy (France) Court of Appeal, to the effect that Kokopelli (a non-profit-making association) was not permitted to market seed that did not appear in official catalogues. This position is in line with a productivist trend that disregards the desirability of being able to benefit from a varied range of plant seed, including 'old varieties'.

1. Is the Commission aware that this trend gravely harms the very biodiversity that it claims to want to protect?

2. Is the Commission aware of all the consequences of this ruling, which will set a precedent?

3. Does the Commission consider it necessary to review the provisions of the directive in question?

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

1. The Commission is aware that the range of species on which human food security rests has decreased in the last century and that genetic erosion is continuing, mainly due to the fact that breeding of new varieties increasingly focuses on a limited number of crops of global importance. The Commission thus acknowledges the importance of maintaining and developing a wider genetic basis for cultivated plants. The EU legislation on the marketing of plant reproductive material combines securing food supply through high quality plant reproductive material with the protection of the genetic diversity of cultivated plants.

2. The ruling of the Court of Justice on a preliminary ruling concerning the validity of four EU directives brought by the Court of Appeal in Nancy (France) confirms the legal efficacy of this legislation. National implementation of the Commission Directives on conservation varieties ([1]) and on amateur varieties of vegetables ([2]) has so far led to the registration of around 570 varieties in the agricultural and vegetable Common Catalogues within less than 18 months. The Commission is confident that the number of registrations of these varieties will continue to grow.

3. Following a comprehensive evaluation, the Commission is currently concluding the review of the EU plant reproductive material marketing legislation, comprising the legislation on conservation and amateur vegetable varieties.

([1]) Commission Directive 2008/62/EC of 20 June 2008 providing for certain derogations for acceptance of agricultural landraces and varieties which are naturally adapted to the local and regional conditions and threatened by genetic erosion and for marketing of seed and seed potatoes of those landraces and varieties (Text with EEA relevance) (OJ L 162, 21.6.2008, pp. 13-19).

([2]) Commission Directive 2009/145/EC of 26 November 2009 providing for certain derogations, for acceptance of vegetable landraces and varieties which have been traditionally grown in particular localities and regions and are threatened by genetic erosion and of vegetable varieties with no intrinsic value for commercial crop production but developed for growing under particular conditions and for marketing of seed of those landraces and varieties (Text with EEA relevance) (OJ L 312, 27.11.2009, pp. 44-54).

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007398/12
ao Conselho
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(23 de julho de 2012)

Assunto: Direito humano à água potável e ao saneamento básico — Papel da UE

A Relatora Especial das Nações Unidas para o direito humano à água potável e ao saneamento básico, por ocasião da Conferência Rio+20, veio apelar aos Estados, através de uma Carta Aberta, para retomarem o seu empenho na efetiva consecução do direito humano à água e ao saneamento básico. Esse direito, afirma na missiva, «é essencial para o pleno gozo da vida e de outros direitos humanos».

Não obstante, a relatora manifestou a sua preocupação pelo facto de, apesar de a versão original do «rascunho zero» do documento final da conferência sublinhar «a importância do direito à água potável e ao saneamento básico como um direito humano que é essencial para o pleno gozo da vida e de todos os direitos humanos» (parágrafo 67), alguns Estados terem sugerido uma linguagem alternativa que não se refere explicitamente ao direito humano à água e saneamento.

A verdade é que o direito à água e ao saneamento constitui um direito humano que já foi reconhecido pelo direito internacional, inclusivamente pela Assembleia-Geral e pelo Conselho dos Direitos Humanos, em 2010.

Assim, e tendo em conta que alguns Estados-Membros, lamentavelmente, se abstiveram na votação na Assembleia-Geral da ONU que reconheceu o direito à água e ao saneamento como um direito humano, solicito ao Conselho que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Efetuou o Conselho alguma discussão sobre o apelo da Relatora Especial das Nações Unidas para o direito humano à água potável e ao saneamento básico?

2. Que medidas concretas discutiu o Conselho, até à data, para apoiar a efetiva fruição deste direito, sem exclusões?

Resposta
(12 de outubro de 2012)

Desde a Cimeira Mundial sobre o Desenvolvimento Sustentável (WSSD) realizada em Joanesburgo em 2002, a UE tem liderado a nível internacional as questões relativas à água e ao saneamento no contexto do desenvolvimento sustentável. O lançamento nessa ocasião da iniciativa da UE «Água pela Vida», bem como a assinatura de vários acordos de parceria com países africanos, latino-americanos, asiáticos e da Europa Oriental e Central, no domínio da água e do saneamento, podem ser considerados como resultados da maior importância.

No contexto da cooperação UE-ACP, a UE atribuiu, desde 2004, cerca de 700 milhões de euros provenientes do 9.° e 10.° FED, essencialmente ao abrigo da Facilidade para a Água, a fim de dinamizar os fundos destinados à água e ao saneamento nos países ACP.

Nos últimos dez anos, o Conselho tem promovido de forma consistente uma abordagem integrada dos recursos hídricos e de saneamento, tanto a nível da UE como a nível global, nomeadamente no âmbito de fóruns internacionais, como o Fórum Mundial da Água realizado em Quioto (2003), no México (2006), em Istambul (2009) e em Marselha (2012).

A fim de preparar a Conferência Rio+20, realizada no passado mês de junho, o Conselho debateu aprofundadamente as questões referidas pelo Sr. Deputado, tendo adotado uma posição a esse respeito plenamente consentânea com a legislação internacional e com os seus compromissos internacionais.

O Conselho Europeu de março de 2012 declarou que a Conferência Rio+20 «deverá pugnar por que, a nível nacional e internacional, se estabeleçam metas operacionais claras e ações concretas a pôr em prática dentro de um calendário acordado». Nessa perspetiva, o Conselho incluiu na posição da UE para a Conferência Rio+20 uma proposta de objetivo e respetiva meta operacional, nomeadamente a fim de «garantir o acesso universal à água potável e ao saneamento»([1]).

([1]) Doc. 9070/12.

Nesse contexto, o Conselho continua a reafirmar o seu empenhamento em prol do direito das pessoas à água potável e a um saneamento seguros, bem como a necessidade de melhorar significativamente a implementação a todos os níveis da gestão integrada dos recursos hídricos.

No relatório de 6 de junho de 2012 intitulado: «Direitos Humanos e Democracia no Mundo: Relatório sobre a ação da UE em 2011»([2]) declara-se que «os direitos económicos, sociais e culturais continuaram a ser abordados através dos instrumentos específicos da política de direitos humanos da UE em países terceiros». A título de exemplo, a UE emitiu em 22 de março uma declaração para comemorar o Dia Mundial da Água em que reafirmava que «todos os Estados têm obrigações em matéria de direitos humanos no que respeita ao acesso à água potável, que tem de estar disponível e ser fisicamente acessível, a um preço razoável e de qualidade aceitável».

Ainda mais recentemente e de forma mais explícita, a UE e os seus Estados-Membros reafirmaram, no âmbito das Prioridades da UE para a 67.ª sessão da Assembleia Geral das Nações Unidas, adotadas pelo Conselho em 23 de julho de 2012, «os (seus) compromissos no tocante ao direito humano de acesso a água potável e a saneamento»([3]).

Esses elementos constituem a prova de que o Conselho, não só o leva a sério como honra o compromisso assumido pela UE e pelos seus Estados-Membros em defesa do direito à água potável e a um saneamento seguros.

([2]) Doc. 9238/12.
([3]) Doc. 12851/12.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007398/12
to the Council
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(23 July 2012)

Subject: Human right to water and sanitation — role of the EU

In an open letter to the Rio+20 conference, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the human right to water and sanitation called on States to recommit to the human right to water and sanitation, which she described as 'essential for the full enjoyment of life and all human rights'.

In her letter, she expressed concern that, even though the original version of the 'zero draft' of the final conference document underlined 'the importance of the right to safe and clean drinking water and sanitation as a human right that is essential for the full enjoyment of life and all human rights' (paragraph 67), some States had suggested alternative language that did not explicitly refer to the human right to water and sanitation.

In fact, the right to water and sanitation is a human right that has been already recognised under international law, including by the General Assembly and the Human Rights Council in 2010.

In this context, and bearing in mind that, regrettably, some Member States abstained from the vote in the UN General Assembly which recognised the right to water and sanitation as a human right, can the Council answer the following questions:

1. Has the Council held any discussions on the appeal made by the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the human right to water and sanitation?

2. What practical measures has the Council discussed to date with a view to supporting the effective enjoyment of this right, without any exceptions?

Reply
(12 October 2012)

Ever since the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD), which took place in Johannesburg in 2002, the EU has been in the lead internationally on water and sanitation issues in the context of sustainable development. The launching on that occasion of the EU Water for Life Initiative, and the signature of several partnership agreements with African, Latin American, eastern European and central Asian countries in the field of water and sanitation, can be considered as a major outcome of the WSSD.

In the context of EU-ACP cooperation, the EU has, since 2004, allocated some EUR 700 million from the 9th and 10th EDF, mostly under the EU Water Facility, for leveraging funds for water and sanitation in ACP countries.

Over the past 10 years, the Council has consistently promoted an integrated approach to water resources and sanitation, at both EU and global level, notably in international fora such as the World Water Forum held in Kyoto (2003), Mexico (2006), Istanbul (2009) and Marseilles (2012).

In preparation for the Rio+20 Conference last June, the Council held in-depth discussions on the issues addressed by the Honourable Member and adopted a position in that regard which is fully consistent with international law and international commitments.

The European Council of March 2012 had stated that Rio+20 'should work towards clear operational targets and concrete actions at national and international level within agreed time frames.' To that end, the Council included in the EU position for Rio+20 a proposal for a goal and related operational target to, notably, 'ensure universal access to drinking water and sanitation.' ([1])

In that context, the Council continues to reaffirm the commitment to the human right to safe drinking water and sanitation and the need to significantly improve the implementation of integrated water resources management at all levels.

([1]) Doc. 9070/12.

The report of 6 June 2012 on 'Human Rights and Democracy in the world: report on EU action in 2011' ([2]) states that 'economic, social and cultural rights continued to be addressed through the specific tools of the EU human rights policy in third countries. By way of example, on 22 March 2011, the EU issued a declaration commemorating World Water Day, reaffirming that all states bear human rights obligations regarding access to safe drinking water, which must be available, physically accessible, affordable and acceptable.'

Even more recently, and more explicitly, in the EU Priorities for the 67th Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, which the Council adopted on 23 July 2012, the EU and its Member States 'reaffirm our commitments regarding the human right to safe drinking water and sanitation.' ([3])

These elements are proof that the Council not only takes seriously, but is also fulfilling the commitment of the EU and its Member States to, the human right to safe drinking water and sanitation.

([2]) Doc. 9238/12.
([3]) Doc. 12851/12.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007478/12
to the Commission
Phil Prendergast (S&D)
(26 July 2012)

Subject: Irish Building Control Act 2007 and the *acquis communautaire*

Further to Commissioner Barnier's response to Written Questions E-012450/11 and E-000673/12, could the Commission indicate whether the Irish Building Control Act 2007 is in conformity with the *acquis communautaire*, in particular Directive 2005/36/EC on the recognition of professional qualifications?

The Commission is requested to consider this in light of, in particular:

— the admission/assessment fees for temporary and permanent establishment and the additional annual registration charge of EUR 490, taking due note of Section 14(4) of the Act;

— the scope of the information and proofs sought by the registration body for temporary and for permanent establishment;

— the undertakings which successful applicants must give to the registration body for temporary and for permanent establishment;

— the requirement under Section 15(1)(g)(ii)(III) of the Act to pass an examination in a Member State which is not offered, or is not obligatory, in all Member States;

— the requirement under Section 15(2) of the Act for non-national Directive-rights architects to possess a knowledge of language deemed necessary for practising architecture in Ireland rather than that necessary for the provision of the particular architectural services anticipated by a migrant practitioner, a demand from which non-EU architects are exempt, taking due note of Sections 16(9), 16(10)(b)(ii) and 16(13)(a)(ii); and

— the processing time arising from the registration procedures and the consequences of delay for those seeking establishment in Ireland.

The detailed registration procedures can be accessed on the website of the registration body set up by the Act: www.riai.ie/admissions/architects/

Preliminary answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(22 August 2012)

The Commission is aware of a number of questions with regards to the compatibility of the Irish Building Control Act 2007 with EC law. It has already undertaken a detailed investigation which is ongoing.

In this context, the Commission will also consider all the points raised by the Honourable Member and will inform the Honourable Member of the outcome as soon as possible.

Supplementary answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2013)

The Irish authorities have provided clarifications to the Commission on the legal regime and administrative practice applicable to the registration of architects from other Member States seeking to provide services or become established in Ireland. In addition, they have agreed to amend their current administrative practice towards providers of services on a temporary basis (notably, by simplifying standard forms and clarifying information available on their website). At this stage, there does not appear to be sufficient grounds to pursue infringement proceedings against Ireland in relation to the provisions of the Irish Building Control Act 2007 concerning the registration of architects.

In view of the length of the detailed answers to the specific questions raised by the Honourable Member, the Commission is sending them directly to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's Secretariat.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007494/12
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(27 July 2012)

Subject: Reduced VAT rates on labour-intensive services

Will the Commission provide a current list of those Member States which make use of the freedom to levy reduced rates of VAT on certain labour-intensive services, and a current list, for each Member State, of the services to which a reduced VAT rate is applied and of the rate applied in each case?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(30 August 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the document *VAT rates applied by the Member States of the European Union* ([1]) that is published on the Commission's website.

The purpose of this document however is to disseminate only general information about the VAT rates in force in the Member States of the EU. It is the Member States that are in a position to provide complete, binding and up-to-date information on the VAT rates applicable within their territories.

The Commission therefore cannot be held responsible for the accuracy of the information contained therein, and neither does the document's publication imply any endorsement by the Commission of those Member States' legal provisions.

The list of goods and services ([2]) which Member States may subject to a reduced VAT rate has been agreed unanimously by the Member States. Since reduced VAT rates are optional, it is however for each Member State to decide whether to apply them or not.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/taxation/vat/how_vat_works/rates/vat_rates_en.pdf
([2]) Annex III to Council Directive 2006/112/EC of 28 November 2006 — OJ L 347, 11.12.2006. .

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007495/12
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(27 July 2012)

Subject: Schengen situation

With reports of dissatisfaction amongst current members of the Schengen area (including several Member States and Norway), and with Parliament involvement in the issue having so far been bypassed, what steps is the Commission taking to review the Schengen Agreement to ensure that a balanced solution is found?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(30 August 2012)

In September 2011, the Commission adopted proposals which are designed to strengthen the governance of the Schengen area, particularly as to how Member States are fulfilling their obligations regarding the protection of the Union's external borders, thereby enabling problems to be resolved promptly.

The proposals are currently the subject of negotiation in the European Parliament and in the Council. The Commission hopes that the co-legislators will be able to overcome recent difficulties on this file; it stands ready to work with the Parliament and the Council to make substantial progress and achieve a legally sound compromise.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007497/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
David Martin (S&D)
(27 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Civil rights of Palestinians in Lebanon

Has the European External Action Service (EEAS) had any discussions with the Lebanese authorities regarding the civil rights of Palestinians living in refugee camps inside Lebanon? In particular, will the EEAS encourage Lebanon to annul the law that prevents Palestinians from taking up certain professions outside the refugee camps?

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

The EU holds regular discussions with the Lebanese authorities on the situation of Palestinian refugees in Lebanon in the framework of the annual EU-Lebanon Subcommittee on Human Rights, Democracy and Governance. In its latest meeting, held on 6 February 2012, the EU called on Lebanon to advance the implementation of the 2010 amendment of the Labour Law, enabling employment of the Palestinian refugees, as well as to further improve their employment possibilities.

The new EU-Lebanon ENP Action Plan, currently under negotiation, is expected to have protection of vulnerable populations, including Palestinian refugees, among its priorities. As part of this priority, further access to employment will be promoted, and access to the social and health protection schemes will be sought.

Besides this formal dialogue, the EU is financing several programmes directed at improving living conditions of the Palestinian refugees. These programmes are accompanied by policy dialogue with the Lebanese authorities in cooperation with UNRWA.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007498/12
to the Commission
David Martin (S&D)
(27 July 2012)

Subject: CITES — Namibian seal hunt

The Commission will be aware of the annual seal cull in Namibia which began this month, with a target of clubbing 80 000 pups and 6 000 bulls. This is considered to be the second-biggest seal cull in the world, after the Canadian cull.

In accordance with the EU's stance against the trade in seal products, does the Commission intend to appeal to CITES to move seals into Appendix I of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora in order further to restrict the trade in seal products, including products from this Namibian hunt?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(5 September 2012)

In line with Regulation (EC) no 1007/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 September 2009 on trade in seal products ([1]), the import into the EU market of Cape fur seals is prohibited. The only exemptions to this prohibition are laid down in Article 3(2) of that regulation.

In addition, Cape fur seals are included in CITES Appendix II. As a consequence, international trade (other than import into the EU) for such specimens is authorised if the exporting country demonstrates that this will not be detrimental to the survival of the species. The European Commission notes that the species is considered as 'least concern' in the IUCN Red list. It does not intend to propose the inclusion of the species into CITES Appendix I.

([1]) OJ L 286/3 of 31.10.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007499/12
to the Commission
David Martin (S&D)
(27 July 2012)

Subject: Trans-Pacific Partnership and geographical indications

Do the ongoing negotiations to create a Trans-Pacific Partnership in any way complicate our bilateral negotiations with the countries involved? In particular, do they make our goal of including geographical indications in our free trade agreements more difficult to achieve?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(30 August 2012)

When defending its trade interests, the EU always takes into account the individual context of each of its bilateral negotiations.

Some of the EU's negotiating partners are naturally engaged in parallel negotiations with other third countries. This is the case with the Trans Pacific Partnership (TPP) Agreement, where some of the EU's partners are also involved in concurrent negotiations with the US and Australia. This could potentially make the EU's bilateral negotiation efforts more complex. Therefore, the Commission is paying particular attention to the possible impact of ongoing TPP negotiations on the EU's bilateral objectives, in particular on Geographical Indications (GIs).

As regards GIs, the objective of the EU in the negotiations of bilateral agreements remains to add value compared to the basic provisions of TRIPS and thus to improve and ensure an appropriate protection of EU GIs in third countries.

With regard to the latter, it can be noted that the majority of current and potential TPP partners in Asia have a nascent or growing GI sector and in the long term have an interest in a framework of rules to secure to a high level of protection for their GIs, such as that put forward by the EU in its bilateral agreements.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007500/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
David Martin (S&D)
(27 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — EU civilian monitoring operation in Gaza

Can the High Representative explain what steps are being taken to reactivate EUBAM Rafah, the EU civilian border assistance mission in Gaza, after it suspended its operations in 2007?

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

In line with the Council conclusions on the Middle East Peace Process of 23 May 2011, the EU stands ready to reactivate the EUBAM Rafah once political and security conditions allow, in order to ensure the EU third party role at the Rafah Crossing Point, as set out in the 2005 Agreement on Movement and Access (AMA).

Furthermore, reactivation is subject to a unanimous agreement of both Parties to the AMA, i.e. the Government of Israel and the Palestinian Authority and to a subsequent political decision by the Council. Any steps to reactivate the mission in operational terms are conditioned upon and would follow the aforementioned political decisions.

It is to be noted that, upon decision of the Council, the mission was co-located with the EU Delegation in Tel-Aviv and its size was reduced to a Head of Mission and three international staff as of 1 July 2012. The new structure does not prejudice the mission's capacity and preparedness to reactivate within the conditions described above.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007501/12
to the Commission
David Martin (S&D)
(27 July 2012)

Subject: World food supply

What assessment has the Commission made of world food supply in the light of the drought in the USA? In particular, is the Commission monitoring the impact on vulnerable African countries?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(12 September 2012)

The Commission monitors the situation of world food security and follows information and analysis from sources dedicated to monitoring the state of world food supply and fluctuations in food prices, such as the Food and Agriculture Organisation, the International Food Policy Research Institute and the Famine Early Warning Systems Network. It is also actively contributing to AMIS — an agricultural market information system called for by G20 agriculture ministers with the aim of addressing food price volatility through more timely, accurate and transparent information on global food markets.

It is, however, premature to draw conclusions until the harvests are finalised.

The Commission closely monitors developments, particularly any impact on vulnerable countries. Over the past years, there has been an increase in disasters, such as droughts and floods, and also an emergence of stress factors, such as high food prices. For countries where food insecurity is chronic, those factors have contributed to increased vulnerability. Therefore, the Commission is stepping up its efforts and support to strengthen resilience to such shocks. In this context, it is raising stronger awareness at EU Delegation level in those countries most concerned with a view to defining appropriately future programming priorities of EU aid. It is currently also preparing a communication on resilience. The Commission upholds food security at the top of the EU development agenda, in discussion with partner countries and in global fora. The EU is the world's largest donor to food security, providing around EUR 1 billion annually; this includes substantial support to information systems and early warning systems in Africa and to organisations such as the abovementioned.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007502/12
to the Commission
David Martin (S&D)
(27 July 2012)

Subject: Free trade agreement with ASEAN

The Commission previously abandoned the approach of negotiating a region-to-region free trade agreement with the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) in favour of negotiations with individual ASEAN countries. Recent reports have suggested that the Commission plans to return to the region-to-region approach in 2015. This is welcome, but can the Commission explain what factors have enabled it to see this as a viable approach once again?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(17 September 2012)

The Commission continues to pursue negotiations of Free Trade Agreements with individual ASEAN countries and is at present not engaging in region-to-region negotiation with ASEAN as a group.

Differences in the level of ambition appeared during the period the EU and ASEAN were engaged in region-to-region negotiations. For that reason the Commission decided to re-orient the process towards bilateral negotiations with those ASEAN members with whom it was possible to proceed towards a deep and comprehensive Free Trade Agreement.

This said, the Commission continues to be ready to re-engage with ASEAN as a region. An agreement in the regional framework with ASEAN countries remains an important strategic objective for the EU and the bilateral FTAs with ASEAN members should be seen as building blocks for a future bi-regional FTA.

Regarding the possible return to a region-to-region approach for negotiations, the Commission can confirm that it is currently not considering this. At the same time, ASEAN is continuing with its integration, notably with the plans to finalise the ASEAN Economic Community by 2015, which aims to transform ASEAN into a region with free movement of goods, services, investment, skilled labour, and freer flow of capital.

The Commission has therefore indicated that 2015 might be a good time to re-assess if the prospects for region-to-region negotiations have become more favourable.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007503/12
to the Commission
David Martin (S&D)
(27 July 2012)

Subject: Cariforum regional programmes

What problems has the Commission identified in the allocation of development aid from the European Development Fund (EDF) in the Cariforum region, and how does it plan to improve the process to ensure that regional programmes can fully benefit from the financial support available?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(10 September 2012)

The focal sector of the Caribbean 10th EDF regional programme is regional economic integration and cooperation. The mid-term review of all the 10th EDF regional programmes put the Caribbean region on top of the performance list with 79% of the 10th EDF funds committed at the end of 2011.

Nevertheless, reinforcing administrative capacities remains crucial for the effective implementation of regional integration commitments at national level, and to increase the capacity to absorb the funds made available by the EU. Therefore, part of the 10th EDF funds for the Caribbean Single Market and Economy (CSME) are destined to reinforce national administrative capacities. In addition, in order to optimise the relevance of the support, the establishment of a monitoring system (comparable to the internal market scoreboard) is being facilitated.

Furthermore, with a view to address the above concern, particularly in the context of the 10th EDF EPA support programme, the involvement of a variety of specialised actors has been ensured, such as the IMF, the Caribbean Export Development Agency, the Caribbean Development Bank and the German organisation for standardisation.

Finally, the need to continue improving donor coordination mechanisms in the region persists. This is being considered in the context of the Commission's support programmes, and it is expected that the region will take further initiatives in this area.

During the 11th EDF, it is anticipated that these approaches will be continued as appropriate.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007504/12
to the Commission
David Martin (S&D)
(27 July 2012)

Subject: Israel's destruction of EU-funded projects

By the Commission's own estimation, Israel destroyed up to EUR 49 million worth of EU-funded projects in the Occupied Palestinian Territories between 2001 and 2011.

Can the Commission explain what action it is taking to hold Israel to account for this deliberate destruction, and what action it intends to take in the future to prevent this practice continuing?

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

As the largest donor to the Palestinian Authority, the EU expects its investments in support of the Palestinian people to be protected from damage and destruction.

The EU Delegation in East Jerusalem has in the past lodged a protest with the Israeli Ministry of Defence following incidents leading to the damage or destruction of EU-funded projects, in particular regarding EU-funded projects which have not yet been handed over to the end beneficiary. The question of damage and destruction of EU-funded projects is also raised with Israel in the framework of the EU-Israel political dialogue. Diplomatic channels are also regularly used to seek to ensure the protection of EU investments.

Enhanced efforts are being taken by the EU as a whole to ensure such incidents do not take place in future. As stated in the Foreign Affairs Council conclusions of May, ensuring the development of Area C of the West bank — where Israel has full administrative control — is critical for the viability of a future Palestinian state. The EU called upon Israel to meet its obligations regarding the living conditions of the Palestinian population in Area C, including by halting demolition of Palestinian infrastructure and simplifying administrative procedures to obtain building permits. The EU underlined its intention to continue to provide financial assistance for Palestinian development in Area C and its expectation that such investment be protected for future use. The EU will engage with the Government of Israel to work out improved mechanisms for the implementation of the donor-funded projects for the benefit of the Palestinian population in Area C.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007505/12
to the Commission
David Martin (S&D)
(27 July 2012)

Subject: Funding and procurement in relation to the Occupied Palestinian Territories

Can the Commission provide details of the EU funding allocated under the Seventh Framework Programme to Israeli organisations operating in the Occupied Palestinian Territories?

And can the Commission confirm that, under the upcoming revision of public procurement rules, a Member State could choose to exclude Israeli companies which operate in the Occupied Palestinian Territories from a tender contract?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(18 September 2012)

In accordance with the Rules for Participation ([1]), the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013) is open to the participation of legal entities from any country in the world, unless there are sanctions adopted by the Council which currently is not the case for Israel. Therefore, entities established in Israel and created under Israeli law are considered to be eligible for participation and for obtaining funding in FP7. There is no restriction as to where eligible participants may carry out part of their research and, hence, such entities can carry out work in the occupied Palestinian territory (oPtT). The Commission is aware that AHAVA Laboratories and the Israeli Antiquities Authority have received funding to a total EUR 1.4 million and EUR 0.114 million respectively, part of which may have been expended in the oPt.

EU public procurement *acquis* provides rules regarding transparency, open competition and sound procedural management which should lead to a fair procurement process. As such, it does not contain specific provisions detailing the conditions regarding the exclusion of tenders. The Commission proposals on the reform of the Public Procurement Directives ([2]) and on an International Procurement Instrument ([3]) are currently being discussed with the Council and the Parliament. The Commission cannot prejudge the outcome of these discussions and, therefore, is unable to comment on them.

([1]) OJ L 391, 20.12.2006, p. 1.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/publicprocurement/modernising_rules/reform_proposals_en.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/publicprocurement/modernising_rules/international_access/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007506/12
to the Commission
Emma McClarkin (ECR)
(27 July 2012)

Subject: Maltese bus fares

One of my constituents visited Malta this year and, as a senior citizen, wanted to take advantage of the country's bus fares for seniors. However, when he tried to purchase such a ticket, it was more expensive for him because he is not a Maltese resident.

Can the Commission advise me on the correct position regarding different ticket prices for residents and non-residents, and whether this is in line with current EU legislation?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(5 September 2012)

The Commission is committed to ensuring the full respect of the principle of non-discrimination on grounds of nationality enshrined in Article 18 of the TFEU (the Treaty) and the right of every Union citizen to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States, subject to the limitations and conditions laid down in the Treaties and by the measures adopted to give them effect as forseen in Article 21(1) of the Treaty.

Articles 18 and 21(1) of the Treaty have given rise to case law of the Court of Justice that requires that Union citizens should be treated outside of their Member State of origin similarly to the nationals of the host Member State when they are in a similar situation unless differential treatment can be justified by objective considerations of public interest that are independent of nationality of the persons concerned and are proportionate to the legitimate aim of the national provisions (Case C-103/08 Gottwald).

The Commission is already in contact with the Maltese authorities rearding the Maltese bus fare scheme and is currently awaiting further information to carry out its assessment.

The Commission has however, not yet analysed whether a situation where non-resident pensioners do not have access to lower fares for senior citizens in Malta is compatible with the abovementioned Treaty provisions as it has not been brought to its attention so far. The Commission will request further information on that particular aspect of the Maltese bus fare scheme and its possible justifications from the Maltese authorities so as to assess whether it complies with Articles 18 and 21(1) of the Treaty and the requirements set out by the Court of Justice in the relevant case law.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007507/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Rischio per la futura efficienza dei Fondi strutturali 2014-2020

A fronte della crisi di liquidità che affligge in queste ore le finanze pubbliche di tutti gli Stati membri, come intende la Commissione, che sta procedendo alla sua revisione, garantire l'efficienza della nuova programmazione dei Fondi strutturali per il periodo 2014-2020, quando è chiaro che il principio del cofinanziamento dei progetti rappresenta oggi il principale deterrente alla loro realizzazione? Come pensa di adeguare a una situazione senza precedenti nell'economia europea il meccanismo di funzionamento dei Fondi strutturali per evitare che, di fatto, essi rimangano inaccessibili?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(12 settembre 2012)

I tassi di cofinanziamento dell'UE proposti dalla Commissione per il periodo 2014-2020 confermano l'attuale livello elevato di partecipazione dell'UE (fino all'85 % nelle regioni meno sviluppate). Al fine tuttavia di evitare potenziali ritardi nell'attuazione riconducibili alla limitata capacità di cofinanziamento degli Stati membri, la Commissione ha proposto di migliorare l'accessibilità dei fondi, in particolare istituendo un nuovo sistema di gestione finanziaria. Tale soluzione mira a garantire che gli Stati membri possano avvalersi di pagamenti iniziali in aggiunta ai pagamenti annuali anticipati, col risultato di assicurare sufficiente liquidità per i pagamenti ai beneficiari. Gli Stati membri che accusano difficoltà temporanee di bilancio saranno inoltre autorizzati a chiedere un aumento di 10 punti percentuali del tasso di cofinanziamento dell'UE (portandolo in tal modo al 95 %).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007507/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 July 2012)

Subject: Risk for the future efficiency of the Structural Funds 2014-2020

Given the liquidity crisis currently afflicting the public finances of all the Member States, how will the Commission (which is currently reviewing the Structural Funds programming) ensure that the Structural Funds are efficient in the 2014-2020 programming period, when it is clear that the co-financing of projects is currently the main obstacle to their completion?

How will it adapt the operating mechanisms of the Structural Funds to a situation that is unprecedented in the European economy, to ensure that the funds remain accessible?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(12 September 2012)

The EU co-financing rates proposed by the Commission for the 2014-2020 period maintain the present high level of EU participation (up to 85% in less developed regions). Nevertheless, to prevent potential implementation delays due to limited co-financing capacity of Member States, the Commission has proposed to improve the accessibility of the Funds, in particular by setting up a new financial management system. This is to ensure that Member States benefit from initial as well as annual advance payments that allow for sufficient liquidity to make payments to beneficiaries. In addition, Member States experiencing temporary budget difficulties would be entitled to request an increase of 10 percentage points in the EU co-financing rate (i.e. increasing the EU co-financing rate up to 95%).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007508/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Problemi che minano il buon funzionamento del settore del commercio al dettaglio

In riferimento alla risposta E-005193/2012 può la Commissione esplicitare quali sono i problemi che stanno alla base delle disfunzioni all'interno del settore del commercio al dettaglio secondo la relazione cui fa riferimento?

Può essa inoltre indicare le modalità con le quali si intende affrontare le problematiche emerse?

Considerando che in tale relazione non si forniscono dati esaustivi sull'andamento del settore del commercio al dettaglio nei singoli Stati membri, come intende la Commissione ottenerli?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(3 settembre 2012)

La relazione del 2010 «Esercizio di sorveglianza del mercato nel settore del commercio e della distribuzione» ([1]) ha messo in luce una ventina di pecche che compromettono il corretto funzionamento del commercio al dettaglio, riguardanti, fra l'altro, norme in materia di stabilimento, questioni relative all'accessibilità per i consumatori, pratiche commerciali sleali tra imprese e problematiche connesse all'impiego della manodopera.

La Commissione sta attualmente elaborando una comunicazione relativa al Piano d'azione europeo per il commercio al dettaglio, che è prevista per l'autunno 2012. La comunicazione intende definire le azioni strategiche per affrontare le questioni rilevate dalla relazione sull'Esercizio di sorveglianza del mercato, nonché altri temi segnalati dal Parlamento europeo nella sua relazione d'iniziativa e raccolti durante le consultazioni con i soggetti interessati.

È inoltre in corso uno studio sul costo della non-Europa. Si tratterà di un'analisi approfondita di vari settori, fra i quali il commercio al dettaglio.

Le informazioni sul commercio al dettaglio nei singoli Stati membri sono consultabili nel documento di lavoro dei servizi della Commissione che contiene informazioni dettagliate sull'attuazione della direttiva 2006/123/CE relativa ai servizi nel mercato interno ([2]). Tale documento contiene dati analitici relativi all'attuazione della direttiva servizi in tutti gli Stati membri.

([1]) COM(2010)355, http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/retail/docs/monitoring_report_it.pdf
([2]) SWD(2012)148, http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/services/docs/services-dir/implementation/report/SWD_2012_148_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007508/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 July 2012)

Subject: Problems undermining the proper functioning of the retail sector

With reference to its reply to Written Question E-005193/2012 can the Commission clarify what exactly are the problems that have been undermining the proper functioning of the retail sector, according to the report to which it refers?

Can it also say how it intends to address the issues which have emerged?

Given that this report does not provide comprehensive data on the performance of the retail sector in individual Member States, how does the Commission intend to obtain such data?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(3 September 2012)

The 2010 Retail Market Monitoring Report ([1]) identified some 20 problems that were undermining the proper functioning of the retail sector, including rules on establishment, accessibility issues for consumers, unfair commercial practices between businesses as well as some issues linked to the use of labour.

The Commission is currently preparing a communication on the European Retail Action Plan, which is due for autumn 2012. This communication would set out policy actions addressing issues identified by the Retail Market Monitoring Report as well as other matters identified by the European Parliament in its own initiative report and gathered in consultations with stakeholders.

In addition, a study is being carried out on the cost of non-Europe. It will consist of an in-depth analysis of different sectors, including the retail sector.

Data on retail in individual Member States can be found in the Commission staff working paper regarding detailed information on the implementation of Directive 2006/123/EC on services in the internal market ([2]). This document contains analytical data on the implementation of the Services Directive in all Member States.

([1]) COM(2010) 355, http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/retail/docs/monitoring_report_en.pdf
([2]) SWD(2012) 148, http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/services/docs/services-dir/implementation/report/SWD_2012_148_en.pdf