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 270 E/01)

Treść **Strona**

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005440/12
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(30. Mai 2012)

Betrifft: Vorbereitung auf eine Verschärfung der Eurokrise

Medienberichten zufolge arbeitet das Nicht-Euro-Land Schweiz an einem Notfallplan für den Fall einer Eskalation im Euro-Währungsraum. Konkret sollen Vorschläge erarbeitet werden, was die Regierung in einem solchen Fall zur Stützung des Finanz- und Arbeitsmarktes unternehmen könnte. Auch Großbritannien soll sich für den Fall eines Zusammenbruchs der Eurozone mit Notfall-Plänen auf eine mögliche Immigrations-Welle vorbereiten.

1. Werden auf EU-Ebene ebenfalls Notfallpläne für eine Verschärfung der Eurokrise oder gar einen Zusammenbruch der Eurozone erarbeitet?

2. Inwieweit werden auf EU-Ebene konkrete Pläne erarbeitet, um einen möglichst geordneten Ausstieg Griechenlands aus der Eurozone zu bewerkstelligen?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Rehn im Namen der Kommission
(23. Juli 2012)

Die Kommission kommentiert keine spekulativen Presseberichte. Sie konzentriert sich darauf, die Einheit des Euro-Währungsraums zu erhalten, und auf die zur Erreichung dieses Ziels notwendigen Mittel. Die Kommission hat sich wiederholt nachdrücklich dafür ausgesprochen, dass Griechenland Mitglied des Euro-Währungsraums bleibt, und unterstrichen, dass sie weiterhin alles in ihrer Macht Stehende tun wird, um dies zu ermöglichen.

Die Europäische Kommission möchte den Herrn Abgeordneten auf die gemeinsame Erklärung vom 17. Juni 2012 von Herrn Präsidenten Barroso und Herrn Präsidenten Van Rompuy verweisen ([1]).

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/12/453&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005827/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(11 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: La Svizzera si prepara alla fine dell'euro: e le banche europee?

In un articolo del 28 maggio (Swiss Franc Traders Shrug Off Risk Of Capital Controls), il Wall Street Journal segnala come la Svizzera stia considerando misure di controllo sui movimenti di capitale per evitare una forte rivalutazione del franco svizzero nel caso di collasso del sistema dell'euro.

È stata anche creata una task-force per valutare le azioni più opportune nel caso la Grecia decida di ritornare alla dracma.

Nel contempo, dalla Commissione europea arrivano segnali contrastanti: il commissario Karel De Gucht, in un'intervista al quotidiano fiammingo «De Standaard» ha affermato che anche la Commissione sta studiando le conseguenze di un'uscita dalla zona euro da parte della Grecia, mentre la Commissione ha smentito di stare lavorando all'ipotesi di tale scenario.

Può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Ha intrapreso studi seri sulla tutela dell'euro da un punto di vista valutario nel caso la Grecia esca dall'eurozona?

2. Ha invitato le banche centrali europee ad approntare piani di emergenza per questa eventualità?

3. Non ritiene che l'uscita dell'euro da parte della Grecia comprometterebbe la credibilità stessa della moneta rendendo opportuno un ritorno alle valute nazionali?

4. Cosa intende fare per tutelare gli altri Stati membri che soffrirebbero delle conseguenze della svalutazione della moneta unica europea e dei forti e inevitabili conseguenti disequilibri del mercato monetario?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005850/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(12 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Misure a fronte del default della Grecia

La Grecia è insolvente: ma, mentre una fazione nell'Eurozona ha preso atto di questa realtà ed è pronta a negoziare una moratoria del debito e un'uscita dall'Euro, nessuno veramente sa quali saranno le conseguenze del default.

Robert Zoellick, che alla fine di giugno rimetterà il mandato di presidente della Banca Mondiale, ha scritto sul Financial Times del 31 maggio che, se la Grecia lasciasse l'Euro, non ci sarebbe modo di evitare il contagio. «Coloro che vivono nell'edificio dell'eurozona, specialmente quelli ai piani direzionali (alti), sono sordi ai campanelli d'allarme, ma dovrebbero leggere le istruzioni. I fatti della Grecia potrebbero causare il panico in Spagna, Italia e in tutta Eurolandia, spingendo l'Europa in una zona pericolosa. Se la Grecia esce dall'Euro, è impossibile prevedere il contagio, proprio come [il crollo di] Lehman ebbe conseguenze inattese».

Di fatto, l'unico strumento disponibile all'interno del sistema è l'espansione monetaria, il cui potenziale iperinflazionistico ha già superato i valori di soglia.

La Commissione non ritiene che l'unico modo per impedire il disastro sia la separazione bancaria, un sistema di parità tra monete nazionali sovrane e cioè una politica di credito produttivo e un New Deal del XXI secolo?

Risposta congiunta di Olli Rehn a nome della Commissione
(23 luglio 2012)

La Commissione non commenta comunicati stampa speculativi. La Commissione si concentra sulla salvaguardia dell'integrità della zona euro e su ciò che è necessario per conseguire questo obiettivo. Essa ha più volte espresso il vivo auspicio che la Grecia rimanga membro della zona euro e continuerà a fare quanto è in suo potere perché ciò accada.

La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alla dichiarazione congiunta dei presidenti Barroso e Van Rompuy del 17 giugno 2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/12/453&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005231/12
aan de Commissie
Barry Madlener (NI)
(23 mei 2012)

Betreft: Crisisteam ECB

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht ([1]) dat de ECB een crisisteam heeft klaarstaan voor een exit scenario van de euro uit Griekenland? Kan de Commissie dit bevestigen?

2. Heeft de Commissie inmiddels ook een crisisteam samengesteld? Zo ja, hoe is dat team samengesteld en wat is zijn taakomschrijving? Zo nee, waarom niet?

3. Heeft de Commissie zich terdege voorbereid op een spoedig Grieks exit? Zo nee, waarom niet? En zo ja op welke wijze heeft de Commissie zich voorbereid?

4. Is de Commissie bereid om het Parlement op korte termijn te informeren over de stand van zaken over een Griekse exit uit de eurozone en de gevolgen daarvan? Zo nee, waarom niet?

5. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht van Reuters ([2]) dat er al een drukker bekend is voor het drukken van de Griekse drachme?

6. Is de Commissie nog steeds van mening dat er een domino effect optreedt als Griekenland de eurozone verlaat? Zo ja, heeft de Commissie dan ook een exit scenario voorhanden voor die andere landen, bijvoorbeeld Spanje?

7. Heeft de Commissie zich gerealiseerd dat de huidige kapitaalvlucht uit Zuid-Europa gemakkelijk tot een algemene bankrun kan leiden die het financiële stelsel volledig kan ontwrichten? Heeft de Commissie daarvoor ook een scenario klaarliggen?

8. Wordt er sinds het mislukken van het vormen van een Griekse regering nog geld overgemaakt vanuit de internationale instituties (ECB, EU, IMF)?

Antwoord van de heer Rehn namens de Commissie
(23 juli 2012)

De Commissie gaat niet in op speculatieve persberichten. De Commissie concentreert zich op het behoud van de integriteit van de eurozone en wat nodig is om dit doel te bereiken. De Commissie heeft herhaaldelijk de sterke wens geuit dat Griekenland lid van de eurozone blijft en verklaard dat zij alles wat in haar vermogen ligt zal blijven doen om dit mogelijk te maken.

De Commissie verzoekt het geachte Parlementslid kennis te nemen van de gemeenschappelijke verklaring van voorzitters Barroso en Van Rompuy van 17 juni 2012 ([3]).

([1]) http://www.standaard.be/artikel/detail.aspx?artikelid=DMF20120523_150
([2]) http://uk.reuters.com/article/2012/05/18/uk-delarue-greece-idUKBRE84H0DH20120518
([3]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/12/453&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005060/12
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(16 de maio de 2012)

Assunto: Grécia: eventual saída do Euro

Não obstante não haver qualquer previsão nos Tratados a este respeito, avolumam-se a um ritmo preocupante as informações e os pareceres acerca da possibilidade da saída da Grécia da zona euro e do seu retorno à moeda nacional.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Como avalia a possibilidade de permanência da Grécia na zona euro?

— Está ciente de que muitos observadores e peritos internacionais se inclinam para a necessidade da sua saída?

— Que consequências esta poderia ter para a Grécia bem como para os demais integrantes da zona euro?

— Já previu a possibilidade da saída grega?

— Tem previstas medidas que acautelem o seu impacto e protejam a economia europeia, nomeadamente dos países que sofrem mais duramente os efeitos da crise?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005094/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(16 de Maio de 2012)

Assunto: Crise política na Grécia põe em risco permanência na zona euro

Tem sido veiculada pela imprensa a informação de que a crise da zona euro se encontra em risco de agravar em resultado da crise política na Grécia, pondo em causa a sua permanência na moeda única.

Face ao exposto, pergunto à Comissão:

— Sabendo que tal cenário terá um impacto grave nos Estados-Membros submetidos a programas de ajustamento, como Portugal e Irlanda, bem como no próprio projeto europeu, confirma a informação descrita?

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

A Comissão não se pronuncia sobre notícias de imprensa de natureza especulativa. A Comissão tem por objetivo preservar a integridade da zona do euro e fazer o necessário para atingir esse fim. A Comissão tem manifestado repetidamente o seu profundo desejo de que a Grécia continue a fazer parte da zona do euro, e de continuar a fazer tudo o que estiver ao seu alcance para que tal seja possível.

A Comissão convida o Senhor Deputado a consultar a declaração conjunta pelos Presidentes Durão Barroso e Van Rompuy, de 17 de junho de 2012 ([1]).

([1]) (http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/12/453&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en)

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005060/12
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(16 May 2012)

Subject: Greece: possible exit from the euro

Information and opinions on Greece's possible exit from the euro area and its return to national currency are spiralling at an alarming rate, despite no provisions for it being laid down in the Treaties.

I therefore ask the Commission:

— How does it view the likelihood of Greece remaining in the euro area?

— Is it aware that many international observers and experts are in favour of Greece's exit?

— What consequences could this have for Greece as well as other members of the euro area?

— Has it already made provisions for Greece's possible exit?

— Has it made provisions to safeguard against its impact and protect the European economy, particularly in countries worst hit by the effects of the crisis?

Question for written answer E-005094/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(16 May 2012)

Subject: Political crisis in Greece jeopardises its membership of the single currency

It has been reported in the press that the crisis in the euro area is set to worsen as a result of Greece's political crisis, thus jeopardising its membership of the single currency.

In view of the above, I ask the Commission:

— Given that such an outcome will have a serious impact on Member States following Structural Adjustment Programmes, such as Portugal and Ireland, as well as on the Treaty for the European Union itself, can it confirm the aforementioned information?

Question for written answer E-005231/12
to the Commission
Barry Madlener (NI)
(23 May 2012)

Subject: ECB Crisis Team

1. Is the Commission acquainted with the report ([1]) to the effect that the European Central Bank (ECB) has a crisis team ready for Greece's exit from the euro? Can the Commission confirm this?

2. Has the Commission assembled its own crisis team? If so, what is the team's composition and remit? If not, why not?

3. Has the Commission thoroughly prepared itself for a rapid Greek exit? If not, why not? If so, what has the Commission done to prepare itself?

4. Is the Commission prepared to inform Parliament at short notice of the state of affairs regarding a Greek exit from the euro area and its consequences? If not, why not?

([1]) http://www.standaard.be/artikel/detail.aspx?artikelid=DMF20120523_150

5. Is the Commission acquainted with the Reuters report ([2]) to the effect that there is already a known printer who will print the Greek drachma?

6. Is the Commission still of the opinion that Greece's leaving the euro area will have a domino effect? If so, does the Commission have an exit scenario ready for other countries such as Spain?

7. Has the Commission realised that the current flight of capital from southern Europe may easily turn into a general bank run which could dislocate the whole financial system? Does the Commission have any scenario in place for this eventuality?

8. Following Greece's failure to form a government, will it continue to receive money from the international institutions (ECB, EU, IMF)?

Question for written answer E-005440/12
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(30 May 2012)

Subject: Preparations for an intensification of the euro crisis

According to reports in the media, Switzerland, which is not a member of the euro area, is working on an emergency plan in the event that the single currency crisis escalates. In concrete terms, proposals are to be drawn up for what the government could do to support the financial and labour markets. The United Kingdom is also said to be preparing emergency plans for a possible wave of immigration in the event that the euro area collapses.

1. Is the EU also drawing up emergency plans in the event of an intensification of the euro crisis, or even the collapse of the euro area?

2. To what extent is the EU making specific plans to manage the most orderly exit possible for Greece from the euro area?

Question for written answer E-005827/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(11 June 2012)

Subject: Switzerland is preparing for the end of the euro; what about European banks?

In an article published on 28 May ('Swiss Franc Traders Shrug Off Risk Of Capital Controls'), the *Wall Street Journal* reported that Switzerland is considering capital controls to prevent a sharp rise in the value of the Swiss franc in the event of the collapse of the euro area.

A task force has also been set up to evaluate the most appropriate course of action should Greece decide to return to the drachma.

Meanwhile, the European Commission is giving conflicting signals: in an interview with the Flemish daily newspaper *De Standaard*, Commissioner Karel De Gucht said that the Commission is also examining the consequences of a Greek exit from the euro area, while the Commission itself has denied working on any such assumption.

Can the Commission state:

1. whether it has undertaken any serious study of how to protect the euro on the currency markets if Greece should leave the euro area?

2. whether it has asked the European central banks to prepare emergency plans for this eventuality?

3. whether it does not think that an exit from the euro area by Greece would compromise the credibility of the euro, making it expedient to return to national currencies?

4. how it intends to protect the other Member States from the consequences of a devaluation of the euro and the inevitable resulting turmoil on the currency markets?

([2]) http://uk.reuters.com/article/2012/05/18/uk-delarue-greece-idUKBRE84H0DH20120518

Question for written answer E-005850/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(12 June 2012)

Subject: Measures in relation to the Greek default

Greece is insolvent: however, while one faction in the eurozone has taken note of this reality and is ready to negotiate a debt moratorium and an exit from the euro, no-one really knows what the consequences of the default will be.

Robert Zoellick, who steps down as President of the World Bank at the end of June, wrote in the *Financial Times* on 31 May that, if Greece does leave the euro, there will be no way of avoiding the contagion. 'While those living in the eurozone building, especially those on the executive floors (the top ones), will not want to hear an alarm, they had best read the instructions. Events in Greece could trigger financial fright in Spain, Italy, and across the eurozone, pushing Europe into a danger zone. If Greece leaves the eurozone, the contagion is impossible to predict, just as [the collapse of] Lehman had unexpected consequences'.

In fact the only available tool within the system is monetary expansion, the potential of which for hyperinflation has already crossed the threshold values.

Does the Commission not think that the only way of preventing disaster is banking separation, a system of parity between national sovereign currencies and, in other words, a policy of productive credit and a 21st-century New Deal?

Joint answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(23 July 2012)

The Commission does not comment on speculative press reports. The Commission concentrates on preserving the integrity of the euro area and what is needed for achieving this objective. The Commission has repeatedly expressed the strong desire that Greece should remain a member of the euro area and that it will continue to do everything in its power for this to happen.

The Commission invites the Honourable Member to refer to the joint statement by Presidents Barroso and Van Rompuy of 17 June 2012 ([3]).

([3]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/12/453&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005321/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(29 Μαΐου 2012)

Θέμα: Νέα καταδίκη της Λεϊλά Ζανά στην Τουρκία

Τουρκικό δικαστήριο επέβαλε νέα δεκαετή κάθειρξη και στέρηση των πολιτικών δικαιωμάτων στην Λεϊλά Ζανά, βουλευτή κουρδικής καταγωγής, για παραβίαση του τουρκικού αντιτρομοκρατικού νόμου. Η Λεϊλά Ζανά κατηγορούνταν για εννέα διαφορετικές ομιλίες που πραγματοποίησε, μεταξύ των οποίων και μία στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο. Αξίζει επίσης να σημειωθεί ότι η Ζανά ήταν υποψήφια για το Νόμπελ Ειρήνης το 1995 και κάτοχος του ευρωπαϊκού βραβείου Ζαχάροφ.

Δεδομένου ότι σε προηγούμενη ερώτησή μου (E-000909/2012) σχετικά με συλλήψεις καθηγητών, φοιτητών και δημοσιογράφων στην Τουρκία, η Επιτροπή είχε απαντήσει «οι διατάξεις του τουρκικού ποινικού κώδικα, της αντιτρομοκρατικής νομοθεσίας και του κώδικα ποινικής δικονομίας, που προσδιορίζουν τα εγκλήματα που σχετίζονται με την τρομοκρατία, πρέπει να αλλάξουν ώστε να διαχωρίζεται σαφώς η ελεύθερη έκφραση της γνώμης από την προτροπή σε βία», ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Πώς σχολιάζει τα παραπάνω; Τι έχει πράξει προκειμένου να συμπαρασταθεί στην Λεϊλά Ζανά; Τι προτίθεται να πράξει προκειμένου να σταματήσουν οι δικαστικές διώξεις σε βάρος της και οι περιορισμοί που υπάρχουν στο δικαίωμα της ελευθερίας έκφρασης των τούρκων πολιτών;

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005584/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(4 Ιουνίου 2012)

Θέμα: Νέα καταδίκη της Λεϊλά Ζανά

Η κουρδικής καταγωγής βουλευτής Λεϊλά Ζανά, στην οποία απενεμήθη το Βραβείο Ζαχάρωφ από το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, καταδικάστηκε εκ νέου σε δεκαετή φυλάκιση από το 5ο Ποινικό Δικαστήριο, στο Ντιγιαρμπακίρ της Τουρκίας, γιατί την περίοδο 2007-2008, έκανε συνολικά 9 ομιλίες (συμπεριλαμβανομένων και ομιλιών στο ΕΚ), που άπτονται του θέματος της τρομοκρατίας, που είναι η συνήθης καταδίκη εναντίον Κούρδων πολιτικών και ακτιβιστών. Η νέα καταδίκη της Λεϊλά Ζανά φανερώνει με τον πιο παραστατικό τρόπο πως η ελευθερία έκφρασης είναι υπό δίωξη στα Ποινικά Δικαστήρια της Τουρκίας και πως οι βασικές ελευθερίες παραβιάζονται. Σημειωτέον πως για τις ίδιες κατηγορίες εξέτισε στο παρελθόν δεκαετή φυλάκιση και απελευθερώθηκε, μεσούσης της 15ετούς καταδίκης της, το 2004, λόγω έντονων πιέσεων της διεθνούς κοινωνίας. Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Τι προτίθεται να πράξει ώστε να αρθεί άμεσα αυτή η νέα καταδίκη και να διασφαλιστεί το δικαίωμα της Κούρδισσας βουλευτού να απολαμβάνει το δικαίωμα ελεύθερης έκφρασης, χωρίς καταδίκες και άδικες φυλακίσεις;

2. Το προαναφερθέν περιστατικό συνάδει με την ενταξιακή πορεία της Τουρκίας και το όραμά της για πλήρη ενσωμάτωση στην ΕΕ;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(18 Ιουλίου 2012)

Η ΕΕ εκφράζει την ανησυχία της για την πρόσφατη δικαστική απόφαση στην υπόθεση της Λέιλα Ζανά. Ενώ υποστηρίζει τον αγώνα της Τουρκίας κατά της τρομοκρατίας, η ΕΕ θεωρεί την ελευθερία της έκφρασης θεμελιώδη αξία, η προστασία της οποίας πρέπει να συμβιβάζεται με την αποτελεσματική καταπολέμηση της τρομοκρατίας. Η Τουρκία θα έπρεπε να ασχοληθεί με το ζήτημα της υπερβολικά ευρείας ερμηνείας της τρομοκρατίας που δίνεται από τα δικαστήρια, και να εξασφαλίσει να γίνεται σαφής διαχωρισμός στο νόμο και στην πράξη μεταξύ προτροπής σε βία και μη βίαιης έκφρασης ιδεών. Τα θεμελιώδη δικαιώματα είναι βασική προτεραιότητα στο πλαίσιο του από μέρους της Επιτροπής ελέγχου της προόδου της Τουρκίας σε ό,τι αφορά την εκπλήρωση των πολιτικών κριτηρίων. Η Επιτροπή συστηματικά καταγγέλλει στις τουρκικές αρχές συγκεκριμένα περιστατικά παραβιάσεων ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων. Επί πλέον, η αντιπροσωπεία της ΕΕ στην Τουρκία παρακολουθεί από κοντά σημαντικές υποθέσεις όπως η παρούσα, ακόμη και με την παρουσία της σε ακροαματικές διαδικασίες. Η Επιτροπή θα συνεχίσει να παρακολουθεί εκ του σύνεγγυς την έφεση που ασκήθηκε κατά της απόφασης αυτής, καθώς και άλλες υποθέσεις που της έχουν αναφερθεί.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005520/12
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI) en Barry Madlener (NI)
(31 mei 2012)

Betreft: Sakharovprijswinnaar Leyla Zana veroordeeld tot 10 jaar cel

In Turkije is het Koerdische parlementslid Leyla Zana veroordeeld tot 10 jaar cel voor „het verspreiden van propaganda voor de PKK in een reeks speeches uit 2007-2008". In 1995 kreeg zij de Sakharovprijs voor vrijheid van denken.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht „Turkije vonnist Koerdische politica" ([1])?

2. Veroordeelt de Commissie het dat Leyla Zana is veroordeeld wegens het uiten van haar mening? Zo neen, waarom niet?

3. Ziet de Commissie in dat de vrijheid van meningsuiting in Turkije nog altijd onder gigantische druk staat?

4. Welke consequenties verbindt de Commissie aan de veroordeling van Leyla Zana inzake de toetredingsonderhandelingen met Turkije?

5. Is de Commissie voornemens actie te ondernemen inzake de veroordeling van Leyla Zana? Zo ja, wat? Zo neen, waarom niet?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(18 juli 2012)

De EU is bezorgd over de recente uitspraak in de zaak Leyla Zana. De EU steunt Turkije in zijn strijd tegen terrorisme, maar beschouwt de vrijheid van meningsuiting als een fundamentele waarde; de bescherming ervan moet verenigbaar zijn met een doeltreffende bestrijding van terrorisme. Turkije moet de te ruime interpretatie van terrorisme door de rechtbanken aanpakken en erop toezien dat zowel juridisch als in de praktijk een duidelijk onderscheid wordt gemaakt tussen het aanzetten tot geweld en het geweldloos uiten van een mening. Fundamentele rechten zijn een belangrijke prioriteit voor de Commissie bij haar toezicht op de vooruitgang van Turkije wat betreft de politieke criteria. De Commissie bespreekt stelselmatig specifieke gevallen van schendingen van de mensenrechten met de Turkse autoriteiten. Voorts volgt de EU-delegatie in Turkije belangrijke zaken zoals deze op de voet, onder meer door rechtszittingen bij te wonen. De Commissie zal het beroep in deze zaak nauwlettend blijven volgen, alsook in andere zaken die onder haar aandacht worden gebracht.

([1]) http://nos.nl/artikel/376434-turkije-vonnist-koerdische-politica.html

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande P-005430/12
till kommissionen (Vice-ordföranden / Höga representanten)
Marita Ulvskog (S&D)
(30 maj 2012)

Angående: VP/HR – den bristande respekten för grundläggande rättigheter i Turkiet och domen mot Leyla Zana

1. Tordagen den 24 maj 2012 dömde en turkisk domstol den kurdiska politikern Leyla Zana till tio års fängelse för att ha ”spridit militant propaganda”. 1995 fick hon ta emot Sacharov-priset för sitt arbete med att försvara mänskliga rättigheter och kämpa för en fredlig och demokratisk lösning på konflikten mellan den turkiska staten och den kurdiska befolkningen. Hur kommer vice ordföranden för kommissionen/unionens höga representant att fördöma den domen?

2. Men tanke på EU:s försvar för grundläggande rättigheter och yttrandefrihet, hur kommer vice ordföranden för kommissionen/unionens höga representant att agera när det gäller Turkiets fortsatta förbud mot yttrandefrihet?

3. Turkiet är ett viktigt grannland till EU och ett kandidatland. Hur arbetar vice ordföranden för kommissionen/unionens höga representant konkret med frågor om grundläggande rättigheter i EU:s förbindelser med Turkiet?

Samlat svar från Štefan Füle på kommissionens vägnar
(18 juli 2012)

Domen som avkunnats i målet mot Leyla Zana bekymrar EU. Även om man stöder Turkiets kamp mot terrorismen ser EU yttrandefriheten som en grundläggande värdering som måste skyddas samtidigt som man för en effektiv kamp mot terrorismen. Turkiet bör ta itu med domstolarnas alltför breda tolkning av definitionen av terrorism och se till att det i både lagstiftning och praxis görs tydlig skillnad mellan uppvigling till våld och fredligt yttrande av åsikter. Grundläggande rättigheter är en huvudprioritet vid kommissionens övervakning av Turkiets framsteg i fråga om de politiska kriterierna. Kommissionen tar systematiskt upp specifika fall av brott mot de mänskliga rättigheterna med de turkiska myndigheterna. EU:s delegation i Turkiet övervakar dessutom noggrant rättsfall som detta och närvarar även vid rättegångar. Kommissionen kommer att fortsätta att noggrant följa överklagandet av denna dom, samt andra fall som kommit till dess kännedom.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005321/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(29 May 2012)

Subject: New sentence for Leyla Zana in Turkey

A Turkish court has imposed a fresh ten-year prison sentence on Leyla Zana, a Turkish MP of Kurdish origin, for violating Turkish anti-terrorism laws and has stripped her of her civil rights. The charges against Leyla Zana were based on nine separate speeches she gave — one of the speeches in question was given at the European Parliament. It is also worth noting that Zana was a candidate for the Nobel Peace Prize in 1995 and is a holder of the European Sakharov Prize.

Given that, in reply to my previous question (E-000909/2012) on the arrest of lecturers, students and journalists in Turkey, the Commission stated that 'the provisions in the Turkish Criminal Code, the Anti-Terror Law and the Code of Criminal Procedures, which define crimes related to terrorism, need to be changed — to make a clear distinction between the free expression of opinion and incitement to violence', will the Commission say:

How does it view this issue? What has it done to support Leyla Zana? What does it intend to do to stop the legal proceedings against her and end the restrictions on Turkish citizens' right to free speech?

Question for written answer P-005430/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Marita Ulvskog (S&D)
(30 May 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Failure to respect fundamental rights in Turkey and the sentence against Leyla Zana

1. On Thursday 24 May 2012, a Turkish court sentenced the Kurdish politician Leyla Zana to 10 years in prison on charges of 'spreading militant propaganda'. In 1995 she was awarded the Sakharov Prize for her work in defending human rights and fighting for a peaceful and democratic resolution to the conflicts between the Turkish Government and Kurdish population. How will the Vice-President/High Representative condemn the sentence?

2. Given that the EU is a defender of fundamental rights and freedom of speech, how will the Vice-President/High Representative act regarding Turkey's continuing denial of freedom of speech?

3. Since Turkey is also an important neighbour to the EU and a candidate country, in what specific ways is the Vice-President/High Representative working with the issues of fundamental rights in the EU's relations with Turkey?

Question for written answer E-005520/12
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI) and Barry Madlener (NI)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Sakharov prize winner Leyla Zana sentenced to 10 years in prison

In Turkey, Kurdish parliamentarian Leyla Zana has been sentenced to 10 years in prison for 'disseminating propaganda for the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK) in a series of speeches from 2007 to 2008'. She was awarded the Sakharov Prize for Freedom of Thought in 1995.

1. Is the Commission familiar with the article 'Turkije vonnist Koerdische politica', reporting the conviction of Leyla Zana? ([1])

2. Does the Commission condemn Leyla Zana's conviction for expressing her opinion? If not, why not?

3. Does the Commission realise that in Turkey, freedom of speech is still under huge pressure?

([1]) http://nos.nl/artikel/376434-turkije-vonnist-koerdische-politica.html

4. What consequences does the Commission propose that Leyla Zana's sentence should have for the accession negotiations with Turkey?

5. Does the Commission intend to act on Leyla Zana's sentence? If so, what action will it take? If not, why not?

Question for written answer E-005584/12
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(4 June 2012)

Subject: Leyla Zana sentenced again

Leyla Zana is a Kurdish parliamentarian who was awarded the Sakharov Prize by the European Parliament. She has once again been sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment by the Diyarbakir 5th High Criminal Court for making a total of nine speeches (including speeches in the European Parliament) on terrorism in the period 2007-2008. This is the standard reason for conviction of Kurdish politicians and activists. The fresh verdict against Leyla Zana provides a graphic illustration of how freedom of expression is being penalised by the criminal courts in Turkey and how fundamental freedoms are violated. It should be noted that she served 10 years in prison on the same charges and was freed in 2004, part-way through her 15-year sentence, as a result of intense pressure from the international community.

Can the Commission answer the following:

1. What action does it intend to take with a view to securing an immediate overturn of this new sentence, enabling this Kurdish parliamentarian to enjoy freedom of speech without criminal convictions and unjust imprisonment?

2. Is this case compatible with Turkey's accession progress and its vision of full European Union membership?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(18 July 2012)

The EU is concerned about the recent ruling in the Leyla Zana case. While supporting Turkey in its fight against terrorism, the EU regards freedom of expression as a fundamental value, the protection of which should be compatible with an effective fight against terrorism. Turkey should address the too wide interpretation of terrorism by the courts, and make sure a clear distinction is made in law and in practice between the incitement to violence and the non-violent expression of ideas. Fundamental rights are a key priority in the Commission's monitoring of progress on the political criteria for Turkey. The Commission systematically raises specific cases of violations of human rights with the Turkish authorities. Furthermore, the EU Delegation in Turkey closely monitors important cases such as this, including by attending trial hearings. The Commission will continue to closely follow the appeal of this case, and other cases brought to its attention.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007409/12
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(24 July 2012)

Subject: EU transport funding for island communities

Residents of the EU's many island groups are totally dependent upon increasingly costly inter-island ferries for day-to-day transportation.

Can the Commission advise whether there is any EU funding available to aid in the provision of fixed links, such as causeways, bridges or tunnels between islands?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(12 September 2012)

In the past, cohesion policy funding has been available to support investments in island communities. In the 2014-2020 period, the Commission has proposed that cohesion policy continues to provide funding for investments in island communities, including in the transport sector.

Given that cohesion policy operates under shared management, Member States establish tailored regional development programmes in line with European policy priorities such as TEN-T for transport.

Certain infrastructure links which are part of the trans-European transport network as defined in Decision No 661/2010/EU ([1]) could also be eligible for funding under the TEN-T programme as set out in Regulation (EC) No 680/2007 ([2]). On 19 October 2011 ([3]), the Commission proposed a revision of TEN-T policy, which is currently in the ordinary legislative procedure.

([1]) Decision No 661/2010/EU of the European 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, pp. 1-129.

([2]) Regulation (EC) No 680/2007 of the European 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, pp. 1-10.

([3]) COM(2011) 650 Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network and COM(2011) 665 Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the Connecting Europe Facility.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-007432/12
до Комисията

Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Alejo Vidal-Quadras (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Simon Busuttil (PPE), Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE), Elmar Brok (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Ioannis Kasoulides (PPE), Андрей Ковачев (PPE), Jean-Paul Gauzès (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Gay Mitchell (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Erik Bánki (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Ivo Belet (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Romana Jordan (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Krišjānis Kariņš (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Надежда Нейнски (PPE), Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Hubert Pirker (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Csaba Sógor (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Róża Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Владимир Уручев (PPE), Dominique Vlasto (PPE), Iuliu Winkler (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE) и Paweł Zalewski (PPE)

(24 юли 2012 г.)

Относно: Безработицата сред младежта: искане за информация относно резултатите, постигнати от „екипите за действие“ и реорганизирането на европейските фондове за младежка заетост

По време на неофициалното заседание на Европейския съвет, проведено на 30 януари 2012 г., Комисията създаде осем „екипа за действие“, които ще бъдат изпратени в европейски държави с високи равнища на младежка безработица (Италия, Испания, Гърция, Словакия, Литва, Португалия, Латвия и Ирландия), и обяви, че 82 милиарда евро все още неусвоени европейски средства ще бъдат използвани за подкрепа на мерки за борба с младежката безработица, за стимулиране на растежа и подпомагане на МСП. В периода между февруари и май 2012 г. експерти от Комисията проведоха консултации във въпросните осем държави членки. На 23 май 2012 г. председателят на Комисията Барозу представи първите резултати, постигнати от „екипите за действие“, като обяви, че вече 7.3 милиарда евро са заделени за ускорено отпускане или са преразпределени.

Като се има предвид, че наличните данни са неясни, тъй като са непълни и недостатъчно подробни, както и че Комисията и Парламента многократно са подчертавали нуждата от активно и конкретно участие на младите хора в процеса на вземане на решения, може ли Комисията да отговори на следните въпроси:

1. Освен документа, представен от председателя Барозу на 23 май 2012 г., съществуват ли по-точни и по-подробни документи и данни относно финансирани и текущи проекти?

2. Извършен ли е анализ на добри практики и разработена ли е стратегия за дългосрочни действия за стимулиране на младежката заетост?

3. Включвани ли са младежки организации и в кои случаи, а така също и по какъв начин са им предоставяни консултации в съответствие с предвиденото в съобщението на Комисията, озаглавено Инициатива „Възможности за младежта“, и резолюцията на Парламента от 24 май 2012 г. относно инициативата „Възможности за младежта“?

4. Какви резултати са постигнати и какви решения са взети по време на консултациите с другите седем държави с равнище на безработицата над средното за ЕС (България, Кипър, Франция, Унгария, Полша, Румъния, Швеция)?

Отговор, даден от г-н Андор, от името на Комисията
(6 септември 2012 г.)

Въпроси № 1 и 4. По време на двустранните срещи и посещенията на екипите за действие бяха потърсени съвместни решения за ускоряване прилагането на съществуващите програми или разширяване на техния обхват чрез увеличаване на бюджета или подобряване на тяхната насоченост. Държавите членки ([1]) се ангажираха да използват по-ефективно фондовете на ЕС чрез пренасочване на неразпределени или неизползвани средства на ЕС за подкрепа на мерките за младежка заетост. Конкретните резултати от тази дейност бяха представени от председателя на Комисията през май.

Въпрос № 2. По време на Европейския семестър Комисията обърна специално внимание на положението с младежката безработица в различните държави членки и на политиките за младежка заетост, съдържащи се в националните програми за реформи. Този анализ е отразен в специфичните за всяка страна препоръки и работни документи на службите на Комисията, представени през май. Като продължение на своето съобщение „Инициатива *Възможности за младежта*“ ([2]), Комисията възнамерява да представи по-късно през 2012 г. пакет от мерки за младежка заетост, включително политически инициативи за гаранции за младите хора и рамка за качество на стажовете. Това ще бъде допълнено от отчитане на изпълнението на посочената инициатива в държавите членки. За тази цел Комисията поиска от държавите членки да докладват до началото на септември 2012 г. за постигнатия напредък, включително актуалните финансови данни за използването на националното и европейското финансиране.

Въпрос № 3. През по-голямата част от посещенията в различните държави екипите за действие имаха срещи със заинтересованите страни, включително младежки неправителствени организации и социални партньори, за да се оцени по-добре положението на място. Комисията се консултира редовно с Европейския младежки форум и е запозната с неговото становище по въпросите. Тя възнамерява да се консултира с форума по планирания пакет от мерки за младежка заетост, както и да насърчи държавите членки да се консултират със своите национални младежки организации.

([1]) Включително седемте държави членки, посочени във въпрос № 4.
([2]) COM(2011) 933, 20 декември 2011 г.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007432/12
a la Comisión
Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Alejo Vidal-Quadras (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Simon Busuttil (PPE), Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE), Elmar Brok (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Ioannis Kasoulides (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE), Jean-Paul Gauzès (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Gay Mitchell (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Erik Bánki (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Ivo Belet (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Romana Jordan (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Krišjānis Kariņš (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Nadezhda Neynsky (PPE), Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Hubert Pirker (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Csaba Sógor (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Róża Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Vladimir Urutchev (PPE), Dominique Vlasto (PPE), Iuliu Winkler (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE) y Paweł Zalewski (PPE)
(24 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Desempleo juvenil: solicitud de información sobre los resultados obtenidos por los «equipos de acción» y la reprogramación de los fondos europeos para el empleo juvenil

Durante la sesión informal del Consejo Europeo celebrada el 30 de enero de 2012, la Comisión estableció ocho «equipos de acción» para que fueran enviados a los Estados miembros con altas tasas de desempleo juvenil (Italia, España, Grecia, Eslovaquia, Lituania, Portugal, Letonia e Irlanda) y anunció que se utilizarían 82 000 millones de euros en fondos europeos hasta ahora no empleados para apoyar las medidas destinadas a luchar contra el desempleo juvenil, potenciar el crecimiento y apoyar a las PYME. Entre febrero y mayo de 2012, expertos de la Comisión se desplazaron a los ocho Estados miembros considerados para celebrar consultas. El 23 de mayo de 2012, el Presidente de la Comisión, Sr. Barroso, presentó los primeros resultados obtenidos por los «equipos de acción», indicando que ya se habían asignado para su ejecución acelerada o reasignado 7 300 millones de euros.

Teniendo en cuenta que los datos disponibles no son claros, ya que son incompletos y no están suficientemente detallados, y que la Comisión y el Parlamento han subrayado en varias ocasiones la necesidad de la participación activa y concreta de los jóvenes en la toma de decisiones, ¿podría indicar la Comisión:

1. si, además del documento presentado por el Presidente Barroso el 23 de mayo de 2012, se dispone de documentos y datos más precisos y detallados sobre los proyectos financiados y pendientes;

2. si se ha realizado un análisis de buenas prácticas y se ha desarrollado una estrategia para una acción a largo plazo para potenciar el empleo juvenil;

3. si y cuándo han participado las organizaciones de jóvenes —y cómo han sido consultadas— conforme a lo dispuesto en la Comunicación de la Comisión titulada «Iniciativa de Oportunidades para la Juventud» y en la Resolución del Parlamento Europeo, de 24 de mayo de 2012, sobre la Iniciativa de Oportunidades para la Juventud;

4. cuáles han sido los resultados obtenidos y las decisiones adoptadas durante las consultas con los otros siete países que presentan una tasa de desempleo superior a la media de la UE (Bulgaria, Chipre, Francia, Hungría, Polonia, Rumania y Suecia)?

Respuesta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(6 de septiembre de 2012)

1. y 4. En las reuniones bilaterales y visitas de los equipos de acción se buscaron soluciones conjuntas para acelerar la ejecución de los programas ya existentes o ampliar su cobertura aumentando el presupuesto o mejorando su orientación. Los Estados miembros ([1]) se comprometieron a utilizar los fondos de la UE de manera más eficaz mediante la distribución de fondos no comprometidos o no utilizados con el objetivo de reforzar las medidas de apoyo al empleo juvenil. El Presidente presentó en mayo los resultados concretos de este ejercicio.

2. Durante el Semestre europeo, la Comisión prestó especial atención a la situación del desempleo juvenil en los Estados miembros y a las medidas relativas al empleo juvenil contenidas en los programas nacionales de reforma. Este análisis se refleja en las recomendaciones específicas por país y en los documentos de trabajo publicados en mayo. Como medida de seguimiento de su Comunicación sobre la Iniciativa de Oportunidades para la Juventud ([2]), la Comisión tiene previsto presentar a finales de 2012 un paquete de medidas para el empleo juvenil que incluirá iniciativas sobre garantías juveniles y un marco de calidad para los períodos de prácticas. Ello se complementará con informes sobre la ejecución de la Iniciativa de Oportunidades para la Juventud en los Estados miembros. A tal fin, la Comisión ha pedido a los Estados miembros que informen a principios de septiembre sobre los progresos realizados, aportando datos financieros actualizados sobre la utilización de los fondos nacionales y de la UE.

3. Durante la mayor parte de las visitas a los países, los equipos de acción se reunieron con las partes interesadas, incluidas las ONG de jóvenes y los interlocutores sociales, a fin de evaluar mejor la situación sobre el terreno. La Comisión consulta periódicamente al Foro Europeo de la Juventud y conoce sus posiciones. Tiene asimismo la intención de consultar al Foro sobre el paquete de medidas para el empleo juvenil y de animar a los Estados miembros a que consulten a sus organizaciones juveniles.

([1]) Incluidos los siete Estados miembros a los que se hace referencia en la pregunta 4.
([2]) COM(2011) 933 de 20 de diciembre de 2011.

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-007432/12
Komisi
Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Alejo Vidal-Quadras (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Simon Busuttil (PPE), Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE), Elmar Brok (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Ioannis Kasoulides (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE), Jean-Paul Gauzès (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Gay Mitchell (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Erik Bánki (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Ivo Belet (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Romana Jordan (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Krišjānis Kariņš (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Nadezhda Neynsky (PPE), Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Hubert Pirker (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Csaba Sógor (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Róża Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Vladimir Urutchev (PPE), Dominique Vlasto (PPE), Iuliu Winkler (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE) a Paweł Zalewski (PPE)
(24. července 2012)

Předmět: Nezaměstnanost mladých lidí: žádost o informace týkající se výsledků, kterých bylo dosaženo „akčními týmy“ a změnou směřování prostředků z evropských fondů na zaměstnanost mladých lidí

V průběhu neformálního zasedání Evropské rady dne 30. ledna 2012 Komise zřídila osm „akčních týmů“, které měly být vyslány do členských států s vysokou mírou nezaměstnanosti mladých lidí (Itálie, Španělsko, Řecko, Slovensko, Litva, Portugalsko, Lotyšsko a Irsko), a oznámila, že 82 miliard EUR z ještě nevyčerpaných evropských fondů bude použito na opatření, jejichž cílem je snižování nezaměstnanosti mladých lidí, podnícení růstu a podpora malých a středních podniků. Odborníci z Komise navštívili mezi únorem a květnem 2012 osm zmíněných členských států za účelem konzultací. 23. května 2012 předložil předseda Komise Barroso první výsledky, jichž „akční týmy“ dosáhly. Uvedl, že z prostředků již bylo vyčleněno na urychlené provádění či přerozděleno 7,3 miliardy EUR.

Vzhledem k tomu, že dostupné údaje jsou nejasné, neboť nejsou kompletní a dostatečně podrobné, a že Komise a Parlament při několika příležitostech zdůraznily, že je třeba mladé lidi aktivně a konkrétně zapojovat do rozhodování, mohla by Komise uvést:

1. zda jsou kromě dokumentu předloženého předsedou Barrosem dne 23. května 2012 k dispozici přesnější a podrobnější dokumenty a údaje o financovaných a rozpracovaných projektech?

2. zda byla provedena analýza osvědčených postupů a zda byla vypracována strategie pro dlouhodobá opatření na podporu zaměstnanosti mladých lidí?

3. zda a kdy se zapojily mládežnické organizace a jak s nimi probíhaly konzultace, jak se o tom hovoří ve sdělení Komise „Příležitosti pro mladé“ a v usnesení Parlamentu o iniciativě Příležitosti pro mladé ze dne 24. května 2012?

4. jaké byly výsledky konzultací s ostatními sedmi zeměmi, kde míra nezaměstnanosti přesahuje průměr EU (Bulharsko, Kypr, Francie, Maďarsko, Polsko, Rumunsko a Švédsko) a jaká rozhodnutí byla v jejich průběhu učiněna?

Odpověď komisaře Andora jménem Komise
(6. září 2012)

1. a 4. Během dvoustranných setkání a návštěv akčních týmů byla hledána společná řešení k urychlení provádění stávajících programů nebo k rozšíření zaměření programů navýšením jejich rozpočtu nebo zlepšením jejich zacílení. Členské státy ([1]) se zavázaly využívat fondy EU účinněji a prostřednictvím přesměrování nepřidělených nebo nevyužitých prostředků EU tak posílit opatření podporující zaměstnanost mladých lidí. Konkrétní výsledky tohoto postupu byly předloženy předsedou Komise v květnu.

2. Během evropského semestru věnovala Komise zvláštní pozornost situaci na poli nezaměstnanosti mládeže v členských státech a politikám zaměstnanosti mládeže předloženým v rámci národních programů reforem. Tato analýza se odráží v doporučeních pro jednotlivé země a pracovních dokumentech útvarů Komise vydaných v květnu. V návaznosti na své sdělení týkající se iniciativy „Příležitosti pro mladé“ ([2]) má Komise v druhé polovině roku 2012 v úmyslu předložit balíček v oblasti zaměstnanosti mládeže, včetně politických iniciativ v oblasti záruk pro mladé lidi a rámce kvality pro stáže. To bude doplněno zprávou o provádění iniciativy Příležitosti pro mladé v členských státech. Za tímto účelem Komise požádala členské státy, aby počátkem září 2012 podaly zprávu o dosaženém pokroku, včetně aktuálních finančních údajů týkajících se využívání vnitrostátního financování a financování z EU.

3. V průběhu většiny návštěv zemí se akční týmy setkaly se zúčastněnými stranami, včetně mládežnických nevládních organizací a sociálních partnerů, aby mohly lépe posoudit situaci na místě. Komise pravidelně konzultuje Evropské fórum mládeže a je si vědoma jeho pozic. Má v úmyslu s fórem konzultovat plánovaný balíček opatření v oblasti zaměstnanosti mládeže a vyzývat členské státy, aby danou problematiku konzultovaly s vnitrostátními organizacemi mládeže.

([1]) Včetně sedmi členských států uvedených v otázce 4.
([2]) KOM(2011) 933 ze dne 20. prosince 2011.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007432/12
an die Kommission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Alejo Vidal-Quadras (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Simon Busuttil (PPE), Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE), Elmar Brok (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Ioannis Kasoulides (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE), Jean-Paul Gauzès (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Gay Mitchell (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Erik Bánki (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Ivo Belet (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Romana Jordan (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Krišjānis Kariņš (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Nadezhda Neynsky (PPE), Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Hubert Pirker (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Csaba Sógor (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Róża Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Vladimir Urutchev (PPE), Dominique Vlasto (PPE), Iuliu Winkler (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE) und Paweł Zalewski (PPE)
(24. Juli 2012)

Betrifft: Jugendarbeitslosigkeit: Anfrage bezüglich der von den „Aktionsgruppen" erzielten Ergebnisse und der Umwidmung von EU-Mitteln für die Schaffung von Arbeitsplätzen für junge Menschen

Während der informellen Tagung des Europäischen Rates vom 30. Januar 2012 hat die Kommission acht „Aktionsgruppen" eingerichtet, die in die Mitgliedstaaten mit einer hohen Jugendarbeitslosigkeit (Italien, Spanien, Griechenland, Slowakei, Litauen, Portugal, Lettland und Irland) entsandt werden sollten. Außerdem hat sie angekündigt, dass bislang nicht ausgegebene EU-Mittel in Höhe von 82 Mrd. EUR für Maßnahmen zur Bekämpfung der Jugendarbeitslosigkeit, Wachstumsförderung und zur Unterstützung von KMU verwandt werden sollen. In der Zeit von Februar bis Mai 2012 reisten Fachleute der Kommission zu Konsultationen in die betreffenden acht Mitgliedstaaten. Am 23. Mai 2012 legte der Präsident der Kommission Barroso die ersten von den „Aktionsgruppen" erzielten Ergebnisse vor und gab bekannt, dass bereits 7,3 Mrd. EUR für eine beschleunigte Umsetzung vorgesehen bzw. umgewidmet worden seien.

Da die vorliegenden Daten aufgrund ihrer Unvollständigkeit und mangelnden Ausführlichkeit nicht genügend aussagekräftig sind, und angesichts der Tatsache, dass die Kommission und das Parlament wiederholt auf die Notwendigkeit der aktiven und konkreten Mitwirkung junger Menschen an Entscheidungsprozessen hingewiesen haben, wird die Kommission um die Beantwortung der folgenden Fragen gebeten:

1. Gibt es zusätzlich zu dem von Präsident Barroso am 23. Mai 2012 vorgelegten Papier genauere und ausführlichere Dokumente und Daten über die finanzierten und anstehenden Vorhaben?

2. Wurde eine Analyse der bewährten Verfahrensweisen vorgenommen und eine Strategie für langfristige Maßnahmen zur Schaffung von Arbeitsplätzen für junge Menschen ausgearbeitet?

3. Wurden Jugendorganisationen einbezogen, wie es in der Mitteilung der Kommission mit dem Titel „Initiative: Chancen für junge Menschen" und der Entschließung des Parlaments vom 24. Mai 2012 zur Initiative: „Chancen für junge Menschen" vorgesehen war, und falls ja, wann und auf welche Weise ist dies geschehen?

4. Was haben die Konsultationen mit den anderen sieben Ländern, deren Arbeitslosenrate über dem EU-Durchschnitt liegt (Bulgarien, Zypern, Frankreich, Ungarn, Polen, Rumänien und Schweden), erbracht und welche Entscheidungen wurden bei der Gelegenheit getroffen?

Antwort von Herrn Andor im Namen der Kommission
(6. September 2012)

1. und 4. Auf den bilateralen Sitzungen und bei den Besuchen der Aktionsgruppen wurde nach gemeinsamen Lösungen gesucht, um die Umsetzung der vorhandenen Programme zu beschleunigen oder deren Interventionsbereich durch Aufstockung der Mittel oder eine bessere Ausrichtung auszuweiten. Die Mitgliedstaaten ([1]) haben sich verpflichtet, die EU-Mittel effizienter einzusetzen, indem nicht gebundene oder nicht verwendete EU-Mittel zugunsten von Beschäftigungsmaßnahmen für junge Menschen umgeschichtet werden. Die konkreten Ergebnisse dieser Maßnahme hat der Präsident im Mai vorgestellt.

2. Während des Europäischen Semesters richtete die Kommission ein besonderes Augenmerk auf die Jugendarbeitslosigkeit in den Mitgliedstaaten und auf die in den nationalen Reformprogrammen vorgeschlagenen Beschäftigungsmaßnahmen für junge Menschen. Diese Analyse ist in die länderspezifischen Empfehlungen und die Arbeitsunterlagen eingegangen, die im Mai veröffentlicht wurden. Als Folgemaßnahme zu ihrer Mitteilung über die Initiative „Chancen für junge Menschen" ([2]) plant die Kommission, Ende 2012 ein Beschäftigungspaket für junge Menschen vorzulegen, das politische Initiativen im Bereich Jugendgarantien und einen Qualitätsrahmen für Praktika umfassen wird. Ergänzend dazu sollen Berichte über die Umsetzung der Initiative „Chancen für junge Menschen" in den Mitgliedstaaten vorgelegt werden. Hierzu hat die Kommission die Mitgliedstaaten ersucht, bis Anfang September 2012 über die erzielten Fortschritte Bericht zu erstatten und aktuelle Finanzdaten über die Verwendung nationaler und EU-Mittel vorzulegen.

3. Bei den meisten Länderbesuchen trafen die Aktionsgruppen mit Stakeholdern, darunter NRO im Jugendbereich und Sozialpartner, zusammen, um die Lage vor Ort besser bewerten zu können. Die Kommission konsultiert regelmäßig das Europäische Jugendforum und kennt dessen Standpunkte. Sie beabsichtigt, das Forum zum geplanten Beschäftigungspaket für junge Menschen anzuhören, und ermuntert die Mitgliedstaaten, ihre nationalen Jugendorganisationen zu konsultieren.

([1]) Einschließlich der in Frage 4 genannten Mitgliedstaaten.
([2]) KOM(2011)933 vom 20. Dezember 2011.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007432/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Alejo Vidal-Quadras (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Simon Busuttil (PPE), Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE), Elmar Brok (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Ioannis Kasoulides (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE), Jean-Paul Gauzès (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Gay Mitchell (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Erik Bánki (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Ivo Belet (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Romana Jordan (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Krišjānis Kariņš (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Nadezhda Neynsky (PPE), Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Hubert Pirker (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Csaba Sógor (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Róża Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Vladimir Urutchev (PPE), Dominique Vlasto (PPE), Iuliu Winkler (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE) και Paweł Zalewski (PPE)
(24 Ιουλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Η ανεργία των νέων: αίτημα ενημέρωσης σχετικά με τα αποτελέσματα που πέτυχαν οι «ομάδες δράσης» και με τον αναπρογραμματισμό ευρωπαϊκών πόρων για την απασχόληση των νέων

Κατά τη διάρκεια της άτυπης συνεδρίασης του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου που έλαβε χώρα στις 30 Ιανουαρίου 2012, η Επιτροπή όρισε οκτώ «ομάδες δράσης» για να σταλούν σε κράτη μέλη με υψηλούς δείκτες ανεργίας νέων (Ιταλία, Ισπανία, Ελλάδα, Σλοβακία, Λιθουανία, Πορτογαλία, Λετονία και Ιρλανδία) και προανήγγειλε τη διάθεση 82 δισ. ευρώ από μη δαπανηθέντες ακόμα πόρους ευρωπαϊκών ταμείων για την υποστήριξη μέτρων καταπολέμησης της ανεργίας της νεολαίας, ενίσχυσης της ανάπτυξης και υποστήριξης των μικρομεσαίων επιχειρήσεων. Μεταξύ Φεβρουαρίου και Μαΐου 2012, εμπειρογνώμονες της Επιτροπής επισκέφθηκαν τα οκτώ εν λόγω κράτη μέλη για διαβουλεύσεις. Στις 23 Μαΐου 2012 ο Πρόεδρος της Επιτροπής Barroso παρουσίασε τα πρώτα αποτελέσματα που πέτυχαν οι «ομάδες δράσης», δηλώνοντας ότι 7,3 δις ευρώ σε κονδύλια είχαν ήδη διατεθεί για ταχύτερη υλοποίηση ή αναδιανεμηθεί.

Δεδομένου ότι τα διαθέσιμα δεδομένα είναι ασαφή ως ατελή και μη επαρκώς λεπτομερή, και ότι η Επιτροπή και το Κοινοβούλιο σε πολλές περιπτώσεις τόνισαν την ανάγκη ενεργού και συγκεκριμένης ανάμειξης των νέων στη λήψη αποφάσεων, μπορεί η Επιτροπή να μας πει:

1. Εάν, πέρα από το έγγραφο που παρουσιάστηκε από τον Πρόεδρο Barrozo στις 23 Μαΐου 2012, είναι διαθέσιμα ακριβέστερα και λεπτομερέστερα έγγραφα και στοιχεία σχετικά με χρηματοδοτούμενα και εκκρεμή έργα;

2. Εάν έχει πραγματοποιηθεί ανάλυση των ορθών πρακτικών, καθώς και αν έχει αναπτυχθεί κάποια στρατηγική μακροπρόθεσμης δράσης για την προώθηση της απασχόλησης των νέων;

3. Εάν και πότε ενεπλάκησαν οργανώσεις νέων -και πώς ζητήθηκε η γνώμη τους- όπως προβλέπεται στην ανακοίνωση της Επιτροπής με τίτλο «Πρωτοβουλία Ευκαιρίες για τους Νέους» και στην απόφαση του Κοινοβουλίου της 24ης Μαΐου 2012 σχετικά με την Πρωτοβουλία Ευκαιρίες για τους Νέους;

4. Ποια ήταν τα αποτελέσματα και τι αποφάσεις ελήφθησαν κατά τη διάρκεια των διαβουλεύσεων με τις άλλες επτά χώρες με δείκτη ανεργίας πάνω από το μέσο όρο της ΕΕ (Βουλγαρία, Κύπρο, Γαλλία, Ουγγαρία, Πολωνία, Ρουμανία και Σουηδία);

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(6 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

1. και 4. Κατά τη διάρκεια των διμερών συνεδριάσεων και των επισκέψεων των ομάδων δράσης επιδιώχθηκε η εξεύρεση κοινών λύσεων για την επίσπευση της εφαρμογής υφιστάμενων προγραμμάτων ή για τη διεύρυνση του πεδίου εφαρμογής τους με την αύξηση του προϋπολογισμού ή τη βελτίωση της στόχευσης. Τα κράτη μέλη [1] δεσμεύτηκαν να χρησιμοποιήσουν αποτελεσματικότερα τα κονδύλια της ΕΕ, με αναπρογραμματισμό μη αναληφθέντων ή μη χρησιμοποιηθέντων πόρων της ΕΕ με σκοπό την ενίσχυση των μέτρων αντιμετώπισης της ανεργίας των νέων. Τα απτά αποτελέσματα αυτής της ενέργειας παρουσιάστηκαν από τον Πρόεδρο τον Μάιο.

2. Κατά το Ευρωπαϊκό Εξάμηνο, η Επιτροπή επικέντρωσε την προσοχή της στην κατάσταση που επικρατεί στα κράτη μέλη όσον αφορά την ανεργία των νέων, καθώς και στις πολιτικές για την απασχόληση των νέων που παρουσιάστηκαν στο πλαίσιο των εθνικών προγραμμάτων μεταρρυθμίσεων. Αυτή η ανάλυση αντικατοπτρίζεται στις ειδικές για κάθε χώρα συστάσεις και στα έγγραφα εργασιών των υπηρεσιών της Επιτροπής που εκδόθηκαν τον Μάιο. Η Επιτροπή προτίθεται — αργότερα εντός του 2012, και στο πλαίσιο της παρακολούθησης της ανακοίνωσής της με τίτλο «Πρωτοβουλία "Ευκαιρίες για τους νέους"» [2] — να υποβάλει δέσμη μέτρων για την απασχόληση των νέων, καθώς και πρωτοβουλίες πολιτικής σχετικά με εγγυήσεις για τους νέους και ποιοτικό πλαίσιο για περιόδους πρακτικής άσκησης. Η δέσμη αυτή θα συνοδεύεται από την υποβολή στοιχείων σχετικά με την εφαρμογή της πρωτοβουλίας «Ευκαιρίες για τους νέους» στα κράτη μέλη. Για τον σκοπό αυτό, η Επιτροπή ζήτησε από τα κράτη μέλη να υποβάλουν στοιχεία, έως τις αρχές Σεπτεμβρίου του 2012, σχετικά με την πρόοδο που έχει επιτευχθεί, καθώς και επικαιροποιημένα οικονομικά στοιχεία για τη χρήση της εθνικής και της ενωσιακής χρηματοδότησης.

3. Στις περισσότερες επισκέψεις στα κράτη μέλη, οι ομάδες δράσης συναντήθηκαν με ενδιαφερομένους, όπως ΜΚΟ νέων και κοινωνικούς εταίρους, για να αξιολογήσουν καλύτερα την κατάσταση επιτόπου. Η Επιτροπή συμβουλεύεται τακτικά το Ευρωπαϊκό Φόρουμ Νεολαίας και γνωρίζει τις θέσεις του. Προτίθεται να συμβουλευθεί το Φόρουμ ως προς τη σχεδιαζόμενη δέσμη μέτρων για την απασχόληση των νέων και να ενθαρρύνει τα κράτη μέλη να συμβουλευθούν τις δικές τους εθνικές οργανώσεις νέων.

---

[1] Συμπεριλαμβανομένων των επτά κρατών μελών που αναφέρονται στην ερώτηση 4.
[2] COM(2011)933 της 20ής Δεκεμβρίου 2011.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007432/12
à la Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Alejo Vidal-Quadras (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Simon Busuttil (PPE), Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE), Elmar Brok (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Ioannis Kasoulides (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE), Jean-Paul Gauzès (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Gay Mitchell (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Erik Bánki (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Ivo Belet (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Romana Jordan (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Krišjānis Kariņš (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Nadezhda Neynsky (PPE), Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Hubert Pirker (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Csaba Sógor (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Róża Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Vladimir Urutchev (PPE), Dominique Vlasto (PPE), Iuliu Winkler (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE) et Paweł Zalewski (PPE)
(24 juillet 2012)

Objet: Le chômage des jeunes: demande d'information concernant les résultats obtenus par les «équipes d'action» et suite à la reprogrammation des fonds européens pour l'emploi des jeunes

Durant la réunion informelle du Conseil européen qui s'est tenue le 30 janvier 2012, la Commission a constitué huit «équipes d'action» qui devaient être envoyées auprès des États membres présentant un taux élevé de chômage des jeunes (Italie, Espagne, Grèce, Slovaquie, Lituanie, Portugal, Lettonie et Irlande). Elle a annoncé que 82 milliards d'euros de fonds européens toujours disponibles seraient alloués afin d'appuyer les mesures destinées à lutter contre le chômage des jeunes, stimuler la croissance et soutenir les PME. Entre février et mai 2012, les experts de la Commission se sont rendus dans les huit États membres en question afin d'y mener des consultations. Le 23 mai 2012, M. Barroso, le président de la Commission, a présenté les premiers résultats obtenus par les «équipes d'action» et a annoncé que 7,3 milliards d'euros de fonds avaient d'ores et déjà été affectés pour une mise en œuvre accélérée ou bien réaffectés.

Les données disponibles étant peu claires car incomplètes et insuffisamment détaillées et la Commission et le Parlement ayant mis l'accent à plusieurs reprises sur la nécessité d'une implication active et concrète des jeunes dans le processus de décision, la Commission pourrait-elle répondre aux questions suivantes:

1. En sus du document présenté par M. Barroso le 23 mai 2012, existe-t-il des données et des documents plus précis et plus détaillés relatifs aux projets financés et en cours?

2. Une analyse des bonnes pratiques a-t-elle été menée et une stratégie d'action à long terme a-t-elle été développée afin de relancer l'emploi des jeunes?

3. A-t-il été fait appel à des organisations de jeunes comme prévu dans la communication de la Commission intitulée «Initiative sur les perspectives d'emploi des jeunes» et dans la résolution du Parlement du 24 mai 2012 relative à l'Initiative sur les perspectives d'emploi des jeunes? Dans l'affirmative, quand et comment ont elles été consultées?

4. Quelles ont été les conclusions des consultations menées avec les sept autres pays dont le taux de chômage est supérieur à la moyenne de l'Union (Bulgarie, Chypre, France, Hongrie, Pologne, Roumanie et Suède) et quelles décisions ont été prises durant ces consultations?

Réponse donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission
(6 septembre 2012)

1 et 4. Les rencontres bilatérales et les visites effectuées par les «équipes d'action» ont eu pour objet, notamment, la recherche de solutions communes pour accélérer la mise en œuvre des programmes existants ou pour en étendre la portée grâce à une augmentation du budget ou à un ciblage plus précis. En parallèle, les États membres ([1]) se sont engagés à utiliser les fonds européens avec plus d'efficacité, en allouant les fonds disponibles et en réaffectant ceux non utilisés aux mesures de lutte contre le chômage des jeunes. Les résultats concrets de ces deux démarches ont été présentés par le président en mai.

2. Pendant le Semestre européen, la Commission s'est particulièrement intéressée au taux de chômage des jeunes dans les États membres et aux politiques d'emploi des jeunes présentées dans les programmes nationaux de réformes. Les recommandations par pays et les documents de travail publiés en mai font état de cette analyse. Dans la continuité de sa communication relative à l'initiative sur les perspectives d'emploi des jeunes ([2]), la Commission prévoit la présentation, avant la fin de l'année 2012, d'un train de mesures en faveur de l'emploi des jeunes, lequel comprendra des initiatives sur les «garanties pour la jeunesse» et un cadre de qualité pour les stages. Ce train de mesures sera complété par un rapport sur l'état d'avancement de l'initiative sur les perspectives d'emploi des jeunes dans les États membres. À cette fin, la Commission a demandé aux États membres de lui transmettre, pour le début du mois de septembre, un rapport rendant compte des progrès accomplis et des données comptables à jour sur l'utilisation des fonds nationaux et européens.

3. Lors de la plupart de leurs visites dans les différents pays, les «équipes d'action» ont rencontré les parties prenantes, dont les ONG consacrées à la jeunesse et les partenaires sociaux, pour mieux évaluer la situation sur le terrain. En outre, la Commission consulte régulièrement le Forum européen de la jeunesse, dont elle connaît les positions. Elle entend recueillir son avis sur le train de mesures en faveur de l'emploi des jeunes qui est prévu et encourager les États membres à consulter leurs organisations nationales consacrées à la jeunesse.

([1]) Y compris les sept États membres cités dans la question 4.
([2]) COM(2011) 933 du 20 décembre 2011.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007432/12
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Alejo Vidal-Quadras (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Simon Busuttil (PPE), Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE), Elmar Brok (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Ioannis Kasoulides (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE), Jean-Paul Gauzès (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Gay Mitchell (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Erik Bánki (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Ivo Belet (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Romana Jordan (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Krišjānis Kariņš (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Nadezhda Neynsky (PPE), Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Hubert Pirker (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Csaba Sógor (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Róża Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Vladimir Urutchev (PPE), Dominique Vlasto (PPE), Iuliu Winkler (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE) e Paweł Zalewski (PPE)
(24 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: La disoccupazione giovanile: richiesta di informazioni sui risultati raggiunti dagli «action team» e sulla riprogrammazione dei fondi europei per la disoccupazione giovanile

Durante la riunione informale del Consiglio europeo tenutasi il 30 gennaio 2012, la Commissione ha istituito otto «action team» da inviare negli Stati membri con un elevato tasso di disoccupazione giovanile (Italia, Spagna, Grecia, Slovacchia, Lituania, Portogallo, Lettonia e Irlanda), e ha annunciato l'impiego di 82 miliardi di euro di fondi europei, che risultavano ancora inutilizzati, per promuovere misure atte a contrastare la disoccupazione giovanile, a rilanciare la crescita e a sostenere le PMI. Tra febbraio e maggio 2012 gli esperti della Commissione si sono recati negli otto Stati membri in questione per effettuare delle consultazioni. Il 23 maggio 2012 il presidente della Commissione, Barroso, ha presentato i primi risultati degli «action team», indicando altresì che 7,3 miliardi di euro di fondi erano già stati destinati ad un più rapido utilizzo o riassegnati.

Dal momento che i dati disponibili risultano poco chiari in quanto incompleti e non sufficientemente dettagliati, e che la Commissione e il Parlamento hanno sottolineato a più riprese la necessità di un coinvolgimento attivo e concreto dei giovani nel processo decisionale, si prega la Commissione di rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Oltre al documento già presentato dal presidente Barroso il 23 maggio 2012, sono disponibili documenti e dati più precisi e dettagliati sui progetti già finanziati e quelli ancora da finanziare?

2. Si è provveduto a condurre un'analisi delle buone pratiche e a sviluppare una strategia d'azione a lungo termine per promuovere l'occupazione giovanile?

3. Sono state consultate le organizzazioni giovanili, come previsto dalla comunicazione della Commissione «Opportunità per i giovani» e dalla risoluzione del Parlamento europeo del 24 maggio 2012 sull'iniziativa «Opportunità per i giovani»? Quando? In che modo?

4. Quali sono i risultati delle consultazioni con gli altri sette paesi il cui tasso di disoccupazione è superiore alla media dell'Unione europea (Bulgaria, Cipro, Francia, Ungheria, Polonia, Romania e Svezia) e quali le decisioni assunte durante le stesse?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(6 settembre 2012)

1 e 4. Durante le riunioni bilaterali e le visite dei gruppi d'azione sono state cercate soluzioni comuni per arrivare ad una più rapida attuazione dei programmi esistenti o ampliarne la copertura, aumentando il finanziamento o rendendoli più mirati. Gli Stati membri ([1]) si sono impegnati a impiegare i fondi dell'Unione europea in modo più efficace reincanalando i fondi UE non impegnati e non usati per rafforzare i provvedimenti a favore dell'occupazione giovanile. I risultati concreti dell'iniziativa sono stati presentati dal presidente nel mese di maggio.

2. Nel corso del semestre europeo la Commissione ha prestato particolare attenzione alla situazione della disoccupazione giovanile negli Stati membri e alle politiche riguardanti l'occupazione giovanile illustrate nei programmi nazionali di riforma. Tale analisi si riflette nelle raccomandazioni specifiche per paese e nei documenti di lavoro pubblicati in maggio. Facendo seguito alla sua comunicazione sull'iniziativa «Opportunità per i giovani» (Youth Opportunities Initiative, YOI) ([2]), nel corso del 2012 la Commissione intende presentare un pacchetto per l'occupazione giovanile che comprenda programmi sulle garanzie per la gioventù e un quadro di qualità per i tirocini. Tale pacchetto sarà completato da una relazione sull'attuazione della YOI negli Stati membri. A tal fine la Commissione ha chiesto agli Stati membri di riferire entro l'inizio di settembre 2012 sui progressi ottenuti, compresi dati finanziari aggiornati relativi all'impiego dei finanziamenti nazionali e dell'Unione.

3. Nel corso della maggior parte delle visite nei vari paesi i gruppi operativi hanno incontrato le parti interessate, comprese le organizzazioni giovanili non governative e le parti sociali, per valutare meglio la situazione in loco. La Commissione consulta regolarmente il Forum europeo della gioventù ed è a conoscenza delle sue posizioni. Essa intende consultare il Forum a proposito del summenzionato pacchetto per l'occupazione giovanile e incoraggiare gli Stati membri a consultare le rispettive organizzazioni nazionali della gioventù.

([1]) Compresi i sette Stati membri di cui al punto 4.
([2]) COM(2011)933 del 20.12.2011.

(Latviešu valodas versija)

Jautājums, uz kuru jāatbild rakstiski, E-007432/12
Komisijai
Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Alejo Vidal-Quadras (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Simon Busuttil (PPE), Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE), Elmar Brok (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Ioannis Kasoulides (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE), Jean-Paul Gauzès (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Gay Mitchell (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Erik Bánki (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Ivo Belet (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Romana Jordan (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Krišjānis Kariņš (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Nadezhda Neynsky (PPE), Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Hubert Pirker (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Csaba Sógor (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), grāfiene Róża von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Vladimir Urutchev (PPE), Dominique Vlasto (PPE), Iuliu Winkler (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE) un Paweł Zalewski (PPE)
(2012. gada 24. jūlijs)

Temats: Jauniešu bezdarbs: informācijas pieprasījums par rīcības grupu sasniegtajiem rezultātiem un Eiropas fondu pārplānošanu jauniešu nodarbinātības veicināšanai

Eiropas Padomes 2012. gada 30. janvāra neoficiālās sanāksmes laikā Komisija izveidoja astoņas rīcības grupas, kuras bija paredzēts sūtīt uz dalībvalstīm ar augstu jauniešu bezdarba līmeni (Itālija, Spānija, Grieķija, Slovākija, Lietuva, Portugāle, Latvija un Īrija), un paziņoja, ka EUR 82 miljardi no vēl neizlietotajiem Eiropas fondiem tiks izmantoti to pasākumu atbalstam, kas paredzēti jauniešu bezdarba novēršanai, izaugsmes sekmēšanai un MVU atbalstam. Laikposmā no 2012. gada februāra līdz maijam Komisijas eksperti apmeklēja astoņas dalībvalstis, lai rīkotu tajās apspriedes. Komisijas priekšsēdētājs Ž. M. Barrozu 2012. gada 23. maijā iepazīstināja ar pirmajiem rīcības grupu rezultātiem, paziņojot, ka EUR 7,3 miljardi no fondu līdzekļiem jau ir paredzēti paātrinātai ieviešanai vai pārvirzīti.

Ņemot vērā to, ka pieejamie dati nav skaidri to nepilnības un nepietiekamo detaļu dēļ un ka Komisija un Parlaments vairākkārt uzsvēra, ka ir nepieciešama aktīva un konkrēta jauniešu iesaistīšana lēmumu pieņemšanas procesā, vai Komisija varētu norādīt:

1. vai papildus dokumentam, ar kuru 2012. gada 23. maijā iepazīstināja priekšsēdētājs Ž. M. Barrozu, ir pieejami precīzāki un detalizētāki dokumenti un dati par finansētajiem un nepabeigtajiem projektiem?

2. vai ir veikta labas prakses piemēru analīze un izstrādāta ilgtermiņa rīcības stratēģija jauniešu nodarbinātības veicināšanai?

3. vai un kādā veidā tika iesaistītas jaunatnes organizācijas, un kā notika apspriedes ar tām, kā tas bija paredzēts Komisijas paziņojumā "Jaunatnes iespēju iniciatīva" un Parlamenta 2012. gada 24. maija rezolūcijā par iniciatīvu jauniešu nodarbinātības izredžu palielināšanai?

4. kādi bija apspriežu rezultāti ar pārējām septiņām valstīm, kurās bezdarba līmenis ir augstāks par ES vidējo rādītāju (Bulgārija, Kipra, Francija, Ungārija, Polija, Rumānija un Zviedrija), un kādi lēmumi tika pieņemti to laikā?

Atbildi Komisijas vārdā sniedza Lāslo Andors
(2012. gada 6. septembris)

1. Divpusējo sanāksmju un rīcības grupas apmeklējumu laikā tika meklēti kopīgi risinājumi, kā paātrināt esošo programmu īstenošanu vai paplašināt to tvērumu, palielinot budžetu vai uzlabojot mērķtiecību. Dalībvalstis ([1]) apņēmās efektīvāk izmantot ES fondus, pārvirzot nesaistītos vai neizmantotos ES līdzekļus, lai atbalstītu pasākumus jauniešu nodarbinātībai. Ar konkrētiem šā pasākuma rezultātiem priekšsēdētājs iepazīstināja maijā.

([1]) Tostarp septiņas dalībvalstis, kas minētas 4. jautājumā.

2. Eiropas pusgada laikā Komisija īpašu uzmanību veltīja jauniešu bezdarbam dalībvalstīs un valstu reformu programmās iekļautajai jaunatnes nodarbinātības politikai. Šī analīze ir iekļauta konkrētām valstīm adresētos ieteikumos un maijā sagatavotajos dienesta darba dokumentos. Pēc paziņojuma "Jaunatnes iespēju iniciatīva" ([2]) Komisija 2012. gadā plāno sagatavot jaunatnes nodarbinātības tiesību aktu kopumu, tostarp politikas ierosmes par garantijām jauniešiem un stažēšanās kvalitātes sistēmu. To papildinās ziņojumi par "Jaunatnes iespēju iniciatīvas" īstenošanu dalībvalstīs. Tādēļ Komisija ir lūgusi dalībvalstis līdz 2012. gada septembra sākumam iesniegt ziņojumus par gūtajiem panākumiem, tostarp atjauninātus finanšu datus par valsts un ES līdzekļu izlietojumu.

3. Lai labāk novērtētu reālo situāciju, daudzo valstu apmeklējumu laikā rīcības grupas tikās ar ieinteresētajām personām, tostarp ar jaunatnes NVO un sociālajiem partneriem. Komisija regulāri apspriežas ar Eiropas Jaunatnes forumu un ir informēta par tā nostāju. Komisija plāno apspriesties ar forumu par paredzēto jaunatnes nodarbinātības tiesību aktu kopumu un aicināt dalībvalstis apspriesties ar savas valsts jaunatnes organizācijām.

4. Sk. atbildi uz 1. jautājumu.

([2]) COM(2011) 933, 2011. gada 20. decembris.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-007432/12
a Bizottság számára
Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Alejo Vidal-Quadras (PPE), Surján László (PPE), Simon Busuttil (PPE), Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE), Elmar Brok (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Ioannis Kasoulides (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE), Jean-Paul Gauzès (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Gay Mitchell (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Gál Kinga (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Bagó Zoltán (PPE), Bánki Erik (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Ivo Belet (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Járóka Lívia (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Romana Jordan (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Krišjānis Kariņš (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Kósa Ádám (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Nadezhda Neynsky (PPE), Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Hubert Pirker (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Sógor Csaba (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Róża Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Vladimir Urutchev (PPE), Dominique Vlasto (PPE), Winkler Gyula (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE) és Paweł Zalewski (PPE)
(2012. július 24.)

Tárgy: Fiatalkori munkanélküliség: információkérés az „akciócsoportok” eredményeivel és a fiatalok foglalkoztatását előmozdító európai alapok újraprogramozásával kapcsolatban

Január 30-án az Európai Tanács nem hivatalos ülésén a Bizottság nyolc „akciócsoportot” hozott létre azzal a céllal, hogy azokat olyan európai országokba küldje, ahol magas a fiatal munkanélküliek aránya (Olaszország, Spanyolország, Görögország, Szlovákia, Litvánia, Portugália, Lettország és Írország), és bejelentette, hogy 82 milliárd eurót, amely az európai alapokból még nem került felhasználásra, a fiatalokat érintő munkanélküliség leküzdését, a növekedés fellendítését és a kkv-k támogatását célzó támogató intézkedésekre fordít. 2012 februárja és májusa között a bizottsági szakértők nyolc tagállamba látogattak el konzultáció céljából. Május 23-án José Manuel Barroso, a Bizottság elnöke ismertette az akciócsoportok első eredményeit, és bejelentette, hogy az alapokból már 7,3 milliárd eurót irányoztak elő gyorsított végrehajtásra, illetve csoportosítottak át.

Mivel a rendelkezésre álló adatok nem átláthatóak, mert hiányosak és nem kellően részletezettek;

mivel a Bizottság és a Parlament számos esetben hangsúlyozta, hogy a fiataloknak aktívan és konkrétan részt kell venniük a döntéshozatalban;

tájékoztatást tudna-e adni a Bizottság arra vonatkozóan, hogy

1. a finanszírozott és folyamatban lévő projektekkel kapcsolatosan a Barroso elnök által május 23-án ismertetett dokumentumon túl rendelkezésre állnak-e pontosabb és részletesebb dokumentumok és adatok?

2. készült-e elemzés a helyes gyakorlatokról és a fiatalok foglalkoztatásának fellendítését célzó hosszú távú fellépés érdekében kidolgozott stratégiáról?

3. bevonták-e ebbe és mikor az ifjúsági szervezeteket, és hogyan konzultáltak velük a „Több lehetőséget a fiataloknak kezdeményezés” című európai bizottsági közleményben és a 2012. május 24-i, azonos című európai parlamenti állásfoglalásban kifejtettek szerint?

4. milyen eredmények és döntések születtek a másik hét olyan országgal (Bulgária, Ciprus, Franciaország, Magyarország, Lengyelország, Románia, Svédország) folytatott konzultációk során, amelyeket az uniós átlagnál magasabb arányú munkanélküliség jellemez?

Andor László válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2012. szeptember 6.)

1. és 4. A kétoldalú megbeszélések és a munkacsoportok látogatásai alkalmával az érdekeltek törekedtek arra, hogy sikerüljön közös megoldásokat találni annak érdekében, hogy a költségvetés növelésével vagy a célok megfelelőbb meghatározásával a jelenlegi programok végrehajtása felgyorsítható legyen, illetve a programok hatóköre bővüljön. A tagállamok ([1]) elkötelezték magukat az uniós források hatékonyabb felhasználása mellett azáltal, hogy a le nem kötött vagy felhasználatlan uniós pénzeszközöket a fiatalok foglakoztatásának elősegítésére irányuló intézkedésekre fordítják. Az elnök májusban ismertette a konkrét eredményeket.

2. Az európai szemeszter során a Bizottság különös figyelmet fordított a fiatalok munkanélküliségének helyzetére a tagállamokban, valamint a nemzeti reformprogramokban bemutatott ifjúsági foglalkoztatási politikákra. Az elemzés eredményeit a májusban előterjesztett országspecifikus ajánlások és munkadokumentumok is tükrözik. A „Több lehetőséget a fiataloknak" kezdeményezésről szóló közleménye ([2]) nyomán 2012 során a Bizottság ifjúságfoglalkoztatási intézkedéscsomagot kíván előterjeszteni, amely ifjúsági garanciákra vonatkozó szakpolitikai kezdeményezéseket és a szakmai gyakorlatok minőségi keretrendszerét is magában foglalná. Ezt a „Több lehetőséget a fiataloknak" kezdeményezés tagállami végrehajtásáról szóló jelentés egészíti ki. Ennek érdekében a Bizottság felkérte a tagállamokat, hogy 2012 szeptemberének elejére nyújtsák be az elért haladásról szóló jelentést, beleértve a nemzeti és uniós források felhasználására vonatkozó legfrissebb pénzügyi adatokat.

3. Az országlátogatások többségének során a munkacsoportok találkoztak az érdekeltekkel, beleértve ifjúsági nem kormányzati szervezeteket és a szociális partnereket, hogy mélyrehatóbban felmérhessék az adott országban kialakult helyzetet. A Bizottság rendszeresen konzultál az Európai Ifjúsági Fórummal, és ismeri annak álláspontját. A tervezett ifjúságfoglalkoztatási intézkedéscsomaggal kapcsolatban is konzultációt kíván folytatni a fórummal, és a tagállamokat is arra kívánja ösztönözni, hogy konzultáljanak nemzeti ifjúsági szervezeteikkel.

([1]) Köztük a 4. kérdésben említett hét tagállam.
([2]) COM(2011) 933., 2011. december 20.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-007432/12
lill-Kummissjoni
Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Alejo Vidal-Quadras (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Simon Busuttil (PPE), Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE), Elmar Brok (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Ioannis Kasoulides (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE), Jean-Paul Gauzès (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Gay Mitchell (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Erik Bánki (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Ivo Belet (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Romana Jordan (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Krišjānis Kariņš (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Nadezhda Neynsky (PPE), Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Hubert Pirker (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Csaba Sógor (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Róża Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Vladimir Urutchev (PPE), Dominique Vlasto (PPE), Iuliu Winkler (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE) u Paweł Zalewski (PPE)
(24 ta' Lulju 2012)

Suġġett: Il-qgħad fost iż-żgħażagħ: talba għal informazzjoni dwar ir-riżultati miksuba mit-"timijiet ta' azzjoni" u l-ipprogrammar mill-ġdid tal-fondi Ewropej għall-impjieg fost iż-żgħażagħ

Waqt il-laqgħa informali tal-Kunsill Ewropew li saret fit-30 ta' Jannar 2012, il-Kummissjoni stabbiliet tmien "timijiet ta' azzjoni" biex jiġu mibgħuta lill-Istati Membri li għandhom rata għolja ta' qgħad fost iż-żgħażagħ (l-Italja, Spanja, il-Greċja, is-Slovakkja, il-Litwanja, il-Portugall, il-Latvja u l-Irlanda) u ħabbret li EUR 82 biljun f'fondi Ewropej li għalissa għadhom ma ntefqux se jintużaw biex jappoġġjaw miżuri mfassla biex jiġi miġġieled il-qgħad fost iż-żgħażagħ, tingħata spinta lit-tkabbir u jingħata appoġġ lill-SMEs. Bejn Frar u Mejju tal-2012, esperti tal-Kummissjoni marru għall-konsultazzjonijiet fit-tmien Stati Membri inkwistjoni. Fit-23 ta' Mejju 2012 il-President tal-Kummissjoni Barroso ppreżenta l-ewwel riżultati miksuba mit-"timijiet ta' azzjoni", b'dikjarazzjoni li EUR 7.3 biljun f'fondi diġa' ġew allokati biex tiġi aċċelerata jew biex terġa' tiġi assenjata l-implimentazzjoni.

Peress li d-data disponibbli m'hijiex ċara għax hija inkompleta u mhux dettaljata b'mod suffiċjenti, u li l-Kummissjoni u l-Parlament f'diversi okkażjonijiet enfasizzaw il-bżonn għall-involviment attiv u konkret taż-żgħażagħ fit-tehid tad-deċiżjonijiet, tista' l-Kummissjoni tgħid:

1. jekk, flimkien mad-dokument ippreżentat mill-President Barroso fit-23 ta' Mejju tal-2012, hemmx iktar dokumenti u data disponibbli li huma iktar preċiżi u dettaljati dwar il-proġetti ffinanzjati u pendenti?

2. jekk twettqitx analiżi tal-prattiki tajba u jekk ġietx żviluppata strateġija għall-azzjoni għall-perjodi twal biex tingħata spinta lill-impjieg fost iż-żgħażagħ?

3. jekk u meta l-organizzazzjonijiet taż-żgħażagħ kienu involuti — u kif dawn ġew ikkonsultati — kif provdut fil-komunikazzjoni tal-Kummissjoni bit-titolu "Inizjattiva għall-Opportunitajiet taż-Żgħażagħ" u fir-Riżoluzzjoni tal-Parlament tal-24 ta' Mejju tal-2012 dwar l-Inizjattiva għall-Opportunitajiet taż-Żgħażagħ?

4. x'kienu r-riżultati ta', u d-deċiżjonijiet meħuda waqt, il-konsultazzjonijiet mas-seba' pajjiżi l-oħra b'rata ta' qgħad li jaqbeż il-medja tal-UE (il-Bulgarija, Ċipru, Franza, l-Ungerija, il-Polonja, ir-Rumanija u l-Isvezja)?

It-Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Andor f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(6 ta' Settembru 2012)

1 u 4. Matul il-laqgħat bilaterali u ż-żjarat tat-timijiet ta' azzjoni, tfittxew soluzzjonijiet konġunti dwar it-tħaffif tal-implimentazzjoni ta' programmi eżistenti jew it-twessigħ tal-kopertura tagħhom permezz ta' żieda fil-baġit jew titjib fil-mira. L-Istati Membri ([1]) impenjaw ruħhom li jużaw il-fondi tal-UE b'mod aktar effettiv permezz tar-riallokazzjoni tal-fondi mhux impenjati jew mhux użati tal-UE biex jissaħħu l-miżuri ta' impjieg għaż-żgħażagħ. Ir-riżultati konkreti ta' dan l-eżerċizzju ġew ippreżentati mill-President f'Mejju.

2. Matul is-Semestru Ewropew, il-Kummissjoni ffukat b'mod partikolari fuq il-qagħda tal-qgħad fost iż-żgħażagħ fl-Istati Membri u fuq il-politiki dwar l-impjieg taż-żgħażagħ ippreżentati fil-Programmi Nazzjonali ta' Riforma. Din l-analiżi hija riflessa fir-Rakkomandazzjonijiet Speċifiċi għall-Pajjiżi u fid-Dokumenti ta' Ħidma tal-Persunal maħruġa f'Mejju. Bħala segwitu għall-komunikazzjoni tagħha dwar l-Inizjattiva għall-Opportunitajiet taż-Żgħażagħ ([2]) YOI), aktar tard fl-2012 il-Kummissjoni beħsiebha tippreżenta Pakkett dwar l-Impjiegi taż-Żgħażagħ, inklużi inizjattivi ta' politika dwar garanziji għaż-żgħażagħ u qafas ta' kwalità għall-apprendistati. Dan se jiġi ssupplimentat b'rappurtar dwar l-implimentazzjoni tal-YOI fl-Istati Membri. Għal dan l-għan, il-Kummissjoni talbet lill-Istati Membri biex jirrappurtaw sal-bidu ta' Settembru 2012 dwar il-progress li sar, inkluża d-dejta finanzjarja aġġornata dwar l-utilità ta' finanzjament nazzjonali u tal-UE.

3. Matul il-parti l-kbira taż-żjarat fil-pajjiżi, it-timijiet ta' azzjoni ltaqgħu mal-partijiet interessati, li jinkludu l-NGOs taż-żgħażagħ u l-imsieħba soċjali, biex jivvalutaw aħjar il-qagħda fuq il-post. Il-Kummissjoni tikkonsulta l-Forum taż-Żgħażagħ Ewropej regolarment u hija konxja tal-pożizzjonijiet tiegħu. Beħsiebha tikkonsulta lill-Forum dwar il-Pakkett ippjanat tal-Impjiegi għaż-Żgħażagħ u tinkoraġġixxi lill-Istati Membri jikkonsultaw l-organizzazzjonijiet nazzjonali taż-żgħażagħ tagħhom.

([1]) Inklużi s-seba' Stati Membri msemmija fil-mistoqsija 4.
([2]) COM(2011) 933 tal-20 ta' Diċembru 2011.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007432/12
aan de Commissie
Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Alejo Vidal-Quadras (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Simon Busuttil (PPE), Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE), Elmar Brok (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Ioannis Kasoulides (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE), Jean-Paul Gauzès (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Gay Mitchell (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Erik Bánki (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Ivo Belet (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Romana Jordan (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Krišjānis Kariņš (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Nadezhda Neynsky (PPE), Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Hubert Pirker (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Csaba Sógor (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Róża Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Vladimir Urutchev (PPE), Dominique Vlasto (PPE), Iuliu Winkler (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE) en Paweł Zalewski (PPE)
(24 juli 2012)

Betreft: Jeugdwerkloosheid: verzoek om informatie over de resultaten die zijn behaald door de actieteams en door de overheveling van Europese middelen naar maatregelen ter bestrijding van de jeugdwerkloosheid

Tijdens de informele vergadering van de Europese Raad van 30 januari 2012 richtte de Commissie acht actieteams op die moesten worden uitgezonden naar de lidstaten met een hoog jeugdwerkloosheidscijfer (Italië, Spanje, Griekenland, Slowakije, Litouwen, Portugal, Letland en Ierland) en kondigde zij aan dat 82 miljard EUR nog onbestede Europese middelen zouden worden gebruikt voor de financiering van maatregelen om de jeugdwerkloosheid te bestrijden, de groei te stimuleren en kmo's te ondersteunen. Tussen februari en mei 2012 zijn Commissiedeskundigen naar de acht lidstaten in kwestie gegaan voor overleg. Op 23 mei 2012 presenteerde Commissievoorzitter Barroso de eerste door de actieteams behaalde resultaten, terwijl hij verklaarde dat al 7,3 miljard EUR was gereserveerd voor versnelde tenuitvoerlegging of was overgeheveld.

Gelet op het feit dat de beschikbare gegevens onduidelijk zijn, doordat zij onvolledig en onvoldoende gedetailleerd zijn, en dat de Commissie en het Parlement bij diverse gelegenheden het feit hebben benadrukt dat jongeren op actieve en concrete wijze moeten worden betrokken bij de besluitvorming, kan de Commissie meedelen:

1. of naast het op 23 mei 2012 door voorzitter Barroso gepresenteerde document, documenten beschikbaar zijn met preciezere en gedetailleerdere gegevens over de projecten die worden gefinancierd of in de pijplijn zitten;

2. of een analyse van goede praktijken is uitgevoerd en een strategie ontwikkeld voor langetermijnactie om de werkgelegenheid voor jongeren te bevorderen;

3. of en wanneer jongerenorganisaties bij de zaak zijn betrokken — en hoe met hen is overlegd — overeenkomstig de mededeling van de Commissie met als titel Initiatief „Kansen voor jongeren" en de resolutie van het Parlement van 24 mei 2012 over het initiatief „Kansen voor jongeren";

4. welke resultaten zijn behaald en welke besluiten zijn genomen tijdens het overleg met de zeven andere landen met een werkloosheidscijfer boven het EU-gemiddelde (Bulgarije, Cyprus, Frankrijk, Hongarije, Polen, Roemenië en Zweden)?

Antwoord van de heer Andor namens de Commissie
(6 september 2012)

1 en 4. Gedurende de bilaterale vergaderingen en de bezoeken van de actieteams werd gezocht naar gezamenlijke oplossingen voor het versnellen van de uitvoering van bestaande programma's of voor het uitbreiden van de dekking daarvan door verhoging van het budget of verbetering van de doelgerichtheid van maatregelen. De lidstaten ([1]) hebben toegezegd EU-fondsen effectiever te zullen gebruiken door niet vastgelegde of ongebruikte EU-middelen om te leiden naar werkgelegenheidsmaatregelen voor jongeren. De voorzitter heeft de concrete resultaten van deze operatie in mei gepresenteerd.

2. In de loop van het Europese Semester heeft de Commissie bijzondere aandacht besteed aan de situatie inzake jeugdwerkloosheid in de lidstaten en aan het werkgelegenheidsbeleid ten behoeve van jongeren in de nationale hervormingsprogramma's. De resultaten van deze analyse zijn terug te vinden in de in mei gepubliceerde landspecifieke aanbevelingen en werkdocumenten van de diensten van de Commissie. Als follow-up van haar mededeling over het initiatief „Kansen voor Jongeren" (Youth Opportunities Initiative, YOI) ([2]) is de Commissie voornemens later in 2012 een werkgelegenheidspakket voor jongeren te presenteren, dat ook beleidsinitiatieven inzake „jongerengaranties" en een kwaliteitskader voor stages zal omvatten. Dit zal worden aangevuld door verslagen over de uitvoering van het YOI in de lidstaten. Met het oog daarop heeft de Commissie de lidstaten verzocht om tegen begin september 2012 verslag uit te brengen over de geboekte vooruitgang, met actuele financiële gegevens over het gebruik van nationale en EU-financiering.

3. De bezoeken van de actieteams omvatten ook ontmoetingen met betrokken partijen, waaronder ngo's op het terrein van jeugdzaken en de sociale partners, om de situatie in het veld beter te kunnen beoordelen. De Commissie raadpleegt regelmatig het Europees Jeugdforum en is op de hoogte van de standpunten daarvan. Zij is voornemens het forum ook te raadplegen over het geplande jeugdwerkgelegenheidspakket en de lidstaten aan te moedigen om hun nationale jongerenorganisaties te raadplegen.

([1]) Waaronder de zeven in vraag 4 genoemde lidstaten.
([2]) COM(2011) 933 van 20 december 2011.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007432/12
do Komisji

Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Alejo Vidal-Quadras (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Simon Busuttil (PPE), Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE), Elmar Brok (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Ioannis Kasoulides (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE), Jean-Paul Gauzès (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Gay Mitchell (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Erik Bánki (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Ivo Belet (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Romana Jordan (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Krišjānis Kariņš (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Nadezhda Neynsky (PPE), Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Hubert Pirker (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Csaba Sógor (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Róża Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Vladimir Urutchev (PPE), Dominique Vlasto (PPE), Iuliu Winkler (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE) oraz Paweł Zalewski (PPE)

(24 lipca 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Bezrobocie osób młodych: wniosek o udzielenie informacji na temat wyników osiągniętych przez „grupy działania" oraz programowania funduszy europejskich na zatrudnienie osób młodych

Na nieformalnym posiedzeniu Rady Europejskiej w dniu 30 stycznia 2012 r. Komisja utworzyła osiem „grup działania" z myślą o wysłaniu ich do państw członkowskich o najwyższej stopie bezrobocia osób młodych (Włochy, Hiszpania, Grecja, Słowacja, Litwa, Portugalia, Łotwa i Irlandia) i ogłosiła, że 82 miliony euro niewydanych wówczas funduszy europejskich zostaną przeznaczone na wsparcie środków na rzecz walki z bezrobociem osób młodych, pobudzenia wzrostu i pomocy dla MŚP. Od lutego do maja 2012 r. eksperci Komisji udali się do tych ośmiu państw UE w celu przeprowadzenia konsultacji. W dniu 23 maja 2012 r. Przewodniczący Komisji J.M. Barroso przedstawił pierwsze wyniki osiągnięte przez „grupy działania" i oświadczył, że fundusze w kwocie 7,3 miliarda euro zostały już przeznaczone na szybszą realizację lub przesunięte.

Z uwagi na niejasny charakter dostępnych danych, które są niepełne i niedostatecznie szczegółowe, oraz na fakt, że Komisja i Parlament niejednokrotnie podkreślały konieczność aktywnego i konkretnego zaangażowania młodych ludzi w proces decyzyjny, czy Komisja może powiedzieć:

1. czy oprócz dokumentu przedstawionego przez Przewodniczącego Barroso w dniu 23 maja 2012 r. dostępne są bardziej precyzyjne i szczegółowe dokumenty i dane dotyczące finansowanych projektów i projektów czekających na realizację;

2. czy przeprowadzono analizę dobrych praktyk i opracowano długofalową strategię na rzecz zwiększenia zatrudnienia osób młodych;

3. czy i kiedy zaangażowano organizacje młodzieżowe oraz w jaki sposób się z nimi konsultowano, co zakładano w komunikacie Komisji dotyczącym inicjatywy „Szanse dla młodzieży" i w rezolucji Parlamentu z dnia 24 maja 2012 r. w sprawie tej inicjatywy;

4. czym zakończyły się negocjacje z pozostałymi siedmioma państwami członkowskimi o stopie bezrobocia powyżej średniej UE (Bułgaria, Cypr, Francja, Węgry, Polska, Rumunia i Szwecja) i jakie decyzje podjęto w ich trakcie?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza László Andora w imieniu Komisji
(6 września 2012 r.)

Ad 1. i 4. Podczas spotkań dwustronnych i wizyt „grup działania" poszukiwano wspólnych rozwiązań służących przyspieszeniu realizacji istniejących programów lub poszerzeniu ich zakresu poprzez zwiększenie budżetu lub poprawę ich ukierunkowania. Państwa członkowskie ([1]) zobowiązały się do skuteczniejszego wykorzystywania funduszy unijnych poprzez przekierowanie niezaangażowanych lub niewykorzystanych funduszy UE i przeznaczenie ich na wsparcie środków służących zatrudnieniu młodzieży. W maju Przewodniczący przedstawił konkretne wyniki tych działań.

Ad 2. W ciągu europejskiego semestru Komisja przykładała szczególną wagę do bezrobocia wśród młodzieży w państwach członkowskich oraz do strategii politycznych na rzecz zatrudnienia młodzieży zawartych w krajowych programach reform. Analiza ta znalazła odzwierciedlenie w wydanych w maju zaleceniach dla poszczególnych krajów i w dokumentach roboczych służb Komisji. W następstwie komunikatu Komisji w sprawie inicjatywy „Szanse dla młodzieży" ([2]) Komisja zamierza przedstawić w 2012 r. Pakiet na rzecz zatrudnienia młodzieży, obejmujący inicjatywy polityczne na rzecz gwarancji dla młodzieży i ram jakości dla staży. Zostanie on uzupełniony sprawozdaniem na temat wdrożenia inicjatywy w państwach członkowskich. Dlatego też Komisja zwróciła się do państw członkowskich o przedstawienie na początku września 2012 r. sprawozdania z postępów, w tym aktualnych danych finansowych w sprawie wykorzystania finansowania krajowego i unijnego.

Ad 3. W ramach większości wizyt krajowych „grupy działania" spotkały się z zainteresowanymi stronami, w tym z młodzieżowymi organizacjami pozarządowymi i partnerami społecznymi, w celu lepszej oceny sytuacji na miejscu. Komisja regularnie zasięga opinii Europejskiego Forum Młodzieży i zna jego stanowisko. Komisja zamierza konsultować z Forum planowany Pakiet na rzecz zatrudnienia młodzieży oraz zachęcać państwa członkowskie do zasięgania opinii krajowych organizacji młodzieżowych.

([1]) W tym siedem państw członkowskich, o których mowa w punkcie 4.
([2]) COM(2011) 933 z dnia 20 grudnia 2011 r.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007432/12
à Comissão

Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Alejo Vidal-Quadras (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Simon Busuttil (PPE), Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE), Elmar Brok (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Ioannis Kasoulides (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE), Jean-Paul Gauzès (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Gay Mitchell (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Erik Bánki (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Ivo Belet (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Romana Jordan (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Krišjānis Kariņš (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Nadezhda Neynsky (PPE), Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Hubert Pirker (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Csaba Sógor (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Róża Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Vladimir Urutchev (PPE), Dominique Vlasto (PPE), Iuliu Winkler (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE) e Paweł Zalewski (PPE)

(24 de Julho de 2012)

Assunto: O desemprego dos jovens: pedido de informações sobre os resultados das «equipas de ação» e reprogramação dos fundos europeus tendo em vista o emprego dos jovens

Durante a reunião informal do Conselho Europeu realizada em 30 de janeiro de 2012, a Comissão criou oito «equipas de ação» a enviar aos Estados-Membros com elevadas taxas de desemprego juvenil (Itália, Espanha, Grécia, Eslováquia, Lituânia, Portugal, Letónia e Irlanda) e anunciou que seriam utilizados 82 mil milhões de fundos europeus ainda não utilizados para fomentar medidas destinadas a combater o desemprego dos jovens, promover o crescimento e apoiar as PME. Entre fevereiro e maio de 2012, foram enviados aos oito Estados-Membros peritos da Comissão a fim de proceder a consultas. Em 23 de maio de 2012, o Presidente da Comissão apresentou os primeiros resultados das «equipas de ação», afirmando que já tinham sido atribuídos para uma aplicação acelerada ou reafetados 7,3 mil milhões de euros.

Dado que os dados disponíveis não são claros porque estão incompletos e insuficientemente detalhados e que a Comissão e o Parlamento por diversas ocasiões sublinharam a necessidade de uma participação ativa e concreta dos jovens na tomada de decisões, pode a Comissão indicar:

1. Para além do documento apresentado pelo Presidente Durão Barroso em 23 de maio de 2012, será que existem documentos e dados mais precisos e detalhados sobre os projetos financiados e pendentes?

2. Será que foi realizada uma análise de boas práticas e elaborada uma estratégia para ações a longo prazo destinadas a aumentar o emprego dos jovens?

3. Foram consultadas organizações de jovens, tal como previsto na Comunicação da Comissão intitulada «Iniciativa Oportunidades para a Juventude» e na resolução do Parlamento de 24 de maio de 2012 sobre a Iniciativa Oportunidades para a Juventude? Em que momento? De que forma?

4. Quais foram os resultados das consultas com os outros sete países com uma taxa de desemprego acima da média da UE (Bulgária, Chipre, França, Hungria, Polónia, Roménia e Suécia) e quais as decisões tomadas durante essas consultas?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(6 de setembro de 2012)

1. e 4. No decurso das reuniões bilaterais e das visitas das equipas de ação, foram procuradas soluções comuns para acelerar a aplicação dos programas existentes ou alargar a sua cobertura, aumentando o orçamento ou orientando melhor a sua aplicação. Os Estados-Membros ([1]) comprometeram-se a utilizar os fundos de forma mais eficaz através da reorientação de fundos não autorizados ou não utilizados, a fim de intensificar a aplicação de medidas em prol do emprego dos jovens. Os resultados concretos deste exercício foram apresentados pelo Presidente em maio.

2. Durante o Semestre Europeu, a Comissão deu particular atenção à situação do desemprego dos jovens nos Estados-Membros e às políticas de emprego juvenil apresentadas nos programas nacionais de reformas. Esta análise está refletida nas recomendações específicas dirigidas a cada país e nos documentos de trabalho dos serviços da Comissão publicados em maio. No seguimento da comunicação sobre a iniciativa Oportunidades para a Juventude ([2]), a Comissão prevê apresentar mais tarde no decurso do ano de 2012 um pacote de medidas em prol do emprego juvenil, incluindo iniciativas políticas no contexto das garantias para a juventude e do quadro de qualidade para os estágios. Esta ação será completada por informação sobre a realização da iniciativa Oportunidades para a Juventude nos Estados-Membros. Para tal, a Comissão solicitou que os Estados-Membros dessem conta, até ao início de setembro de 2012, dos progressos realizados e fornecessem dados financeiros atualizados sobre a utilização do financiamento nacional e da UE.

3. Durante a maior parte das visitas aos países, as equipas de ação encontraram-se com as partes interessadas, incluindo ONG juvenis e parceiros sociais, a fim de melhor se inteirarem da situação no terreno. A Comissão consulta regularmente o Fórum Europeu da Juventude e está ciente das suas posições. Tenciona ouvir o Fórum acerca do futuro pacote em prol do emprego juvenil e encorajar os Estados-Membros a consultarem as respetivas organizações de juventude.

([1]) Incluindo os sete Estados-Membros referidos na pergunta 4.
([2]) COM(2011)933 de 20 de dezembro de 2011.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-007432/12
adresată Comisiei
Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Alejo Vidal-Quadras (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Simon Busuttil (PPE), Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE), Elmar Brok (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Ioannis Kasoulides (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE), Jean-Paul Gauzès (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Gay Mitchell (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Erik Bánki (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Ivo Belet (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Romana Jordan (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Krišjānis Kariņš (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Nadezhda Neynsky (PPE), Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Hubert Pirker (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Csaba Sógor (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Róża Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Vladimir Urutchev (PPE), Dominique Vlasto (PPE), Iuliu Winkler (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE) şi Paweł Zalewski (PPE)
(24 iulie 2012)

Subiect: Șomajul în rândul tinerilor: cerere de informare cu privire la rezultatele obținute de „echipele de acțiune” și la reprogramarea fondurilor europene destinate sprijinirii oportunităților de angajare pentru tineri

În timpul reuniunii neoficiale a Consiliului European, care a avut loc la 30 ianuarie 2012, Comisia a instituit opt „echipe de acțiune” care să fie trimise în statele membre în care nivelurile șomajului în rândul tinerilor sunt ridicate (Italia, Spania, Grecia, Slovacia, Lituania, Portugalia, Letonia și Irlanda) și a anunțat că 82 de miliarde de euro din fondurile europene, care încă nu au fost cheltuite, vor fi alocate în vederea sprijinirii măsurilor menite să combată șomajul în rândul tinerilor, să încurajeze creșterea economică și să sprijine IMM-urile. În perioada februarie-mai 2012, experți ai Comisiei au fost în cele opt state membre în chestiune în vederea unor consultări. La 23 mai 2012, Președintele Comisiei, dl Barroso, a prezentat primele rezultate obținute de către „echipele de acțiune”, declarând că 7,3 miliarde de euro din fonduri au fost deja destinate accelerării punerii în aplicare sau realocării.

Având în vedere că informațiile disponibile sunt neclare, întrucât sunt incomplete și nu oferă suficiente detalii, și că atât Comisia, cât și Parlamentul au subliniat, în mai multe rânduri, nevoia de a implica tinerii, în mod activ și concret, în procesul de luare a deciziilor, poate Comisia să afirme:

1. dacă, pe lângă documentul prezentat de către dl Președinte Barroso, la 23 mai 2012, sunt disponibile documente și informații mai precise și detaliate cu privire la proiectele finanțate și în curs de desfășurare?

2. dacă a fost întreprinsă o evaluare a bunelor practici și dacă a fost dezvoltată o strategie cu acțiune pe termen lung în vederea încurajării oportunităților de angajare în rândul tinerilor?

3. dacă și unde au fost implicate organizațiile de tineret — și în ce măsură au fost consultate — așa cum se prevede în comunicarea Comisiei intitulată Inițiativa „Oportunități pentru tineret” și în rezoluția Parlamentului din 24 mai 2012 privind Inițiativa „Oportunități pentru tineret”?

4. care au fost rezultatele și deciziile luate în timpul consultărilor cu celelalte șapte țări a căror rată a șomajului în rândul tinerilor se situează deasupra nivelului mediu al UE (Bulgaria, Cipru, Franța, Ungaria, Polonia, România și Suedia)?

Răspuns dat de dl Andor în numele Comisiei
(6 septembrie 2012)

1 și 4. În cursul reuniunilor bilaterale și a vizitelor echipei de acțiune au fost căutate soluții comune privind accelerarea punerii în aplicare a programelor existente sau extinderea acoperirii domeniului acestora, prin creșterea bugetului sau îmbunătățirea obiectivelor. Statele membre ([1]) s-au angajat să utilizeze fondurile UE în mod mai eficient prin redirijarea fondurilor UE neangajate sau neutilizate pentru a susține măsurile de ocupare a forței de muncă în rândul tinerilor. Rezultatele concrete ale acestui exercițiu au fost prezentate de către președinte în luna mai.

2. În cursul semestrului european, Comisia a acordat o atenție deosebită situației șomajului în rândul tinerilor în statele membre și politicilor de ocupare a forței de muncă în rândul tinerilor prezentate în cadrul programelor naționale de reformă. Această analiză este descrisă în recomandările specifice fiecărei țări și în documentele de lucru ale serviciilor Comisiei, publicate în luna mai. Ca urmare a comunicării sale referitoare la Inițiativa privind oportunitățile pentru tineri ([2]) (YOI), Comisia intenționează să prezinte, în perioada următoare a anului 2012, un pachet de încadrare în muncă a tinerilor, cuprinzând inițiative strategice privind garanțiile pentru tineret și un cadru de calitate pentru stagii. Acesta va fi completat de o activitate de raportare privind punerea în aplicare a YOI în statele membre. În acest scop, Comisia a invitat statele membre să prezinte, până la începutul lunii septembrie 2012, rapoarte privind progresele realizate, inclusiv date financiare actualizate cu privire la utilizarea finanțării naționale și din partea UE.

3. În cadrul majorității vizitelor efectuate în diverse țări, echipele de acțiune s-au întâlnit cu părțile interesate, inclusiv cu organizațiile neguvernamentale și cu partenerii sociali, pentru o mai bună evaluare a situației de pe teren. Comisia consultă Forumul European al Tineretului în mod regulat și cunoaște pozițiile acestuia. Ea intenționează să consulte Forumul privind proiectul de pachet de încadrare în muncă a tinerilor și să încurajeze statele membre să-și consulte propriile organizații naționale de tineret.

([1]) Inclusiv cele șapte state membre menționate la întrebarea numărul 4.
([2]) COM(2011) 933 din 20 decembrie 2011.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-007432/12
Komisii

Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Alejo Vidal-Quadras (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Simon Busuttil (PPE), Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE), Elmar Brok (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Ioannis Kasoulides (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE), Jean-Paul Gauzès (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Gay Mitchell (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Erik Bánki (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Ivo Belet (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Romana Jordan (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Krišjānis Kariņš (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Nadezhda Neynsky (PPE), Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Hubert Pirker (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Csaba Sógor (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Róża Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Vladimir Urutchev (PPE), Dominique Vlasto (PPE), Iuliu Winkler (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE) a Paweł Zalewski (PPE)

(24. júla 2012)

Vec: Nezamestnanosť mladých: žiadosť o poskytnutie výsledkov, ktoré dosiahli akčné tímy a o preprogramovanie európskych fondov na podporu zamestnanosti mladých

Počas neformálnej schôdze Európskej rady, ktorá sa konala dňa 30. januára 2012, Komisia zostavila 8 akčných tímov, ktoré boli vyslané do členských štátov s vysokou mierou nezamestnanosti mladých (Taliansko, Španielsko, Grécko, Slovensko, Litva, Portugalsko, Lotyšsko a Írsko) a oznámila, že 82 miliárd EUR, ktoré sa doposiaľ z Európskych fondov neminuli, bude použitých na podporu opatrení určených na boj proti nezamestnanosti mladých, podporu rastu a podporu MSP. V priebehu mesiacov február — máj 2012, experti Komisie navštívili osem členských štátov, aby v nich uskutočnili konzultácie. Predseda Komisie, Barroso, dňa 23. mája 2012 predložil prvé výsledky, ktoré dosiahli akčné tímy, a uviedol, že 7,3 miliardy EUR už bolo vyčlenených na urýchlenú implementáciu alebo boli prerozdelené.

Vzhľadom na to, že dostupné dáta nie sú jasné, pretože sú neúplné a málo detailné, a pretože Komisia, ako aj Parlament viackrát zdôraznili potrebu aktívneho a priameho zapájania mladých do rozhodovacieho procesu, môže Komisia povedať:

1. či sú k dokumentom, ktoré dňa 23. mája 2012 predložil predseda Barroso, dostupné presnejšie a detailnejšie dokumenty o financovaných a otvorených projektoch?

2. či bola vykonaná analýza dobrých postupov a vytvorená dlhodobá stratégia na podporu nezamestnanosti mladých?

3. či a kedy boli do činnosti zapojené mládežnícke organizácie , — a ako boli konzultované –, tak ako sa to predpokladá v oznámení Komisie s názvom Iniciatíva Príležitostí pre mladých a v uznesení Parlamentu z dňa 24. mája 2012 o Iniciatíve Príležitostí pre mladých?

4. aké boli výsledky a aké rozhodnutia sa prijali počas konzultácií s ostatnými siedmimi krajinami, ktoré majú mieru nezamestnanosti mladých vyššiu ako európsky priemer (Bulharsko, Cyprus, Francúzsko, Maďarsko, Poľsko, Rumunsko, Švédsko)?

Odpoveď pána Andora v mene Komisie
(6. septembra 2012)

1. a 4. Počas bilaterálnych rokovaní a návštev akčných tímov sa hľadali spoločné riešenia na urýchlenie vykonávania existujúcich programov alebo na rozšírenie ich zamerania prostredníctvom zvýšenia rozpočtu alebo ich lepšieho zacielenia. Členské štáty ([1]) sa zaviazali účinnejšie využívať fondy EÚ prostredníctvom presmerovania nepridelených alebo nevyužitých fondov EÚ s cieľom posilniť opatrenia podporujúce zamestnanosť mladých ľudí. Predseda predstavil konkrétne výsledky tohto úsilia v máji.

2. Počas európskeho semestra Komisia venovala osobitnú pozornosť stavu, pokiaľ ide o nezamestnanosť mladých ľudí v členských štátoch, a politikám zamestnanosti mladých ľudí predloženým v národných reformných programoch. Táto analýza je zohľadnená v odporúčaniach pre jednotlivé krajiny a v pracovných dokumentoch útvarov Komisie, ktoré boli vydané v máji. V nadväznosti na svoje oznámenie o iniciatíve „Príležitosti pre mladých“ ([2]) Komisia plánuje predložiť v 2. polovici roku 2012 balík opatrení v oblasti zamestnanosti mladých ľudí vrátane politických iniciatív týkajúcich sa záruk pre mladých a rámca kvality pre stáže. Balík budú dopĺňať správy o vykonávaní iniciatívy „Príležitosti pre mladých“ v členských štátoch. V tejto súvislosti Komisia požiadala členské štáty, aby začiatkom septembra 2012 predložili správu o dosiahnutom pokroku vrátane aktuálnych finančných údajov týkajúcich sa využívania vnútroštátneho financovania a financovania z EÚ.

3. Počas väčšiny návštev krajín sa akčné tímy stretli so zainteresovanými stranami vrátane mládežníckych MVO a sociálnych partnerov, aby mohli lepšie posúdiť situáciu na mieste. Komisia pravidelne konzultuje Európske fórum mládeže a je si vedomá jeho stanovísk. Komisia má v úmysle konzultovať s fórom o plánovanom balíku opatrení v oblasti zamestnanosti mladých ľudí a povzbudzovať členské štáty, aby v tejto súvislosti konzultovali s vnútroštátnymi mládežníckymi organizáciami.

([1]) Vrátane siedmich členských štátov uvedených v otázke č. 4.
([2]) KOM(2011) 933 z 20. decembra 2011.

(Slovenska različica)

Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-007432/12
za Komisijo
Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Alejo Vidal-Quadras (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Simon Busuttil (PPE), Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE), Elmar Brok (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Ioannis Kasoulides (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE), Jean-Paul Gauzès (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Gay Mitchell (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Erik Bánki (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Ivo Belet (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Romana Jordan (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Krišjānis Kariņš (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Nadezhda Neynsky (PPE), Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Hubert Pirker (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Csaba Sógor (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), grofica Róża Thun Und Hohenstein (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Vladimir Urutchev (PPE), Dominique Vlasto (PPE), Iuliu Winkler (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE) in Paweł Zalewski (PPE)
(24. julij 2012)

Zadeva: Brezposelnost mladih: zahteva za informacije o rezultatih, ki so jih dosegle skupine za ukrepanje, in doseženih rezultatih ponovnega načrtovanja programov evropskih skladov za namen zaposlovanja mladih

Na neuradnem sestanku Evropskega sveta dne 30. januarja 2012 je Komisija ustanovila osem skupin za ukrepanje, ki bi obiskale države članice z visoko stopnjo brezposelnosti mladih (Italija, Španija, Grčija, Slovaška, Litva, Portugalska, Latvija in Irska), in napovedala, da se bo 82 milijard evrov še neporabljenih sredstev iz evropskih skladov uporabilo za podporo ukrepom za zmanjševanje brezposelnosti mladih, spodbujanje rasti ter podporo malim in srednjim podjetjem. Med februarjem in majem 2012 so strokovnjaki Komisije odšli v zadevnih osem držav članic na posvetovanja. Predsednik Komisije Barroso je 23. maja 2012 predstavil prve rezultate, ki so jih dosegle skupine za ukrepanje, in navedel, da se je 7,3 milijard evrov že predvidelo za pospešeno izvajanje ukrepov ali prerazporedilo.

Z ozirom na to, da so razpoložljivi podatki nejasni, saj so nepopolni in ne dovolj podrobni, ter da sta Komisija in Parlament večkrat poudarila potrebo po dejavnem in konkretnem vključevanju mladih v odločanje, ali lahko Komisija odgovori:

1. ali so poleg dokumenta, ki ga je 23. maja 2012 predstavil predsednik Barroso, na voljo natančnejši in podrobnejši dokumenti in podatki o financiranih in načrtovanih projektih?

2. ali je bila opravljena analiza dobrih praks in izdelana strategija dolgoročnega ukrepanja za povečanje zaposlovanja mladih?

3. ali in kdaj so bile vključene organizacije mladih – in na kakšen način je potekalo posvetovanje z njimi –, kot je predvideno v sporočilu Komisije z naslovom „Pobuda Priložnosti za mlade“ in v resoluciji Parlamenta z dne 24. maja 2012 o pobudi Priložnosti za mlade?

4. kateri rezultati so bili doseženi in kateri sklepi sprejeti na posvetovanjih z drugimi sedmimi državami, v katerih je stopnja brezposelnosti nad povprečjem EU (Bolgarija, Ciper, Francija, Poljska, Romunija in Švedska)?

Odgovor komisarja Lászla Andorja v imenu Komisije
(6. september 2012)

1 in 4. Na dvostranskih srečanjih in obiskih skupin za ukrepanje so bile oblikovane skupne rešitve za pospešeno izvajanje obstoječih programov ali razširitev njihovega obsega s povečanjem proračuna ali izboljšanjem njihove ciljne usmerjenosti. Države članice ([1]) so si prizadevale za učinkovitejšo porabo sredstev EU s preusmerjanjem nedodeljenih ali neporabljenih sredstev EU v podporo ukrepom za zaposlovanje mladih. Predsednik je konkretne rezultate teh prizadevanj predstavil maja.

([1]) Vključno s sedmimi državami članicami iz vprašanja 4.

2. Komisija je med evropskim semestrom posebno pozornost namenila brezposelnosti mladih v državah članicah in politikam zaposlovanja mladih, ki so bile predstavljene v okviru nacionalnih programov reform. Učinek te analize se kaže v priporočilih za posamezne države in delovnih dokumentih služb Komisije, objavljenih maja. Komisija namerava po sporočilu „Pobuda Priložnosti za mlade“ ([2]) v drugi polovici leta 2012 predstaviti sveženj ukrepov za zaposlovanje mladih, vključno s pobudami politike na področju jamstev za mlade in okvirom za kakovost pripravništev. To bo dopolnjeno s poročanjem o izvajanju pobude Priložnosti za mlade v državah članicah. Zato je Komisija države članice že pozvala, naj do začetka septembra 2012 poročajo o doseženem napredku, tudi glede najnovejših finančnih podatkov o porabi nacionalnih sredstev in sredstev EU.

3. Na obiskih v državah članicah so se skupne za ukrepanje večinoma sestale z zainteresiranimi stranmi, vključno z mladinskimi nevladnimi organizacijami in socialnimi partnerji, da bi bolje ocenile stanje na terenu. Komisija se redno posvetuje z Evropskim mladinskim forumom in pozna njegova stališča. S Forumom se namerava posvetovati tudi glede načrtovanega svežnja za zaposlovanje mladih in spodbuditi države članice, da se posvetujejo z nacionalnimi mladinskimi organizacijami.

([2]) COM(2011) 933 z dne 20. decembra 2011.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-007432/12
till kommissionen
Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Alejo Vidal-Quadras (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Simon Busuttil (PPE), Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE), Elmar Brok (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Ioannis Kasoulides (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE), Jean-Paul Gauzès (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Gay Mitchell (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Erik Bánki (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Ivo Belet (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Romana Jordan (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Krišjānis Kariņš (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Nadezhda Neynsky (PPE), Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Hubert Pirker (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Csaba Sógor (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Róża Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Vladimir Urutchev (PPE), Dominique Vlasto (PPE), Iuliu Winkler (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE) och Paweł Zalewski (PPE)
(24 juli 2012)

Angående: Ungdomsarbetslöshet: Begäran om information om arbetsgruppernas resultat och omprogrammeringen av EU-medel till ungdomsarbetsplatser

Den 30 januari, under Europeiska rådets informella möte, grundade kommissionen åtta arbetsgrupper som skulle skickas till EU-länder med hög ungdomsarbetslöshet (Italien, Spanien, Grekland, Slovakien, Litauen, Portugal, Lettland och Irland) och tillkännagav att 82 miljarder euro ännu inte använda EU-medel kommer att användas till att stödja åtgärder som ska motverka ungdomsarbetslöshet, öka tillväxten och stödja små och medelstora företag. Mellan februari och mars 2012 var kommissionens experter i de åtta medlemsstaterna för samråd. Den 23 maj lade kommissionens ordförande José Manuel Barroso fram arbetsgruppernas första resultat och tillkännagav att 7,3 miljarder euro från fonder redan öronmärkts till påskyndat genomförande eller har omfördelats.

Med tanke på att den tillgängliga informationen är otydlig på grund av att den är ofullständig och inte tillräckligt detaljerad,

Med tanke på att kommissionen och parlamentet vid flera tillfällen betonat vikten av en aktiv och konkret närvaro av unga människor i beslutsfattandet vill vi be kommissionen svara på följande:

1. Finns det mer tydliga och fullständiga dokument och information tillgängliga både för redan finansierade och oavslutade projekt, utöver dokumentet som ordförande José Manuel Barroso lade fram den 23 maj?

2. Har det gjorts en analys av bästa metoder och tagits fram en strategi för långsiktiga åtgärder som ska öka antalet ungdomsarbetsplatser?

3. Hur och när var ungdomsorganisationer delaktiga och hur rådfrågades de enligt kommissionens meddelande ”Initiativet Bättre möjligheter för unga” och i Europaparlamentets resolution av den 24 maj 2012 ”Initiativet Bättre möjligheter för unga”?

4. Vilka resultat och beslut gjordes under samråden med de andra sju länderna som har en arbetslöshet över EU-genomsnittet (Bulgarien, Cypern, Frankrike, Polen, Rumänien, Sverige och Ungern)?

Svar från László Andor på kommissionens vägnar
(6 september 2012)

1 och 4. Under de bilaterala mötena och arbetsgruppernas besök försökte man hitta gemensamma lösningar på hur man kan genomföra befintliga program snabbare eller bredda deras omfattning genom att höja budgetanslagen eller förbättra inriktningen. Medlemsländerna ([1]) åtog sig att använda EU-medlen effektivare genom att omfördela outnyttjade medel till insatser mot ungdomsarbetslösheten. De konkreta resultaten av den här omfördelningen presenterades av kommissionens ordförande i maj.

2. Under den europeiska planeringsterminen uppmärksammade kommissionen särskilt ungdomsarbetslösheten i medlemsländerna och de ungdomspolitiska åtgärderna i ländernas reformprogram. Analysen återspeglas i de landsspecifika rekommendationerna och kommissionens arbetsdokument från maj. Som en uppföljning till sitt meddelande om initiativet Bättre möjligheter för unga ([2]) avser kommissionen att senare under 2012 lägga fram ett ungdomssysselsättningspaket med bland annat initiativ om ungdomsgarantier och kvalitetskriterier för praktik. Det kommer att kompletteras med rapporter om hur medlemsländerna genomför initiativet Bättre möjligheter för unga. Kommissionen har därför bett länderna att i början av september 2012 rapportera om sina resultat och lämna aktuella uppgifter om hur de har använt egna medel och EU-medel.

3. Under de flesta av besöken i länderna träffade arbetsgrupperna olika aktörer, bland annat ungdomsorganisationer och arbetsmarknadsparter, för att bättre bedöma situationen. Kommissionen samråder regelbundet med Europeiska ungdomsforumet och känner till deras synpunkter. Kommissionen har för avsikt att diskutera det planerade ungdomssysselsättningspaketet med forumet och uppmuntrar medlemsländerna att samråda med sina nationella ungdomsorganisationer.

([1]) Även de sju medlemsländer som nämns i fråga 4.
([2]) KOM(2011) 933 av den 20 december 2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007432/12
to the Commission

Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE), Othmar Karas (PPE), Georgios Papastamkos (PPE), Alejo Vidal-Quadras (PPE), László Surján (PPE), Simon Busuttil (PPE), Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE), Elmar Brok (PPE), Marietta Giannakou (PPE), Ioannis Kasoulides (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE), Jean-Paul Gauzès (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Gay Mitchell (PPE), Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), Kinga Gál (PPE), Elena Băsescu (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), Zoltán Bagó (PPE), Erik Bánki (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Ivo Belet (PPE), Philippe Boulland (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE), Rachida Dati (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), Santiago Fisas Ayxela (PPE), Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Brice Hortefeux (PPE), Lívia Járóka (PPE), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (PPE), Romana Jordan (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Krišjānis Kariņš (PPE), Seán Kelly (PPE), Ádám Kósa (PPE), Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Jan Kozłowski (PPE), Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE), Eduard Kukan (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE), Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Nadezhda Neynsky (PPE), Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE), Hubert Pirker (PPE), Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Csaba Sógor (PPE), Peter Šťastný (PPE), Róża Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Vladimir Urutchev (PPE), Dominique Vlasto (PPE), Iuliu Winkler (PPE), Anna Záborská (PPE) and Paweł Zalewski (PPE)

(24 July 2012)

Subject: Youth unemployment: request for information on the results achieved by the 'action teams' and the reprogramming of European funds for youth employment

During the informal European Council meeting held on 30 January 2012, the Commission set up eight 'action teams' to be sent to Member States with high rates of youth unemployment (Italy, Spain, Greece, Slovakia, Lithuania, Portugal, Latvia and Ireland) and announced that EUR 82 billion in as-yet-unspent European funds would be used to support measures designed to combat youth unemployment, boost growth and support SMEs. Between February and May 2012, Commission experts went to the eight Member States in question for consultations. On 23 May 2012 Commission President Barroso presented the first results achieved by the 'action teams', stating that EUR 7.3 billion in funds had already been earmarked for accelerated implementation or reassigned.

Given that the available data are unclear because they are incomplete and not sufficiently detailed, and that the Commission and Parliament on several occasions stressed the need for the active and concrete involvement of young people in decision-making, can the Commission say:

1. Whether, in addition to the document presented by President Barroso on 23 May 2012, more accurate and detailed documents and data are available on funded and pending projects?

2. Whether an analysis of good practices has been carried out, and a strategy developed for long-term action to boost youth employment?

3. Whether and when youth organisations were involved — and how they were consulted — as provided for in the Commission communication entitled 'Youth Opportunities Initiative' and in Parliament's resolution of 24 May 2012 on the Youth Opportunities Initiative?

4. What were the outcomes of, and the decisions made during, the consultations with the other seven countries with an unemployment rate above the EU average (Bulgaria, Cyprus, France, Hungary, Poland, Romania and Sweden)?

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

1 and 4. During the bilateral meetings and action team visits, joint solutions were sought on speeding up implementation of existing programmes or widening their coverage by increasing the budget or improving targeting. Member States ([1]) committed themselves to use EU funds more effectively by rechannelling uncommitted or unused EU funds to bolster youth employment measures. The concrete results of this exercise were presented by the President in May.

2. During the European Semester, the Commission paid particular attention to the youth unemployment situation in Member States and to the youth employment policies presented in the National Reform Programmes. This analysis is reflected in the Country Specific Recommendations and Staff Working Documents issued in May. As a follow-up to its communication on the Youth Opportunities Initiative (YOI) ([2]), later in 2012 the Commission intends to present a Youth Employment Package, including policy initiatives on youth guarantees and a quality framework for traineeships. This will be supplemented by reporting on the implementation of the YOI in the Member States. To that end, the Commission has asked the Member States to report by early September 2012 on progress made, including up-to-date financial data on the utilisation of national and EU funding.

3. During most of the country visits, the action teams met with stakeholders, including youth NGOs and social partners, to better assess the situation on the ground. The Commission consults the European Youth Forum regularly and is aware of its positions. It intends to consult the Forum on the planned Youth Employment Package and to encourage the Member States to consult their national youth organisations.

([1]) Including the seven Member States referred to in question 4.
([2]) COM(2011) 933 of 20 December 2011.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-007447/12
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(25 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: «Riforma del sistema delle correzioni»

Ai sensi della decisione di Fontainebleau del 1984, la Gran Bretagna ha ottenuto un riconoscimento a una correzione di bilancio (il c.d. rebate), per cui tutti gli altri paesi si impegnano a rimborsare a Londra il 66 % del suo saldo di bilancio negativo.

Tale decisione è stata riconfermata nel tempo ed anche l'attuale disciplina delle risorse proprie prevede, per il periodo 2007-2013, meccanismi di correzione temporanei a favore oltre che del Regno Unito, anche di Germania, Paesi Bassi, Svezia e Austria.

La stessa Commissione ha affermato più volte come le condizioni oggettive alla base dei meccanismi di correzione attuali si siano notevolmente modificate, proponendo anche di semplificare le correzioni di bilancio esistenti sostituendole con delle riduzioni forfettarie (c.d. «lump-sum»).

Considerata l'iniquità e la scarsa trasparenza di tale sistema, caratterizzato da correzioni ad hoc e limitate ad alcuni paesi, può la Commissione:

1. quantificare l'ammontare e le caratteristiche di tali «sconti e correzioni» nel tempo ed indicare quali paesi oltre ai sopra elencati ne abbiano beneficiato?

2. pensare ad una modifica del sistema attuale e prevedere l'eliminazione di tutti i meccanismi di correzione esistenti?

Risposta di Janusz Lewandowski a nome della Commissione
(6 settembre 2012)

1. La correzione britannica è ammontata in totale a 97,3 miliardi di euro nel periodo 1985-2011. Le riduzioni del finanziamento di tale correzione concesse a determinati Stati membri sono state in totale di 15,0 miliardi di euro per la Germania, nel periodo 1985-2011, e, rispettivamente, di 2,3 miliardi di euro per i Paesi Bassi, 1,2 miliardi di euro per l'Austria e 1,2 miliardi di euro per la Svezia, nel periodo 2002-2011.

Le correzioni forfettarie, introdotte esclusivamente per il periodo 2007-2013, sono ammontate (importi netti) a 3,1 miliardi di euro per i Paesi Bassi e a 0,7 miliardi di euro per la Svezia nel periodo 2007-2011.

I profitti derivanti dall'aliquota di prelievo IVA ridotta, introdotta esclusivamente per il periodo 2007-2013, sono ammontati a 5,4 miliardi di euro per la Germania, 2,0 miliardi di euro per i Paesi Bassi, 0,2 miliardi di euro per l'Austria e 1,1 miliardi di euro per la Svezia nel periodo 2007-2011.

2. Nell'ambito delle proposte per il Quadro finanziario pluriennale per il periodo 2014-2020 presentate nel giugno 2011, la Commissione Europea ha proposto di sostituire tutte le correzioni esistenti con un sistema di importi forfettari per il periodo 2014-2020. I dettagli e le motivazioni di questa proposta sono contenuti nella Proposta di Decisione del Consiglio relativa al sistema delle risorse proprie dell'Unione europea (COM/2011/0510 definitivo) del 29 giugno 2011 e nel Documento di lavoro dei servizi della Commissione (SEC(2011)876 definitivo) che la accompagna.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007447/12
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(25 July 2012)

Subject: Reform of the 'correction system'

Under the 1984 Fontainebleau decision, Britain secured a budget 'correction' (the so-called rebate) whereby all the other EU countries undertake to repay London 66% of its adverse net balance.

This decision has been reconfirmed through the years and even the current own resources framework includes, for 2007-13, temporary correction mechanisms not only for the United Kingdom but also for Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden and Austria.

The Commission itself has stated many times that the objective conditions underpinning the existing correction mechanisms have changed significantly; it has also proposed that existing budget corrections be simplified by replacing them with lump-sum reductions.

Given the unfairness and lack of transparency of this system, characterised by ad hoc corrections and limited to only a few countries, can the Commission:

1. say how much these 'discounts and corrections' have amounted to over time and provide more detailed information on them, saying which countries, in addition to those mentioned above, have benefited from them;

2. consider making changes to the current system and provide for the abolition of all existing correction mechanisms?

Answer given by Mr Lewandowski on behalf of the Commission
(6 September 2012)

1. The UK correction has in total amounted to EUR 97.3 billion over the period 1985-2011. The reductions in the financing of this correction granted to certain Member States total EUR 15.0 billion for Germany over the period 1985-2011 and respectively EUR 2.3 billion for The Netherlands, EUR 1.2 billion for Austria and EUR 1.2 billion for Sweden over the period 2002-2011.

The lump-sum corrections, introduced for the period 2007-13 only, have amounted (net) to EUR 3.1 billion for The Netherlands and EUR 0.7 billion for Sweden over the period 2007-11.

The benefit from the reduced VAT call rate, introduced for the period 2007-13 only, has amounted to EUR 5.4 billion for Germany, EUR 2.0 billion for The Netherlands, EUR 0.2 billion for Austria and EUR 1.1 billion for Sweden over the period 2007-11.

2. As part of its June 2011 proposals for the Multi-annual financial Framework 2014-2020 the European Commission proposed to replace all existing corrections with a system of lump-sums for the period 2014-2020. The details and justification of this proposal are included in the proposal for a Council Decision on the system of own resources of the European Union (COM(2011) 510 final) of 29 July 2011 as well as the accompanying Commission Staff Working Paper (SEC(2011) 876 final).

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007476/12
do Komisji
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(26 lipca 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Więzienie za pluszowe misie

13 lipca milicja przeszukała mieszkanie Antona Surapina, 20-letniego studenta dziennikarstwa, który jako pierwszy zamieścił na swej stronie internetowej zdjęcia pluszowych misiów zrzuconych nad Białorusią przez szwedzkich pilotów. Został on zatrzymany w celu wyjaśnienia jego związków z tą akcją. Areszt miał trwać kilka dni, jednak do tej pory Surapin nie został uwolniony. Obrońcy praw człowieka twierdzą, że władze zarzucają dziennikarzowi pomoc w nielegalnym przekroczeniu granicy. A za to grozi od 3 do7 lat więzienia.

To jednak nie jedyna osoba zatrzymana w związku z tą sprawą. 24 lipca pracownikowi agencji nieruchomości, który wynajął mieszkanie szwedzkim pilotom, postawiono zarzut z artykułu o „nielegalnym przekroczeniu granicy". Służby specjalne przesłuchały również w obecności rodziców 16-latkę, która sfotografowała pluszaki w Iwieńcu. Funkcjonariusze udzielili jej ostrzeżenia.

Te wydarzenia potwierdzają jedynie, że sytuacja praw człowieka na Białorusi stale się pogarsza. Białorusinom odbierane są ich podstawowe wolności obywatelskie, niezależni dziennikarze i działacze praw człowieka są zastraszani, a przeciwko aktywistom wysuwane są kłamliwe oskarżenia i wszczynane są sprawy karne. W związku z tym mam pytanie, czy Komisja ma zamiar podjąć interwencję w sprawie zatrzymań i przesłuchań dotyczących tzw. „pluszowego desantu" i wyrazić stanowczy sprzeciw wobec łamania wolności słowa na Białorusi?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(11 września 2012 r.)

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca oraz Komisja uważnie śledzą incydent, o którym wspomniał szanowny Pan Poseł.

Anton Surapin zamieścił na stronie internetowej zdjęcia zrzuconych z samolotu pluszowych misiów. Siarhiej Baszarymau to pracownik agencji obrotu nieruchomościami, o którym sądzi się, że wynajął mieszkanie przedstawicielom firmy „Studio Total", którzy przyjechali na Białoruś przed akcją zrzucania pluszowych misiów, aby to wydarzenie sfotografować i w razie nagłego wypadku udzielić pomocy szwedzkim pilotom. Wieczorem w dniu 17 sierpnia 2012 r. obaj panowie zostali zwolnieni z aresztu, nadal jednak są oskarżani na podstawie części 3 art. 371 kodeksu karnego (udzielenie pomocy w nielegalnym przekroczeniu granicy).

UE jest bardzo zaniepokojona brakiem wolności słowa i skalą nękania społeczeństwa obywatelskiego na Białorusi. Wolność słowa i wolne media są ważnymi elementami budowania trwałej demokracji i stanowią jeden z punktów odniesienia stosowanych przez UE przy ocenie relacji z Białorusią i wsparcia dla tego kraju.

W tym względzie pragnę zwrócić uwagę szanownego Pana Posła na decyzję podjętą przez Komitet Polityczny i Bezpieczeństwa w dniu 10 sierpnia 2012 r., w której oświadczono, że UE i państwa członkowskie podejmują się dokonać przeglądu środków ograniczających wobec Białorusi, w terminie do dnia 31 października 2012 r., na podstawie oceny sytuacji wewnętrznej na Białorusi – w tym utrzymujących się represji wobec społeczeństwa obywatelskiego, losu więźniów politycznych oraz przebiegu zbliżających się wyborów parlamentarnych.

UE wykorzystuje wszelkie nadarzające się okazje, aby w kontaktach z władzami Białorusi poruszać kwestie dotyczące praw człowieka, wolności słowa i uwolnienia więźniów politycznych. Unia będzie też podtrzymywała kontakty ze społeczeństwem obywatelskim i działaczami demokratycznymi na Białorusi i nadal ich wspierała.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007476/12
to the Commission
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(26 July 2012)

Subject: Prison for teddy bears

On 13 July 2012, Belarusian police conducted a search of 20-year-old journalism student Anton Surapin's apartment. Mr Surapin had been the first person to post photographs on his website of teddy bears dropped by Swedish pilots over Belarusian territory. He was detained while his links to the action were investigated. Mr Surapin was only supposed to be held under arrest for a few days; however, he has still not been released. Human rights defenders claim that the authorities are charging the journalist with aiding an illegal border crossing. These charges could carry a sentence of three to seven years' imprisonment.

Mr Surapin is not the only person to be detained in connection with thise case. On 24 July 2012, an employee of a real estate agency who had leased an apartment to the Swedish pilots was charged under an article on 'illegal border crossings'. Secret services also questioned a 16-year-old girl in the presence of her parents after she photographed the teddy bears in Ivianiets. Officers issued her with a caution.

These events serve to confirm that the human rights situation in Belarus is continuing to deteriorate. Basic civil liberties are denied to Belarusians, independent journalists and human rights activists are subject to intimidation, and false charges and criminal cases are brought against activists.

Does the Commission intend to take action in response to the arrests and interrogations linked to the 'teddy bear airdrop' and to take a firm stand against the repression of freedom of speech in Belarus?

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

The HR/VP and the Commission have closely followed the incident raised by the Honourable Member.

Anton Surapin had posted pictures of the teddy bear drop on an Internet page. Syarhey Basharymaw, a real estate agent, is believed to have rented out an apartment to representatives of the company 'Studio Total' who arrived in Belarus ahead of the teddy bear drop in order to take pictures of it and to provide assistance to the Swedish pilots in case of an emergency. In the evening of 17 August 2012 both were released from detention, but continue to be accused under Part 3, Article 371 of the Criminal Code (providing assistance to illegal crossing of the state border).

The EU is very concerned about the lack of freedom of expression and the level of harassment against civil society in Belarus. Freedom of expression and free media are important elements in the building of sustainable democracy and part of the benchmarks against which the EU will assess its relationship and support to Belarus.

In that connection the Honourable Member's attention is drawn to the decision taken by the Political and Security Committee on 10 August 2012, where it was stated that the EU and Member States are set to review the restrictive measures against Belarus before 31 October 2012 on the basis of an assessment of internal developments in Belarus — including the continuing repression of civil society, the fate of political prisoners and the conduct of the forthcoming parliamentary elections.

The EU uses every opportunity to raise issues regarding human rights, freedom of speech and the release of political prisoners with the Belarus authorities and will continue its engagement with and support to civil society and democratic actors in Belarus.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007477/12
an die Kommission
Peter Simon (S&D)
(26. Juli 2012)

Betrifft: Sport: Rechtmäßigkeit von Gebührenerhebungen beim transnationalen Vereinswechsel innerhalb der EU

Sport bietet den Bürgerinnen und Bürgern die Möglichkeit zur Interaktion und zur Bildung von sozialen Netzwerken; er hilft Zuwanderern beim Aufbau von Beziehungen mit anderen Mitgliedern der Gesellschaft und kann einen positiven Beitrag zum sozialen Zusammenhalt in Europa leisten. Nach Auffassung der Kommission sollte die europäische Dimension des Sports gefördert werden. Alle Einwohner der Europäischen Union sollten Zugang zum Sport und die Möglichkeit der Teilnahme an diskriminierungsfreien Wettkämpfen in den einzelnen Sportarten haben.

In der Praxis bestehen allerdings teilweise erhebliche finanzielle Hürden, was den Zugang zum Sport bzw. konkret die Möglichkeit des transnationalen Wechsels von Sportvereinen und in diesem Zusammenhang die mögliche Teilhabe an Wettkämpfen speziell im Amateursport betrifft. So müssen Amateursportlerinnen und -sportler aus EU-Mitgliedstaaten, die einen Vereinswechsel zu einem Sportverein eines anderen EU-Mitgliedstaates vollziehen möchten, erhebliche Geldbeträge von privater Seite aufbringen, um im neuen Verein spielberechtigt zu werden.

In einem konkreten Fall sind für die Erlangung einer Spielerberechtigung einer ungarischen Spielerin in der Badischen Handball-Landesliga Süd (Deutschland) im Einzelnen 75,00 EUR an den Deutschen Handballbund, 150,00 EUR an die EHF (European Handball Federation) und 400,00 EUR an den ungarischen Handballverein, d. h. ein Betrag von insgesamt 625,00 EUR, als „Gebühren" zu entrichten.

Kann die Kommission vor dem Hintergrund des geschilderten Falls folgende Fragen beantworten:

1. Sind der Kommission die Ausmaße der Beträge, wie sie im Amateursport für die Erteilung von Spielberechtigungen im Rahmen eines transnationalen Vereinswechsels anfallen, bekannt?

2. Erachtet die Kommission diese Praxis für rechtmäßig?

Antwort von Frau Vassiliou im Namen der Kommission
(4. September 2012)

Die Kommission ist sich der Tatsache bewusst, dass Sportvereine in der EU Einschreibungsgebühren für Amateursportler erheben; dies ist auch der Fall, wenn Sportler innerhalb eines Mitgliedstaats oder zwischen verschiedenen Mitgliedstaaten den Verein wechseln. Die rechtlichen und wirtschaftlichen Aspekte von Transferregeln bei Mannschaftssportarten werden derzeit im Rahmen einer unabhängigen Studie behandelt, die die Kommission im Januar 2012 eingeleitet hat und aus der zusätzliche Erkenntnisse über diese Praxis hervorgehen sollen. Die Ergebnisse dieser Studie dürften Ende 2012 vorliegen.

Die Kommission möchte daran erinnern, dass im Sportbereich geltende Regelungen, die selbst bei einer von Staatsangehörigkeitsaspekten unabhängigen Anwendung die Freizügigkeit von Sportlern, welche ihre Aktivität in einem anderen Mitgliedstaat fortsetzen möchten, einschränken — wie beispielsweise Transferregeln —, nur dann als mit dem EU-Recht vereinbar angesehen werden können, wenn sie für das Erreichen legitimer Ziele notwendig und verhältnismäßig sind. Darüber hinaus weist die Kommission darauf hin, dass Ausbildungsentschädigungsregelungen als mit den Freizügigkeitsbestimmungen der EU vereinbar gelten können, wenn die Entschädigung im Verhältnis zu den tatsächlichen Ausbildungskosten steht.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007477/12
to the Commission
Peter Simon (S&D)
(26 July 2012)

Subject: Sport: legality of charging fees for transfers to a club in another EU Member State

Sport offers people the chance to meet and get to know one another and to establish social networks; it helps immigrants build relationships with other members of society and can make a positive contribution to social cohesion in Europe. In the Commission's view, the European dimension to sport should be encouraged. All EU residents should have access to sport and the chance to take part in discrimination-free competitions in whatever sport they choose.

In practice, however, and more specifically in amateur sport, people seeking to transfer to a club in another EU Member State and take part in competitions there sometimes have to overcome significant financial obstacles. For example, amateur sportsmen and women may be required to pay substantial sums out of their own pockets in order to become eligible to play for their new clubs.

To take one specific example, in order to become eligible to play in the southern Baden handball league in Germany a Hungarian woman player was required to pay EUR 75 to the German Handball Federation, EUR 150 to the European Handball Federation and EUR 400 to the Hungarian club she played for previously, making a total of EUR 625 in 'fees'.

1. Is the Commission aware of the sums which amateur sportsmen and women have to pay in order to become eligible to play following a transfer to a club in another EU Member State?

2. Does the Commission regard this practice as legal?

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

The Commission is aware that fees for the registration of amateur sportspeople are applied by sport clubs in the EU, including in cases where sportspeople change club within a Member States or across different Member States. The legal and economic aspects of transfer rules in team sports are the subject of an ongoing independent study, launched by the Commission in January 2012, which should provide additional insight about this practice; the results of the study should be made available by the end of 2012.

The Commission would like to recall that sporting rules that, even if applied without regard to nationality, restrict the freedom of movement of sportspeople who wish to pursue their activity in another Member State, such as transfer rules, may be considered as compatible with EC law only when they are necessary and proportionate to the achievement of legitimate objectives. The Commission also notes that training compensation schemes may be considered compatible with EU free movement rules insofar as compensation is related to the actual cost of training.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007479/12
à la Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(26 juillet 2012)

Objet: Protection des élevages d'ovins contre les attaques de loups

La multiplication des attaques de loups met actuellement en péril l'élevage d'ovins, dont dépendent l'activité économique et l'identité des zones montagneuses françaises.

Malgré les mesures prises par l'État français pour organiser la protection des troupeaux et autoriser des prélèvements exceptionnels, les attaques ne cessent de se multiplier. Sur les six premiers mois de l'année, on comptait, dans le seul département des Alpes de Haute-Provence, trente attaques et 102 victimes. Ces attaques se sont multipliées ces derniers jours, et certains troupeaux ont été littéralement décimés.

Les attaques de loups portent un coup très grave à l'activité d'élevage. Au-delà des bêtes tuées, elles infligent des blessures, provoquent des avortements et des pertes de poids, et altèrent la qualité de l'élevage ovin qui fait le succès de nombreux produits de terroir français.

Afin de défendre cette économie de terroir et de donner les moyens aux éleveurs français de protéger leurs troupeaux, il est devenu impératif de faire évoluer la classification trop restrictive du loup comme espèce présentant un intérêt communautaire et nécessitant une protection stricte, dans le cadre de la directive «Habitats», et au niveau international comme espèce strictement protégée dans le cadre de la Convention de Berne.

Il est impératif que l'Union européenne tienne compte des difficultés que les attaques de loups suscitent pour l'élevage européen et modifie les textes en vigueur pour donner aux États membres la possibilité de protéger cette activité.

Les éleveurs concernés attendent de la Commission européenne des réponses. Ils sont confrontés chaque année au même problème. Que compte-t-elle faire pour mieux protéger les éleveurs européens face à ces attaques?

Réponse donnée par M. Potočnik au nom de la Commission
(10 septembre 2012)

La Commission est consciente que l'accroissement de la population de loups dans les régions montagneuses peut engendrer des contraintes et des surcoûts importants pour les éleveurs pastoraux. Cependant, la Commission n'estime pas qu'il faudrait pour autant modifier le statut de protection du loup au niveau de l'UE, comme le demande l'Honorable Parlementaire.

Les dispositions de la directive 92/43/CEE du Conseil ([1]) (la «directive habitats»), tout en exigeant que les États membres prennent des mesures pour assurer ou maintenir le loup dans un état de conservation favorable, offre une marge de manœuvre suffisante pour garantir la préservation des activités pastorales économiquement viables, notamment dans les zones où les populations de loups sont en voie de reconstitution.

Afin d'aider les États membres à faire face à cet accroissement des populations de grands carnivores, la Commission a déjà apporté son soutien à l'élaboration de lignes directrices en vue de l'élaboration de plans de gestion des populations de grands carnivores ([2]). De plus, le Fonds européen agricole pour le développement rural (FEDER) ([3]) peut soutenir la mise en œuvre de mesures de prévention (exclusivement). En revanche, le Fonds ne peut pas verser d'indemnisation en cas de dégâts occasionnés par de grands carnivores.

La Commission présume que les autorités françaises ont déjà mis en place les régimes de primes et de paiement nécessaires pour aider les éleveurs pastoraux à adapter la gestion de leurs troupeaux à la présence des loups.

([1]) JO L 206 du 22.7.1992.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/species/carnivores/docs/guidelines_final2008.pdf
([3]) JO L 277 du 21.10.2005.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007479/12
to the Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(26 July 2012)

Subject: Protecting sheep farms against wolf attacks

The rising number of wolf attacks is jeopardising the future of sheep farms, which are an essential part of the economy and identity of mountain areas in France.

Despite the measures taken by the French Government to protect flocks and provide for the collection of special levies, the number of attacks continues to rise. In the first half of this year, in the department of Alpes de Haute-Provence alone, there have been 30 attacks, killing 102 sheep. These attacks have become more frequent recently, leaving some flocks literally decimated.

Wolves do untold damage to sheep farms: as well as killing animals, they injure them and cause miscarriages and weight loss among sheep. The attacks also compromise the quality of sheep farms, on which the reputation of many French regional specialty products is based.

With a view to defending this important sector of the rural economy and giving French sheep farmers the means to defend their flocks, the time has come to revise the overly narrow classification of wolves as a species of Community interest which enjoys a high level of protection at a European level under the Habitats Directive and, at a global level, under the Berne Convention.

The European Union must respond to the damage done by wolf attacks to European sheep farming by amending the relevant legislation in order to allow Member States to protect farmers' livelihoods.

Sheep farmers are looking to the Commission for answers. Each year they face the same problem. What action will the Commission take to help European farmers deal with these attacks?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(10 September 2012)

The Commission is aware that the population increase of wolves in mountainous regions can generate substantial constraints and additional costs for pastoral farmers. However, the Commission does not consider that this should trigger a change of the current protection status of the wolf at EU level, as requested by the Honourable Member.

The provisions of Council Directive 92/43/EEC ([1]) ('Habitats Directive'), while requiring Member States to take actions to maintain or achieve a favourable conservation status of the wolf, offer a sufficient margin of manoeuvre to ensure that economically viable pastoral activities are preserved, including in those areas where wolf populations are currently recovering.

In order to help Member States in dealing with expanding populations of large carnivores, the Commission has previously supported the elaboration of 'Guidelines for population level management plans for large carnivores' ([2]). Moreover, the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) ([3]) can provide support for implementing (only) preventive measures. However, the Fund cannot pay compensation for the damages done by large carnivores.

The Commission understands that the French authorities have already put in place the necessary incentives and payment schemes to help pastoral farmers to adapt their herd management to the presence of wolves.

([1]) OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/species/carnivores/docs/guidelines_final2008.pdf
([3]) OJ L 277, 21.10.2005.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007480/12
to the Commission
Fiona Hall (ALDE)
(26 July 2012)

Subject: Implementation of EU legislation in Norway

What is the Commission's estimate of the overall volume and proportion of EU legislation that is implemented by Norway?

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

A recent report commissioned by the Norwegian government stated that approximately 75% of EC law and policy are integrated into the EEA Agreement. The Commission has no elements to confirm or to reject this statement.

Further, it should be recalled that it is the EFTA Surveillance Authority (ESA), and not the Commission, that ensures that the participating EFTA States, Norway, Iceland and Liechtenstein, respect their obligations under the EEA Agreement, including their implementation of EU legislation.

The ESA publishes regularly an EFTA Internal Market Scoreboard, whose basis is different from the EU Scoreboard. The ESA Scoreboard monitors to what extent the EFTA States notify on time transposition of new EEA directives incorporated into the Agreement; and the transposition backlog and average delays in transposition of directives. According to the last available figures of February 2012, the average transposition deficit of the EEA EFTA States is below the deficit target of 1%.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007481/12
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(26 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Decisión de la Comisión sobre la Calidad del Aire

La Comisión Europea, en su decisión del día 12 de julio, rechazó la moratoria solicitada por España para que Barcelona, la zona del Vallès-Baix Llobregat y Palma de Mallorca puedan sortear durante cinco años más la obligación de cumplir los límites máximos de contaminación por dióxido de nitrógeno (NO_2).

En su decisión, la Comisión Europea mantiene que «sería necesario incluir medidas de reducción de la contaminación más estrictas para alcanzar el cumplimiento en 2015» en Barcelona y el Vallès-Baix Llobregat.

Considerando que el Gobierno de la Generalitat de Catalunya elimino la restricción de 80 km. por hora en los accesos al área metropolitana, ¿recomendará al Comisión la reintroducción de esta medida?

Además del rechazo de la moratorio y exigir nuevas medidas, ¿qué medidas de sanción se aplicarán por el incumplimiento de la Directiva sobre la calidad del aire? ¿Conoce detalles del plan presentada por el Estado español? ¿Es suficiente para compensar el incumpliendo de contaminación de estas áreas con otras medidas, cuando la salud de la ciudadanía de estas regiones ya se ha visto dañada?

Granada y su área metropolitana y tres áreas de Madrid —la capital, el corredor del Henares y la zona urbana sur— también han solicitado la moratoria a la Comisión a través del ministerio de España. ¿Serán estas moratorias también denegadas?

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

Si bien los valores límite en relación con el aire ambiente para la protección de la salud humana han sido armonizados mediante la Directiva 2008/50/CE ([1]), la elección de los medios para cumplir esos valores límite se deja a la discreción de los Estados miembros y depende de las circunstancias concretas de cada caso. La Comisión puede aceptar que los Estados miembros notifiquen un nuevo aplazamiento del cumplimiento de los valores límite de NO_2 siempre que existan nuevos elementos que demuestren que se cumplen las condiciones contempladas en artículo 22 de la Directiva 2008/50/CE. De no ser así, la Comisión puede incoar un procedimiento de infracción.

Con arreglo al artículo 260 del Tratado de Lisboa, las sanciones por la aplicación incorrecta del Derecho de la UE solo pueden determinarse después de que el Tribunal de Justicia haya fallado que un Estado miembro ha incumplido sus obligaciones y de que el Estado no haya adoptado las medidas necesarias para dar cumplimiento a la sentencia del Tribunal. Por lo tanto, es necesaria una segunda sentencia que imponga una sanción pecuniaria o a tanto alzado al Estado miembro de que se trate.

Las notificaciones segunda y tercera presentadas por las autoridades españolas en relación con las ampliaciones de plazo en las demás zonas (incluido Madrid) se están evaluando y se adoptará una decisión de la Comisión en el plazo de nueve meses a partir de la notificación.

([1]) DO L 152 de 11.6.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007481/12
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(26 July 2012)

Subject: Commission decision on air quality

In a decision of 12 July the Commission rejected the moratorium requested by Spain which would have enabled Barcelona, the Vallès-Baix Llobregat area and Palma de Mallorca to avoid complying with requirements relating to maximum pollution limits for nitrogen dioxide (NO_2) for another five years.

In its decision, the Commission maintains that more stringent measures to reduce pollution should be introduced in order to achieve compliance in Barcelona and the Vallès-Baix Llobregat area by 2015.

Given that the Government of Catalonia (*Generalitat de Catalunya*) has lifted the 80 km per hour speed limit on the access roads to the metropolitan area, will the Commission recommend that this speed limit be reintroduced?

In addition to rejecting a moratorium and demanding new measures, what penalties will the Commission apply for the breach of the directive on air quality? Does it know the details of the plan submitted by the Spanish Government? Is it sufficient to compensate for the breach of the directive and the pollution of these areas with other measures when the health of the citizens of these regions has already been damaged?

Granada and its metropolitan area and three areas of Madrid — the capital, the Henares corridor and the southern urban area — have also requested a moratorium from the Commission through the ministry in Spain. Will these moratoria also be rejected?

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

While ambient air limit values for the protection of human health have been harmonised by Directive 2008/50/EC ([1]), the choice of the means to achieve compliance with such limit values is left to the appreciation of the Member States and depends on the concrete circumstances of each and every case. The Commission can accept that Member States notify further a postponement of the NO_2 limit values provided there are new elements which show that the conditions according to Article 22 of Directive 2008/50/EC have been fulfilled. If this is not the case, then the Commission may launch an infringement procedure.

Under Article 260 of the Lisbon Treaty, the penalties for bad application of EC law can only be determined after the Court of Justice has already found that a Member State has failed to fulfil its obligations, and that the State has not taken the necessary measures to comply with the judgment of the Court. A second judgment is therefore needed, to impose a penalty payment or a lump sum on the Member State concerned.

The second and the third notification submitted by the Spanish authorities with regard to time extensions in other zones (including Madrid) are currently being assessed and a Commission decision will be taken within 9 months from notification.

([1]) OJ L 152, 11.6.2008.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007482/12
do Komisji
Joanna Senyszyn (S&D)
(26 lipca 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Transport zwierząt: zasada ośmiu godzin

W obowiązujących ustawodawstwie UE, tj. w rozporządzeniu Rady (WE) nr 1/2005 w sprawie ochrony zwierząt podczas transportu i związanych z tym działań „długotrwały przewóz" zdefiniowano jako „podróż, przekraczającą 8 godzin".

Ponadto w rozporządzeniu tym wprowadzono podstawową zasadę, że transport zwierząt nie powinien przekraczać ośmiu godzin. Wcześniej obowiązujące przepisy, tj. zmieniona dyrektywa Rady 91/628/EWG, przewidywały tę samą zasadę.

W ostatnich publicznych wypowiedziach przedstawiciele Komisji mówili o maksymalnym 8-godzinnym czasie transportu zwierząt jako o dowolnie przyjętej liczbie, a nie zasadzie już obecnej w przepisach unijnych.

1. Na jakiej podstawie Komisja określiła próg czasowy dla długotrwałego transportu wynoszący dokładnie osiem godzin?

2. Jakimi nowymi danymi dysponuje Komisja, które skłaniają ją do odrzucenia jako nieistotnej zasady ośmiu godzin zawartej już w ustawodawstwie UE?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Johna Dallego w imieniu Komisji
(10 września 2012 r.)

Zgodnie z motywem 5 rozporządzenia Rady (WE) nr 1/2005 w sprawie ochrony zwierząt podczas transportu ([1]), długotrwały przewóz zwierząt powinien być w jak największym stopniu ograniczony.

Limit ośmiu godzin ustalony został początkowo w 1995 r. jako kompromis przyjęty przez Radę ([2]), po czym w 2005 r. utrzymano go i wprowadzono do obecnie obowiązujących przepisów.

Zgodnie z danymi naukowymi zagrożenie dobrostanu zwierząt rośnie wraz z czasem trwania transportu i powyżej pewnego progu uzasadnione jest wprowadzenie dodatkowych warunków w celu zwalczania tego zagrożenia. Dlatego też w rozporządzeniu (WE) nr 1/2005 przewidziano szczególne procedury i normy dla przewozu trwającego ponad osiem godzin. W odniesieniu do długotrwałego przewozu rozporządzenie to ustanawia w szczególności dodatkowe warunki w zakresie planowania i kontroli podróży, zatwierdzania przewoźników oraz norm, a także uznawania pojazdów drogowych. Określony został również czas trwania poszczególnych podróży i czas odpoczynku, oraz ograniczenia w odniesieniu do niektórych grup zwierząt ([3]).

Obecne prawodawstwo UE opiera się zatem na założeniu, że chociaż transport zwierząt trwający powyżej ośmiu godzin może zwiększyć zagrożenie dla dobrostanu zwierząt, zagrożenie to można ograniczyć poprzez wprowadzenie dodatkowych warunków.

Zasada ta została potwierdzona w najnowszej opinii naukowej przyjętej w 2011 r. przez Europejski Urząd ds. Bezpieczeństwa Żywności ([4]), w której uznano, że zagrożenie dobrostanu zwierząt rośnie wraz z czasem trwania transportu, ale też, że różni się ono w zależności od gatunku i innych parametrów krytycznych.

([1]) Dz.U. L 3 z 5.1.2005, s. 1.
([2]) Dyrektywa Rady 95/29/WE z dnia 29 lipca 1995 r. zmieniająca dyrektywę 91/628/EWG dotyczącą ochrony zwierząt podczas transportu, Dz.U. L 148 z 30.6.1995, s. 52.
([3]) Dodatkowe wymagania dotyczące transportu zwierząt na długich dystansach są w szczególności ustanowione w rozdziałach V i VI załącznika I do rozporządzenia (WE) nr 1/2005.
([4]) Panel ds. zdrowia i warunków hodowli zwierząt (AHAW) Europejskiego Urzędu ds. Bezpieczeństwa Żywności (EFSA); Opinia naukowa dotycząca dobrostanu zwierząt podczas transportu. Dziennik EFSA 2011;9(1):1966.[125 pp.].doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2011.1966. Dostępne na stronie internetowej: www.efsa.europa.eu/efsajournal.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007482/12
to the Commission
Joanna Senyszyn (S&D)
(26 July 2012)

Subject: Transport of animals: eight-hour principle

The current EU legislation Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations defines 'long journeys' as 'journeys exceeding eight hours'.

In addition, Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 lays down the basic principle that journeys for animals should not exceed eight hours. The previous legislation, Council Directive 91/628/EEC as amended, stipulated the same basic principle.

In recent public statements, Commission representatives spoke of an eight-hour journey limit as a made-up number, rather than as a principle already present in EU legislation.

1. On what basis did the Commission establish the threshold for long-distance transport as exactly eight hours?

2. What new data does the Commission have which lead it to dismiss as irrelevant this principle already contained in EU legislation?

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

According to Recital (5) of Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport ([1]), the transport of animals over long journeys should be limited as far as possible.

The limit of eight hours was initially set up as a compromise adopted in 1995 by the Council ([2]) and then kept in 2005 for the adoption of the current legislation.

According to scientific data, animal welfare risks increase with the duration of the journey and justify that beyond a certain limit, additional conditions are met in order to control these risks. To that end Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 foresees specific procedures and standards for journeys beyond eight hours. In particular it provides for long journeys additional conditions for the planning and the checks of the journeys, for the approval of transporters and for the standards and the approval of road vehicles. Specific travelling and resting times are defined as well as limitations for certain groups of animals ([3]).

Hence the present EU legislation is based on the principle that, although transport of animals over eight hours may represent a higher risk for the welfare of animals, it can be mitigated through additional conditions.

This principle is confirmed by the most recent scientific opinion adopted in 2011 by the European Food Safety Authority ([4]), which considers that if risks for the welfare of animals increase with length of the journey, it also varies according to the species and is also influenced by other critical parameters.

([1]) OJ L 3, 5.1.2005, p. 1.
([2]) Council Directive 95/29/EC of 29 June 1995 amending Directive 91/628/EEC concerning the protection of animals during transport; OJ L 148, 30.6.1995, p. 52.
([3]) Additional requirements for transporting animals over long journeys are in particular laid down in Chapter V and VI of Annex I of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.
([4]) 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. Available online: www.efsa.europa.eu/efsajournal.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007483/12
to the Commission
Fiona Hall (ALDE)
(26 July 2012)

Subject: Implementation of EU legislation in Turkey

What is the Commission's estimate of the overall volume and proportion of EU legislation that is implemented by Turkey?

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

In its 2011 Progress Report the Commission stated that Turkey continued improving its ability to take on the obligations of membership. Progress was made in most areas. Alignment was advanced in certain areas, such as free movement of goods, anti-trust policy and energy, economic and monetary policy, enterprise and industrial policy, consumer protection, statistics, Trans-European Networks, and science and research. Efforts needed to continue towards alignment in areas such as environment, public procurement, freedom to provide services, social policy and employment and taxation. Enforcement needed to be strengthened in areas such as intellectual property rights and anti-money laundering. As regards the Customs Union and external relations, alignment needed to be improved.

An updated overview of the situation will be available in early October, when the Commission will publish its 2012 Progress Report.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007484/12
to the Commission
Fiona Hall (ALDE)
(26 July 2012)

Subject: Implementation of EU legislation in Switzerland

What is the Commission's estimate of the overall volume and proportion of EU legislation that is implemented by Switzerland?

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

EU-Switzerland relations are governed by over 100 bilateral agreements, managed through a structure of more than 20 independently operating joint committees each with its own distinct working modalities.

In particular in areas of the Schengen and Dublin cooperation, the coordination of social security schemes, the recognition of professional qualifications, air transport, land transport, statistical cooperation and cooperation in media Switzerland by virtue of sectoral agreements Switzerland has to regularly adopt and implement new EU legislation. In addition, the agreements on agriculture, mutual recognition of conformity assessments or public procurement require Switzerland to maintain legislation equivalent to the situation in the EU.

The information on the specific EU legal acts which have been incorporated into some of those Agreements is available through consultation of the relevant Agreements and of the decisions of the Joint Committees established thereby, which are published in the Official Journal (with the exeption of the new EU legislation to be applied for the Swiss association to Schengen).

The Commission does unfortunately not dispose of aggregated statistics on the overall volume of EU legislation implemented by Switzerland. Specific implementation issues, however, are regularly discussed and followed up at joint committee level.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007485/12
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(26 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Allarmante utilizzo di scarti di acciaieria presumibilmente tossici come fondo della bretella autostradale Valdastico Sud, fra le province di Vicenza e Rovigo

A settembre 2012 è prevista l'apertura del primo tratto della bretella autostradale Valdastico Sud — 54,3 km per un costo di 1 180 milioni di euro — che collegherà la A31 in provincia di Vicenza alla statale Transpolesana in provincia di Rovigo. Nel 2011 il Comitato difesa ambiente salute Valdastico Sud, delle province di Vicenza e Padova, denunciò la presenza di materiali di scarto di acciaieria potenzialmente tossici nel fondo stradale della Valdastico Sud, facendo partire due esposti, uno alla procura di Vicenza e uno a quella di Venezia ([1]). Parallelamente, l'associazione Medicina Democratica e l'AIEA (Associazione italiana esposti amianto) presentarono un altro esposto, da cui sono scaturite le indagini dei Carabinieri e della Procura Anti-Mafia di Venezia, attualmente ancora in corso. Nell'esposto ([2]) l'archeologo amatoriale Marco Nosarini ha raccolto diverse foto di pozze gialle e scarti di acciaieria ([3]) sparsi nei campi fra Torri di Quartesolo (VI) e Noventa Vicentina (VI), nei pressi del cantiere dell'autostrada, le quali proverebbero l'utilizzo di materiale altamente inquinante. Residenti della zona hanno altresì testimoniato un viavai notturno di camion che avrebbero scaricato tonnellate di tali materiali. Esistono analisi di laboratorio sul materiale raccolto nel cantiere ([4]) che confermerebbero la presenza di svariate tipologie di metalli pesanti e sostanze chimiche ([5]) in concentrazioni ben superiori ai limiti di legge. Ad oggi pare non essere stata fatta bonifica alcuna.

Inoltre, sono stati registrati più casi sospetti di cani deceduti poco dopo essersi abbeverati da pozze d'acqua lungo il sedime stradale, il che lascia spazio all'ipotesi di acque contaminate dalla presenza di materiali tossici, con conseguente rischio per la salubrità della falda acquifera qualora le sostanze inquinanti filtrassero nel sottosuolo. Sul caso della Valdastico Sud si è espresso anche l'ex magistrato Felice Casson (membro della commissione ambiente del Parlamento italiano) affermando che in Italia i processi sui reati di tipo ambientale non vengono mai portati a termine perché le analisi richiedono tempi lunghi, mentre dopo appena quattro anni i reati si prescrivono ([6]).

La Commissione è a conoscenza del fenomeno fin qui descritto? La Commissione non ritiene utile approfondire la questione, anche in considerazione delle possibili violazioni delle direttive 2000/60/CE sulle acque e 2008/90/CE sui rifiuti? La Commissione è a conoscenza di altri casi italiani di smaltimento illecito di rifiuti grazie alla realizzazione di grandi opere?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(10 settembre 2012)

Secondo l'onorevole parlamentare, il presunto utilizzo di materiali provenienti da rifiuti tossici nella costruzione della bretella autostradale Valdastico Sud è oggetto di indagini da parte di due procure italiane, in seguito a denunce presentate da un comitato locale di cittadini. In tale contesto non sarebbe giustificato avviare un'indagine parallela da parte della Commissione in quanto i magistrati italiani sono nella posizione migliore per raccogliere e valutare tutte le prove che possano essere disponibili.

La Commissione non ha prove di casi di smaltimento illecito di rifiuti pericolosi tramite opere pubbliche in Italia.

([1]) Cfr. articolo di Giulio Todescan in «La Nuova Vicenza» del 23.12.2011.
([2]) Ripreso dall'Espresso: http://espresso.repubblica.it/dettaglio/quellautostrada-e-una-discarica/2170938
([3]) Foto pubblicate al seguente link: http://www.vicenzapiu.com/foto/guarda/bozza-nuova-galleria-240
([4]) Analisi commissionate dal Comitato su un campione di rifiuto prelevato nel cantiere in località Lovolo di Albettone (VI).
([5]) Fra questi: cianuri, arsenico, piombo, nichel, cobalto, cadmio, cromo, mercurio, amianto…
([6]) Cfr. articolo in «Corriere del Veneto» del 5.1.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007485/12
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(26 July 2012)

Subject: Alarming use of steel plant waste products (presumably toxic) as road-building material for the Valdastico Sud motorway link road, between the provinces of Vicenza and Rovigo

In September 2012 the first stretch of the *Valdastico Sud* motorway link road — 54.3 km, costing EUR 1.18 billion — linking the A31 in the province of Vicenza to the Transpolesana road in the province of Rovigo is expected to open. In 2011 the *Valdastico Sud* Committee for the Defence of the Environment and Health, from the provinces of Vicenza and Padua, reported that potentially toxic waste materials from steel plants were being used to build the surface of the *Valdastico Sud* road. They sent two official complaints, one to the public prosecutor's office of Vicenza and the other to that of Venice ([1]). In parallel, the Democratic Medicine association and the IAEA (Italian association of people exposed to asbestos) sent another complaint, which resulted in investigations by the Carabinieri police and the Anti-Mafia Prosecutor of Venice, which are still under way. To the complaint ([2]), amateur archaeologist Marco Nosarini attached several photos of yellow puddles and steel scraps ([3]) that were scattered around the fields between Torri di Quartesolo (VI) and Noventa Vicentina (VI), near the motorway works site, which allegedly prove that highly polluting material was being used. Residents in the area have also witnessed nocturnal comings and goings of lorries that apparently unloaded tons of these materials. Laboratory tests have been carried out on material collected on the site ([4]), which apparently confirm the presence of various types of heavy metals and chemicals ([5]) in concentrations well above the legal limits. So far there have apparently been no clean-up operations.

Moreover, there have been several suspicious cases of dogs that have died shortly after drinking from puddles of water along the road. This indicates that the water may have been contaminated with toxic materials, with a consequent risk to the aquifer should the pollutants filter underground. Former magistrate Felice Casson (a member of the Italian Parliament's Environment Committee) has also expressed his view on the *Valdastico Sud* case, stating that in Italy, legal proceedings for environmental crimes are never concluded because tests take so long to conduct and, after only four years, the offences are statute barred ([6]).

Is the Commission aware of this? Does the Commission not think it might be useful to pursue the matter, also in view of the possible breaches of Directives 2000/60/EC on water and 2008/90/EC on waste? Is the Commission aware of any other Italian cases of illegal waste disposal by means of major works?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(10 September 2012)

According to the Honourable Member, the alleged use of toxic waste materials in the construction of the 'Valdastico Sud' motorway link is being investigated by Italian prosecutors following complaints submitted by a local residents' committee. Under those circumstances, it would not be justified to launch a parallel investigation by the Commission as national prosecutors are best placed to collect and assess any evidence that may be available.

The Commission has no evidence of cases of illegal disposal of hazardous waste by means of major works in Italy.

([1]) See article by Giulio Todescan in 'La Nuova Vicenza', 23.12.2011.
([2]) See article in L'Espresso magazine: http://espresso.repubblica.it/dettaglio/quellautostrada-e-una-discarica/2170938
([3]) Photos published on the following website: http://www.vicenzapiu.com/foto/guarda/bozza-nuova-galleria-240
([4]) Tests commissioned by the Committee on a sample of waste collected in the Lovolo di Albettone (VI) area.
([5]) Including cyanides, arsenic, lead, nickel, cobalt, cadmium, chromium, mercury and asbestos.
([6]) See article in 'Corriere del Veneto', 5.1.2012.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007486/12
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(26 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Mancata attuazione di specifici piani di gestione relativi a 19 specie di uccelli in sfavorevole stato di conservazione e oggetto di caccia in Italia in contrasto con la direttiva «Uccelli»

Attualmente in Italia sono cacciabili 19 specie di uccelli ([1]) le cui popolazioni sono in uno stato di conservazione sfavorevole, così come risulta dalla classificazione prevista dal Sistema SPEC (specie europee di interesse conservazionistico) che determina lo stato di conservazione degli uccelli europei ([2]) in base alla classificazione elaborata da BirdLife International e fatta propria dagli organismi comunitari.

La direttiva 2009/147/CE stabilisce che gli Stati membri adottino le misure necessarie per «mantenere o adeguare la popolazione di tutte le specie di uccelli … ad un livello che corrisponde in particolare alle esigenze ecologiche, scientifiche e culturali» (articolo 1) e che non deve essere provocato «un deterioramento della situazione attuale per quanto riguarda la conservazione di tutte le specie di uccelli» (articolo 13).

La guida interpretativa della direttiva «Uccelli» sulla conservazione degli uccelli selvatici ([3]) in merito alle specie con uno stato di conservazione sfavorevole stabilisce che è preferibile non autorizzarne la caccia o che la caccia può essere autorizzata solo se per la specie interessata venga previsto un adeguato piano conservazionistico di gestione (§ 2.4.24).

Per questa ragione la Commissione ha già approvato diversi piani di gestione internazionali che devono essere recepiti nei diversi Stati membri.

Con lettera del 12.3.2012 alcune associazioni italiane ([4]) hanno scritto al governo italiano, alle regioni e all'ISPRA ([5]) evidenziando la violazione della direttiva 2009/147/CE e richiedendo l'adozione di piani di gestione nazionali per le dette specie oggetto di caccia e, nelle more dell'adozione di detti piani, l'esclusione delle stesse dall'elenco delle specie cacciabili. Solo ISPRA ha risposto in data 19.3.2012 ([6]) dichiarandosi disponibile alla redazione dei piani di gestione qualora vengano richiesti dalle pubbliche amministrazioni, mentre nessun ministero e nessuna delle regioni italiane (che approvano ogni anno i calendari venatori con la lista delle specie cacciabili) hanno provveduto a stilare detti piani continuando a mantenere cacciabili tali specie senza adottare alcuna misura precauzionale di tutela (queste specie continuano infatti ad essere cacciate con le stesse modalità previste per quelle che godono di un buono stato di conservazione).

Come intende procedere la Commissione al fine di evitare un danno irreparabile alle suddette specie dovuto alla mancata applicazione dei principi di tutela previsti dalla direttiva 2009/147/CE?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(4 settembre 2012)

La Commissione ha ricevuto informazioni riguardo alla questione sollevata dall'onorevole Parlamentare la cui analisi è attualmente in corso.

La Commissione non esiterà ad adottare adeguate misure, inclusi, se necessario, procedimenti di infrazione a norma dell'articolo 258 del TFUE ([7]), al fine di garantire la conformità alla direttiva 2009/147/CE ([8]).

([1]) Allodola, moriglione, pernice rossa, coturnice, pavoncella, combattente, canapiglia, codone, marzaiola, mestolone, moretta, fagiano di monte, pernice sarda, starna, quaglia, frullino, beccaccia, beccaccino, tortora.
([2]) Il Sistema SPEC è adottato dal progetto «Birds in Europe» di Birdlife International.
([3]) «Guida alla disciplina della caccia nell'ambito della direttiva 79/409/CEE sulla conservazione degli uccelli selvatici», Commissione europea, 2008.
([4]) Amici della Terra, Animalisti Italiani, ENPA, Fare Verde, LAC, LAV, Legambiente, LIPU, VAS, WWF Italia.
([5]) Istituto Superiore per la Protezione e la Ricerca Ambientale.
([6]) Documento protocollo n. 0011480.
([7]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:12008E258:IT:HTML
([8]) Direttiva 2009/147/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio del 30 novembre 2009 concernente la conservazione degli uccelli selvatici, GU L 20 del 26.1.2010, versione codificata della direttiva 79/409/CEE del Consiglio, del 2 aprile 1979, sulla conservazione degli uccelli selvatici, GU L 103 del 25.4.1979.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007486/12
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(26 July 2012)

Subject: Failure to implement specific management plans for 19 species of birds which have unfavourable conservation status and are being hunted in Italy, in breach of the Birds Directive

At present in Italy there are 19 huntable bird species ([1]) whose populations have unfavourable conservation status, as shown in the SPEC classification system (Species of European Conservation Concern) which determines the state of conservation of European birds ([2]) in accordance with the classification developed by BirdLife International and endorsed by the EU institutions.

Directive 2009/147/EC stipulates that Member States must take the requisite measures to 'maintain the population of the species […] at a level which corresponds in particular to ecological, scientific and cultural requirements' (Article 2) and that no 'deterioration in the present situation as regards the conservation of the species of birds referred to in Article 1' must be caused' (Article 13).

The guidance document relating to the Birds Directive on the conservation of wild birds ([3]), with regard to the species having an unfavourable conservation status, states that it would be preferable not to authorise the hunting of these species, or that hunting could be authorised only if the species concerned were the subject of an adequate conservation management plan (§ 2.4.24).

That is why the Commission has already adopted several international management plans which must be incorporated into the national law of the Member States.

By letter of 12 March 2012, a number of Italian associations ([4]) wrote to the Italian Government, the regional authorities and ISPRA ([5]) to point out that directive 2009/147/EC was being infringed and to call for the adoption of national management plans for the species being hunted and, pending the adoption of such plans, the exclusion of the bird species in question from the list of huntable species. Only ISPRA replied, on 19 March 2012 ([6]), stating that it would be willing to draw up management plans should it be requested to do so by government departments. However, no ministry and none of the Italian regions (which, every year, approve the hunting calendar with the list of huntable species) have drawn up any such plans and they are continuing to allow those species to be hunted without taking any precautionary measures to protect them (indeed, the species in question continue to be hunted in the same way as those which have favourable conservation status).

What action will the Commission take in order to avoid irreparable harm to these species due to the failure to apply the protection principles laid down in Directive 2009/147/EC?

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

The Commission has received information on the issue raised by the Honourable Member which it is now reviewing.

The Commission will not hesitate to take appropriate action, including if need be, infringement procedures pursuant to Article 258 of the TFUE ([7]), to ensure compliance with the provisions of the Directive 2009/147/EC ([8]).

([1]) Skylark, pochard, red-legged partridge, rock partridge, lapwing, ruff, gadwall, pintail, teal, shoveler, tufted duck, grouse, Sardinian partridge, quail, jack snipe, woodcock, snipe, dove.
([2]) The SPEC system was adopted by the 'Birds in Europe' project of BirdLife International.
([3]) Guidance document on hunting under Council Directive 79/409/EEC on the conservation of wild birds, European Commission, 2008.
([4]) Friends of the Earth, Animalisti Italiani, ENPA, Fare Verde, LAC, LAV, Legambiente, LIPU, VAS, WWF Italia.
([5]) Institute for Environmental Protection and Research.
([6]) Reference No 0011480.
([7]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:12008E258:EN:HTML
([8]) Directive 2009/147/EC of the Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, OJ L 20, 26.1.2010, that codifies the Council Directive 79/409/EEC of 2 April 1979 on the conservation of wild birds, OJ L 103, 25.4.1979.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007487/12
to the Commission
Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR)
(26 July 2012)

Subject: Non-legislative voluntary agreements with industry to help deaf EU citizens go about their daily lives with greater ease

In January 2012 the Commission informed me in its reply to Written Question E-010847/2011 that the EU Disability Strategy for 2010-2015 includes an undertaking to prepare a European Accessibility Act, whereby action will be taken to promote dialogue between users and industry leading to voluntary agreements in relevant areas, and to ensure that services are gradually made accessible to people with a visual or hearing difficulty.

In the light of the above, and in response to a concerned London constituent, could you comment on the need for telephones to be equipped with the induction loop transmission facility (T loop setting) through non-legislative voluntary agreements with industry, which would help deaf EU citizens go about their daily lives with greater ease?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(26 September 2012)

The Commission is currently working on an Accessibility Act in order to improve the market of goods and services that are accessible for persons with disabilities and elderly persons. This initiative will prioritise goods that are critical for the citizen to participate in society.

Based on the outcome of this initiative and the priority areas identified therein the Commission may envisage taking specific action in order to improve the accessibility of mobile phones for people with disabilities, including deaf people. In the case where the Commission would propose new measures, it would examine which instrument would be the most appropriate to achieve this objective (legislation, voluntary agreement, standardisation, etc.). Furthermore all technical solutions available to improve accessibility will be taken into account.

Moreover, the Universal Service Directive ([1]) extends its subject matter and scope to 'certain aspects of terminal equipment intended to facilitate access for disabled end-users', and thereby requests Member States to encourage the availability of terminal equipment offering the necessary services and functions.

([1]) Directive 2009/136/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2009 amending Directive 2002/22/EC.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007488/12
à la Commission
Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE)
(26 juillet 2012)

Objet: Conditions de détention au sein de l'Union européenne

La population carcérale totale de l'Union européenne a été estimée, sur la période 2009-2010, à 633 909 personnes. Plusieurs constats à l'échelle européenne: un surpeuplement carcéral, une augmentation de la population carcérale, une augmentation du nombre de ressortissants étrangers détenus (21,7 % en moyenne), un nombre important de prisonniers en détention provisoire (24,7 % en moyenne), de nombreux détenus souffrant de troubles physiques ou psychiques et enfin un nombre élevé de décès et de suicides. Ces conditions de détention au sein de l'Union européenne, la durée de la détention préventive et la longueur de l'administration judiciaire sont régulièrement condamnées par la Cour européenne des Droits de l'homme.

En juin 2011, la Commission européenne a publié son livre vert sur la détention, qui fait état de la situation préoccupante des prisons au sein de l'Union. En décembre 2011, le Parlement européen a adopté une résolution dans laquelle il demande à la Commission de présenter une proposition législative sur les droits des personnes privées de liberté, ainsi que de définir et de mettre en œuvre des normes minimales en matière de conditions tant d'incarcération que de détention.

Dès lors, la Commission peut-elle répondre aux questions suivantes:

1. Que compte-t-elle, à l'échelon de l'Union, pour veiller à ce que les droits fondamentaux des personnes détenues soient respectés et que les conditions de détention s'améliorent dans les États membres? Que compte-t-elle faire contre les abus constatés en matière de détention préventive, la surpopulation, les taux d'occupation élevés des prisons et les taux élevés de détenus étrangers?

2. Que compte-t-elle en matière de suivi de la résolution adoptée par le Parlement européen?

3. N'est-il pas temps pour elle de proposer un instrument législatif contraignant concernant les normes minimales en matière de conditions d'incarcération et de détention, et ce, pour le respect des libertés fondamentales et de la dignité humaine au sein de l'Union?

4. Peut-elle indiquer quelles mesures et quelles actions elle entend proposer prochainement, afin de donner suite au vote des parlementaires? Selon quel calendrier?

Réponse donnée par Mme Viviane Reding au nom de la Commission
(18 septembre 2012)

La Commission invite l'Honorable Parlementaire à se reporter aux réponses qu'elle a apportées aux questions écrites E-2438/2012 posée par M. Stoyanov, E-6882/2012 posée par Mme Childers et E-7035/2012 posée par Mme Romero López ([1]).

La Commission s'intéresse au thème soulevé en raison de l'importance capitale que revêt le principe de reconnaissance mutuelle des décisions de justice pour l'espace de liberté, de sécurité et de justice. Elle tient toutefois à souligner que les questions concernant les conditions de détention, la détention provisoire, les solutions alternatives à la détention et la réadaptation ou réinsertion sociale des anciens détenus relèvent principalement de la compétence des États membres.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html

Dans le cadre de la consultation publique sur le livre vert qu'elle a publié le 14 juin 2011, la Commission a reçu plus de 200 réponses émanant des États membres, des autorités et d'autres parties intéressées. Comme indiqué au Parlement européen le 14 décembre 2011, la Commission les examine actuellement avec soin. Une première analyse de ces réponses fait apparaître que même si la grande majorité des États membres, des organisations non gouvernementales et des organisations professionnelles soutiennent, au niveau de l'UE, la promotion de solutions alternatives à la détention, par des mesures non législatives, la plupart des États membres ont demandé que l'on se concentre sur la mise en œuvre des instruments de reconnaissance mutuelle adoptés dans le domaine de la détention ([2]), avant d'élaborer de nouvelles propositions législatives. La Commission s'attache actuellement à déterminer les mesures qui peuvent être prises au niveau européen.

([2]) Décision-cadre 2008/909/JAI du 27 novembre 2008 concernant l'application du principe de reconnaissance mutuelle aux jugements en matière pénale prononçant des peines ou des mesures privatives de liberté aux fins de leur exécution dans l'Union européenne, JO L 327 du 5.12.2008, p. 27, décision-cadre 2008/947/JAI du 27 novembre 2008 concernant l'application du principe de reconnaissance mutuelle aux jugements et aux décisions de probation aux fins de la surveillance des mesures de probation et des peines de substitution, JO L 337 du 16.12.2008, p. 102, et décision-cadre 2009/829/JAI du 23 octobre 2009 concernant l'application, entre les États membres de l'Union européenne, du principe de reconnaissance mutuelle aux décisions relatives à des mesures de contrôle en tant qu'alternative à la détention provisoire, JO L 294 du 11.11.2009, p. 20.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007488/12
to the Commission
Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE)
(26 July 2012)

Subject: Detention conditions in the European Union

Between 2009 and 2010 the total prison population of the European Union was estimated to be 633 909. There are several observations to be made at EU level: prison overcrowding, an increase in the prison population, an increasing number of foreign nationals being detained (21.7% on average), a significant number of prisoners on remand (24.7% in average), many inmates suffering from physical or mental disorders and, last but not least, a high number of deaths and suicides. These detention conditions in the European Union, the duration of preventive custody and the length of time it takes for justice to be administered, are regularly condemned by the European Court of Human Rights.

In June 2011 the Commission published its Green Paper on detention, which reports on the worrying situation of prisons in the Union. In December 2011 the European Parliament adopted a resolution calling on the Commission to submit a legislative proposal on the rights of prisoners and to define and implement minimum standards for both prison and detention conditions.

Can the Commission therefore answer the following questions:

1. What will it do, at EU level, to ensure that the human rights of detainees are respected and that prison conditions improve in the Member States? What will it do to combat abuses in respect of preventive custody, overcrowding, high prison occupancy rates and high rates of foreign prisoners?

2. What will it do to follow up the resolution adopted by the European Parliament?

3. Has the time not come for it to propose a binding legislative instrument concerning minimum standards of conditions of imprisonment and detention, in order to respect fundamental freedoms and human dignity within the Union?

4. Can it say what measures and what action it intends to propose shortly, in response to the vote by MEPs? In accordance with what timetable?

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

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the answers to the Written Questions E-2438/2012 by Mr Stoyanov, E-6882/2012 by Ms Childers and E-7035/2012 Ms Romero López ([1]).

The Commission is interested in this matter due to the central importance of the principle of mutual recognition of judicial decisions for the area of freedom, security and justice. It has however to be underlined that questions in relation to detention conditions, pre-trial detention, alternatives to detention and rehabilitation or social reintegration of ex-prisoners are mainly part of the responsibilities incumbent upon Member States.

In reply to the Green Paper published by the Commission on 14 June 2011 the Commission has received over 200 replies from Member States, authorities and other stakeholders. As stated at the European Parliament on 14 December 2011 the Commission is carefully analysing the replies. From a first analysis of these replies it appears that even though a large majority of the Member States, non-governmental and professional organisations support the promotion of alternatives to detention at EU level through non-legislative measures, most Member States called for a focus on the implementation of the mutual recognition instruments adopted in the field of detention ([2]) before developing any new legislative proposals. The Commission is currently assessing what action can be taken at European level.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

([2]) The framework Decision 2008/909/JHA of 27 November 2008 on the application of the principle of mutual recognition to judgments in criminal matters imposing custodial sentences or measures involving deprivation of liberty for the purpose of their enforcement in the European Union, OJ 5.12.2008, L 327/27, the framework Decision 2008/947/JHA of 27 November 2008 on the application of the principle of mutual recognition to judgments and probation decisions with a view to the supervision of probation measures and alternative sanctions, OJ 16.12.2008, L 337/102, and the framework Decision 2009/829/JHA of 23 October 2009 on the application, between Member States of the European Union, of the principle of mutual recognition to decisions on supervision measures as an alternative to provisional detention, OJ 11.11.2009, L 294/20.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007489/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(27 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Incendios forestales en el Mediterráneo

Según un informe publicado en 2009 por la Oficina Regional Mediterránea del Instituto Forestal Europeo (Efimed), los cinco países mediterráneos que pertenecen a la UE (Grecia, Francia, Italia, Portugal y España) invierten más de 2 500 millones de euros al año en la prevención y extinción de incendios forestales; el 60 % de dicho importe se invierte en equipos, personal y operaciones de lucha contra los incendios, en tanto que el resto se utiliza para prevención. No obstante, dicho importe puede estar subestimado, dado que los datos de muchos países son incompletos. En muchos casos, esto se debe en parte al elevado número de instituciones que destinan dinero a actividades relacionadas con los incendios, lo que hace difícil reunir y asignar todos estos fondos.

Teniendo en cuenta lo anterior, ¿podría responder la Comisión a las siguientes preguntas?

1. ¿Ha realizado la Comisión alguna investigación para conocer la cuantía de las inversiones de los países anteriormente mencionados, así como de otros Estados miembros? En caso afirmativo, ¿podría facilitar detalles la Comisión? En caso negativo, ¿podría explicar por qué no?

2. ¿Podría realizar la Comisión algún comentario sobre la conveniencia de centrar lasinversiones en la prevención de incendios en vez de, ante todo, en su extinción?

3. ¿Podría realizar la Comisión algún comentario sobre la necesidad de coordinar la gestión de incendios a nivel europeo, dado que los incendios forestales son una cuestión transfronteriza?

Respuesta de la Sra. Georgieva en nombre de la Comisión
(20 de septiembre de 2012)

La gestión de los incendios forestales es una cuestión de responsabilidad nacional, aunque la prevención de incendios forestales se puede cofinanciar a través del Fondo Europeo Agrícola de Desarrollo Rural. Con cargo a este fondo, los cinco países mediterráneos previeron gastar más de 1 200 millones EUR en medidas destinadas a la prevención y restauración de las catástrofes naturales durante el período 2007-2013. A finales de 2011 habían gastado más de 136 millones EUR en prevención de incendios y 5 millones EUR en restauración. La Comisión no dispone de datos sobre el gasto global en prevención y extinción de incendios forestales.

La Comisión considera de primordial importancia la prevención de incendios forestales y emprende iniciativas destinadas a promover las evaluaciones de riesgo, mejorar los conocimientos y hacer un mejor uso de los mecanismos de financiación. El Sistema europeo de información sobre incendios forestales (EFFIS) ([1]) reúne información sobre las medidas de prevención de incendios forestales en los Estados miembros.

La Comisión facilita la coordinación entre los Estados miembros en cuanto a preparación y respuesta frente a los incendios forestales a través del Centro de Control e Información ([2]) y EFFIS proporcionando plataformas para el intercambio de información y el apoyo de las actividades de seguimiento. Además, EFFIS aporta diariamente previsiones sobre el peligro de incendios en Europa, hace un seguimiento de la evolución de los grandes incendios y ofrece estimaciones de los daños en estrecha cooperación con las autoridades nacionales. Esta información sirve de base para la toma de decisiones sobre las actividades de colaboración internacional en materia de lucha contra incendios.

([1]) EFFIS ha sido creado por la Dirección General de Medio Ambiente de la Comisión Europea y el Centro Común de Investigación (CCI) y está gestionado por el CCI.

([2]) El Centro de Control e Información es el centro de operaciones del mecanismo comunitario de protección civil, establecido por la Decisión 2007/779/CE, Euratom del Consejo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007489/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(27 July 2012)

Subject: Mediterranean forest fires

According to a report published in 2009 by the Mediterranean Regional Office of the European Forest Institute (EFIMED), the five Mediterranean countries which belong to the EU (Greece, France, Italy, Portugal and Spain) invest more than EUR 2.5 billion each year in forest fire prevention and suppression, of which 60% is invested in equipment, personnel and fire-fighting operations, while the remainder is used for prevention. However, that amount may still be an underestimate, as the data for many countries is incomplete. In many cases this is due partly to the large number of different institutions that spend money on fire-related activities, which makes it difficult to compile and assign all such expenditure.

1. Has the Commission undertaken any research to find out how much money is invested by the countries mentioned above, and by other Member States? If so, could the Commission provide details? If not, could it explain why not?

2. Can the Commission comment on whether, instead of focusing investment mainly on the suppression of fires, it would be better to invest in prevention?

3. Can the Commission comment on whether there is a need to coordinate fire management at a European level, since forest fires are a cross-border issue?

Answer given by Ms Georgieva on behalf of the Commission
(20 September 2012)

Forest fire management is a matter of national responsibility although forest fire prevention can be co-funded through the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development. From this fund the five Mediterranean countries planned to spend more than EUR 1.2 billion on measures targeting prevention and restoration of natural disasters during 2007-2013. By the end of 2011 they had spent more than EUR 136 million on fire prevention and EUR 5 million on fire restoration. The Commission has no data on the overall spending in forest fire prevention and suppression.

The Commission considers forest fire prevention of primary importance and undertakes initiatives to promote risk assessments, improve knowledge and better use of financing mechanisms. The European Forest Fire Information System (EFFIS) ([1]) gathers information on forest fire prevention measures in the Member States.

The Commission facilitates coordination among Member States in forest fire preparedness and response through the Monitoring and Information Centre ([2]) and EFFIS that provide platforms to exchange information and support monitoring activities. Additionally, EFFIS provides daily fire danger forecasts in Europe, monitors the evolution of large fires and provides estimates of the damages in close cooperation with the National Authorities. This information supports decision making for international collaboration on fire fighting activities.

([1]) EFFIS has been established by the Directorate General for Environment of the European Commission and the Commission's Joint Research Centre (JRC) and is operated by JRC.

([2]) The Monitoring and Information Centre is the operational hub of the European Civil Protection Mechanism established by the Council Decision 2007/779/EC, Euratom.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007490/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(27 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Eficiencia económica de la gestión de incendios

Hace dos años, el Centro Común de Investigación de Ispra financió el proyecto «Desarrollo de una metodología para el análisis del impacto socioeconómico de los incendios forestales y de la eficiencia económica de la gestión de incendios» (acrónimo: Masiff), que tenía por objeto elaborar y aplicar una metodología para la evaluación del impacto socioeconómico de los incendios forestales en Europa y de la eficiencia económica de la gestión de incendios. A pesar de que los resultados finales se han publicado, los modelos e indicadores propuestos aún no se han aplicado, lo que se debe, en parte, a la falta de los datos que deben facilitar los Estados miembros.

¿Considera la Comisión que hay falta de información por parte de los Estados miembros? En caso afirmativo, ¿podría explicar si existen planes para mejorar la disponibilidad de datos a nivel de la UE e indicar qué información relacionada con los incendios deberían facilitar, ante todo, los Estados miembros?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(20 de septiembre de 2012)

La Comisión remite a Su Señoría a la respuesta que dio a su pregunta escrita E-7489/2012 ([1]).

En lo que respecta a proyectos como Masiff, la plena aplicación de los modelos se basa en la disponibilidad de datos y su presentación voluntaria por parte de los Estados miembros.

El análisis de los efectos socioeconómicos de los incendios forestales exige datos sobre los recursos en juego que también deben facilitar los Estados miembros. Como no se disponía de todos los datos cuando se realizó el estudio Masiff, los modelos no pudieron aplicarse por completo.

La base de datos europea sobre los incendios forestales, que es un elemento importante del sistema europeo de información sobre incendios forestales (EFFIS), también se basa en la presentación voluntaria de datos por parte de los Estados miembros.

En el marco del EFFIS, la Comisión está trabajando en la recogida de la información necesaria sobre los recursos en juego para un análisis global de los efectos socioeconómicos de los incendios forestales.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007490/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(27 July 2012)

Subject: Economic efficiency of fire management

Two years ago the Joint Research Centre in Ispra financed the project 'Development of a Methodology for the Analysis of Socioeconomic Impact of Forest Fires and Economic Efficiency of Fire Management' (acronym: MASIFF), which aimed to develop and implement a methodology for assessing the socioeconomic impact of forest fires in Europe and evaluating the economic efficiency of fire management. Although the final results have been released, the proposed models and indicators have still not been implemented. This is partly because of missing data that have to be provided by Member States.

Does the Commission believe there is a lack of information from the Member States? If so, could it explain whether there any plans to improve the availability of data at the EU level, and indicate which fire-related information would have to be provided mainly by the Member States?

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

The Commission would also refer the Honourable Member to its reply to Written Question E-7489/2012 by the Honourable Member ([1]).

As far as projects such as MASIFF are concerned, the full implementation of the models relies on the availability and voluntary submission of data by the Member States.

The analysis of the socioeconomic impact of forest fires requires data on the resources that are at stake which must also be provided by the Member States. Since data were not fully available during the time of the MASIFF study, the models could not be fully implemented.

The European forest fire database, which is an important component of the European Forest Fire Information System (EFFIS), is also based on the voluntary submission of data by Member States.

In the context of the EFFIS, the Commission is working on gathering the required information on the resources that are at stake for a comprehensive analysis of the socioeconomic impact of forest fires.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007491/12
to the Commission
Gay Mitchell (PPE)
(27 July 2012)

Subject: Disability entitlements and benefits in the EU

The Treaty on the Functioning of the EU (TFEU) guarantees all EU citizens the right of free movement throughout the EU. Access to disability-related benefits for EU citizens is closely linked to this fundamental right.

EU Directive 2004/38/EC governs the right of residence of non-economic residents, and in particular Article 24(1) thereof provides that EU citizens who are resident in another Member State are entitled to equal treatment with nationals.

In principle, this right to equal treatment should extend to the right to claim disability benefits. However, in practice this is not the case, as there appear to be a number of conditions which a non-economic resident must fulfil in order to access such benefits.

A particular situation has been brought to my attention in which an Irish national, who has been certified as legally blind in Ireland, has had his blind benefits removed since he ceased to live in Ireland and moved to the Netherlands. It appears that he has no entitlement to benefits within the Dutch system as he does not fulfil the necessary conditions.

Will the Commission agree that this situation, i.e. the number of conditions non-economic residents must fulfil in order to access disability benefits, contravenes equality of treatment for EU citizens in their host Member State, as laid down in the TFEU? Does the Commission have any plans to address this problem?

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

Benefits granted without individual and discretionary assessment of personal needs on the basis of a legally defined position and concerning a risk expressly listed in Article 3(1) of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 ([1]), are social security benefits that shall be provided, pursuant to Article 4 of that regulation, on equal basis to all persons who are subject to the social security legislation of the competent State. Directive 2004/38/EC ([2]), which applies to social assistance, does not limit the equal treatment principle under Regulation (EC) No 883/2004.

It must be considered that EC law on social security provides for the coordination and not the harmonisation. Each Member State is free to determine the details of its social security system, including which benefits shall be provided, the conditions of eligibility, the calculation and the level of contribution. Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 establishes common rules and principles which must be observed by all national authorities when applying national law. These rules ensure that the application of the different national legislations respects the basic principles of equality of treatment and non-discrimination.

A non-active EU national, who is not a pensioner, is subject to the legislation of the State of residence and shall be treated equally as the nationals thereof.

Without the complete state of facts, the Commission cannot assess the refusal of disability benefits by the Netherlands in the situation described ([3]).

([1]) 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.
([2]) OJ L 158, 30.4.2004.
([3]) The Irish Blind Pension is, as a so-called special non-contributory benefit within the meaning of Article 70 of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004, non-exportable.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007492/12
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(27 July 2012)

Subject: Commission action on Romania

President Barroso recently acknowledged 11 points of concern with regard to political and constitutional changes occurring within Romania. What steps is the Commission taking to ensure that democratic practices are encouraged and upheld within Romania?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(25 September 2012)

In meetings held with representatives of the Romanian Government in the week of 9 July, the Commission expressed its serious concerns about recent political events in Romania in relation to the rule of law, the independence of the judiciary and the role of the Constitutional Court. These concerns were detailed in the report adopted by the Commission on 18 July 2012, on Romania's progress under the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism, which sets out explicit benchmarks on the judiciary and the fight against corruption ([1]). That report also detailed a series of recommendations to help resolve the current controversies and invited the Romanian authorities to take immediate action to address these. The Romanian authorities have already taken the necessary actions to address some of these recommendations.

The Commission has set-out its actions regarding recent events in Romania in a declaration on the political situation in Romania in the European Parliament on 12 September. The Commission is closely monitoring the situation and is in frequent dialogue with the Romanian authorities. The Commission will adopt a further report under the CVM before the end of the year. This report will assess whether the concerns identified regarding the rule of law and the independence of the judiciary have been addressed and whether democratic checks and balances have been restored.

([1]) COM(2012) 410 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007493/12
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(27 July 2012)

Subject: Accessibility of Erasmus programme

Twenty-five years ago, universities in 12 Member States of the European Economic Community started dealing with Erasmus students. Between 1987 and 2012 it is estimated that the total number of students who will have enrolled in the Erasmus programme will be 3 million. However, this suggests that only 1-3% of the total university population is willing or able to participate in this experience.

Given the cultural and social benefits of such a programme, what is the Commission doing to encourage more students to try Erasmus, and to make it a more accessible option?

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

Using data from countries currently participating in Erasmus, the Commission estimates that around 4.5% of higher education graduates participate in the current Erasmus programme.

The Commission sets the maximum ceiling for the monthly grant per host country, while the grant allocation policy is left to national agencies implementing the Erasmus programme and higher education institutions. The Commission encourages national agencies and institutions to take into account the socioeconomic background of students in their allocation policy and to complement EU grants under the Lifelong Learning programme with funding from other sources.

This said, current demand far exceeds available funds in all countries. Thus, the Commission has proposed to invest more than EUR 19 billion in Erasmus for All (2014-2020), an increase of more than 70% as compared to the current seven existing programmes (Lifelong learning programme, Youth in Action, Erasmus Mundus, Tempus, Alfa, Edulink and the bilateral cooperation programme with industrialised countries).

The future programme will support more mobility opportunities for more participants across the educational spectrum (from 2.5 million in 2007-2013 to nearly 5 million people in 2014-2020). It will ensure widened access for under-represented groups by supporting learners from lower socioeconomic backgrounds and by supporting other forms of mobility to complement the one- or two-semester model. A loan guarantee mechanism is further proposed to help those who wish to do a Master's programme abroad and currently have no access to loans.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007509/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Estorsioni ai danni delle imprese operanti sulla A3

La Procura di Reggio Calabria ha concluso pochi giorni fa l'operazione «Alba di Scilla», che ha portato al sequestro di beni immobili e conti correnti per un valore di alcuni milioni di euro e a dodici arresti fra presunti affiliati alla cosca mafiosa operante sul territorio. I reati ad essi imputati vanno dall'associazione mafiosa all'estorsione aggravata.

Le imprese con cantieri sul tratto autostradale della A3, compreso fra Gioia Tauro, Rosarno e Palmi, erano costrette con la violenza a versare agli esponenti dell'associazione criminale una cifra pari al 3 % dell'importo totale dei lavori che stavano portando avanti e, se si rifiutavano, subivano ritorsioni che andavano dalle intimidazioni personali, al furto o al danneggiamento degli automezzi industriali di loro proprietà.

Può la Commissione far sapere se è a conoscenza di questi fatti?

Può riferire se per i lavori su quel tratto autostradale sono stati impiegati anche fondi europei?

Alla Commissione risultano casi simili negli altri Stati membri?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(3 ottobre 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza dell'indagine «Alba di Scilla», condotta in Italia sui casi di estorsione aggravata commessi nell'ambito dei lavori sul tratto autostradale Salerno-Reggio Calabria da parte di gruppi di criminalità organizzata.

La Commissione ha chiesto informazioni in proposito all'autorità responsabile dell'amministrazione della regione Calabria, ma per il momento non ha ricevuto alcuna segnalazione di irregolarità.

Conformemente al principio della gestione condivisa applicato per amministrare la politica di coesione, tra i compiti fondamentali degli Stati membri rientrano la prevenzione, l'individuazione e la correzione delle irregolarità, nonché il recupero degli importi versati indebitamente a seguito della prima. La Commissione è pienamente coinvolta in tutte queste fasi: gli Stati membri hanno infatti il dovere di segnalarle tutte le irregolarità e di informarla sull'andamento delle procedure amministrative e legali. Inoltre, la Commissione ha predisposto tutti i possibili strumenti per garantire un utilizzo corretto e una buona gestione delle risorse finanziarie.

Tuttavia, i regolamenti europei prevedono che la diffusione di alcune informazioni possa essere differita per non ostacolare il risultato delle indagini.

Casi di racket delle estorsioni ad opera di gruppi di criminalità organizzata esistono nella maggior parte degli Stati membri dell'UE, seppur con ampie differenze di entità e frequenza. La Commissione invita l'onorevole parlamentare a prendere visione dello «Studio sul racket delle estorsioni» ([1]) pubblicato nel 2010, in cui si valuta l'entità del problema in ogni Stato membro e si formulano raccomandazioni su come affrontare questo fenomeno a livello nazionale e dell'UE.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/doc_centre/crime/docs/study_on_extortion_racketeering_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007509/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 July 2012)

Subject: Extortion against firms working on the A3

The Public Prosecutor's Office of Reggio Calabria recently concluded its operation *'Alba di Scilla'*, which led to the seizure of property and bank accounts worth several million euro, and to 12 arrests of suspected members of the Mafia gang operating in the area. They have been charged with crimes ranging from Mafia association to aggravated extortion.

Firms that had been working on sites on the A3 motorway, between Gioia Tauro, Rosarno and Palmi, had been violently forced to pay the members of the criminal association 3% of the total amount of work they were doing. If they refused, they suffered reprisals ranging from personal intimidation to theft or damage to industrial vehicles they owned.

Is the Commission aware of these facts?

Can it say whether EU funds have also been used for the work on that part of the motorway?

Is the Commission aware of any similar cases in other Member States?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(3 October 2012)

The Commission is aware of the Italian investigation *Alba di Scilla,* concerning cases of aggravated extortion perpetrated by organised criminal groups in connection with the works on the Salerno-Reggio Calabria motorway.

The Commission has asked for information on the issue from the managing authority of the Calabria region but for the time being has not received notice of irregularities.

In line with the shared management principle used for the administration of cohesion policy, the prevention, detection and correction of irregularities as well as the recovery of amounts unduly paid as a result of the former fall within the core duties of Member States. The Commission is fully involved in all these phases, as Member States have the duty to notify it of all irregularities and keep it informed of the progress of administrative and legal proceedings. The Commission has, moreover, put in place all possible instruments to guarantee a sound use and management of financial resources.

However, European regulations foresee that the reporting of certain information may be deferred not to hinder the outcome of investigations.

Cases of extortion racketeering involving organised criminal groups exist in most EU Member States, although with wide differences in scale and frequency. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the Study on Extortion Racketeering ([1]) published in 2010, assessing the magnitude of the problem in each Member State and making recommendations on how to tackle this phenomenon at EU and national level.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/doc_centre/crime/docs/study_on_extortion_racketeering_en.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007510/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Epidemia di colera a Cuba

Cuba sta affrontando un'epidemia di colera, la prima da circa 130 anni sull'isola. Le fonti ufficiali del Ministero della salute cubano confermavano, al 3 luglio, solo 3 vittime ed affermavano che la situazione era sotto controllo, mentre notizie provenienti da dissidenti parlano di oltre 29 decessi in tutta l'isola e di centinaia di contagiati.

La Commissione è a conoscenza della situazione? Reputa che vi sia pericolo per i cittadini europei presenti o che si recheranno a Cuba? Dispone e può fornire di notizie certe circa la gravità, l'origine e l'evolversi dell'epidemia?

Risposta di Kristalina Georgieva a nome della Commissione
(4 settembre 2012)

La Commissione invita l'onorevole parlamentare a consultare la propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta P-007100/2012 presentata il 16 luglio 2012 dall'onorevole Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR), nella quale si precisano i seguenti punti:

— l'UE segue molto da vicino la situazione in loco;

— in base alle informazioni a nostra disposizione, l'epidemia sarebbe in regresso. Le autorità stanno affrontando il problema ed è in corso un'inchiesta per individuare la fonte del focolaio;

— la Commissione è pronta a mobilitare le proprie risorse qualora fosse necessario ed esperti in loco valutano costantemente le esigenze del caso.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007510/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 July 2012)

Subject: Cholera epidemic in Cuba

Cuba is currently facing a cholera epidemic, the first in about 130 years on the island. On 3 July, officials of the Cuban Ministry of Health confirmed that there had only been three victims and claimed that the situation was under control, while reports from dissidents speak of more than 29 deaths across the island and hundreds of infected people.

Is the Commission aware of the situation? Does it think there is any danger for EU citizens in Cuba or who are about to travel to Cuba? Does it have and can it provide reliable information about the severity, origin and evolution of the epidemic?

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

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question P-007100/2012 of 16 July 2012 by Mr Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR):

— The EU is following very closely the situation on the ground.

— Following the information at our disposal, the outbreak seems to be in regression. The authorities are dealing with the problem. An investigation as to the source of the outbreak is ongoing.

— The Commission is prepared to mobilise its resources should the need arise. Needs are constantly monitored by experts on the ground.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007511/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR)
(27 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Safeguarding Member States' national identities at the London Olympics

The Treaty of Lisbon states that the European Union shall respect the equality of the Member States before the Treaties, along with their national identities. The High Representative, as a patriotic British citizen, will no doubt be proud to see the Olympics hosted in London and will be supporting the British team's efforts to win as many medals as possible.

Against this background, will the High Representative:

1. Explain why the July edition of *EU Insight* ([1]), the e-newsletter of the EU Delegation to the USA, gave a cumulative medals total for the 27 Member States at the Vancouver Olympics?

2. Agree that this is misleading to a United States audience and implies that the Member States compete collectively in the Olympic Games?

3. Publish an urgent correction to this misleading article and discuss with the head of delegation and his staff ways to prevent a recurrence of similar misrepresentations concerning the European Union?

4. Ensure that all information published by the EEAS and its delegations safeguards the Member States' national identities and gives them the respect they deserve and which the Treaties have bestowed on them?

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

It is a great pleasure to see the Olympic and Paralympic Games back in Europe, and the opportunity they provide to celebrate sporting excellence at its best, as well as the Olympic values of excellence, friendship and respect.

As stressed in the European Parliament's resolution of 8 May 2008 on the White Paper on Sport, European sport is an inalienable part of European identity, European culture and citizenship and under Article 165 of the Lisbon Treaty, EU action should be aimed at developing the European dimension in sport. Furthermore in its resolution of 18 November 2011 on the European dimension in sport the European Parliament recognises that sport can play a part in various areas of the EU's external relations, among others by means of diplomacy.

The EEAS and the EU Delegations fully respect the Member States' national identities and their national public diplomacy activities. The EEAS works together with the Member States on joint EU communication activities via the EU Delegations. The edition of EU Insight entitled 'Europe: A Sporting Powerhouse' and published by the EU Delegation to the USA in no way seeks to imply that the EU Member States compete collectively in the Olympic Games. The EU institutions take full account of the specificity of sport and fully respect the autonomy of national sports organisations.

([1]) http://www.eurunion.org/eu/images/euinsight_sports.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-007512/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(30 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Disomogeneità strutturale e ruolo della strategia di governance multilivello

Fin dalla sua fondazione, il Progetto europeo ha dovuto affrontare le difficoltà connesse alla disomogeneità strutturale dei propri territori. Tra le soluzioni individuate, l'UE ha deciso di tracciare un percorso basato sull'agevolazione di strutture atte a garantire i benefici e la flessibilità di una governance multilivello. Tra tali strutture figurano: Euroregioni, Macroregioni, Gruppi di cooperazione transfrontaliera.

La Commissione può indicare, per ciascuna di queste strutture:

1. base giuridica;

2. modalità di costituzione;

3. modalità di funzionamento;

4. ruolo e finalità nel mercato interno?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(13 settembre 2012)

Il concetto di Euroregioni è stato elaborato dal Consiglio d'Europa. Esse sono istituite al di fuori del quadro giuridico dell'UE, da gruppi, in genere di autorità pubbliche, interessati a cooperare a livello transfrontaliero. Tali gruppi sono istituiti conformemente alle rispettive legislazioni nazionali e definiscono le proprie regole di funzionamento. Sebbene il concetto non sia stato elaborato dall'UE, la Commissione è favorevole al ruolo che le Euroregioni possono svolgere nello sviluppo di progetti transfrontalieri e per superare gli ostacoli alla cooperazione, costituendo in questo modo un importante valore aggiunto per il mercato interno.

Fino ad ora gli approcci macroregionali sono stati elaborati sulla base di richieste del Consiglio europeo. Non esiste una procedura formale per l'istituzione delle macroregioni, ma l'esperienza si basa su aree vaste, che condividono sfide e opportunità comuni, che si uniscono per affrontare tali sfide in un quadro ampio che sottolinea il valore aggiunto pratico a livello di UE. Le macroregioni e la loro struttura di governance sono descritte nella comunicazione e nel piano d'azione relativi a ciascuna strategia dell'UE, integrati da orientamenti concordati dai partner partecipanti. Le macroregioni generalmente operano su una scala più ampia rispetto alle Euroregioni. L'agevolazione del mercato interno figura tra le strategie macroregionali esistenti nell'UE.

Vi sono molti tipi di gruppi di cooperazione transfrontaliera, con una struttura più o meno formale. Uno strumento formale disponibile nel contesto della politica di coesione è il gruppo europeo di cooperazione territoriale (GECT) ([1]). Il regolamento (CE) n. 1082/2006 descrive come istituire e gestire un GECT. I GECT agevolano e promuovono la cooperazione territoriale a vantaggio anche del mercato interno.

([1]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1082/2006 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007512/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(30 July 2012)

Subject: Structural heterogeneity and the role of the multi-level governance strategy

From its inception, the European project has had to face difficulties relating to the structural heterogeneity of its territories. Among the solutions found, the EU has decided to promote the establishment of structures which are able to provide the benefits and flexibility of multi-level governance. These structures include: Euro-regions, macro-regions and cross-border cooperation groups.

Can the Commission provide the following information, for each of these structures:

1. their legal basis;

2. how they are formed;

3. how they operate;

4. their role and purpose in the internal market?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(13 September 2012)

The concept of Euroregions was developed by the Council of Europe. They are created outside the EU legal framework by groupings of, generally, public authorities interested in cooperating across borders. The groupings are created on the basis of respective national law. They define their own operating rules. Although the concept is not an EU creation, the Commission is positive about the role they can play in developing cross-border projects, and in overcoming obstacles to cooperation, thus representing an important added value for the internal market.

Macro-regional approaches have been developed to date on the basis of requests from the European Council. There is no formal procedure to establish macroregions, but experience is based on large-scale areas sharing common challenges and opportunities, coming together to address these in a broad framework emphasising practical EU-level added-value. Macro-regions and their governance framework are described in the communication and Action Plan pertaining to each EU Strategy, supplemented by guidance agreed by the partners involved. Macro-regions would normally operate on a larger scale than Euroregions. The existing EU macroregional strategies include facilitation of the internal market.

There are many varieties of cross-border cooperation groups, with varying degrees of formality. One formal instrument available in a cohesion policy context is the European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation (EGTC) ([1]). How to establish and operate an EGTC is described in Regulation (EC) No 1082/2006. EGTCs facilitate and promote territorial cooperation, thus benefiting the internal market as well.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1082/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007513/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(30 Ιουλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Χρηματοδοτικό εργαλείο για ΜΜΕ στην περιφέρεια Πελοποννήσου στη διαχείριση δράσης του ΕΣΠΑ

Σύμφωνα με την προδημοσίευση ([1]) του Υπουργείου Ανάπτυξης, Ανταγωνιστικότητας και Ναυτιλίας για την προκήρυξη δράσης που αφορά στην ενίσχυση, αρχικώς, Μικρομεσαίων Επιχειρήσεων που δραστηριοποιούνται στους τομείς Μεταποίησης — Τουρισμού — Εμπορίου -Υπηρεσιών στο πλαίσιο των Περιφερειακών Επιχειρησιακών Προγραμμάτων του ΕΣΠΑ 2007-2013, αναφέρεται πως για την περιφέρεια Πελοποννήσου έχει δεσμευτεί δημόσια δαπάνη 22,5 εκ. ευρώ. Το ποσό αυτό θα διατεθεί μέσω εξειδικευμένου χρηματοδοτικού εργαλείου νέου τύπου με τη μορφή είτε δανείων χαμηλού επιτοκίου προς τις επιχειρήσεις, είτε εγγυήσεων επιχειρηματικών δανείων, και δεν θα περιλαμβάνει ενίσχυση των επιχειρήσεων μέσω επιδοτήσεων. Το μοντέλο αυτό ([2]) προβλέπει τη δημιουργία Ταμείου Επιχειρηματικότητας που θα διευκολύνει την πρόσβαση των μικρών επιχειρήσεων στις πηγές χρηματοδότησης και στοχεύει στη δυνατότητα μόχλευσης επιπρόσθετων πόρων από τον ιδιωτικό τομέα.

Για το λόγο αυτό ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Εφαρμόζονται παρόμοια καινοτόμα εργαλεία όσον αφορά στη διαχείριση πόρων των Διαρθρωτικών Ταμείων σε άλλες οικονομίες κρατών μελών με σοβαρά δημοσιονομικά προβλήματα και έλλειμμα ανταγωνιστικότητας, όπως η Ελλάδα;

2. Αν ναι, υπάρχουν παραδείγματα βέλτιστων πρακτικών; Θεωρεί πως το συγκεκριμένο χρηματοδοτικό εργαλείο της περιφέρειας Πελοποννήσου θα μπορούσε να αποτελέσει μοντέλο και για τις υπόλοιπες περιφέρειες της Ελλάδας;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(28 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

1. Χρηματοδοτικά μέσα (ΧΜ) που υποστηρίζονται από προγράμματα με πόρους του Ευρωπαϊκού Ταμείου Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης (ΕΤΠΑ) χρησιμοποιούνται σχεδόν σε όλα τα κράτη μέλη. Η ανανεωνόμενη συνδρομή διατέθηκε στο πλαίσιο της πολιτικής συνοχής από την περίοδο 2000-2006. Μολονότι στην εν λόγω περίοδο, τα ΧΜ αντιπροσώπευαν το 1 % περίπου του όγκου του ΕΤΠΑ, το μερίδιο τους αυξήθηκε σημαντικά κατά την τρέχουσα περίοδο. Στο τέλος του 2010, είχε δεσμευτεί κατ' εκτίμηση συνολική δημόσια χρηματοδότηση ύψους 8,1 δισεκατομμυρίων (ΕΤΠΑ: 6,2 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ) για την υποστήριξη 389 ΧΜ για επιχειρήσεις.

2. Οι εμπειρίες στη χρησιμοποίηση των ΧΜ διαφέρουν από μία χώρα και από μία περιφέρεια σε άλλη. Η χρήση των ΧΜ μπορεί να προσφέρει πολλά πλεονεκτήματα, ειδικά στις οικονομίες που αντιμετωπίζουν οικονομικές δυσκολίες. Εκτός από τον ανανεωνόμενο χαρακτήρα τους, τα ΧΜ παρέχουν τη δυνατότητα για αρχική χρηματοδότηση επενδυτικών σχεδίων στις ΜΜΕ σε αντίθεση με τις επιδοτήσεις που συνήθως παρέχουν εκ των υστέρων χρηματοδότηση. Σε ορισμένες περιπτώσεις σημειώθηκαν καθυστερήσεις στην υλοποίηση, αλλά αυτό μπορεί συνήθως να εξηγηθεί με το ότι πρόκειται για νεωτεριστικά μέσα στην πολιτική συνοχής και σε συναφή με τις κρατικές ενισχύσεις θέματα.

Τα δάνεια και οι εγγυήσεις για τις επιχειρήσεις έχουν γίνει συνεχώς πιο δημοφιλή σε όλη την Ευρώπη. Το 2010 ήδη, περίπου 3,2 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ επενδύθηκαν μέσω των ΧΜ σε επιχειρήσεις στα κράτη μέλη. Επίσης, υπολογίζεται ότι 90 000 θέσεις εργασίας έχουν δημιουργηθεί ή διασωθεί με τη βοήθεια αυτών των χρηματοδοτικών μέσων.

Όσον αφορά το ειδικό Περιφερειακό Ταμείο για την Επιχειρηματικότητα στην Πελοπόννησο, χρειάζεται περισσότερος χρόνος για να αξιολογηθεί αν η προσέγγιση που χρησιμοποιήθηκε θα μπορούσε να μεταφερθεί σε άλλες περιφέρειες.

([1]) http://www.espa.gr/Lists/Proclamations/Attachments/2120/ypaan_120502_Prodim_Mikromesaies_z.pdf
([2]) http://ppel.gov.gr/2012/05/225-%CE%B5%CE%BA%CE%B1%CF%84%CE%BF%CE%BC%CE%BC%CF%8D%CF%81%CE%B9%CE%B1-%CE%B5%CF%85%CF%81%CF%8E-%CF%81%CE%AF%CF%87%CE%BD%CE%B5%CE%B9-%CE%B7-%CF%80%CE%B5%CF%81%CE%B9%CF%86%CE%AD%CF%81%CE%B5%CE%B9/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007513/12
to the Commission
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(30 July 2012)

Subject: Financial instrument for SMEs in the Peloponnese region for the management of an NSRF action

The advance publication ([1]) by the Ministry of Development, Competitiveness and Shipping announcing an action to provide initial support for SMEs active in the processing, tourism, trade and services sectors under the NSRF's Regional Operational Programmes for 2007-2013 mentions that EUR 22.5 million in public funds has been committed for the Peloponnese region. This sum will be distributed via a dedicated new type of financial instrument in the form either of low interest loans to businesses or of guarantees for business loans and will not include subsidies for enterprises. This model ([2]) provides for the creation of an Entrepreneurship Fund to facilitate the access of small businesses to sources of funding and is intended to leverage additional resources from the private sector.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Are similar innovative instruments being used for the management of Structural Fund resources in the economies of other Member States facing serious financial problems and a severe competitiveness deficit like Greece?

2. If so, do examples of best practices exist? Does it believe that this particular financial instrument which is being applied in the Peloponnese region could provide a model for other regions of Greece?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(28 September 2012)

1. Financial instruments (FIs) supported from programmes with European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) resources are being used in almost all Member States. Revolving assistance has been available under cohesion policy since the 2000-06 period. While in that period, FIs represented about 1% of the ERDF volume, their share increased significantly in the current period. At the end of 2010, an estimated total public funding of EUR 8.1 billion (ERDF: EUR 6.2 billion) had been committed to support 389 FIs for enterprises.

2. Experience in using FIs varies from one country and region to another. The use of FIs can bring many advantages, especially in economies facing financial difficulties. In addition to their revolving character, FIs provide potential for upfront financing for SME investment projects as compared to grants, which usually provide the financing *ex-post*. In some cases delays in implementation have occurred, but this can usually be explained by the novelty of the instruments in cohesion policy and state aid related issues.

Loans and guarantees for enterprises have become more and more popular throughout Europe. Already in 2010, some EUR 3.2 billion had been invested through FIs in enterprises in Member States. It is also estimated that 90 000 jobs were created or safeguarded through such financial instruments.

Regarding the specific Regional Fund for Entrepreneurship in the Peloponnese, more time is necessary to assess whether the approach used could be transferable to other regions.

([1]) http://www.espa.gr/Lists/Proclamations/Attachments/2120/ypaan_120502_Prodim_Mikromesaies_z.pdf
([2]) http://ppel.gov.gr/2012/05/225-%CE%B5%CE%BA%CE%B1%CF%84%CE%BF%CE%BC%CE%BC%CF%8D%CF%81%CE%B9%CE%B1-%CE%B5%CF%85%CF%81%CF%8E-%CF%81%CE%AF%CF%87%CE%BD%CE%B5%CE%B9-%CE%B7-%CF%80%CE%B5%CF%81%CE%B9%CF%86%CE%AD%CF%81%CE%B5%CE%B9/

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-007514/12
Komisii
Anna Záborská (PPE)
(30. júla 2012)

Vec: Používanie kodifikovaného jazyka v oficiálnych dokumentoch: rod alebo pohlavie

V nedávnych oznámeniach Komisia použila v troch pivotných jazykoch EÚ v spojitosti s politikami zameranými na sociálne inžinierstvo termín rod alebo rodová rovnosť na vyjadrenie pojmu „pohlavie“ alebo „rovnaké príležitosti pre ženy a mužov“.

V článku 8 Zmluvy o fungovaní Európskej únie (ZFEÚ) je však uvedené: „Vo všetkých svojich činnostiach sa Únia zameriava na odstránenie nerovností a podporu rovnoprávnosti medzi mužmi a ženami.“ Okrem toho sa v článku 10 ZFEÚ tvrdí: „Pri vymedzovaní a uskutočňovaní svojich politík a činností sa Únia zameriava na boj proti diskriminácii z dôvodu pohlavia (…).“

V súlade s týmito dvoma článkami sa pojem „rovnaké príležitosti pre ženy a mužov“ používa v súvislosti s činnosťami zameranými na podporu rovnosti oboch pohlaví.

Čo je v ZFEÚ právnym základom používania pojmu rod v oficiálnych publikáciách EÚ?

Je si Komisia vedomá lingvistických rozdielov medzi pracovnými jazykmi európskych inštitúcií (DE, EN, FR), pokiaľ ide o túto politiku?

Mohla by Komisia objasniť svoje interné zásady používania kodifikovaného jazyka v súvislosti s daným druhom politiky EÚ?

Aké sú očakávané následky vykonávania politík Únie nazývaných „rodová rovnosť“ namiesto „rovnaké príležitosti pre ženy a mužov“?

Odpoveď pani Redingovej v mene Komisie
(17. septembra 2012)

Rovnosť medzi ženami a mužmi je zásada, ktorá je zakotvená v Zmluve o EÚ. Článok 157 ods. 3 Zmluvy o fungovaní EÚ poskytuje právny základ na prijímanie opatrení na zabezpečenie uplatňovania tejto zásady.

S cieľom komplexného zavedenia zásady rovnosti medzi ženami a mužmi Komisia predstavila „Stratégiu rovnosti medzi ženami a mužmi na roky 2010 – 2015“, ktorá je referenčným dokumentom pre jej vnútorné aj vonkajšie politiky a ktorá bola vypracovaná na základe interných a externých konzultácií.

Pojmy „rod“ a „rodová rovnosť“ (napr. uplatňovanie hľadiska rodovej rovnosti, rodové stereotypy atď.) sú už dlho používané, a to nielen odborníkmi a v akademickom prostredí, ale aj národnými vládami, parlamentmi a verejnými správami na celom svete a v EÚ, ako aj medzinárodnými organizáciami. Používanie tejto terminológie teda nepredstavuje nový vývoj. Je takisto v súlade s uznesením Európskeho parlamentu o podpore rovnosti medzi ženami a mužmi, ktoré zahŕňa napr. „uplatňovanie hľadiska rodovej rovnosti v práci Európskeho parlamentu“ [uznesenie 2011/2151(INI)] alebo s ďalšími uzneseniami, v ktorých sa táto terminológia používa [napr. uznesenia 2010/2115(INI) a 2011/2295(INI)].

Komisia bude aj naďalej venovať pozornosť konzistentnému používaniu terminológie v rôznych jazykových verziách svojich dokumentov, ktoré majú rovnakú váhu.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007514/12
to the Commission
Anna Záborská (PPE)
(30 July 2012)

Subject: Use of codified language in official documents: 'gender' or 'sex'

In recent communications the Commission has used the term 'gender' or 'gender equality' in the EU's three pivot languages to express the concepts of 'sex' or 'equal opportunities for men and women' when dealing with policies aimed at social engineering.

However, Article 8 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) states: 'In all its activities, the Union shall aim to eliminate inequalities, and to promote equality, between men and women.' Furthermore, Article 10 TFEU states: 'In defining and implementing its policies and activities, the Union shall aim to combat discrimination based on sex […].'

In accordance with these two articles, the term 'equal opportunities for women and men' is used when referring to activities aimed at promoting equality for both sexes.

What is the legal basis in the TFEU for the use of the term 'gender' in official EU publications?

Is the Commission aware of the linguistic differences between the working languages of the EU institutions (DE, EN, FR) as regards this policy?

Could the Commission clarify its internal policy on codified linguistic usage attached to a given type of EU policy?

What are the expected consequences of implementing Union policies called 'gender equality' instead of 'equal opportunities for women and men'?

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

Equality between women and men is a principle enshrined in the EU Treaty. Article 157(3) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU provides a legal basis to take measures to ensure its application.

In order to implement the principle of equality between women and men in a comprehensive way, the Commission presented a 'Strategy on equality between women and men 2010-2015', which is a reference for its internal and external policies and was the result of internal and external consultations.

The terms 'gender' and 'gender equality' have long been used (e.g. gender mainstreaming, gender stereotypes, etc.) not only in the research and academic world, but also by national governments, parliaments and public administrations worldwide and in the EU, and by international organisations, so the use of this terminology does not constitute a new development. It is also in line with the resolution of the European Parliament to promote equality between women and men, including for instance by promoting 'gender mainstreaming in the work of the European Parliament' (resolution 2011/2151(INI)) or other resolutions which use this terminology (e.g. resolutions 2010/2115(INI) and 2011/2295(INI)).

The Commission will continue to pay attention to the consistent use of terminology in the various language versions of its documents, which have equal value.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007523/12
to the Commission
Phil Prendergast (S&D)
(30 July 2012)

Subject: Ryanair website and flight cancellation insurance

Pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 1008/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 September 2008 on common rules for the operation of air services in the Community, and further to the judgment by the Court of Justice of the European Union in Case C-112/11 (ebookers.com Deutschland GmbH v the German federal union of consumer organisations and associations), could the Commission indicate whether the practice by the ryanair.com website, whereby the 'opt-out' option for flight cancellation insurance is not the default option, is in compliance with EC law?

What action, if any, does the Commission intend to take in this regard?

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

Regulation (EC) No 1008/2008 ([1]) of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 September 2008 on common rules for the operation of air services in the Community contains price transparency provisions which clearly indicates in its Article 23, paragraph 1, that optional price supplements shall be communicated in a clear, transparent and unambiguous way at the start of any booking process and their acceptance by the customer shall be on an 'opt-in' basis.

In that same line, Article 22 of the new Directive on Consumer Rights (2011/83/EU ([2])), which must be transposed in the national laws of the Member States by 13 December 2013, provides that if the trader unduly infers the consumer's consent by using default options, such as pre-ticked boxes on a website, then the consumer is entitled to reimbursement of the extra payment.

Since the Member States are in charge of the enforcement of these provisions, under the control of the Commission as guardian of the Treaty, it is therefore up to the Member States to determine compliance with EC law in specific cases such as this one and take appropriate action.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1008/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 September 2008 on common rules for the operation of air services in the Community, OJ L 293, 31.10.2008, pp. 3-20.
([2]) COM(2011) 0793 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007531/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(31 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Utilizzo fondi UE per la lingua sarda

Da qualche tempo è in atto in Sardegna un vivace dibattito intorno alla lingua sarda. L'ultimo episodio risale al 10 luglio scorso, quando gli stessi parlamentari sardi non hanno presentato alcun emendamento in favore del sardo, accettando di fatto un testo di ratifica della Carta europea delle lingue regionali e minoritarie, che finisce con il delegittimare l'insegnamento a scuola e la circolazione sociale dell'antica lingua isolana: di fatto il sardo non figura più tra le lingue minoritarie da difendere (come succede invece, ad esempio, per il tedesco in Alto Adige o il francese in Valle d'Aosta).

L'Unione europea aveva erogato 128 milioni di euro per finanziare in Sardegna iniziative su insegnamento, promozione e circolazione della lingua sarda. Pare quindi che i finanziamenti sopra citati non sono stati utilizzati come inizialmente previsto.

La Commissione intende verificare come sono stati utilizzati questi finanziamenti che avrebbero dovuto tutelare la lingua sarda?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(26 settembre 2012)

Con decisione C(2007)6081 del 30 novembre 2007 ([1]), la Commissione ha adottato il programma operativo del Fondo Sociale Europeo per la Regione Sardegna per il periodo 2007-2013. Tale programma mira innanzitutto a i) promuovere l'accesso al mercato del lavoro; ii) accrescere la capacità di adattamento dei lavoratori e delle imprese; e iii) aumentare gli investimenti nel capitale umano. Il programma operativo in questione non prevede misure volte all'insegnamento, alla promozione e alla diffusione della lingua sarda. Per ulteriori informazioni sulle misure contenute nel programma operativo, la Commissione invita l'onorevole parlamentare a consultare il sito seguente: http://www.regione.sardegna.it/j/v/17?v=9&s=1&nodesc=2&na=1&c=4755&n=10&nohr=1&esp=1

([1]) Decisione della Commissione del 30-XI-2007 che adotta il programma operativo per l'intervento comunitario del Fondo sociale europeo ai fini dell'obiettivo «Competitività regionale e occupazione» nella regione Sardegna in Italia (CCI 2007IT052PO016).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007531/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(31 July 2012)

Subject: Use of EU funds for the Sardinian language

A lively debate has been taking place in Sardinia for some time on the subject of the Sardinian language. The latest development occurred on 10 July 2012, when Sardinian members of the Italian Parliament failed to table any amendments in support of the Sardinian language, in effect accepting a text ratifying the Charter on Regional and Minority Languages and ultimately delegitimizing the teaching and wider use of the island's ancient language, which will no longer be classified as a protected minority language (in contrast to German in Alto Adige or French in Valle d'Aosta, for example).

The European Union has allocated EUR 128 million to fund projects in Sardinia involving the teaching, promotion and dissemination of the Sardinian language. It appears, therefore, that the funding in question has not been used for the purpose for which it was originally intended.

Does the Commission intend to ascertain how these funds — which were supposed to protect the Sardinian language — were used?

(Version française)

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

Par décision C(2007) 6081 du 30 novembre 2007 ([1]), la Commission a adopté le programme opérationnel du Fonds Social Européen pour la région Sardaigne pour la période 2007-2013. Le programme opérationnel vise en priorité à i) promouvoir l'accès au marché du travail; ii) améliorer l'adaptabilité des travailleurs et des entreprises; et iii) augmenter l'investissement dans le capital humain. Le programme opérationnel en question ne prévoit pas de mesures visant à l'enseignement, la promotion et à la diffusion de la langue sarde. Pour plus d'informations sur les mesures prévues par le programme opérationnel, la Commission invite l'Honorable Parlementaire à consulter le site suivant: (http://www.regione.sardegna.it/j/v/17?v=9&s=1&nodesc=2&na=1&c=4755&n=10&nohr=1&esp=1).

([1]) Décision de la Commission du 30.11.2007 qui a adopté le programme opérationnel pour l'intervention communautaire du Fonds social européen pour l'application de l'objectif <«Competitività regionale e occupazione» dans la région de Sardaigne en Italie (CCI 2007IT052PO016).

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007535/12
à la Commission
Philippe Lamberts (Verts/ALE)
(1er août 2012)

Objet: Mise en œuvre de certaines dispositions (circonstances atténuantes) du pacte de stabilité et de croissance tel que modifié par le train de six mesures («six-pack»)

1. Comment la Commission applique-t-elle l'exclusion des dépenses d'intérêts, des dépenses liées aux programmes de l'Union qui sont intégralement couvertes par des recettes provenant de fonds de l'Union et des modifications non discrétionnaires intervenant dans les dépenses liées aux indemnités de chômage, prévue à l'article 5 du règlement (UE) nº 1175/2011 en ce qui concerne l'évaluation relative à la réalisation de l'objectif budgétaire à moyen terme? Pourrait-elle fournir un tableau comparant, pour chaque État membre, le déficit/l'excédent des finances publiques avant et après la prise en compte de cette disposition et ventilant la différence de façon à isoler ces trois aspects?

2. La Commission estime-t-elle que la contraction soudaine et brutale de l'économie de la zone euro ainsi que la crise de la dette publique, l'effet de contagion, les vagues successives de recapitalisation obligatoire des banques, etc., constituent une «circonstance inhabituelle indépendante de la volonté [des États membres]» (article 5 de ce même règlement)? Dans l'affirmative, comment la Commission en a-t-elle tenu compte dans ses recommandations en vue des avis du Conseil sur les programmes de stabilité? Dans la négative, quel évènement constituerait une telle circonstance selon la Commission?

3. L'article 2, paragraphe 3, du règlement (UE) nº 1177/2011 du Conseil (concernant une prise en considération particulière de la solidarité financière et du soutien entre États membres) implique-t-il que les garanties, le capital versé dans le cas du Fonds européen de stabilité financière/Mécanisme européen de stabilisation financière (ou de la BEI par exemple) et les autres obligations financières contractées en vue d'aider les États membres en proie à de graves difficultés ne sont pas pris en compte lors du calcul du déficit public? Quel est le montant de ce dernier pour chaque État membre?

Réponse donnée par M. Rehn au nom de la Commission
(20 septembre 2012)

Pour déterminer si un État membre a suffisamment progressé vers son objectif à moyen terme, la Commission examinera un agrégat de dépenses hors mesures discrétionnaires en matière de recettes ([1]). Les dépenses d'intérêt, les dépenses liées aux programmes de l'Union intégralement couvertes par des recettes provenant de fonds de l'UE et les modifications non discrétionnaires intervenant dans les dépenses liées aux indemnités de chômage en seront exclues. C'est pourquoi l'exclusion de ces dépenses ne s'applique pas à l'évaluation du solde budgétaire des États membres mais à leur niveau de dépenses. Les États membres ont, pour la première fois, présenté une estimation de ces dépenses dans leur programme de stabilité ou de convergence de 2012 ([2]).

La mesure concernant une «circonstance inhabituelle indépendante de la volonté de l'État membre» est elle aussi entrée en vigueur le 13 décembre 2011 et n'a été invoquée dans aucune des recommandations de la Commission en vue de recommandations du Conseil relatives aux programmes de stabilité ou de convergence. Tout recours futur à cette clause sera évalué au cas par cas.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:306:0033:0040:FR:PDF

([2]) À la suite de l'entrée en vigueur du règlement le 13 décembre 2011, conformément aux prescriptions du «code de conduite» qui impose aux États membres de fournir des informations sur les dépenses exclues du critère des dépenses. L'agrégat de dépenses modifié qui est utilisé pour le critère des dépenses figure dans une annexe du document de travail joint à la recommandation de la Commission en vue d'une recommandation du Conseil. Pour la Belgique, cliquer sur le lien suivant (tableau III, p. 33):
http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/economic_governance/sgp/pdf/20_scps/2012/02_staff_working_document/be_2012-05-30_swd_en.pdf;
Les programmes de tous les autres États membres sont disponibles à l'adresse suivante:
http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/economic_governance/sgp/convergence/programmes/2012_en.htm

Le règlement (UE) nº 1177/2011 ([3]) du Conseil ne prévoit pas d'exclure du calcul du déficit public les éléments énumérés dans la question. En réalité, dans la plupart des cas, les soutiens bilatéraux ou multilatéraux entre États membres visant à préserver la stabilité financière ne sont pas de nature à aggraver le déficit. En revanche, la Commission accordera toute l'attention voulue «aux contributions financières destinées à encourager la solidarité internationale et à favoriser la réalisation des objectifs des politiques de l'Union, à la dette résultant d'un soutien bilatéral et multilatéral entre États membres dans le cadre de la préservation de la stabilité financière et à la dette liée aux opérations de stabilisation financière pendant des crises financières majeures» lorsqu'elle élaborera le rapport prévu à l'article 126, paragraphe 3, du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne ([4]).

([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:306:0033:0040:FR:PDF

([4]) Eurostat a publié des données concernant l'incidence sur la dette des prêts intergouvernementaux dans le contexte de la crise financière. Cliquer sur le lien suivant pour consulter les tableaux par pays à partir de la page 4: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_PUBLIC/2-23042012-AP/EN/2-23042012-AP-EN.PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007535/12
to the Commission
Philippe Lamberts (Verts/ALE)
(1 August 2012)

Subject: Implementation of certain provisions (mitigating factors) of the Stability and Growth Pact as amended by the six-pack

1. How does the Commission apply the exclusion of interest expenditure, expenditure on Union programmes fully matched by Union funds revenue and non-discretionary changes in unemployment benefit expenditure which is foreseen in Article 5 of Regulation (EU) No 1175/2011 in terms of assessment towards the medium-term budgetary objective? Can it provide a table comparing, for each Member State government, the levels of deficit/surplus before and after taking this provision into account and breaking down the difference in such a way as to single out the three items?

2. Does the Commission consider that the sudden and steep contraction of the eurozone economy and the sovereign debt crisis, the contagion effect, the succeeding waves of mandatory bank recapitalisation, etc., amount to an 'unusual event outside the control of the Member States' (Article 5 of the same regulation)? If so, how has the Commission addressed this in its recommendations for Council opinions on stability programmes? If not, what would the Commission consider to constitute such an event?

3. Does Article 2(3) of Council Regulation (EU) No 1177/2011 (concerning giving particular consideration to financial solidarity and support between Member States) mean that guarantees, paid-in capital in the case of the EFSFESM (or the EIB for instance) and other liabilities incurred for purposes of supporting Member States facing serious difficulties are not taken into account when calculating the general government deficit? What is its amount for each Member State?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(20 September 2012)

The Commission will judge whether a Member State (MS) has made sufficient progress towards its Medium Term Objective, by computing an aggregate of expenditure net of discretionary revenue measures ([1]). Interest expenditure, expenditure on Union programmes fully matched by Union funds revenue and non-discretionary changes in unemployment benefit expenditure will be excluded from this expenditure aggregate. The exclusion of these items doesn't therefore apply to an assessment of MS budget balances but to their level of expenditure. MS submitted estimates of these items in 2012 round of Stability and Convergence Programmes for the first time ([2]).

The provision relating to an 'unusual event outside the control of the MS' also entered into force on 13 December 2011 and has not been invoked in any Commission recommendations for Council recommendations on Stability and Convergence programmes. Any future use of this clause will be judged on a case by case basis.

Council Regulation (EU) No 1177/2011 ([3]) doesn't provide for the items listed in the question to be excluded from the general government deficit. In most cases, the bilateral and multilateral support between MS in the context of safeguarding financial stability is not actually deficit increasing. Instead, 'financial contributions to fostering international solidarity and achieving the policy goals of the Union, the debt incurred in the form of bilateral and multilateral support between MS in the context of safeguarding financial stability, and the debt related to financial stabilisation operations during major financial disturbances' will be taken into consideration when the Commission prepares a report under Article 126(3) TFEU ([4]).

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:306:0033:0040:EN:PDF

([2]) Following the entry into force of the regulation on 13 December 2011, in line with the requirements of the 'Code of Conduct' which requires MS to provide information regarding the expenditure excluded from the expenditure benchmark. In an annex to the staff working document accompanying the Commission recommendation for a Council recommendation the modified expenditure aggregate used for the expenditure benchmark is also listed. For Belgium the link can be found here, table III on p. 33: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/economic_governance/sgp/pdf/20_scps/2012/02_staff_working_document/be_2012-05-30_swd_en.pdf All other Member States' programmes can be found here: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/economic_governance/sgp/convergence/programmes/2012_en.htm

([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:306:0033:0040:EN:PDF

([4]) Data on the impact on debt of intergovernmental lending in the context of the financial crisis is published by Eurostat. See the country tables starting on page 4 of http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_PUBLIC/2-23042012-AP/EN/2-23042012-AP-EN.PDF

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007546/12
a la Comisión
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(2 de agosto de 2012)

Asunto: Exclusión de la flota cefalopodera de Galicia del acuerdo de Pesca Unión Europea-Mauritania

La expiración del Protocolo por el que se fijan las posibilidades de pesca y la contrapartida financiera previstas en el acuerdo de asociación en el sector pesquero entre la Comunidad Europea y la República Islámica de Mauritania para el período comprendido entre el 1 de agosto de 2008 y el 31 de julio de 2012, ha dejado fuera de las posibilidades de pesca futuras a la flota cefalopodera de Galicia, y ha puesto en enormes dificultades a otros sectores. Las nuevas condiciones firmadas después de las varias rondas de negociaciones no han tenido la suficiente transparencia con el Parlamento Europeo, sobre todo respecto a la presentación de datos científicos, una cuestión que he planteado en la pregunta parlamentaria del 16 de julio de 2012 a la Comisión Europea.

La exclusión de la flota cefalopodera del nuevo acuerdo pesquero supone dejar al margen al 30 % de la flota que faenaba en Mauritania. Sin embargo, la compensación económica de la Unión Europea a Mauritania va a aumentar anualmente en las nuevas previsiones presupuestarias del acuerdo. Entre los objetivos del Protocolo recientemente expirado estaba el desarrollo de la pesca artesanal, la creación de infraestructuras y un desarrollo del sector pesquero en Mauritania que beneficie a la población local y a las personas que trabajan en el sector pesquero. Sin embargo, esto no ha sido así, y el sector pesquero artesanal no ha recibido apoyo de Mauritania, una contradicción que deja también a ese sector de la flota en una situación de insostenibilidad social y económica sin ningún beneficio del acuerdo y que plantea dudas sobre la efectividad e impacto social del mismo.

La flota europea de Galicia también va a sufrir las consecuencias socieconómicas por ser excluida del acuerdo. Los trabajadores y empresas de la flota cefalopodera que han quedado fuera del acuerdo, proceden de comarcas de Galicia como O Morrazo, y de zonas que son altamente dependientes de la pesca y caracterizadas concretamente por la alta dependencia directa e indirecta con este acuerdo. Es además una flota altamente especializada que tiene dificultades de recolocación laboral en otro tipo de flota pesquera.

¿Ha previsto la Comisión ayudas económicas por la paralización temporal o definitiva para paliar los efectos de la decisión que deja a 24 embarcaciones de Galicia fuera del acuerdo? ¿Qué alternativas prevé la Comisión para esta flota?

Respuesta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(5 de noviembre de 2012)

La Comisión considera que el Protocolo rubricado el 26 de julio de 2012 constituye el mejor acuerdo que la UE podía conseguir y que es preferible, con mucho, a no tener ningún Protocolo. Ofrece oportunidades viables para la flota de la UE, y garantiza la continuidad de las actividades pesqueras a la espera de una aplicación provisional del Protocolo. El acuerdo se negoció con total transparencia y con la participación de las partes interesadas.

El Protocolo negociado se ajusta al mandato del Consejo y a los principios contenidos en él, en particular en lo que respecta a la utilización de los mejores dictámenes científicos disponibles y a la explotación circunscrita a los recursos excedentarios. Según los mejores dictámenes científicos disponibles ([1]), los cefalópodos están en situación de sobreexplotación y no se dispone de ningún excedente. Por lo tanto, Mauritania optó por no conceder posibilidades de pesca para esta población a la UE y desarrollar su propia pesca costera. Por lo tanto, aunque resultó imposible conseguir una cuota para los cefalópodos, el Protocolo incluye una cláusula de revisión para solicitar posibilidades de pesca en caso de que se produzca una recuperación de la población en un futuro. Sin embargo, es preciso recordar que en consonancia con la Unclos, la decisión de incrementar su propio esfuerzo pesquero o de conceder posibilidades de pesca a la UE quedará a discreción de Mauritania.

Para aliviar las consecuencias socioeconómicas de las flotas afectadas, los Estados miembros pueden recurrir al Fondo Europeo de Pesca con vistas a obtener ayudas para la paralización temporal o definitiva de las actividades pesqueras. El 25 de abril de 2012, la Comisión adoptó una Decisión a fin de incrementar la flexibilidad en el uso de paralizaciones temporales para España.

([1]) http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/documents/43805/254315/11-11_STECF+11-18+-+Consolidated+Advice+on+Fish+Stocks_JRC67802.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007546/12
to the Commission
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(2 August 2012)

Subject: Exclusion of Galicia's cephalopod fleet from the European Union-Mauritania Fisheries Agreement

The expiry of the Protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement between the European Community and the Islamic Republic of Mauritania, which established the fishing opportunities and the financial contribution for the period between 1 August 2008 and 31 July 2012, has excluded Galicia's cephalopod fleet from future fishing opportunities and placed other sectors in enormous difficulties. Parliament has not been kept sufficiently informed regarding the new conditions signed in the wake of a number of rounds of negotiations, especially with regard to the submission of scientific data, a question I raised myself in a question to the Commission on 16 July 2012.

The exclusion of the cephalopod fleet from the new Fisheries Agreement means setting aside 30% of the fleet operating in Mauritania. The financial contribution paid by the European Union to Mauritania will however rise annually under the agreement's new budgetary clauses. The objectives of the Protocol that has just expired included development of small-scale fishing, creation of infrastructure and development of the fishing industry in Mauritania for the benefit of the local population and people employed in the fishing industry. However this did not happen; Mauritania did not give the small-scale fishing sector any support, a contradiction which calls the agreement's effectiveness and social impact into question, with this sector of the fleet also left in a socially and economically unsustainable situation and deriving no benefit from the agreement.

Galicia's EU fishing fleet will also suffer socioeconomic consequences as a result of being excluded from the agreement. Employees and firms in the cephalopod fleet that has been excluded from the agreement are based in Galician districts such as O Morrazo, areas that are highly dependent on fishing and, directly or indirectly, on this agreement in particular. This is, furthermore, a highly specialised fleet and people will find it difficult to find other employment in another type of fishing fleet.

Has the Commission provided for financial aid for the temporary or permanent cessation of fishing in order to mitigate the effects of its decision which excludes 24 Galician vessels from the agreement? What alternative solutions does the Commission envisage for this fleet?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(5 November 2012)

The Commission believes that the Protocol initialled on 26 July 2012 is the best deal the EU could get, and is by far preferable to a situation without a Protocol. It offers viable opportunities for the EU fleet, and ensures continuity of fishing operations, pending the provisional application of the Protocol. It was negotiated in full transparency and with the involvement of the stakeholders.

The initialed Protocol is in line with the mandate from the Council and the principles therein, in particular regarding the use of the best available scientific advice and targeting only the surplus resources. Concerning cephalopods, the best available scientific advice ([1]) is that stocks are currently overexploited and there is no surplus available. Hence, Mauritania has decided not to grant any fishing opportunities for the EU for this stock and to develop its own coastal fishery. While it was thus impossible to get a quota for cephalopods, the Protocol does include a review clause to ask for fishing opportunities if the stock recovers in the future. It should be noted however that, in line with Unclos, it will be at Mauritania's discretion whether to increase its own fishing effort, or to grant fishing opportunities to the EU.

To alleviate the socioeconomic consequences for the fleet concerned, Member States may decide to use the European Fisheries Fund to provide aid for temporary or permanent cessation of fishing activities. The Commission adopted a decision on 25 April 2012 in order to increase the flexibility in the use of temporary cessation for Spain.

([1]) http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/documents/43805/254315/11-11_STECF+11-18+-+Consolidated+Advice+on+Fish+Stocks_JRC67802.pdf

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007560/12
aan de Commissie
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE) en Marietje Schaake (ALDE)
(6 augustus 2012)

Betreft: Virtuele burgerwachten: online bedrijven controleren op crimineel gedrag

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van het feit dat Facebook de activiteiten van zijn gebruikers controleert op mogelijk crimineel gedrag?

2. Is de Commissie van mening dat dit een schending vormt van de in Europa van toepassing zijnde wetgeving op het gebied van gegevensbescherming en privacy?

3. Is de Commissie het ermee eens dat het onderzoeken van criminaliteit een taak is van de overheden en dat Facebook zich als virtuele burgerwacht gedraagt? Is de Commissie van mening dat deze manier van opsporing van criminaliteit op eigen initiatief door een particuliere onderneming zoals Facebook in overeenstemming is met de Europese wetgeving en wettelijke normen? Is de Commissie van mening dat een bedrijf dat binnen de EU opereert deze methoden uit de VS mag toepassen op zijn in de EU gevestigde gebruikers?

4. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van andere bedrijven uit de VS of uit andere landen buiten de EU die op dezelfde manier opereren?

5. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van de details van de methode die door Facebook wordt gebruikt? Is de Commissie bereid Facebook te vragen zijn methoden te verduidelijken, welke activiteiten het als „crimineel" bestempelt en op welke rechtsgronden, hoeveel gevallen er aan de autoriteiten zijn gemeld en tot hoeveel veroordelingen dit heeft geleid?

Antwoord van mevrouw Malmström namens de Commissie
(5 november 2012)

De preventie en bestrijding van criminaliteit en de bescherming van slachtoffers is een brede maatschappelijke verantwoordelijkheid van alle belanghebbende partijen. Voor de aanpak van strafbare feiten die worden gepleegd via internet, waarvan de infrastructuur voor het overgrote deel privaat is, zijn publiek-private partnerschappen van essentieel belang.

Het Europees Parlement en de Raad hebben zich bij de vaststelling van wetgeving en financiering altijd op dit standpunt gesteld ([1]). Ook steunt de Commissie de „coalitie van CEO's" die ernaar streeft internet geschikter te maken voor kinderen. Het gaat om een zelfreguleringsinitiatief dat tot moet leiden tot concrete maatregelen ten behoeve van alle kinderen. Het gaat de coalitie er onder meer om een veiliger internetomgeving tot stand te brengen en de online verspreiding van beelden van seksueel kindermisbruik, te bestrijden.

Wat betreft de activiteiten van Facebook is de Commissie ervan op de hoogte dat het NCMEC ([2]) en de internetindustrie in de Verenigde Staten samenwerken om te voorkomen dat beelden van seksueel kindermisbruik worden verspreid via internet ([3]). In het kader van die samenwerking controleert Facebook — met een door Microsoft ontwikkeld instrument waarmee beelden in digitale handtekeningen kunnen worden omgezet en codes kunnen worden vergeleken — of specifieke beelden van seksueel kindermisbruik die bekend zijn bij de overheid van de Verenigde Staten worden geüpload, om hiervan in voorkomend geval melding te maken.

([1]) Besluit van de Raad van 29 mei 2000 ter bestrijding van kinderpornografie op internet (PB L 138 van 9.6.2000, blz. 1), Besluit nr. 1351/2008/EG van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 16 december 2008 tot vaststelling van een meerjarenprogramma van de Gemeenschap betreffende de bescherming van kinderen die het internet en andere communicatietechnologieën gebruiken (PB L 348 van 24.12.2008, blz. 118), en Richtlijn 2011/93/EU van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 13 december 2011 ter bestrijding van seksueel misbruik en seksuele uitbuiting van kinderen en kinderpornografie, en ter vervanging van Kaderbesluit 2004/68/JBZ van de Raad, PB L 335 van 17.12.2011, blz. 1.

([2]) Het National Center for Missing and Exploited Children van de Verenigde Staten.

([3]) National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, jaarverslag 2011:
http://www.missingkids.com/en_US/publications/NC171.pdf
http://www.missingkids.com/missingkids/servlet/NewsEventServlet?LanguageCountry=en_US&PageId=4168
http://www.microsoft.com/en-us/news/press/2009/dec09/12-15photodnapr.aspx
http://blogs.technet.com/b/microsoft_blog/archive/2011/05/19/500-million-friends-against-child-exploitation.aspx

De Commissie is op de hoogte van de berichten in de media dat chatsessies en onlineberichten die mogelijk neerkomen op kinderlokken en waardoor kinderen het slachtoffer van seksueel misbruik kunnen worden, door Facebook automatisch worden ontdekt ([4]). Voor zover Facebook onderworpen is aan het nationaal recht, waarin de richtlijn gegevensbescherming is omgezet ([5]), moet het overeenkomstig de waarborgen ten aanzien van de gegevensbescherming en grondrechten handelen. De praktijken van Facebook op dit vlak worden momenteel door de Ierse gegevensbeschermingsautoriteit onderzocht.

([4]) http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/07/12/us-usa-internet-predators-idUSBRE86B05G20120712

([5]) Richtlijn 95/46/EG van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 24 oktober 1995 betreffende de bescherming van natuurlijke personen in verband met de verwerking van persoonsgegevens en betreffende het vrije verkeer van die gegevens, PB L 281 van 23.11.1995, blz. 31.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007560/12
to the Commission
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE) and Marietje Schaake (ALDE)
(6 August 2012)

Subject: Virtual vigilantes: online companies scanning for criminal behaviour

1. Is the Commission aware that Facebook scans the activities of its users for possible criminal behaviour?

2. Does the Commission consider that this constitutes a violation of laws on data protection and privacy that apply in Europe?

3. Does the Commission agree that responsibility for investigating crime lies with public authorities, and that Facebook is acting like a virtual vigilante? Does the Commission consider that action of this kind by a private company like Facebook to seek out crime at its own initiative is in line with European laws and legal standards? Does the Commission consider that a company operating within the EU from the US is authorised to apply this kind of method to its EU-based users?

4. Is the Commission aware of other companies operating in the same way, from the US or from other non-EU countries?

5. Is the Commission aware of the details of the method used by Facebook? Will the Commission ask Facebook to clarify its methods, which activities it qualifies as 'criminal' and on what legal grounds, how many cases have been reported to the authorities and how many convictions this has led to?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(5 November 2012)

The prevention of and fight against crime, and the protection of victims is a responsibility of society at large involving all stakeholders. Where offences are committed using the Internet, whose infrastructure is overwhelmingly private, public-private partnerships are essential to fight crime.

The European Parliament and the Council have consistently held this view when deciding on legislation and funding ([1]). The Commission, too, supports e.g. the CEO Coalition to make Internet a Better Place for Kids. This is a self-regulatory scheme to provide concrete measures for all children, including creating a safer online environment and fighting against child sexual abuse material online.

Concerning the activities of Facebook, the Commission is aware of the cooperation in place between the US NCMEC ([2]) and the US Internet industry to prevent the use of their infrastructure to disseminate child sexual abuse images ([3]). Within that scheme, Facebook checks — by using a tool developed by Microsoft to convert images into digital signatures and by comparing codes — whether specific child sexual abuse images known to US public authorities are being uploaded, and if so, reports them.

The Commission is also aware of media reports on Facebook conducting automatic detection of chats and postings that may amount to grooming and involve the risk of children becoming victims of sexual abuse offences ([4]). Insofar as Facebook is subject to national law implementing the Data Protection directive ([5]), it must act in accordance with data protection safeguards and fundamental rights. Facebook's practices in this are currently being investigated by the Irish Data Protection Authority.

([1]) Council Decision of 29 May 2000 to combat child pornography on the Internet, OJ L 138, 9.6.2000, pp. 1-4; Decision No 1351/2008/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2008 establishing a multiannual Community programme on protecting children using the Internet and other communication technologies, OJ L 348, 24.12.2008, p. 118; Directive 2011/93/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on combating the sexual abuse and sexual exploitation of children and child pornography, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2004/68/JHA, OJ L 335, 17.12.2011, p. 1.

([2]) National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

([3]) National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, Annual Report 2011:
http://www.missingkids.com/en_US/publications/NC171.pdf
http://www.missingkids.com/missingkids/servlet/NewsEventServlet?LanguageCountry=en_US&PageId=4168
http://www.microsoft.com/en-us/news/press/2009/dec09/12-15photodnapr.aspx
http://blogs.technet.com/b/microsoft_blog/archive/2011/05/19/500-million-friends-against-child-exploitation.aspx

([4]) http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/07/12/us-usa-Internet-predators-idUSBRE86B05G20120712

([5]) Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, OJ L 281, 23.11.1995, pp. 31-50.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007561/12
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(6 agosto 2012)

Oggetto: Gravissimo superamento dei limiti di legge degli inquinanti dell'aria in numerose città italiane, in palese violazione della direttiva 2008/50/CE relativa alla qualità dell'aria

I limiti di inquinamento dell'aria previsti dalla legge sono superati da molti anni in numerose città italiane in violazione della direttiva 2008/50/CE sulla qualità dell'aria ([1]), con gravi danni alla salute dei cittadini. La normativa fissa il limite di tolleranza giornaliero di concentrazione nell'aria del particolato fine PM10 a 50 µg/m^3, valore che non deve essere superato per più di 35 giorni all'anno ([2]).

I dati raccolti da Codacons ([3]), che ha recentemente lanciato una campagna di adesione all'azione collettiva «Italia Sotto Smog», dimostrano che nel 2010 ben 45 città italiane hanno superato i 35 giorni di sforamento consentiti, con casi eclatanti di città che hanno rasentato o superato i 100 sforamenti annui ([4]).

Nel 2011 la situazione è gravemente peggiorata. Le città capoluogo di provincia fuorilegge sono state ben 55 sulle 82 monitorate, come evidenziato dall'associazione Legambiente nel suo dossier «Mal'aria di città 2012» ([5]). Nel 2011 le città che hanno registrato oltre 100 superamenti annui sono salite a ben tredici ([6]). L'Italia settentrionale, e in particolare la Pianura Padana, si confermano come le zone più critiche: Torino, Milano e Verona sono le prime tre in classifica per quantità di superamenti annui, con rispettivamente 159, 131 e 130 sforamenti. In Veneto, ad esempio, ben 6 capoluoghi di provincia su 7 non rispettano i limiti imposti dalla legge. Nella Pianura Padana, ad esempio a Milano, Brescia, Verona, Padova, Treviso e Ferrara l'inquinamento è stato così consistente, che a gennaio si è registrato un importante e diffuso fenomeno della «neve chimica» ([7]), una pioggia di ghiaccio dovuta alla condensazione del vapore acqueo sul particolato presente nell'aria.

La direttiva 2008/50/CE ha reso definitivamente obbligatorio anche il monitoraggio del PM2,5, il particolato ultrafine che rappresenta la parte più nociva delle polveri sottili. Tuttavia, a causa del sistema di misurazione, le prime valutazioni sulla quantità di PM2,5 nell'aria arriveranno solo nel 2013. Una riduzione dei livelli di PM10 e PM2,5 allungherebbe l'aspettativa di vita della popolazione, riducendo l'insorgenza di molte gravi malattie, con consistenti benefici economici in termini di risparmio di spese sanitarie.

Alla luce di quanto esposto, considerata l'indifferenza delle regioni interessate, come ad esempio il Veneto, come intende procedere la Commissione nei confronti dell'Italia, affinché i cittadini possano beneficiare dell'applicazione di questa direttiva, come avviene nel resto dell'Europa, evitando che respirino aria avvelenata?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(2 ottobre 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza dei problemi di inquinamento dell'aria ambiente cui fa riferimento l'onorevole parlamentare e ha adito la Corte di giustizia (causa C-68/11) in relazione ad una possibile violazione del diritto UE.

([1]) Applicata in Italia dal Decreto Legislativo 13 agosto 2010 n. 155.
([2]) Cfr. l'allegato XI del d.lgs. n. 155 del 13/08/2010.
([3]) Coordinamento delle associazioni per la difesa dell'ambiente e dei diritti degli utenti e dei consumatori.
([4]) Cfr.: http://www.codacons.it/articoli/italia_sotto_smog_clamorosa_azione_collettiva_del_codacons_24 8995.html
([5]) Il dossier è disponibile al link: http://www.legambiente.it/sites/default/files/docs/dossier_malaria_2012_finale.pdf
([6]) Nel 2012 Torino e Frosinone. Nel 2011 Torino, Milano, Verona, Alessandria, Monza, Asti, Brescia, Vicenza, Cremona, Frosinone, Mantova, Pavia e Treviso.
([7]) Cfr. Il Gazzettino, edizione di Padova, 21/01/2012, p. 23, il Resto del Carlino, edizione di Ferrara, 19/01/2012 http://www.il restodelcarlino.it/ferrara/cronaca/2012/0/19/655569-neve_artificiale_sulla_città.shtml e il Corriere della Sera, 17/01/2012 http://www.corriere.it/scienze_e_tecnologie/12_gennaio_17/neve-chimica-smog-caprara_e4d06b6c-40d6-11 e 1-b71c-2a80ccba9858.shtml

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007561/12
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(6 August 2012)

Subject: Air pollution well over legal limits in many Italian cities, in clear breach of Directive 2008/50/EC on air quality

Legally established limits for air pollution have been exceeded for many years now in a great many Italian towns and cities, with serious affects on public health and in breach of Directive 2008/50/EC on air quality ([1]). Legally, the daily tolerance level for concentrations in the air of fine particle pollution PM10 stands at 50 µg/m^3, a figure that may not be exceeded for more than 35 days in the year ([2]).

Data collected by Codacons ([3]), an Italian consumer and environmental protection association which recently launched a membership campaign for 'Italia Sotto Smog' [Italy under smog], show that, in 2010, this limit was exceeded for more than the 35 days permitted in 45 Italian towns or cities, with some particularly striking cases where pollution was higher than permitted nearly or more than 100 times in the year ([4]).

The situation became a great deal worse in 2011. Out of the 82 provincial capitals monitored, 55 were outside the legal limits, as confirmed by the association Legambiente in its report 'Mal'aria di città 2012' ([5]). In 2011, 13 towns recorded excess pollution levels more than 100 times in the year ([6]). Northern Italy, and the Po Valley in particular, were confirmed as being the worst affected areas: Turin, Milan and Verona top the list for the number of days per year over the pollution limit, with 159, 131 and 130 days respectively. In Veneto, for example, six out of seven provincial capitals do not comply with the legal limits. In the Po Valley, in Milan, Brescia, Verona, Padova, Treviso and Ferrara for example, pollution is now so constant that a widespread major occurrence of the 'chemical cloud' phenomenon ([7]), icy rain caused by condensation of steam in the particulate matter present in the air, was recorded in January.

Directive 2008/50/EC has also made it mandatory to monitor PM2.5, the fine particle that is the most harmful form of fine particle pollution. However, owing to the measuring system, initial figures on the amount of PM2.5 in the air will not be available until 2013. A drop in PM10 and PM2.5 levels would extend the population's life expectation, lessening the onset of very serious illnesses, with substantial economic benefits in terms of savings on health costs.

In light of the aforegoing and the indifference displayed by the regions concerned, such as Veneto for example, what action will the Commission take against Italy to ensure that the public may benefit from enforcement of the terms of this directive, as occurs in the rest of the European Union, and no longer be obliged to breath in poisoned air?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(2 October 2012)

The Commission is aware of the ambient air pollution problems mentioned by the Honourable Member and, in relation to the possible breach of EU legislation, has brought the case before the Court of Justice (Case C-68/11).

([1]) Transposed in Italy through Legislative Decree No 155 of 13 August 2010.
([2]) See: Annex XI of Leg. Decree No 155 of 13.8.2010.
([3]) Coordination of associations for the protection of the environment and the rights of users and consumers.
([4]) See: http://www.codacons.it/articoli/italia_sotto_smog_clamorosa_azione_collettiva_del_codacons_24 8995.html
([5]) Can be consulted at: http://www.legambiente.it/sites/default/files/docs/dossier_malaria_2012_finale.pdf
([6]) In 2012 Turin and Frosinone. In 2011 Turin, Milan, Verona, Alessandria, Monza, Asti, Brescia, Vicenza, Cremona, Frosinone, Mantova, Pavia and Treviso.
([7]) See: Il Gazzettino, Padova edition, 21.1.2012, p. 23, Il Resto del Carlino, Ferrara edition, 19.1.2012 http://www.il restodelcarlino.it/ferrara/cronaca/2012/0/19/655569-neve_artificiale_sulla_città.shtml and il Corriere della Sera, 17/01/2012 http://www.corriere.it/scienze_e_tecnologie/12_gennaio_17/neve-chimica-smog-caprara_e4d06b6c-40d6-11 e 1-b71c-2a80ccba9858.shtml

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007571/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(7 août 2012)

Objet: Droits d'auteur et informatique en nuage

Au sujet de l'informatique en nuage (ou cloud computing), un pan entier de la réflexion porte sur les droits d'auteur. En principe, le nuage n'a de sens que si l'utilisateur est libre d'avoir accès à son contenu à partir de différents appareils et de territoires multiples.

1. Le stockage hors site des données n'ouvre-t-il pas la porte à la collecte et à la copie de contenu protégé par le droit d'auteur et ne permet-il pas d'accéder à ce contenu à tout endroit?

2. Quelle est, au fond, la stratégie à ce sujet, ainsi que les perspectives chiffrées?

Réponse donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission
(31 octobre 2012)

L'informatique en nuage est l'utilisation via un réseau numérique de ressources informatiques multiples qui se trouvent sur des serveurs. Elle peut être utilisée pour une large gamme de services, notamment la fourniture active d'accès à des contenus créatifs que les utilisateurs peuvent télécharger sur leurs dispositifs et/ou auxquels ils peuvent accéder en continu sur l'internet. La fourniture active d'accès est souvent associée à un outil de synchronisation qui permet à différents services d'utiliser les mêmes contenus. Il se peut que les contenus proposés par les fournisseurs de services en nuage soient protégés par le droit d'auteur ou des droits voisins au titre du cadre européen sur le droit d'auteur ([1]). Dans ce cas, des accords de licence spécifiques doivent être conclus avec le titulaire du droit d'auteur concerné. Des services tels qu'iTunes ou Ultraviolet démontrent que des accords de licence souples sont négociés, au titre du cadre juridique actuel de l'UE, entre les titulaires de droits et les fournisseurs de services en nuage, de façon à mettre à la disposition des consommateurs, partout dans l'UE, toute une série de services novateurs. Il peut s'avérer plus difficile aux entreprises européennes de taille plus petite d'obtenir les licences nécessaires dans le cadre juridique actuel. La Commission étudiera dès lors comment faciliter davantage encore la conclusion de contrats de licence pour ces services en nuage innovants.

Bien qu'il n'existe pas encore de données générales concernant les différents types de services en nuage utilisant des contenus créatifs, l'évolution du marché de la musique en ligne peut être considérée comme représentative de la tendance générale au niveau mondial. Selon les prévisions, le marché mondial de la musique numérique devrait tripler de volume ([2]) d'ici à 2015 et son chiffre d'affaires devrait atteindre 10 milliards d'euros. En Suède et au Royaume-Uni, par exemple, les ventes de musique dans le nuage représentent actuellement 25-30 % de la totalité du marché des ventes de musique. Le 27 septembre 2012, la Commission a adopté une communication intitulée «Exploiter le potentiel de l'informatique en nuage en Europe» ([3]) qui recense notamment les questions inhérentes au cadre juridique actuel de l'UE dans le contexte spécifique du nuage.

([1]) En particulier les droits de reproduction et de mise à la disposition du public prévus aux articles 2 et 3 de la directive 2001/29/CE.
([2]) Par rapport à 2010.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/cloudcomputing/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007571/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(7 August 2012)

Subject: Copyright and cloud computing

The issue of copyright protection is an important aspect of the debate on cloud computing. In principle, cloud computing does not make sense unless users are free to access their content via different devices and from a number of different locations.

1. Does not off-site data storage open the door to the collection and duplication of copyright material and make it possible to access this content from any location?

2. What is the Commission's basic strategy in this area, and what is its estimate of the figures likely to be involved?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(31 October 2012)

Cloud computing refers to the use of multiple server-based computing resources via a digital network. It may be used for the provision of a wide range of services, including for the active provision of access to creative content, by allowing users both to download it onto their devices and/or to stream it. Active provision of access is often coupled with a synchronisation tool which allows content to be accessed from different devices. Content provided by cloud-based service providers may be protected by copyrights or related rights under the EU copyright framework ([1]). Where this is the case, this requires specific licensing agreements to be concluded with any relevant copyright holder. Services such as iTunes or Ultraviolet demonstrate that under the current EU legal framework, flexible licensing agreements are being entered into between right holders and cloud-based service providers, in such a way so as to make available a variety of innovative services to consumers across the EU. Smaller EU companies may have a harder time to get all the licences they need under the current framework. The Commission will, therefore, examine how licences for such innovative cloud-based services can be further facilitated.

Although no generalised data relating to all type of cloud-based services using creative content are available yet, the way the online music market is evolving may be representative of general global trends. Forecasts show that by 2015 the global digital music market is expected to triple in size ([2]) with global revenues reaching EUR 10 billion. In Sweden and the United Kingdom, for example, cloud-based sales of music currently represent 25-30% of the entire music sales market. On 27 September 2012, the Commission adopted a communication 'Unleashing the Potential of Cloud Computing in Europe' ([3]) which identifies *inter alia* cloud-specific issues pertaining to the current EU legal framework.

([1]) In particular pertaining to the reproduction and making available rights as laid down in Articles 2 and 3 of the Directive 2001/29/EC.
([2]) As compared to 2010.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/cloudcomputing/index_en.htm

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007573/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(7 août 2012)

Objet: Google contre Commission

On sait que Google est sous les feux de la Commission, notamment pour abus de position dominante. En août 2011, il était indiqué que «la Commission enquêtera sur la question de savoir si Google a abusé d'une position dominante dans le marché de la recherche en ligne en abaissant dans ses résultats de recherche gratuits le rang de services concurrents qui se spécialisent dans la fourniture aux utilisateurs de certains types de contenu spécifiques tels que les comparateurs de prix (ces fournisseurs de services sont connus sous le nom de services de recherche verticaux), ainsi qu'en accordant à ses propres services de recherche verticaux un placement préférentiel, afin d'exclure les services concurrents. La Commission enquêtera également sur les allégations selon lesquelles Google aurait dégradé le "score de qualité" de services de recherche verticaux concurrents dans ses résultats de recherche payants. Le "score de qualité" est un des facteurs qui détermine le prix à payer pour l'affichage d'une publicité sur Google».

Google a dernièrement proposé des concessions à la Commission. Antoine Colombani, le porte-parole du commissaire Joaquin Almunia, a indiqué qu'elles constituaient «une bonne base de discussion».

— Comment est-il possible d'évoquer des concessions ou même des transactions, voire des négociations?

— La loi n'est-elle pas la même pour tous? En quoi la Commission devrait-elle transiger avec un opérateur privé?

Réponse donnée par M. Almunia au nom de la Commission
(4 octobre 2012)

Quatre types de pratiques commerciales employées par Google pourraient constituer un abus de position dominante au regard de l'article 102 du TFUE. Préoccupée par cette situation, la Commission a entamé des discussions avec l'entreprise.

Si, à l'issue de ces discussions, Google propose des solutions répondant à ces préoccupations, elle pourrait adopter une décision les rendant obligatoires, conformément à l'article 9 du règlement (CE) n° 1/2003 ([1]).

Elle estime que si Google propose des solutions satisfaisantes, la concurrence pourrait être rétablie rapidement et sans heurts dans ces marchés très fluctuants, ce qui profiterait aux consommateurs européens. Les plaignants et les tierces parties seraient dûment associés à ce processus et toute solution définitive proposée par Google serait mise à l'essai sur le marché avant d'être rendue légalement obligatoire. Comme l'a confirmé la Cour de justice dans l'arrêt Alrosa ([2]), la procédure décrite par l'article 9 du règlement (CE) n° 1/2003 vise à garantir l'application efficace des règles de concurrence posées par le traité grâce à des engagements obligatoires, si ceux-ci sont jugés appropriés par la Commission, afin de résoudre plus rapidement le problème de concurrence qu'elle a identifié, au lieu de suivre la procédure formelle de constatation d'une infraction.

La Commission tient aussi à préciser que si les discussions avec Google n'aboutissent pas, elle poursuivra la procédure formelle indiquée à l'article 7 du règlement (CE) n° 1/2003.

Enfin, elle aimerait assurer l'auteur de la question de sa détermination à faire respecter les règles européennes de concurrence, dans l'intérêt du consommateur.

([1]) JO L 1 du 04.01.2003, p. 1.
([2]) Arrêt de la Cour du 29 juin 2010 dans l'affaire C-441/07 P (Commission v Alrosa Company Ltd), RCE 2010, p. I-05949, paragraphe 35.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007573/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(7 August 2012)

Subject: Google v the Commission

Google is known to be in the Commission's sights, particularly as regards abuse of its dominant position. In August 2011, the Commission issued the following announcement: 'The Commission will investigate whether Google has abused a dominant market position in online search by allegedly lowering the ranking of unpaid search results of competing services which are specialised in providing users with specific online content such as price comparisons (so-called vertical search services) and by according preferential placement to the results of its own vertical search services in order to shut out competing services. The Commission will also look into allegations that Google lowered the "Quality Score" for sponsored links of competing vertical search services. The Quality Score is one of the factors that determine the price paid to Google by advertisers.'

Google recently offered to make certain concessions, which Antoine Colombani, spokesperson for Commissioner Joaquin Almunia, described as 'a good basis' for further talks.

— How can there be any talk of concessions, deals or, indeed, negotiations?

— Is not the law the same for everyone? Why should the Commission bargain with a private operator?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(4 October 2012)

The Commission has initiated discussions with Google regarding possible remedies to address the Commission's concern that four types of Google business practices may constitute an abuse of a dominant position within the meaning of Article 102 TFEU.

Should these discussions result in Google offering remedies which meet the Commission's four concerns, this would allow the Commission to adopt a commitment decision pursuant to Article 9 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2003 ([1]).

The Commission believes that if Google were to offer sufficient remedies to address the concerns, competition in these fast moving markets could be restored swiftly at an early stage to the benefit of European consumers. Complainants and interested third parties would be duly associated with such a process and any final remedies proposal by Google would be market-tested before it is made legally binding by the Commission. As the Court of Justice has confirmed in the Alrosa judgment ([2]) the procedure under Article 9 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2003 is intended to ensure that the competition rules laid down in the Treaty are applied effectively by making commitments, if considered appropriate by the Commission, binding in order to provide a more rapid solution to the competition problems identified by the Commission, instead of proceeding by making a formal finding of an infringement.

The Commission would also like to point out that should the discussions with Google fail to deliver a satisfactory set of remedies, the Commission will continue with formal proceedings under Article 7 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2003.

Finally, the Commission would like to assure the Honourable Member that it remains committed to ensuring the full respect of European competition rules for the benefit of consumers.

([1]) OJ L 1, 4.1.2003, p. 1.
([2]) Judgment of the Court of 29 June 2010 in Case C-441/07 P (*Commission* v *Alrosa Company Ltd*), ECR 2010, p. I-05949, paragraph 35.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007583/12
aan de Commissie
Barry Madlener (NI)
(8 augustus 2012)

Betreft: Falend Griekenland

1. Is de Commissie bekend met de berichten dat de Grieken fors achter lopen op schema en niet kunnen voldoen aan de eisen van de EU en het IMF?

2. Hoe beoordeelt zij het dat van de 300 hervormingsmaatregelen 210 maatregelen niet zijn uitgevoerd door Griekenland?

3. Klopt het dat nog steeds wordt gefraudeerd met uitkeringen, zoals de 30 000 pensioenen aan (waarschijnlijk) overleden personen en het gesjoemel met blindenuitkeringen, zoals de 700 „blinden" op het eiland Zakynthos waarvan er slechts 60 echt blind zijn?

4. Is de Commissie het met ons eens dat de Grieken zich keer op keer niet aan de afspraken houden en dat onderhand.d. maat vol is?

5. Naar verwachting krimpt de Griekse economie dit jaar met 6,7 %, terwijl was gerekend met een krimp van 4,5 %. De werkloosheid is gestegen van 16,5 % van de beroepsbevolking naar 22,5 %, een stijging van 36,4 %! Hoe kunnen de Grieken in deze omstandigheden de gestelde bezuinigingsdoelen halen? Is de Commissie niet bezig te trekken aan een dood paard?

6. Gaat de Commissie de aanvraag om uitstel van betaling en de uitbetaling van de volgende tranches blokkeren als Griekenland zich niet aan de afspraken heeft gehouden? Zo nee, waarom niet?

Antwoord van de heer Rehn namens de Commissie
(30 oktober 2012)

Antwoord op de punten 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 en 6.

De Commissie gaat niet in op speculatieve persberichten. Momenteel is een eerste controlebezoek van de trojka ([1]) aan de gang in het kader van het in juni 2012 van start gegane tweede economische aanpassingsprogramma voor Griekenland. Met het controlebezoek wordt in de eerste plaats beoogd ervoor te zorgen dat passende stappen worden ondernomen ten aanzien van de toekomstige begrotingen en de noodzakelijke structurele en budgettaire hervormingen. De Griekse autoriteiten hebben zich vastbesloten getoond het nodige te doen om het programma weer op schema te krijgen: zij hebben de vereiste maatregelen getroffen om de onderschrijding van de doelstellingen voor 2012 ten dele te compenseren, ondanks het feit dat de recessie dieper is uitgevallen dan verwacht. Uit de besprekingen van de Europese Raad blijkt dat in de nabije toekomst een overeenkomst met de Griekse autoriteiten wordt verwacht.

De Commissie heeft er alle vertrouwen in dat Griekenland de structurele zwakheden van zijn economie kordaat zal aanpakken en zijn verbintenissen zal nakomen. De in het tweede aanpassingsprogramma uitgestippelde basisstrategie is nog steeds geldig en blijft dan ook onveranderd. Het terugdringen van het tekort en het wederom houdbaar maken van de schuld zijn van cruciaal belang om het evenwicht van de economie te herstellen. Alleen als de in het economische aanpassingsprogramma beschreven lopende budgettaire en structurele hervormingen worden voortgezet, zullen het internationale concurrentievermogen en de budgettaire en financiële houdbaarheid worden hersteld, waardoor een welvarender toekomst in de eurozone zal worden verzekerd. De genoemde hervormingen zijn dan ook noodzakelijk om de toekomstige welvaart van Griekenland veilig te stellen.

Wat de uitkeringsfraude betreft, is de Commissie goed op de hoogte, zowel van de feiten die de Griekse overheid aan het licht brengt en openbaar maakt, als van de kordate stappen en acties die zij onderneemt om paal en perk te stellen aan misbruik en verspilling.

([1]) De trojka bestaat uit medewerkers van de Europese Commissie, de ECB en het IMF.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007583/12
to the Commission
Barry Madlener (NI)
(8 August 2012)

Subject: Greece found wanting

1. Is the Commission aware of the reports that the Greeks are far behind schedule and cannot comply with the requirements of the EU and IMF?

2. What view does the Commission take of the fact that, of the 300 reform measures, Greece has failed to implement 210?

3. Is it true that benefit fraud is still going on, for example that 30 000 pensions are being paid to people who are (probably) dead and that benefits for the blind are being paid without justification, for instance to many of the 700 'blind people' on the island of Zakynthos, only 60 of whom are genuinely blind?

4. Does the Commission agree that, time and again, the Greeks have failed to respect agreements and that now enough is enough?

5. This year, the Greek economy is expected to shrink by 6.7%, rather than the anticipated 4.5%. Unemployment has risen from 16.5% of the workforce to 22.5%, an increase of 36.4%! In these circumstances, how can the Greeks attain the targets which have been set for budget cuts? Is the Commission not dealing with a hopeless case here?

6. Will the Commission block the application for a longer repayment period — and withhold the next tranches — unless Greece complies with the agreements? If not, why not?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(30 October 2012)

Answer to points 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6.

The Commission does not comment on speculative press reports. The troika ([1]) is carrying out the first review mission under the 2nd Economic Adjustment Programme for Greece since June 2012. The main objectives of the mission are to ensure that appropriate steps are taken concerning future budgets and necessary structural and fiscal reforms. The Greek authorities have shown a strong commitment to take the necessary steps to bring the programme back on track, by delivering the measures required to fill the part of the gap which has emerged with respect to the 2012 targets, notwithstanding the deeper than expected recession. As discussed at the European Council, an agreement with the Greek authorities is expected in the near future.

The Commission is confident that Greece will resolutely address the structural weaknesses of its economy, and respect its commitments. The basic strategy set out in the Second Adjustment Programme is valid and remains intact. The reduction in the deficit and restoring debt sustainability are of critical importance to rebalance the economy. Continuing the ongoing fiscal and structural reforms spelled out in the Economic Adjustment Programme is the only way to regain international competitiveness, fiscal and financial sustainability, and to therefore ensure a more prosperous future in the euro area. These reforms are needed to deliver the future prosperity of Greece.

Concerning benefit fraud, the Commission is well aware of the facts which the Greek Government is discovering and making public, as well as the resolute steps and actions that it is undertaking to fight abuse and waste.

([1]) The Troika consists of staff from the European Commission, the ECB and the IMF.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007588/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 août 2012)

Objet: Sanction de surpêche

Les États membres qui ont dépassé à plusieurs reprises les limites imposées par l'Union en matière de pêche bénéficieront de quotas très réduits cette année, dans la mesure où l'Union veut à tout prix garantir une pêche durable, selon ce qu'a annoncé la Commission le mercredi 1er août.

Les pays les plus concernés sont la France, le Portugal et l'Espagne.

Les quotas sont généralement réduits sur la base du pourcentage de surpêche de l'État.

La France, le Portugal et l'Espagne se sont contentés de pratiquer la surpêche sur les mêmes espèces dans les mêmes zones au cours de ces trois dernières années.

La sanction prise envers ces pays consiste à réduire de 50 % cette année leur quota en comparaison avec leurs limites de 2011.

1. La Commission compte-elle se borner à ce genre de sanctions?

2. Ces sanctions pourraient-elles être assorties d'une peine d'intérêt général infligée à l'État en tort comme une revalorisation de la faune et des fonds marins, des investissements dans la pisciculture ou toute autre alternative au type de pêche pour laquelle cet État a été sanctionné, ou toute autre piste mettant la durabilité de la nature en avant?

Réponse donnée par Mme Damanaki au nom de la Commission
(7 octobre 2012)

Le règlement de l'Union relatif au contrôle de la pêche prévoit des déductions de quotas comme mesures visant à assurer une exploitation durable des ressources, et aucune sanction. En fonction du volume de la surpêche, un coefficient multiplicateur est appliqué au quota déduit. Lorsqu'un même quota est surexploité à plusieurs reprises, lorsque la surpêche constitue une grave menace pour la conservation du stock surexploité ou lorsque le stock surexploité fait l'objet d'un plan de gestion, un coefficient multiplicateur supplémentaire de 1,5 est appliqué.

Lorsque la surpêche risque de menacer gravement la conservation des ressources aquatiques vivantes, la Commission peut suspendre, voire supprimer, l'aide financière de l'Union accordée au titre du règlement (CE) n° 1198/2006 en faveur des mesures dont l'efficacité est compromise ou susceptible de l'être en cas de non-respect. Si l'État membre concerné ne respecte pas ses obligations relatives à la mise en œuvre d'un plan de gestion, la Commission peut également fermer la pêcherie concernée. Lorsque le non-respect des règles du plan pluriannuel risque de menacer gravement la conservation des stocks visés par ce plan pluriannuel, la Commission peut également prendre des mesures supplémentaires, à savoir la déduction de quotas pour non-respect des règles applicables.

Le non-respect d'une limitation de captures constitue également une infraction à une obligation découlant du droit de l'Union lui-même qui peut être portée devant la Cour de justice de l'Union européenne. À l'exception de ces mesures, la législation de l'Union ne prévoit pas la possibilité d'accompagner ce type de mesures d'un «service communautaire» qui se concentrerait sur la durabilité de la nature.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007588/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 August 2012)

Subject: Overfishing penalty

On Wednesday 1 August the Commission announced that Member States which had repeatedly exceeded the fishing limits imposed on them by the EU would receive greatly reduced fishing quotas this year, insofar as the EU wanted to ensure, at all costs, that fisheries were sustainable.

The countries most affected by this are France, Portugal and Spain.

Quotas are generally reduced in accordance with the percentage of overfishing of the country concerned.

France, Portugal and Spain have contented themselves with overfishing the same species in the same areas over the past three years.

The penalty imposed on these countries will consist of reducing their quota this year by 50% compared to their 2011 quota.

1. Will the Commission confine itself to this kind of penalty?

2. Could these penalties not be accompanied by a kind of 'community service' imposed on the state at fault, such as a requirement to restore marine wildlife and the seabed, to invest in fish farming or an alternative type of fishing to that for which the state has been punished, or any other measures that focus on the sustainability of nature?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(17 October 2012)

The EU fisheries control regulation foresees deductions of quotas as measures aiming at achieving the sustainable exploitation of the resources, and not penalties. Depending on the size of the overfishing a multiplying factor is applied to the deducted quota. In case the same quota has been overfished repeatedly, when overfishing constitutes a serious threat to the conservation of the overfishing stock, or if the overfished stock is subject to a management plan, an additional multiplying factor of 1.5 applies.

If the overfishing might lead to a serious threat to the conservation of living aquatic resources the Commission may suspend, and possibly cancel, Union financial assistance under Regulation (EC) No 1198/2006. This is possible for those measures where the effectiveness is affected or is likely to be affected, by the non-compliance.- In case the Member State concerned does not respect its obligations for the implementation of a management plan the Commission may also close the fishery concerned. Where the non-compliance with rules of a multiannual plan might lead to a serious threat to the conservation of the stocks under such a multiannual plan, the Commission may also additionally deduct quotas for failure to comply with such rules.

The non-compliance with a catch limitation constitutes also an infringement of an obligation under Union law in its own right which may be brought before the European Court of Justice.

Apart from these measures Union legislation does not foresee the possibility to accompany any such measure with a sort of 'Community service' that would focus on the sustainability of nature.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007589/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 août 2012)

Objet: Initiative citoyenne européenne vidée de son sens?

Instaurée par le traité de Lisbonne, l'initiative citoyenne européenne (ICE) est une nouvelle forme de participation à l'élaboration des politiques de l'Union européenne. Conformément au traité et sur la base d'une proposition de la Commission, le Parlement européen et le Conseil ont adopté un règlement qui définit les règles et les procédures d'utilisation de ce nouvel instrument. L'initiative citoyenne européenne permet à un minimum d'un million de citoyens issus d'au moins un quart des États membres de l'Union d'inviter la Commission à présenter des propositions d'actes juridiques dans des domaines relevant de sa compétence. Les organisateurs d'une initiative citoyenne doivent former un comité des citoyens composé d'au moins sept citoyens de l'Union résidant dans au moins sept États membres différents. Ils disposent d'une année pour recueillir les déclarations de soutien nécessaires. Le nombre de déclarations de soutien doit être certifié par les autorités compétentes dans les États membres. La Commission dispose alors de trois mois pour examiner l'initiative et décider de la suite à lui donner.

1. Cependant, plus de transparence ne serait-elle pas nécessaire vis-à-vis du citoyen et ce, quant à l'enregistrement des initiatives, dans la mesure où plusieurs raisons peuvent être invoquées pour le rejet d'une ICE? Une initiative peut en effet être rejetée si elle va à l'encontre des valeurs de l'Union, ne relève pas de la compétence de la Commission ou est manifestement abusive, fantaisiste ou vexatoire.

Ces règles ne sont-elles pas trop vagues et ne permettent-elles pas à la Commission de bloquer une ICE sans qu'elle ait été nécessairement examinée en profondeur plus en amont; ce qui devrait pourtant être la règle?

2. La Commission a déclaré qu'elle n'enregistrerait pas les ICE proposant des amendements aux traités de l'Union, dans la mesure où elles pourraient aller à l'encontre des propositions en cours.

Cela ne vide-t-il pas partiellement de sa substance les ICE? En effet, cela risque de tuer dans l'œuf de nombreuses ICE, étant donné que la Commission elle-même est habilitée à proposer des amendements aux traités? Quelle est l'argumentation de la Commission à ce propos?

3. Dispose-t-on de statistiques sur les ICE déposées, acceptées et refusées?

Réponse donnée par M. Šefčovič au nom de la Commission
(24 septembre 2012)

1. Toute décision de refus d'enregistrement d'une proposition d'initiative citoyenne européenne (ICE) doit préciser les motifs de ce refus, si l'une des conditions prévues à l'article 4, paragraphe 2, du règlement ICE n'est pas remplie. Pour des raisons de transparence, ces décisions sont publiées sur le site web consacré à l'ICE ([1]). Les destinataires de telles décisions peuvent saisir les juridictions européennes s'ils estiment que les refus ne sont pas justifiés sur le fond. Ils sont également en droit de déposer une plainte auprès du médiateur européen pour mauvaise administration.

2. En effet, la Commission ne peut enregistrer une ICE qui viserait à faire modifier les traités de l'UE. Ce principe découle directement du libellé de l'article 11, paragraphe 4, du Traité UE, qui dispose qu'une proposition d'ICE doit consister à «inviter la Commission européenne, dans le cadre de ses attributions, à soumettre une proposition appropriée sur des questions pour lesquelles ces citoyens considèrent qu'un acte juridique de l'Union est nécessaire aux fins de l'application des traités».

3. La plupart des renseignements demandés figurent sur le site web ICE, qui fournit des informations directes sur:

— toutes les initiatives enregistrées en attente de signatures,

— toutes les initiatives clôturées,

— toutes les initiatives obsolètes ([2]), et

— toutes les initiatives non enregistrées (voir ci-dessus).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/citizens-initiative/public/initiatives/non-registered
([2]) Pour les trois catégories, voir la page d'accueil du site web ICE: http://ec.europa.eu/citizens-initiative/public/welcome?lg=fr

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007589/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 August 2012)

Subject: Is the European Citizens' Initiative being undermined?

Established by the Treaty of Lisbon, the European Citizens' Initiative (ECI) is a new form of participation in the framing of EU policies. In accordance with the Treaty and on the basis of a Commission proposal, the European Parliament and the Council have adopted a regulation which sets out the rules and procedures for using this new instrument. The ECI enables a minimum of one million citizens from at least one quarter of EU Member States to call on the Commission to submit proposals for legal acts in areas in which it has the power to act. The organisers of a citizens' initiative have to form a citizens' committee made up of at least seven EU citizens residing in at least seven different Member States. They have one year in which to collect the necessary statements of support. The number of statements of support has to be certified by the competent authorities in the Member States. The Commission then has three months in which to consider the initiative and decide on the action to be taken.

1. However, should there not be more transparency for citizens with regard to the registration of initiatives, insofar as several reasons can be given for rejecting an ECI? Indeed, an initiative may be rejected if it is contrary to the values of the Union, if it falls outside the framework of the Commission's powers or if it is manifestly unreasonable, frivolous or vexatious.

Are these rules not too vague and do they not enable the Commission to halt an ECI without it having necessarily been scrutinised further upstream, which should be the rule?

2. The Commission has stated that it will not register any ECIs that propose amendments to the EU treaties, insofar as they could run counter to current proposals.

Does this not partially defeat the purpose of ECIs? Indeed, could this not nip many ECIs in the bud, given that the Commission itself has the power to propose amendments to the treaties? What is the Commission's reasoning in this regard?

3. Does the Commission have any statistics on ECIs that have been submitted, accepted and rejected?

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

1. Any decision refusing registration of a proposed ECI has to provide reasons for such refusal, if one of the conditions foreseen by Article 4(2) of the ECI Regulation is not fulfilled. For the sake of transparency, such decisions are published on the ECI website ([1]). The rejections can be challenged at the European Courts by their addressees, should they consider them not to be justified on substance or they can be subject to a complaint to the European Ombudsman in case of a supposed maladministration.

2. Indeed, the Commission cannot register an ECI which would propose amendments to the EU treaties. This is a direct consequence of the wording of Article 11(4) of TUE, which provides that a proposed ECI should fit '[…] within the framework of [the Commission's] powers, to submit any appropriate proposal on matters where citizens consider that a legal act of the Union is required for the purpose of implementing the Treaties'.

3. Most of the requested information can be found on the ECI website, which provides direct information on:

— all registered initiatives open for signatures;

— all closed initiatives;

— all obsolete initiatives ([2]); and

— all non-registered initiatives (see above).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/citizens-initiative/public/initiatives/non-registered
([2]) For all three categories see on the homepage of the ECI website: http://ec.europa.eu/citizens-initiative/public/welcome?lg=en

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007594/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 août 2012)

Objet: Accord UE-Asie: Danger pour le secteur automobile européen

L'accord commercial passé entre l'Union européenne et la Corée prévoit que les deux partenaires doivent éliminer progressivement 98 % de leurs droits de douane. Ce texte contient également la suppression de barrières non douanières, notamment de certaines réglementations et normes dans le secteur de l'automobile, des médicaments et de l'électronique grand public. En résumé, pour que la Corée vende mieux ses produits à l'Union, et inversement, les frais et les procédures sont quasiment réduits à néant. À titre de comparaison, les automobiles japonaises, produites hors de l'Union, se voient imposer des droits d'entrée de 10 % à leur arrivée sur le marché européen — un droit dont la Corée est aujourd'hui dispensée.

À première vue, c'est un accord avantageux pour les deux parties, à ce détail près que, même si les deux parties tirent profit de cet accord, la Corée en bénéficie bien davantage que l'Europe. En effet, au cours des onze mois qui ont suivi la signature de l'accord, la Corée du Sud a exporté dans l'Union européenne 400 000 voitures assemblées localement, ce qui représente une hausse de 40 % par rapport à la même période l'année précédente. Dans le même temps, le pays a importé 73 000 véhicules européens, soit une hausse de 13 %.

1. Les conditions d'une mise sous surveillance sont-elles réunies, comme le déclare le gouvernement français?

2. Le commissaire De Gucht a annoncé «la première d'une longue série en cours de négociations avec nos partenaires en Asie». On sait que le Japon fait partie de la liste. Quels sont les autres partenaires?

3. Si l'accord avec le Japon est, dans les grandes lignes, similaire à celui passé avec la Corée et que les conséquences sont globalement les mêmes, on peut aisément imaginer que la production automobile européenne sera gravement en danger. Est-ce un facteur qui entre en ligne de compte pour la Commission? Cela fait-il partie des scénarios étudiés?

4. On imagine mal que de tels accords soient passés sans avoir une perspective chiffrée des conséquences économiques pour l'Europe. Quels sont ces chiffres?

Réponse donnée par M. De Gucht au nom de la Commission
(1er octobre 2012)

Depuis l'entrée en vigueur, le 1er juillet 2011, de l'accord de libre-échange (ALE) entre l'UE et la Corée du Sud, la Commission surveille de près les importations en provenance de la Corée du Sud dans des secteurs sensibles, notamment celui de l'industrie automobile. Deux fois par mois, la commission INTA communique les chiffres correspondants aux États membres et au Parlement européen.

Comme cela est indiqué dans la communication de la Commission de 2006 intitulée «Une Europe compétitive dans une économie mondialisée», des négociations avec la Corée, l'Inde et certains États membres de l'ANASE ont été lancées. Des négociations sont en cours avec l'Inde, Singapour et la Malaisie, et ont récemment été ouvertes avec le Viêt Nam. La Commission est également en contact avec d'autres États membres de l'ANASE afin d'examiner leurs intérêts. Enfin, la Commission a présenté au Conseil un projet de directives de négociation d'un ALE avec le Japon.

La Commission est pleinement consciente des défis que pourrait poser la conclusion d'un ALE avec le Japon, en particulier pour l'industrie automobile européenne, mais aussi des possibilités qu'il pourrait offrir, notamment du fait de la réduction des obstacles non tarifaires auxquels sont confrontés les exportateurs de l'UE.

La Commission a procédé à une évaluation approfondie de l'impact que pourrait avoir la conclusion d'un ALE avec le Japon, y compris sur l'économie européenne, et l'a publiée sur son site web (http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2012/july/tradoc_149809.pdf). Cette analyse montre qu'un ALE ambitieux pourrait permettre une augmentation du PIB de l'UE atteignant 1,9 % (soit 320 milliards d'euros).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007594/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 August 2012)

Subject: EU-Asia agreements — danger for the European automobile sector

The trade agreement which the EU has concluded with South Korea stipulates that the two sides will phase out 98% of their reciprocal customs duties. The agreement also provides for the abolition of non-customs barriers to trade, in particular certain rules and standards applicable in the automobile, medicinal products and consumer electronics sectors. In short, virtually all the costs and formalities which prevent South Korea and the EU from selling each other more products have been done away with. By way of comparison, a 10% import duty is imposed on Japanese cars manufactured outside the Union.

At first sight, therefore, the agreement is beneficial to both parties. However, a closer examination reveals that South Korea will benefit substantially more than Europe, given that, in the 11 months following the signing of the agreement, South Korea exported 400 000 locally assembled cars to the European Union, a year-on-year increase of 40%. Over the same period, South Korea imported 73 000 European vehicles, a 13% increase.

1. Have proper arrangements been made for the monitoring of the agreement, as the French Government has stated?

2. Commissioner De Gucht has described the agreement as the first in a long series currently being negotiated with our Asian partners. To which countries other than Japan was he referring?

3. If the agreement with Japan is broadly similar to that concluded with South Korea and the consequences are broadly the same, it is easy to see that the European automobile industry will be facing a serious threat. Does the Commission acknowledge this as an issue? Has this factor been taken into account when assessing the impact of these trade agreements?

4. It is hard to imagine that such agreements are concluded without figures first being drawn up concerning the impact on the European economy. What are those figures?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(1 October 2012)

Since the entry into force of the Free Trade Agreement (FTA) between the EU and South Korea on 1st July 2011, the Commission has been closely monitoring imports from South Korea in sensitive sectors, including the automotive industry. The figures are reported to the EU Member States and the European Parliament, via the INTA committee, twice a month.

As outlined in the Commission's communication of 2006 'Global Europe in a Competing World', FTA negotiations have been launched with Korea, India and some ASEAN Member States. Negotiations are ongoing with India, Singapore and Malaysia and have recently been launched with Vietnam. The Commission is also in contact with other ASEAN Member States to explore their interest. Finally, the Commission has presented to the Council draft negotiating directives for an FTA with Japan.

The Commission is fully aware of the challenges that an FTA with Japan might imply, in particular for the European car sector, but also of the opportunities such an agreement can provide, particularly by reducing non-tariff barriers faced by EU exporters.

The Commission has undertaken a thorough assessment of the impact an FTA with Japan might have, including on the European economy, which is available on the Commission's website (http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2012/july/tradoc_149809.pdf). This analysis shows that an ambitious FTA could lead to an EU GDP increase of up to 1.9% (or EUR 320 billion).

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007596/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 août 2012)

Objet: Soupçons de la Commission concernant Servier

La Commission européenne a annoncé avoir communiqué ses griefs au groupe pharmaceutique français Servier et à plusieurs de ses concurrents génériques, qu'elle soupçonne d'avoir fait retarder l'entrée sur le marché d'un médicament.

Gardienne de la concurrence en Europe, la Commission soupçonne Servier, qui a développé le médicament cardio-vasculaire *perindopril*, d'avoir passé des accords avec des fabricants de génériques pour retarder «l'arrivée sur le marché européen d'un générique» moins cher.

Selon elle, les «règlements amiables en matière de brevets conclus par Servier avec Niche/Unichem, Matrix (désormais Mylan Laboratories Limited), Teva, Krka et Lupin, ainsi que l'acquisition, par Servier, de technologies concurrentes essentielles relèvent d'une stratégie globale visant à retarder ou à empêcher l'entrée sur le marché de versions génériques bon marché du perindopril».

Si les faits sont avérés, il convient de saluer le travail de la Commission dans ce dossier.

1. Quelle est la liste exacte des griefs?

2. Quel a été le modus operandi pour découvrir la supercherie?

3. Quel est le pourcentage d'entreprises pharmaceutiques contrôlées annuellement par la Commission?

Réponse donnée par M. Almunia au nom de la Commission
(18 septembre 2012)

1. Dans sa communication des griefs du 27 juillet 2012, la Commission a estimé à titre préliminaire que Servier s'était entendue avec ses concurrents génériques pour restreindre la concurrence sur le marché du périndopril et avait acquis, dans le cadre d'une stratégie globale, des technologies concurrentes susceptibles de permettre à ses concurrents d'entrer sur ce même marché. Ces pratiques pourraient avoir eu pour finalité de préserver la position de Servier en ce qui concerne le périndopril.

La Commission a formulé des griefs à l'égard de deux ensembles de pratiques spécifiques de la part de Servier. Premièrement, Servier, qui semble occuper une position dominante sur le marché du périndopril, a acquis les rares technologies concurrentes de fabrication du produit, entravant ou retardant de la sorte l'entrée de génériques sur le marché. Deuxièmement, elle a indûment protégé son exclusivité commerciale en incitant ses concurrents génériques à conclure des règlements amiables en matière de brevets. S'il devait être établi, ce comportement serait contraire aux articles 101 et 102 du TFUE ([1]).

2. Le secteur pharmaceutique et le secteur des services de santé font l'objet d'une surveillance constante de la part de la direction générale de la Concurrence de la Commission. C'est ainsi que les pratiques illégales présumées ont été mises en lumière.

3. Dans le cadre de la surveillance susmentionnée, la Commission procède sur une base annuelle au suivi des règlements amiables en matière de brevets ([2]), en invitant les entreprises innovantes et les entreprises de génériques à fournir un exemplaire des règlements amiables qu'elles ont conclus pour l'année visée. Il ressort de ces données que, bien que le nombre de règlements amiables en matière de brevets ait augmenté (passant de 73 en 2009 à 120 à 2011), les règlements susceptibles, à première vue, de soulever des problèmes de concurrence ont diminué de 22 % (2009) à 11 % (2011) ([3]).

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/12/835&format=HTML&aged=0&language=FR&guiLanguage=en
([2]) La Commission a procédé à l'examen des brevets pour les périodes de référence suivantes: 1) de la mi-2008 à la fin 2009; 2) 2010 et 3) 2011.
([3]) Pour de plus amples informations, veuillez consulter le troisième rapport sur la surveillance des règlements amiables en matière de brevets: (http://ec.europa.eu/competition/sectors/pharmaceuticals/inquiry/patent_settlements_report3_en.pdf).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007596/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(13 August 2012)

Subject: Commission suspicions concerning Servier

The Commission has announced that it has forwarded a statement of objections to the French pharmaceuticals group Servier and several of its competitors in the generic drugs sector outlining its suspicions that Servier delayed the arrival of a drug on the market.

As the guardian of competition in Europe, the Commission suspects that Servier, which developed the cardiovascular drug perindopril, concluded agreements with manufacturers of generic drugs in order to delay 'the market entry of cheap generic versions of perindopril'.

According to the Commission, 'the patent settlement agreements concluded by Servier with Niche/Unichem, Matrix (today Mylan Laboratories Limited), Teva, Krka and Lupin, as well as Servier's acquisition of key competing technologies were aimed at delaying or preventing the market entry of cheap generic versions of perindopril'.

If these allegations are confirmed, the Commission is to be congratulated on its excellent work in this case.

1. What is the exact nature of the Commission's objections?

2. How was the alleged illegal practice brought to light?

3. What percentage of pharmaceuticals companies does the Commission scrutinise in this way each year?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(18 September 2012)

1. In its Statement of objections of 27 July 2012, the Commission has taken the preliminary view that Servier and generic competitors agreed to limit competition to perindopril and that, as part of a comprehensive strategy, Servier acquired competing technologies which may have enabled competitors to enter the perindopril market. These practices could have aimed at preserving Servier's position with regard to perindopril.

The Commission formed objections against two specific sets of practices by Servier. Firstly, Servier, which appears to be dominant in the market for perindopril, acquired scarce competing technologies to produce perindopril, rendering generic market entry more difficult or delayed. Secondly, Servier unduly protected its market exclusivity by inducing its generic challengers to conclude patent settlements. This behaviour, if established, would infringe Articles 101 and 102 TFEU ([1]).

2. The Commission's Directorate-General for Competition monitors the pharmaceutical and health services sectors on a continual basis. As a result of which, the alleged illegal practices were brought to light.

3. As part of the aforementioned surveillance, the Commission undertakes an annual patent settlement monitoring exercise ([2]) in which generic and originator companies are asked to submit copies of their respective patent settlement agreements concluded for that year. The data shows that while the number of patent settlements has increased (from 73 in 2009 to 120 in 2011), there is a decrease from 22% (2009) to 11% (2011) in settlements that may *prima facie* raise competition concerns ([3]).

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/12/835&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en

([2]) The Commission has conducted three patent monitoring exercises for the following reference periods: (1) mid-2008-end 2009 (2) 2010 and (3) 2011.

([3]) For more detail, please see the Third Report on the Monitoring of Patent Settlements: http://ec.europa.eu/competition/sectors/pharmaceuticals/inquiry/patent_settlements_report3_en.pdf

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007598/12
do Rady
Tomasz Piotr Poręba (ECR)
(13 sierpnia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Funkcjonowanie Komitetu Regionów

Zgodnie z zapisami Traktatu o funkcjonowaniu UE (TFUE), Parlament Europejski, Rada i Komisja są wspomagane przez Komitet Regionów, który pełni wobec nich funkcje doradcze. Szereg przepisów TFUE wymaga ponadto, by w trakcie procedury stanowienia aktów prawnych UE Komitet Regionów był obowiązkowo konsultowany. W związku z tym, uprzejmie proszę o odpowiedź na następujące pytania:

1. Jak Rada ocenia efektywność działalności Komitetu Regionów?

2. W jakich konkretnych przypadkach opinia Komitetu Regionów miała wpływ na ostateczną treść przyjętego aktu ustawodawczego, rozporządzenia wykonawczego lub działania UE? Będę wdzięczny za wskazanie konkretnych przykładów oraz przedstawienie procentowe, ile – w okresie ostatnich pięciu lat – projektów aktów ustawodawczych, rozporządzeń wykonawczych i działań UE zostało zmodyfikowanych w wyniku opinii wyrażonych przez Komitet Regionów?

3. Kiedy po raz ostatni Rada – na podstawie art. 300 ust. 5 TFUE – dokonywała przeglądu zasad, o których mowa w art. 300 ust. 2 i 3 TFUE? Jakie w tym zakresie przyjmowano decyzje i formułowano wnioski?

4. Kiedy ostatnio Rada – i ewentualnie w jakim celu – żądała zwołania Komitetu Regionów na podstawie art. 306 TFUE?

5. Ile razy – ewentualnie w jakich przypadkach – Komitet Regionów był w okresie pięciu ostatnich lat konsultowany przez Radę w trybie art. 307 TFUE? Jaki był stopień efektywności wyrażonych w tym trybie opinii? Czy wpływały one – a jeśli tak, to w jakich przypadkach – na ostateczną treść aktu?

6. Czy Komitet Regionów doprowadził do stwierdzenia przez Trybunał Sprawiedliwości UE niezgodności jakiegokolwiek aktu UE z zasadą pomocniczości? Czy inicjował takie procedury? Jeśli tak, to w jakim przypadku? Jakie stanowisko w tym zakresie zajmowała Rada?

7. Czy Rada korzystała z konsultacji i pomocy Komitetu Regionów także w innych przypadkach, w tym nieprzewidzianych wprost Traktatami?

8. Czy poszczególni członkowie Komitetu Regionów podejmują indywidualne interwencje w Radzie i podległych jej jednostkach w sprawach dotyczących reprezentowanych przez nich społeczności regionalnych i lokalnych lub w innych sprawach? Jak Rada ocenia takie ewentualne interwencje?

9. Jak Rada, której Komitet Regionów jest organem doradczym, ocenia jego funkcjonowanie?

Odpowiedź
(31 października 2012 r.)

Rada zasięgała opinii Komitetu Regionów we wszystkich przypadkach przewidzianych w Traktatach oraz w niektórych innych przypadkach, w których uznała to za stosowne, zgodnie z art. 307 TFUE. Szczegółowy wykaz konsultacji ze strony Rady w ciągu ostatnich pięciu lat przedstawia się następująco:

— 2008 r.: konsultacje obligatoryjne: 44 konsultacje fakultatywne: 15;

— 2009 r.: konsultacje obligatoryjne: 33 konsultacje fakultatywne: 12;

— 2010 r.: konsultacje obligatoryjne: 16 konsultacje fakultatywne: 13;

— 2011 r.: konsultacje obligatoryjne: 37 konsultacje fakultatywne: 21;

— 2012 r.: konsultacje obligatoryjne: 23 konsultacje fakultatywne: 19.

Oprócz takich konsultacji każda urzędująca prezydencja w Radzie zwraca się do Komitetu z wnioskami o opracowanie opinii w sprawach szczególnych, ściśle związanych z jej priorytetami. Należy zauważyć, że Komitet opracowuje także opinie z inicjatywy własnej.

Opinie wydawane przez Komitet są analizowane w Radzie i mogą mieć wpływ na dyskusje na temat danego wniosku ustawodawczego. Ze względu na charakter doradczy, opinie nie są traktowane jako zmiany prawne zgłaszane do stanowiska Rady. W tym kontekście nie są dostępne dane dotyczące wpływu opinii Komitetu na stanowisko Rady. Ponadto indywidualne interwencje podejmowane w Radzie przez poszczególnych członków Komitetu nie wchodzą w zakres ram instytucjonalnych działalności doradczej Komitetu; Rada analizuje tylko opinie wydawane przez Komitet jako instytucję.

Oprócz zasięgania opinii kontakty z Komitetem odbywają się także w formie regularnego udziału przedstawicieli prezydencji Rady w posiedzeniach Komitetu, podczas których prezentują oni aktualne priorytety. Zwyczajowo prezydencje Rady zapraszają także członków Komitetu Regionów do udziału w nieformalnych posiedzeniach ministrów, w szczególności tych, podczas których omawiane są kwestie związane z polityką spójności, rozwojem obszarów miejskich i gospodarką przestrzenną.

Zawarty w art. 300 ust. 5 zapis dotyczący przeglądu składu Komitetu – na wniosek Komisji – został wprowadzony Traktatem z Lizbony. Jak dotąd do Rady nie wpłynął żaden wniosek Komisji w tej sprawie.

Jeśli chodzi o art. 306 TFUE: nie odnotowano dotąd zwołania Komitetu na żądanie Rady.

Odnośnie do wszczęcia postępowania przed Trybunałem Sprawiedliwości w związku z naruszeniem zasady pomocniczości: Komitet nie podejmował takich interwencji prawnych, nie było zatem konieczne zajęcie stanowiska przez Radę.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007598/12
to the Council
Tomasz Piotr Poręba (ECR)
(13 August 2012)

Subject: Functioning of the Committee of the Regions

The Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) stipulates that the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission shall be assisted by the Committee of the Regions, which exercises advisory functions. The TFEU also contains a number of provisions requiring the Committee of the Regions to be consulted during the EC lawmaking procedure. With this in mind:

1. What is the Council's assessment of the Committee of the Regions' work?

2. In which specific cases has the Committee of the Regions' opinion influenced the final content of legislation, implementing regulations or EU actions? Over the last five years, how many draft legislative acts, implementing regulations and EU actions have been amended in the light of opinions issued by the Committee of the Regions? Please give specific examples and percentages.

3. When did the Council last carry out a review, on the basis of Article 300(5) TFEU, of the rules referred to in Article 300(2) and (3) TFEU? How are decisions taken and proposals formulated on this matter?

4. When did the Council last convene the Committee of the Regions on the basis of Article 306 TFEU? What was the reason for doing so?

5. How many times — and in what cases, if any — has the Committee of the Regions been consulted by the Council under Article 307 TFEU over the last five years? What was the impact of the opinions issued under this procedure? Did they have any influence on the final content of the legislation, and if so, in what cases?

6. Has the Committee of the Regions taken action that has resulted in the Court of Justice of the European Union finding any EU legislation incompatible with the subsidiarity principle? Has it initiated any such procedures? If so, in what cases? What has the Council's stance been on this matter?

7. Has the Council consulted and been assisted by the Committee of the Regions in any other cases, including those not directly provided for by the Treaties?

8. Do individual members of the Committee of the Regions make individual representations to the Council and its departments on matters of concern to the people in the regions and areas they represent or on other matters? What view does the Council take of any such representations?

9. How does the Council assess the functioning of the Committee of the Regions, one of its advisory bodies?

Reply
(31 October 2012)

The Committee has been consulted by the Council in all cases where the Treaties so provide and in some other cases, where the Council has considered it appropriate, pursuant to Article 307 TFEU. The detailed list of Council consultations for the last five years can be broken down as follows:

— 2008: by right: 44 optional: 15

— 2009: by right: 33 optional: 12

— 2010: by right: 16 optional: 13

— 2011: by right: 37 optional: 21

— 2012: by right: 23 optional: 19

In addition to such consultations, every acting Presidency of the Council requests several specific opinions from the Committee that are closely linked to the Presidencies' priorities. It should be noted that the Committee also delivers opinions on its own initiative.

Opinions delivered by the Committee are examined within the Council and may influence the discussions on the relevant legislative proposal. Given their consultative nature, opinions are not treated as legal amendments to the position of the Council. In this sense, there are no data available on the influence exercised by the opinion of the Committee on the Council position. Moreover, individual members' representations to the Council do not fall within the institutional framework of the consultative activity of the Committee and only opinions delivered by the Committee as a body are examined within the Council.

Besides opinions, contacts with the Committee take the form of regular appearances by Council Presidencies at Committee meetings to present their priorities. Traditionally, Council Presidencies also invite Committee members to attend informal ministerial meetings, in particular when dealing with matters such as cohesion policy, urban development and territorial planning.

The provision referred to in Article 300(5), concerning the revision of the composition of the Committee on a proposal from the Commission, was introduced by the Treaty of Lisbon. No Commission proposal to that effect has so far reached the Council.

As for Article 306 TFEU, the Council has no record of having asked the chair to convene the Committee.

Concerning subsidiarity actions before the Court of Justice, no such legal action has been taken by the Committee, so that no Council stance has been necessary.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007599/12
do Komisji
Tomasz Piotr Poręba (ECR)
(13 sierpnia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Funkcjonowanie Komitetu Regionów

Zgodnie z zapisami Traktatu o funkcjonowaniu UE (TFUE) Parlament Europejski, Rada i Komisja są wspomagane przez Komitet Regionów, który pełni wobec nich funkcje doradcze. Szereg przepisów TFUE wymaga ponadto, by w trakcie procedury stanowienia aktów prawnych UE Komitet Regionów był obowiązkowo konsultowany.

W związku z tym uprzejmie proszę o odpowiedź na następujące pytania:

1. Jak Komisja ocenia efektywność działalności Komitetu Regionów?

2. W jakich konkretnych przypadkach opinia Komitetu Regionów miała wpływ na ostateczną treść przyjętego aktu ustawodawczego, rozporządzenia wykonawczego lub działania UE? Będę wdzięczny za wskazanie konkretnych przykładów oraz przedstawienie procentowe, ile – w okresie ostatnich pięciu lat – projektów aktów ustawodawczych, rozporządzeń wykonawczych i działań UE zostało zmodyfikowanych w wyniku opinii wyrażonych przez Komitet Regionów?

3. Jak w tym kontekście Komisja ocenia stopień wpływu Komitetu Regionów na modyfikację pierwotnych projektów przedstawianych przez Komisję? Jakie w tym zakresie przyjmowano decyzje i formułowano wnioski?

4. Kiedy po raz ostatni – na podstawie art. 300 ust. 5 TFUE – dokonano przeglądu zasad, o których mowa w art. 300 ust. 2 i 3 TFUE? Jakie w tym zakresie – na wniosek Komisji – przyjmowano decyzje?

5. Jak Komisja ocenia praktyczne wykorzystywanie przez Komitet Regionów sprawozdań przedstawianych mu przez Komisję na podstawie art. 175 TFUE? Czy w ocenie Komisji są one materiałem stymulującym konkretne działania po stronie Komitetu Regionów? Jeśli tak, to w jakim zakresie?

6. Kiedy ostatnio Komisja – i ewentualnie w jakim celu – żądała zwołania Komitetu Regionów na podstawie art. 306 TFUE?

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007600/12

do Komisji
Tomasz Piotr Poręba (ECR)
(13 sierpnia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Funkcjonowanie Komitetu Regionów cz. 2

Zgodnie z zapisami Traktatu o funkcjonowaniu UE (TFUE), Parlament Europejski, Rada i Komisja są wspomagane przez Komitet Regionów, który pełni wobec nich funkcje doradcze. Szereg przepisów TFUE wymaga ponadto, by w trakcie procedury stanowienia aktów prawnych UE Komitet Regionów był obowiązkowo konsultowany.

W związku z tym, uprzejmie proszę o odpowiedź na następujące pytania:

1. Ile razy – ewentualnie w jakich przypadkach – Komitet Regionów był w okresie pięciu ostatnich lat konsultowany przez Komisję w trybie art. 307 TFUE? Jaki był stopień efektywności wyrażonych w tym trybie opinii? Czy wpływały one – a jeśli tak, to w jakich przypadkach – na ostateczną treść aktu?

2. Czy Komitet Regionów doprowadził do stwierdzenia przez Trybunał Sprawiedliwości UE niezgodności jakiegokolwiek aktu UE z zasadą pomocniczości? Czy inicjował takie procedury? Jeśli tak, to w jakim przypadku? Jakie stanowisko w tym zakresie zajmowała Komisja?

3. Czy Komisja korzystała z konsultacji i pomocy Komitetu Regionów także w innych przypadkach, w tym nieprzewidzianych wprost Traktatami?

4. Czy poszczególni członkowie Komitetu Regionów podejmują indywidualne interwencje w Komisji i podległych jej jednostkach w sprawach dotyczących reprezentowanych przez nich społeczności regionalnych i lokalnych lub w innych sprawach? Jak Komisja ocenia takie ewentualne interwencje?

5. Jak Komisja, której Komitet Regionów jest organem doradczym, ocenia jego funkcjonowanie?

Wspólna odpowiedź udzielona przez Przewodniczącego José Manuela Barroso w imieniu Komisji
(24 września 2012 r.)

Komitet Regionów przyjął, od 2007 do 2012 r., 339 opinii, w tym opinii dotyczących wniosków ustawodawczych (83), komunikatów i innych dokumentów konsultacyjnych (133), opinii rozpoznawczych (15) oraz sprawozdań z inicjatyw (58).

Komisja regularnie przekazuje Komitetowi Regionów dokumenty sprawozdawcze, w tym także te wynikające z art. 175 TFUE, w których Komisja określa swoje propozycje realizacji środków. Informacje te można znaleźć na stronie internetowej Komitetu Regionów, podobnie jak oceny skutków przeprowadzane w związku z tym przez sam Komitet Regionów ([1]). Komisja zwróciła się o stanowisko Komitetu Regionów w 15 przypadkach dotyczących tematów, w zakresie których posiada on specjalistyczną wiedzę, szczególnie w odniesieniu do wielkich projektów reformy polityki regionalnej i polityki spójności.

Komisja wysoce ceni sobie działalność konsultacyjną Komitetu Regionów i jest zadowolona ze współpracy przejawiającej się w zaangażowaniu władz lokalnych i regionalnych w przygotowanie i realizację strategii politycznych Unii Europejskiej ([2]).

Komisja i Komitet Regionów uaktualniły ostatnio i pogłębiły swój protokół współpracy odzwierciedlający różne poziomy i dziedziny współpracy i interakcji, jakie istnieją między Komitetem Regionów i Komisją ([3]).

([1]) http://cor.europa.eu/en/activities/opinions/Pages/impact.aspx
([2]) Dni otwarte (ang. Open Days) w przypadku polityki regionalnej, strategia Europa 2020 i komunikacja zdecentralizowana.
([3]) http://cor.europa.eu/en/about/interinstitutional/Documents/EN.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007599/12
to the Commission
Tomasz Piotr Poręba (ECR)
(13 August 2012)

Subject: Functioning of the Committee of the Regions

The Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) stipulates that the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission shall be assisted by the Committee of the Regions, which exercises advisory functions. The TFEU also contains a number of provisions requiring the Committee of the Regions to be consulted during the EC lawmaking procedure.

With this in mind:

1. What is the Commission's assessment of the Committee of the Regions' work?

2. In which specific cases has the Committee of the Regions' opinion influenced the final content of legislation, implementing regulations or EU actions? Over the last five years, how many draft legislative acts, implementing regulations and EU actions have been amended in the light of opinions issued by the Committee of the Regions? Please give specific examples and percentages.

3. What, in this context, is the Commission's assessment of the extent of the Committee of the Regions' influence when it comes to amending the Commission's original drafts? How are decisions taken and proposals formulated on this matter?

4. When was a review of the rules referred to in Article 300(2) and (3) TFEU last carried out on the basis of Article 300(5) TFEU? How — on a proposal from the Commission — are decisions taken on this matter?

5. What is the Commission's assessment of the practical action the Committee of the Regions takes in response to the reports submitted to it by the Commission under Article 175 TFEU? Does the Commission take the view that these reports spur the Committee of the Regions to take practical action? If so, in what circumstances?

6. When did the Commission last convene the Committee of the Regions on the basis of Article 306 TFEU? What was the reason for doing so?

Question for written answer E-007600/12
to the Commission
Tomasz Piotr Poręba (ECR)
(13 August 2012)

Subject: Functioning of the Committee of the Regions (part 2)

The Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) stipulates that the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission shall be assisted by the Committee of the Regions, which exercises advisory functions. The TFEU also contains a number of provisions requiring the Committee of the Regions to be consulted during the EC lawmaking procedure.

With this in mind:

1. How many times — and in what cases, if any — has the Committee of the Regions been consulted by the Commission under Article 307 TFEU over the last five years? What was the impact of the opinions issued under this procedure? Did they have any influence on the final content of the legislation, and if so, in what cases?

2. Has the Committee of the Regions taken action that has resulted in the Court of Justice of the European Union finding any EU legislation incompatible with the subsidiarity principle? Has it initiated any such procedures? If so, in what cases? What has the Commission's stance been on this matter?

3. Has the Commission consulted and been assisted by the Committee of the Regions in any other cases, including those not directly provided for by the Treaties?

4. Do individual members of the Committee of the Regions make individual representations to the Commission and its departments on matters of concern to the people in the regions and areas they represent or on other matters? What view does the Commission take of any such representations?

5. How does the Commission assess the functioning of the Committee of the Regions, one of its advisory bodies?

(Version française)

Réponse commune donnée par M Barroso au nom de la Commission
(24 septembre 2012)

Le Comité des Régions (CdR) a adopté, de 2007 à 2012, 339 avis, y compris les avis sur propositions législatives (83), les communications et autres documents de consultation (133), les avis exploratoires (15) et les rapports d'initiatives (58).

La Commission transmet régulièrement au CdR des documents de suivi, en ce compris ceux relatifs à l'article 175 TFUE, qui précisent les suites que la Commission entend y donner. Ces informations sont disponibles sur le site web du Comité des Régions, de même d'ailleurs que les analyses d'impact réalisées à ce propos par le Comité lui-même ([1]). La Commission a sollicité la position du CdR à 15 reprises sur des sujets à propos desquels ce dernier dispose d'une expertise spécifique, en particulier, s'agissant des grands projets de réforme de la politique régionale et de cohésion.

La Commission apprécie hautement l'activité consultative du Comité et se félicite de la coopération qu'il manifeste s'agissant de l'implication des autorités locales et régionales dans la préparation et la mise en œuvre des politiques de l'Union européenne ([2]).

La Commission et le CdR ont récemment mis à jour et approfondi leur protocole de coopération qui reflète les différentes niveaux et domaines de coopération et d'interaction existante entre le Comité et la Commission ([3]).

([1]) http://cor.europa.eu/en/activities/opinions/Pages/impact.aspx
([2]) Open Days pour la politique régionale, la Stratégie Europe 2020 et la communication décentralisée.
([3]) http://cor.europa.eu/en/about/interinstitutional/Documents/EN.pdf

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007603/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(14 août 2012)

Objet: La pêche européenne détrousse-t-elle Madagascar?

L'Europe est très demandeuse en poissons. Les eaux européennes étant déjà surexploitées, l'Union doit soit s'approvisionner sur les marchés internationaux soit conclure des accords de pêche avec des pays tiers pour envoyer les bateaux dans des zones encore riches en ressources. D'après l'Organisation des Nations unies pour l'alimentation et l'agriculture, la consommation européenne de poisson s'élevait à 22,2 kg par personne et par an en 2007, soit une augmentation de 2 % par an. Résultat: chaque année, 65 % du poisson mangé sur le Vieux-continent est importé. Pour permettre cette consommation, la Commission européenne a conclu des accords de partenariat de pêche avec 21 pays africains. Selon plusieurs études, les quotas de pêche européenne en eaux malgaches ont augmenté de 30 % depuis 1986, date du premier accord avec le pays: aujourd'hui, les flottes européennes pêchent plus de 13 300 tonnes de thon par an au large des côtes malgaches contre 10 000 en 1986.

1. Comment expliquer alors que, dans le même temps, les versements effectués en contrepartie par l'Union ont diminué? Si le prix nominal semble montrer une augmentation, passant de 1,1 million d'euros en 1986 à 1,7 million en 2010, la réalité est différente en ce qui concerne le prix ajusté: si on tient compte de l'inflation, malgache d'un côté et européenne de l'autre, les revenus annuels de la pêche perçus par Madagascar ont régressé de 90 % sur la période, tandis que la contribution de l'Union a été allégée de 20 %. Et si 2 000 Malgaches travaillent grâce à l'exploitation européenne du thon, la trésorerie du pays n'en profite pas vraiment, faute de taxes à l'exportation.

2. Les tarifs payés à Madagascar, dont l'accord de pêche vient d'être renouvelé pour la période 2013-2014, s'avèrent très faibles par rapport au prix du marché: 130 euros la tonne de thon pour un poisson qui se vend actuellement 1 800 euros au premier prix de gros sur le marché. Sur cette somme de 130 euros, les armateurs ne déboursent que 35 euros, grâce aux subventions de l'Europe, qui couvrent 75 % du prix.

3. Actuellement, c'est donc essentiellement le contribuable européen qui finance la pêche à Madagascar. Certes, les pêcheurs ont des charges d'exploitation mais leurs marges sont substantielles. Or, selon la politique commune de la pêche, les bénéfices devraient être plus équitablement partagés entre les pays. Comment la Commission compte-elle se mettre plus en conformité avec la politique commune de la pêche en l'occurrence?

Réponse donnée par Mme Damanaki au nom de la Commission
(25 octobre 2012)

En ce qui concerne les accords de pêche thonière, la contribution financière de l'Union est liée aux niveaux de référence de captures dont bénéficie la flotte de l'UE et tient également compte de l'évolution historique de la pêche et des avis scientifiques émis par les organisations régionales de gestion des pêches (ORGP) compétentes. Ces niveaux ne sont pas considérés comme des quotas mais comme des références budgétaires indicatives. À la contribution versée pour avoir accès aux eaux des pays tiers s'ajoute une aide financière destinée à promouvoir le développement durable du secteur de la pêche dans les pays tiers.

Les accords de partenariat dans le secteur de la pêche visent à garantir l'exploitation durable des ressources marines dans les eaux des pays tiers. La contribution de l'Union garantit l'accès des navires de l'Union dans un cadre réglementé. Dans le contexte de la réforme de la PCP, il est également prévu d'augmenter les redevances acquittées par les armateurs jusqu'à un niveau proportionnel à leurs bénéfices.

Dans le cas de Madagascar, l'augmentation du tonnage de référence a été assortie d'une hausse de la contribution financière de l'Union calculée en termes réels. Si l'on tient compte de l'évolution de l'inflation et si l'on utilise les valeurs de 2010, la contribution annuelle de l'Union est passée de 1,2 million d'euros en 1986 à 1,3 million d'euros dans le protocole actuel. Par ailleurs, cette contribution sera à nouveau revue à la hausse pour atteindre 1,5 million d'euros dans le prochain protocole (2013-2014) étant donné que le tonnage de référence a été augmenté pour tenir compte de l'évolution des captures au cours des années précédentes conformément aux avis scientifiques. Les contributions versées aux armateurs pour l'obtention de licences de pêche ont également progressé au cours de la même période (de 25 % pour les senneurs à senne coulissante et d'environ 5 % pour les palangriers). Enfin, l'aide allouée au secteur a été augmentée afin de mieux tenir compte des besoins de Madagascar.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007603/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(14 August 2012)

Subject: Is Madagascar being robbed by European fishing?

Europe has a very high demand for fish. European waters are already overfished, and the EU has either to supply itself on international markets or conclude fisheries agreements with third countries allowing it to send fishing vessels to areas that are still rich in resources. According to the UN's Food and Agriculture Organisation, European fish consumption was 22.2 kg per person per year in 2007 and is rising at 2% per year. As a result, every year 65 % of the fish eaten in Europe is imported. To allow for this level of consumption, the Commission has concluded fisheries partnership agreements with 21 African countries. Various studies show that European fishing quotas in Madagascan waters have increased by 30% since 1986, when the first agreement was concluded with Madagascar. Today, European fleets catch more than 13 300 tonnes of tuna per year off the coasts of Madagascar, compared with 10 000 in 1986.

1. How is it, then, that over the same period the EU's financial contributions have fallen? While the face-value price appears to show a rise, from EUR 1.1 million in 1986 to EUR 1.7 million in 2010, the reality in terms of the adjusted price is different. Taking account of inflation, in Madagascar as well as in the EU, Madagascar's annual fishing income has fallen by 90% during this period, while the EU's contribution has diminished by 20%. And although 2000 Madagascar nationals have jobs thanks to European tuna fishing, in the absence of export taxes the country's treasury does not really benefit.

2. The tariffs paid to Madagascar, whose fisheries agreement has just been renewed for 2013-2014, are very low compared to the market price: EUR 130 per tonne of tuna for a fish that is currently traded on the market at an initial wholesale price of EUR 1800. Of that EUR 130, shipowners pay only EUR 35 thanks to European subsidies which cover 75% of the price.

3. At present, then, it is essentially the European taxpayer who is funding fishing off Madagascar. It is true that fishermen have operating costs, but their profit margins are substantial. According to the common fisheries policy, profits should be more fairly shared between the countries. How does the Commission propose to bring itself more closely into line with the common fisheries policy?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(25 October 2012)

For tuna agreements, the EU financial contribution is related to the reference levels of catches that the EU fleet would benefit and also reflects historical fishing trends and scientific opinions issued by the competent regional fisheries organisations (RFMOs). They are not considered as quotas but as indicative budgetary references. The contribution paid for the access to third country waters is supplemented by a financial support, aimed at promoting the sustainable development of the third country fisheries sector.

FPAs aim at ensuring the sustainable exploitation of marine resources in third country waters. The EU contribution guarantees that EU vessels are granted access within a regulated framework. In the context of the CFP reform, it is also foreseen that the fees paid by ship-owners would be increased to a level commensurate to their benefits.

In the case of Madagascar, the increase of the reference tonnage has been accompanied by an increase of the EU financial contribution as calculated in real terms. If we consider the evolutions of the inflation and use 2010 values, the annual contribution from the EU went from EUR 1.2 million in 1986 to EUR 1.3 million in the current protocol. In addition, this contribution will be further increased to EUR 1.5 million in the future protocol (2013-2014) as the reference tonnage has been raised to reflect the trend of the catches in the previous years in line with scientific advice. The contributions paid by the shipowners for obtaining fishing licences have also increased during the same period (by 25% for purse seiners and about 5% for long-liners). Finally, the sectoral support envelope was increased to better take into account Madagascar needs.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007604/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(14 août 2012)

Objet: Stocks de maquereaux

Déjà en 2010, la fixation d'un quota de maquereaux de 85 000 tonnes par les îles Féroé était pour le moins déconcertante. Ce montant était trois fois supérieur au quota fixé sous le régime de gestion multilatérale entre l'Union européenne, la Norvège et le les îles Féroé en vigueur jusqu'en 2009.

Ce quota élevé était d'ailleurs de la même eau que celui arrêté par l'Islande qui s'élevait à 130 000 tonnes, un chiffre bien plus élevé que de coutume.

Selon la Commission, le total des quotas de prises pour le maquereau fixés par l'Union, la Norvège, les îles Féroé et l'Islande en 2012 se situait à un niveau supérieur de 36 % à celui préconisé par les avis scientifiques et ce, sans tenir compte des captures russes.

Force est de constater qu'en deux ans, rien n'a changé!

1. La Commission compte-elle enfin sanctionner les pays fraudeurs dans le cadre de la guerre du maquereau, considérant que leurs pêcheurs prélèvent des quantités trop importantes de poisson qui risquent de mettre en danger les stocks?

2. Quelles sont les mesures commerciales potentielles, spécifiques dans le dossier du maquereaux, que la Commission pourrait mettre en œuvre à l'encontre des pêcheurs d'Islande et des îles Féroé?

3. Ce taux de capture du maquereau ne dépasse-t-il pas largement les limites biologiques de sécurité?

4. Les conséquences de telles surpêches ont-elles été estimées?

Réponse donnée par Mme Damanaki au nom de la Commission
(22 octobre 2012)

Le règlement devrait entrer en vigueur très prochainement, après son adoption par le Parlement européen et le Conseil prévue lors de la session plénière d'octobre 2012. La Commission prend des dispositions concernant la possibilité d'appliquer des mesures au titre de ce règlement une fois qu'il sera entré en vigueur. Dans l'intervalle, des discussions avec l'ensemble des États côtiers, y compris l'Islande et les Îles Féroé, se tiendront jusqu'en novembre en ce qui concerne la fixation d'un quota pour les captures de maquereau en 2013.

Les mesures éventuelles doivent être efficaces mais aussi proportionnées aux objectifs poursuivis et compatibles avec les accords internationaux.

Pour l'année 2012, le CIEM ([1]) avait recommandé que le total des captures en 2012 ne dépasse pas 639 000 tonnes. Toutefois, selon les estimations, les captures atteignaient en 2012 un niveau nettement supérieur, à savoir 930 000 tonnes. Le taux de capture dépasse donc largement la quantité requise pour maintenir le stock à des niveaux permettant d'atteindre le rendement maximal durable. Cette situation est imputable aux nouvelles pêcheries exploitées par l'Islande et les Îles Féroé et non à l'Union européenne et la Norvège, qui ont maintenu leurs niveaux de capture existants.

En raison de ces activités de pêche non durables, le CIEM a recommandé que les captures pour l'année 2013 ne dépassent pas 542 000 tonnes, ce qui constitue une réduction importante (15 %) par rapport au volume de captures recommandé en 2012. Le CIEM a également indiqué qui si les niveaux de pêche actuels sont maintenus, cela conduirait à une importante diminution de la taille du stock d'ici à 2014. Si tel est le cas, il sera nécessaire de procéder à d'autres réductions beaucoup plus importantes des captures en 2014 afin de permettre au stock de se reconstituer.

([1]) Le Conseil international pour l'exploration de la mer (CIEM) est le principal organisme consultatif scientifique pour la gestion des pêches dans l'Atlantique du Nord-Est.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007604/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(14 August 2012)

Subject: Mackerel stocks

Back in 2010 the setting of an 85 000-tonne quota for mackerel by the Faroe Islands was disconcerting to say the least. This amount was three times higher than the quota set under the multilateral management arrangements between the European Union, Norway and the Faroe Islands which had been in force until 2009.

This high quota was of the same order as the one adopted by Iceland, which at 130 000 tonnes was much higher than it had traditionally set.

According to the Commission, the total of catch quotas for mackerel set by the EU, Norway, the Faroe Islands and Iceland in 2012 was 36% higher than the level recommended by scientific opinions, without taking account of Russian catches.

It is clear that in two years nothing has changed!

1. Does the Commission propose finally to impose penalties on countries that cheat in the mackerel war, given that their fishermen catch excessive quantities of fish at the risk of endangering stocks?

2. What specific trade measures could the Commission potentially impose on Icelandic and Faroe Islands fishermen in connection with the mackerel issue?

3. Does not this mackerel catch rate vastly exceed the safe biological limits?

4. Have any assessments been made of the consequences of such overfishing?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(22 October 2012)

The regulation should enter into force in the near future, following adoption by the European Parliament and the Council scheduled for the 2012 October Plenary. The Commission is preparing for the possibility of applying measures under that regulation once it has entered into force. In the meantime, discussions with all Coastal States, including Iceland and the Faroe Islands, on setting a quota for mackerel catches in 2013 will be held until November.

Possible measures need to be effective, but also proportionate to the objectives pursued and compatible with international agreements.

For 2012, ICES ([1]) recommended that total catches in 2012 should have been 639 000 tonnes as a maximum. However, catches in 2012 have been estimated at the much higher level of 930 000 tonnes. This resulted in a catch rate well in excess of what is required to maintain the stock at levels producing maximum sustainable yield. This situation is due to new fisheries developed by Iceland and the Faroe Islands, and not by the European Union and Norway, which have maintained their existing catch levels.

As a consequence of this unsustainable fishing ICES has recommended that catches in 2013 should not exceed 542 000 tonnes, an important reduction (15%) compared to recommended catches in 2012. ICES also indicated that continued fishing at the current levels would lead to an important decline in the size of the stock by 2014. Should that be the case, further and more drastic reductions in catch would be required in 2014 to allow the stock to rebuild itself.

([1]) The International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) is the main scientific advisory body for the management of fisheries in the North-east Atlantic.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007609/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(14 août 2012)

Objet: Apple joue avec le consommateur européen

La sortie prochaine de la version 5 de l'iPhone d'Apple devrait poser problème aux consommateurs européens. Il semble en effet que le connecteur Dock du smartphone sera plus petit que celui de ses prédécesseurs et autres produits Apple, rendant inutilisables les accessoires actuels.

En effet, le connecteur du futur iPhone sera plus petit que celui des produits Apple existants, ce qui permettrait à la «firme à la pomme» de changer, par exemple, la taille de l'écran, selon les commentateurs.

Un design plus moderne ou plus beau, peut-être. Mais ce sera surtout un gros problème pour les consommateurs qui possèdent toute une batterie d'accessoires (enceintes, chargeurs, etc.) qui ne seront plus compatibles avec le nouvel iPhone.

Ceci devrait relancer la vente d'accessoires, en baisse depuis quelques années.

Les consommateurs devront utiliser des adaptateurs. Et les fabricants d'accessoires devront adapter leur offre. Apple touchant une redevance de 4 dollars sur chaque appareil qui se branche sur son Dock, cela devrait aussi gonfler son chiffre d'affaires.

1. Les consommateurs européens ne risquent-ils pas d'être lésés deux fois vu que toutes les connectiques risquent à nouveau de changer l'année prochaine, à cause d'un accord européen?

2. Cette nouvelle ne va-t-elle pas à l'encontre de ce que dit prôner la Commission, à savoir la standardisation des prises sur les téléphones?

3. Cette stratégie d'Apple n'est-elle pas contraire à l'esprit de l'accord qu'Apple vient de signer avec l'Union européenne, même si celui-ci ne sera d'application qu'en 2013?

Réponse donnée par M. Tajani au nom de la Commission
(19 octobre 2012)

À la suite d'une demande de la Commission, 14 grands fabricants de téléphones portables ont accepté de signer, en juin 2009, un protocole d'accord destiné à uniformiser les chargeurs pour téléphones portables informatisés vendus dans l'UE. Apple fait partie de ses signataires.

Suite à un mandat de la Commission, le CEN-Cenelec et l'ETSI, organismes européens de normalisation, ont publié les normes harmonisées que doivent respecter les téléphones portables informatisés compatibles avec le nouveau chargeur commun à partir de 2011. La solution du chargeur commun repose sur la technologie des prises micro-USB. Pour les téléphones qui ne possèdent pas d'interface micro-USB, le protocole d'accord permet de recourir à un adaptateur.

La Commission ne dispose d'aucune preuve démontrant qu'Apple ne respecte pas l'accord. D'après les informations reçues d'Apple, l'iPhone 5 peut être utilisé avec un adaptateur permettant la connexion au chargeur commun.

Un récent rapport sur l'état d'avancement des travaux fourni par les signataires du protocole d'accord montre que plus de 95 % des nouveaux modèles de téléphones portables informatisés mis sur le marché de l'UE par les signataires au premier semestre de 2012 sont compatibles avec le chargeur commun, ce qui montre que l'accord volontaire a été profitable aux citoyens.

La Commission continue à surveiller l'état du marché. Comme le protocole d'accord expire à la fin de 2012, la Commission examinera des mesures de suivi appropriées et étudiera la possibilité d'étendre l'accord à d'autres catégories de produits.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007609/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(14 August 2012)

Subject: European consumers messed around by Apple

The impending launch of the Apple iPhone 5 is likely to cause problems for European consumers. The new smartphone's dock connector will apparently be smaller than that of older iPhones and other Apple products, which means that existing accessories will become unusable.

Commentators point out that reducing the size of the new iPhone's connector in this way will allow the manufacturer to make other changes, for example in screen size.

While this may well be a design plus in terms of modernity and looks, its main effect will be a major headache for consumers with a whole set of accessories (speakers, chargers, etc.) which will be incompatible with the new smartphone.

Sales of accessories — in decline for several years — should thus get a boost.

Consumers will need adaptors, and accessory manufacturers will have to adapt their products. As Apple collects a four-dollar licence fee for every device that connects to its dock, the change will also boost its turnover.

1. Is there not a risk that European consumers will be hit twice, with the likelihood of another change affecting all connectors next year as the result of an EU agreement?

2. Is this latest development not at odds with the Commission's declared aim, which is the standardisation of phone connectors?

3. Surely Apple's strategy breaches the spirit of the agreement — albeit not due to come into force until 2013 — that the company has just concluded with the EU?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(19 October 2012)

Following a request from the Commission, 14 major mobile phone manufacturers agreed to sign a memorandum of understanding (MoU) in June 2009 to harmonise chargers for data-enabled mobile phones sold in the EU. The MoU signatory companies include Apple.

Following a mandate from the Commission, the European Standardisation Bodies CEN-CENELEC and ETSI issued the harmonised standards to be adhered to by data-enabled mobile phones compatible with the new common charger as of 2011. The common charger solution is based in the Micro-USB connector technology. For phones that do not have a Micro-USB interface an adapter is allowed under the memorandum of understanding.

The Commission does not have any evidence that Apple has breached the agreement. According to the information received from Apple the iPhone 5 can be used with an adapter allowing to connect to the common charger.

A recent progress report provided by the MoU signatories has shown that more than 95% of the new models of data enabled mobile phones placed on the EU market by the signatories during the 1st half of 2012 offer the common charging capability. This indicates that the voluntary agreement has been successful in delivering benefits for citizens.

The Commission continues monitoring the status of the market. In view of the expiry of the MoU by the end of 2012 the Commission will examine appropriate follow-up measures and investigate the possibility of extending the agreement to other product categories.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-007613/12
till kommissionen
Christofer Fjellner (PPE)
(16 augusti 2012)

Angående: Hasardspel online och offline

Sedan april 2012 har personalen på kommissionens generaldirektoratet för inre marknaden och tjänster som sköter tillhandahållandet av hasardspeltjänster införlivats i Enhet E3 ("Onlinetjänster"). Jag välkomnar att kommissionen, ett år efter den senaste omorganiseringen av detta direktorat, medger att informationssamhällets tjänster används och erbjuds både från företag till företag och från företag till konsumenter. I ljuset av denna utveckling undrar jag dock:

1. Innebär denna omorganisering att generaldirektoratet för inre marknaden och tjänster från och med nu endast avser att sköta tillhandahållandet av hasardspeltjänster inom ramen för onlinemarknaden och därmed helt ignorera tillhandahållandet av hasardspeltjänser över gränserna genom offlinemarknaden?

2. Har kommissionen därmed en syn som skiljer sig från EU-domstolen i och med att den senare endast ser onlinespel som en distributionskanal av speltjänster medan kommissionen snarare verkar se det som en separat marknad och som en del av onlinetjänster?

3. Kan kommissionen förklara skälet bakom att endast bemöta denna särskilda onlinebaserade distributionskanal av hasardspeltjänster? Anses offlinemarknaden vara mindre viktig när det gäller gränsöverskridande konsekvenser, trots att en betydande mängd relevant rättspraxis från EU-domstolen – som senast omfattar bland annat målen *Costa* och *Cifone* (förenade målen C-72/10 och C-77/10 av den 16 februari 2012), men som sträcker sig tillbaka nästan ett decennium (t.ex. mål C-243/01 av den 6 november 2003, förenade målen C-338/04, C-359/04 och C-360/04 av den 6 mars 2007, mål C-260/04 av den 13 september 2007 samt mål C-316/07 av den 8 september 2010) – sydligt visar på motsatsen?

Svar från Michel Barnier på kommissionens vägnar
(5 november 2012)

1–2. Det är enhet E3 i generaldirektoratet för inre marknaden och tjänster som har ansvaret för speltjänster på den inre marknaden (både online- och offlinespel), när det gäller de grundläggande friheter som fastställs i EUF-fördraget, framför allt etableringsfrihet och fri rörlighet för tjänster (artiklarna 49 respektive 56).

3. Det offentliga samråd om grönboken som hölls förra året inriktades på onlinespel eftersom det väl utvecklade gränsöverskridande tillhandahållandet av sådana tjänster ökar snabbt i EU, men också till följd av att kommissionen specifikt uppmanats till det i bland annat Europaparlamentets rapport om integriteten för hasardspel online av den 17 februari 2009 ([1]). Såsom visas i grönboken kan dock flera frågor som behandlades i samrådet ha direkt relevans även för speltjänster offline (via fysiska försäljningspunkter). I det meddelande som antogs den 23 oktober 2012 aviserar kommissionen ett antal åtgärder avseende onlinespeltjänster. Flera av dessa åtgärder kommer att vara av betydelse även för speltjänster offline.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/consultations/docs/2011/online_gambling/com2011_128_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007613/12
to the Commission
Christofer Fjellner (PPE)
(16 August 2012)

Subject: Online and offline gambling

Since April 2012, the staff of the Commission's Directorate-General 'Internal Market and Services' (DG MARKT) dealing with the provision of gambling services have been incorporated into Unit E3 ('Online Services'). I welcome the fact that the Commission, one year after the previous reorganisation of this directorate, recognises that information society services are used and offered both in a business-to-business and in a business-to-consumer context. However, in view of this development:

1. Does this reorganisation signify that DG MARKT from now on intends to deal with the provision of gambling services solely in the context of the online distribution channel, completely ignoring the cross-border provision of gambling services via offline distribution channels?

2. Does the Commission thus have a view that differs from that of the CJEU, in that the latter sees online gambling as only a distribution channel of gambling services while the Commission seems to view it, rather, as a separate market and as a part of online services?

3. Can the Commission explain the rationale behind addressing only this particular online distribution channel of gambling services? Is the offline distribution channel considered less significant in terms of cross-border implications, despite a considerable body of relevant CJEU jurisprudence — including most recently the *Costa* and *Cifone* rulings (Joined Cases C-72/10 and C-77/10, 16 February 2012), but dating back almost a decade (e.g. Case C-243/01 of 6 November 2003, Joined Cases C-338/04, C-359/04 and C-360/04 of 6 March 2007, Case C-260/04 of 13 September 2007 and Case C-316/07 of 8 September 2010) — which clearly indicates otherwise?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(5 November 2012)

1-2. Unit E3 in DG Internal Market and Services is responsible for both online and off-line gambling services in the internal market, in respect of the fundamental freedoms set out by the TFEU, notably, freedom of establishment and the free movement of services (Articles 49 and 56 respectively).

3. The Green Paper public consultation held last year focused on online gambling in light of its growth in the EU of the well-developed cross-border supply of such services, but also in response to specific calls to that effect from, *inter alia*, the European Parliament in its report on integrity of online gambling of 17 February 2009 [1]. However, as highlighted in the Green Paper, a number of the issues consulted on may be of direct relevance to other 'offline' gambling services ('brick and mortar' establishments). In the communication adopted on 23 October 2012, the Commission announces a number of policy actions regarding online gambling services. A number of these actions will nonetheless be pertinent to both online and offline gambling services.

[1] http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/consultations/docs/2011/online_gambling/com2011_128_en.pdf

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-007614/12
till kommissionen
Christofer Fjellner (PPE)
(16 augusti 2012)

Angående: Överträdelser i hasardspel

Den 7 december 2011 offentliggjorde kommissionen en rapport med titeln Tillämpningen av direktiv 98/34/EG under 2009 och 2010 (KOM(2011)0853). I rapporten fastslår kommissionen att de ”avgav detaljerade yttranden för 105 anmälningar, vilket motsvarar 7 % av det totala antalet anmälda utkast från de 27 medlemsstaterna”. Kommissionen följde upp detta med överträdelseförfaranden i tre fall under 2009 och sju fall under 2010. I kategorin hasardspel och all relevant föreslagen lagstiftning undrar parlamentet:

1. Kan kommissionen tillhandahålla de detaljerade yttranden för hasardspelssektorn som offentliggjordes för den nämnda perioden och de berörda länderna?

2. Kan kommissionen ange vilka av svaren på de detaljerade yttrandena som ansågs tillfredsställande och vilka som inte var det?

3. Av de som inte ansågs vara tillfredsställande, kan kommissionen ange vilka ytterligare steg som togs, om några?

4. Kan kommissionen ange hur många av rättsakterna som de detaljerade yttrandena handlade om som blev nationella lagar utan att ändra villkoren enligt de detaljerade yttrandena? Hur många används fortfarande?

5. Kan kommissionen slutligen ange om de nämnda medlemsstaterna som i praktiken ignorerade kommissionens detaljerade yttranden har anmält genomförande eller andra handlingar som har ursprung i sådan ”bristfällig” lagstiftning samt hur kommissionen har gått till väga i dessa fall?

Svar från Antonio Tajani på kommissionens vägnar
(3 oktober 2012)

1. Under 2009 och 2010 avgav kommissionen sex detaljerade yttranden rörande hasardspel. De länder som var aktuella var Frankrike, Belgien, Danmark, Polen och Rumänien (2).

2. Två anmälningar drogs tillbaka (2009/122/F och 2010/225/PL). Kommissionens avdelningar ansåg svaret på det detaljerade yttrandet rörande anmälan 2009/372/DK som tillfredsställande. Kommissionens avdelningar ansåg däremot inte svaren rörande anmälningarna 2009/172/B, 2010/382/RO och 2010/747/RO som tillfredsställande.

3. Kommissionen fortsätter med sin dialog med myndigheterna i de medlemsstater vars svar inte ansågs tillfredsställande, och kommer att bedöma om det förefaller nödvändigt att inleda formella överträdelseförfaranden rörande den aktuella lagstiftningen om hasardspel på nätet.

4. Beträffande anmälningarna 2009/172/B, 2010/382/RO och 2010/747/RO hade de anmälda utkasten antagits utan att tillräcklig hänsyn tagits till det detaljerade yttrandet eller utan att yttrandet besvarats på ett tillfredsställande sätt. Vad kommissionens avdelningar känner till är dessa bestämmelser fortfarande i kraft.

5. Senare anmäldes genomförandeåtgärder i samband med anmälan 2012/172/B enligt förfarandet i direktiv 98/34/EG (anmälningarna 2010/287/B, 2010/288/B, 2010/289/B, 2010/357/B, 2010/801/B och 2010/802/B). Kommissionen reagerade inte enligt direktiv 98/34/EG på dessa anmälda genomförandeåtgärder. Kommissionen förbehåller sig under alla omständigheter rätten att vidta eventuella lämpliga åtgärder utanför förfarandet enligt direktiv 98/34/EG.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007614/12
to the Commission
Christofer Fjellner (PPE)
(16 August 2012)

Subject: Gambling infringements

On 7 December 2011, the Commission published a report entitled 'The operation of Directive 98/34/EC in 2009 and 2010' (COM(2011) 0853). In this report, the Commission states that it 'issued detailed opinions in relation to 105 notifications, which represents 7% of the total number of drafts notified by the 27 Member States'. The Commission followed with infringement proceedings in three cases in 2009 and seven cases in 2010.

With regard to the category of games of chance and all relevant notified draft legislation:

1. Can the Commission provide the number of detailed opinions for the gambling sector that were issued for the period above and the countries concerned?

2. Can the Commission indicate which of the replies to those detailed opinions were deemed satisfactory and which were not?

3. Concerning those that were not deemed satisfactory, can the Commission indicate what further steps, if any, were taken?

4. Can the Commission indicate how many of those notified items of legislation which were the subject of detailed opinions became national laws without changing those provisions concerned by the detailed opinions? How many are still in force?

5. Can the Commission, finally, indicate whether those Member States that for all practical purposes ignored its detailed opinions have notified implementing or other acts originating from such 'flawed' legislation, and state how it has proceeded in those cases?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(3 October 2012)

1. Between 2009 and 2010, six detailed opinions were issued by the Commission in the field of games of chance. The countries concerned were France, Belgium, Denmark, Poland and Romania (2).

2. Two of the notifications were withdrawn (2009/122/F and 2010/225/PL). The Commission services considered as satisfactory the answer to the detailed opinions on notification 2009/372/DK. The answers to notifications 2009/172/B 2010/382/RO and 2010/747/RO were not considered as satisfactory by the Commission services.

3. The Commission continues the dialogue with the authorities of the Member States where the replies to the detailed opinions in question were not deemed satisfactory and will assess whether it appears necessary to purse formal infringement proceedings in relation to the online gambling legal frameworks concerned.

4. The notified drafts were adopted without sufficiently addressing the points of the detailed opinion (or without replying satisfactorily to these points) in case of notifications 2009/172/B, 2010/382/RO and 2010/747/RO. According to the information available to the Commission services, these measures are still in force.

5. Subsequent implementing measures related to the notification 2012/172/B were notified under the Directive 98/34/EC procedure (notifications 2010/287/B, 2010/288/B, 2010/289/B, 2010/357/B, 2010/801/B and 2010/802/B). The Commission did not issue any reaction under Directive 98/34/EC to these notified implementing decrees. In any case, the Commission reserves a right to take any action if appropriate outside of the Directive 98/34/EC procedure.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007645/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(22 agosto 2012)

Oggetto: Arresto di una bambina down cristiana per blasfemia e tutela dei diritti umani in Pakistan

Rimsha Masih, una bambina pachistana di 11 anni affetta da sindrome di Down, è stata arrestata a Islamabad con l'accusa di blasfemia, per aver bruciato alcune pagine di un libro islamico usato per imparare le basi del Corano. Secondo le fonti dell'agenzia missionaria AsiaNews, questo è il primo caso nella storia del Pakistan in cui la legge islamica, all'art. 295-B del Codice penale (la stessa che ha portato alla carcerazione di Asia Bibi due anni fa), ha effetto su un minore. A seguito della vicenda, la famiglia di Masih e altre 600 famiglie cristiane hanno abbandonato le loro case a causa delle minacce di linciaggio da parte dei fondamentalisti islamici, che costituiscono la maggioranza della popolazione pachistana.

È la Commissione a conoscenza della vicenda di Rimsha Masih? Come intende agire per sollecitare il governo di Islamabad a provvedere all'immediata scarcerazione della bambina?

L'UE considera i diritti umani universali e indivisibili e si impegna pertanto a garantirne attivamente la difesa, sia all'interno dei suoi confini, sia nelle relazioni con i paesi terzi. Nel 2001 l'Unione europea e il Pakistan hanno firmato un Accordo di cooperazione, il cui articolo 1 prevede una clausola sul rispetto dei diritti umani e dei principi democratici. Nonostante la sottoscrizione di tale accordo, in Pakistan si riscontrano quotidianamente casi di fondamentalismo islamico contro le minoranze cristiane e nei confronti delle donne. È a giudizio della Commissione plausibile la possibilità di sospendere la cooperazione tra l'UE e il Pakistan a seguito delle continue violazioni dei diritti umani perpetrate in quel paese? I bambini e le persone con disabilità sono due delle categorie più deboli della popolazione e perciò necessitano di tutele ad hoc che prevengano l'esposizione di questi individui a qualunque tipo di violenza nei loro confronti. Considera la Commissione sufficienti le normative in vigore in Pakistan che regolano la tutela delle suddette categorie?

Risposta congiunta di Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(24 settembre 2012)

Il caso di Rimsha Masih è molto inquietante: l'età, il sesso e il presunto stato mentale della ragazza contribuiscono ad aumentare le preoccupazioni. È incoraggiante constatare che il governo pakistano ha reagito e che il presidente Asif Ali Zardari ha denunciato l'uso scorretto delle leggi sulla blasfemia allo scopo di perseguire interessi personali. Il presidente ha prontamente condannato il caso Rimsha con la massima fermezza. Anche alcuni membri autorevoli del governo hanno fatto riferimento ad abusi commessi in nome delle leggi sulla blasfemia. Il 6 settembre 2012 il Ministro dell'interno Malik ha istituito un comitato per esaminare il caso. Da allora, Rimsha è stata rilasciata dal carcere su cauzione ed è stata trasferita in un luogo sicuro insieme alla sua famiglia, ai fini della loro tutela. L'UE continuerà a sorvegliare da vicino gli sviluppi del caso.

Tuttavia, le minoranze in Pakistan sono spesso vittime di abusi. Le cause fondamentali che rendono possibile questo fenomeno, tra cui rientrano l'indottrinamento nelle madrase e il reclutamento da parte di estremisti, devono ancora essere affrontate. La povertà e la mancanza di istruzione contribuiscono al problema.

La protezione di Rimsha Masih spetta alle autorità pakistane, ma l'UE segue gli sviluppi da vicino e continua a sostenere coloro che si oppongono all'estremismo. L'UE è impegnata in un dialogo regolare con il Pakistan in materia di diritti umani e, in occasione della visita dell'AR/VP a Islamabad a luglio, le due parti hanno deciso di avviare un dialogo strategico nell'ambito di un piano d'impegno quinquennale concernente, tra l'altro, i diritti umani. L'UE finanzierà progetti di potenziamento delle capacità delle istituzioni federali e provinciali, allo scopo di aumentare la sensibilizzazione ai diritti umani e la tutela degli stessi, favorire l'accesso alla giustizia per i gruppi vulnerabili e rafforzare le organizzazioni della società civile. Ciò si aggiunge al sostegno costante dell'UE in Pakistan a favore dell'istruzione e della tolleranza verso le altre religioni.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-007615/12
aan de Commissie (Vicevoorzitter — Hoge Vertegenwoordiger)
Peter van Dalen (ECR)
(20 augustus 2012)

Betreft: VP/HR — Gehandicapt meisje in Pakistan gearresteerd voor blasfemie

Enkele dagen geleden is in een dorp in de omgeving van Islamabad, Pakistan, de 11-jarige Rimsha gearresteerd voor het vermeend ontheiligen van pagina's van de Koran. Volgens Paul Bhatti, de Pakistaanse minister voor Nationale Eenheid, is het bekend dat het meisje een geestesstoornis heeft. De ouders van het meisje moesten in „beschermende hechtenis" worden genomen en vele christelijke families zijn de buurt ontvlucht.

1. Is de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger op de hoogte van de arrestatie van dit 11-jarige meisje, dat waarschijnlijk het syndroom van Down heeft, in een dorp in de omgeving van Islamabad op beschuldiging van het overtreden van de blasfemiewet?

2. Is de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger het ermee eens dat dit 11-jarige meisje onmiddellijk vrijgelaten moet worden en dat aan haar de nodige bescherming moet worden gegeven?

3. Welke onmiddellijke stappen zal de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger in deze zaak nemen tegenover de regering van Pakistan?

4. Overweegt de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger sancties op te leggen, zoals een bevriezing van de hulp, om het Pakistaanse regime ertoe aan te zetten actie te ondernemen?

5. Gaat de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger ermee akkoord dat er dringend een algemene en gecoördineerde internationale actie ondernomen moet worden teneinde deze blasfemiewet af te schaffen en is de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger bereid hierin het voortouw te nemen?

6. Kunnen de EDEO en de Commissie de politieke en financiële steun verhogen aan organisaties die slachtoffers van de blasfemiewet in Pakistan ondersteunen, zoals CLAAS (het Centrum voor gerechtelijke bijstand, steun en schikking — the Centre for Legal Assistance, Aid and Settlement)?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(24 september 2012)

De zaak-Rimsha Masih is zeer verontrustend. Haar leeftijd, sekse en vermeende geestelijke gesteldheid zijn reden voor bezorgdheid. Gelukkig heeft de Pakistaanse regering goed gereageerd en heeft president Asif Ali Zardari zijn afkeuring uitgesproken over de onjuiste toepassing van de blasfemiewetten vanwege persoonlijke belangen. Hij heeft het incident in verband met Rimsha snel en zeer krachtig veroordeeld. Prominente leden van de regering hebben ook gewezen op excessen die worden begaan uit naam van de blasfemiewetten. Op 6 september 2012 heeft minister van Binnenlandse Zaken Malik een comité opgezet om de zaak te onderzoeken. Sindsdien is Rimsha op borgtocht vrijgelaten en zijn zij en haar familie voor hun eigen veiligheid overgebracht naar een beschermde locatie. De EU zal de ontwikkelingen de komende tijd nauwlettend blijven volgen.

Minderheden in Pakistan worden vaak slecht behandeld. De kernoorzaken, waaronder indoctrinatie in Koranscholen en rekrutering door radicale groeperingen, moeten nog altijd worden aangepakt. Armoede en gebrek aan onderwijs zijn ook een deel van het probleem.

Het is de taak van de Pakistaanse autoriteiten om Rimsha Masih te beschermen, maar de EU volgt de ontwikkelingen nauwlettend en blijft steun verlenen aan mensen die zich verzetten tegen extremisme. De EU onderhoudt een regelmatige dialoog met Pakistan over de mensenrechten en bij het bezoek van de hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter aan Islamabad in juli hebben Pakistan en de EU afgesproken een Strategische Dialoog te voeren ter ondersteuning van een vijfjarenplan, onder andere inzake mensenrechten. De EU zal financiering verstrekken voor projecten voor capaciteitsopbouw bij federale en provinciale instellingen om het bewustzijn te vergroten, de mensenrechten beter te beschermen, de toegang tot justitie voor kwetsbare groepen te verbeteren en het maatschappelijk middenveld te versterken. Deze steun komt bovenop de langetermijnsteun van de EU voor onderwijs in Pakistan, onder andere wat betreft religieuze verdraagzaamheid.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007638/12
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Konrad Szymański (ECR)
(21 sierpnia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Aresztowanie 11-letniej chrześcijanki w Pakistanie

11-letnia dziewczynka, Rifta Masih, została aresztowana i oskarżona o bluźnierstwo w ubiegły czwartek w wiosce koło Islamabadu. Zarzuty wobec niej wnieśli sąsiedzi, którzy oskarżają ją o spalenie Koranu. Zgodnie z obowiązującą w Pakistanie ustawą o bluźnierstwie, chrześcijance grozi kara śmierci. Według niektórych źródeł dziewczynka ma zespół Downa.

W ostatnim okresie nasilają się prześladowania chrześcijan w Pakistanie. Około 900 chrześcijan, którzy żyją na obrzeżach Islamabadu, musiało opuścić okolicę ze względu na rosnące napięcia. Wiele osób stało się ofiarami ustawy o bluźnierstwie.

1. Czy Komisja, w tym Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel zgadza się, iż dziewczynka powinna zostać natychmiast zwolniona z aresztu? Jeżeli tak, jakie kroki podjęto w tej sprawie?

2. Czy Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel rozważa wprowadzenie sankcji przeciw reżimowi w Pakistanie, czy na przykład wstrzymanie unijnej pomocy? Jakie kroki zostaną podjęte w relacjach z pakistańskim rządem?

3. Czy Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel może wzmocnić wsparcie polityczne i finansowe dla organizacji, takich jak CLAAS, które wspomagają ofiary dyskryminacyjnej ustawy o bluźnierstwie w Pakistanie?

Wspólna odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton
w imieniu Komisji
(24 września 2012 r.)

Przypadek Rimshy Masih jest bardzo niepokojący. Jej wiek, płeć oraz domniemany stan umysłowy budzi duże obawy. Obiecujące jest to, że rząd Pakistanu podjął działania, a prezydent Asif Ali Zardari potępił niewłaściwe stosowanie przepisów dotyczących bluźnierstwa w celu zaspokajania własnych interesów. Bardzo szybko i w mocnych słowach skrytykował incydent dotyczący Rimshy. Czołowe osobistości z rządu również odniosły się do nadużyć popełnianych w ramach przepisów dotyczących bluźnierstwa. 6 września 2012 r. minister spraw wewnętrznych Malik powołał komisję do zbadania tej sprawy. Od tego czasu Rimshę uwolniono z więzienia za kaucją oraz przeniesiono ją wraz z rodziną w bezpieczne miejsce, aby zapewnić im ochronę. UE będzie uważnie śledzić rozwój tej sprawy.

Mniejszości narodowe w Pakistanie często jednak doświadczają złego traktowania. Główne przyczyny umożliwiające tego rodzaju nadużycia, w tym indoktrynacja w medresach oraz rekrutacja przeprowadzana przez radykalnych działaczy, pozostają nadal nierozwiązane. Część problemu stanowią również ubóstwo oraz brak wykształcenia.

Ochrona Rimshy Masih należy do obowiązków władz Pakistanu, ale UE uważnie śledzi rozwój sprawy i cały czas wspiera tych, którzy sprzeciwiają się ekstremizmowi. UE prowadzi regularny dialog z Pakistanem w kwestii praw człowieka. Podczas wizyty Wysokiej Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącej w Islamabadzie w lipcu Pakistan i UE uzgodniły strategiczny dialog wspierający pięcioletni plan zaangażowania, który obejmuje również kwestie praw człowieka. UE będzie kontynuować finansowanie projektów tworzących potencjał w instytucjach federalnych i regionalnych w celu zwiększenia świadomości w zakresie praw człowieka oraz ich ochrony, poprawy dostępu do wymiaru sprawiedliwości dla grup najbardziej zagrożonych oraz wzmocnienia organizacji społeczeństwa obywatelskiego. Oprócz tego UE nadal wspiera edukację w Pakistanie, obejmującą tolerancję dla innych wyznań.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007615/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Peter van Dalen (ECR)
(20 August 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Disabled Pakistani girl arrested for blasphemy

A few days ago an 11-year old girl called Rimsha was arrested in a village near Islamabad, Pakistan, for allegedly desecrating pages of the Koran. According to Paul Bhatti, Pakistan's Minister for National Harmony, the girl is known to have a mental disorder. The girl's parents have had to be taken into protective custody and many Christian families have fled the neighbourhood.

1. Has the Vice-President/High Representative taken note of the arrest of this 11-year old girl, who is thought to have Down's syndrome, in a village near Islamabad, on the accusation of violating blasphemy legislation?

2. Does the Vice-President/High Representative agree that this 11-year old girl must be released immediately and given necessary protection?

3. What immediate steps will the Vice-President/High Representative take vis-à-vis the Government of Pakistan in this matter?

4. Will the Vice-President/High Representative consider imposing sanctions, such as an aid freeze, as a means of pressurising the Pakistani regime into taking action?

5. Does the Vice-President/High Representative agree that it is high time to take broad and coordinated international action for the eradication of this blasphemy legislation, and is the Vice-President/High Representative willing to take the lead?

6. Could the EEAS and the Commission intensify political and financial support for organisations that support victims of the blasphemy law, such as CLAAS — the Centre for Legal Assistance, Aid and Settlement — in Pakistan?

Question for written answer E-007638/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Konrad Szymański (ECR)
(21 August 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Arrest of an 11-year-old Christian girl in Pakistan

Last Thursday, an 11-year-old Christian girl, Rifta Masih, was arrested and accused of blasphemy in a village near Islamabad. Her neighbours accused her of burning the Qur'an. Pakistan's blasphemy law means that she could face the death penalty. There are reports that the little girl has Down's syndrome.

The persecution of Christians in Pakistan has intensified recently. The mounting tension has forced around 900 Christians living in the outskirts of Islamabad to leave the area. Many people have fallen victim to the blasphemy law.

1. Do the Commission and the Vice-President/High Representative agree that the little girl should be released immediately? If so, what steps have been taken on this matter?

2. Is the Vice-President/High Representative considering imposing sanctions against the regime in Pakistan, or, for example, withholding EU aid? What steps will be taken as regards relations with the Pakistani Government?

3. Can the Vice-President/High Representative step up political and financial support for organisations like the Centre for Legal Aid Assistance and Settlement that assist the victims of Pakistan's discriminatory blasphemy law?

Question for written answer E-007645/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(22 August 2012)

Subject: Human rights situation in Pakistan: arrest of a Christian girl with Down's syndrome for blasphemy

An 11 year-old Pakistani girl called Rimsha Masih, who has Down's syndrome, has been arrested in Islamabad on charges of blasphemy for having burned several pages of an Islamic book used to teach the fundamentals of the Koran. According to sources at the missionary news agency Asia News, this is the first time in Pakistan's history that Islamic law, in the form of Article 295-B of the Criminal Code (the article under which Asia Bibi was imprisoned two years ago) has been applied to a minor. Following Rimsha Masih's arrest, her family and some 600 other Christian families had to leave their homes under threat of lynching by Islamic fundamentalists, who make up the majority of Pakistan's population.

Is the Commission aware of the case of Rimsha Masih? What action will it take to spur the Pakistan Government to see to her immediate release?

The EU considers human rights to be universal and indivisible and is therefore committed to actively ensuring their defence both within its borders and in its relations with third countries. In 2001, the EU and Pakistan signed a cooperation agreement, Article 1 of which sets out a clause on respect for human rights and democratic principles. Although Pakistan has signed that agreement, cases of Islamic fundamentalism against the Christian minority and women are reported on a daily basis. Does the Commission consider suspension of the cooperation agreement between the EU and Pakistan, following the continued violations of human rights in that country, to be a realistic possibility? Children and the disabled are two of the most vulnerable groups in Pakistani society and therefore need special protection to prevent their being exposed to any form of violence. Does the Commission consider the current rules governing the protection of these groups in Pakistan to be sufficient?

Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(24 September 2012)

The case of Rimsha Masih is very disturbing. Her age, gender and alleged mental condition heighten concerns. It is encouraging that the Pakistani Government has been responsive and that President Asif Ali Zardari denounced the misuse of the Blasphemy Laws as serving vested interests. He was quick to condemn the Rimsha incident in the strongest terms. Leading government figures have also referred to excesses committed under the Blasphemy Laws. On 6 September 2012 Interior Minister Malik set up a committee to examine the case. Since then, Rimsha has been released from jail on bail and she and her family have been moved to a secure location for their own protection. The EU will continue to monitor developments closely as the case progresses.

However, minorities in Pakistan often suffer abuse. The fundamental causes that make these abuses possible, including indoctrination in Madrassas and recruitment by radicals, are yet to be addressed. Poverty and lack of education are a part of the problem.

It is the responsibility of the Pakistani authorities to protect Rimsha Masih, but the EU follows developments closely and continues to support those who stand up to extremism. The EU engages in regular dialogue with Pakistan on human rights, and on the occasion of the HR/VP visit to Islamabad in July, Pakistan and the EU agreed on a Strategic Dialogue supporting a 5-Year Engagement Plan including human rights. The EU will be funding capacity-building projects in federal and provincial institutions to improve awareness and protection of human rights, access to justice for vulnerable groups and strengthen civil society organisations. This is in addition to continued EU support for education in Pakistan, including tolerance of other religions.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007616/12
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(20 August 2012)

Subject: Access to publicly funded infrastructure in Ireland

In relation to Question E-004550/2012 and the answer given by the Commission, could the Commission state when the investigation was launched? Can the Commission outline on foot of what complaint the investigation is taking place, including the year in which the complaint was made? How long has this investigation been going on for? There is an ongoing problem for private companies trying to access state-funded infrastructure such as bus stations, and this needs to be addressed without delay. Can the Commission give a more specific date, other than '2012', for the publication of this report?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(22 October 2012)

The Commission notified Ireland by letter of 18 July 2007 of its decision to initiate the formal investigation procedure, C31/2007, and the decision was published in the Official Journal on 15 September 2007 ([1]). The investigation has therefore been going on since this date.

The Irish Coach Tourism and Transport Council submitted a complaint, in a letter of 8 December 2005, concerning alleged unlawful state aid granted to the Córas Iompair Éireann bus companies, Dublin Bus and Bus Éireann. After making various requests for information to both the complainant and the Irish authorities during 2006 and 2007 ([2]), the Commission took the decision to open the investigation.

Access for private companies to bus stations forms part of the investigation. On the basis of available information, it appears that investment grants have been used for the upgrading of passenger facilities such as bus stations and bus stops of Bus Éireann and the garages for the parking and maintenance of bus fleets of Dublin Bus. In the opening decision, the Commission expressed doubts regarding the compatibility of such grants. In its final analysis, the Commission will notably take into consideration the fact that these stations are not opened to competitors.

The Commission will adopt a decision on this case as soon as possible, but additional information needs to be provided by the Irish authorities.

([1]) Case C 31/07 (ex NN 17/07), OJ C 217, 15.09.2007, p. 44.
([2]) See section 'A. Procedure' in the link above for more detail.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-007628/12
до Съвета
Ивайло Калфин (S&D)
(20 август 2012 г.)

Относно: Световната конференция по международни телекомуникации на Международния съюз по далекосъобщения (МСД)

На своята международна конференция през декември в Дубай Международният съюз по далекосъобщения (МСД) планира да преразгледа своите международни уредби в областта на телекомуникациите — Договор от 1988 г. Някои държави членки се опитват да установят регулиращи правомощия над интернет чрез МСД и биха могли да използват тези правомощия за приемането на политики, вредни за развитието на интернет и за потребителите.

Като се има предвид, че всяко европейско правителство ще бъде представено и ще гласува на конференцията в Дубай през декември:

1. Работи ли председателството на ЕС по координиран подход на ЕС по този въпрос и ще изрази ли Европа единна позиция?

2. Може ли Съветът да обясни позицията си по отношение на процеса на подготовка на Световната конференция по международни далекосъобщения и предложенията, които се представят?

3. Може ли Съветът да обясни дали и по какъв начин координира позициите на държавите членки на ЕС?

4. Споделя ли Съветът мнението, че МСД не е най-правилната структура за регулиране, като се има предвид липсата на прозрачност и фактът, че той включва мненията на множество заинтересовани страни?

Отговор
(22 октомври 2012 г.)

Световната конференция по международни далекосъобщения се подготвя от работната група към Съвета на МСД. На заседанието на тази работна група в периода 10—22 юни 2012 г. членове на МСД представиха консолидиран документ. Държавите членки на ЕС и Комисията участваха активно в процеса на подготовка посредством Конференцията за пощенска и телекомуникационна администрация и работната група.

Съгласно член 218, параграф 9 от Договора за функционирането на Европейския съюз Съветът установява позицията си въз основа на предложение на Комисията. На 2 август 2012 г. Съветът получи предложение от Комисията и се очаква то да бъде обсъдено от неговите подготвителни органи.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007628/12
to the Council
Ivailo Kalfin (S&D)
(20 August 2012)

Subject: ITU World Conference on International Telecommunications

The International Telecommunication Union is planning to revise its International Telecommunication Regulations, a 1988 treaty, at its World Conference in December in Dubai. Some Member States are seeking to assert regulatory authority over the Internet through the ITU and might use any such authority to adopt policies harmful to the development of the Internet and to consumers.

As each European government will be present and will vote at the conference in December in Dubai:

1. Is the EU Presidency working on a coordinated EU approach on this and will Europe be speaking with one voice?

2. Can the Council explain its position with respect to the WCIT preparatory process and the proposals being presented?

3. Can the Council explain whether and how it is coordinating the positions of the EU Member States?

4. Does the Council share the view that the ITU is not the right place to regulate, given its lack of transparency and the fact that it includes multi-stakeholder voices?

Reply
(22 October 2012)

The WCIT is being prepared by the ITU Council Working Group. At the meeting of this Working Group from 10 to 22 June 2012, a consolidated input document from ITU members was presented. The EU Member States and the Commission have actively participated in this preparatory process through the Conference of Postal and Telecommunications Administrations (CEPT) and the Working Group.

In accordance with Article 218(9) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the Council establishes its position on the basis of a Commission proposal. The Council received a Commission proposal on 2 August 2012 and this is due to be discussed by its preparatory bodies.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007630/12
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(20 agosto 2012)

Oggetto: Inquinanti nocivi alla salute presenti nel cemento da costruzione. Informazione al consumatore insufficiente e assenza di verifiche sull'impatto sulla salute

In Italia i cementifici sono attualmente autorizzati a bruciare rifiuti di svariate tipologie e inoltre utilizzano diversi tipi di ceneri nell'impasto del prodotto finito.

Tra il materiale incenerito nei cementifici per produrre energia, troviamo rifiuti non pericolosi come quelli urbani, farine e grassi animali, plastiche, gomme, pneumatici usati, fanghi da depurazione e rifiuti pericolosi come oli usati, emulsioni oleose, solventi non clorurati ([1]). Tutti questi rifiuti inceneriti finiscono nell'impasto del cemento come ingredienti.

Tra i materiali utilizzati direttamente come ingredienti per la produzione del cemento troviamo innumerevoli rifiuti derivanti da impianti di combustione (ceneri), da impianti siderurgici (scorie, terre di fonderia, polveri, fanghi) e dall'industria chimica (gessi, fanghi, ecc.) ([2]).

Con questo cemento in Europa vengono costruiti i nostri ambienti di vita e di lavoro (abitazioni, uffici, fabbriche, scuole, ospedali, ecc.), senza particolari verifiche in merito all'impatto di questo materiale sulla salute delle persone che ne vengono a contatto e senza alcuna informazione ai consumatori sulla presenza di questi componenti.

A titolo di esempio si riporta un recente caso accaduto a Musestre, frazione del comune di Roncade in provincia di Treviso, dove una cittadina nel contesto di un contenzioso legale contro un fornitore e un produttore di cemento, ha fatto eseguire cinque perizie sulla propria abitazione che hanno messo in evidenza che nel cemento utilizzato erano presenti ceneri, diossine e metalli pesanti ([3]). Queste sostanze tossico/nocive e pericolose, che dovrebbero essere smaltite in discariche speciali, sono invece andate a finire in un'abitazione civile.

Alla luce di quanto esposto la Commissione:

1. non ritiene utile, necessario ed urgente avviare verifiche sulla compatibilità dell'utilizzo di questi cementi così prodotti nella costruzione di ambienti di vita e di lavoro al fine di garantire la massima tutela della salute umana?

2. non ritiene doveroso che per tale prodotto immesso in commercio venga almeno comunicata al consumatore, tramite comprensibili indicazioni, la sua completa e dettagliata composizione chimica e fisica?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(9 novembre 2012)

La produzione di cemento è disciplinata dalla direttiva 2008/1/CE sulla prevenzione e la riduzione integrate dell'inquinamento ([4]). Gli impianti che rientrano nel campo di applicazione di tale direttiva devono operare in conformità di autorizzazioni rilasciate dagli Stati membri che includano i valori limite di emissione basati sulle migliori tecniche intese ad evitare oppure, qualora non sia possibile, a ridurre le emissioni. Anche la direttiva 2000/76/CE sull'incenerimento dei rifiuti ([5]) si applica ai cementifici che utilizzano rifiuti come combustibile e stabilisce determinati obblighi in merito alle condizioni di esercizio e alla gestione dei residui ([6]).

([1]) Cf. pag. 58 Relazione Annuale 2010 Associazione Italiana Tecnico Economica Cemento — http://www.aitec-ambiente.org/portals/2/Documenti/pubblici/relazione2010.pdf
([2]) Cf. pag. 59 Relazione Annuale 2010 Associazione Italiana Tecnico Economica Cemento — http://www.aitec-ambiente.org/portals/2/Documenti/pubblici/relazione2010.pdf
([3]) Articolo del Gazzettino di Treviso del 22 Marzo 2012 «Cemento tossico: chiede un milione».
([4]) GU L 152 dell'11.6.2008.
([5]) GU L 332 del 28.12.2000.
([6]) Ad esempio, l'autorizzazione concessa a un impianto di incenerimento che fa uso di rifiuti pericolosi riporta dei valori limite massimi di inquinanti che possono essere immessi nel flusso di rifiuti (ad es. PCB, PCP, cloro, metalli pesanti, ecc.).

Il regolamento (CE) n. 1272/2008 relativo alla classificazione, all'etichettatura e all'imballaggio delle sostanze e delle miscele ([7]) si applica al cemento e alle miscele che contengono cemento. L'articolo 11 del regolamento stabilisce che è necessario tenere conto di ogni impurità, additivo o singolo costituente identificato. Qualora il cemento, a causa del suo processo di produzione, contenga sostanze pericolose in quantità tale da classificarlo come pericoloso, l'etichetta deve indicare i rischi identificati. Inoltre ai cementi nelle miscele di cemento si applicano elementi supplementari dell'etichetta per il tenore di cromo solubile (VI) ([8]).

Entro aprile 2014 la Commissione dovrà valutare la necessità specifica di informazioni sulle sostanze pericolose contenute nei prodotti da costruzione, incluso il cemento, e vagliare l'opportunità di estendere ad altre sostanze l'obbligo di informazione di cui all'articolo 6, paragrafo 5, del regolamento sui prodotti da costruzione ([9]).

([7]) GU L 353 del 31.12.2008.
([8]) Cfr. l'allegato II del regolamento CLP.
([9]) GU L 88 del 4.4.2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007630/12
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(20 August 2012)

Subject: Pollutants harmful to health in construction cement. Insufficient information for consumers and failure to monitor impact on health

In Italy, cement plants are currently allowed to burn waste of various types and also use different types of ash in the mixture of the finished product.

The material incinerated in cement plants to produce energy includes non-hazardous waste such as urban waste, flour and animal fats, plastics, rubbers, used tyres and sewage sludge, and hazardous waste such as used oils, oily emulsions and chlorinated solvents ([1]). All of this incinerated waste ends up as part of the cement mixture.

The materials used directly as ingredients in the production of cement include countless types of waste from combustion plants (ash), from steel plants (slag, foundry wastes, dust, sludge) and from the chemical industry (gypsum, sludge, etc.) ([2]).

With this cement we build our living and working environments in Europe (homes, offices, factories, schools, hospitals, etc.). No special checks are carried out on the impact of this material on the health of people who come into contact with it and no information is given to consumers on the presence of these ingredients.

As an example, please note a recent case in Musestre, municipality of Roncade, province of Treviso, where a citizen, as part of a legal dispute against a supplier and a cement manufacturer, commissioned five expert opinions on her home which showed that the cement used contained ash, dioxins and heavy metals ([3]). These toxic, harmful and dangerous substances, which should be disposed of in special sites, ended up in somebody's house instead.

In the light of the above:

1. Does the Commission, with a view to ensuring the maximum protection of human health, not agree that it would be useful, necessary and urgent to begin checking whether cements produced in this way are compatible with being used in the building of living and working environments?

2. Does it not think that, for the marketing of such a product, consumers should at least be given, in a clear and comprehensible way, its full, detailed chemical and physical composition?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(9 November 2012)

The production of cement falls under Directive 2008/1/EC concerning integrated pollution prevention and control ([4]). Installations covered must operate in accordance with permits issued by Member States including emission limit values based on best available techniques designed to prevent and, where not practicable, reduce emissions. Directive 2000/76/EC on the incineration of waste ([5]) also applies to cement plants using wastes as fuel and sets requirements for operating conditions and residue management ([6]).

Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008 on classification, labelling and packaging of substances and mixtures ([7]) applies to cement and mixtures containing cement. According to Article 11 of the regulation identified impurities, additives and individual constituents have to be taken into account. If, due to its production process, cement contains hazardous substances in amounts that lead to its classification as hazardous, the label has to indicate the identified hazards. Furthermore, supplemental label elements apply for the content of Chromium VI in cement and cement containing mixtures ([8]).

([1]) Cf. p. 58, 2010 Annual Report of the Associazione Italiana Tecnico Economica Cemento (Italian cement industry association) — http://www.aitec-ambiente.org/portals/2/Documenti/pubblici/relazione2010.pdf
([2]) Cf. p. 59, Annual Report of the Associazione Italiana Tecnico Economica Cemento (Italian cement industry association) — http://www.aitec-ambiente.org/portals/2/Documenti/pubblici/relazione2010.pdf
([3]) Article in the Gazzettino di Treviso newspaper of 22 March 2012 — 'Cemento tossico: chiede un milione'
([4]) OJ L 152, 11.6.2008.
([5]) OJ L 332, 28.12.2000.
([6]) For instance, the permit of an incineration plant using hazardous waste shall specify the maximum contents of pollutants in the waste stream (e.g. PCB, PCP, chlorine, heavy metals, etc.).
([7]) OJ L 353, 31.12.2008.
([8]) Annex II CLP Regulation.

The Commission shall also assess by April 2014 the specific need for information on the content of hazardous substances in construction products — including cement and consider the possible extension of the information obligation provided for in Article 6(5) of the Construction Product Regulation ([9]) to other substances.

([9]) OJ L 88, 4.4.2011.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007632/12
an die Kommission
Jutta Steinruck (S&D)
(21. August 2012)

Betrifft: Verletzung der sozialen Mindeststandards durch Scheinselbstständigkeit und Subunternehmen

Immer häufiger werden auf Baustellen Fälle bekannt, in denen über Subunternehmerketten und Scheinselbstständigkeit Verantwortung für die Einhaltung von sozialen Mindeststandards nicht mehr besteht.

Konkretes Beispiel ist eine Baustelle in Kelheim, Deutschland, auf der rumänische Arbeiter als Selbstständige durch einen Subunternehmer beauftragt wurden. Nachdem diese allerdings keine Löhne ausbezahlt bekamen, saßen sie in Deutschland mittellos fest.

Den Kontrollbehörden fehlen zu häufig Möglichkeiten zum Einschreiten, da aufgrund der Einschaltung von Subunternehmern und der Unterzeichnung rechtswidriger Verträge vonseiten der Arbeitnehmer kaum verwertbare Beweise vorliegen. Das Problem ist jedoch nicht nur ein deutsches Problem. Es ist mittlerweile in ganz Europa zu einem Phänomen mit unvorhersehbaren sozialen Konsequenzen für die Betroffenen geworden.

Beschäftigte werden unter falschen Versprechungen und mit nicht rechtskonformen Selbstständigkeiten nach Deutschland gelockt und werden um ihren versprochenen Lohn betrogen. Weiterhin werden ihnen angebliche Leistungen in Rechnung gestellt, um ihren Lohn noch weiter zu drücken.

1. Wie will die Kommission im Zuge der Überarbeitung der Durchsetzungsrichtlinie sicherstellen, dass die Einhaltung geltenden europäischen Rechts auch in den Mitgliedstaaten kontrolliert und sanktioniert werden kann?

2. Ist der Kommission bewusst, dass es in den Mitgliedstaaten massive Probleme mit ArbeitnehmerInnen gibt, die als Selbstständige arbeiten müssen?

3. Seit wann ist der Kommission bekannt, dass sich aufgrund der mangelhaften gesetzlichen Abgrenzung zwischen abhängig Beschäftigten und Selbstständigen viele ArbeitnehmerInnen in größten sozialen Schwierigkeiten befinden? Wurden in der Vergangenheit Schritte unternommen, um diese abzumildern?

4. Welche Maßnahmen wird die Kommission ergreifen, um kurzfristig die Mitgliedstaaten anzuhalten, die Mindeststandards für Sicherheit, Sozialversicherung und Unterkunft auch bei selbstständig arbeitenden Arbeitnehmern zu garantieren und somit eine gewisse Rechtssicherheit bis zur Überarbeitung des Gesetzes zu gewährleisten?

Antwort von Herrn Andor im Namen der Kommission
(11. Oktober 2012)

1. Die Kommission ist sich der von der Frau Abgeordneten angesprochenen Schwierigkeiten im Zusammenhang mit der Entsendung bewusst. Daher wurde in den Vorschlag für eine Durchsetzungsrichtlinie eine beispielhafte, nicht erschöpfende Aufzählung qualitativer Kriterien aufgenommen, anhand derer klarer zwischen scheinselbstständigen und entsandten Arbeitskräften unterschieden werden kann.

2. und 3. Das Problem ist bekannt ([1]). Es stellt sich dann, wenn eine abhängig beschäftigte Person nicht als Arbeitnehmer behandelt wird, um ihren wahren Rechtsstatus zu verschleiern und Kosten (z. B. Steuern oder Sozialbeiträge) zu sparen.

Es ist Aufgabe der nationalen Behörden, einschließlich der Gerichte, die Kriterien für die Bestimmung des Status eines Arbeitnehmers festzulegen und durchzusetzen; zudem können auf der nationalen Ebene missbräuchliche Praktiken wirksamer vermieden bzw. sanktioniert werden.

([1]) Vgl. das Grünbuch „Ein moderneres Arbeitsrecht für die Herausforderungen des 21. Jahrhunderts“ (KOM(2006)708 endg.) und die vergleichende Studie zu den rechtlichen Aspekten der Entsendung von Arbeitnehmern, die in Vorbereitung des Vorschlags für eine Durchsetzungsrichtlinie durchgeführt wurde: (http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=6677&langId=en); darin wird die Scheinselbstständigkeit als Missbrauch der Entsendevorschriften identifiziert.

4. Die Rechtsgrundlage für das Sekundärrecht der EU im Bereich Sicherheit und Gesundheitsschutz am Arbeitsplatz ([2]) gilt nur für Arbeitnehmer, d. h. „jede Person, die von einem Arbeitgeber beschäftigt wird, einschließlich Praktikanten und Lehrlingen, jedoch mit Ausnahme von Hausangestellten“ ([3]). Selbstständig erwerbstätige Personen, deren Erwerbstätigkeit nicht einem Beschäftigungsverhältnis mit einem Arbeitgeber unterliegt, fallen nicht unter die EU-Richtlinien zu Sicherheit und Gesundheitsschutz am Arbeitsplatz, außer in einigen wenigen Fällen.

Die EU-Vorschriften zur Koordinierung der sozialen Sicherheit in grenzüberschreitenden Fällen sehen für selbstständig Erwerbstätige Rechte vor, die über die Mindeststandards hinausgehen und unmittelbar in allen Mitgliedstaaten gelten ([4]).

Die Kommission plant keine Maßnahmen bezüglich der Unterkunft selbstständig Erwerbstätiger.

([2]) Artikel 153 AEUV.

([3]) Artikel 3 Buchstabe a der Richtlinie 89/391/EWG des Rates 12. Juni 1989 über die Durchführung von Maßnahmen zur Verbesserung der Sicherheit und des Gesundheitsschutzes der Arbeitnehmer bei der Arbeit, ABl. L 183 vom 29.6.1989, S. 1.

([4]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 883/2004 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 29. April 2004 zur Koordinierung der Systeme der sozialen Sicherheit (ABl. L 166 vom 30.4.2004, S. 1) und Verordnung (EG) Nr. 987/2009 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 16. September 2009 zur Festlegung der Modalitäten für die Durchführung der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 883/2004 über die Koordinierung der Systeme der sozialen Sicherheit (ABl. L 284 vom 30.10.2009, S. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007632/12
to the Commission
Jutta Steinruck (S&D)
(21 August 2012)

Subject: Infringement of minimum social standards through bogus self-employment and subcontractors

There is increasing evidence on building sites that the presence of subcontracting chains and bogus self-employment is leading to a failure to comply with minimum social standards.

One specific example is that of a building site in Kelheim, Germany where Romanian workers were taken on by a subcontractor as self-employed workers. They then, however, received no wages and were left penniless in Germany.

The inspection authorities are often unable to intervene as the use of subcontractors and the unlawful contracts signed by workers mean that almost no concrete evidence of the abuse exists. This is not, however, an exclusively German problem. It has become a trend throughout Europe with unforeseeable social consequences for those affected.

Workers are lured to Germany with false promises and a non-legally compliant self-employed status and are then cheated out of their promised wages. Furthermore, deductions are then made for purported benefit contributions to drive their wages down even further.

1. When revising the enforcement directive, how does the Commission intend to ensure that compliance with the relevant European law can also be monitored and sanctioned in the Member States?

2. Is the Commission aware that massive problems exist in the Member States for workers obliged to work on a self-employed basis?

3. How long has the Commission been aware that deficiencies in the legal position regarding the distinction between employed and self-employed workers have left many workers with enormous social difficulties? Have steps been taken in the past to relieve this situation?

4. What measures will the Commission take to make it incumbent upon the Member States in the near future to guarantee minimum standards for safety, social security and accommodation for self-employed workers too, and thus to ensure a degree of legal certainty until the law is revised?

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

1. The Commission is aware of the difficulties in the context of posting raised by the Honourable Member. This is why the proposal for an enforcement Directive contains an indicative, non-exhaustive list of qualitative criteria to distinguish more clearly between bogus self-employed and posted workers.

2 and 3. The problem has been identified ([1]). It arises where an employee is classified otherwise than as an employee to hide his or her true legal status and to avoid costs (e.g. tax or social security contributions).

The national authorities, including the courts, are responsible for laying down and enforcing the criteria for determining the status of an employed person and can prevent and sanction abuses more effectively at their level.

4. The legal basis for the EU's secondary legislation on health and safety at work ([2]) allows workers only to be covered, i.e. 'any person employed by an employer, including trainees and apprentices but excluding domestic servants' ([3]). Self-employed persons whose work is not subject to an employment relationship with an employer are not covered by the EU directives dealing with health and safety at work, except in certain limited cases.

([1]) See Green Paper 'Modernising labour law to meet the challenges of the 21st century' (COM(2006) 708 final) and 'Comparative study on the legal aspects of the posting of workers' carried out in preparation for the proposal for an Enforcement Directive' at http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=6677&langId=en, which identify bogus self-employment as an abusive practice in the context of the posting.
([2]) Article 153 TFEU.
([3]) Article 3(a) of Council Directive 89/391/EEC of 12 June 1989 on the introduction of measures to encourage improvements in the safety and health of workers at work, OJ L 183, 29.6.1989, p. 1.

The EU rules on social security coordination in cross-border cases, which grant self-employed workers rights that amount to more than just minimum standards, are directly applicable in all Member States ([4]).

The Commission does not intend taking any action on accommodation for the self-employed.

([4]) 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) and Regulation (EC) No 987/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 September 2009 laying down the procedure for implementing Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 on the coordination of social security systems (OJ L 284, 30.10.2009, p. 1).

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007642/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(21 août 2012)

Objet: Date limite pour la mise en œuvre de Galileo

De nombreux citoyens de l'Union européenne ont sans doute remarqué le gain en précision des signaux GPS au cours des trois dernières années, lequel a été rendu possible grâce à l'amélioration apportée par EGNOS, service européen de navigation par recouvrement géostationnaire, dont le propriétaire et gestionnaire est l'Union elle-même.

EGNOS est donc un système qui améliore les performances en termes de précision dans la localisation des équipements, des voitures, des trains, des avions et des bateaux, et qui permet également d'assurer ce que l'on appelle l'intégrité des signaux GPS.

Dans une interview accordée à un média tchèque, Paul Flament, l'un des responsables de la Commission, explique — je cite —: «Les délais sur Galileo sont compliqués».

— Or, une échéance a été fixée à 2014. Les délais seront-ils respectés? Où en est-on de ce projet Galileo?

Réponse donnée par M.Tajani au nom de la Commission
(26 octobre 2012)

La Commission a pris toutes les mesures nécessaires pour se doter, d'ici à la fin de 2014, de l'infrastructure qui permettra de fournir les premiers services de Galileo: le service ouvert, le service de recherche et de sauvetage, le service public réglementé et un premier service commercial.

Dans cette perspective, la Commission a conclu tous les contrats industriels requis pour un déploiement accéléré de satellites et de stations terrestres. Une constellation composée de quatre satellites Galileo est déjà en place. Après trois lancements par an en 2013 et en 2014, 14 satellites supplémentaires seront mis en orbite d'ici à la fin de 2014. Dix d'entre eux seront placés par le lanceur Soyouz, qui emporte deux satellites à la fois, et les quatre autres seront transportés dans l'espace par un lanceur Ariane 5.

La Commission a renforcé la coordination des activités des parties prenantes du programme Galileo pour permettre la fourniture de services et suivra de près la mise en œuvre de ces contrats et activités.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007642/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(21 August 2012)

Subject: Date limite de Galileo

Many people in the EU have no doubt noticed an increase in the precision of GPS signals over the past three years. This has been made possible by improvements introduced by EGNOS (the European Geostationary Navigation Overlay Service), which is owned and operated by the European Union.

EGNOS is a system which improves performance in terms of precisely identifying the location of equipment, cars, trains, planes and ships and which helps ensure what is known as GPS signal integrity.

In an interview with Czech media, Paul Flament, one of the Commission officials involved in the programme, stated that: 'The timeframe for Galileo is complicated'.

— However, since a deadline of 2014 has been set, will the timeframe be complied with? What is the state of play regarding Galileo?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(26 October 2012)

The Commission has undertaken all the necessary steps to have, by the end of 2014, the infrastructure to ensure the provision of early Galileo services — the open service, the search and rescue service, the public regulated service and an initial commercial service.

In view of this objective, the Commission has concluded all industrial contracts required for an accelerated deployment of satellites and ground stations. A constellation of four Galileo satellites is already in place. By the end of 2014, 14 additional satellites will be released into orbit, following three launches each year in both 2013 and 2014. The Soyuz launcher, carrying two satellites at a time, will place 10 of them while the remaining four satellites will be carried into space with an Ariane-5 launcher.

The Commission has reinforced the coordination of the activities of the stakeholders involved in the Galileo Programme in order to allow for the delivery of services and will closely monitor the implementation of these contracts and activities.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-007653/12
adresată Comisiei
Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE)
(23 august 2012)

Subiect: Bugetul UE pentru dezvoltarea cercetării în domeniul cancerului de piele

UE a alocat deja sprijin financiar pentru cercetare în cadrul temei privind sănătatea, însă nu au fost publicate încă date sau cifre reale referitoare la sumele exacte alocate din bugetul UE pentru dezvoltarea cercetării în domeniul cancerului de piele.

1. Poate Comisia specifica sumele exacte alocate programelor ce vizează cancerul de piele în cadrul:

— celui de al șaptelea Program-cadru pentru cercetare și dezvoltare tehnologică (PC7);

— Programului-cadru pentru competitivitate și inovare (CIP);

— fondurilor structurale;

— Orizont 2020;

— Mecanismului Conectarea Europei?

2. Poate Comisia specifica care este contribuția statelor membre la finanțare, îndeosebi în regiunile îndepărtate sau mai puțin dezvoltate?

Răspuns dat de dna Geoghegan-Quinn în numele Comisiei
(12 octombrie 2012)

1. Cercetarea în domeniul tratării și prevenirii cancerului de piele, inclusiv a melanomului, a fost și este finanțată pe parcursul celui de-Al șaptelea program-cadru pentru cercetare și dezvoltare tehnologică (PC7, 2007-2013) ([1]). Până în prezent, cercetării privind melanomul i-au fost alocate 67 de milioane EUR. Printre domeniile abordate se numără, de exemplu, depistarea și diagnosticarea precoce, mecanismele de început care duc la apariția cancerului și noile terapii.

Cercetarea privind melanomul nu este sprijinită în prezent prin Programul-cadru pentru competitivitate și inovare (CIP) ([2]) și prin mecanismul Conectarea Europei (CEF) ([3]).

Cercetarea privind melanomul ar putea fi sprijinită prin politica de coeziune ([4]). Statele membre răspund de selectarea proiectelor din cadrul programelor naționale sau regionale care ar putea contribui cel mai mult la îndeplinirea obiectivelor acestei politici, asigurând respectarea normelor aplicabile și păstrând o evidență a acestor proiecte. Responsabilitatea Comisiei constă în asigurarea conformității cu legislația UE.

Propunerea Comisiei pentru Orizont 2020 — Cadrul strategic comun pentru cercetare, inovare (2014-2020) ([5]), identifică „sănătatea, schimbările demografice și bunăstarea” drept una dintre cele șase provocări societale care trebuie abordate. Deși această propunere va oferi oportunități pentru cercetarea în domeniul cancerului, este încă prematur să se știe sigur care vor fi domeniile de cercetare abordate.

2. Cererile pentru cercetare depuse în cadrul cererii de propuneri aferente PC7 sunt selectate printr-o procedură de evaluare *inter pares* ([6]), excelența științifică fiind principalul criteriu de selecție, iar cele mai bune dintre acestea primesc sprijin financiar, indiferent de originea lor geografică. În regiunile îndepărtate ([7]) și mai puțin dezvoltate ([8]) ale Uniunii Europene ([9]), societatea Jenlab GmbH din Thüringen efectuează cercetări privind melanomul, ca parte a proiectului PC7 SKINSPECTION ([10]).

([1]) http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/home_en.html
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/cip/index_ro.htm
([3]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/12/583
([4]) http://cordis.europa.eu/eu-funding-guide/annex03_en.html#annexes
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/horizon2020/index_en.cfm?pg=h2020-documents
([6]) ftp://ftp.cordis.europa.eu/pub/fp7/docs/fp7-evrules_ro.pdf
([7]) Așa-numitele „regiuni ultraperiferice”; a se vedea: http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/activity/outermost/index_ro.cfm
([8]) Așa-numitele „regiuni de convergență”; a se vedea: http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/atlas2007/index_ro.htm
([9]) http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/index_ro.cfm
([10]) http://www.skinspection-fp7.eu/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007653/12
to the Commission
Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE)
(23 August 2012)

Subject: EU budget for developing research on melanoma

The EU has already earmarked financial support for research under the Health theme, but no real data or figures for the precise amounts allocated from the EU budget for developing research on melanoma have been published.

1.Can the Commission specify the precise amount allocated to programmes linked to melanoma under:

— the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Innovation (FP7);

— the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme (CIP);

— the Structural Funds;

— Horizon 2020;

— the Connecting Europe Facility?

2. Can the Commission state how this funding is shared out among the Member States, especially in remote and less developed regions?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(12 October 2012)

1. Research on treatment and prevention of skin cancers, including melanoma, has been funded across the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013) ([1]). So far, EUR 67 million have been devoted to research on melanoma. Areas addressed include for instance early detection and diagnosis, mechanisms of cancer initiation and novel therapies.

Research on melanoma is currently not being supported within the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme (CIP) ([2]) and the Connecting Europe Facility ([3]) (CEF).

Research on melanoma could be supported by cohesion policy ([4]). Member States are responsible for the selection of projects under national or regional programmes, which may best contribute to the objectives of this policy, ensuring respect of applicable rules and keeping a record of these projects. The Commission's responsibility is to ensure compliance with the EU legislation.

The Commission's proposal for Horizon 2020 — The Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-1220) ([5]), identifies 'Health, demographic change and well-being' as one of the six societal challenges to be tackled. Although it will provide opportunities for cancer it is yet too premature to ascertain which research areas will be addressed.

2. Research applications submitted to FP7 calls for proposals are selected through a peer-review evaluation procedure ([6]) with scientific excellence as the overriding criterion and financial support awarded to the best applications, irrespective of their geographical origin. Within the remote ([7]) and less developed ([8]) regions of the European Union ([9]), the company Jenlab GmbH in Thüringen performs research on melanoma as part of the FP7 project SKINSPECTION ([10]).

([1]) http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/home_en.html
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/cip/
([3]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/12/583
([4]) http://cordis.europa.eu/eu-funding-guide/annex03_en.html#annexes
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/horizon2020/index_en.cfm?pg=h2020-documents
([6]) ftp://ftp.cordis.europa.eu/pub/fp7/docs/fp7-evrules_en.pdf
([7]) So-called 'outermost regions'; see: http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/activity/outermost/index_en.cfm
([8]) So-called 'convergence regions'; see: http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/atlas2007/index_en.htm
([9]) http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/index_en.cfm
([10]) http://www.skinspection-fp7.eu/

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-007654/12
adresată Comisiei
Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE)
(23 august 2012)

Subiect: Deciziile privind stabilirea prețurilor și rambursarea cheltuielilor pentru medicamentele destinate pacienților care suferă de cancer de piele

Pacienții care suferă de cancer de piele nu au acces la soluții terapeutice aprobate și eficiente, ca urmare a întârzierilor privind procedurile de stabilire a prețurilor și rambursare la nivelul UE.

Având în vedere semnificația potențială a medicamentelor inovatoare pentru terapia și tratamentul persoanelor care suferă de cancer de piele și având în vedere faptul că Directiva 89/105/CEE stabilește o procedură centralizată pentru acordarea autorizațiilor de introducere pe piață a medicamentelor în Uniunea Europeană, poate Comisia să răspundă la întrebările următoare:

1. Ce măsuri ar putea lua Comisia pentru a proteja dreptul pacienților din UE la terapie cu medicamentele adecvate pentru tratarea bolii lor (în acest caz, metastaza cancerului de piele), în conformitate cu o autorizație de introducere pe piață acordată de către Comisie în cadrul unei proceduri centralizate în temeiul Directivei 2001/83/CE, atunci când medicamentele respective nu sunt disponibile în statul lor membru?

2. Ce măsuri ar putea lua instituțiile UE cu privire la deciziile autorităților naționale care le refuză pacienților accesul la medicamente care le-ar putea salva viața, ca urmare a întârzierilor procedurale legate de deciziile privind stabilirea prețurilor și rambursarea cheltuielilor?

Răspuns dat de domnul Tajani în numele Comisiei
(23 octombrie 2012)

Comisia regretă situațiile în care pacienților care suferă de cancer de piele li se refuză accesul la o soluție terapeutică aprobată și eficace. Cu toate acestea, organizarea sistemelor de securitate socială și finanțarea serviciilor de îngrijire medicală intră în responsabilitatea fiecărui stat membru ([1]). Prin urmare, este la latitudinea fiecărui stat membru să decidă cu privire la includerea medicamentelor în domeniul de aplicare al sistemului național de asigurări de sănătate. Aceasta implică faptul că, în cazul în care un stat membru refuză accesul pacienților la medicamente, Comisia nu poate lua nicio măsură, întrucât este vorba despre o chestiune de competență națională.

Așa-numita „Directivă privind transparența" ([2]) stabilește doar o serie de norme de procedură aplicabile oricărei măsuri naționale privind reglementarea prețurilor medicamentelor și includerea acestora în domeniul de aplicare al sistemelor de asigurări de sănătate. Această directivă, fără a aduce atingere procesului de stabilire a prețurilor și de rambursare în esența sa, are drept scop garantarea faptului că deciziile naționale în acest domeniu sunt luate în mod transparent și în anumite termene.

Deși Directiva 89/105/CEE nu reglementează acțiunile statelor membre cu privire la stabilirea prețurilor și la rambursarea medicamentelor, ci doar modul de realizare a acestora, Comisia a propus, la 1 martie 2012, revizuirea sa, pentru a moderniza procedurile naționale relevante și a le face mai eficace, cu scopul precis de a contribui la un acces mai bun și mai rapid al pacienților la medicamente, în conformitate cu sistemele naționale de sănătate.

([1]) Articolul 168 alineatul (7) din Tratatul privind funcționarea Uniunii Europene.
([2]) Directiva 89/105/CEE a Consiliului din 21 decembrie 1988 privind transparența măsurilor care reglementează stabilirea prețurilor medicamentelor de uz uman și includerea acestora în domeniul de aplicare al sistemelor naționale de asigurări de sănătate [1989], JO L 40/8.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007654/12
to the Commission
Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE)
(23 August 2012)

Subject: Pricing and reimbursement decisions for medicinal products for melanoma patients

Melanoma patients are being denied an approved and effective therapeutic solution due to the delays in pricing and reimbursements procedures at EU level.

In view of the potential significance of innovative medicines for the therapy and treatment of persons with melanoma, and given that Directive 89/105/EEC establishes a centralised procedure for the marketing authorisation of medicinal products in the European Union, will the Commission answer the following questions:

1. What could the Commission do to safeguard the right of patients to obtain therapy with the medicinal products indicated for the treatment of their pathology (in this case, metastatic melanoma) within the EU, in accordance with a marketing authorisation granted by the Commission in the framework of a centralised procedure under Directive 2001/83/EC, when this medicinal product is not available in their Member State?

2. What measures could the EU institutions take on decisions by national authorities which deny patients access to life-saving medicinal products due to procedural delays in pricing and reimbursement decisions?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(23 October 2012)

The Commission regrets situations where the melanoma patients are being denied an approved and effective therapeutic solution. However, the organisation of the social security systems and the funding of healthcare services fall within the responsibility of each Member State ([1]). It is therefore up to each Member State to decide on the inclusion of medicinal products in the scope of national health insurance system. This implies that, if a Member State denies patient access to medicines, the Commission cannot take any action as this is a matter of national competence.

The so-called 'Transparency Directive' ([2]) only lays down a series of procedural rules applicable to any national measure regulating prices of medicines and their inclusion in the scope of health insurance systems. This directive, without touching upon the substance of pricing and reimbursement, aims at ensuring that national decisions in this area are taken in a transparent way and within certain time limits.

Although Directive 89/105/EEC does not regulate what the Member States can do with regard to the pricing and reimbursement of medicines, but only how they can do it, the Commission proposed on 1 March 2012 its revision in order to modernise relevant national procedures and to make them more effective, with a view precisely to contributing to a better and more rapid access of patients to medicines, in accordance with national health systems.

([1]) Article 168 (7) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.
([2]) Council Directive 89/105/EEC of 21 December 1988 relating to the transparency of measures regulating the prices of medicinal products for human use and their inclusion in the scope of national health insurance systems [1989] OJ L40/8.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007656/12
à la Commission
Franck Proust (PPE)
(23 août 2012)

Objet: Désertification médicale des campagnes

À l'instar du reste de l'Europe occidentale, les zones rurales françaises ont de plus en plus de mal à recruter de nouveaux médecins lorsque ceux qui sont encore en activité sont sur le point de partir à la retraite. Paradoxalement, c'est bien dans ces zones que se concentre la demande la plus forte, la part de la population âgée augmentant plus vite qu'en zone urbaine. C'est une véritable question de société qui menace l'équilibre de nos territoires et qui a toute les chances de s'aggraver avec le temps.

1. Vu la dimension de ce phénomène, l'Europe constitue l'échelon par excellence pour aborder cette question. La Commission s'est-elle saisie de cette question? Dans l'affirmative, quel constat fait-elle?

2. Comment l'Europe peut-elle lutter contre la désertification rurale? Les fonds européens, les programmes d'échange et de formation constituent-ils des outils solides? Sont-ils les seuls? Comment trouver de nouveaux moyens à l'avenir?

Réponse donnée par M. Šefčovič au nom de la Commission
(19 octobre 2012)

1. D'après les estimations de la Commission, l'évolution démographique et le vieillissement du personnel de santé pourraient conduire à une pénurie d'environ 1 million de professionnels de la santé d'ici 2020. Les travaux du projet de recherche européen PROMeTHEUS attestent l'existence de pénuries de professionnels de la santé dans nombre de zones rurales, notamment en France, en Allemagne, au Danemark, en Finlande et en Roumanie.

Pour aider les États membres à lutter ensemble contre l'aggravation de ces pénuries, la Commission a adopté, le 18 avril 2012, un plan d'action en faveur du personnel de santé dans l'Union, dans le cadre de sa communication intitulée «Vers une reprise génératrice d'emplois» ([1]). Ce plan d'action comporte les trois priorités suivantes: améliorer la planification et les prévisions des effectifs du secteur de la santé, mieux anticiper les compétences qui seront nécessaires dans les professions médicales et stimuler l'échange de bonnes pratiques en matière de recrutement et de fidélisation des professionnels de la santé.

2. Les Fonds structurels peuvent contribuer aux modifications structurelles des systèmes de santé des États membres, notamment en finançant des investissements dans les infrastructures et les équipements, dans les technologies et dans la formation du personnel. La Commission a proposé d'élargir encore les possibilités d'intervention des Fonds structurels en faveur de la santé durant le cycle de programmation 2014-2020. Les stratégies nationales ou régionales dans le domaine de la santé — dont l'existence est l'une des conditions de l'intervention de ces fonds — doivent énoncer clairement les mesures à prendre pour améliorer l'efficacité du système de santé.

([1]) COM(2012) 173 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007656/12
to the Commission
Franck Proust (PPE)
(23 August 2012)

Subject: Shortage of medical practitioners in the countryside

As in the rest of Western Europe, rural areas in France are finding it increasingly difficult to recruit new doctors to replace those who are about to retire. Paradoxically, it is in these areas that the need is greatest, since the population of the elderly is increasing more rapidly there than in urban areas. It is a real social issue that threatens to upset the balance between regions and will probably only get worse with time.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Given the scale of this phenomenon, this issue is best addressed at European level. Has it been asked to look into this issue? If so, what conclusions has it reached?

2. How can Europe fight against rural depopulation? Are EU funds, exchange programmes and training effective tools for addressing this problem? Are they the only ones? How can fresh means be found in future?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(19 October 2012)

1. According to Commission estimates, demographic change and an ageing health workforce could lead to a shortage of about 1 million health professionals by 2020. The EU research project PROMeTHEUS provides evidence of health workforce shortages in many rural areas, in particular in France, Germany, Denmark, Finland and Romania.

To foster European cooperation to tackle the growing shortages of health professionals, the Commission adopted an Action Plan for the EU health workforce on 18 April 2012, as part of its communication 'Towards a job rich recovery' ([1]). Actions focus on three core areas: to improve health workforce planning and forecasting workforce needs, to better anticipate future skills needs in the health professions and to stimulate the exchange of good practice on the recruitment and retention of health professionals.

2. Structural funds can contribute to structural changes in Member States' health systems including investment in health infrastructure and equipment, technology, and training of health professionals. The Commission proposed to further enlarge the possibilities for Structural Funds' investment in health in the new programming cycle 2014-2020. National or regional health strategies, as part of the *ex-ante* conditionalities for benefitting from such funds, should have a clear view on how to improve the efficiency of the health system.

([1]) COM(2012) 173 final.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-007662/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(27. augusta 2012)

Vec: Nárast psychických ochorení v Európe

V Európskej únii rapídne pribúdajú pacienti trpiaci na určitý druh psychického ochorenia. Jedným z faktorov, ktoré túto situáciu spôsobujú, je zlá ekonomická situácia v členských krajinách. Nárast nezamestnanosti má napríklad vplyv na zvyšujúci sa počet samovrážd. V Grécku sa počet samovrážd od roku 2008 zvýšil o neuveriteľných 18 %. Takmer 55 % mužskej populácie v krajine pritom udáva, že má psychické problémy. Podobný stav je aj v ostatných členských štátoch. Výrazné škrty v oblasti zdravotníctva a v sociálnej oblasti tento problém ešte zhoršujú. Viacerí odborníci pritom upozorňujú na skutočnosť, že zdravie je jednou z najdôležitejších hodnôt a je podmienkou pre ekonomický rast.

— Akým spôsobom Komisia bojuje proti nárastu psychických ochorení obyvateľov Európskej únie, spôsobených najmä hospodárskou krízou a úspornými opatreniami národných vlád?

Odpoveď pána Dalliho v mene Komisie
(19. októbra 2012)

Komisia podporuje členské štáty v súvislosti s Európskym paktom za duševné zdravie a pohodu. O vplyve hospodárskej krízy na duševné zdravie sa už rokovalo v rámci tohto paktu na konferencii o prevencii depresie a samovrážd z decembra 2009 ([1]). Po nej nasledovala „Aktualizácia spoločného posúdenia sociálneho vplyvu hospodárskej krízy a politických reakcií zo strany Výboru pre sociálnu ochranu a Európskej komisie za rok 2010." ([2]) Vplyv krízy na duševný stav bol predmetom stretnutí skupiny vládnych odborníkov v oblasti duševného zdravia a pohody počas rokov 2011 a 2012.

Ako odpoveď na predkladanie návrhov z roku 2012 v rámci programu EÚ v oblasti zdravia sa pripravuje jednotná akcia pre duševné zdravie a pohodu medzi Komisiou a členskými štátmi, ako sa uvádza vo vykonávacom rozhodnutí Komisie z 1. decembra 2011 o prijatí pracovného plánu na rok 2012 (2011/C 358/06).

Nakoniec, členské štáty môžu využiť svoje operačné programy štrukturálnych fondov EÚ na podporu investícií do rastu a konkurencieschopnosti, aby prekonali krízu, ale zároveň zmiernili jej sociálny dopad. V období od roku 2007 do roku 2013 sa naplánovali, okrem iného, investície v oblasti zdravia prostredníctvom štrukturálnych fondov na zabezpečenie prístupu zraniteľných skupín obyvateľstva k zdravotnej starostlivosti, ochrany zdravia a bezpečnosti pri práci, podpory zdravia a prevencie chorôb. Okrem toho, na obdobie 2014 – 2020 návrh Komisie ([3]) o Európskom sociálnom fonde stanovuje tematický cieľ na podporu sociálneho začlenenia a boj proti chudobe s investičnou prioritou zlepšenia prístupu k dostupným, udržateľným a vysokokvalitným službám vrátane zdravotnej starostlivosti.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/mental_health/docs/depression_factsheets_en.pdf
([2]) http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/10/st10/st10140.en11.pdf
([3]) Článok 3 ods. 1 písm. c) bod (iv) (KOM(2011) 607 v konečnom znení zo 6. októbra 2011).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007662/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(27 August 2012)

Subject: Increase in mental illness in Europe

The number of patients in the European Union suffering from certain kinds of mental illness is rapidly increasing. One of the factors contributing to this situation is the state of the economy in the Member States. Growth in unemployment is, for example, a factor in the increasing number of suicides. In Greece, the suicide rate has increased by an incredible 18% since 2008, and almost 55% of the male population claims to have mental health problems. The situation is similar in other Member States. Sweeping cuts in healthcare and in the social sector are exacerbating this problem. A number of experts have pointed out that health is one of the most fundamental values and is a precondition for economic growth.

— What action is the Commission taking to deal with the increase in mental health problems amongst the EU population caused in particular by the economic crisis and the austerity measures taken by national governments?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(19 October 2012)

The Commission supports Member States in the context of the European Pact for Mental Health and Well-being. The impact of the economic crisis on mental illness was already discussed in the December 2009 Pact conference on the prevention of depression and suicide ([1]). This was followed by the '2010 Update of the Joint Assessment by the Social Protection Committee and the European Commission of the social impact of the economic crisis and of policy responses' ([2]) During 2011 and 2012, the mental health effects of the crisis were discussed in meetings of the Group of Governmental experts on Mental Health and Well-being.

In response to the 2012 call for proposals under the EU Health Programme, a Joint Action between the Commission and the Member States on Mental Health and Well-being is under preparation as foreseen in the Commission Implementing Decision of 1 December 2011 on the adoption of the 2012 work plan (2011/C 358/06).

Finally, Member States have the possibility to use their EU-Structural Funds Operational Programmes to support investments for growth and competitiveness in order to fight the crisis, but also to mitigate its social impact. In the period 2007-13 health investments through Structural Funds have been planned, *inter alia*, for access to healthcare by vulnerable social groups, health and safety at work, health promotion and disease prevention. In addition, the Commission proposal ([3]) for the European Social Fund in the period of 2014-2020 provides for a thematic objective on promoting social inclusion and combating poverty, with an investment priority for enhancing access to affordable, sustainable, high-quality services, including healthcare.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/mental_health/docs/depression_factsheets_en.pdf
([2]) http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/10/st16/st16905.en10.pdf
([3]) Article 3(1)(c)(iv) (COM(2011) 607 final of 6 October 2011).

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-007666/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(27. augusta 2012)

Vec: Vzájomné vzťahy EÚ a Grónska

Grónsko je najväčší ostrov sveta. Má úžasný potenciál v súvislosti s ťažbou ropy, zemného plynu, vzácnych zemín a minerálov. Rovnako sa na ňom nachádza až 10 % svetovej pitnej vody. Vďaka svojmu klimatickému prostrediu je zároveň dôležitým miestom klimatického výskumu a rovnako aj zdrojom dôležitých informácií o tom, aká bola klíma na planéte Zem tisíce rokov dozadu. V roku 1953 sa stalo Grónsko súčasťou Dánska, avšak v roku 1979 získalo autonómiu, ktorá bola po referende v roku 2008 ešte rozšírená. Dánsko teda v súčasnosti spravuje len jeho zahraničnú politiku a obranu. Krajina v súčasnosti smeruje k nezávislosti od Dánska a pre svetové mocnosti je strategicky mimoriadne zaujímavá.

— Aká je podľa názoru Komisie úloha Európskej únie v súvislosti s podporou bezpečného rozvoja Grónska?

Odpoveď pána Piebalgsa v mene Komisie
(19. októbra 2012)

Komisia si je plne vedomá významu Grónska a rastúceho strategického záujmu oň zo strany svetových veľmocí.

Dňa 7. decembra 2011 prijala návrh na nové rozhodnutie Rady, v ktorom sa stanovuje právny rámec spolupráce medzi EÚ a Grónskom na obdobie rokov 2014 – 2020. V uvedenom návrhu je vymedzených niekoľko oblastí možnej spolupráce, medzi nimi vzdelávanie, prírodné zdroje a otázky Arktídy.

Po prijatí dohody EÚ o finančnom rámci na obdobie rokov 2014 – 2020 a po prijatí rozhodnutia Rady o vzťahoch medzi EÚ na jednej strane a Grónskom a Dánskym kráľovstvom na strane druhej sa uskutočnia rokovania medzi vládou Grónska a Komisiou na účel vymedzenia oblastí budúcej spolupráce (2014 – 2020).

Komisia vo svojom návrhu naznačuje možnosť politického dialógu s Grónskom o širokom spektre oblastí. V tejto súvislosti podpredseda Komisie Tajani a komisár Piebalgs podpísali 13. júna 2012 spolu s predsedom vlády Grónska Kuupikom Kleistom vyhlásenie o zámere spolupracovať v oblasti nerastných surovín.

Navyše, v novom spoločnom oznámení o pokroku pri vytváraní politiky Európskej únie pre Arktídu, ktoré bolo prijaté 26. júna 2012, Komisia a vysoká predstaviteľka/podpredsedníčka Komisie navrhujú niekoľko základných prvkov konštruktívneho zapojenia EÚ v arktickej oblasti s cieľom riešiť problém udržateľného rozvoja a podporovať účinný dohľad nad ekosystémom a zároveň sa širšie zapájať do dialógu a spolupráce so zainteresovanými stranami v arktickom regióne.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007666/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(27 August 2012)

Subject: Mutual relations between the EU and Greenland

Greenland is the world's largest island. It has enormous potential for the extraction of oil, natural gas, rare earth elements and minerals. In addition, something like 10% of the world's drinking water is located there. Due to its climatic environment, it is also a key location for climate research and a source of significant information about what the earth's climate was like thousands of years ago. Greenland became part of Denmark in 1953, but obtained autonomy in 1979, a status that was further enhanced after a referendum in 2008. Denmark is currently responsible only for its foreign policy and defence. Greenland is moving towards full independence from Denmark and is of exceptional strategic interest for the world's powers.

— What role does the Commission consider that the European Union is called upon to play in the safe development of Greenland?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(19 October 2012)

The Commission is fully aware of the importance of Greenland and the growing strategic interest from the world's powers.

The Commission adopted on the 7th December 2011 its proposal for a new Council Decision which sets the legal framework for cooperation between the EU and Greenland for the period 2014-2020. The proposal defines several possible areas of cooperation, among others education, natural resources and Arctic issues.

Upon agreement by the EU on the Financial Framework for the period 2014-2020 and upon adoption by the Council of the decision on relations between the EU on the one hand, and Greenland and the Kingdom of Denmark on the other, negotiations between the Government of Greenland and the Commission will take place in order to define the areas of future cooperation (2014-2020).

In its proposal, the Commission indicated the possibility of policy dialogue with Greenland around a broad spectrum of areas. In this context, on 13 June 2012 Vice-President Tajani and Commissioner Piebalgs signed together with the Prime Minister of Greenland Kuupik Kleist a Letter of Intent on cooperation in the area of mineral resources

Moreover, in the new joint Communication on Developing an EU Policy towards the Arctic Region, adopted on 26th June 2012, the Commission and the High Representative/Vice-President propose a set of building blocks for the EU's constructive engagement in the Arctic to tackle the challenge of sustainable development and to promote the effective stewardship of the ecosystem while engaging more extensively in dialogue and cooperation with Arctic stakeholders.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-007673/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(27. augusta 2012)

Vec: Situácia v Sýrií

Ani v týchto dňoch neutíchajú boje v Sýrii. Naopak, situácia sa stále viac a viac vyhrocuje, v dôsledku čoho musela Európska únia nevyhnutne prijať voči tejto arabskej krajine ďalšie sankcie namierené proti režimu prezidenta al-Assada. Ide v poradí o sedemnásty súbor sankčných opatrení v období od vypuknutia sýrskych nepokojov v marci minulého roka. Tie lode a lietadlá, ktoré budú (napriek zbrojnému embargu) podozrivé z pašovania zbraní alebo tovaru potenciálne využiteľného na potlačenie protivládneho sýrskeho povstania, sa budú povinne prehľadávať. Navyše, aktuálnu, už i tak napätú situáciu značne komplikuje i skutočnosť, že vláda v Sýrii, podporovaná Ruskou federáciou, vylučuje riešenie konfliktu rezignáciou prezidenta Baššára al-Assada. Ak však napokon bude Assadov režim zvrhnutý, Sýria zdevastovaná bojmi bude čeliť nesmierne zložitej situácii.

— Akým spôsobom sa bude Komisia snažiť pomôcť zdevastovanej Sýrii v prípade, ak bude Assadov režim zvrhnutý?

Odpoveď podpredsedníčky Komisie/vysokej predstaviteľky Ashtonovej v mene Komisie
(7. januára 2013)

EÚ v súčasnosti pripravuje plány na „deň po“ ukončení konfliktu v Sýrii a na prechodné obdobie po zmene režimu. EÚ má k dispozícii celý rad nástrojov vrátane nástrojov v oblasti bezpečnosti a stability, správy vecí verejných a budovania inštitúcií, prechodného súdnictva, právneho štátu a humanitárnej pomoci, ktoré spájajú pomoc, obnovu a rozvoj atď. Pri podpore obnovy Sýrie sa bude opierať o svoje predchádzajúce poznatky v oblasti rekonštrukcie po skončení konfliktov.

Na základe Rámca priateľov sýrskeho ľudu, konkrétne prostredníctvom pracovnej skupiny pre hospodársku obnovu, EÚ zaujala pozíciu koordinátora darcov. Táto koordinačná práca, ktorú EÚ začala, má za cieľ spojiť všetky kľúčové medzinárodné organizácie a bilaterálnych darcov, aby sa koordinovalo spoločné úsilie a poskytla sa pomoc sýrskemu ľudu počas prechodného obdobia.

EÚ je v súčasnosti prvým humanitárnym darcom v tejto kríze; reagovala na výzvu medzinárodných mimovládnych organizácií, agentúr Organizácie Spojených národov a hnutia Červeného kríža a červeného polmesiaca, pričom poskytuje pomoc vo výške takmer 230 miliónov EUR. Humanitárna pomoc EÚ podporuje Sýrčanov tak vnútri Sýrie, ako aj v susedných krajinách.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007673/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(27 August 2012)

Subject: Situation in Syria

Even now there is no lull in the fighting in Syria. On the contrary, the situation is becoming ever more tense. As a result, the European Union has had no alternative but to impose further sanctions on the country aimed at the regime of President al-Assad. They are the seventeenth consecutive set of sanctions imposed since the outbreak of the unrest in Syria in March last year. Ships and planes which are suspected of being used (despite the arms embargo) to smuggle weapons, or other items that could potentially be used to suppress the anti-government movement in Syria, will be subject to compulsory search. Furthermore, the already tense situation is being complicated by the fact that the Syrian Government, supported by the Russian Federation, is refusing to consider the possibility of the conflict being resolved through the resignation of Bashar al-Assad. Once the Assad regime has been overthrown, however, Syria will face a very difficult task of reconstruction after the devastation caused by the fighting.

— How will the Commission assist Syria in recovering from devastation if the Assad regime is indeed overthrown?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(7 January 2013)

The EU is currently preparing and planning for a Day After situation in Syria, and the following transition period, once there is a regime change. The EU has a range of tools in its disposal, including in the fields of security and stability, governance and institution-building, transitional justice, rule of law, humanitarian aid, linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development etc. and will build on its previous expertise in post-conflict reconstruction to support Syria's recovery.

Under the Friends of Syrian people framework, notably its Working Group on Economic Recovery, the EU has taken the lead for donor coordination. This coordination work that the EU has started aims at bringing together all the key international organisations and bilateral donors to coordinate efforts and assistance to the Syrian people during the transition period.

The EU is currently the first humanitarian donor to the crisis, responding to the call of International Non-Governmental Organisations, United Nations agencies and the Red Cross — Red Crescent movement with a total of almost EUR 230 million of assistance. EU humanitarian aid supports Syrians both inside Syria and in the neighbouring countries.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-007675/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(27. augusta 2012)

Vec: Otázka transparentnosti veľkých obchodných spoločností

Nezávislá protikorupčná organizácia Transparency International analyzovala transparentnosť určitých firemných správ z pohľadu ich protikorupčných opatrení. Správa ako nebezpečnú označila skutočnosť, že obchodné spoločnosti nezverejňujú, koľko platia štátom. Zo sledovaných 105 firiem to neuvádza 64. Zo správy teda vyplýva, že veľké obchodné spoločnosti neaplikujú dostatočne transparentné opatrenia, a tým zabraňujú účinnému predchádzaniu možným hospodárskym problémom. Je ale opodstatnené, aby veľké obchodné spoločnosti spravodlivou formou prispievali štátu, na území ktorého pôsobia.

— Plánuje Komisia vypracovať návrhy legislatívnych opatrení, ktoré by riešili problém nedostatočnej transparentonosti veľkých obchodných spoločností pôsobiacich v členských štátoch EÚ?

Odpoveď pána Barniera v mene Komisie
(26. októbra 2012)

Komisia zdieľa záujem váženej pani poslankyne Európskeho parlamentu, ktorý prejavila v otázke transparentnosti veľkých obchodných spoločností pôsobiacich v EÚ. Je to významná otázka, ktorá si vzhľadom na svoj vplyv na inkluzívny a udržateľný hospodársky rast a zamestnanosť zaslúži osobitnú pozornosť. Komisia pracuje vo vzťahu k tejto otázke konkrétne na dvoch opatreniach, ktoré sú v rôznych fázach:

Komisia pripravuje iniciatívu o zverejňovaní environmentálnych a sociálnych údajov spoločnosťami vo všetkých hospodárskych odvetviach, čo avizovala v oznámení o podnikovej sociálnej zodpovednosti, prijatom v októbri 2011 a predtým v oznámení o Akte o jednotnom trhu, prijatom v apríli 2011. Cieľom je predstaviť vyvážený návrh, ktorý umožní významný pokrok v užitočnom transparentnom zverejňovaní informácií, ale zabráni neprimeranej administratívnej záťaži pre spoločnosti, a to najmä pre tie najmenšie. Komisia sa nachádza v pokročilom štádiu príprav a s návrhom príde čo najskôr.

Dňa 25. októbra 2011 prijala Komisia legislatívny návrh o „vykazovaní podľa jednotlivých krajín." Tento návrh vyžaduje povinné zverejnenie platieb vládam na základe jednotlivých krajín a na projektovom základe všetkými kótovanými aj veľkými nekótovanými spoločnosťami v EÚ s činnosťami v oblasti ropy, zemného plynu, baníctva a ťažby dreva. Takéto zverejnenie by poskytlo občianskej spoločnosti v krajinách bohatých na zdroje informácie, na základe ktorých môžu byť vlády brané na zodpovednosť za všetky príjmy pochádzajúce z využívania prírodných zdrojov. O legislatívnom návrhu EÚ sa v súčasnosti rokuje v Rade a Európskom parlamente.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007675/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(27 August 2012)

Subject: The issue of transparency in big business

The independent anti-corruption organisation Transparency International has examined the transparency of certain company reports from the anti-corruption angle. Its report highlights as a significant risk the failure of corporations to publish details of how much they pay governments. 64 of the 105 firms examined failed to indicate this. It emerges from the report that big corporations do not apply sufficiently transparent measures and thus hinder effective action to prevent economic problems arising. Yet it is entirely justified for big firms to contribute in a fair and just way to the state on whose territory they pursue their activities.

— Is the Commission planning to draw up proposals for legislative measures to resolve the problem of insufficient transparency in big corporations pursuing activities in EU Member States?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(26 October 2012)

The Commission shares the interest of the honourable Member of the European Parliament concerning the transparency of large companies operating in the EU, which is a significant issue deserving particular attention given its impact on inclusive and sustainable economic growth and employment. Concretely, the Commission is working on two measures related to this issue, which are at different stages.

The Commission prepares an initiative on disclosure of environmental and social information by companies across all economic sectors. This was announced in the communication on Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) adopted in October 2011, and previously in the single market Act communication adopted in April 2011. The aim is to present a balanced proposal allowing for significant progress on useful, transparent disclosure of information, but avoiding undue administrative burden for companies, and in particular for the smallest ones. The Commission's work is at an advanced stage and a proposal will follow as soon as possible.

On 25 October 2011, the Commission adopted a legislative proposal on 'country-by-country reporting'. The proposal requires mandatory disclosure of payments to governments on a country and project basis by all listed and large unlisted EU companies with activities in the oil, gas, mining and logging sectors. Such disclosure would provide civil society in resource-rich countries with the information needed to hold governments to account for any income made through the exploitation of natural resources. The EU legislative proposal is currently being negotiated in the Council and the EP.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-007924/12
adresată Comisiei
Adrian Severin (NI)
(7 septembrie 2012)

Subiect: Demiterea Președintelui României Traian Băsescu văzută ca puci parlamentar

În cadrul declarației sale din Le Monde din 1 septembrie 2012, Comisarul european pentru justiție, Viviane Reding, referindu-se la acțiunea de demitere a președintelui României, Traian Băsescu, a calificat-o ca pe „un puci parlamentar" și a pus sub semnul întrebării funcționalitatea și credibilitatea statului de drept în România.

Puciul este o lovitură de stat militară, o lovitură de stat fiind „o acțiune de preluare a puterii într-un stat prin răsturnarea violentă a conducerii legitime de către un grup de complotiști". Rezultă că în România, în locul aplicării procedurilor legale pentru schimbarea conducerii statului, s-a recurs la violență.

În fapt, atât procedura inițierii, cât și modul de desfășurare a procesului de demitere a președintelui României au fost validate de Curtea Constituțională a României ca fiind valabile. În cadrul desfășurării referendumului care a urmat deciziei Parlamentului, un total de 8,5 milioane de cetățeni s-au prezentat la vot, dintre care 7,4 milioane au votat pentru demitere (87,7 %).

— Rugăm Comisia să precizeze care sunt faptele pe care se bazează calificarea evenimentelor din România din perioada iulie-august 2012 drept o lovitură de stat. Cine au fost complotiștii? În ce au constat violențele?

— Care sunt argumentele care susțin ideea că procedura urmată a fost legală?

Răspuns comun dat de dna Reding în numele Comisiei
(11 octombrie 2012)

Cu privire la poziția Comisiei referitoare la evoluția situației politice și instituționale din această vară în România, Comisia ar dori să aducă în atenția distinsului membru răspunsul pe care aceasta l-a oferit la întrebările scrise E-007112/2012 și E-007534/2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/ro/parliamentary-questions.html

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-007678/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(27. augusta 2012)

Vec: Situácia v Rumunsku

Rumunsko sa v poslednom období nachádza v politickej neistote. Nedávno bol v krajine zvolený nový premiér, Victor Ponta. Situácia je od tej doby znepokojujúca. Konflikt premiéra s prezidentom krajiny, obavy z ohrozovania právneho štátu, konanie, ktoré pravdepodobne ohrozuje pôsobenie nezávislých inštitúcií a útoky na nezávislosť Ústavného súdu v Rumunsku. Krajina kvôli momentálnej situácii čelí ostrej medzinárodnej kritike, Rada Európy dokonca požiadala právnych expertov na preskúmanie legitimity odvolania rumunského prezidenta.

— Dominieva sa Komisia, že konanie rumunského premiéra je v súlade s princípmy právneho štátu a demokracie, rovnako ako s európskymi princípmi a hodnotami?

Spoločná odpoveď pani Redingovej v mene Komisie
(11. októbra 2012)

So zreteľom na pozíciu Komisie k politickému a inštitucionálnemu vývoju v Rumunsku v priebehu tohto leta by Komisia chcela odkázať váženú poslankyňu na svoju odpoveď na písomné otázky E-007112/2012 a E-007534/2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007678/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(27 August 2012)

Subject: Situation in Romania

Romania has recently been in a state of political uncertainty. A new prime minister, Victor Ponta, was elected and since then the situation has been alarming, marked by clashes between the PM and the President, fears of threats to the rule of law in the country, actions likely to pose a threat to the work of independent institutions and attacks on the independence of the Constitutional Court. Romania has been sharply criticised by the international community because of the current situation. The Council of Europe has even asked legal experts to examine the legitimacy of the suspension of the Romanian President.

— Does the Commission consider that the behaviour of the Romanian Prime Minister has complied with the principles of the rule of law and democracy, and with European principles and values?

Question for written answer E-007924/12
to the Commission
Adrian Severin (NI)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Dismissal of Traian Basescu, President of Romania — a parliamentary putsch?

In a statement in the 1 September 2012 edition of *Le Monde*, the European Commissioner for Justice, Viviane Reding, described the dismissal of the President of Romania, Traian Basescu, as a 'parliamentary putsch' and raised question marks over the proper functioning and credibility of the rule of law in Romania.

A putsch is a military coup, and a coup can be defined as 'a takeover of the powers of state by a group of conspirators who replace the legitimate leadership using violence'. This would imply that, in Romania, rather than the correct legal procedures for changing the head of state being applied, violence was used.

In fact, the Romanian Constitutional Court approved both the instigation and the procedure for the dismissal of the President of Romania. In the referendum which followed the decision adopted in the Romanian Parliament, the turnout was 8.5 million, with 7.4 members of the public voting in favour of dismissal (87.7%).

— Can the Commission state its grounds for describing the events in Romania in the period July to August 2012 as a coup d'état. Who were the conspirators? In what way did they act violently?

— What arguments are there to indicate that the procedure followed was not legal?

Joint answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(11 October 2012)

With regard to the Commission position on the political and institutional developments of this summer in Romania, the Commission would like to refer the Honourable Members to its reply to written questions E-007112/2012 and E-007534/2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007684/12
alla Commissione
Sonia Alfano (ALDE)
(27 agosto 2012)

Oggetto: Titolarità effettiva di persone giuridiche/istituti giuridici

La relazione della Commissione COM(2012)0168 sull'applicazione della direttiva 2005/60/CE suggerisce che sia ulteriormente preso in considerazione l'inserimento, «nella direttiva antiriciclaggio o in un altro strumento giuridico vigente nel settore del diritto societario, di misure volte a promuovere la trasparenza delle persone giuridiche/degli istituti giuridici».

Tenendo presente che:

— la Commissione (COM(2010)0673) ha chiesto che la normativa UE antiriciclaggio venga utilizzata per «aumentare la trasparenza delle persone giuridiche e degli istituti giuridici»;

— il Parlamento ha richiesto due volte maggiore trasparenza in materia di titolarità delle società (2011/2744(RSP) e 2012/2599(RSP));

— diciotto Stati membri rispettano solo in parte o non rispettano affatto la raccomandazione della task force «Azione finanziaria» in base alla quale i paesi sono tenuti a garantire la disponibilità delle informazioni in materia di titolarità effettiva delle società;

— i gruppi industriali, inclusa la Federazione bancaria dell'Unione europea, che rappresenta le associazioni bancarie di tutti gli Stati membri, e le organizzazioni della società civile, in rappresentanza di oltre 1 000 gruppi, hanno chiesto che siano resi disponibili i registri pubblici dei titolari effettivi delle società europee;

la Commissione è in grado di dire quali misure intende prendere nell'ambito della revisione della direttiva 2005/60/CE o di un'iniziativa separata, per assicurare che le informazioni sulla titolarità effettiva di persone giuridiche/istituti giuridici siano raccolte e rese accessibili al pubblico?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(22 ottobre 2012)

La proposta di revisione della direttiva 2005/60/CE, che la Commissione prevede di adottare entro la fine dell'anno, attuerà le norme internazionali in modo consono al contesto dell'UE. Le nuove raccomandazioni del GAFI contengono nuove disposizioni che impongono di garantire la disponibilità di informazioni sulla titolarità effettiva delle persone giuridiche o degli istituti giuridici, prevedendo misure mirate ad assicurare la trasparenza e l'accesso e inserendo specifiche disposizioni per la cooperazione internazionale. Le autorità devono garantire alle competenti autorità un accesso tempestivo a informazioni adeguate, precise e aggiornate sulla titolarità effettiva. I paesi devono scegliere come rendere disponibili le informazioni sull'effettiva titolarità, richiedendone la disponibilità nei registri delle imprese o direttamente dalle imprese; oppure utilizzando informazioni esistenti (ad esempio informazioni ottenute da istituti finanziari). Per quanto riguarda gli istituti giuridici, i fiduciari devono ottenere e mantenere informazioni sulla titolarità effettiva e renderne noto lo status agli istituti finanziari e alle imprese non finanziarie o alle professioni quando agiscono come fiduciari.

La Commissione presta attenzione ai solleciti delle parti interessate e del Parlamento europeo affinché si migliori la trasparenza e attualmente sta prendendo in considerazione le opzioni per migliorare la disponibilità delle informazioni sulla titolarità effettiva all'interno dell'Unione, non solo per le autorità competenti, ma anche per gli enti obbligati che rispettano la normativa UE in materia di antiriciclaggio.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007684/12
to the Commission
Sonia Alfano (ALDE)
(27 August 2012)

Subject: Beneficial ownership of legal persons/legal arrangements

The Commission's report COM(2012) 0168 on the application of Directive 2005/60/EC suggests that further consideration could be given to: 'including, either into the AML Directive or in another existing legal instrument in the company law area, measures to promote the transparency of legal persons/legal arrangements'.

Bearing in mind that:

— the Commission (COM(2010) 0673) has requested that the EU's Anti-Money Laundering Directive be used to 'enhance the transparency of legal persons and legal arrangements';

— Parliament has twice called for greater transparency over the ownership of companies (2011/2744(RSP) and 2012/2599(RSP));

— eighteen Member States are only partially compliant or indeed not compliant at all with the Financial Action Task Force's recommendation that countries ensure that beneficial ownership information in relation to companies is available;

— industry groups, including the European Banking Federation (which represents the banking associations of all Member States), and civil society organisations representing over 1 000 groups, have called for public registers of the beneficial owners of EU companies to be made available;

can the Commission say what steps it plans to take, either as part of a revision of Directive 2005/60/EC or as part of a separate initiative, to ensure that information regarding the beneficial ownership of legal persons/legal arrangements is collected and made publicly available?

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

The proposal to revise Directive 2005/60/EC, which the Commission plans to adopt before the end of this year, will implement the international standards in ways which fit the EU context. The new FATF Recommendations contain new provisions on making information available on the beneficial ownership of a legal person or legal arrangement by imposing measures aimed at providing clarity and accessibility and including specific requirements for international cooperation. Authorities should ensure timely access for competent authorities to adequate, accurate and up-to-date beneficial ownership information. Countries should choose how to make beneficial ownership available, whether by requiring it to be available in company registries or directly from companies; or by using existing information (e.g. such as information obtained by financial institutions). With respect to legal arrangements, trustees should obtain and hold beneficial ownership information and disclose their status to financial institutions and designated non-financial businesses or professions when they act as trustees.

The Commission is sensitive to calls by stakeholders and the European Parliament for improved transparency, and is currently considering options to enhance availability of beneficial ownership information within the EU, not just to competent authorities but also to obliged entities complying with EU AML legislation.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007685/12
to the Commission
Seán Kelly (PPE)
(27 August 2012)

Subject: Impact assessment under Directive 98/70/EC ('Fuel Quality Directive')

The Commission is in the process of undertaking an impact assessment concerning a draft implementing measure on calculation methods and reporting requirements, pursuant to Directive 98/70/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council relating to the quality of petrol and diesel fuels, also referred to as the 'Fuel Quality Directive' (FQD).

To avoid missing this opportunity and to ensure a coherent and workable solution, it is important that the impact assessment should be comprehensive and adequately address the concerns of both Member States and stakeholders.

1. Can the Commission confirm that a comprehensive cross-impact assessment will be completed?

2. Can the Commission clarify:

— the nature and the scope of the impact assessment, and in particular the extent to which it will qualify and quantify the economic, administrative, trade and other (potentially negative) implications of differentiation between different crudes or groups of crude;

— the extent to which the impact assessment will also look at the potential impacts of alternative proposals to the implementing measure as put forward by different Member States, such as the Netherlands and Italy, and by stakeholders;

— the timing of the impact assessment, specifying when it Commission intends to have it concluded;

— the timing of the announced limited consultation, stating who will be invited to participate;

— which party will be conducting the cross-impact assessment, and what external experts will be engaged in this process and to what extent?

Answer given by Mme Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(1 October 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the response given to Question E-005887/2012 by Mrs Jordan Cizelj, Mr Seeber, Mr Sonik and Mr Tatarella ([1]).

The Commission has published a roadmap setting out details of the impact assessment; this can be found at the following web address:
http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/planned_ia/docs/2012_clima_009_ghg_emissions_fossil_fuel_en.pdf.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007688/12
aan de Commissie
Cornelis de Jong (GUE/NGL) en Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE)
(27 augustus 2012)

Betreft: Arbeidsinspecties en Cibeles

Mensenhandel, niet-gedwongen illegale tewerkstelling, misbruik van werknemers en tekortschieting (het achterblijven) van de rechtspositie van arbeidsmigranten zijn nog steeds veelvoorkomende problemen in de interne markt voor de werkgelegenheid ([1]). Nationale arbeidsinspecties spelen een belangrijke rol bij het analyseren van deze problemen. Maar ze worden blijkbaar beperkt door grenzen, waar dit voor arbeidsmigratie niet het geval is. Het Cibeles-project heeft deze problemen in kaart gebracht en een aantal voorstellen voor Europese wetgeving en samenwerking geformuleerd die vervolgens door het Senior Labour Inspectors' Committee (SLIC) grotendeels zijn overgenomen.

In de mededeling van de Commissie „Towards a job-rich recover" ([2]) is betrokkenheid op het gebied van samenwerking tussen de nationale arbeidsinspecties beloofd. De Commissie wil een raadpleging opzetten om te bekijken of een EU-platform tussen de arbeidsinspecties en andere handhavinginstanties op het gebied van illegale tewerkstelling opgericht kan worden. Dit is bedoeld om ervaringen te delen en gezamenlijke beginselen te identificeren. Deze samenwerking is van groot belang en heeft een zekere tijdsnoodzaak. De raadpleging wordt gezien als een samenkomst van enkel belanghebbenden, in tegenstelling tot een openbare raadpleging over een document. Daarnaast heeft de Commissie enkele voorstellen gedaan in de ontwerprichtlijn over de handhaving van de detacheringsrichtlijn.

1. Wat is het karakter van de raadpleging? Is deze openbaar? Heeft de Commissie niet al informatie opgevraagd van de lidstaten? Beschikt de Commissie niet reeds over gegevens over de arbeidssituatie in de lidstaten? Zo ja, waar kunnen deze gegevens worden geraadpleegd? Welke informatie heeft de Commissie over onvoldoende controles en misbruik?

2. Wat is de reden dat de Commissie überhaupt eerst een raadpleging wil, nu Cibeles al onderzoek gedaan heeft en het SLIC de voorstellen van Cibeles grotendeels heeft onderschreven?

3. Bedoelt de Commissie met een EU-platform ook, zoals Cibeles, dat er een elektronisch netwerk komt dat via een Commissie-server loopt en alle informatie over detacheringen opslaat?

4. Is de Commissie bereid om naast het voorstel voor een platform ook het voorstel van Cibeles voor een verordening over gegevensuitwisseling tussen arbeidsinspecties voor te bereiden? Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie de overige voorstellen van Cibeles?

Antwoord van de heer Andor namens de Commissie
(19 oktober 2012)

1. Momenteel houdt de Commissie een reeks raadplegingen met de lidstaten en andere belanghebbenden in verschillende werkgroepen, waaronder het Comité van hoge functionarissen van de arbeidsinspectie, om na te gaan welke meerwaarde van de samenwerking op EU-niveau biedt en wat het beste kader is voor een dergelijke samenwerking, de taakomschrijving en de beoogde resultaten.

2. Het Cibeles-project was gericht op arbeidsinspectieactiviteiten in verband met grensoverschrijdende handhaving op het gebied van veiligheid en gezondheid op het werk. Het geplande Europees platform moet alle aspecten van zwartwerk bestrijken. Cibeles en soortgelijke initiatieven, zoals ICENUW en de haalbaarheidsstudies van Regioplan, bieden nuttige input voor die raadplegingen en de voorstellen ervan zullen helpen bij het opzetten van het platform.

3. Wat de terbeschikkingstelling van werknemers betreft, is in mei 2011 een proefproject van start gegaan waarbij gebruik wordt gemaakt van een aparte module van het informatiesysteem interne markt (IMI), om de elektronische uitwisseling van informatie tussen de lidstaten te verbeteren en te intensiveren in verband met de administratieve samenwerking op dit gebied.

([1]) http://www.standaard.be/artikel/detail.aspx?artikelid=DMF20120516_123
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/news/employment/120419_en.htm

4. De Commissie heeft bij het opstellen van een voorstel voor de handhavingsrichtlijn betreffende de terbeschikkingstelling van werknemers rekening gehouden met de problemen die bij het Cibeles-project zijn geconstateerd. Cibeles draagt voor een aantal problemen oplossingen aan, zoals regels voor grensoverschrijdende handhaving van administratieve boetes/sancties, en nauwere administratieve samenwerking tussen de bevoegde autoriteiten, hetgeen te realiseren zou zijn via het IMI. Dit laatste zou ook de problemen in verband met gegevensbescherming oplossen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007688/12
to the Commission
Cornelis de Jong (GUE/NGL) and Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE)
(27 August 2012)

Subject: Labour inspectorates and CIBELES

Trafficking in human beings, non-forced illegal employment, employee abuse and a less favourable legal position for migrant workers are still frequent problems in the internal labour market ([1]). National labour inspectorates play an important role in investigating these problems. However, they are clearly restricted by national borders, which migrant workers are not. The CIBELES (Convergence of Inspectorates Building a European-Level Enforcement System) project has mapped these problems and made a number of proposals for European legislation and cooperation which were subsequently taken up by the Senior Labour Inspectors' Committee (SLIC).

In its communication 'Towards a job-rich recovery' ([2]), the Commission promises involvement in cooperation between national labour inspectorates. It intends to launch a consultation on setting up an EU-level platform between labour inspectorates and other enforcement bodies in the field of undeclared work, in order to share experiences and identify common principles. Such cooperation is very important and is indeed urgently needed. The consultation is seen as a meeting between individual stakeholders, rather than a public consultation on a document. In addition the Commission has made a number of proposals in its proposal for a directive on the enforcement of the Posting of Workers Directive.

1. What is the nature of the consultation? Is it public? Has the Commission not already gathered information from the Member States? Does the Commission not already possess data on the employment situation in the Member States? If so, where may these data be consulted? What information does the Commission possess on inadequate checks and abuses?

2. Why does the Commission want a consultation anyway, when CIBELES has already carried out a study and SLIC has largely endorsed the CIBELES proposals?

3. Does the Commission mean by an EU-level platform — as CIBELES does — that there is to be an electronic network running via a Commission server and storing all information on the posting of workers?

4. Is the Commission willing, in addition to its proposal for a platform, also to prepare CIBELES's proposal for a regulation on data exchange between labour inspectorates? What is the Commission's view of the other CIBELES proposals?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(19 October 2012)

1. At present the Commission is conducting a series of consultations with the Member States and other stakeholders in various working groups, including the Senior Labour Inspectors' Committee, to identify the added value of EU-level cooperation and determine the best framework for such cooperation, the terms of reference and the outputs.

2. The Cibeles project focused on labour inspection activities in connection with cross-border enforcement in the area of occupational health and safety. The planned European platform is intended to cover the whole sphere of undeclared work. Cibeles and similar initiatives, such as the ICENUW and the Regioplan Feasibility studies, provide useful input for those consultations and their proposals will facilitate the setting-up of the platform.

3. With respect to the posting of workers, a pilot project which uses a special, separate module of the internal market Information System (IMI) to improve and step up electronic information exchange between the Member States was launched in May 2011 in connection with administrative cooperation in this area.

4. The Commission took account of the problems identified by the Cibeles project when drafting the proposal for the Enforcement Directive concerning the posting of workers. Cibeles sets out a number of solutions to the problems identified, such as provisions on cross-border enforcement of administrative fines/penalties, and closer administrative cooperation between the competent authorities, to be implemented through IMI. The latter would also solve the problems raised in relation to data protection.

([1]) http://www.standaard.be/artikel/detail.aspx?artikelid=DMF20120516_123
([2]) COM(2012) 173 final; see also http://ec.europa.eu/news/employment/120419_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007693/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 agosto 2012)

Oggetto: Gestione dei rifiuti: situazione italiana disomogenea tra virtù e forti ritardi nell'applicazione della direttiva comunitaria

La direttiva 2008/98/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio del 19 novembre 2008 stabilisce il quadro normativo per il trattamento dei rifiuti nell'Unione europea. Una recente relazione della Commissione europea sulla gestione dei rifiuti urbani negli Stati membri (BiPRO (2012): Screening of waste management performance of EU Member States. Report submitted under the EC project «Support to Member States in improving waste management based on assessment of Member States' performance». Relazione preparata per la Commissione europea, DG ENV, luglio 2012) (Rassegna delle prestazioni degli Stati membri in materia di gestione dei rifiuti) denota l'esistenza di comportamenti molto diversi tra gli Stati UE: i più virtuosi sono quelli nordici, dotati di sistemi completi di raccolta dei rifiuti, dove le discariche rappresentano solo il 5 % dell'intero sistema. A non attenersi alle linee guida comunitarie sono gli Stati di più recente adesione all'UE, e l'Italia. Il modus operandi dei Paesi meno virtuosi agisce da freno alla modernizzazione dell'intero settore del riciclaggio e non permette un uso mirato dei fondi strutturali comunitari.

Al contrario, lo sviluppo del settore dei rifiuti creerebbe occupazione e garantirebbe una qualità della vita più alta. Il tema della gestione dei rifiuti è oggetto di diverse petizioni presentate al PE da parte di cittadini che vogliono tutelare se stessi e il proprio territorio dalla costruzione di nuove discariche e inceneritori. Pur avendo recepito la direttiva comunitaria 2008/98/CE con D.L. 205/2010, l'Italia presenta tuttora un Nord molto virtuoso con più dell'85 % dei Comuni che attuano il riciclaggio, mentre al Centro e al Sud prevale ancora un uso massiccio di inceneritori e discariche (stime di Legambiente per il 2012).

— La Commissione prevede di eseguire nuove ispezioni nelle zone d'Italia in cui si ricorre ancora a discariche e inceneritori come soluzione principale allo smaltimento dei rifiuti?

— Dati i forti interessi del crimine organizzato nella gestione dei rifiuti, per la quale vengono stanziati ingenti finanziamenti comunitari, in che modo intende procedere la Commissione per limitare questo fenomeno?

— In particolare, ritiene plausibile l'adozione di un sistema di monitoraggio finanziario sui finanziamenti europei erogati alle imprese, da parte di autorità nazionali e locali, come suggerito nella risoluzione non legislativa approvata dal Parlamento in data 2 febbraio 2012 (P7_TA(2012)0026)?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(11 ottobre 2012)

Sulla base dello studio menzionato dall'onorevole parlamentare, la Commissione ha individuato l'Italia come uno degli Stati membri in ritardo nel settore della gestione dei rifiuti. Di conseguenza, il 25 ottobre 2012, i servizi della Commissione terranno un seminario a Roma per presentare e discutere con le autorità italiane competenti una tabella di marcia per migliorare la gestione dei rifiuti urbani in particolare nelle regioni meridionali italiane. Tale iniziativa promozionale mirata alla conformità comprenderà raccomandazioni volte a conseguire a medio e lungo termine gli obiettivi della Commissione, in linea con le pertinenti disposizioni della direttiva quadro sui rifiuti ([1]), in particolare per quanto riguarda la gerarchia dei rifiuti e gli obiettivi di riciclaggio per i rifiuti domestici.

La lotta contro la criminalità organizzata connessa alla gestione dei rifiuti è principalmente una questione di competenza nazionale in relazione alla quale la Commissione svolge solo un ruolo limitato. Per quanto riguarda il cofinanziamento, la Commissione ha proposto che il quadro finanziario pluriennale 2014-2020 garantisca un'applicazione più trasparente e sistematica delle cosiddette «condizionalità» nel settore della gestione dei rifiuti. Ciò significa che qualsiasi investimento di fondi dell'UE in infrastrutture per la gestione dei rifiuti sarà subordinato all'adempimento di certe condizioni ex ante, quali la conformità con la gerarchia dei rifiuti e l'esistenza di piani di gestione dei rifiuti in linea con la direttiva summenzionata.

Analogamente a quanto sopra, il monitoraggio e il controllo dei finanziamenti pubblici ad imprese private costituiscono una questione di competenza nazionale e, di conseguenza, la Commissione non prevede di introdurre tali procedure nel quadro della normativa UE.

([1]) GU L 312 del 22.11.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007693/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(28 August 2012)

Subject: Waste management situation in Italy: differences in performance and significant delays in implementation of the Waste Directive

Directive 2008/98/EC of the European Parliament and the Council of 19 November 2008 lays down the regulatory framework governing waste treatment in the European Union. In July 2012, the European Commission's DG ENV drew up a report on the management of municipal waste in the Member States entitled 'BiPRO (2012): Screening of waste management performance of EU Member States' (report submitted under the EC project 'Support to Member States in improving waste management based on assessment of Member States' performance'). That report notes that approaches vary greatly from one Member State to another. The Scandinavian countries perform best, and are equipped with comprehensive waste collection systems in which only 5% of waste is not recycled. European guidelines are not being followed by the newest Member States, or in Italy. The modus operandi of the worst-performing countries is hampering the modernisation of the whole recycling sector and impeding the use of Community structural funding in this field.

Developing the waste sector would, in fact, create jobs and make for a better quality of life. Waste management has formed the subject of several petitions to the EP by citizens wishing to safeguard themselves and the places they live against the construction of new waste tips and incinerators. Italy has transposed Community Directive 2008/98/EC via Legislative Decree 205/2010, but the north of the country is performing significantly better than the centre and south, with over 85% of municipalities in the north recycling, while the centre and the south still make extensive use of incinerators and waste tips (Legambiente figures for 2012).

— Does the Commission plan to conduct fresh inspections in those regions of Italy which still resort to the use of waste tips and incinerators to dispose of waste?

— Given that organised crime is closely linked with waste management, for which enormous Community financing is available, what will the Commission do to limit this situation?

— More particularly, does it consider that a financial monitoring system could be introduced to monitor the funding allocated to enterprises by national and local authorities, as suggested in the non-legislative resolution adopted by Parliament on 2 February 2012 (P7_TA(2012)0026)?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(11 October 2012)

Based on the study mentioned by the Honourable Member, the Commission has identified Italy as one of the Member States lagging behind in the area of waste management. As a result, on 25 October 2012 the Commission services will hold a seminar in Rome in order to present and discuss with Italian competent authorities a roadmap to improve management of municipal waste particularly in Italian southern regions. This compliance promotion initiative will include recommendations aimed at achieving mid-term and long-term Commission objectives in line with the relevant requirements of the Waste Framework Directive ([1]), notably the waste hierarchy and the recycling target for household waste.

Tackling organised crime related to waste management is mainly a matter of national competence where the Commission has only a limited role to play. As regards co-financing the Commission has proposed that the Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-20 should ensure a more transparent and systematic application of so-called 'conditionalities' in the area of waste management. This means that any investment of EU funds in waste management infrastructure would be conditional upon the fulfilment of certain ex-ante conditions, such as the compliance with the waste hierarchy and the existence of waste management plans in line with the aforementioned directive.

Monitoring and controlling public funding to private enterprises is also a matter of national competence. Hence, the Commission does not envisage introducing such schemes under EU legislation.

([1]) OJ L 312, 22.11.2008.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007697/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(28. August 2012)

Betrifft: EU-weite Angleichung von Renten und Pensionen

Bezüglich des erwähnten ganzheitlichen Ansatzes, den die EU im Bereich Renten und Pensionen verfolgen will, erscheint eine europaweite, zumindest annähernde Angleichung des Renteneintrittsalters, möglicherweise auch unter Berücksichtigung der Besonderheiten einzelner Branchen, doch erstrebenswert, damit die Arbeitnehmer einzelner Länder in diesem Kontext nicht benachteiligt werden.

1. Hat die Kommission nun schon konkrete Anregungen für die Mitgliedstaaten dafür, wie sie die Koppelung von Ruhestandsalter und Lebenserwartung angemessen durchführen können?

2. Wie bewertet die Kommission die im Weißbuch angeführten Möglichkeiten, spätere Renten- oder Pensionseintrittsalter zu erreichen?

3. Welche Auswirkungen ergeben sich aus den Ansätzen nun konkret für die Kosten der Sozialsysteme der einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten?

Antwort von Herrn Andor im Namen der Kommission
(18. Oktober 2012)

Die Kommission betont, dass ein ausgewogenes Verhältnis zwischen Arbeits- und Ruhestandsjahren beibehalten werden muss. Vor dem Hintergrund der steigenden Lebenserwartung bedeutet dies, dass Erwerbstätige ermutigt und befähigt werden müssen, länger beruflich aktiv zu bleiben. Der Standpunkt der Kommission zu Pensionen und Renten kann in ihrem einschlägigen Weißbuch ([1]) nachgelesen werden.

In den Jahreswachstumsberichten sowie in den länderspezifischen Empfehlungen im Rahmen der Strategie Europa 2020 werden die Mitgliedstaaten aufgefordert, die Möglichkeiten zur Frühverrentung zu beschränken und das gesetzliche Rentenalter an die steigende Lebenserwartung anzupassen. Die Kommission erkennt jedoch auch an, dass, „wann immer vorzeitige Ruhestandsoptionen abgebaut werden, es wichtig ist dafür zu sorgen, dass die betroffenen Personen länger arbeiten oder, wenn das nicht möglich ist, entsprechende Einkommenssicherheit genießen können“ ([2]).

Es ist Sache der Mitgliedstaaten und — soweit die betriebliche Altersversorgung betroffen ist — der Arbeitgeber- und Arbeitnehmervertreter, unter Berücksichtigung der jeweiligen besonderen Umstände geeignete Mittel zur Umsetzung dieser allgemeinen politischen Leitlinien zu finden. Zudem müssen die zuständigen Behörden der Mitgliedstaaten die finanziellen Auswirkungen von Reformen beurteilen. Die Kommission wird diese Auswirkungen auch bei ihrer multilateralen haushaltspolitischen Überwachung im Rahmen des Stabilitäts- und Wachstumspakts, des finanzpolitischen Rahmens der EU, berücksichtigen.

([1]) Weißbuch: Eine Agenda für angemessene, sichere und nachhaltige Pensionen und Renten (KOM(2012)55 endg. vom 16. Februar 2012), abrufbar unter: http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=7341&langId=de

([2]) Ebd.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007697/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(28 August 2012)

Subject: Alignment of state and private pensions throughout the EU

Given the holistic approach being sought by the EU with regard to state and private pensions, at least some degree of harmonisation of the age of retirement throughout the EU, taking account of special circumstances in individual sectors where appropriate, would appear to be desirable, so as to prevent any discrimination against workers in individual Member States.

1. Can the Commission make any specific recommendations as to how Member States could bring the retirement age suitably into line with life expectancy?

2. What view does the Commission take of the possibilities of increasing the age of eligibility for state and private pensions referred to in the White Paper?

3. What are the specific implications of these proposals for welfare costs in the individual Member States?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(18 October 2012)

The Commission insists on the need to maintain a good balance between years spent working and years spent in retirement. This implies that workers are encouraged and enabled to remain longer on the labour market as life expectancy rises. The Commission's views on pensions can be found in its White Paper on Pensions ([1]).

The annual growth surveys and the country-specific recommendations in the context of the Europe 2020 strategy call on Member States to restrict access to early retirement and to link the statutory pensionable age to changes in life expectancy. However, the Commission also acknowledges that 'Whenever early retirement options are eliminated, it is important to ensure that the individuals concerned are enabled to work longer or, if this is not possible, can enjoy adequate income security' ([2]).

It is up to the Member States and, as far as occupational pensions are concerned, the representatives of management and labour, to find appropriate ways of implementing these general policy orientations, taking due account of the specific circumstances applying. The spending implications of reforms are also to be assessed by the competent authorities in the Member States, and will be taken into account in the Commission's multilateral budgetary surveillance under the EU fiscal framework, the Stability and Growth Pact.

([1]) 'White Paper: An Agenda for Adequate, Safe and Sustainable pensions' (COM(2012) 55 final of 16 February 2012) at http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=7341&langId=en
([2]) ibid.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007700/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(28. August 2012)

Betrifft: HPV-Impfung

Im Engagement für die Krebsbekämpfung fordert der Medizin-Nobelpreisträger zur Hausen vor allem Prävention.

In Österreich beträgt die Impfrate bei Impfungen gegen das unter anderem Gebärmutterhalskrebs auslösende HPV circa 5 % (in anderen Industriestaaten hingegen bis zu 90 %).

1. Hat die Kommission Kenntnis von diesem gravierenden Unterschied? Wenn ja: Kann es sein, dass der sehr hohe Preis für diese Impfung in Österreich eine Ursache dafür ist?

2. Welche Impfraten gibt es diesbezüglich EU-weit?

3. Gedenkt die Kommission, hier einerseits durch entsprechende Informationskampagnen tätig zu werden und andererseits gegebenenfalls durch entsprechende finanzielle Zuschüsse diese zu ermöglichen?

Antwort von Herrn Dalli im Namen der Kommission
(11. Oktober 2012)

Der Kommission sind die offiziellen österreichischen HPV-Impfraten nicht bekannt, da Österreich hierzu keine Informationen vorgelegt hat. In den Mitgliedstaaten, die ein routinemäßiges HPV-Immunisierungsprogramm eingeführt haben und Angaben dazu vorlegen, liegen die HPV-Impfraten zwischen 24 und 84 % ([1]). HPV-Impfungen sind teuer, und in Österreich werden die Kosten gänzlich von den Patienten getragen.

Was Informationskampagnen zu HPV-Impfungen betrifft, so ist die Kommission der Ansicht, dass diese sich wirkungsvoller auf nationaler Ebene durchführen lassen. Die ECDC stellt zudem fest, dass soziale Faktoren und Verhaltensweisen, die Auswirkungen auf die Akzeptanz von Impfungen haben, teilweise länderspezifisch sind und daher auf nationaler Ebene berücksichtigt werden müssen. Die EU kann Informationskampagnen auf nationaler Ebene nicht finanzieren; sie fallen in die Zuständigkeit der Mitgliedstaaten, und im Rahmen des Gesundheitsprogramms können nur Projekte mit europäischer Dimension finanziert werden, an denen mehrere Mitgliedstaaten beteiligt sind.

Nach Auffassung der Kommission bedeutet die Unterstützung der Mitgliedstaaten durch die EU bei der Werbung für Immunisierung sowohl in der Öffentlichkeit als auch in den Reihen der Gesundheitsberufe einen Mehrwert. Dieser Punkt wird auch ein wichtiges Thema auf der Konferenz zu Schutzimpfungen für Kinder ([2]) sein, die die Kommission am 16. und 17. Oktober 2012 organisiert und in deren Rahmen sich eine große Zahl von Interessenträgern mit den Prioritäten für Maßnahmen auf EU-Ebene auseinandersetzen soll. Das Europäische Zentrum für die Prävention und die Kontrolle von Krankheiten unterstützt die Mitgliedstaaten darüber hinaus mit technischen Leitlinien ([3]) für die Aufklärung über Impfungen.

([1]) http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/Publications/20120905_GUI_HPV_vaccine_update.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/vaccination/events/ev_20121016_en.htm
([3]) http://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/Publications/TER-Immunisation-and-trust.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007700/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(28 August 2012)

Subject: HPV vaccination

The importance of prevention above all in combating cancer is acknowledged by people such as Harald zur Hausen, winner of the Nobel Prize in medicine.

In Austria, the rate of vaccination against HPV, a cause of disorders such as cervical cancer, is around 5% (compared with up to 90% in other industrialised countries).

1. Is the Commission aware of this serious disparity? If so, could it be explained at least in part by the extremely high cost of the vaccination in Austria?

2. What are the vaccination percentages throughout the EU?

3. Does the Commission intend, on the one hand, to launch an information campaign in favour of such vaccinations and, on the other, to provide the necessary funding for this purpose, where appropriate?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(11 October 2012)

The Commission does not have official HPV vaccination rates for Austria as Austria has not provided such information. In the Member States that have implemented a routine HPV immunisation programme and which provide information on vaccination rates, HPV vaccination rates reported range from 24% to 84% ([1]). HPV vaccination cost is high and is fully borne by the patient in Austria.

Regarding information campaigns on HPV vaccines, the Commission considers that it is more effective to organise such campaigns at a national level. The ECDC also notes that 'social factors and behaviour affecting vaccine acceptance […] are in part country-specific and need to be addressed at a national level'. The EU cannot provide funding for information campaigns at national level: this is the competence of Member States and the health programme can only fund projects with a European dimension, involving several Member States.

The Commission considers that there is EU added value in supporting Member States on advocacy on immunisation both to the public and healthcare professionals. The latter is an important theme in the Conference on childhood immunisation ([2]) organised by the Commission on 16-17 October 2012, where a wide range of stakeholders will discuss priority areas for future EU level action. The European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control further supports the Member States by providing technical guidance ([3]) on communication on vaccination.

([1]) http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/Publications/20120905_GUI_HPV_vaccine_update.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/vaccination/events/ev_20121016_en.htm
([3]) e.g. http://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/Publications/TER-Immunisation-and-trust.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007701/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(28. August 2012)

Betrifft: Griechenlands Privatisierungen

Griechenland erwartet Milliarden Euro an weiteren Einnahmen durch die Privatisierung von Staatseigentum. Werden Griechenland dadurch auf der anderen Seite Einnahmen daraus langfristig abgehen?

Welche Kenntnisse hat die Kommission hierzu, und was gedenkt sie auf europäischer Ebene zu tun, um nachhaltige Einbußen von Einnahmen, die Griechenland und somit seine Bevölkerung verlieren, zu verhindern?

Antwort von Herrn Rehn im Namen der Kommission
(30. Oktober 2012)

Wie die Frau Abgeordnete weiß, schreibt die Mehrzahl der in den Privatisierungsplan der griechischen Regierung aufgenommenen öffentlichen Unternehmen Verluste und ist für die Griechische Republik deshalb eine Quelle beträchtlicher Verschwendung. Auch zahlreiche Immobilien erzielen keine Einnahmen und belasten den Staat insgesamt durch Wartungskosten und operative Ausgaben.

Privatisierungen öffentlicher Unternehmen dienen dem Schulden- und Subventionsabbau sowie der Verringerung anderer Transfers und staatlicher Garantien für Unternehmen im Staatsbesitz. Zudem können sie die Effizienz der Unternehmen erhöhen und damit zur Steigerung der Wettbewerbsfähigkeit der Wirtschaft insgesamt beitragen und ausländische Direktinvestitionen ins Land holen.

Die Privatisierung von Staatseigentum kann nach Ansicht der Kommission der Gesellschaft Nutzen bringen, wenn umsichtig vorgegangen wird. Deshalb sollten Privatisierungen erfolgen, wenn ein geeigneter Rechtsrahmen geschaffen wurde, der einen Missbrauch durch private Monopole verhindert. Gleichzeitig ist es wichtig, ein gutes Gleichgewicht zu finden zwischen gleichberechtigtem und fairem Zugang zu öffentlichen Gütern, einer hohen Qualität der erbrachten Dienstleistungen und einem finanziell tragfähigen Angebot.

Die Liste zu privatisierender Vermögenswerte ist öffentlich zugänglich. Wir verweisen die Frau Abgeordnete in diesem Zusammenhang auf die im griechischen Anpassungsprogramm enthaltene, jüngste Fassung des Privatisierungsplans (im März 2012 unterzeichnetes Memorandum of Understanding) ([1]).

([1]) Siehe insbesondere die Seiten 31-33 und 118: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2012/op94_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007701/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(28 August 2012)

Subject: Greek privatisation

Greece is expecting to obtain further revenue worth billions of euros from the privatisation of state property. Will the longer-term consequence be that Greece will subsequently lose revenue as a result of this privatisation?

What information does the Commission have on this subject, and what action will it take at European level to prevent any long-term loss of revenue to Greece and hence to its population?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(30 October 2012)

As the Honourable Member knows, most of the public companies that are included in the Greek Government's Privatisation Plan are loss-making, generating serious waste for the Hellenic Republic. There are also numerous real estate assets that do not generate any revenues and are causing a burden to the State in terms of maintenance costs and operational expenditures overall.

Privatisation of public companies contributes to the reduction of public debt, as well as to the reduction of subsidies, other transfers or state guarantees to state-owned enterprises. It also has the potential of increasing the efficiency of companies and, by extension, the competitiveness of the economy as a whole, while attracting foreign direct investment.

The Commission believes that privatisation of State property can deliver benefits to the society when carefully made. To this end, privatisation should take place once the appropriate regulatory framework has been prepared to avoid abuses by private monopolies. At the same time, it is important to find a balance between equal and fair access to public goods, high quality of services and a financially sustainable supply.

The list of assets for privatisation is in the public domain and the Honourable Member is invited to consult the latest review of the Privatisation Plan (MoU signed last March 2012), included in Greece's economic adjustment programme ([1]).

([1]) See specifically in pages 31-33 and 118: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2012/op94_en.htm

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007705/12
an den Rat
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(28. August 2012)

Betrifft: Neues Ratsgebäude in Brüssel

Die Mitgliedstaaten und die Bürger Europas leiden gegenwärtig unter den Folgen einer schweren Finanz- und Wirtschaftskrise und führen auf allen Ebenen Sparmaßnahmen ein. Trotz dieser schwierigen Lage setzt der Rat jedoch den Bau seines neuen Gebäudes im Europa-Viertel fort. Es stellt sich die Frage, ob dies in Zeiten knapper Kassen die richtige Botschaft ist?

1. Wie hoch werden die gesamten Kosten für das Projekt derzeit geschätzt?

2. Wie hoch sind die Baukosten bislang? Entsprechen sie der ursprünglichen Planung bei Baubeginn?

3. Wie hoch werden die Kosten für die Ausstattung derzeit geschätzt?

4. Wann wird der Bau fertiggestellt werden? Liegt der Bau im vorgesehenen Zeitplan?

5. Hat der Rat erwogen, die Bauzeit zu verlängern oder den Umfang des Projekts zu reduzieren, um den Steuerzahlern Ausgaben zu ersparen und in Zeiten knapper Kassen ein gutes Beispiel für die europäischen Bürger abzugeben?

Antwort
(19. November 2012)

In Bezug auf das Gebäude „Europa“ teilt der Rat der Frau Abgeordneten Folgendes mit:

1. Die derzeitige gerundete Kostenschätzung (in Preisen von Januar 2004) beträgt 219 Mio. EUR bzw. (in Preisen von November 2011) 290 Mio. EUR. Die Höchstgrenze für die Projektgesamtkosten (in Preisen von Januar 2004) beläuft sich auf 240 Mio. EUR. Dies entspricht in Preisen von November 2011 323 Mio. EUR.

2. Die Gesamtkosten für die Errichtung des Gebäudes bis Juni 2012 betragen 27,8 Mio. EUR, einschließlich der Asbestsanierung. Dies entspricht weitgehend den Kostenschätzungen.

3. Die Ausstattung (Innenausbau und Gebäudetechnik) ist bereits in den Kosten für die Errichtung des Gebäudes enthalten.

4. Das mit dem belgischen Staat vereinbarte Übergabedatum ist der 15. April 2014. Die belgische Gebäudeverwaltung, die vom belgischen Staat mit der Beaufsichtigung der Bauarbeiten beauftragt wurde, prüft derzeit ein Ersuchen des Bauunternehmens, die Übergabe auf Herbst 2014 zu verschieben.

5. Jegliche Änderung der Spezifikationen oder der Planung während der laufenden Bauarbeiten würde zu Mehrkosten führen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007705/12
to the Council
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(28 August 2012)

Subject: New Council building in Brussels

Currently, Member States and European citizens are suffering from the effects of a severe financial and economic crisis, so that they have had to introduce austerity measures at all levels. Despite this difficult situation, the Council is continuing with the construction of its new building in the European Quarter. The question is: is this is the right message to send out in times of austerity?

1. What is the current estimate of the total project costs?

2. What are the construction costs so far? Are they in line with the amount provided for at the beginning of construction?

3. What is the current estimate for internal fitting out?

4. When will it actually be finished? Are the construction works currently in line with the time frame for the project?

5. Has the Council considered stretching construction times or downsizing the project in order to save taxpayers' money and set a good example to European citizens in times of austerity?

Reply
(19 November 2012)

Regarding the Europa building, the Council informs the Honourable Member that :

1. The current rounded cost estimate, at January 2004 prices, is EUR 219 million or, at November 2011 prices, EUR 290 million. The ceiling for the total project costs, at January 2004 prices, is EUR 240 million. This represents at November 2011 prices EUR 323 million.

2. The total cost of construction works up to June 2012 amount to EUR 27.8 million, including asbestos removal works. This is broadly in line with the estimates.

3. The internal fitting out (internal partitions and fixtures) is already included in the construction cost.

4. The handover date agreed with the Belgian state is 15 April 2014. The Belgian Buildings Agency, charged by the Belgian state with overseeing the construction of the building, is studying a request from the construction company to delay the handover to autumn 2014.

5. Any change in the specifications or in the planning while construction work is in progress would lead to supplementary costs.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007706/12
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin)
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(28. August 2012)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Flüchtlinge des Bürgerkriegs in Syrien

Syrien und seine Nachbarstaaten sehen sich einer schweren humanitären Krise gegenüber. Medienberichten zufolge fliehen Hunderttausende von Menschen vor dem Krieg. Allein in Jordanien werden 130 000 Flüchtlinge erwartet. Die jordanischen Behörden haben deshalb beschlossen, in Mafraq nahe der Grenze zu Syrien ein provisorisches Zeltlager für die Flüchtlinge zu errichten.

1. Wie reagiert die Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin auf diese humanitäre Krise?

2. Welche Maßnahmen ergreifen die EU und der EAD, um den Flüchtlingen zu helfen und die Nachbarstaaten von Syrien dabei zu unterstützen, die Situation besser zu bewältigen?

3. Welche Maßnahmen hat die Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin gegenüber der syrischen Regierung ergriffen, um dem Bürgerkrieg in Syrien ein Ende zu bereiten? Welche Ergebnisse wurden dabei erzielt?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(7. November 2012)

Die EU hat auf die Verschärfung der humanitären Krise rasch mit umfassenden Maßnahmen reagiert. Sie hat die humanitäre Hilfe für Syrien im Februar 2012 aufgenommen und hat die für die Krisenhilfe vorgesehenen Mittel inzwischen durch fünf Beschlüsse erheblich erhöht, da sich die Lage verschlechtert hat.

— Der EU-Beitrag für humanitäre Hilfe beläuft sich nun auf 191 Mio. EUR, von denen 96 Mio. EUR aus dem EU-Haushalt und 95 Mio. EUR im Wege der bilateralen Hilfe von den EU-Mitgliedstaaten bereitgestellt werden. Somit ist die EU insgesamt der größte Geber, der Mittel für die Bewältigung der Krise bereitstellt. Die Hilfe trägt der Lage in Syrien Rechnung und schließt Maßnahmen zur Unterstützung der Binnenvertriebenen und der syrischen Flüchtlinge in Nachbarländern ein.

— Mit einer Reihe von Sondermaßnahmen, für die über das Europäische Nachbarschafts- und Partnerschaftsinstrument (ENPI) für 2011 und 2012 33 Mio. EUR bereitgestellt werden, werden Zivilpersonen in Syrien (12,6 Mio. EUR), syrische Flüchtlinge in Libanon (5 Mio. EUR) und in Jordanien (5,4 Mio. EUR) und palästinensische Flüchtlinge in Syrien (10 Mio. EUR) unterstützt. Die EU ist bereit, diese Beträge aufzustocken und neue Maßnahmen zur Unterstützung der syrischen Bevölkerung und der Nachbarländer zu ergreifen.

Die Kommission ist an der Koordinierung der humanitären Hilfe maßgeblich beteiligt, da sie den Ko-Vorsitz im humanitären Forum zu Syrien innehat, das bisher fünfmal in Genf zusammengetreten ist. Außerdem wurde das Beobachtungs- und Informationszentrum (MIC) auf Antrag der jordanischen Behörden aktiviert. Die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin verfolgt die Entwicklung der Lage im Rahmen ihrer Kontakte und zusammen mit Partnern in der Region weiterhin sehr aufmerksam.

Die EU unterstützt nachdrücklich den gemeinsamen Sonderbeauftragten der Vereinten Nationen und der Liga der arabischen Staaten für Syrien, L. Brahimi, sowie eine friedliche Lösung der Krise.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007706/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(28 August 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Refugees from Syrian civil war

Syria and its neighbouring states are facing a severe humanitarian crisis. According to media reports, hundreds of thousands of people are fleeing from the war. Jordan alone is anticipating the arrival of 130 000 refugees. The Jordanian authorities have therefore decided to construct a temporary tent camp for the refugees at Mafraq, near the border with Syria.

1. What is the reaction of the Vice-President/High Representative to this humanitarian disaster?

2. What measures and actions are the EU and the EEAS taking to support these refugees and to assist the states surrounding Syria to better cope with the situation?

3. What action has the Vice-President/High Representative taken vis-à-vis the Syrian Government to resolve the civil war in Syria? And what have the results of this action been?

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

The EU response to the worsening humanitarian crisis has been swift and substantial. The first EU humanitarian assistance was launched in February 2012 and to date there have been five major decisions increasing the amount of EU assistance to deal with the crisis. The EU funding matches the deterioration of the situation:

— The EU contribution to the humanitarian aid has reached now EUR 191 million of which EUR 96 million is from the EU budget, EUR 95 million bilaterally from EU Member States making the EU collectively the largest donor to the crisis. The aid has addressed the situation in Syria, including the internally displaced as well as Syrian refugees in neighboring countries.

— A series of Special Measures funded under the European Neighborhood Policy Instrument (ENPI) for 2011 and 2012 amount to EUR 33 million and will support civilians inside Syria (EUR 12.6 million); Syrian refugees in Lebanon (EUR 5 million) and Jordan (EUR 5.4 million), and Palestinian refugees inside Syria (EUR 10 million). We stand ready to step up these amounts and launch new actions in the favor of the Syrian population and of its neighboring countries.

The Commission has a key role in coordinating the humanitarian aid with the Commission co-chairing of the Syrian Humanitarian Forum, which has met 5 times in Geneva. Furthermore the Monitoring and Information Centre (MIC) has been activated for Jordan following the request by the Jordanian authorities. The HR/VP continues to follow closely the evolving situation through her contacts and with partners in the region.

The EU fully supports the UN-Arab League Joint Special Representative, L. Brahimi and a peaceful solution of the crisis.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007707/12
an die Kommission Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin)
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(28. August 2012)

Betrifft: VP/HR — 800 Roma in Montenegro obdachlos

Jüngsten Medienberichten zufolge wohnten im Sommer dieses Jahres in Podgorica, der Hauptstadt Montenegros, 800 Roma in Holzbaracken. Der Rat beschreibt ihre Lebensbedingungen als „unmenschlich und gefährlich". Nun sind die Holzbaracken abgebrannt und Montenegro erwägt, die Menschen in einfachen Zelten unterzubringen.

1. Welche Schritte und Maßnahmen hat die Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin eingeleitet, um die Roma in Podgorica zu unterstützen?

2. Entspricht die Behandlung, die diese Menschen erfahren, den europäischen Rechtsvorschriften und europäischen Werten, und insbesondere der Charta der Menschenrechte?

3. Was hat die Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin gegenüber der Regierung von Montenegro unternommen, um eine Verbesserung des Lebensstandards und der Sicherheitslage für diese Menschen zu bewirken?

Antwort von Herrn Füle im Namen der Kommission
(22. Oktober 2012)

Die Europäische Union misst der Achtung der Rechte von Vertriebenen in Montenegro, vor allem von Roma, Aschkali und Balkan-Ägyptern, große Bedeutung bei. Gleiches gilt für die Annahme und Umsetzung einer nachhaltigen Strategie für die Schließung des Lagers Konik. Da es sich hierbei um einen Schwerpunktbereich der Reformen des Landes handelt, wurden diesbezügliche Entwicklungen in den letzten Jahren von der Kommission aufmerksam verfolgt. Im Frühjahrsbericht über Montenegro vom Mai 2012 stellte die Kommission fest, dass durchaus Fortschritte erzielt wurden, diese jedoch noch ausgebaut werden sollten, um die Registrierung, die wirtschaftlichen Rechte und die soziale Inklusion dieser Menschen zu gewährleisten. Im Rahmen der EU-Beitrittsverhandlungen mit Montenegro wird das Monitoring fortgesetzt. Das Land muss den Besitzstand in diesem Bereich, einschließlich der Bestimmungen der Europäischen Menschenrechtscharta, vollständig umsetzen.

Durch den Brand in Konik im Juli 2012 wurden 800 Roma obdachlos und — als Notlösung — vorübergehend in Zelten untergebracht. Zusätzlich zu den von der montenegrinischen Regierung bereitgestellten Containern hat die Kommission bereits 60 000 EUR für Sanitärblocks zur Verfügung gestellt. Darüber hinaus sind im Rahmen eines mit 2 500 000 EUR ausgestatteten Projekts des Instruments für die Heranführungshilfe (IPA) neue und dauerhafte Unterkünfte im Gebiet Konik geplant. Mit Hilfe des Projekts werden Wohnungen gebaut, in denen die am stärksten benachteiligten Gruppen der dort lebenden Bevölkerung untergebracht werden sollen. Weitere Mittel für neue Unterkünfte und die soziale Integration werden über andere IPA-Mittel sowie über ein regionales Wohnungsbauprogramm bereitgestellt, das von der Kommission in Zusammenarbeit mit anderen internationalen Organisationen durchgeführt wird.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007707/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(28 August 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — 800 Roma in Montenegro without home

According to media reports this summer, 800 Roma were housed in wooden barracks in Podgorica, the capital of Montenegro. The living conditions in the camp have been described by the European Council as 'inhuman and dangerous'. The wooden barracks recently burned down, and the Montenegrin authorities are now considering plans to house the people in simple tents.

1. What actions and measures has the Vice-President/High Representative undertaken to support the Roma living in Podgorica?

2. Is the treatment of this group of Roma in line with European legislation and European values, especially with the provisions of the Charter of Human Rights?

3. What actions and measures has the Vice-President/High Representative undertaken vis-à-vis the Government of Montenegro to improve the standard of living of and security for this group of Roma?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(22 October 2012)

The European Union attaches great importance to the respect of the rights of displaced persons in Montenegro, in particular of Roma, Askhali and Egyptians (RAE). The same applies to the adoption and implementation of a sustainable strategy for the closure of Konik camp. This has been identified as a key priority area of reform for the country and was therefore closely monitored by the Commission in recent years. In the Spring Report on Montenegro issued last May, the Commission acknowledged that progress has been made and that this progress should be reinforced to ensure registration, as well as the economic rights and social inclusion of RAE persons. Monitoring will continue in the framework of the EU accession negotiations with Montenegro. The country will have to ensure the full alignment with the *acquis* in this field, including with the provisions of the European Charter of Human Rights.

After the fire in Konik in July 2012, 800 Roma who lost their home have been temporarily accommodated in tents as an emergency solution. The Commission has already provided EUR 60 000 for sanitation blocks, complementary to the containers provided by the Montenegrin Government. Furthermore, new and permanent housing in the Konik area is already foreseen under an EU Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA) project worth EUR 2 500 000. The project foresees the construction of apartments to accommodate the most vulnerable groups within the population living there. Additional funds for new residences and social integration will come through further IPA funds, as well as through a regional housing programme, run by the Commission in cooperation with other international organisations.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007709/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(28. August 2012)

Betrifft: Paralympische Spiele in London

Am 29. August 2012 beginnen die Paralympischen Spiele in London.

1. Wie viele Mitglieder der Kommission werden den Paralympischen Spielen in London beiwohnen? (Um eine Namensliste wird gebeten.)

2. Worin besteht der Zweck dieser Besuche und wodurch sind sie begründet?

3. Wie hoch sind die Gesamtkosten dieser Besuche?

Antwort von Frau Vassiliou im Namen der Kommission
(28. November 2012)

Im Rahmen der Zusammenarbeit zwischen der EU und der paralympischen Bewegung wurden das verantwortliche Kommissionsmitglied sowie Vertreter der für Sport zuständigen Dienststellen der Kommission vom Internationalen Paralympischen Komitee offiziell dazu eingeladen, der Eröffnungsfeier der Spiele in London sowie einigen am ersten Tag stattfindenden Wettkämpfen beizuwohnen.

Die Kommissarin, ein Kabinettsmitglied und ein Kommissionsbediensteter, der im Referat „Sport“ der Generaldirektion Bildung und Kultur für den Bereich Chancengleichheit zuständig ist, besuchten die Veranstaltung. Im Rahmen seines Arbeitsauftrags kam dieser Bedienstete mit Vertretern des Europäischen Paralympischen Komitees zusammen, um über die laufende Zusammenarbeit zu sprechen. Außerdem traf er sich mit dem Vorsitzenden der EU-Expertengruppe zur allgemeinen und beruflichen Bildung im Sport sowie dem Vorsitzenden der britischen Stiftung „Street Games“.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007709/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(28 August 2012)

Subject: London Paralympic Games

The Paralympic Games start on 29 August 2012.

1. How many people from the Commission will attend the Paralympic Games in London (please provide a list of names)?

2. What are the purposes and justifications of these visits?

3. What are the total costs of these visits?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(28 November 2012)

In the framework of the cooperation between the EU and the Paralympic movement, the responsible Member of the Commission and representatives of the Commission services in charge of sport were officially invited by the International Paralympic Committee to attend the Opening Ceremony of the Games in London and to attend some specific competitions on the first day.

The Commissioner, one cabinet member and one Commission official, in charge of equal opportunities at the sport unit of the Directorate-General for Education and Culture, attended the event. In the framework of the official's mission he met with representatives of the European Paralympic Committee to discuss ongoing cooperation and also had separate meetings with the Chairman of the EU Group of experts on Education and Training in Sport and the Street Games Foundation in the UK.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007711/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(28. August 2012)

Betrifft: Olympische Spiele in London

Die Olympischen Spiele fanden in London statt.

1. Wie viele Mitglieder der Kommission wohnten den Olympischen Spielen in London bei (um eine Namensliste wird gebeten)?

2. Worin bestand der Zweck dieser Besuche und wie wurden sie begründet?

3. Wie hoch waren die Gesamtkosten dieser Besuche?

Antwort von Frau Vassiliou im Namen der Kommission
(28. November 2012)

Wie bereits in der Antwort auf die schriftlichen Anfragen E-002877/2012 und E-002878/2012 ([1]) ausgeführt, waren die für Sport zuständigen Kommissionsdienststellen nicht offiziell zu den Olympischen Spielen in London eingeladen, und folglich nahm kein Vertreter dieser Dienststellen im Namen der Kommission an der Veranstaltung teil.

Die zuständige Kommissarin war offiziell zur Schlussfeier der Olympischen Spiele eingeladen und nahm in Begleitung eines Mitglieds ihres Kabinetts daran teil.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/de/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007711/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(28 August 2012)

Subject: London Olympic Games

The Olympic Games took place in London.

1. How many people from the Commission attended the Olympic Games in London (please provide a list of names)?

2. What were the purposes and justifications of these visits?

3. What were the total costs of these visits?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(28 November 2012)

As stated in the reply to written questions E-002877/2012 and E-002878/2012 ([1]), the Commission services responsible for sport were not officially invited to the London Olympic Games and consequently no representative of these services attended the event on behalf of the institution.

The responsible Commissioner was officially invited to and attended the closing ceremony of the Olympic Games, accompanied by one member of her cabinet.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007713/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(28. August 2012)

Betrifft: Hautkrebs durch Solarien

Die Fachzeitschrift „British Medical Journal" veröffentlichte einen Artikel des „International Prevention Research Institute" im französischen Lyon, dem zufolge die Nutzung von Solarien zu einem um 20 Prozent erhöhten Hautkrebsrisiko führt. Die repräsentative Studie deckt 18 europäische Staaten ab. Für Menschen, die bereits vor ihrem 35. Lebensjahr Solarien nutzen, steigt die Wahrscheinlichkeit auf 87 Prozent. Die Wissenschaftler warnen, dass die Nutzung von Solarien daher weit gefährlicher ist als bislang bekannt.

1. Wie reagiert die Kommission auf diese neuen Erkenntnisse?

2. Verfolgt die Kommission bestimmte Maßnahmen, um die europäischen Bürger über die Gefahren zu informieren, die mit der Nutzung von Solarien einhergehen?

3. Wie plant die Kommission, speziell jüngere Menschen zu schützen?

Antwort von Herrn Dalli im Namen der Kommission
(2. Oktober 2012)

Die Kommission ist sich des engen Zusammenhangs zwischen der Benutzung von Sonnenbänken und der Entstehung von Hautkrebs vollkommen bewusst. In der Vergangenheit wurden in Zusammenarbeit mit den Mitgliedstaaten bereits zahlreiche Schritte unternommen, um sicherzustellen, dass von diesen Produkten keine Gefahr für die Gesundheit und Sicherheit der Verbraucher ausgeht und dass die Verbraucher über Risiken und die geeignete Nutzung dieser Geräte informiert werden.

Als Ergebnis eines von der Kommission erteilten Auftrags für Normungsarbeiten, in deren Rahmen eine Stellungnahme des Wissenschaftlichen Ausschusses „Konsumgüter" (SCCP) aus dem Jahr 2004 ([1]) berücksichtigt wurde, hat Cenelec die Norm EN 60335-2-27:2003 für Sonnenbänke geändert. Die überarbeitete Norm dient als Anleitung für Sonnenbankbetreiber sowie als Richtschnur für nationale Behörden, die die Geräte und Praktiken in Sonnenstudios bezüglich ihrer Konformität mit der Niederspannungsrichtlinie überprüfen. Die Norm enthält nun einen Grenzwert für die effektive Bestrahlungsstärke (0,3 W/m^2) sowie das vollständige Verbot der Benutzung von Sonnenbänken durch Jugendliche unter 18 Jahren.

Weitere Einzelheiten kann die Frau Abgeordnete den Antworten der Kommission auf die schriftlichen Fragen E-4126/09, E-4233/09, E-4250/09, E-5338/09 und E-1249/10 ([2]) entnehmen.

Um den generellen Schutz und die Information von Verbrauchern zu verbessern, hat die Kommission außerdem die Bemühungen der Mitgliedstaaten durch finanzielle Beiträge zu zwei gemeinsamen Maßnahmen zwischen 2009 und 2011 unterstützt. Diese Projekte zielten darauf ab, die Anzahl der Kontrollen zu erhöhen und den Verbrauchern verbesserte Informationen über die Risiken im Zusammenhang mit der Nutzung von Sonnenbänken bereitzustellen. Der Abschlussbericht über das zweite Projekt soll Ende 2012 veröffentlicht werden.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_risk/committees/04_sccp/docs/sccp_o_031b.pdf
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/de/parliamentary-questions.html#sidesForm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007713/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(28 August 2012)

Subject: Skin cancer caused by sunbeds

According to a study by the International Prevention Research Institute in Lyon, France, presented in an article in the *British Medical Journal*, the use of sunbeds increases the risk of skin cancer by 20%. The representative study encompasses 18 European countries. The probability rate increases to 87% for people who use sunbeds before their 35th birthday. On the basis of these results, the scientists warn that the use of sunbeds is much more dangerous than was previously known.

1. What is the reaction of the Commission to these new findings?

2. Does the Commission have any policy in place to inform European citizens of the dangers that the use of sunbeds poses?

3. What does the Commission intend to do to protect younger people in particular?

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

The Commission is fully aware of the strong correlation between the use of sunbeds and the development of skin cancer. Several steps have already been taken in the past in cooperation with the Member States to ensure both that these products do not endanger the health and safety of consumers and that consumers are informed about risks and proper use.

Following a Commission standardisation work mandate, which takes into account a 2004 opinion of the Scientific Committee on Consumer Products (SCCP) ([1]), CENELEC has amended the EN 60335-2-27:2003 standard for sunbeds. The revised standard guides sunbed operators and also serves as benchmark when national authorities inspect tanning studios' equipment and practices against the safety requirements of the Low Voltage Directive. The standard now includes a maximum limit for effective irradiance (0.3 W/m^2) and totally forbids the use of sunbeds by children under 18 years of age.

The Honourable Member will find more detailed information in the Commission's answer to Written Questions E-4126/09, E-4233/09, E-4250/09, E-5338/09 and E-1249/10 ([2]).

In addition, to improve the overall protection and information of consumers, the Commission has supported Member States' efforts by providing financial contributions to two joint actions, between 2009 and 2011. These projects were aimed at increasing the number of inspections and improving the provision of information to consumers on the risks associated with sunbed use. The final report of the second project is due to be published later in 2012.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_risk/committees/04_sccp/docs/sccp_o_031b.pdf
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html#sidesForm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007716/12
to the Commission
Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR)
(28 August 2012)

Subject: Purchasing or registering a car in Italy without first applying for and obtaining residence

I have been contacted by a constituent in London who has expressed concern over circumstances relating to the fact that he has owned a house in Italy since 2003, being therefore permitted to reside there with his family for up to three months in a given year without having to apply for a residence permit. My constituent has informed me that they pay all their local taxes in respect of this property, and that they have met the necessary requirements for a *codice fiscale* (tax code) and an Italian bank account.

Despite this, he has been informed by the Italian authorities that the members of his family may not purchase or register a car in Italy without first applying for and obtaining a residence permit. My London constituent does not wish to apply for residence, and therefore questions the reasoning as to why as EU citizens, he and his family are being prevented from purchasing or registering a car within another Member State. Can the Commission provide an explanation?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(26 October 2012)

Directive on vehicle registration 1999/37/EC ([1]) regulates the content of the registration document but it does not prevent Member States from linking the registration of a vehicle to the place of residence.

The Commission would also like to inform the Honourable Member that according to the Commission proposal of 4 April 2012 for a regulation on simplifying the transfer of motor vehicles registered in another Member State ([2]) a Member State may only require registration on its territory of a vehicle registered in another Member State if the holder of the registration certificate has his normal residence on its territory.

([1]) Council Directive 1999/37/EC of 29 April 1999 on the registration documents for vehicles, OJ L 138, 1.6.1999, pp. 57-65.
([2]) COM(2012) 164 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007717/12
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(28 August 2012)

Subject: Restoration of Greek Cypriot-owned properties in Northern Cyprus

I have been contacted by a constituent who wishes to enquire as to the best and most appropriate way to apply for funding from the EU to refurbish his late grandfather's farmhouse in the Maronite village of Kormakitis (Koruçam), which is now situated in Northern Cyprus.

The house has been vacant since the partition of Cyprus in 1974 and my constituent tells me he has been advised that there are funds available from the EU to restore it to its former glory.

Can the Commission confirm:

1. whether there are EU funds available to refurbish Greek Cypriot-owned properties in Northern Cyprus?

2. how my constituent can apply for such EU funding to restore his late grandfather's property?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(18 October 2012)

Under the 2006 Aid Programme for the Turkish Cypriot community, a number of projects were approved for the benefit of Maronites in the northern part of Cyprus. So far, the overall value of these projects is approximately EUR 560 000.

Under the Rural Development Sector Programme, seven grants projects have been signed for projects within the Maronite Community, including renovating squares in the villages of Kormakitis and Karpasha.

Additionally, under the Upgrading of Urban and Local Infrastructure programme funded by the EU under the Aid Programme and implemented by UNDP ([1]), a project has been awarded to the Maronite Community. The main objective of this project was to refurbish the old school building in Kormakitis and convert it into a village community centre. The closing ceremony was organised during autumn 2011.

For the moment, there is no call for proposals open under the Rural Development Sector Programme. In case of a new call for proposals next year, the call, including all the conditions to apply for it, will be widely advertised through the regular channels (press, Internet) once it is launched.

([1]) UNDP = United Nations Development Programme.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007719/12
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(28 August 2012)

Subject: Fitting phones with induction loop transmission facilities for the deaf

I have been contacted by a constituent who is severely deaf and who depends on special equipment to work and go about his daily life. He tells me that, like others in his situation, he needs to use phones that are equipped with an induction loop transmission facility (T-loop setting).

However, my constituent tells me that hardly any new phones on the market have this feature built in, even though adding it would, he believes, only cost a few pence/cents.

1. Is the Commission aware of this problem for deaf citizens?

2. Does the Commission have any plans to introduce measures to compel the sellers of all new phone equipment to add the induction loop function to their phones as standard?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(18 October 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to written question E-007487/2012 by Ms Marina Yannakoudakis ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bWQ%2bE-2012-007487%2b0%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2f%2fEN&language=EN

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007722/12
aan de Commissie
Philippe De Backer (ALDE)
(28 augustus 2012)

Betreft: Btw-pakket — Interpretatie art. 53 Richtlijn 2006/112/EG

Bij de implementatie van het btw-pakket op 1 januari 2010 was er een ruime interpretatie van art. 53 Richtlijn 2006/112/EG. Dit artikel was van toepassing op de toegangverlening en met de toegangverlening samenhangende diensten, met inbegrip van de diensten van de organisatoren van dergelijke activiteiten en alsmede de daarmee samenhangende diensten.

Sinds 1 januari 2011 is de toepassing van art. 53 Richtlijn 2006/112/EG nochtans beperkt tot het verlenen van toegang en de hiermee samenhangende diensten (eveneens opgenomen in de Uitvoeringsverordening van de Raad nr. 282/2011 van 15 maart 2011). Echter, sinds de aanpassing van dit artikel merken we in de praktijk dat er veel interpretatieverschillen bestaan tussen de verschillende lidstaten met betrekking tot bovengenoemd artikel.

Deze verschillen kunnen resulteren in een dubbele btw-heffing enerzijds, maar ook in een grote onzekerheid bij ondernemingen die actief zijn in het buitenland omtrent het feit of ze zich al dan niet dienen te registreren voor btw-doeleinden. Aangezien de wetgeving geen duidelijkheid biedt, is het mogelijk dat ondernemingen onvrijwillig niet aan hun verplichtingen tegenover de btw-administratie van een bepaalde lidstaat voldoen.

We zouden deze interpretatieverschillen graag illustreren aan de hand van een voorbeeld, meer bepaald: verhuur van beursstands.

Diensten die samenhangen met het organisatorisch aspect van het evenement vallen onder de toepassing van de algemene B2B-plaatsbepaling (art. 44 Richtlijn 2006/112/EG). Echter, in verschillende idstaten, waaronder Frankrijk, wordt de verhuur van beursstands aan exposanten geacht plaats te vinden waar het onroerend goed zich bevindt (art. 47 Richtlijn 2006/112/EG). In het „Bulletin officiel des impôts nr. 29" van 5 april 2011 wordt gesteld dat de verhuur van een beursgebouw of een beursstand gelokaliseerd moet worden waar het onroerend goed gelegen is, tenzij de verhuur deel uitmaakt van een algemene dienst waar de terbeschikkingstelling van een (deel van het) onroerend goed niet van doorslaggevend belang is. In zulk geval is de algemene B2B-regel van toepassing.

Indien voormelde interpretatie niet toegepast wordt door de lidstaat waar de klant gevestigd is, kan dit leiden tot dubbele btw-heffing.

Gelet op het voorgaande zouden wij willen vragen of:

1. de Commissie kennis heeft van deze interpretatieverschillen?

2. de Commissie haar interpretatie wil geven van art. 53 Richtlijn 2006/112/EG om op die manier de verschillen tussen de lidstaten uit te sluiten?

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007723/12
aan de Commissie
Philippe De Backer (ALDE)
(28 augustus 2012)

Betreft: Btw-pakket — Interpretatie art. 53 Richtlijn 2006/112/EG

Bij de implementatie van het btw-pakket op 1 januari 2010 was er een ruime interpretatie van art. 53 Richtlijn 2006/112/EG. Dit artikel was van toepassing op de toegangverlening en met de toegangverlening samenhangende diensten, met inbegrip van de diensten van de organisatoren van dergelijke activiteiten en alsmede de daarmee samenhangende diensten.

Sinds 1 januari 2011 is de toepassing van art. 53 Richtlijn 2006/112/EG nochtans beperkt tot het verlenen van toegang en de hiermee samenhangende diensten (eveneens opgenomen in de Uitvoeringsverordening van de Raad nr. 282/2011 van 15 maart 2011). Echter, sinds de aanpassing van dit artikel merken we in de praktijk dat er veel interpretatieverschillen bestaan tussen de verschillende lidstaten met betrekking tot bovengenoemd artikel.

Deze verschillen kunnen resulteren in een dubbele btw-heffing enerzijds, maar ook in een grote onzekerheid bij ondernemingen die actief zijn in het buitenland omtrent het feit of ze zich al dan niet dienen te registreren voor btw-doeleinden. Aangezien de wetgeving geen duidelijkheid biedt, is het mogelijk dat ondernemingen onvrijwillig niet aan hun verplichtingen tegenover de btw-administratie van een bepaalde lidstaat voldoen.

We zouden deze interpretatieverschillen graag illustreren aan de hand van een voorbeeld, meer bepaald: toegangsgeld.

In Nederland is er een strikte interpretatie voor wat betreft „verlenen van toegang tot een evenement". Concreet is er een toegangsticket vereist om binnen de interpretatie van art. 53 Richtlijn 2006/112/EG te vallen. De deelname aan seminaries en conferenties waarbij geen toegangsticket vereist is, valt daardoor — volgens de Nederlandse belastingautoriteiten — niet binnen de interpretatie van toegang van voornoemd artikel. Voormelde interpretatie veroorzaakt dan ook problemen bij de recuperatie van Nederlandse btw door in een andere lidstaat gevestigde ondernemingen via teruggaafverzoek krachtens de „8e Richtlijn".

Gelet op het voorgaande zouden wij willen vragen of:

1. de Commissie kennis heeft van deze interpretatieverschillen?

2. de Commissie haar interpretatie wil geven van art. 53 Richtlijn 2006/112/EG om op die manier de verschillen tussen de lidstaten uit te sluiten?

Antwoord van de heer Šemeta namens de Commissie
(9 oktober 2012)

De Commissie is zich ervan bewust dat de toepassing van de regels met betrekking tot de plaats van dienst in sommige gevallen niet consequent is. Wanneer er echter sprake is van inconsequenties, worden deze voorgelegd aan het btw-comité: een raadgevend comité dat op grond van artikel 398 van de btw-richtlijn ([1]) is ingesteld. Dit comité is samengesteld uit vertegenwoordigers van de lidstaten en de Commissie en heeft als taak uniformiteit te garanderen bij de toepassing van EU-bepalingen inzake btw.

In vervolg op de goedkeuring van het btw-pakket is het verlenen van toegang tot evenementen een van de kwesties die door het btw-comité worden besproken, evenals diensten met betrekking tot onroerende goederen. In dit verband is de kwalificatie van de verhuur van beursstands eveneens besproken. De Commissie is zich bewust van de noodzaak om een scherper onderscheid te maken tussen het verlenen van toegang tot evenementen, vallend onder artikel 53 van de btw-richtlijn, en andere educatieve activiteiten die daar niet onder vallen. Zij pleegt op dit moment overleg met de lidstaten in het btw-comité om tot een gezamenlijk standpunt te komen teneinde kwesties zoals de genoemde te vermijden.

De door het btw-comité overeengekomen richtsnoeren worden door de Commissie openbaar gemaakt ([2]). Zodra een gemeenschappelijk standpunt is ingenomen over de vraag met betrekking tot het verlenen van toegang tot evenementen, zal dit document worden bijgewerkt.

([1]) Richtlijn 2006/112/EG van de Raad.
([2]) De richtsnoeren van het btw-comité worden gepubliceerd op: http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/taxation/vat/key_documents/vat_committee/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007722/12
to the Commission
Philippe De Backer (ALDE)
(28 August 2012)

Subject: VAT package — Interpretation of Article 53 of Directive 2006/12/EC

When the VAT package came into effect on 1 January 2010, Article 53 of Directive 2006/112/EC was given a broad interpretation. This article covered admission [to cultural and similar events] and services linked to admission, including the activities of the organisers of such events and ancillary services.

Since January 2011 the scope of Article 53 of Directive 2006/112/EC has been restricted to admission and services ancillary to admission (which are also included in Council Implementing Regulation No 282/2011 of 15 March 2011). However, since this article has been in force it has been clear in practice that there are many discrepancies in the interpretation of the abovementioned article between the various Member States.

These discrepancies may lead not only to the double charging of VAT, but also to a great deal of uncertainty among undertakings that do business abroad about whether or not they need to register for VAT. Since the legislation does not provide any clarity, it is possible that undertakings are unwittingly failing to comply with their obligations towards the VAT administration of a particular Member State.

I should like to illustrate these differing interpretations by reference to the example of the hire of exhibition stands.

Services linked to the organisational aspects of an event are covered by the general B2B rules determining of the place of supply (Article 44 of Directive 2006/112/EC). However, in some Member States, including France, the hire of exhibition stands to exhibitors is deemed to take place where the building is situated (Article 47 of Directive 2006/112/EC). The 'Bulletin officiel des impôts No 29' of 5 April 2011 states that the hire of an exhibition building or exhibition stand must be deemed to take place where the building is situated, unless the hire forms part of a general service where the supply of (part of) the building is not of decisive importance. In such cases the general B2B rule applies.

If this interpretation is not applied by the Member State in which the customer is established, this may lead to double charging of VAT.

In the light of the above:

1. Is the Commission aware of these discrepancies in interpretation?

2. Will the Commission give its interpretation of Article 53 of Directive 2006/112/EC in order to eliminate these discrepancies between the Member States?

Question for written answer E-007723/12
to the Commission
Philippe De Backer (ALDE)
(28 August 2012)

Subject: VAT Package — Interpretation of Article 53 of Directive 2006/112/EC

When the VAT package came into effect on 1 January 2010, Article 53 of Directive 2006/112/EC was given a broad interpretation. This article covered admission [to cultural and similar events] and services linked to admission, including the activities of the organisers of such events and ancillary services.

Since January 2011 the scope of Article 53 of Directive 2006/112/EC has been restricted to admission and services ancillary to admission (which are also included in Council Implementing Regulation No 282/2011 of 15 March 2011). However, since this article has been in force it has been clear in practice that there are many discrepancies in the interpretation of the abovementioned article between the various Member States.

These discrepancies may lead not only to the double charging of VAT, but also to a great deal of uncertainty among undertakings that do business abroad about whether or not they need to register for VAT. Since the legislation does not provide any clarity, it is possible that undertakings are unwittingly failing to comply with their obligations towards the VAT administration of a particular Member State.

I should like to illustrate these differing interpretations by reference to the example of admission fees.

In the Netherlands there is a strict interpretation of 'admission to an event'. Specifically an admission ticket is required in order for an event to be covered by Article 53 of Directive 2006/112/EC. Participation in seminars and conferences for which no ticket is required is therefore not covered — according to the Dutch tax authorities — by the interpretation of 'admission' under that article. This interpretation then leads to problems for undertakings established in another Member State in reclaiming of Dutch VAT by way of a refund application pursuant to the Eighth VAT Directive.

In the light of the above:

1. Is the Commission aware of these discrepancies in interpretation?

2. Will the Commission give its interpretation of Article 53 of Directive 2006/112/EC in order to eliminate these discrepancies between the Member States?

Joint answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(9 October 2012)

The Commission is aware that, in some instances, the application of the rules on the place of supply of services may not be consistent. However, when inconsistencies are found, they are brought to the VAT Committee, an advisory committee set up under Article 398 of the VAT Directive ([1]) consisting of representatives of the Member States and the Commission, with a view to ensuring the uniform application of EU provisions on VAT.

As a follow up to the adoption of the VAT package, admission to events is among the issues being discussed by the VAT Committee, as well as services connected with immovable property. In this context, the qualification of the hiring of exhibition stands to exhibitors has also been discussed. The Commission, conscious of the need for further clarification as to the line to be drawn between admission to events, which is covered by Article 53 of the VAT Directive, and other educational activities, which are not, is currently consulting with Member States in the VAT Committee with a view to agree on a common line that would avoid issues such as those mentioned.

Guidelines agreed by the VAT Committee are published by the Commission ([2]). This document will be updated as soon as a common line will be agreed on the admission to events question.

([1]) Council Directive 2006/112/EC.
([2]) Guidelines of the VAT Committee are published at http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/taxation/vat/key_documents/vat_committee/index_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007726/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(29 agosto 2012)

Oggetto: Persecuzione religiosa contro le comunità cristiane

Gli atti di terrorismo e violenza in seguito a fenomeni di intolleranza religiosa verso le comunità cristiane si susseguono ormai a ritmo quasi quotidiano, in Africa, India, Vietnam, Pakistan e in molte altre regioni del globo.

1. Può la Commissione fornire dati circa il numero di cristiani deceduti dal gennaio 2011 ad oggi?

2. Ritiene la Commissione necessario promuovere uno studio che fornisca un quadro esaustivo della persecuzione che stanno subendo i cristiani nel mondo e metta in evidenza sia il numero delle vittime, sia il contesto socio-politico in cui tali violenze sono perpetrate, col quale poter strutturare una strategia comune dell'Unione europea di concreta tutela della cristianità nel mondo?

3. Può la Commissione riferire circa l'avanzamento dello sviluppo di una strategia dell'UE sull'esercizio del diritto umano alla libertà di religione, come richiesto dalla risoluzione del Parlamento europeo del 20 gennaio 2011 sulla situazione dei cristiani nel contesto della libertà religiosa?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(6 novembre 2012)

La Commissione europea è a conoscenza delle relazioni pubblicate da varie fonti, quali enti governativi o ONG, riguardo alla violenza esercitata nei confronti di persone appartenenti a gruppi religiosi, tra cui i cristiani. L'Unione europea ha ripetutamente condannato, al più alto livello, atti violenti e terroristici di questo tipo perpetrati in diverse parti del mondo. Nel 2011 tutte le delegazioni dell'UE sono state invitate a verificare la situazione relativa alla libertà di religione o di credo nei rispettivi paesi e a riferire in proposito alla sede centrale del SEAE. Tali informazioni sono utilizzate dall'Unione europea per valutare la situazione in loco e per affrontare tali questioni laddove necessario, affinché la libertà di religione o di credo divenga una parte integrante delle sue relazioni bilaterali con i paesi che ospitano le delegazioni.

In quanto diritto umano universale, la libertà di religione o di credo è altamente prioritaria nella politica dell'UE sui diritti umani, come testimoniano i due gruppi di conclusioni del Consiglio adottati nel 2009 e nel 2011. Da ultimo, il 25 giugno 2012 il Consiglio dell'Unione europea ha adottato un quadro strategico in materia di diritti umani e di democrazia, insieme a un piano d'azione destinato a metterlo in pratica. Uno dei primi risultati da conseguire è l'elaborazione, sulla base degli strumenti e dei documenti esistenti, di «orientamenti pubblici dell'UE in materia di libertà di religione o di credo che ricordino i principi fondamentali e comprendano priorità e strumenti chiaramente definiti per la promozione della libertà di religione o di credo». Tali orientamenti, che forniranno alle delegazioni dell'UE e alle ambasciate degli Stati membri meccanismi d'intervento specifici e concreti, dovrebbero essere adottati entro la fine dell'anno.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007726/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(29 August 2012)

Subject: Religious persecution of Christian communities

Acts of terrorism and violence as a result of religious intolerance towards Christian communities are now being carried out on an almost daily basis in Africa, India, Vietnam, Pakistan and many other regions of the planet.

1. Can the Commission provide data on the number of Christians who have died since January 2011?

2. Should the Commission not launch a study to provide a comprehensive picture of the persecution that Christians are suffering in the world and highlight the number of victims and the socio-political background against which such violence is being perpetrated, in order to develop a common EU strategy to genuinely protect Christianity in the world?

3. Can the Commission report on the progress made in the development of an EU strategy concerning the human right to freedom of religion, as called for by the European Parliament resolution of 20 January 2011 on the situation of Christians in the context of freedom of religion?

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

The European Commission is aware of the reports published by various sources, including governmental bodies or NGOs, regarding violence targeting individuals belonging to religious groups, including Christians. The European Union, at the highest level, has repeatedly condemned such violence and acts of terrorism worldwide. In 2011, all EU Delegations have been requested to monitor the state of Freedom of Religion or Belief (FoRB) in their respective host countries and to report to EEAS headquarters. The EU uses this information to assess the situation on the ground and to engage on such issues whenever necessary, in order to make FoRB an integral part of the EU's bilateral relations with their host country.

As a universal human right, FoRB is a high priority under EU's human rights policy, and this is reflected in the two sets of Council Conclusions adopted in 2009 and 2011. More recently in July 2012, the Council of the European Union adopted on 25 June 2012 a Strategic Framework on Human Rights and Democracy with an Action Plan for putting it into practice. Developing new EU public guidelines on FoRB is one of its early deliverables, and should 'build upon existing instruments and documents, recalling key principles and containing clearly defined priorities and tools for the promotion of FoRB'. Such guidelines, which will provide for specific and concrete action mechanisms to EU delegations and member states embassies, should be adopted before the end of the year.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007733/12
to the Commission
George Lyon (ALDE)
(29 August 2012)

Subject: Single Farm Payment entitlements — rent reviews

The Commission will be aware of the concern of Scottish tenant farmers that the value of their single farm payment entitlements is being taken into account by landlords when negotiating rent reviews.

1. Can the Commission confirm whether it has the legal powers to prevent the value of tenant farmers' Single Farm Payment entitlements being taken into consideration in determining the rent farmers pay for the land on which the entitlements are claimed?

2. If the Commission does have a legal basis to take action on this matter, can the Commission clarify whether it intends to address this problem in the context of the current reform of the common agricultural policy?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(12 October 2012)

1. Beneficiaries of the single payment scheme are farmers exercising agricultural activity ([1]). This implies, when it comes to the allocation of entitlements in case of leased-out farms, that the tenant is allocated entitlements and not the landlord, provided that the tenant meets all eligibility conditions including that it is him who undertakes the agricultural activity on the land. As to the lease of farms, there is contractual freedom between the two parties and the Commission has no competence to intervene in order to ensure the prevention of the situation quoted by the Honourable Member. Nevertheless, any national legislation that would stipulate that at the expiry of a lease contract the payment entitlements would have to go automatically from the tenant to the landlord is not in compliance with the relevant EU-rules, as the tenant is the owner of the entitlements and can dispose freely of them ([2]). The landlord, if it is then him to exercise the agricultural activity, would need to buy the entitlements from the tenant or others.

2. The Commission, in its proposal for the CAP-post 2013 ([3]), seeks to further strengthen the targeting of direct payments to active farmers by proposing binding additional exclusion criteria. Moreover, as a main rule, the access to the allocation of entitlements in 2014 is foreseen for the beneficiaries of the single payment scheme or the single area payment scheme in respect of the claim year 2011. The use of this historical reference year for eligible farmers should limit the risk that the 2014 reference year for the number of payment entitlements to be allocated would induce certain landowners to change their lease contract before 2014.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 (OJ L 270 of 21.10.2003, p. 1): Article 43 on determination of the payment entitlements and Article 2 for the definition of 'farmer' and 'agricultural activity'.

([2]) According to Article 43 of Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003, he had received the payment entitlements. According to Article 12(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1120/2009 (OJ L 316 of 2.12.2009, p. 1), they can be transferred at any time.

([3]) COM(2011) 625; Article 9.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007735/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(29 August 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Possible weakening of EU sanctions against the Government of the Republic of Zimbabwe

In 2000 the Government of Zimbabwe under President Robert Mugabe started a policy of arbitrary expropriation of land and property owned by Zimbabwean farmers, often employing violence and in total disregard of internationally recognised fundamental human rights and the rule of law. This led to the introduction by the EU of targeted sanctions against the ZANU-PF regime, which included asset freezes and bans on travel to the EU affecting certain political leaders, including the President himself. In 2009 the International Court for the Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID) ruled in favour of an appeal from a group of Zimbabwean farmers (Funnekotter & Others v. Republic of Zimbabwe) by granting them monetary compensation on the legal basis of treaty undertakings by Zimbabwe to promote and protect bilateral investments (BIPPA).

In April 2012 various Zimbabweans associated with the regime called on the European Court of Justice to lift the targeted sanctions against them, arguing infringement of their human rights. Navi Pillay, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, has also called for the EU's sanctions to be suspended until 2013, when elections will have been held and the outcome of reforms in Zimbabwe will be clear. Human Rights Watch has taken a contrary position criticising any current lifting of the sanctions.

Similarly, the Zimbabwe Mining Development Corporation appears to be a conduit for raising money untransparently, for government finances and individuals associated with the regime, by bypassing official channels. This company has been criticised by the NGO Global Witness, which demands that it should remain on the EU sanctions list, together with its subsidiaries. Meanwhile, the Movement for Democratic Change (MDC), the main opposition party, has called for the lifting of sanctions. In response to all this, on 23 July 2012 the EU Foreign Affairs Council announced that it was satisfied with the progress made by the Government of National Unity, and that, following a peaceful and credible referendum on the Constitution leading to a free and fair presidential election, it would lift the majority of EU restrictive measures.

1. Does the Vice-President/High Representative not agree that the lifting of EU sanctions against Zimbabwe must be made conditional on the Zimbabwean government abiding by all its international obligations, including honouring the ICSID ruling?

2. Can the Vice-President/High Representative explain the announcement by the Foreign Affairs Council, which seems to contradict the allegations that ZANU-PF militants are continuing to commit grave human rights abuses against their opponents?

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

At the Foreign Affairs Council on 23 July 2012 the EU decided to suspend appropriate measures under Article 96 of the Cotonou Agreement in Zimbabwe. This decision does not constitute a lifting of measures against Zimbabwe but will allow the EU to work directly with the Government of National Unity to develop new assistance programmes for the benefit of the people of Zimbabwe. This decision is consistent with the EU's incremental approach to adjust its policy as progress is made by the Zimbabwean parties along the Global Political Agreement and the Southern African Development Community (SADC) Roadmap. The EU agrees that a peaceful and credible referendum on the constitution will represent an important milestone in the preparation of democratic elections.

Although significant concerns remain, the EU recognises improvements achieved in the Human Rights situation and in this context welcomes the recent visit to Zimbabwe of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (UNHCHR) at the invitation of the Government of National Unity. The EU reaffirms its partnership with the people of Zimbabwe and calls on all parties to complete the implementation of the Global Political Agreement ahead of elections in 2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007736/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(29 agosto 2012)

Oggetto: Dieta «Dukan», possibili ripercussioni gravi sulla salute

La «dieta Dukan» è tuttora una delle cure dimagranti più conosciute e seguite nel mondo. Il fine che si propone è far perdere peso mediante un regime alimentare iperproteico a base di carne, associato a un bassissimo consumo di frutta e verdura e a un apporto pari a zero di zuccheri e carboidrati. Molti sono gli esperti del settore che considerano la dieta Dukan un regime alimentare squilibrato, che può recare danni fisici nel lungo periodo, dai quali, in molti casi, è difficile guarire. Ne sono un esempio i corpi chetonici, risultato dell'apporto iperproteico, i quali causano danni ai reni, soprattutto negli individui obesi.

In alcune catene di supermercati diffuse in Italia si possono acquistare prodotti comuni con la denominazione «dieta Dukan».

È la Commissione a conoscenza dei gravi rischi alla salute che possono derivare dall'osservanza della dieta Dukan?

Intende avviare studi specifici per ottenere un quadro completo dell'incidenza di questi effetti collaterali della dieta in questione?

Se a seguito dei dati raccolti la Commissione dovesse concludere che la dieta Dukan può causare seri danni fisici, considera possibile il ritiro dal mercato della linea di prodotti alimentari sponsorizzati da tale dieta?

Al fine di tutelare i consumatori europei, non ritiene fondamentale promuovere una comunicazione chiara e trasparente per garantire un'informazione obiettiva circa i benefici e soprattutto le possibili ripercussioni a lungo termine di particolari diete, come quella Dukan, che godono di un'ampia eco commerciale e promozionale su scala mondiale?

Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(8 ottobre 2012)

La Commissione europea non è informata degli effetti negativi indicati della dieta Dukan né prevede di effettuare studi specifici su tali effetti.

La legislazione europea non prevede norme specifiche per le diete. La questione rientra pertanto nella sfera di competenza degli Stati membri. D'altro canto, la direttiva 96/8/CE ([1]) stabilisce norme specifiche di composizione e di etichettatura per gli alimenti destinati ad essere utilizzati nell'ambito di diete ipocaloriche volte alla riduzione del peso al fine di garantire che tali prodotti siano adeguati al particolare uso nutrizionale cui sono destinati. Inoltre il regolamento (CE) n. 1924/2006 ([2]) stabilisce che tutte le indicazioni sulla salute in base alle quali un alimento ha effetti dimagranti o connessi con l'appetito debbano essere autorizzate a livello dell'UE prima di poter essere integrate nelle comunicazioni commerciali. Il regolamento prevede che tutte le indicazioni sulla salute di questo tipo debbano essere provate scientificamente e non debbano indurre in errore i consumatori.

Il potere avere consumatori meglio informati è stato identificato come una delle sei aree prioritarie nel Libro bianco della Commissione «Una Strategia europea sugli aspetti sanitari connessi all'alimentazione, al sovrappeso e all'obesità» ([3]), adottato nel maggio 2007, nel quale viene sottolineato l'approccio strategico per il periodo 2007-2013.

I progressi realizzati e le azioni adottate nel quadro della Strategia sono descritti in modo particolareggiato nella relazione del dicembre 2010 ([4]) che comprende azioni volte ad informare meglio i consumatori.

La Strategia 2007-2013 è attualmente oggetto di una valutazione ex-post. La relazione di valutazione dovrebbe essere disponibile nel secondo trimestre del 2013.

([1]) Direttiva 96/8/CE della Commissione del 26 febbraio 1996 sugli alimenti destinati a diete ipocaloriche volte alla riduzione del peso, GU L 55 del 6.3.1996, pag. 22.
([2]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1924/2006 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio del 20 dicembre 2006 relativo alle indicazioni nutrizionali e sulla salute fornite sui prodotti alimentari, GU L 404 del 30.12.2006, pag. 9.
([3]) COM(2007)279 definitivo, del 30.5.2007.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/docs/implementation_report_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007736/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(29 August 2012)

Subject: Dukan diet: possible serious adverse effects on health

The Dukan diet is one of the best known and most widely used slimming diets in the world. It is a high-protein diet which involves eating large quantities of meat, very small quantities of fruit and vegetables and almost no sugars and starches. Many nutritional experts consider it an unbalanced diet which, in the long term, can cause physical damage which, in many cases, is difficult to reverse. One example of this is the kidney damage that can be caused by the ketone bodies produced by a high-protein diet, in particular in obese subjects.

Some Italian supermarkets carry a range of everyday products bearing the 'Dukan diet' label.

Is the Commission aware of the serious health risks to which the Dukan diet can give rise?

Does it intend to have studies carried out in order to gain a comprehensive picture of the incidence of side effects of that diet?

If, on the basis of the findings of such studies, the Commission were to conclude that the Dukan diet can cause serious physical damage, could the 'Dukan diet' range of products be withdrawn from the market?

Would the Commission not agree that, with a view to protecting EU consumers, it is essential for clear and objective information to be provided on the possible repercussions of long-term adherence to diets such as the Dukan diet which are widely marketed and promoted around the world?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(8 October 2012)

The European Commission is not aware of the mentioned adverse effects of the Dukan diet nor is envisaging carrying out specific studies on its effects.

EU legislation does not foresee specific rules for diets. Therefore this falls under the competence of Member States. On the contrary, Directive 96/8/EC ([1]) sets specific composition and labelling rules for foods intended for use in energy restricted diet for weight reduction in order to ensure that these products are suitable for the particular nutritional use they are intended for. Also, Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 ([2]) requires all health claims that a food has slimming or appetite related effects to be authorised at EU level before they can be made in commercial communications. The regulation requires all such health claims to be scientifically substantiated and not to mislead consumers.

Better informed consumers have been identified as one of the six priority areas in the Commission White Paper 'A Strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity-related health issues' ([3]), adopted in May 2007, outlining the strategic approach for the period 2007-2013.

The progress made and the actions taken under the strategy are reflected in detail in the progress report of December 2010 ([4]) which includes actions to better inform consumers.

The strategy 2007-2013 is currently subject to an *ex-post* evaluation. The evaluation report should be available in the second quarter of 2013.

([1]) Commission Directive 96/8/EC of 26 February 1996 on foods intended for use in energy-restricted diets for weight reduction, OJ L 55, 6.3.1996, p. 22.
([2]) Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 December 2006 on nutrition and health claims made on foods, OJ L 404, 30.12.2006, p. 9.
([3]) COM(2007) 279 final, 30.5.2007.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/docs/implementation_report_en.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007740/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(30 agosto 2012)

Oggetto: Emergenza siccità

Una fortissima siccità ha investito l'Europa, Italia compresa, compromettendo seriamente le principali colture estive e, di conseguenza, le imprese agricole. Nel solo Veneto i primi rilevamenti portati avanti da AVEPA (Agenzia Veneta per i Pagamenti in agricoltura) mostrano che sono sofferenti più di 360 000 ettari di aree coltivate e le associazioni di categoria stimano perdite che vanno dal 20 % all'80 % in base alle zone e alle specifiche colture.

La Commissione:

— è a conoscenza della situazione in Italia e in particolare nel Veneto?

— ritiene necessario sviluppare una strategia comune europea sul lungo periodo capace di far uscire gli Stati dalla logica delle misure straordinarie elaborate di anno in anno per questo genere di emergenze?

— intende dar seguito nel più breve tempo possibile alla richiesta del governo italiano di autorizzare l'erogazione degli anticipi PAC 2012 già il prossimo 16 ottobre, accorciando le normali scadenze comunitarie, così da mettere a disposizione un sostegno economico immediato alle imprese agricole, col quale far fronte al periodo di oggettiva difficoltà?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(4 ottobre 2012)

La Commissione è consapevole delle gravi difficoltà finanziarie sostenute dagli agricoltori europei a causa delle avverse condizioni meteorologiche, quali la grave siccità in talune regioni come indicato dall'onorevole parlamentare. Per alleviare queste difficoltà, il 27 agosto 2012 la Commissione ha autorizzato gli Stati membri ad anticipare i pagamenti diretti agli agricoltori al 16 ottobre 2012 ([1]).

Oltre al pagamento di anticipi sugli aiuti diretti, la politica agricola comune (PAC) offre un'ampia gamma di strumenti per sostenere gli agricoltori in circostanze analoghe.

Il regolamento sull'organizzazione comune di mercato unica prevede che gli Stati membri abbiano la possibilità di inserire l'assicurazione del raccolto tra le misure ammissibili nei programmi operativi delle organizzazioni di produttori del settore ortofrutticolo o nei programmi nazionali di sostegno del settore vitivinicolo.

In termini di aiuti di Stato, un aiuto «de minimis» può essere concesso fino a 7 500 EUR per beneficiario e per un periodo di tre esercizi finanziari. Esso non richiede particolari formalità, salvo la registrazione nel registro «de minimis» e il rispetto di tutte le condizioni del regolamento (CE) n. 1535/2007 ([2]). Inoltre, nel caso in cui le perdite siano pari al 30 % della produzione, con una richiesta di esenzione (solo per le PMI) o con una notifica può essere concesso un aiuto che copre l'80 % dei danni.

La politica di sviluppo rurale dell'UE prevede la possibilità di intervenire mediante la misura 126 ([3]). Questa misura, che era stata programmata nella versione originaria del PSR Veneto, è stata recentemente ritirata dalla regione.

Infine, le proposte della Commissione per la PAC dopo il 2013 rafforzano gli strumenti disponibili in caso di eventi estremi, compresa la possibilità per gli Stati membri di erogare i pagamenti diretti agli agricoltori a partire dal 16 ottobre, senza autorizzazione della Commissione.

([1]) Regolamento di esecuzione (UE) n. 776/2012 della Commissione (GU L 231 del 28.8.2012, pag. 8).
([2]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1535/2007 della Commissione, del 20 dicembre 2007, relativo all'applicazione degli articoli 87 e 88 del trattato CE agli aiuti de minimis nel settore della produzione dei prodotti agricoli (GU L 337 del 21.12.2007, pag. 35).
([3]) «Ripristino del potenziale produttivo agricolo danneggiato da calamità naturali e introduzione di adeguate misure di prevenzione».

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007740/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(30 August 2012)

Subject: Drought emergency

Europe, including Italy, is suffering from a very severe drought, which is posing a serious threat to the main summer crops and hence to farm holdings. In the Veneto Region alone, the initial statistics gathered by AVEPA (the agricultural payments agency for the Veneto) show that over 360 000 hectares of land under cultivation are affected, and producer associations estimate losses of between 20% and 80% depending on the area and crop concerned.

Can the Commission state:

— Whether it is aware of the situation in Italy and in particular in the Veneto Region?

— Whether it does not consider that a long-term common European strategy should be adopted so that Member States do not have to resort to the extraordinary measures that are implemented each year in response to this kind of emergency?

— Whether it will act promptly on the Italian Government's request to authorise the bringing-forward of the advance CAP payments for 2012 to 16 October, in order to provide immediate financial support to farmers to see them through this clearly difficult period?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(4 October 2012)

The Commission is well aware of the severe financial difficulties encountered by European farmers due to unfavourable weather conditions, such as extreme drought in some regions as mentioned by the Honourable Member. In order to help alleviate these difficulties, on 27 August 2012 the Commission allowed Member States to advance direct payments to farmers from 16 October 2012 ([1]).

In addition to the payment of advances on direct support, the common agricultural policy offers a wide range of tools which can be used to support farmers in similar circumstances.

The Single Common Market Organisation Regulation provides the possibility for Member States to include harvest insurance as an eligible measure under their fruit and vegetables producer organisations' operational programmes or their wine national support programme.

In terms of state aid, a *de minimis* aid can be provided up to EUR 7 500 per beneficiary over a period of three fiscal years. It requires no particular formality but the registration in the *de minimis* register and the respect of all the conditions of Regulation (EC) No 1535/2007 ([2]). Furthermore, in case the loss reaches 30% of production, an aid covering 80% of the damage may be granted by way of an application for exemption (for SMEs only) or a notification.

The EU Rural Development policy provides for the possibility to intervene through measure 126 ([3]). This measure, which had been planned in the original version of the RDP Veneto, has recently been withdrawn from the region.

Finally, the Commission proposals for the CAP after 2013 strengthen the tools available in case of occurrence of extreme events, including the possibility for Member States to pay direct support to farmers as from 16 October, without Commission authorisation.

([1]) Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 776/2012, OJ L 231, 28.8.2012, p. 8.
([2]) Commission Regulation (EC) No 1535/2007 of 20 December 2007 on the application of Articles 87 and 88 of the EC Treaty to *de minimis* aid in the sector of agricultural production, OJ L 337, 21.12.2007, pp. 35-41.
([3]) 'Restoring agricultural production potential damaged by natural disasters and introducing appropriate prevention measures'.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007742/12
aan de Commissie
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(30 augustus 2012)

Betreft: Verkoop LED-verlichting in de EU

Om de energie-efficiëntie in de Europese Unie te verhogen, kan LED-verlichting (Light-Emitting Diode) een belangrijke rol spelen. Deze vorm van verlichting is relatief zuinig. Daarnaast gaan LED-lampen langer mee en zijn ze minder belastend voor het milieu dan vele andere types van lampen.

Een groot probleem is echter de hoge aankoopprijs van LED-verlichting, waardoor veel consumenten aarzelen om dergelijke verlichting aan te kopen.

In vergelijking met de Verenigde Staten liggen de prijzen voor LED-verlichting in Europa zelfs nog een stuk hoger. Sommige lampen zijn meer dan de helft goedkoper in de VS, waar gloeilampen nog tot 2014 mogen worden verkocht en dus een concurrentie vormen voor de duurdere LED-verlichting.

Daarnaast zijn er door lampenfabrikanten steeds betere en zuinigere LED-lampen ontwikkeld, maar worden deze in Europa niet op de markt gebracht. Zo zal de 10A19/LPRIZE-PRO/2700-900 DIM 10/1 van Philips, die de Amerikaanse Lighting Price won voor meest energie-efficiënte lamp ter vervanging van de 60 Watt gloeilamp, niet worden verkocht in Europa.

Naast de hoge kostprijs kwamen in de publieke consultatie van de Europese Commissie nog twee andere obstakels naar voren: een gebrekkige kwaliteit van sommige LED-producten en ontoereikende informatie voor consumenten.

Zo worden lampen met e.a.t dezelfde eigenschappen soms onder een andere naam en productnummer verkocht tegen een hogere of lagere prijs. Er zijn ook gevallen bekend waarbij er sprake was van verkeerde of misleidende productinformatie van de producten. Zo zou de lichtopbrengst van de LED-lamp type GU5.3 9W 25° van Toshiba geen 470 lumen zijn, zoals op de verpakking wordt vermeld, maar minder dan 300 lumen.

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van elk van deze problemen, en welke maatregelen plant zij om deze in de nabije toekomst te verhelpen?

2. Welke maatregelen acht de Commissie gepast om de verkoop van LED-verlichting in de Europese Unie te ondersteunen?

Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie
(11 oktober 2012)

De Commissie sluit zich aan bij het standpunt van het geachte Parlementslid dat hoge aankoopkosten, onbevredigende kwaliteit en ontoereikende en misleidende consumenten-informatie belemmeringen vormen voor de marktpenetratie van ledlampen.

De Commissie heeft de volgende maatregelen genomen om deze problemen aan te pakken of heeft daarmee een begin gemaakt:

1. Bij de verordeningen inzake ecologisch ontwerp zijn eisen vastgesteld voor de minimale energie-efficiëntie van ledlampen ([1]). De richtlijn betreffende de energie-etikettering van lampen ([2]) is recentelijk geactualiseerd ([3]) teneinde daaronder ook gerichte ledlampen te laten vallen en de klassen A+-A++ bovenop klasse A te introduceren om zo de aankoop van de meest efficiënte ledlampen te bevorderen.

([1]) Verordening (EG) nr. 244/2009 van de Commissie van 18 maart 2009 houdende uitvoeringsbepalingen van Richtlijn 2005/32/EG van het Europees Parlement en de Raad voor het vaststellen van eisen inzake ecologisch ontwerp voor niet-gerichte lampen voor huishoudelijk gebruik, PB L 76 van 24.3.2009.
Ontwerpverordening van de Commissie tot uitvoering van Richtlijn 2009/125/EC inzake eisen inzake ecologisch ontwerp voor gerichte lampen, ledlampen en gerelateerde uitrusting. De ontwerpverordening is op 21 augustus 2012 als document D021781 in het comitologieregister ter bespreking ingediend bij het Europees Parlement en de Raad.

([2]) Richtlijn 98/11/EG van de Commissie van 27 januari 1998 houdende uitvoeringsbepalingen van Richtlijn 92/75/EEG van de Raad wat de etikettering van het energieverbruik van lampen voor huishoudelijk gebruik betreft, PB L 71 van 10.3.1998.

([3]) Gedelegeerde Verordening (EU) nr. 874/2012 van de Commissie van 12 juli 2012 houdende aanvulling van Richtlijn 2010/30/EU van het Europees Parlement en de Raad met betrekking tot de energie-etikettering van elektrische lampen en verlichtingsarmaturen, PB L 258 van 26.9.2012.

Bij deze verordeningen inzake ecologisch ontwerp zijn ook eisen vastgelegd inzake de minimumkwaliteit van ledlampen, alsmede informatie-eisen die het voor de consument gemakkelijker moeten maken om gericht te kiezen, en waarbij de minimale lichtstroom is bepaald van ledlampen waarvan wordt beweerd dat zij equivalent zijn met klassieke lampen met een bepaald lampvermogen.

2. De Commissie werkt aan een pakket maatregelen ([4]) dat bedoeld is om het nationale markttoezicht, dat tot doel heeft de inachtneming van de in punt 1 bedoelde verordeningen, aan te wakkeren.

3. De EU-milieukeur voor lichtbronnen ([5]) biedt de betrokken sector een instrument op basis van vrijwilligheid om de meest efficiënte lampen te bevorderen.

4. Naar verwachting zal de richtlijn inzake energie-efficiëntie ([6]) de markt sturen naar de meest efficiënte lampen doordat de centrale overheden krachtens de richtlijn producten van de hoogste energieklasse zullen moeten aankopen en de lidstaten verplichte energie-efficiëntieregelingen zullen moeten opleggen aan energiedistributeurs en verkopers op kleinhandelsniveau.

De financiële stimulansen voor het gebruik van efficiënte verlichting worden beschreven in het antwoord van de Commissie op schriftelijke vraag E-388/2012 van de heer Rossi ([7]).

Valse claims met betrekking tot producten, zoals bedoeld door het geachte Parlementslid, kunnen sinds 1986 worden vervolgd krachtens de EU-wetgeving betreffende misleidende reclame en oneerlijke handelspraktijken ([8]).

([4]) Afgezien van de voorstellen voor vaststelling en tenuitvoerlegging van het goederenpakket werkt de Commissie momenteel aan een herziening van de richtlijn inzake algemene productveiligheid, een nieuwe verordening betreffende markttoezicht en een meerjarenactieplan voor markttoezicht.

([5]) Besluit 2011/331/EU van de Commissie van 6 juni 2011 tot vaststelling van de milieucriteria voor de toekenning van de EU-milieukeur voor lichtbronnen, PB L 148 van 7.6.2011.

([6]) De artikelen 5 en 6 van de ontwerprichtlijn inzake energie-efficiëntie, op 9 september door de Raad vastgesteld en in oktober 2012 gepubliceerd.

([7]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

([8]) Richtlijn 2005/29/EG van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 11 mei 2005 betreffende oneerlijke handelspraktijken van ondernemingen jegens consumenten op de interne markt en tot wijziging van Richtlijn 84/450/EEG van de Raad, Richtlijnen 97/7/EG, 98/27/EG en 2002/65/EG van het Europees Parlement en de Raad en van Verordening (EG) nr. 2006/2004 van het Europees Parlement en de Raad, PB L 149 van 11.6.2005.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007742/12
to the Commission
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(30 August 2012)

Subject: Sale of LED lighting in the EU

The LED (light-emitting diode) can play an important part in efforts to increase energy efficiency in the EU. LED bulbs are relatively economical, in addition to which they last longer and are less environmentally harmful than other types of bulb.

However, a major problem is that many consumers are being deterred by the high purchase costs.

In Europe, LED bulbs are considerably more expensive than in the United States, where in certain cases they cost less than half as much, being forced to compete with cheaper standard light bulbs, which may be sold until 2014.

In addition, LED bulbs are being constantly improved and made more energy-efficient by their manufacturers. However, bulbs such as the, the 10A19/LPRIZE-PRO/2700-900 DIM 10/1 produced by Philips, which won the American lighting prize for the most energy-efficient bulb replacing the 60 watt standard light bulb, are not being marketed in Europe.

In addition to the high purchase price, a survey held by the Commission revealed two additional obstacles: the unsatisfactory quality of certain LED products and insufficient consumer information.

As a result, bulbs with exactly the same specifications are sometimes sold under different names or product numbers at different prices. There have also been cases of inaccurate or misleading product information. For example it appears that the light emitted by the Toshiba GU5.3 9W 25° LED bulb is not 470 lumens as indicated on the packaging but less than 300 lumens.

1. Is the Commission aware of these specific problems and what measures does it intend to take in the immediate future to help resolve them?

2. What measures does the Commission consider appropriate to encourage the sale of LED bulbs in the European Union?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(11 October 2012)

The Commission agrees with the Honourable Member that high purchase costs, unsatisfactory quality and insufficient and misleading consumer information constitute barriers to the market penetration of LED bulbs.

The Commission has introduced or is introducing the following measures to address the issues raised.

1. Ecodesign regulations establish requirements on the minimum energy efficiency of LED bulbs. ([1]) The lamp energy label ([2]) was recently updated ([3]) to cover directional LEDs and to include classes A+/A++ on top of Class A, to promote efficient LEDs.

These ecodesign regulations also establish requirements on the minimum quality of LED bulbs, and information requirements which help users make informed choices and which determine the minimum light emission of LED bulbs claiming to retrofit bulbs of a particular power.

([1]) Commission Regulation (EC) No 244/2009 of 18 March 2009 implementing Directive 2005/32/EC of the Parliament and of the Council with regard to ecodesign requirements for non-directional household lamps, OJ L 76, 24.3.2009. Draft Commission Regulation implementing Directive 2009/125/EC with regard to ecodesign requirements for directional lamps, LED lamps and related equipment. The draft regulation was submitted to the right of scrutiny of the Parliament and of the Council on 21 August 2012 as document D021781 in the comitology registry.

([2]) Commission Directive 98/11/EC of 27 January 1998 implementing Council Directive 92/75/EEC with regard to energy labelling of household lamps, OJ, L 71, 10.3.1998.

([3]) Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No 874/2012 of 12.7.2012 supplementing Directive 2010/30/EU of the Parliament and of the Council with regard to energy labelling of electrical lamps and luminaires, OJ L 258, 26.9.2012.

2. The Commission is preparing a package of measures ([4]) aimed at energising national market surveillance, whose duty is to check compliance with the regulations mentioned in point 1.

3. The EU ecolabel on light bulbs ([5]) provides a voluntary means for industry to highlight the most efficient bulbs.

4. The Energy Efficiency Directive ([6]) is expected to steer the market towards the most efficient bulbs by requiring central governments to purchase products of the higher energy classes, and by requiring Member States to establish energy efficiency obligation schemes for energy distributors and retail sales companies.

Financial incentives to efficient lighting are described in the Commission's answer to Written Question E-388/2012 by Mr Rossi ([7]).

False claims about products, as referred to by the Honourable Member, have been liable to pursuit since 1986 under EU legislation on misleading advertising and unfair commercial practices ([8]).

([4]) Further to the proposals for the adoption and implementation of the goods package, the Commission is preparing a revised General Product Safety Directive, a new Market Surveillance Regulation and a multi-annual action plan for market surveillance.

([5]) Commission Decision 2011/331/EU of 6 June 2011 on establishing the ecological criteria for the award of the EU Ecolabel for light sources, OJ L 148, 7.6.2011.

([6]) Articles 5 and 6 of the draft Energy Efficiency Directive, adopted by Parliament on 9 Sept, to be adopted by Council and published in October 2012.

([7]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

([8]) Directive 2005/29/EC of the Parliament and of the Council of 11 May 2005 concerning unfair business-to-consumer commercial practices in the internal market and amending Council Directive 84/450/EEC, Directives 97/7/EC, 98/27/EC and 2002/65/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council and Regulation (EC) No 2006/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council, OJ L 149, 11.6.2005.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007747/12
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(30 August 2012)

Subject: Regulation (EU) No 1177/2010 concerning the rights of passengers

Regulation (EU) No 1177/2010 concerning the rights of passengers when travelling by sea and inland waterways provides disabled persons and persons with reduced mobility with the same opportunities to travel by water as they have in the rail and aviation sectors across the EU.

Article 8 of the Regulation sets out exceptions and special conditions relating to the overriding right to have tickets issued for people with disabilities and reduced mobility. The following is stated in Article 8(4): 'Carriers, travel agents and tour operators may require that a disabled person or person with reduced mobility be accompanied by another person who is capable of providing the assistance required by the disabled person or person with reduced mobility. As regards passenger services, such an accompanying person shall be carried free of charge'.

Within the UK, certain passenger services can be zero-rated for VAT purposes. This zero— rating can be extended to cruise passenger services in specific circumstances; in such cases, the essential nature of the service must be passenger transport, with all elements of the cruise being integral to it and it being neither practicable nor realistic to separate them, and with the cruise itself being held out for sale at a single price, with no specific charges or discounts for particular services taken or not taken up (UK HMRC Notice 744A).

— In the light of the obligations laid down by Regulation (EU) No 1177/2010, and given that a cruise can be defined for VAT duty purposes as a passenger service, in the case of circumstances where a cruise operator insists that a disabled or citizen with reduced mobility must be accompanied by another person, can the Commission confirm whether that accompanying person should be carried without charge?

— What advice and guidance has the Commission provided to national enforcement bodies and tour operators concerning Regulation (EU) No 1177/2010?

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

According to Article 8(4) of Regulation (EU) No 1177/2010 a person accompanying a disabled person or a person with reduced mobility shall be carried free of charge as regards passenger services. 'Passenger services' and 'cruise' respectively defined at Article 3(f) and (t) of Regulation (EU) No 1177/2010 are distinct services and are seperately mentioned under Article 2(1) of the same Regulation. It results, without prejudice to any future interpretation of the Court of Justice, that in the case a cruise operator insists that a disabled person or a person with reduced mobility must be accompanied by another person, there is no obligation that this accompanying person is carried free of charge. The Commission would however recommend the industry to offer a commercial gesture such as providing the transport service part of the cruise free of charge or the global price of the cruise at a significant discounted rate to the accompanying person. This position is in line with the one expressed in the 'Interpretative Guidelines on the application of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the rights of disabled persons and persons with reduced mobility when travelling by air' ([1]) as regards air transport.

The Commission has reminded Member States of their obligations to designate national enforcement bodies for the enforcement of rights of passengers travelling by sea and inland waterways and handling of complaints of such passengers, to lay down rules on penalties applicable to infringements of the Regulation (EU) No 1177/2010 and to inform the Commission of the exemptions that they plan to use under that regulation ([2]). At this early stage, it does not intend to issue guidelines on the application of this regulation.

([1]) SWD(2012)171final — See answer under question 5(b).
([2]) before it becomes applicable on 18 December 2012.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-007751/12
till kommissionen
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(31 augusti 2012)

Angående: Statistik från medlemsstaterna om övergrepp mot barn på internet

Skulle kommissionen kunna ge mig statistik som den har till sitt förfogande om utredningar och/eller åtal för antingen publicering eller användning av material som visar övergrepp mot barn på internet i Europeiska unionen?

Har kommissionen fått sådan statistik från samtliga medlemsstater? Om inte, vilka medlemsstater har inte offentliggjort uppgifterna?

Svar från Cecilia Malmström på kommissionens vägnar
(17 oktober 2012)

Medlemsstaterna är enligt EU:s lagstiftning ([1]) inte skyldiga att rapportera antalet utredningar eller åtal för brott som avser distribution, spridning eller överföring av barnpornografi, eller förvärv eller innehav av sådant material. Kommissionen har således inte tillgång till någon sammanställd statistik på EU-nivå.

För att på medellång sikt underlätta insamlingen av tillförlitlig och jämförbar brottsstatistik på EU-nivå har kommissionen infört en ny handlingsplan för brottsstatistik för perioden 2011–2015. Handlingsplanen koncentrerar sig på utbyte av information och insamling av statistik inom särskilda områden, t.ex. människohandel, penningtvätt, it-brottslighet och korruption, med syftet att stegvis utvidga metodiken för insamling av statistik av god kvalitet till att omfatta annan brottslighet, som exempelvis sexuella övergrepp mot barn.

Uppgifter om åtal och domar finns tillgänglig på nationell nivå, i enlighet med nationell lagstiftning och nationella förfaranden.

([1]) Rådets rambeslut 2004/68/RIF av den 22 december 2003 om bekämpande av sexuellt utnyttjande av barn och barnpornografi, EUT L 13, 20.1.2004, s. 44; Europaparlamentets och rådets direktiv 2011/92/EU av den 13 december 2011 om bekämpande av sexuella övergrepp mot barn, sexuell exploatering av barn och barnpornografi samt om ersättande av rådets rambeslut 2004/68/RIF, EUT L 335, 17.12.2011, s. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007751/12
to the Commission
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(31 August 2012)

Subject: Online child abuse material — statistics from Member States

Can the Commission provide me with any statistics at its disposal with regard to investigations and/or prosecutions for either publishing child abuse material online or accessing such material in the European Union?

Can the Commission indicate whether it has such statistics from all Member States and, if not, which Member States have not made these data available?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(17 October 2012)

On the basis of EU legislation ([1]), Member States are under no obligation to report on the number of investigations or prosecutions for the offences of distribution, dissemination or transmission of child sexual abuse material, nor on acquisition or possession of such material. The Commission therefore does not dispose of consolidated statistics at EU level.

To facilitate in the mid-term the collection of reliable and comparable crime statistics at EU level, the Commission has launched a new Action Plan on crime statistics covering the period 2011-15. The action plan focuses on the exchange of information and the collection of statistics in particular areas, such as trafficking in human beings, money laundering, cybercrime and corruption, the aim being to gradually extend the methodology for collecting good quality statistics to other crime areas such as child sexual abuse.

Data on prosecutions and convictions are available at national level, according to domestic legislation and procedures.

([1]) Council Framework Decision 2004/68/JHA of 22 December 2003 on combating the sexual exploitation of children and child pornography, OJ L 13, 20.1.2004, p. 44; and Directive 2011/92/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on combating the sexual abuse and sexual exploitation of children and child pornography, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2004/68/JHA, OJ L 335, 17.12.2011, p. 1.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007752/12
aan de Commissie
Marietje Schaake (ALDE)
(31 augustus 2012)

Betreft: Repressie van onlineprotesten door de Belarussische autoriteiten — Vergunningplicht voor uitvoer van ICT naar Belarus

Op 30 augustus 2012 ([1]) werd melding gemaakt van het feit dat een aantal beheerders van Belarussische sociale netwerksites met connecties met pro-oppositiegroeperingen in Minsk gearresteerd is. Naar verluidt heeft de Belarussische KGB pro-oppositiefora op het Russische sociale netwerk „VKontakte.ru" gehackt. Het gaat om de fora „Wij hebben genoeg van Loekasjenko", met meer dan 37 000 leden en „Loekasjenko dood", met 15 000 leden. Volgens de plaatselijke mensenrechtenorganisatie Vesna-96 zijn vier personen, waaronder Pavel Euthyakheev, Andrej Tkachov en Raman Pratesevich gevangengenomen en is hen gevraagd om de wachtwoorden van de onlinefora door te geven. In 2011 heeft de regering Loekasjenko alle vormen van protest verboden en de KGB gemachtigd om onderzoeken te starten naar personen waarvan vermoed wordt dat zij tot de oppositie behoren en deze zonder aanhoudingsbevel te arresteren. Aangezien er op 23 september 2012 parlementaire verkiezingen zullen plaatsvinden, is dit optreden, dat overduidelijk in strijd is met de vrijheid van meningsuiting en de vrijheid van vergadering op internet, bijzonder zorgwekkend.

1. Op welke wijze gaat de Commissie druk op de Belarussische autoriteiten uitoefenen om ervoor te zorgen dat de digitale vrijheden worden gerespecteerd en de gedetineerde beheerders van de websites worden vrijgelaten?

2. Is de Commissie in het licht van de komende verkiezingen en het vermeende hacken van websites door de KGB in staat en bereid om om redenen van openbare veiligheid of uit mensenrechtenoverwegingen op grond van artikel 8, lid 1, van Verordening (EG) nr. 428/2009 („de verordening") voor de hele EU een ad-hocvergunningplicht in te voeren voor de uitvoer van de volgende producten voor tweeërlei gebruik die niet op de lijst van bijlage I voorkomen: public LAN database centralised monitoring systems, internet- en 2G/3G-diensten (met inbegrip van operationele ondersteuning en dienstverlening), waaronder: tekenapparatuur voor communicatiestromen, interface- en mediationsystemen voor systeemcomponenten, monitored flows processing power, monitored flows processing software, opslag van databestanden, werkstations voor gegevensbeheer, software voor gegevensbeheer en LAN-infrastructuur? Zo nee, waarom niet?

3. Als de Commissie geen vergunningplicht voor de hele EU krachtens artikel 8, lid 1 van de verordening kan invoeren, wil zij dan uitleggen waarom zij dat niet kan?

4. Is de Commissie bereid tegen Belarus ad-hocmaatregelen te treffen, waaronder een verbod op de uitvoer van bovengenoemde technologieën en diensten, gelijk aan de sancties die zijn opgelegd aan Syrië ([2]) (artikel 4, bijlage 5) en Iran ([3])? Zo nee, waarom niet?

5. Is de Commissie het ermee eens dat de vrijheid van meningsuiting en de vrijheid van vergadering ook van toepassing zijn in de onlinesfeer en dat alle inspanningen van de EU om de mensenrechten en de fundamentele vrijheden in Belarus (en elders in de wereld) te beschermen en bevorderen er ook op gericht moeten zijn om digitale vrijheden te ondersteunen en beschermen? Zo nee, waarom niet?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(22 oktober 2012)

1. De EU blijft uiting geven aan haar diepe bezorgdheid wat betreft het gebrek aan vrijheid van meningsuiting in Belarus en blijft erop aandringen om een einde te maken aan het repressieve beleid. Tot dusver werden 243 individuen onderworpen aan een visumverbod en bevriezing van tegoeden in het kader van de beperkende maatregelen tegen Belarus. De EU heeft steeds benadrukt dat de beperkende maatregelen kunnen worden aangepast en permanent worden geëvalueerd.

([1]) http://www.charter97.org/en/news/2012/8/30/57616/
http://rt.com/politics/services-opposition-groups-social-952/
http://www.jpost.com/Headlines/Article.aspx?id=283267
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:016:0001:0032:NL:PDF
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:016:0001:0032:NL:PDF

2.-3. Artikel 8, lid 1, van de verordening staat lidstaten toe om aanvullende controles uit te voeren om redenen van nationale veiligheid of uit mensenrechtenoverwegingen. Naast juridische overwegingen blijkt het selecteren van de juiste producten voor dergelijke handelsmaatregelen ook technisch een uitdaging, omdat veel van deze producten ook voor civiele toepassingen worden gebruikt. In 2011 nam de Commissie een groenboek aan waarmee de herziening van de controlesystemen van de Europese export is ingeleid en de Commissie blijft bekijken hoe exportcontroles beter kunnen worden aangepakt op EU-niveau.

4. Over bijkomende beperkende maatregelen tegen Belarus in het kader van Besluit 2010/639/GBVB van de Raad en Verordening (EG) nr. 765/2006 van de Raad moet worden beslist door de lidstaten volgens de vereiste juridische procedure en zonder het doel van het EU-sanctiebeleid tegen Belarus uit het oog te verliezen. Dergelijke maatregelen kunnen niet ad hoc worden vastgesteld door de Commissie.

5. De hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter is het eens met de uitspraken van het geachte Parlementslid. De EU heeft Belarus ook aangemaand om de aanbevelingen van het laatste VN-verslag van de hoge commissaris voor de rechten van de mens over Belarus ter harte te nemen, waarin onder andere de regering werd opgeroepen om ervoor te zorgen dat regelgeving niet leidt tot censuur van de elektronische media.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007752/12
to the Commission
Marietje Schaake (ALDE)
(31 August 2012)

Subject: Crackdown on online dissent by the Belarusian authorities — authorisation requirements for ICT exports to Belarus

On 30 August 2012 it was reported ([1]) that a number of administrators of social networking websites in Belarus linked to pro-opposition groups had been detained in Minsk. The Belarus KGB allegedly hacked pro-opposition communities on the Russian 'VKontakte.ru' social network. The groups are: 'We're fed up with Lukashenko', which has over 37 000 members, and 'Only SHOS', with 15 000 members. According to the local human rights group Vesna-96, four people, among them Pavel Euthyakheeu, Andrei Tkachou and Raman Pratesevich, have been detained and asked to surrender the passwords of the online groups. In 2011 the Lukashenko administration outlawed all forms of protest and empowered the KGB to conduct searches and arrests without warrant on suspicion of political dissent. Given that parliamentary elections are scheduled for 23 September 2012, this action, which is in clear violation of freedom of expression and assembly online, is extremely worrying.

1. What pressure will the Commission put on the Belarusian authorities to ensure that they respect digital freedoms and the detained web administrators are released?

2. Given the upcoming elections and the claims of hacking of websites by the KGB, is the Commission able and willing to impose an EU-wide ad hoc authorisation requirement, based on Article 8(1) of Regulation (EC) No 428/2009 ('the regulation'), on the export of the following dual-use items, which are not listed in Annex A to the regulation on grounds of public security and human rights considerations: public LAN database centralised monitoring systems, Internet and 2G/3G services (including operational support and services), including: communication flows drawing equipment, interface and mediation systems for system components, monitored flows processing power, monitored flows processing software, data filing storage, database management workstations, database management software and LAN infrastructure? If not, why not?

3. If the Commission is not able to implement an ad hoc EU-wide authorisation requirement under Article 8(1) of the regulation, can it explain why?

4. Is the Commission willing to impose ad hoc sanctions on Belarus, to include exports of the abovementioned technologies and services, similar to the sanctions applying to Syria ([2]) (Article 4, Annex A) and Iran ([3])? If not, why not?

5. Does the Commission agree that freedom of expression and assembly also extend to the online sphere, and that all efforts by the EU to protect and promote human rights and fundamental freedoms in Belarus (and elsewhere) should also aim to uphold and protect digital freedoms? If not, why not?

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

1. The EU continues to express grave concern regarding the lack of freedom of expression in Belarus and continues to call for repressive policies to be reversed. Under the restrictive measures against Belarus, 243 individuals have so far been subjected to assets freeze and visa bans, The EU has consistently stressed that its restrictive measures remain open and under constant review.

2-3. Art. 8(1) of the regulation empowers Member States, to introduce additional controls for reasons of national security or human rights considerations. Apart from legal considerations, the identification of suitable items for application of such trade measures appears to be technically challenging, as many of the relevant items have numerous 'civilian' applications. In 2011 the Commission adopted a Green Paper initiating a review of the EU Export control system and will continue to examine options for an enhanced EU approach on export controls.

([1]) http://www.charter97.org/en/news/2012/8/30/57616/
http://rt.com/politics/services-opposition-groups-social-952/
http://www.jpost.com/Headlines/Article.aspx?id=283267
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:016:0001:0032:EN:PDF
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:016:0001:0032:EN:PDF

4. The imposition of additional restrictive measures against Belarus under Council Decision 2010/639/CFSP and Council Regulation (EC) No 765/2006 would have to be decided by the Member States following the required legal procedure bearing in mind the objective of the EU sanctions policy against Belarus. Such measures cannot be adopted on an ad hoc basis by the Commission.

5. The HR/VP agrees with the Honourable Member's assertions. The EU has also urged Belarus to follow the recommendations of the latest UN HCHR report on Belarus, which, i.a., call on the government to ensure that regulations do not lead to censorship of electronic media.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007760/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(3 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Tutela dei pellegrini diretti a Medjugorie

Migliaia di visitatori dall'UE affluiscono ogni anno, passando dalla Croazia, in Bosnia-Erzegovina per visitare il santuario di Medjugorie. Alla frontiera sono spesso sottoposti a controlli assolutamente discriminatori, a volte addirittura con il sequestro dei documenti.

La Commissione è a conoscenza di tali episodi?

Non ritiene utile un monitoraggio a tutela dei pellegrini che subiscono, alla frontiera fra Croazia e Bosnia, controlli discriminatori?

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(26 ottobre 2012)

La Commissione non ha ricevuto alcuna segnalazione di controlli discriminatori sui pellegrini che attraversano la frontiera fra la Croazia e la Bosnia-Erzegovina.

La Commissione riferisce regolarmente sugli sviluppi nel settore della giustizia, della libertà e della sicurezza e sulla specifica questione dei controlli di frontiera per quanto riguarda la Croazia e la Bosnia-Erzegovina. L'ultima valutazione della Commissione relativa alla Croazia, pubblicata nell'ottobre 2012, conferma che il paese soddisfa in generale gli impegni e le condizioni in quest'ambito derivanti dai negoziati di adesione.

La Commissione continuerà a monitorare la situazione in questo settore alle future frontiere esterne dell'UE della Croazia. Ciò avverrà in occasione del dialogo regolare con le autorità e anche con missioni tecniche mirate, in stretta cooperazione con esperti degli Stati membri. La sicurezza e il mantenimento dell'ordine alle frontiere in Bosnia-Erzegovina continueranno a loro volta ad essere valutati nel quadro del meccanismo di controllo post-liberalizzazione dei visti. La Commissione riferisce regolarmente al Parlamento e al Consiglio a tale riguardo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007760/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: Protection of pilgrims on their way to Medjugorje

Thousands of visitors from the EU go to Bosnia and Herzegovina each year, passing through Croatia, to visit the shrine of Medjugorje. At the border they are often subjected to totally discriminatory checks and sometimes even have their documents seized.

Is the Commission aware of these incidents?

Does it not think it would be useful to monitor the situation, in order to protect pilgrims who are subjected to discriminatory checks at the border between Croatia and Bosnia?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(26 October 2012)

Cases of discriminatory controls on pilgrims crossing the borders between Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina have not been reported to the Commission.

The Commission reports regularly on the developments in the field of justice, freedom and security and the specific issue of border control for Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. The latest Commission assessment on Croatia, issued in October 2012, confirms that the country is generally meeting the commitments and requirements arising from the accession negotiations in this field.

The Commission will continue to monitor the situation in this area at the Croatian future external EU borders during the regular dialogue with the authorities, and also through targeted technical missions, in close cooperation with experts from the EU member states. Border security and policing will also continue to be assessed in Bosnia and Herzegovina under the post-visa liberalisation monitoring mechanism. In this framework, the Commission reports regularly to the Parliament and Council.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007761/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(3 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Studio sui movimenti di denaro del settore bancario islamico in Europa

In riferimento alla risposta E-007699/2011, ha la Commissione acquisito nuove informazioni?

Reputa essa utile procedere ad uno studio, da essa stessa promosso, col quale dirimere tale questione, considerata anche la politica dell'UE di lotta al terrorismo?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(31 ottobre 2012)

La Commissione non ha acquisito alcuna nuova informazione comprovante le affermazioni dell'onorevole parlamentare.

Per il momento la Commissione non intende pertanto procedere ad alcuno studio al riguardo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007761/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: Study on money movements in the Islamic banking sector in Europe

With reference to the answer to Written Question E-007699/2011, has the Commission acquired any new information?

Does it not agree that it might be useful to launch a study in order to resolve this issue, in view also of the EU's anti-terrorism policy?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(31 October 2012)

The Commission has not acquired any new information substantiating the allegations made by the Honourable Member.

Therefore, the Commission does not plan at this moment any study covering that subject.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-007765/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3. septembra 2012)

Vec: Problém nezamestnanosti v Európe

Jedným z hlavných cieľov stratégie Európa 2020 je dosiahnutie 75 % miery zamestnanosti osôb vo veku 20 – 64 rokov do roku 2020. Súčasná situácia je však diametrálne odlišná. Nezamestnanosť v Európskej únii je na historických maximách. Takmer 24,5 milióna obyvateľov EÚ je bez práce. Toto číslo pritom predstavuje viac ako 10 % pracovne aktívneho obyvateľstva. V snahe o vymanenie sa z krízy je tvorba pracovných miest jedným z najpálčivejších problémov.

Aké konkrétne opatrenia zamerané na tvorbu nových pracovných miest a na znižovanie nezamestnanosti v Európe plánuje Európska komisia prijať v nadchádzajúcom roku 2013?

Odpoveď pána Andora v mene Komisie
(25. októbra 2012)

Komisia súhlasí s názorom váženej pani poslankyne, že vytváranie pracovných miest musí byť absolútnou prioritou Európskej únie. Komisia spolu s členskými štátmi plánuje pokračovať v snahe o reformnú cestu v rámci európskeho semestra hospodárskeho riadenia, aby vytvorila podmienky pre rast a zamestnanosť a zároveň riešila problém nezamestnanosti. Komisia bude sledovať vykonávanie odporúčaní pre jednotlivé krajiny, ktorú prijala Rada v júli 2012 ([1]).

V súvislosti s balíkom zamestnanosti, ktorý bol prijatý 18. apríla 2012 ([2]), sa Komisia takisto snaží preorientovať politiku zamestnanosti EÚ zameriavaním sa na aspekty politík trhu práce a reforiem, ktoré podporujú rast. Robí tak hlavne prostredníctvom opatrení zameraných na tvorbu pracovných miest, zvyšovanie dopytu po práci a úplné využitie sektorov s potenciálom veľkého počtu pracovných miest („zelené“ hospodárstvo, informačné a komunikačné technológie a zdravotnícke služby). Balík zamestnanosti tiež vymedzuje kľúčové oblasti pre reformy, aby sa trhy práce stali dynamickejšími a inkluzívnejšími, a navrhuje posilniť riadenie politík zamestnanosti EÚ a úlohu sociálnych partnerov.

([1]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/ecofin/131662.pdf
([2]) COM(2012) 173 z 18. apríla 2012: Smerom k oživeniu hospodárstva sprevádzaného tvorbou veľkého počtu pracovných miest.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007765/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: Problem of unemployment in Europe

One of the main aims of the Europe 2020 strategy is to achieve a 75% employment rate for the 20-64 age group in the EU by 2020. The current situation is, however, totally at variance with this aim. Unemployment in the European Union is at historically high — its highest ever — levels. Almost 24 million EU citizens are without work. This number represents more than 10% of the working population. Job creation is one of the most burning issues in efforts to deal with the crisis.

What concrete steps aimed at creating new jobs and reducing unemployment in Europe is the Commission planning to take in 2013?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(25 October 2012)

The Commission agrees with the Honourable Member that job creation must be an absolute priority for the European Union. The Commission intends to continue pursuing together with Member States the reform path undertaken within the European Semester of economic governance to create the conditions for growth and jobs and tackle unemployment. The Commission will also monitor the implementation of the Country Specific Recommendations adopted by the Council in July 2012 ([1]).

In line with its Employment Package, adopted on 18 April 2012 ([2]), the Commission also seeks to reorient European employment policy by focusing on growth-enhancing aspects of labour market policies and reforms. Specifically with measures aimed at job creation, boosting demand for labour and harnessing the potential of job-rich sectors (green economy, information and communication technologies and the healthcare services). The Package also identifies key areas for reform so that labour markets become more dynamic as well as inclusive, and proposes to reinforce EU governance of employment policies and the the role of the social partners.

([1]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/ecofin/131662.pdf
([2]) COM(2012) 173 of 18.04.2012 — Towards a job-rich recovery.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-007767/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3. septembra 2012)

Vec: Dobré životné podmienky zvierat

Asi len tretina krajín Európskej únie dbá dostatočne na to, aby boli na jednotlivých farmách zabezpečené dobré životné podmienky zvierat. Dobré životné podmienky zvierat sú pritom jedným z hlavných faktorov, ktoré ovplyvňujú kvalitu produktov, ktoré sa dostávajú na stôl európskym spotrebiteľom. Má teda významný vplyv na verejné zdravie. V súčasnej dobe nemáme ani len definíciu, ktorá by dobré životné podmienky zvierat určovala. Monitorovanie dodržiavania súčasne platných pravidiel je rovnako nedostatočné.

Je podľa názoru Komisie tlak na jednotlivé členské štáty, aby uplatňovali pravidlá EÚ na zabezpečenie dobrých životných podmienok zvierat, dostatočný?

Odpoveď pána Šefčoviča v mene Komisie
(23. októbra 2012)

V článku 13 Zmluvy o fungovaní Európskej únie sa zvieratá uznávajú za cítiace bytosti a vyžaduje sa v ňom maximálny ohľad na požiadavky, ktoré sa týkajú dobrých životných podmienok zvierat pri tvorbe a vykonávaní príslušných politík EÚ. Právne predpisy EÚ v oblasti dobrých životných podmienok zvierat stanovujú minimálne normy na ochranu hospodárskych zvierat chovaných a držaných v poľnohospodárskych podnikoch ([1]), počas prepravy ([2]) a v čase ich usmrcovania ([3]). Členské štáty nesú hlavnú zodpovednosť za vykonávanie týchto právnych predpisov.

Ako sa uvádza v stratégii EÚ na ochranu a dobré životné podmienky zvierat 2012 – 2015 ([4]), prioritou Komisie je dosiahnutie správneho presadzovania súčasných právnych predpisov EÚ v tejto oblasti. Komisia pravidelne hodnotí stav implementácie týchto predpisov v členských štátoch prostredníctvom auditov inšpekčných služieb, ako aj pomocou správ príslušných členských štátov o svojich kontrolných činnostiach. V prípadoch, keď Komisia má dostatočné dôkazy o tom, že členský štát systematicky nedodržiava svoje povinnosti voči legislatíve EÚ v oblasti dobrých životných podmienok zvierat, Komisia môže začať konanie o porušení právnych predpisov.

([1]) Smernica Rady 98/58/ES o ochrane zvierat chovaných na hospodárske účely, Ú. v. ES L 221, 8.8.1998, s. 23.
([2]) Nariadenie Rady (ES) č. 1/2005 o ochrane zvierat počas prepravy, Ú. v. EÚ L 3, 5.1.2005, s. 1.
([3]) Smernica rady 93/119/ES o ochrane zvierat v čase porážky alebo usmrtenia, Ú. v. ES L 340, 31.12.1993, s. 21.
([4]) COM(2012) 6 final http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/actionplan/actionplan_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007767/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: Animal welfare

Only about one third of EU countries take sufficient steps to ensure that animal welfare rules are properly implemented on their farms. Yet animal welfare is one of the key factors in ensuring the quality of the products that reach the tables of European consumers, and it therefore has a significant influence on public health. At the moment, we do not even have a common definition on which animal welfare could be based, and monitoring of compliance with currently applicable rules is also inadequate.

Does the Commission consider that the pressure on Member States to apply EU animal welfare rules is sufficient?

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

Article 13 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union recognises animals as sentient beings and requires full regards be given to the welfare requirements of animals while formulating and implementing the relevant EU policies. EU welfare legislation lays down minimum standards for the protection of farmed animals bred and kept in holdings ([1]), during transport ([2]) and at the time of killing ([3]). Member States are primarily responsible for the implementation of this legislation.

As stated in the EU strategy for the protection and welfare of animals 2012-2015 ([4]), achieving proper enforcement of existing EU welfare legislation is a priority for the Commission. The Commission regularly assesses the state of implementation of this legislation in Member States by audits of its inspection services as well as reports of the Member States on their control activities. In cases where the Commission has sufficient evidence showing that a Member State does not comply systematically with EU welfare legislation, the Commission can launch infringement procedures.

([1]) Council Directive 98/58/EC concerning the protection of animals kept for farming purposes, OJ L 221, 8.8.1998, p. 23.
([2]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport, OJ L 3, 5.1.2005, p. 1.
([3]) Council Directive 93/119/EC on the protection of animals at the time of slaughter or killing, OJ L 340, 31.12.1993, p. 21.
([4]) COM(2012) 6 final, http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/actionplan/actionplan_en.htm

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-007768/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3. septembra 2012)

Vec: Spoločná energetická politika EÚ

V jednotlivých európskych spotrebiteľských krajinách sú v súvislosti s dodávkami energie z tretích krajín odlišné podmienky. Jednotlivé členské štáty však o sebe nemajú žiadne informácie. Európska únia by mala byť pri rokovaniach s dodávateľmi z tretích krajín jednotná. Na to je však nevyhnutná lepšia komunikácia a výmena relevantných informácií. Jednotný postoj Únie pri rokovaniach v oblasti energetiky by zabezpečil spoľahlivé dodávky energie za prijateľné ceny. Rovnako by sa posilnila pozícia EÚ na medzinárodných trhoch.

Akým spôsobom by sa podľa názoru Komisie dala zabezpečiť jednotnosť a lepšia spolupráca jednotlivých členských krajín pri rokovaniach s vonkajšími dodávateľmi energie?

Odpoveď pána Oettingera v mene Komisie
(18. októbra 2012)

Zlepšovanie vnútornej koherentnosti a koordinácie EÚ v oblasti externej energetickej politiky patrilo k hlavným prvkom politiky, ktorá bola v septembri 2011 navrhnutá v oznámení Komisie o zabezpečení dodávok energie a medzinárodnej spolupráci ([1]). Okrem toho Komisia predložila návrh mechanizmu výmeny informácií o medzivládnych dohodách medzi členskými štátmi a tretími krajinami ([2]). Tento mechanizmus má byť zárukou dodržiavania pravidiel EÚ týkajúcich sa vnútorného trhu a zabezpečovania dodávok energie, dosiahnutia vyššej transparentnosti medzi členskými štátmi v duchu solidarity, ako aj posilnenia pozície pri individuálnych a kolektívnych rokovaniach členských štátov EÚ s tretími krajinami. Parlament prijal správu ([3]) o návrhu uvedenej legislatívy v prvom čítaní v rámci plenárneho zasadnutia v septembri 2012.

Komisia okrem toho uviedla, že najmä v prípade rozsiahlej infraštruktúry prepájajúcej energetickú sieť EÚ so sieťami tretích krajín môže celoeurópsky prístup prispieť k zníženiu politických, obchodných či právnych rizík. Dojednanie dohôd na úrovni EÚ preto môže byť potrebné v zložitých prípadoch, ktoré majú veľký vplyv na ciele energetickej politiky EÚ. Ako príklad takejto dohody môže slúžiť dohoda o transkaspickom plynovode s Azerbajdžanom a Turkménskom, o ktorej sa v súčasnosti rokuje.

([1]) KOM(2011) 539.
([2]) KOM(2011) 540.
([3]) A7-0264/2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007768/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: EU common energy policy

Varying conditions apply to energy supplies from third countries in the different EU countries that need imported energy, and individual countries have no information about each other in relation to this issue. The European Union should take a unified approach in talks with external energy suppliers. For that, however, improved communication and exchange of relevant information are imperative. If the EU could speak with one voice in energy talks, it would be a means of ensuring reliable energy supplies at affordable prices and it would strengthen the EU's position on the international markets.

How does the Commission consider that this united approach by and improved communication between the Member States in talks with external energy suppliers could be achieved?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(18 October 2012)

Improving internal EU coherence and coordination on external energy policy was among the main elements of the policy proposed in the Commission Communication on security of energy supply and international cooperation ([1]) in September 2011. Alongside this, the Commission has put forward a proposal for an information exchange mechanism on intergovernmental agreements between the Member States and third countries ([2]). The mechanism aims to ensure that the EU internal market rules and energy security policy goals are respected, to enhance transparency among Member States in a spirit of solidarity, and to reinforce the individual and collective negotiating positions of the EU Member States vis-à-vis third countries. The Parliament adopted its report ([3]) on the draft legislation in the first reading during the September 2012 plenary session.

In addition, the Commission has suggested that, particularly in cases of large-scale infrastructure linking the EU energy network to third countries, the EU approach can help reduce political, commercial or legal risks. Negotiating EU-level agreements might therefore be necessary in complex cases that have a large bearing on EU energy policy objectives. The agreement on a Trans-Caspian gas pipeline with Azerbaijan and Turkmenistan, currently being negotiated, is one such example.

([1]) COM(2011) 539.
([2]) COM(2011) 540.
([3]) A7-0264/2012.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-007769/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3. septembra 2012)

Vec: Rozšírenie pôsobnosti Európskej banky pre obnovu a rozvoj

Európska banka pre obnovu a rozvoj EBOR bola v 90. rokoch vytvorená s cieľom podporiť transformačný proces krajín strednej a východnej Európy a krajín bývalého Sovietskeho zväzu na krajiny s trhovým hospodárstvom. Jej úlohou je podpora demokratizácie a plynulého prechodu od autoritatívnych režimov na otvorené trhovo orientované ekonomiky. Vzhľadom na významné politické zmeny bolo nedávno v Európskom parlamente schválené rozšírenie pôsobnosti EBOR aj na krajiny južného a východného Stredomoria.

Aký má Európska komisia názor na rozšírenie pôsobnosti Európskej banky pre obnovu a rozvoj na krajiny južného a východného Stredomoria?

Považuje Európska komisia v súčasnej dobe hospodárskej krízy takúto formu intervencie za vhodnú?

Odpoveď pána Rehna v mene Komisie
(9. novembra 2012)

Komisia by chcela váženú pani poslankyňu informovať, že po výzvach zo strany EÚ ([1]) a s podporou v rámci zasadnutia G8 v Deauville v roku 2011 Európska banka pre obnovu a rozvoj (EBOR) úspešne zavádza proces rozšírenia svojho mandátu na krajiny južného a východného Stredomoria. Činnosť EBOR sa bude v tomto novom regióne pôsobnosti zameriavať na jej kľúčové oblasti odbornosti, a to najmä na podporu rozvoja súkromného sektora. Prvé zásadné investičné projekty v tomto regióne schválila Rada riaditeľov EBOR počas septembra 2012.

Toto by malo prispieť k presadzovaniu politických cieľov EÚ v južnom a východnom Stredomorí. Komisia tento rozvoj plne podporuje.

([1]) Pozri najmä spoločné oznámenie Európskej komisie a vysokej predstaviteľky pre zahraničné veci a bezpečnostnú politiku o novej reakcii na meniace sa susedstvo z 25. mája 2011 a závery Rady o európskej susedskej politike Rady pre zahraničné veci z 20. júna 2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007769/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: Extension of the activities of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development

The European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) was established in the 1990s to help transform the countries of central and eastern Europe and of the former Soviet Union into market economies. Its task is to promote democracy and support transition from authoritarian regimes to open-market economies. In the wake of recent, significant political changes, the European Parliament recently approved an extension of EBRD activities to the countries of the southern and eastern Mediterranean.

What is the Commission's opinion of the extension of EBRD activities to the countries of the southern and eastern Mediterranean?

Does it consider such a form of action to be appropriate in this time of economic crisis?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(9 November 2012)

The Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that after the calls from the EU ([1]), and encouraged by the G8 meeting in Deauville 2011, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) is successfully implementing the process of extending its mandate to the countries in the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean (SEMED) region. EBRD activity in this new region of operations will focus on its core areas of expertise, notably in promoting private sector development. The first substantive investment projects in the region were approved by the EBRD Board of Directors during September 2012.

This should contribute to advance EU policy objectives in the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean. The Commission fully supports these developments.

([1]) See in particular the Joint Communication of the European Commission and the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy on a new response to a changing neighbourhood of 25 May 2011 and the Council conclusions on the European Neighbourhood Policy of the Foreign Affairs Council of 20 June 2011.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-007770/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3. septembra 2012)

Vec: Boj proti mučeniu vo svete

Medzinárodné právo ustanovuje absolútny zákaz mučenia a iného krutého, neľudského alebo ponižujúceho zaobchádzania. Európska únia sa zaviazala, že sa bude snažiť mučenie odstrániť a predchádzať mu. Stále však existujú spoločnosti, ktoré toto ohavné a mimoriadne ponižujúce porušovanie ľudských práv tolerujú. Každý deň pribúdajú v rôznych kútoch sveta ďalšie obete, ženy, muži a aj deti. Existujú dokonca prípady údajného mučenia aj v samotnej Únii. Podľa názoru generálneho tajomníka Združenia pre prevenciu mučenia by sa EÚ ako celok mala v záujme úspešného boja proti mučeniu zapojiť do celosvetového systému, a to pristúpením k Opčnému protokolu k Dohovoru OSN proti mučeniu.

Aké konkrétne opatrenia zamerané na prevenciu a boj proti mučeniu a inému krutému, neľudskému a ponižujúcemu zaobchádzaniu prijala Európska komisia v poslednom čase?

Aký je názor Komisie na pristúpenie Európskej únie ako celku k Opčnému protokolu k Dohovoru OSN proti mučeniu?

Odpoveď pani Redingovej v mene Komisie
(6. novembra 2012)

Zákaz mučenia a neľudského alebo ponižujúceho zaobchádzania alebo trestu je zakotvený v článku 4 Charty základných práv Európskej únie. Komisia sa pevne zaviazala zabezpečiť, aby sa plne dodržiavali ustanovenia charty, ktoré sú záväzné pre inštitúcie EÚ a členské štáty pri ich vykonávaní práva Únie. Ako sa uvádza vo výročnej správe o uplatňovaní charty z roku 2011, Komisia prijala rad opatrení, aby zabezpečila, že zákaz mučenia a ponižujúceho zaobchádzania sa účinne vykonáva, keď ide o právo Únie ([1]). Návrh smernice o právach podozrivých a obvinených osôb v trestnom konaní, ktorý vypracovala Komisia, odráža názor Komisie, že dôležitými zárukami proti zlému zaobchádzaniu sú právo na advokáta a komunikácia s tretími stranami. Európska únia podporuje výročné rezolúcie o mučení na Valnom zhromaždení Organizácie spojených národov a v Rade pre ľudské práva a propaguje odstránenie mučenia tým, že vedie dialógy o ľudských právach s jednotlivými krajinami. Usmernenia politiky EÚ voči tretím krajinám týkajúce sa mučenia tvoria kľúčový nástroj zahraničnej politiky ([2]). Európska únia poskytuje aj finančnú pomoc zameranú na programy proti mučeniu ([3]).

Pokiaľ ide o pristúpenie EÚ k Opčnému protokolu k Dohovoru OSN proti mučeniu, treba zdôrazniť, že opčný protokol je otvorený na podpis iba pre tie štáty, ktoré podpísali Dohovor OSN proti mučeniu ([4]). Z tohto dôvodu Komisia v tomto štádiu nezamýšľa pristúpiť k Opčnému protokolu k Dohovoru OSN proti mučeniu.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/charter/application/index_en.htm (pozri s. 28 – 34).

([2]) Usmernenia politiky EÚ voči tretím krajinám týkajúce sa mučenia a iného krutého neľudského alebo ponižujúceho zaobchádzania alebo trestania (prijaté Radou pre všeobecné záležitosti 18. apríla 2008, dostupné na: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/TortureGuidelines.pdf)

([3]) V strategickom dokumente EIDHR na roky 2011 – 2013 sa počíta s finančnou podporou pre projekty MVO na zabránenie mučeniu a rehabilitáciu obetí mučenia vo výške 38 mil. EUR, ktoré sú vyčlenené na podporu organizácií občianskej spoločnosti v boji proti mučeniu. EÚ podporuje projekty Rady Európy (6,9 mil. EUR) najmä týkajúce sa reformy väzenského systému, nezávislých nejusticných mechanizmov na ochranu ľudských práv, boja proti zlému zaobchádzaniu a beztrestnosti.

([4]) V súlade s článkami 26 a 28 Dohovoru OSN proti mučeniu môžu k tomuto medzinárodnému nástroju pristúpiť iba štáty, ktoré sú stranami dohovoru.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007770/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: Fighting torture in the world

International law imposes an absolute ban on torture and other forms of brutal, inhuman and degrading treatment. The European Union has committed itself to the objective of eliminating and preventing the use of torture. Yet there are still societies that tolerate this repellent and exceptionally humiliating violation of human rights. Every day there are more victims — women, men and children — in various parts of the world. There are even cases of alleged torture within the European Union itself. According to the Secretary-General of the Association for the Prevention of Torture, the EU as a whole should, in order to further its campaign against torture, join the global system by acceding to the Optional Protocol to the UN Convention against Torture.

What specific measures to combat and prevent torture and other forms of brutal, inhuman and degrading treatment has the Commission adopted recently?

What is the Commission's view on accession by the EU to the Optional Protocol to the UN Convention against Torture?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(6 November 2012)

The prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment is enshrined in Article 4 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights. The Commission is fully committed to ensure that the provisions of the Charter, which is binding on EU institutions and Member States when they are implementing Union law, are fully respected. As explained in its 2011 Annual Report on the application of the Charter, the Commission has taken a number of steps to ensure that the prohibition of torture and degrading treatment is effectively implemented when it comes to Union law ([1]). The Commission's proposal for a directive on the right of suspects and accused persons in criminal proceedings reflects the Commission's view that having access to a lawyer and communicating with third parties are important safeguards against ill-treatment. The EU sponsors annual resolutions on torture at the UN General Assembly and the Human Rights Council and promotes the eradication of torture through human rights dialogues with individual countries. Guidelines to EU policy towards third countries on torture constitute a key foreign policy tool ([2]). The EU also provides financial assistance to programs against torture ([3]).

As regards the accession by the EU to the Optional Protocol to the UN Convention against Torture, it should be pointed out that the Optional Protocol is open for signature only by States that have signed the UN Convention against torture ([4]). For this reason, the accession of the European Union to the UN Convention against Torture is not at this stage envisaged by the Commission.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/charter/application/index_en.htm (see pp. 28-34).
([2]) Guidelines to EU policy towards third countries on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment (adopted by the General Affairs Council of 18 April 2008, available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/TortureGuidelines.pdf).
([3]) Financial support to NGO projects in prevention of torture and rehabilitating torture victims is foreseen in the EIDHR Strategy Paper for 2011-2013, with almost EUR 38 million allocated to support civil society organisations to fight torture. The EU supports Council of Europe projects (EUR 6.9 million) notably related to prison reform, independent national non-judicial mechanisms for the protection of human rights; fight against ill-treatment and impunity.
([4]) In accordance with Articles 26 and 28 of the UN Convention against Torture, this international instrument is open to accession by State parties only.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-007771/12
Komisii (podpredsedníčke Komisie/vysokej predstaviteľke)
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3. septembra 2012)

Vec: VP/HR – Praktiky mučenia v Sýrii

Medzinárodná organizácia na ochranu ľudských práv Human Rights Watch vydala správu, v ktorej obviňuje sýrskych vojakov zo sexuálneho násilia, ktoré majú používať ako mučiaci prostriedok. Organizácia tvrdí, že sa jej podarilo zdokumentovať 20 prípadov mimoriadne krutého sexuálneho násilia. Ide o znásilnenia a iné formy násilia, ktoré je páchané na mužoch, ženách a dokonca aj deťoch. K otrasným praktikám podľa organizácie dochádza najmä v zajateckých táboroch a pri vládnych prehliadkach mestských častí a domov. Organizácia z týchto činov obviňuje vládu.

Zaoberá sa VP/HR touto správou organizácie Human Rights Watch?

Ak áno, aké konkrétne opatrenia mieni v tejto súvislosti podniknúť?

Odpoveď podpredsedníčky Komisie/vysokej predstaviteľky Ashtonovej v mene Komisie
(7. decembra 2012)

Vysoká predstaviteľka a podpredsedníčka Komisie je informovaná o systematickom porušovaní ľudských práv v sýrskych zajateckých táboroch, ktoré je jedným z faktorov, čo v marci 2011 viedli k vypuknutiu súčasného povstania. Vysoká predstaviteľka a podpredsedníčka EK vyjadrila vo viacerých vyhláseniach obavy o telesnú bezpečnosť svojvoľne zatknutých aktivistov za ľudské práva a požadovala informácie o mieste ich zadržiavania a vyzvala sýrsky režim, aby bezodkladne prepustil všetkých politických väzňov. Delegácia EÚ pozorne sleduje prípady svojvoľného zatýkania a pri viacerých príležitostiach odsúdila údajné prípady mučenia v sýrskych zajateckých táboroch.

V záveroch Rady pre zahraničné veci Európska únia vždy vyzývala k vyšetreniu všetkých prípadov údajného porušovania ľudských práv v Sýrii a jasne zdôrazňovala, že pôvodcovia týchto činov sa za ne musia zodpovedať. Na dosiahnutie tohto cieľa EÚ plne podporuje nezávislú vyšetrovaciu komisiu, ktorá má mandát Rady OSN pre ľudské práva (UNHRC), vo vyšetrovaní všetkých údajných porušení ľudských práv v Sýrii. Európska únia bola hnacou silou osobitného zasadnutia Rady OSN pre ľudské práva, ktoré sa týkalo Sýrie, a zabezpečila, aby tento orgán prijal prísne stanovisko, pokiaľ ide o zodpovednosť za tieto činy. EÚ uvítala posilnenie nezávislej vyšetrovacej komisie z 28. septembra a opakovane vyzýva sýrsky režim, aby tejto komisii poskytol bezodkladný a neobmedzený prístup do Sýrie.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007771/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — The practice of torture in Syria

The international human rights organisation Human Rights Watch has issued a report accusing soldiers in the Syrian army of sexual violence, which they are required to engage in as a means of torture. It maintains that it has succeeded in documenting 20 cases of exceptionally brutal sexual attacks involving rape and other forms of violence perpetrated on men, women and even children. It claims that these appalling practices take place particularly in detention centres and during army patrols of residential areas and searches of people's homes. It accuses the Syrian Government of being behind these attacks.

Is the VP/HR examining this report by Human Rights Watch?

If so, what specific action does it intend to take on this issue?

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

The HR/VP is aware of systematic human rights violations in Syrian detention centers, one of the factors that led to the outbreak of the current uprising in March 2011. In her multiple statements she expressed her concern over the physical safety of arbitarily arrested human rights activists, demanded information on their whereabouts and called on the Syrian regime to immediately release all political prisoners. The EU Delegation has closely followed cases of arbitrary arrests and has on numerous occasions condemned alleged instances of torture in Syrian detention facilities.

In its Foreign Affairs Council conclusions, the EU has consistently called for investigations into all alleged human rights violations in Syria. It made clear that those responsible need to be held accountable. To this end, the EU fully supports the Independent Commission of Inquiry (CoI), mandated by the UN Human Rights Council (UNHRC) to investigate all alleged human rights violations in Syria. The EU has been a driving force in the UNHRC's Special Sessions on Syria, making sure that the body adopts a strong stance on accountability. The EU welcomed the reinforcement of the CoI on 28 September and has repeatedly called on the Syrian regime to grant the CoI immediate and unhindered access to Syria.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-007775/12
Komisii (podpredsedníčke Komisie/vysokej predstaviteľke)
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3. septembra 2012)

Vec: VP/HR – Situácia v Afganistane

Výsledky stratégie Európskej únie pre Afganistan sú podľa názoru viacerých odborníkov nedostatočné. Situácia v krajine je dlhodobo mimoriadne nepriaznivá a neustále sa zhoršuje. Pretrvávajú problémy s korupciou, drogami, chudobou a radikálnym nábožensko-politickým hnutím Taliban. Jednotky NATO však majú krajinu opustiť už v roku 2014.

Bude podľa názoru VP/HR úroveň stability a demokracie v Afganistane v roku 2014 dostatočná na to, aby krajina po odchode jednotiek NATO prevzala zodpovednosť za situáciu do vlastných rúk?

Odpoveď podpredsedníčky Komisie/vysokej predstaviteľky Ashtonovej v mene Komisie
(29. októbra 2012)

Afganistan je už viac ako 30 rokov postihnutý pretrvávajúcimi násilnými konfliktami a niektoré z jeho ukazovateľov ľudského rozvoja patria medzi najnižšie na svete. Za takých okolností je vždy pravdepodobné, že pokrok sa bude dosahovať pomaly a nerovnomerne. Značný pokrok sa v poslednom desaťročí dosiahol v zlepšovaní života obyčajných Afgancov a začatí budovania štátu, ktorý môže spravovať túto krajinu účinne a v záujme všetkých jej obyvateľov. Naďalej však ostáva veľa práce. Ešte stále je užitočným základom pre spoločnú činnosť inštitúcií aj členských štátov EÚ akčný plán EÚ z roku 2009.

Vláda Afganistanu a medzinárodné spoločenstvo spolupracujú, aby vytvorili potrebné štruktúry a zdroje na zaručenie stability a rozvoja počas procesu transformácie. Vláda Afganistanu predložila na konferencii v Tokiu v júli stratégiu na dosiahnutie sebestačnosti v tom zmysle, že Afganci sa budú vo všetkých oblastiach správy postupne ujímať vedúcej úlohy. Medzinárodné spoločenstvo nielenže podporilo túto stratégiu, ale sa aj zaviazalo, a to vrátane EÚ, poskytovať dlhodobú a predvídateľnú finančnú pomoc v záujme jej plnenia – za predpokladu, že vláda Afganistanu svoje záväzky stanovené v rámci tokijskej stratégie dodrží.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007775/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Situation in Afghanistan

Many experts say that the EU's strategy for Afghanistan has failed to achieve sufficient results. The situation in the country has been desperate for years and is still getting worse. Problems with corruption, drugs, poverty and the radical religious and political Taliban movement persist. NATO forces are due to leave the country in 2014.

Does the VP/HR consider that the level of stability and democracy in Afghanistan will be sufficient in 2014 for the Afghan Government to take charge of the situation by itself after the departure of the NATO troops?

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

Afghanistan has been afflicted by persistent violent conflict for more than 30 years and has some of the lowest indicators of human development in the world. In such an environment, progress is always likely to be slow and uneven. Considerable advances have been made in the last decade in improving the lives of ordinary Afghans and in beginning to build a state that can govern the country effectively and in the interests of all Afghans. Much remains to be done. The 2009 EU action plan is still a useful basis for common action by the EU institutions and the Member States.

The Government of Afghanistan and the international community are working together to put in place the necessary structures and resources to ensure stability and development through the transition process. At the Tokyo conference in July, the Government of Afghanistan presented its strategy for moving towards 'self-reliance' which sees Afghans progressively adopting the leading role in all areas of governance. The international community has not only endorsed this strategy, but they, including the EU, have committed to provide long-term and predictable financial support to achieve it — provided that the Government of Afghanistan meets its own commitments as set out in the Tokyo Framework.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-007776/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3. septembra 2012)

Vec: Segregované vzdelávanie rómskych detí na Slovensku

Každé dieťa má právo na rovnaký prístup k vzdelaniu. Absolútny zákaz diskriminácie na základe rasy či farby pleti ustanovujú všetky relevantné právne záväzné dokumenty na ochranu ľudských práv. Aj napriek tomu existuje na Slovensku segregácia vo vzdelávaní. Slovenské školstvo dlhodobo a systematicky oddeľuje rómske deti do výlučne rómskych tried. Etnická segregácia závažným spôsobom porušuje všetky medzinárodné dokumenty, ktorými je Slovenská republika viazaná, a rómskym žiakom spôsobuje veľmi vážnu ľudskoprávnu ujmu.

Zaoberá sa Európska komisia problematikou systematickej etnickej segregácie rómskych deti v školskom systéme Slovenskej republiky?

Akým spôsobom podporuje Európska komisia desegregáciu slovenských škôl a princípy inkluzívneho vzdelávania?

Odpoveď pani Redingovej v mene Komisie
(5. novembra 2012)

Komisia vo svojej prvej hodnotiacej správe o národných stratégiách integrácie Rómov z 21. mája 2012 ([1]) a najmä v pracovnom dokumente útvarov Komisie ([2]) zdôraznila priority, ktorým by sa malo Slovensko venovať. Okrem iného medzi ne patrí boj proti diskriminácii a segregácii v školstve. Komisia odporučila zamerať sa na desegregačné opatrenia v školstve a zabezpečiť, aby hlavné politiky reagovali aj na osobitné potreby rómskych detí. Komisia od slovenskej vlády očakáva, že sa bude týmto prioritám, ktoré boli v správe zdôraznené, venovať.

Komisia bude každoročne hodnotiť implementáciu národných stratégií a predkladať správu Európskemu parlamentu a Rade, ako aj v rámci stratégie Európa 2020.

Komisia okrem toho predložila v rámci európskeho semestra odporúčanie pre danú krajinu týkajúce sa začlenenia Rómov, ktoré bolo prijaté na najvyššej úrovni vedúcimi predstaviteľmi štátov v rámci Európskej rady ([3]). Úspešná realizácia odporúčania závisí od schopnosti Slovenska implementovať potrebné politické reformy. Komisia odporučí na tento účel Slovensku, aby pridelilo dostatočné zdroje v rámci štrukturálnych fondov v období rokov 2014 – 2020 na investičnú prioritu týkajúcu sa integrácie marginalizovaných skupín obyvateľstva, ako sú napríklad Rómovia.

([1]) COM(2012) 226 final: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/roma/national-strategies/index_en.htm
([2]) SWD(2012) 133 final: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/swd2012_133_en.pdf
([3]) 11271/12: http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/sk/12/st11/st11271.sk12.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007776/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: Segregated schooling for Roma children in Slovakia

Every child has the right to fair access to education. All relevant legally binding documents on the protection of human rights impose an absolute ban on discrimination based on race or skin colour. Despite this, in Slovakia there is segregation in education. The school system systematically separates Roma children into exclusively Roma classes, and has done so for a long time. This ethnic segregation seriously infringes all international documents which are binding on the Slovak Republic and seriously violates the human rights of Roma children.

Is the Commission looking into the issue of the systematic ethnic segregation of Roma children in the school system of the Slovak Republic?

In what way is the Commission promoting the desegregation of Slovak schools and the principles of inclusive education?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(5 November 2012)

In its first assessment report of the National Roma Integration Strategies of 21/05/2012 ([1]) and specifically in the Staff Working Document ([2]), the Commission pointed out the priorities which need to be addressed by Slovakia. Among others, these are fighting discrimination and segregation in education. The Commission recommended to focus on desegregation measures in education and to ensure that mainstream policies also respond to the specific need of Roma children. The Commission expects the Slovak government to address these priorities pointed out in the report.

The Commission will review annually the implementation of the National Strategies, reporting to the European Parliament and the Council, as well as under the framework of Europe 2020.

In addition under the European Semester a Country Specific Recommendation on Roma inclusion was proposed by the Commission and endorsed at the highest level by national leaders in the European Council ([3]). The success of the recommendation depends on the ability of Slovakia to implement the necessary policy reforms. To this end, the Commission will recommend to Slovakia allocating sufficient resources to an investment priority of integrating marginalised communities such as Roma under 2014-2020 Structural Funds.

([1]) COM(2012) 226 final: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/roma/national-strategies/index_en.htm
([2]) SWD(2012) 133 final: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/swd2012_133_en.pdf
([3]) 11271/12: http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/12/st11/st11271.en12.pdf

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-007777/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3. septembra 2012)

Vec: Právo na vzdelanie rómskych detí na Slovensku

Charta základných práv Európskej únie v čl. 14 ustanovuje, že každý má právo na vzdelanie a na prístup k odbornému a ďalšiemu vzdelávaniu. Právo na vzdelanie rovnako garantuje aj Všeobecná deklarácia ľudských práv a Európsky dohovor o ochrane ľudských práv a základných slobôd v znení svojich dodatkových protokolov. Nedostatočná úroveň vzdelania prispieva k chudobe a znižuje šance uplatnenia sa na pracovnom trhu. Vzdelanostná úroveň rómskych detí na Slovensku, ktoré pochádzajú z nižších sociálno-ekonomických vrstiev, je však žalostne nízka. Rómske deti pritom predstavujú významné percento detskej populácie. Svoje právo na vzdelanie si však nie sú schopné dostatočne uplatniť. Organizácia Amnesty International navyše upozorňuje na skutočnosť, že z výsledkov jej výskumu je zrejmé, že veľký počet rómskych detí na Slovensku je nesprávne zaraďovaný do špeciálnych škôl alebo tried pre žiakov s mentálnym postihnutím.

Aký má Európska komisia názor na nedostatočný prístup k vzdelaniu rómskych detí na Slovensku?

Bude sa zaoberať upozorneniami organizácie Amnesty International o nesprávnom a neodôvodnenom zaraďovaní rómskych deti do špeciálnych škôl a tried pre žiakov s mentálnym postihnutím?

Odpoveď pani Redingovej v mene Komisie
(29. októbra 2012)

Komisia si je vedomá tvrdení organizácie Amnesty International o nespravodlivom zaobchádzaní s rómskymi deťmi v školskom systéme na Slovensku.

Vo svojej prvej hodnotiacej správe vnútroštátnych stratégií integrácie Rómov, ktorá bola prijatá 21. mája 2012, a osobitne v pracovnom dokumente útvarov Komisie, Komisia zdôraznila priority, ktorými sa má Slovensko zaoberať. Okrem iného ide o boj proti diskriminácii a segregácií vo vzdelávaní, ako aj proti zneužívaniu osobitného vzdelávania. Komisia odporučila sústrediť sa na opatrenia na odstránenie segregácie vo vzdelávaní a zabezpečiť, aby sa hlavné politiky takisto venovali osobitným potrebám rómskych detí. Komisia očakáva, že sa slovenská vláda bude prioritami uvedenými v správe zaoberať.

Okrem toho Komisia v rámci európskeho semestra navrhla odporúčania pre jednotlivé krajiny týkajúce sa začleňovania Rómov, ktoré boli schválené najvyššími predstaviteľmi jednotlivých štátov na zasadnutí Európskej rady v júli 2012 ([1]). Ich úspech závisí od schopnosti Slovenska uskutočniť potrebné politické reformy. Komisia odporučí na tento účel Slovensku, aby pridelilo dostatočné zdroje v rámci štrukturálnych fondov v období 2014 – 2020 na investičnú prioritu týkajúcu sa integrácie marginalizovaných skupín obyvateľstva, ako sú napríklad Rómovia.

Pokiaľ ide o zistenia Amnesty International, smernica o rasovej rovnosti 2000/43/ES ([2]) implementuje zásadu rovnakého zaobchádzania s osobami bez ohľadu na rasový alebo etnický pôvod a zakazuje diskrimináciu v mnohých oblastiach vrátane vzdelávania. Slovenská republika transponovala túto smernicu do svojho vnútroštátneho práva. Komisia však naďalej pokračuje v monitorovaní správnej implementácie tejto smernice a jej uplatňovania v členských štátoch a touto problematikou sa bude zaoberať.

([1]) 11271/12: http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/12/st11/st11271.en12.pdf
([2]) Smernica Rady 2000/43/ES z 29. júna 2000, ktorou sa zavádza zásada rovnakého zaobchádzania s osobami bez ohľadu na rasový alebo etnický pôvod, Ú. v. EÚ L 180, 19.7.2000.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007777/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: Right to education of Roma children in Slovakia

Article 14 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights stipulates that everyone has the right to education and to have access to vocational and continuing training. The right to education is also laid down in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, as amended by its Protocols. Having an insufficient level of education increases the likelihood of poverty and reduces the chance of finding a job. The educational level of Roma children in Slovakia, who come from the lowest socioeconomic levels, is desperately low. Yet Roma children make up a significant proportion of the child population. They are, however, unable to assert their right to education. Amnesty International also draws attention to the finding of its survey that a large number of Roma children in Slovakia are evidently being unfairly placed in special schools or classes for mentally handicapped pupils.

What is the Commission's view of the inadequate access of Roma children to education in Slovakia?

Will the Commission look into Amnesty International's statements that Roma children are unfairly and without justification being placed in special schools and classes for mentally handicapped pupils?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(29 October 2012)

The Commission is aware of the statements of the Amnesty International about the unfair treatment of Roma children in educational system of Slovakia.

In its first assessment report of the National Roma Integration Strategies adopted on 21 May 2012 and specifically in the Staff Working Document, the Commission pointed out the priorities necessary to be addressed by Slovakia. Among the others, these are fighting discrimination and segregation in education, as well as the misuse of special needs education. The Commission recommended to focus on desegregation measures in education and to ensure that mainstream policies also respond to the specific need of Roma children. The Commission expects the Slovak government to address these priorities presented in the report.

In addition, under the European Semester, a Country Specific Recommendation on Roma inclusion was proposed by the Commission and endorsed at the highest level by national leaders in the European Council in July 2012. ([1]) Its success depends on the ability of Slovakia to implement the necessary policy reforms. To this end, the Commission will recommend to Slovakia to allocate sufficient resources to an investment priority of integrating marginalised communities such as Roma under 2014-2020 Structural Funds.

As regards the findings of Amnesty International, Racial Equality Directive 2000/43/EC ([2]) implements the principle of equal treatment of people irrespective of racial or ethnic origin and prohibits discrimination in a number of fields, including education. The Slovak Republic has transposed the directive into national law. However, the Commission continues to monitor the directive's correct implementation and application in the Member States and will look into this matter.

([1]) 11271/12: http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/12/st11/st11271.en12.pdf
([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.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-007778/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3. septembra 2012)

Vec: Informovanosť verejnosti o ľudských právach

Porušovanie a ohrozovanie ľudských práv a základných slobôd je každodennou smutnou realitou. Ich rešpektovanie a obrana sú však jednou z najhlavnejších priorít Európskej únie. Ak však už došlo k porušeniu či ohrozeniu, náprava vzniknutej situácie je veľmi ťažká, ak vôbec možná. Preto je nesmierne dôležité, aby sme ľudskoprávnym ujmám účinne predchádzali. V tomto smere je nevyhnutná vysoká miera informovanosti verejnosti a systematické zvyšovanie jej povedomia o danej problematike.

Chystá Európska komisia v najbližšej dobe určitú formu kampane s cieľom zvýšiť informovanosť obyvateľov EÚ o problematike ohrozovania, porušovania a obrany ľudských práv a základných slobôd?

Odpoveď pani Redingovej v mene Komisie
(26. októbra 2012)

Komisia prisudzuje informovanosti verejnosti o základných právach veľkú dôležitosť.

V záujme zvýšenia informovanosti o základných právach zakotvených v Charte základných práv Európskej únie uverejňuje Komisia od roku 2010 výročnú správu o uplatňovaní charty ([1]). V tejto správe sa monitoruje pokrok v oblastiach, ktoré sú v kompetencii EÚ, a poukazuje sa v nej na to, akým spôsobom bola charta zohľadnená v konkrétnych prípadoch, a to najmä pri navrhovaní nových právnych predpisov EÚ. Ďalším cieľom správy je vysvetliť, v akých situáciách sa charta uplatňuje, pričom navyše pomáha občanom EÚ zistiť, na koho sa majú obrátiť, ak sú presvedčení, že ich základné práva boli porušené niektorou z inštitúcií EÚ alebo vnútroštátnym orgánom vykonávajúcim právo EÚ.

V časti európskeho elektronického portálu e-Justice, ktorá sa venuje základným právam, sú uvedené ďalšie informácie o vnútroštátnych orgánoch zodpovedných za ochranu základných práv v členských štátoch ([2]).

Komisia plánuje v roku 2013 vyvíjať činnosti na zvyšovanie informovanosti o otázkach násilia proti ženám a financovať ich na vnútroštátnej úrovni.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/charter/application/index_en.htm
([2]) https://e-justice.europa.eu/content_fundamental_rights-176-sk.do

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007778/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: Public awareness of human rights

Violations of or restrictions on human rights and fundamental freedoms are sadly a fact of everyday life. Respect for and defence of such rights are, however, one of the European Union's main priorities. Once such violations or restrictions have been put in place, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to remedy the resulting situation. It is therefore immensely important to take measures effectively to prevent such violations of human rights from occurring. For this purpose, it is essential for there to be a high level of awareness of human rights issues amongst the general public and a systematic attempt to raise this level.

Is the Commission preparing any form of campaign in the very near future to raise the awareness of the general public in Europe of issues relating to the violation of, threat to and need for defence of human rights and fundamental freedoms?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(26 October 2012)

The Commission attaches great importance to public awareness of fundamental rights.

In order to promote awareness of the fundamental rights enshrined in the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, the Commission has published, since 2010, an Annual Report on the Application of the Charter ([1]). It monitors progress in the areas where the EU has powers to act, showing how the Charter has been taken into account in actual cases, notably when new EU legislation is proposed. It also aims at explaining in which situation the Charter applies and it also helps EU citizens to determine where they need to turn to when they believe that their fundamental rights have been violated by an EU institution or by a national authority implementing EC law.

The Fundamental rights' section of the European e-Justice Portal provides further information concerning the national authorities responsible for the protection of fundamental rights in Member States ([2]).

For 2013 the Commission is envisaging to develop awareness-raising activities on the issue of violence against women and finance such activities at national level.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/charter/application/index_en.htm
([2]) https://e-justice.europa.eu/content_fundamental_rights-176-en.do

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-007779/12
Komisii (podpredsedníčke Komisie/vysokej predstaviteľke)
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3. septembra 2012)

Vec: VP/HR – Väznica Guantánamo

Väznica Guantánamo bola zriadená ešte v roku 2002, funguje teda viac ako desať rokov. Väznica mala byť zatvorená ešte v roku 2010, doposiaľ sa tak však nestalo. Počas dekády svojho fungovania boli v Guantáname väznené aj neplnoleté osoby, dochádzalo tu k mučeniu, sexuálnej degradácii, náboženskému prenasledovaniu, väzni páchali samovraždy alebo sa o to pokúšali. Zatýkalo sa na neobmedzenú dobu, väčšinou bez súdnych procesov, dochádzalo k násilným praktikám vypočúvania. S väzňami sa v Guantáname naďalej zaobchádza nezákonným spôsobom, ktorý ohrozuje a porušuje ľudské práva a základné slobody a prieči sa akýmkoľvek medzinárodným štandardom ochrany ľudských práv.

Plánuje byť VP/HR v súvislosti s porušovaním ľudských práv vo väznici Guantánamo určitým spôsobom aktívna?

Odpoveď podpredsedníčky Komisie/vysokej predstaviteľky Ashtonovej v mene Komisie
(26. októbra 2012)

EÚ opakovane vyhlásila svoje stanovisko, že boj proti terorizmu sa musí viesť v plnom súlade s medzinárodnými normami ľudských práv a právneho štátu.

Únia preto privítala rozhodnutie prezidenta Obamu z dňa 22. januára 2009 do jedného roka uzatvoriť špeciálne detenčné zariadenie v Zálive Guantánamo. S cieľom uľahčiť uzatvorenie uvedeného detenčného zariadenia rad členských štátov EÚ prijal určitý počet prepustených bývalých väzňov.

Kongres USA však kládol početné a neustále prekážky realizácii plánu administratívy na zatvorenie Guantánama. V dôsledku týchto rôznych ťažkostí pôvodne stanovený termín Obamovej administratívy zatvoriť Guantánamo do jedného roka nebol dodržaný a vykonávacie nariadenie prezidenta Obamu zo 7. marca 2011 stanovilo, že viacero jednotlivcov bude aj naďalej zadržiavaných v špeciálnom zariadení v Zálive Guantánamo bez obvinenia alebo súdneho procesu.

Ako už bolo oznámené Európskemu parlamentu, EÚ vyjadrila v súvislosti s týmito otázkami znepokojenie pri stretnutí s právnym poradcom Ministerstva zahraničia USA Haroldom Kohom počas neformálneho stretnutia s misiami členských štátov EÚ vo Washingtone a s členmi pracovnej skupiny Rady pre medzinárodné právo verejné (COJUR) v priebehu pravidelného neformálneho dialógu o medzinárodnom práve a boji proti terorizmu. Tieto otázky sa riešili aj v kontexte demaršov EÚ adresovaných Ministerstvu zahraničia USA a ministerstvu spravodlivosti USA v súvislosti s príslušnými ustanoveniami právnych predpisov USA (zákon schvaľujúci prostriedky pre národnú obranu – National Defence Authorisation Act z roku 2012).

EÚ aj naďalej vyzýva uzatvoriť zariadenie v Zálive Guantánamo vzhľadom na predĺžené zadržiavanie osôb v Guantaname bez súdneho procesu. Tieto otázky sa budú aj naďalej riešiť v spolupráci s partermi v administratíve Spojených štátov.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007779/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Guantánamo prison

Guantánamo prison was set up in 2002 and has now been in operation for over 10 years. It was due to be closed in 2010, but this has not yet happened. During the decade in which it has been in operation, its inmates have included minors, torture, sexual degradation and religious persecution have taken place within its walls, and prisoners have committed or attempted suicide. Suspects have been held there for unlimited periods, usually without trial, and interrogations are known to have involved violent methods. Detainees in Guantánamo today continue to be treated illegally, which constitutes an infringement and a violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms and runs counter to all international standards for the protection of human rights.

Is the VP/HR planning to take any action in connection with the abuse of human rights taking place in Guantánamo prison?

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

The EU has repeatedly stated its position that the fight against terrorism must be conducted in full compliance with international human rights standards and the rule of law.

The EU therefore welcomed the decision by President Obama on 22 January 2009 to close Guantanamo Bay within a year. With a view to facilitating the closure of Guantanamo Bay, a number of Member States accepted certain ex-detainees who had been released.

However, the US Congress has posed numerous and persistent obstacles to the Administration's plan for closing Guantánamo. As a result of these various difficulties, the Obama Administration's original one-year deadline for shutting down Guantánamo was not met and President Obama's Executive Order of 7 March 2011 established that a number of individuals will continue to be detained at Guantanamo Bay without charge or trial.

As previously reported to the European Parliament, the EU has raised its concerns on these issues with the United States State Department Legal Adviser, Harold Koh, in informal meetings with EU Member States' Missions in Washington and with members of the Council Working Group on Public International Law (COJUR) in their regular informal dialogue on international law and counter-terrorism. These issues have also been addressed in the context of EU demarches with the US Department of States and Department of Justice in relation to relevant provisions of US legislation (NDAA — National Defence Authorisation Act 2012).

The EU continues to call for the closure of the Guantanamo Bay detention facility as regards prolonged detention of the Guantanamo detainees without trial as contrary to international law. These issues will continue to be addressed with counterparts in the United States administration.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-007780/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3. septembra 2012)

Vec: Násilie páchané na ženách

Ženy sú veľmi častými obeťami násilia. Nezáleží pritom na tom, či sa krajina nachádza vo vojnovom alebo mierovom stave, či k násiliu dochádza v rodine, komunite, či v rukách štátu. Organizácia Amnesty International uvádza, že rodovo podmienené násilie pritom postihuje viac žien vo veku 14 – 55 rokov ako rakovina, dopravné nehody alebo malária. Milióny žien sú každoročne obeťami sexuálnych trestných činov. Znásilňujú ich partneri, príbuzní, kolegovia, cudzí ľudia či príslušníci bezpečnostných zložiek a armád. Život bez násilia je však základným ľudským právom.

Akým konkrétnym spôsobom Európska komisia bojuje proti násiliu, ktoré je páchané na ženách?

Odpoveď pani Redingovej v mene Komisie
(26. októbra 2012)

Komisia sa zaviazala prijať rázne politické opatrenia na boj proti všetkým formám násilia proti ženám, ako tomu nasvedčuje Štokholmský program a Stratégia rovnosti žien a mužov (2010 – 2015) ([1]). Ide najmä o posilnenie postavenia žien, zvyšovanie informovanosti, výmenu osvedčených postupov a zlepšenie zberu údajov. Finančná podpora na nadnárodné projekty v tejto oblasti sa poskytuje na základe programu Daphne III.

Medzi trestnoprávne opatrenia, ktoré boli prijaté, patria právne predpisy týkajúce sa obchodovania s ľuďmi ([2]), sexuálneho zneužívania a sexuálneho vykorisťovania detí ([3]) ako aj práv obetí trestnej činnosti. Balík opatrení Komisie venovaný problematike obetí zahŕňa smernicu (prijatú 4. októbra 2012), v ktorej sa stanovujú minimálne normy v oblasti práv, podpory a ochrany obetí trestných činov vychádzajúce z existujúcich právnych predpisov EÚ. Medzi tieto normy patrí právo na rešpekt a uznanie, na poskytovanie a získavanie informácií a na ochranu. Cieľom okrem iného je zabezpečiť, aby potreby obetí boli posúdené jednotlivo a aby sa s najzraniteľnejšími obeťami vrátane obetí všetkých foriem násilia založeného na rodovej príslušnosti zaobchádzalo primerane ich požiadavkám ([4]). V spomínanom súbore opatrení je zahrnutý aj návrh nariadenia o vzájomnom uznávaní ochranných opatrení v občianskych veciach. O tomto návrhu v súčasnosti rokujú ďalší zákonodarcovia a je doplnením európskeho ochranného príkazu ([5]), ktorý bol už prijatý v decembri 2011. Tieto dva nástroje zabezpečia, aby sa ochranné opatrenia prijaté v jednom členskom štáte uznávali aj v inom členskom štáte. Umožní to predísť tomu, že obete prídu o ochranu v prípade, keď cestujú alebo sa presťahujú do inej krajiny EÚ.

Podľa rámcovej stratégie a akčného plánu EÚ pre ľudské práva a demokraciu bude EÚ podporovať iniciatívy v tretích krajinách, vrátane iniciatív občianskej spoločnosti proti násiliu založenému na rodovej príslušnosti a vraždám žien.

([1]) COM(2010) 491 v konečnom znení, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0491:FIN:SK:PDF

([2]) Smernica Európskeho parlamentu a Rady 2011/36/EÚ z 5. apríla 2011 o prevencii obchodovania s ľuďmi a boji proti nemu a o ochrane obetí obchodovania, ktorou sa nahrádza rámcové rozhodnutie Rady 2002/629/SVV, Ú. v. EÚ L 101, 15.4.2011, s. 1 – 11.

([3]) Smernica Európskeho parlamentu a Rady 2011/93/EÚ z 13. decembra 2011 o boji proti sexuálnemu zneužívaniu a sexuálnemu vykorisťovaniu detí a proti detskej pornografii, ktorou sa nahrádza rámcové rozhodnutie Rady 2004/68/SVV.

([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/policies/criminal/victims/docs/com_2011_275_en.pdf

([5]) Smernica Európskeho parlamentu a Rady 2011/99/EÚ z 13. decembra 2011 o európskom ochrannom príkaze (Ú. v. EÚ L338, 21.12.2011, s. 2), ktorý sa uplatňuje v trestných veciach.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007780/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: Violence against women

Women are very frequently subjected to violence. They can become victims irrespective of whether their country of residence is at war or peace, and the violence can occur in the family, in the community or at the hands of the state. Amnesty International shows that violence within the family affects more women in the age group 14-55 than cancer, road accidents or malaria. Millions of women every year are victims of criminal sexual acts. They are raped by their partners, relatives, colleagues, strangers or members of the security services or the army. Yet a life without violence is one of the basic human rights.

What specific action is the Commission taking to tackle violence against women?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(26 October 2012)

The Commission is committed to a strong policy response to combat all forms of violence against women, as seen in the Stockholm Programme and the strategy for equality between women and men (2010-2015) ([1]). This primarily through empowerment of women, awareness raising, exchanges of good practice and improving data collection. The Daphne III Programme provides financial support for transnational projects in this field.

Criminal justice measures being taken include legislation on human trafficking ([2]), sexual abuse and sexual exploitation of children ([3]) and the rights of victims of crime. The Commission's Victims' Package includes a directive (adopted on 4 October 2012) establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime that builds on existing EU legislation. It includes the rights to respect and recognition, to provide and receive information, and to protection. It also aims to ensure that needs of victims are individually assessed and that the most vulnerable including victims of all forms of gender-based violence receive treatment appropriate to their requirements ([4]). The Package also includes a proposal for a regulation on mutual recognition of protection measures in civil matters — currently being negotiated by co-legislators — which complements the European Protection Order ([5]) already adopted in December 2011. These two instruments will ensure that protection measures issued in one Member State can be recognised in another, to avoid victims losing their protection if they move or travel.

According to the EU Strategic Framework and Action Plan on Human Rights and Democracy the EU will support initiatives in third countries, including of civil society, against gender based violence and feminicide.

([1]) COM(2010) 491 final, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0491:FIN:EN:PDF

([2]) Directive 2011/36/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 April 2011 on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2002/629/JHA, OJ L 101, 15.4.2011, pp. 1-11.

([3]) Directive 2011/93/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on combating the sexual abuse and sexual exploitation of children and child pornography, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2004/68/JHA, OJ L 335, 17.12.2011, pp. 1-14.

([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/policies/criminal/victims/docs/com_2011_275_en.pdf

([5]) The Directive 2011/99/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on the European protection order (OJ L338, 21.12.2011, p. 2) which is applicable in criminal matters.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007889/12
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Franziska Katharina Brantner (Verts/ALE), Marije Cornelissen (Verts/ALE), Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE), Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE), Nicole Kiil-Nielsen (Verts/ALE), Carl Schlyter (Verts/ALE), Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE), Werner Schulz (Verts/ALE), Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE) y Jan Philipp Albrecht (Verts/ALE)
(6 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: VP/HR — «Pussy Riot»

El 17 de agosto de 2012, tres miembros de la banda rusa de punk «Pussy Riot» (Nadezha Tolokonnikova, María Alyokhina y Yekaterina Samutsevich) fueron condenadas a dos años de prisión tras ser declaradas culpables de «vandalismo» por haber cantado una canción anti-Putin en la Catedral Ortodoxa de Moscú. Este castigo desproporcionado es una demostración clara de la supresión de las libertades fundamentales y del uso de la fuerza por un Estado que se niega a respetar cualquier voz crítica y que ha utilizado este caso para enviar un claro mensaje de intimidación a todos los disidentes.

Como ha señalado la Baronesa Ashton en su declaración sobre el caso, este incidente plantea un serio interrogante sobre el respeto de Rusia de sus obligaciones internacionales de celebrar un juicio justo, transparente e independiente ([1]).

Si bien estas tres mujeres han merecido la atención internacional, es importante conocer y defender los numerosos actos individuales de expresión en Rusia que han sido reprimidos por el Estado. La libertad de expresión no puede limitarse sólo a los que atraen el apoyo de los medios de comunicación o de los ambientes artísticos o políticos. En sus resoluciones, el Parlamento ha dado reiteradamente prueba de su compromiso con la protección de los derechos de los que participan en protestas no violentas y de la libre expresión a todos los niveles en Rusia.

En la actualidad, el trío ha apelado la condena. Es una oportunidad para que las autoridades rusas muestren su capacidad para tratar de manera ecuánime un delito menor, ordenando la inmediata liberación de las tres mujeres condenadas.

¿Qué otras medidas piensa tomar la VP/AR para asegurar un juicio justo, transparente e independiente para estas tres mujeres, que han apelado su condena?

¿Se incluirá este asunto en la próxima ronda entre UE y Rusia sobre derechos humanos, cuya celebración está prevista en otoño de 2012?

¿Qué papel estado jugando la Delegación de la UE en Moscú en apoyo de las activistas de «Pussy Riot», y cómo las apoyará en el proceso de apelación?

Respuesta conjunta de la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta Sra. Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(29 de octubre de 2012)

La Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta (AR/VP) ha seguido muy de cerca el caso de las *Pussy Riot* y comparte plenamente las preocupaciones de Sus Señorías, tal como manifestó con claridad en su declaración, hecha pública inmediatamente después de la sentencia contra las *Pussy Riot* el 17 de agosto. La protección de esta libertad fundamental tanto dentro como fuera de las fronteras de la Unión Europea continúa siendo una prioridad.

Las cuestiones relativas a este proceso judicial en concreto y a la libertad de expresión en general se han planteado a las autoridades rusas en todas las ocasiones que se han presentado. Se abordaron en unas reuniones para el diálogo político que se celebraron este otoño y también en la ronda más reciente de consultas sobre derechos humanos, que tuvo lugar el 20 de julio de este año. De hecho, la próxima ronda de consultas supondrá otra oportunidad para tratar este tema de manera más detallada. La AR/VP expresó su preocupación sobre los últimos acontecimientos en Rusia, incluidos los relacionados con el juicio a las *Pussy Riot*, en su discurso ante el Parlamento Europeo el 11 de septiembre. La Delegación de la UE en Moscú también ha seguido muy de cerca este proceso, se ha reunido de manera regular con los abogados de las componentes de las *Pussy Riot* que fueron juzgadas y también ha asistido como observadora del proceso en el tribunal.

([1]) http://www.eu-un.europa.eu/articles/en/article_12514_en.htm

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007889/12
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin)
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Franziska Katharina Brantner (Verts/ALE), Marije Cornelissen (Verts/ALE), Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE), Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE), Nicole Kiil-Nielsen (Verts/ALE), Carl Schlyter (Verts/ALE), Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE), Werner Schulz (Verts/ALE), Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE) und Jan Philipp Albrecht (Verts/ALE)
(6. September 2012)

Betrifft: VP/HR — „Pussy Riot"

Am 17. August 2012 wurden drei Mitglieder der russischen Punkband „Pussy Riot" (Nadeschda Tolokonnikowa, Marija Aljochina und Jekaterina Samuzewitsch) zu zwei Jahren Haft verurteilt, nachdem sie wegen der Aufführung eines Anti-Putin-Songs in der orthodoxen Kathedrale in Moskau des Hooliganismus für schuldig befunden waren. Diese unverhältnismäßige Strafe ist ein deutlicher Beleg für die Unterdrückung der Grundfreiheiten und die Anwendung von Gewalt durch einen Staat, der sich weigert, kritische Stimmen zu tolerieren, und diesen Fall dazu benutzt hat, ein deutliches Signal der Einschüchterung an alle Dissidenten zu senden.

Wie Baroness Ashton in ihrer Erklärung zu diesem Fall zum Ausdruck gebracht hat, stellt dieses Vorkommnis die Einhaltung internationaler Verpflichtungen in Bezug auf ein faires, transparentes und unabhängiges Gerichtsverfahren infrage ([1]).

Diese drei Frauen haben die Aufmerksamkeit der internationalen Gemeinschaft auf sich gezogen; es ist jedoch wichtig, zahlreiche andere einzelne Fälle von Meinungsäußerungen in Russland, die vom Staat beschnitten werden, anzuerkennen und zu verteidigen. Freie Meinungsäußerung darf nicht nur auf diejenigen beschränkt werden, die die Aufmerksamkeit der Medien oder künstlerischer oder politischer Kreise auf sich ziehen. In seinen Entschließungen hat das Parlament wiederholt unter Beweis gestellt, dass es sich verpflichtet fühlt, die Rechte des gewaltfreien Protests und des Ausdrucks der eigenen Persönlichkeit zu schützen.

Das Trio hat jetzt Berufung eingelegt gegen dieses Urteil. Dies ist jetzt eine Chance für die russischen Behörden, zu zeigen, dass sie in der Lage sind, bei einem geringfügigen Delikt gelassen vorzugehen und die unverzügliche Freilassung der drei verurteilten Frauen anzuordnen.

Welche weiteren Schritte plant die Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin, um ein faires, transparentes und unabhängiges Verfahren für diese drei Frauen zu gewährleisten?

Wird dieser Fall bei der nächsten Runde der Menschenrechtskonsultationen zwischen der EU und Russland, die für den Herbst 2012 vorgesehen sind, aufgegriffen werden?

Welche Rolle hat die EU-Delegation in Moskau bei der Unterstützung der „Pussy Riot"-Aktivistinnen gespielt, und wird sie sie im Rahmen des Berufungsverfahrens unterstützen?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(29. Oktober 2012)

Die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin verfolgt den Fall „Pussy Riot" sehr aufmerksam und teilt die Bedenken der Damen und Herren Abgeordneten. Dies hat sie in ihrer Erklärung unmittelbar nach dem Urteil zu „Pussy Riot" am 17. August 2012 deutlich zum Ausdruck gebracht. Der Schutz der freien Meinungsäußerung innerhalb wie auch außerhalb der Europäischen Union genießt nach wie vor höchste Priorität.

Die durch dieses Gerichtsverfahren aufgeworfenen Fragen wie auch die Redefreiheit im Allgemeinen wurden mit den russischen Behörden bei jeder sich bietenden Möglichkeit angesprochen: u. a. auf einem Treffen anlässlich des politischen Dialogs im Herbst dieses Jahres sowie bei der letzten Runde der Menschenrechtskonsultationen am 20. Juli 2012. Die nächste Runde der Menschenrechtskonsultationen bietet erneut die Möglichkeit, diese Angelegenheit ausführlich zu erörtern. Am 11. September hat die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin in ihrer Rede vor dem Europäischen Parlament ihre Bedenken bezüglich der jüngsten Entwicklungen in Russland, einschließlich des Gerichtsverfahrens zu „Pussy Riot", zum Ausdruck gebracht. Die EU-Delegation in Moskau verfolgt diesen Fall ebenfalls sehr genau: Sie trifft sich regelmäßig mit den Anwälten der verurteilten Mitglieder von „Pussy Riot" und ist als Beobachter beim Gerichtsverfahren anwesend.

([1]) http://www.eu-un.europa.eu/articles/en/article_12514_en.htm

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007889/12
à la Commission (Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante)
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Franziska Katharina Brantner (Verts/ALE), Marije Cornelissen (Verts/ALE), Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE), Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE), Nicole Kiil-Nielsen (Verts/ALE), Carl Schlyter (Verts/ALE), Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE), Werner Schulz (Verts/ALE), Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE) et Jan Philipp Albrecht (Verts/ALE)
(6 septembre 2012)

Objet: VP/HR — Pussy Riot

Le 17 août 2012, trois membres du group punk russe Pussy Riot (Nadejda Tolokonnikova, Maria Alekhina et Ekaterina Samoutsevich) ont été condamnées à deux ans d'emprisonnement après avoir été reconnues coupables de «vandalisme» pour avoir chanté une chanson anti-Poutine dans la cathédrale orthodoxe de Moscou. Cette peine disproportionnée constitue une preuve criante de la suppression des libertés fondamentales et de l'utilisation de la force par un État qui refuse de laisser s'exprimer toute voix critique et qui a utilisé cette affaire pour envoyer un message clair d'intimidation à tous les dissidents.

Comme Mme Ashton l'a relevé dans sa déclaration sur le sujet, cet incident «fait planer de graves doutes sur le respect par la Russie de ses obligations internationales en matière de procédures judiciaires équitables, transparentes et indépendantes» ([1]).

Si ces trois femmes ont su attirer à elles l'attention de la communauté internationale, il importe de prendre connaissance et de défendre les nombreux autres actes individuels d'expression en Russie qui sont réprimés par l'État. La liberté d'expression ne peut pas concerner que ceux qui réussissent à recueillir un soutien de la part des médias ou de milieux artistiques ou politiques. Dans ses résolutions, le Parlement a donné à plusieurs reprises des gages de son attachement à protéger le droit de protester de manière non violente et le droit à l'expression individuelle à tous les niveaux en Russie.

Le trio a fait appel de cette condamnation. Les autorités russes se voient ainsi donner la possibilité de montrer leur capacité de traiter intelligemment un délit mineur en ordonnant la libération immédiate de ces trois femmes.

Quelles mesures supplémentaires la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante entend-elle prendre afin de garantir un procès équitable, transparent et indépendant à ces femmes, toutes trois ayant fait appel de leur condamnation?

Cette affaire sera-t-elle évoquée lors de la troisième session de consultations entre l'Union européenne et la Russie sur les Droits de l'homme qui doit se tenir à l'automne 2012?

Quelle rôle la délégation de l'Union à Moscou joue-t-elle pour appuyer les militantes des Pussy Riot et comment les soutiendra-t-elle lors du procès en appel?

Réponse commune donnée par M^me^ Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission
(29 octobre 2012)

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante a suivi de près l'affaire des Pussy Riot et partage entièrement les préoccupations des membres, comme elle l'a exprimé dans la déclaration qu'elle a publiée immédiatement après le jugement des Pussy Riot le 17 août. La protection de cette liberté fondamentale au sein et en dehors des frontières de l'UE demeure une priorité.

Les questions relatives à cette affaire en particulier et la liberté de parole en général ont été soulevées auprès des autorités russes à toutes les occasions possibles. Elles ont été traitées lors d'un dialogue politique qui s'est tenu cet automne, ainsi que lors du plus récent cycle de consultations sur les Droits de l'homme, qui a eu lieu le 20 juillet de cette année. Le prochain cycle de consultations permettra de discuter de cette question de façon fouillée. La haute représentante/vice-présidente a fait part de ses préoccupations à l'égard des développements qui ont eu lieu récemment en Russie, notamment en ce qui concerne le jugement des Pussy Riot lors de son discours au Parlement européen le 11 septembre. La délégation de l'UE à Moscou suit aussi cette affaire de près en rencontrant régulièrement les avocats des membres de Pussy Riot qui ont été jugés et en suivant le déroulement du jugement au tribunal.

([1]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/FR/foraff/132200.pdf

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007889/12
aan de Commissie (Vicevoorzitter — Hoge Vertegenwoordiger)
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Franziska Katharina Brantner (Verts/ALE), Marije Cornelissen (Verts/ALE), Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE), Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE), Nicole Kiil-Nielsen (Verts/ALE), Carl Schlyter (Verts/ALE), Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE), Werner Schulz (Verts/ALE), Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE) en Jan Philipp Albrecht (Verts/ALE)
(6 september 2012)

Betreft: VP/HR — Pussy Riot

Op 17 augustus jl. zijn drie leden van de Russische punkband „Pussy Riot" (Nadezjda Tolokonnikova, Maria Alechina en Jekaterina Samoetsevitsj) wegens de uitvoering van een punknummer tegen Poetin in de orthodoxe kathedraal van Moskou veroordeeld tot twee jaar gevangenisstraf na schuldig te zijn bevonden aan relschopperij. Dit buitensporige vonnis is een duidelijk uiting van de onderdrukking van de fundamentele vrijheden en gebruik van geweld door een staat die geen kritische geluiden tolereert en deze gebeurtenis heeft aangegrepen om een duidelijk intimiderend signaal af te geven aan alle opposanten.

Zoals mevrouw Ashton stelde in haar verklaring, plaatst dit incident ernstige vragentekens achter de naleving door Rusland van zijn internationale verplichtingen inzake een eerlijke, transparante en onafhankelijke rechtsgang ([1]).

Deze drie vrouwen hebben de internationale aandacht gekregen, maar het is belangrijk de vele andere individuele daden van meningsuiting in Rusland die door de staat worden beknot te erkennen en te steunen. De vrijheid van meningsuiting kan niet worden beperkt tot degenen die in de media en artistieke en politieke kringen steun vinden. Het Europees Parlement heeft verschillenden malen in resoluties blijk gegeven van zijn inzet voor het recht op niet-gewelddadige protest en zelfexpressie op elk niveau in Rusland.

Het trio is nu in beroep gegaan tegen het vonnis en dit is een kans voor het Russische systeem om te laten zien dat het in staat is nuchter op te treden bij een kleine overtreding en de drie veroordeelde vrouwen onmiddellijk vrij te laten.

Welke verdere stappen is de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger van plan te ondernemen om een eerlijke, transparante en onafhankelijke juridische procedures te verzekeren voor deze drie vrouwen, die in beroep gaan tegen het vonnis?

Wordt dit specifieke geval opgenomen in de volgende ronde van het mensenrechtenoverleg van de EU en Rusland dat zal plaatsvinden in het najaar 2012.

Welke rol heeft de EU-delegatie in Moskou gespeeld in het ondersteunen van de Pussy Riot-activisten en hoe zal de delegatie hen steunen bij de zaak in hoger beroep?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(29 oktober 2012)

De hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter volgt de zaak van Pussy Riot aandachtig en deelt de bezorgdheid van de geachte Parlementsleden volledig, zoals zij te kennen gaf in haar verklaring die werd gepubliceerd op 17 augustus, onmiddellijk na de veroordeling van de leden van Pussy Riot. Deze fundamentele vrijheid, zowel binnen als buiten de grenzen van de EU, blijft een prioriteit.

De problemen die gerelateerd zijn aan deze specifieke rechtszaak en de vrijheid van meningsuiting in het algemeen, werden bij elke mogelijke gelegenheid ter sprake gebracht bij de Russische autoriteiten. Ze werden deze herfst besproken op een vergadering in het kader van de politieke dialoog, alsook op de meest recente ronde van het overleg over mensenrechten, die plaatsvond op 20 juli dit jaar. De volgende ronde van het overleg zal inderdaad nog een kans bieden om deze zaak verder in detail te bespreken. In haar toespraak voor het Europees Parlement op 11 september uitte de hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter haar bezorgdheid over de recente ontwikkelingen in Rusland en verwees zij naar het proces van de leden van Pussy Riot. De EU-delegatie in Moskou volgt deze zaak ook aandachtig en heeft regelmatig ontmoetingen met de advocaten van het terechtstaande lid van Pussy Riot. Zij observeert ook het proces in de rechtbank.

([1]) http://www.eu-un.europa.eu/articles/en/article_12514_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007889/12
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Franziska Katharina Brantner (Verts/ALE), Marije Cornelissen (Verts/ALE), Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE), Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE), Nicole Kiil-Nielsen (Verts/ALE), Carl Schlyter (Verts/ALE), Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE), Werner Schulz (Verts/ALE), Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE) e Jan Philipp Albrecht (Verts/ALE)
(6 de setembro de 2012)

Assunto: VP/HR — Pussy Riot

No passado dia 17 de agosto, três membros da banda russa punk «Pussy Riot» (Nadezha Tolokonnikova, Maria e Yekaterina Alyokhina Samutsevich) foram condenadas a dois anos de prisão depois de terem sido consideradas culpadas de vandalismo pelo seu desempenho de uma canção anti-Putin na catedral ortodoxa de Moscovo. Trata-se de uma sentença desproporcionada, que é uma clara demonstração da supressão das liberdades fundamentais e do uso da força por um Estado que se recusa a respeitar qualquer voz crítica e se serviu do evento para enviar uma mensagem clara de intimidação a todos os dissidentes.

Na sua declaração sobre o caso, Catherine Ashton afirmou que este «levanta graves questões sobre o respeito da Rússia pelas obrigações internacionais de realizar um processo justo, transparente e independente» ([1]).

Embora estas três mulheres tenham atraído a atenção internacional, é importante reconhecer e apoiar os inúmeros atos individuais de expressão na Rússia, que foram abafados pelo Estado. A liberdade de expressão não pode limitar-se àqueles que são objeto do apoio dos meios de comunicação, de apoio artístico ou de apoio político. O Parlamento Europeu mostrou várias vezes em resoluções o seu compromisso no sentido da proteção do direito ao protesto não violento e à liberdade de expressão a todos os níveis, na Rússia.

O trio recorreu da sentença, o que constitui uma oportunidade para as autoridades russas de mostrarem a sua capacidade de tratar de uma forma íntegra um delito menor, ordenando a libertação imediata das três mulheres condenadas.

Que outras medidas tenciona a VP/HR tomar para garantir um processo justo, transparente e independente a estas três mulheres que recorreram da sentença?

Será este caso em particular incluído na próxima ronda de consultas UE-Rússia em matéria de direitos humanos, cuja realização está prevista para o outono de 2012?

Que papel tem vindo a desempenhar a Delegação da UE em Moscovo no apoio às ativistas da banda «Pussy Riot» e como irá a Delegação apoiá-las no processo do recurso?

Resposta conjunta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(29 de outubro de 2012)

A AR/VP tem vindo a acompanhar de perto o caso da banda Pussy Riot e partilha plenamente as preocupações dos Senhores Deputados, tal como expressou de forma clara na sua declaração, emitida imediatamente após a condenação das Pussy Riot, em 17 de agosto. A proteção desta liberdade fundamental, tanto dentro como fora das fronteiras da União Europeia, continua a ser uma prioridade.

As questões relacionadas com este caso judicial, específico e com a liberdade de expressão em geral, foram levantadas junto das autoridades russas em todas as ocasiões possíveis. Foram, nomeadamente, abordadas nas reuniões de diálogo político realizadas este outono, bem como durante o ciclo mais recente de consultas em matéria de direitos humanos, que teve lugar em 20 de julho do corrente ano. A próxima ronda de consultas proporcionará, de facto, uma nova oportunidade para debater esta questão com mais pormenor. A AR/VP manifestou a sua preocupação com os recentes acontecimentos na Rússia, nomeadamente no que diz respeito ao julgamento das Pussy Riot, no seu discurso ao Parlamento Europeu em 11 de setembro. A delegação da UE em Moscovo também seguiu de perto este caso, reunindo-se regularmente com os advogados dos membros das Pussy Riot que estavam a ser julgadas, tendo também observado o seu julgamento em tribunal.

([1]) http://www.eu-un.europa.eu/articles/en/article_12514_en.htm

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-007783/12
Komisii (podpredsedníčke Komisie/vysokej predstaviteľke)
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3. septembra 2012)

Vec: VP/HR – Ohrozovanie slobody prejavu v Rusku

Dňa 30. júla 2012 sa v Rusku začal súdny proces s členkami hudobnej skupiny, ktoré ruské orgány obvinili z trestnej činnosti. Členky skupiny totiž ešte vo februári odohrali pieseň, ktorej slová považujú ruské orgány za urážlivé. Nedávno bol v tomto prípade vydaný rozsudok, v ktorom sa obžalované odsudzujú na dvojročný trest odňatia slobody v trestaneckej kolónii. V súvislosti s týmto rozsudkom však existujú obavy z porušenia ľudských práv a slobôd v krajine, a to konkrétne slobody prejavu. Organizácie na ochranu ľudských práv a základných slobôd sa obávajú, že ide len o pokus umlčať hlasy, ktoré sa odvážili kritizovať súčasný politický režim v krajine, a to protestom, ktorý síce bol potenciálne urážlivý, ale legitímny. Nikto predsa nemôže byť odsúdený za pokojné prejavenie svojho politického presvedčenia.

Aký je postoj VP/HR k tomuto závažnému prípadu? Plánuje vyvinúť určitú formu politického nátlaku s cieľom zvrátiť súdne rozhodnutie ruských orgánov?

Spoločná odpoveď podpredsedníčky Komisie/vysokej predstaviteľky Ashtonovej v mene Komisie
(29. októbra 2012)

Vysoká predstaviteľka a podpredsedníčka podrobne sleduje prípad skupiny Pussy Riot a plne zdieľa obavy poslancov, ako jasne vyjadrila vo vyhlásení, ktoré bolo vydané bezprostredne po vynesení rozsudku nad členkami skupiny Pussy Riot dňa 17. augusta. Prioritou aj naďalej je ochrana základných slobôd na území Európskej únie aj za jej hranicami.

Otázky, ktoré sa vynárajú v súvislosti s týmto konkrétnym súdnym prípadom a so slobodou prejavu vo všeobecnosti, boli pri rokovaniach s ruskými orgánmi nastolené pri všetkých možných príležitostiach. Riešili sa aj počas stretnutí venovaných politickému dialógu, ktoré sa uskutočnili túto jeseň, ako aj počas zatiaľ posledného kola konzultácií o ľudských právach, ktoré sa konalo 20. júla tohto roku. Ďalšou príležitosťou na vedenie podrobnejších diskusií o tejto problematike bude ďalšie kolo uvedených konzultácií. Vysoká predstaviteľka a podpredsedníčka vyjadrila obavy v súvislosti s nedávnym vývojom v Rusku, a to aj pokiaľ ide o súdne konanie s členkami skupiny Pussy Riot, aj vo svojom prejave v Európskom parlamente 11. septembra. Tento prípad veľmi podrobne sleduje aj delegácia EÚ v Moskve, pričom sa pravidelne stretáva s právnikmi členiek skupiny Pussy Riot, ktorí sa zúčastnili na súdnom konaní, a sleduje aj priebeh konania na súde.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-007889/12
till kommissionen (Vice-ordföranden/Höga representanten)
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Franziska Katharina Brantner (Verts/ALE), Marije Cornelissen (Verts/ALE), Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE), Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE), Nicole Kiil-Nielsen (Verts/ALE), Carl Schlyter (Verts/ALE), Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE), Werner Schulz (Verts/ALE), Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE) och Jan Philipp Albrecht (Verts/ALE)
(6 september 2012)

Angående: VP/HR – ”Pussy Riot”

Den 17 augusti 2012 dömdes tre medlemmar i det ryska punkbandet ”Pussy Riot” (Nadezjda Tolokonnikova, Marija Aljochina och Jekaterina Samutsevitj) till två års fängelse efter att ha befunnits skyldiga till huliganism för sitt framförande av en anti-Putin-låt i en ortodox katedral i Moskva. Detta oproportionerliga straff är ett tydligt exempel på förtrycket av grundläggande friheter och våldsanvändningen i en stat som vägrar att respektera varje kritisk röst och som har använt det här fallet för att sända en klar skrämselsignal till alla oliktänkande.

Catherine Ashton pekade i sitt uttalande om fallet att den här incidenten ”sätter ett stort frågetecken vad gäller Rysslands respekt för internationella förpliktelser om rättvisa, öppna och oberoende rättsprocesser” ([1]).

Även om de här tre kvinnorna har nu har uppmärksammats internationellt är det viktigt att lyfta fram och försvara de många andra uttryck för egna åsikter i Ryssland som har kringskurits av staten. Yttrandefriheten får inte begränsas till dem som fångas upp och stöds av medierna eller av konstnärliga och politiska kretsar. I sina resolutioner har parlamentet upprepade gånger visat prov på sitt engagemang för att skydda rätten till fredliga protester och uttryckande av egna tankar på alla nivåer i Ryssland.

Trion överklagar nu domen. Här finns en möjlighet för de ryska myndigheterna att visa sin förmåga till sansad behandling av en mindre förseelse genom att beordra de tre kvinnornas omedelbara frisläppande.

Vilka vidare åtgärder tänker kommissionens vice ordförande/unionens höga representant för utrikes frågor och säkerhetspolitik vidta för att säkerställa en rättvis, öppen och oberoende rättsprocess för dessa kvinnor, när de nu alla tre kommer att överklaga sina domar?

Kommer denna rättssak att ingå i nästa omgång av samråd mellan EU och Ryssland om mänskliga rättigheter som planeras under hösten 2012?

Vilken roll har unionens delegation i Moskva spelat för att stödja ”Pussy Riot”-aktivisterna hittills, och hur kommer den att stödja dem under överklagandeförfarandet?

Samlat svar från den höga representanten/vice ordförande Catherine Ashton på kommissionens vägnar
(29 oktober 2012)

Fru Ashton har följt ”Pussy Riot” mycket noga och delar till fullo den oro som parlamentsledamöterna känner, vilket tydligt kom till uttryck i hennes uttalande omedelbart efter domarna i ”Pussy Riot”-målet den 17 augusti. Skyddet av denna grundläggande frihet både inom och utanför EU:s gränser är alltjämt en prioritering.

Frågetecknen rörande domstolsprocessen i synnerhet och yttrandefriheten i allmänhet har påtalats för de ryska myndigheterna vid alla tänkbara tillfällen. De togs upp vid ett möte inom ramen för den politiska dialogen i höst, och även vid den senaste omgången av människorätts-dialogen den 20 juli i år. Vid nästa omgång av samrådet infinner sig ännu ett tillfälle att diskutera denna fråga mer ingående. Fru Ashton uttryckte i talet till Europaparlamentet den 11 september sin oro över den senaste tidens utveckling i Ryssland, bl.a. när det gäller rättegången mot ”Pussy Riot”. EU:s delegation i Moskva har också följt detta fall mycket nära och regelbundet träffat advokaterna till de ”Pussy Riot”-medlemmar som stod åtalade samt även närvarat vid rättegången i domstolen.

([1]) http://www.eu-un.europa.eu/articles/en/article_12514_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007783/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Threat to freedom of speech in Russia

On 30 July 2012 the trial began of the members of a band accused of criminal activity by the Russian authorities. In February the band had played a song that the authorities deemed to be offensive. The verdict recently handed down condemns the accused to two years' detention in a penal colony. This case gives rise to concern about violations of human rights and freedoms in Russia, specifically the right to freedom of speech. Human rights organisations fear that this is an attempt to silence criticism of the current political regime in the country, in this case through a protest that was admittedly potentially offensive, but was nonetheless legitimate. Nobody can be condemned to prison for orderly expression of his or her political convictions.

What is the VP/HR's position on this serious case? Is it planning to apply any form of political pressure with the aim of having the decision of the Russian authorities overturned?

Question for written answer E-007889/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Franziska Katharina Brantner (Verts/ALE), Marije Cornelissen (Verts/ALE), Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE), Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE), Nicole Kiil-Nielsen (Verts/ALE), Carl Schlyter (Verts/ALE), Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE), Werner Schulz (Verts/ALE), Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE) and Jan Philipp Albrecht (Verts/ALE)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — 'Pussy Riot'

On 17 August 2012, three members of the Russian punk band 'Pussy Riot' (Nadezha Tolokonnikova, Maria Alyokhina and Yekaterina Samutsevich) were sentenced to two years' imprisonment after having been found guilty of 'hooliganism' for their performance of an anti-Putin song in Moscow's Orthodox cathedral. This disproportionate punishment is a clear demonstration of the suppression of fundamental freedoms and the use of force by a state that refuses to respect any critical voice and has used this case to send out a clear message of intimidation to all dissidents.

As Baroness Ashton has pointed out in her statement on the case, this incident 'puts a serious question mark over Russia's respect for international obligations of fair, transparent, and independent legal process' ([1]).

While these three women have captured international attention, it is important to recognise and defend the many other individual acts of expression in Russia that have been curtailed by the state. Freedom of speech cannot be limited only to those who attract support from the media or from artistic or political milieux. In its resolutions, Parliament has repeatedly given proof of its commitment to protecting the rights of non-violent protest and self-expression at every level in Russia.

The trio are now appealing the sentence. This is an opportunity for the Russian authorities to show their capacity for level-headed treatment of a minor offence by ordering the immediate release of the three condemned women.

What further steps does the VP/HR plan to take to ensure a fair, transparent and independent legal process for these women, all three of whom will be appealing their sentence?

Will this case be included in the next round of EU-Russia human rights consultations which is planned to take place in autumn 2012?

What role has the EU Delegation in Moscow been playing in support of the 'Pussy Riot' activists, and how will it support them in the appeal process?

([1]) http://www.eu-un.europa.eu/articles/en/article_12514_en.htm

Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(29 October 2012)

The HR/VP has been following the case of the Pussy Riot very closely and fully shares the concerns of the Honourable Members, as expressed clearly in her statement, which was issued immediately following the sentencing on the Pussy Riot on 17 August. The protection of this fundamental freedom within, as well as outside, the borders of the European Union remains a priority.

The issues pertaining to this court case in particular and the freedom of speech in general have been raised with the Russian authorities on all the possible occasions. They were addressed at a political dialogue meetings that took place this autumn, and also at the most recent round of the human rights consultations, which took place on the 20 July of this year. The next round of the consultation will indeed offer one other opportunity to discuss this matter in greater detail. HR/VP expressed her concern over the recent developments in Russia, including with regards to the trial of the 'Pussy Riot', in her speech to the European Parliament on 11 September. The EU Delegation in Moscow has also been following this case very closely, regularly meeting with the lawyers of the Pussy Riot member that were on trial, and also observing the trial in court.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008143/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(17 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Artisti tunisini accusati per opere immorali

Il 3 settembre 2012 Human Rights Watch ha riferito che sono stati avviati procedimenti penali a carico di due scultori tunisini in quanto le loro opere sono state ritenute pericolose per l'ordine pubblico e la morale. Se giudicati colpevoli, gli artisti — Nadia Jelassi e Mohamed Ben Salem — potrebbero essere condannati a fino a cinque anni di reclusione. Un rappresentante di Human Rights Watch ha osservato che «i pubblici ministeri utilizzano sistematicamente la legislazione penale per reprimere espressioni critiche o artistiche. […] Blogger, giornalisti e ora anche artisti sono perseguiti penalmente per il fatto di esercitare il loro diritto alla libertà di espressione».

Le opere in questione rappresentano sculture di donne velate in mezzo a un cumulo di pietre e una fila di formiche che esce dalla cartella di un bambino andando a formare la parola «Allah». La mostra si è svolta ad al-Abdelliya, un palazzo di proprietà dello Stato a La Marsa, una cittadina nella periferia a nord di Tunisi. Il 10 giugno 2012 decine di persone hanno fatto irruzione nell'edificio e vandalizzato la mostra. Sono inoltre scoppiate sommosse in diverse città del paese. I manifestanti hanno incendiato tribunali, stazioni di polizia e altre istituzioni statali. Alcuni predicatori nelle moschee hanno chiesto di condannare a morte gli artisti per apostasia. Il 17 agosto Nadia Jelassi è stata chiamata a comparire dinanzi al tribunale di primo grado di Tunisi, dove il giudice per le indagini le ha notificato le accuse di «pregiudizio all'ordine pubblico e alla morale pubblica» formulate a suo carico.

La causa Jelassi è uno dei quattro casi in cui i pubblici ministeri hanno formulato accuse per espressioni ritenute offensive per la moralità pubblica e l'ordine pubblico in virtù dell'articolo 121, paragrafo 3, del codice penale tunisino. L'articolo 121, paragrafo 3, stabilisce che è reato «distribuire, mettere in vendita, esibire pubblicamente o possedere, con l'intento di distribuire, vendere ed esibire a scopi propagandistici, opuscoli, comunicati e volantini, di origine straniera o meno, suscettibili di recare pregiudizio all'ordine pubblico o alla morale pubblica». Secondo Human Rights Watch, l'attuale governo non si è adoperato in alcun modo per ritirare questa legge, dal momento che può essere utilizzata efficacemente per ridurre al silenzio le persone che fomentano il dissenso.

1. Qual è l'attuale posizione del Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante rispetto ai casi di cittadini tunisini come Nadia Jelassi e Mohamed Ben Salem, perseguiti penalmente a causa della loro produzione artistica?

2. Quali misure hanno adottato i funzionari dell'UE per sollevare la questione della riforma del sistema giudiziario, in particolare per quanto riguarda l'articolo 121, paragrafo 3, del codice penale tunisino, con il governo del primo ministro Hamadi Jebali?

3. Qual è la valutazione dei funzionari dell'UE a Tunisi in merito al rispetto della libertà di espressione da parte del governo tunisino? Vi sono preoccupazioni che devono essere affrontate? In caso affermativo, quali sono?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(9 novembre 2012)

L'AR/VP segue gli sviluppi in Tunisia, specie per quanto riguarda il rispetto dei diritti umani e dei valori democratici.

Dopo la rivoluzione del 2011 la Tunisia ha fatto notevoli progressi in questo campo, anche per quanto riguarda il rispetto della libertà di espressione, che hanno portato al pluralismo dei media nel paese e consentono ai cittadini di accedere a un'ampia gamma di opinioni e informazioni su questioni di importanza pubblica.

L'UE è tuttavia preoccupata per le restrizioni applicate di fatto alla libertà di espressione, tra cui l'articolo 121, paragrafo 3, del codice penale a cui fa riferimento l'onorevole parlamentare, e per l'operato di una piccola minoranza che utilizza la violenza per limitare il pluralismo dell'opinione.

L'UE ha costantemente sollevato tali questioni nel dialogo con le autorità tunisine, pur giudicando positivamente le misure adottate per garantire il rispetto dei diritti umani in generale, e continuerà a incoraggiare dette autorità a prendere provvedimenti per garantire il pieno rispetto dei diritti umani conformemente agli impegni internazionali della Tunisia.

L'UE sostiene la riforma del settore giudiziario attraverso un programma di 25 milioni di euro volto a rafforzare l'indipendenza e l'efficienza della magistratura, l'accesso alla giustizia e la modernizzazione del sistema penitenziario. Il programma, che prevede anche l'allineamento della legislazione vigente agli standard internazionali, sosterrà le ONG mediante la promozione e l'introduzione di nuove leggi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008143/12
to the Commission (Vice-President / High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Tunisian artists charged for immoral work

On 3 September 2012, Human Rights Watch reported that criminal charges had been brought against two Tunisian sculptors for art works deemed harmful to public order and good morals. If convicted, the artists — Nadia Jelassi and Mohamed Ben Salem — could be sentenced for up to five years in prison. A representative of Human Rights Watch commented that 'time and again, prosecutors are using criminal legislation to stifle critical or artistic expression. […] Bloggers, journalists and now artists are being prosecuted for exercising their right to free speech'.

The works in question feature sculptures of veiled women in the midst of a pile of stones and a line of ants streaming out of a child's schoolbag to spell 'Allah'. The exhibition was held in al-Abdelliya, a state-owned hall in La Marsa, a town in the northern suburbs of Tunis. On 10 June 2012, dozens of people broke into the building and vandalised the exhibition. Riots also broke out in several towns across the country. Protestors set fire to courts, police stations and other state institutions. Several preachers in mosques called for the artists to be put to death as apostates. On 17 August, Nadia Jelassi was summoned to the First Degree Court of Tunis, where the investigative judge informed her that she faces charges of 'harming public order and public morals'.

Jelassi is one of four cases where prosecutors have used Article 121(3) of the Tunisian penal code to bring charges for speech deemed offensive to public morality and public order. Article 121(3) makes it an offense to 'distribute, offer for sale, publicly display, or possess, with the intent to distribute, sell, display for the purpose of propaganda, tracts, bulletins, and fliers, whether of foreign origin or not, that are liable to cause harm to the public order or public morals'. According to Human Rights Watch, the current government has made no effort to reverse this law as it can effectively be used to silence people who foment dissent.

1. What is the current position of the High Representative/Vice-President on the cases of Tunisian individuals, such as Nadia Jelassi and Mohamed Ben Salem, who face criminal charges because of their art work?

2. What steps have EU officials taken to raise the issue of judicial reform, specifically as regards Article 121(3) of the Tunisian penal code, with the government of Prime Minister Hamadi Jebali?

3. What is the assessment of EU officials in Tunis with regard to the Tunisian Government's respect for freedom of speech? Are there any concerns that need to be addressed, and if so, what are they?

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

The HR/VP is following developments in Tunisia particularly as regards respect for human rights and democratic values.

Since the Revolution in 2011, Tunisia has made very significant progress in this area including respect for freedom of expression. As a result, today the media landscape in Tunisia is pluralist and Tunisians can access a wide range of opinions and information on issues of public importance.

Nonetheless the EU is concerned at certain limitations on freedom of expression in practice including Article 121(3) of the Penal Code as described by the Honourable Member. The EU is also concerned by the actions of a small minority which appear to be aimed at limiting plurality of opinion through violent means.

The EU has consistently raised these issues in its dialogue with the Tunisian authorities, while welcoming positive measures taken to ensure respect for human rights more generally. It will continue to encourage the authorities to take action to guarantee full respect for human rights in accordance with Tunisia's international commitments.

As regards the justice sector more generally, the EU is currently supporting judicial reform through a EUR 25 million programme. The programme aims at reinforcing the independence and efficiency of the judiciary, access to justice and the modernisation of penitentiary system. The alignment of current legislation to international standards is also part of the programme. In addition, the programme will support NGOs in promoting/initiating new legislation.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008144/12
al Consiglio
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(17 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Spose bambine nel Regno Unito

Il 9 settembre 2012 il Sunday Times ha riferito che, all'interno del Regno Unito, religiosi musulmani sono pronti ad ufficiare matrimoni per ragazzine di appena 12 anni. Sono stati indagati due imam i quali hanno ammesso ad un giornalista in incognito di essere disposti a celebrare la cerimonia di matrimonio di una ragazzina minore con un uomo di più di venti anni. L'imam del Centro islamico Husaini di Peterborough ha sottolineato la necessità della segretezza per il giornalista che si è spacciato per il padre di una ragazzina di dodici anni che intendeva accasare. Un altro imam in pensione, Abdul Haque, che tuttora officia in occasione di matrimoni, ha affermato di essere altresì pronto ad officiare una cerimonia di matrimonio islamico per una ragazzina. Per quanto riguarda la questione dell'età, ha rilevato: «Dobbiamo seguire la strada del sacro profeta. Siamo i suoi seguaci e questo è quello che deve spiegare [a sua figlia]».

Nel Regno Unito, il quotidiano ha riferito che uno su sette degli 8 000 matrimoni forzati di cittadini britannici dovrebbero interessare ragazzine di quindici anni o meno. Il governo britannico sta attualmente esaminando l'opportunità di varare una legge che proibisca il matrimonio forzato e ciò potrebbe anche includere i matrimoni sharia di minori. Il Segretario generale del Consiglio musulmano britannico ha risposto: «Vi siamo fermamente contrari in quanto illegale secondo la legge del paese in cui viviamo, ma anche perché molto discutibile in base alla sharia».

1. Qual è la posizione del Consiglio per quanto riguarda l'attuale legislazione in materia di matrimoni sharia?

2. Quali passi è pronto ad adottare al fine di affrontare la questione del matrimonio forzato e, in particolare, dei matrimoni di minori celebrati secondo la legge islamica?

3. Può confermare se abbia adottato o meno iniziative in passato per affrontare la questione? In caso positivo, quali?

Risposta
(7 novembre 2012)

Non spetta al Consiglio pronunciarsi su articoli pubblicati dalla stampa.

Il Consiglio desidera tuttavia richiamare l'attenzione dell'onorevole Parlamentare sul fatto che il matrimonio non è una questione regolamentata a livello dell'UE.

Spetta pertanto ad ogni Stato membro determinare nel suo diritto nazionale le condizioni che devono essere soddisfatte affinché un matrimonio sia valido, quali ad esempio l'età legale per contrarre matrimonio e le eventuali norme che disciplinano la celebrazione stessa.

Il Consiglio rammenta comunque che tutti gli Stati membri hanno ratificato la convenzione sui diritti del fanciullo del 1989 delle Nazioni Unite e che la violenza sessuale su minori costituisce una grave violazione di tali diritti.

Rammenta inoltre che, in virtù della direttiva 2011/92/UE ([1]) recentemente adottata, chiunque compie atti sessuali con un minore che non ha raggiunto l'età del consenso sessuale è punito con una pena detentiva massima di almeno cinque anni. Sono inoltre punibili l'istigazione e il concorso, nonché l'abuso di una posizione riconosciuta di fiducia o autorità.

([1]) Direttiva 2011/92/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 13 dicembre 2011, relativa alla lotta contro l'abuso e lo sfruttamento sessuale dei minori e la pornografia minorile, e che sostituisce la decisione quadro 2004/68/GAI del Consiglio (GU L 335 del 17.12.2011, pag. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008144/12
to the Council
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: Child brides in the UK

On 9 September 2012 the *Sunday Times* reported that, within the UK, Muslim clerics are prepared to officiate at weddings for girls as young as 12. Two imams were investigated, and admitted to an undercover journalist that they were prepared to perform the wedding ceremony of an underage girl to a man in his twenties. The imam from the Husaini Islamic Centre in Peterborough stressed the need for secrecy to the reporter, who posed as the father of a 12-year-old girl he wanted to marry. Another retired imam, Abdul Haque, who still officiates at weddings, said he was also prepared to perform an Islamic marriage ceremony for a young girl. In reference to the age issue, he noted: 'We have to follow the way of the Holy Prophet. We are his followers, and that is what you have to explain [to your daughter]'.

In the UK, the newspaper reported that one out of every seven of the 8 000 forced marriages of UK citizens are believed to involve girls of 15 or younger. The British Government is currently looking into introducing a bill outlawing forced marriage, and this could also include underage sharia weddings. The response of the secretary-general of the Muslim Council of Britain was: 'We are strongly opposed to it on the basis that it is illegal under the law of the land where we are living, and even under sharia it is highly debatable'.

1. What is the position of the Council regarding current legislation on sharia weddings?

2. What steps is the Council prepared to take in order to tackle the issue of forced marriage and in particular underage marriages conducted according to Islamic law?

3. Can the Council confirm whether or not it has taken steps in the past to address this issue? If so, what are they?

Reply
(7 November 2012)

It is not for the Council to comment on articles appearing in the press.

Nevertheless, the Council would like to draw the Honourable Member's attention to the fact that marriage is a matter which is not regulated at EU level.

It is therefore for each Member State to determine in its national law the conditions which have to be met for a marriage to be valid, such as, for instance, the legal age for the contraction of marriage and the rules governing the celebration itself, if any.

In any case, the Council recalls that all Member States have ratified the 1989 United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child and that sexual abuse of children constitutes a serious violation of those rights.

It further recalls that, under the recently adopted Directive 2011/92/EU ([1]), engaging in sexual activities with a child who has not reached the age of sexual consent shall be punishable by a maximum term of imprisonment of at least 5 years. In addition, inciting and abetting, as well as abusing a recognised position of trust or authority, is also punishable.

([1]) Directive 2011/92/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on combating the sexual abuse and sexual exploitation of children and child pornography and replacing Council Framework Decision 2004/68/JHA (OJ L 335, 17.12.2011, p. 1).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008145/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(17 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Attacchi di militanti islamici a Bengasi e al Cairo

Il 12 settembre 2012, l'Ambasciatore statunitense in Libia, Chris Stevens, e altri tre diplomatici sono stati uccisi in un attacco con dei razzi nella città di Bengasi. Il Vice Primo ministro ad interim della Libia, Mustafa Abushagur, ha affermato che le forze di sicurezza hanno lanciato una caccia all'uomo per trovare gli assassini. Abushagur ha condannato il «vile attacco al consolato USA e l'uccisione di Chris Stevens».

Stevens era intervenuto come inviato presso i ribelli libici che hanno combattuto per rovesciare il colonnello Gheddafi, l'ex leader libico. Le circostanze della sua morte non sono chiare. La scintilla dell'attacco è però costituita da un breve filmato che sbeffeggia il Profeta Maometto, prodotto da un uomo d'affari residente in California. Una folla è scesa verso il consolato USA, la sera di martedì 11 settembre, appiccandole il fuoco. Sembra che Stevens sia stato ucciso nei pressi del consolato, mentre veniva allontanato in macchina dalla teppaglia. Il gruppo militante Ansar al-Sharia ha rivendicato la responsabilità dell'attacco.

Fonti giornalistiche hanno riferito che altri dimostranti hanno attaccato l'ambasciata americana al Cairo in Egitto. Alcuni dimostranti si sono arrampicati sul muro di cinta issando la bandiera islamica, mentre le forze antisommossa egiziane non sono riuscite a disperderli. La dimostrazione è proseguita per tutta la notte. Secondo il New York Times, il Presidente egiziano Mohamed Morsi ha esortato il governo USA a perseguire i «pazzi» responsabili del video che rappresenta il profeta Maometto in una dubbia luce. Il Segretario di Stato USA Hillary Clinton ha risposto affermando: «Condanno con la massima fermezza l'attacco sferrato oggi alla nostra missione a Bengasi». In risposta al film che ha scatenato gli attacchi, ha aggiunto: «Non vi è mai giustificazione per atti violenti di questo tipo».

1. Il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante ritiene che gli attacchi perpetrati contro sedi diplomatiche USA al Cairo e a Bengasi costituiscano un rischio per la sicurezza del personale UE che opera in tali paesi?

2. Intende offrire sostegno all'attuale governo libico onde affrontare gruppi militanti come Ansar al-Sharia?

3. Quali passi, in particolare, sta adottando l'UE per aiutare le forze libiche a confiscare le armi e altre attrezzature che contribuiscono a rafforzare i movimenti ribelli nel paese?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(9 novembre 2012)

L'UE prende molto sul serio la questione della sicurezza del suo personale e segue con la massima attenzione tutti gli eventi che possono avere ripercussioni su di essa. L'Unione ritiene che gli attacchi contro le ambasciate degli Stati Uniti non rappresentino una minaccia diretta per il suo personale. Tuttavia, il servizio europeo per l'azione esterna (SEAE) ha emanato orientamenti in cui raccomanda al personale dell'UE di adottare una serie di misure di sicurezza.

Per quanto riguarda l'assistenza alla Libia, un programma di cooperazione dell'UE pari a 39 milioni di euro prevede azioni di riconciliazione, mediazione e dialogo con la società civile, a sostegno di una transizione pacifica, e lo sviluppo di capacità presso l'amministrazione centrale per consentire al governo di garantire meglio la sicurezza.

Per scongiurare ulteriori rischi di diffusione illecita di armi convenzionali e munizioni in Libia e dalla Libia, l'UE intende offrire sostegno alle autorità libiche competenti a livello di incolumità fisica e gestione delle scorte così da garantire uno stoccaggio sicuro delle armi e delle munizioni. L'UE sta inoltre elaborando un programma di riforma del settore della sicurezza, destinato alla polizia e all'apparato giudiziario, che permetterà alle autorità di contrastare in modo più efficace i flussi di armi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008145/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Attacks by Islamic militants in Benghazi and Cairo

On 12 September 2012, the United States Ambassador to Libya, Chris Stevens, and three other staff members were killed in a rocket attack in the city of Benghazi. The Libyan interim Deputy Prime Minister, Mustafa Abushagur, said that security forces had launched a manhunt to look for the killers. Mr Abushagur condemned the 'cowardly act of attacking the US consulate and the killing of Mr Stevens'.

Mr Stevens had served as an envoy to the Libyan rebels who had fought to overthrow the former Libyan leader Colonel Gaddafi. The circumstances of his death are not clear. However, the attack was sparked by a short film that mocked the Prophet Muhammad, produced by a California-based businessman. A mob descended on the US consulate on the evening of Tuesday, 11 September and set it on fire. It seems Mr Stevens was killed close to the consulate while being driven away from the mob. The militant group Ansar al-Sharia has claimed responsibility for the attack.

Media sources report that other demonstrators attacked the American Embassy in Cairo, Egypt. Some protesters climbed over the walls and raised the Islamic flag, while Egyptian riot police failed to disperse the demonstrators. The demonstration continued throughout the night. According to the *New York Times*, Egyptian President Mohamed Morsi has urged the US Government to prosecute the 'madmen' behind the video which depicted the Prophet Muhammad in a poor light. US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton responded by saying: 'I condemn in the strongest terms the attack on our mission in Benghazi today'. And in response to the film which sparked the attacks, she added: 'There is never any justification for violent acts of this kind'.

1. Does the Vice-President/High Representative believe that the attacks perpetrated against the US embassies in Cairo and Benghazi pose a security risk for EU staff working in those countries?

2. Does the Vice-President/High Representative plan to offer support to the current Libyan Government in order to tackle militant groups such as Ansar al-Sharia?

3. In particular, what steps is the EU currently taking to help Libyan officials confiscate weapons and other relevant equipment, which are helping to bolster insurgent movements in the country?

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

The EU takes the security of its staff extremely seriously and closely monitors any events that may affect them. Its current assessment is that the attacks against United States Embassies do not represent a direct threat to EU staff. However, as a precaution, the European External Action Service (EEAS) has issued guidance to EU staff working internationally, recommending that they adopt a range of security measures.

On assistance to Libya the EU has a EUR 39 million Programme of cooperation which includes actions on reconciliation, mediation and dialogue with civil society designed to support peaceful transition together with capacity building of central administration designed to improve the capacity of the Libyan Government to deliver better security.

In order to address the further risk of the illicit spread of conventional weapons and ammunition in and from Libya, the EU is planning to offer to the responsible Libyan authorities support on physical security and stockpile management to ensure weapons and ammunition can be securely stored. The EU is also designing a Security Sector Reform Programme focused on police and justice that will enable the authorities to better interdict such arms flows.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-008147/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Sophocles Sophocleous (S&D)
(17 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Καταγγελία Εταιρείας Στοιχήματος εναντίον της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας

Με στόχο την καταπολέμηση του ξεπλύματος βρώμικου χρήματος και των στημένων παιχνιδιών, η Βουλή των αντιπροσώπων της Κύπρου ψήφισε στις 6 Ιουλίου 2012, το νομοσχέδιο για τη ρύθμιση του στοιχήματος, στο οποίο περιλαμβάνεται και το ηλεκτρονικό στοίχημα.

Στο νομοσχέδιο συγκαταλέγεται η απαγόρευση της λειτουργίας του ανταλλακτηρίου στοιχήματος, κατά το οποίο οι παίκτες στοιχηματίζουν μεταξύ τους με τη διαμεσολάβηση μιας εταιρείας, η οποία λαμβάνει συγκεκριμένη προμήθεια.

Διεθνής εταιρεία στοιχήματος κατέθεσε καταγγελία στην Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή εις βάρος της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας για το εν λόγω νομοσχέδιο, με την επιχειρηματολογία ότι στο νομοσχέδιο ενσωματώθηκαν στοιχεία τα οποία δεν συμβαδίζουν με το Ευρωπαϊκό Δίκαιο.

Παρακαλώ όπως με ενημερώσει η Επιτροπή για το χρονοδιάγραμμα εξέτασης της υπόθεσης και κατά πόσο έχει βάση η καταγγελία της εταιρείας.

Απάντηση του κ. Barnier εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(24 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή μπορεί να επιβεβαιώσει ότι της υποβλήθηκε καταγγελία σχετικά με τη συμμόρφωση με τη νομοθεσία της ΕΕ του πρόσφατα εκδοθέντος νομοσχεδίου της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας για τη ρύθμιση του στοιχήματος. Η Επιτροπή θα εξετάσει προσεκτικά την καταγγελία λαμβάνοντας υπόψη το εφαρμοστέο ενωσιακό δίκαιο, ιδίως τα άρθρα 49 και 56 της ΣΛΕΕ σχετικά με την ελευθερία εγκατάστασης και την ελεύθερη κυκλοφορία των υπηρεσιών. Κατόπιν εξέτασης των γεγονότων, η Επιτροπή θα αποφασίσει εάν πρέπει να ληφθούν περαιτέρω μέτρα σχετικά με την καταγγελία. Η Επιτροπή θα προσπαθήσει να λάβει απόφαση επί της ουσίας (συγκεκριμένα, να κινήσει διαδικασίες παραβάσεως ή να κλείσει την υπόθεση) εντός 12 μηνών από την καταχώριση της καταγγελίας.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-008147/12
to the Commission
Sophocles Sophocleous (S&D)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: Complaint by a betting company against the Republic of Cyprus

In order to combat money-laundering and match-fixing, the Cyprus House of Representatives adopted on 6 July 2012 a bill regulating betting, including online betting.

The bill includes a ban on the operation of betting exchanges, in which players bet amongst themselves through the intermediary of a company, which receives a specific commission.

An international betting company has filed a complaint to the European Commission against the Republic of Cyprus about this bill, on the grounds that it incorporates elements that are incompatible with European law.

Will the Commission provide information about the timetable for examining this case and say whether the company's complaint has any substance?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(24 October 2012)

The Commission can confirm that it has registered a complaint regarding compliance with EC law of the recently adopted Cypriot gambling bill. The Commission will carefully consider the complaint in the light of the applicable European Union law, in particular Articles 49 and 56 TFEU on the freedom of establishment and the free movement of services. After examining the facts, the Commission will decide whether further action should be taken on the complaint. The Commission will endeavour to take a decision on the substance, namely to either open infringement proceedings or to close the case, within twelve months of registration of the complaint.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008148/12
an die Kommission
Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE)
(17. September 2012)

Betrifft: Übertragung von Verkehrsmitteln aus dem Kohäsionsfonds auf andere Projekte

In den vergangenen Monaten hat sich der Verkehrsausschuss des Europäischen Parlaments wiederholt mit dem Ersuchen verschiedener Mitgliedstaaten auseinandergesetzt, für bestimmte Verkehrsprojekte vorgesehene Mittel aus dem Kohäsions- und Regionalfonds auf andere Projekte inner- und außerhalb des Verkehrsbereichs zu übertragen.

Bezug nehmend auf den Brief des Vorsitzenden des Verkehrsausschusses, Brian Simpson, vom 2.9.2011 sowie die Antwort von Kommissar Johannes Hahn vom 10.10.2011 wird die Kommission mit der Bitte um eine nach Mitgliedstaaten aufgeschlüsselte Übersicht um Beantwortung folgender Fragen gebeten:

1. Welche Mitgliedstaaten haben in den Jahren 2011 und 2012 eine Übertragung von Mitteln aus den Kohäsions- und Regionalfonds auf andere Projekte inner- bzw. außerhalb des Verkehrssektors beantragt?

2. Für welche Projekte wurde eine Mittelübertragung beantragt?

3. Welche Entscheidung hat die Kommission jeweils getroffen bzw. in welchem Bearbeitungsstadium befinden sich die Anträge bei der Kommission?

Antwort von Herrn Hahn im Namen der Kommission
(15. November 2012)

Die beigefügte Tabelle ([1]) enthält eine Aufstellung der Mitgliedstaaten, die eine Übertragung von Mitteln zwischen verschiedenen Verkehrsbereichen bzw. vom Verkehrsbereich als Ganzem auf andere Bereiche beantragt haben. Aus der Tabelle geht hervor, welche Programme und welche Fonds betroffen waren und ob die Übertragung genehmigt oder abgelehnt wurde bzw. derzeit noch geprüft wird.

([1]) Der Anhang wurde dem Herrn Abgeordneten sowie dem Sekretariat des Parlaments direkt zugesandt.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008148/12
to the Commission
Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: Transfer of cohesion fund appropriations from transport to other projects

In recent months the European Parliament's Committee on Transport and Tourism has dealt with repeated requests from various Member States to transfer appropriations earmarked for specific transport projects from the cohesion and regional funds to other projects both within and outside the transport sector.

Referring to the letter of 2 September 2011 from Brian Simpson, Chair of the Committee on Transport and Tourism, and the reply of 10 October 2011 by Commissioner Johannes Hahn, could the Commission please answer the following questions, supplying a breakdown by Member State:

1. Which Member States applied in 2011 and 2012 for a transfer of appropriations from the cohesion and regional funds to other projects within or outside the transport sector?

2. For which projects was a transfer of appropriations applied for?

3. What decision did the Commission take in each case and what stage have these applications reached in their treatment by the Commission?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(15 November 2012)

The attached table ([1]) provides a list of Member States which have requested a transfer of funds either between different transport sectors or from the transport sector as a whole to other sectors. The table indicates which programmes and which funds were affected, and indicates whether the transfer has been approved, rejected or is still under consideration.

([1]) The annex is sent directly to the Honourable Member and to the Secretariat of Parliament.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-008149/12
an die Kommission
Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE)
(17. September 2012)

Betrifft: Grenzüberschreitende Fahrten von LKW mit einem Gewicht von über 40 Tonnen

Am 16. August 2012 beschloss die schwedische Regierung, LKW mit einem Gewicht von über 40 Tonnen im grenzüberschreitenden Verkehr mit den Nachbarländern zuzulassen, sofern sie nationalen schwedischen Zulassungsbestimmungen entsprechen.

1. Sind grenzüberschreitende Verkehre von LKW mit einem Gewicht von über 40 Tonnen nach geltendem Recht zulässig? Wenn ja, warum? Wenn nein, warum nicht?

2. Wenn diese Verkehre unzulässig sind, was gedenkt die Kommission zur Durchsetzung geltenden Rechts zu unternehmen?

Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(23. Oktober 2012)

Grenzüberschreitende Fahrten von Fahrzeugen mit einem Gewicht von über 44 Tonnen sind ausnahmslos zulässig, wenn diese Fahrzeuge einen 40-Fuß-ISO-Container im Rahmen des kombinierten Verkehrs befördern. Ansonsten können die Mitgliedstaaten nach Artikel 4 Absatz 2 der Richtlinie 96/53/EG ([1]) auf ihrem Gebiet von den in der Richtlinie vorgeschriebenen Höchstgewichten abweichen.

([1]) Richtlinie 96/53/EG des Rates vom 25. Juli 1996 zur Festlegung der höchstzulässigen Abmessungen für bestimmte Straßenfahrzeuge im innerstaatlichen und grenzüberschreitenden Verkehr in der Gemeinschaft sowie zur Festlegung der höchstzulässigen Gewichte im grenzüberschreitenden Verkehr (ABl. L 235 vom 17.9.1996, S. 59).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008149/12
to the Commission
Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: Cross-border journeys by lorries with a weight exceeding 40 tonnes

On 16 August 2012 the Swedish Government decided to allow lorries with a weight exceeding 40 tonnes to cross the borders with its neighbouring countries, provided they comply with Swedish national authorisation requirements.

1. Are cross-border journeys by lorries with a weight exceeding of 40 tonnes permissible under current legislation? If so, why? If not, why not?

2. If such journeys are not permissible, what action does the Commission propose to take to enforce the current legislation?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(23 October 2012)

Cross-border use of vehicles up to 44 tonnes is permissible without derogation if these vehicles carry a 40 foot ISO container as part of a combined transport operation. Otherwise Member States may decide to deviate from the maximum weights in the directive on their own territory according to Art. 4(2) of Directive 96/53/EC ([1]).

([1]) Council Directive 96/53/EC of 25 July 1996 laying down for certain road vehicles circulating within the Community the maximum authorised dimensions in national and international traffic and the maximum authorised weights in international traffic (OJ L 235, 17.9.1996, p.59).

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008150/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Sophocles Sophocleous (S&D)
(17 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Η κατάσταση του ιστορικού μνημείου της Τρίκλιτης Βασιλικής της Αγίας Τριάδας

Η ιστορική εκκλησία της Τρίκλιτης Βασιλικής της Αγίας Τριάδας στην κατεχόμενη Γιαλούσα, αποτελεί μέρος της παγκόσμιας πολιτιστικής κληρονομιάς. Στο παρελθόν αποτελείτο από αψίδες οι οποίες καλύπτονταν από σημαντικά γεωμετρικά και εικονιστικά ψηφιδωτά. Με την πάροδο των αιώνων όμως, έχουν μείνει μόνο τα ψηφιδωτά στο δάπεδο τα οποία καταστρέφονται καθημερινά λόγω της αδιαφορίας του ψευδοκράτους. Τα ψηφιδωτά ξεκολλούν από το δάπεδο, επιφέροντας σταδιακά την πλήρη καταστροφή της εκκλησίας.

Να σημειωθεί ότι οι επισκέπτες του ιστορικού μνημείου καταβάλλουν το ποσό των πέντε τουρκικών λιρών, μέρος του οποίου προορίζεται για το κόστος συντήρησης όπως αναφέρουν οι κατοχικές αρχές. Εντούτοις, οι μοναδικές εργασίες που έχουν πραγματοποιηθεί στον ιστορικό χώρο της Αγίας Τριάδας είναι η κοπή αγριόχορτων.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Είναι ενήμερη για το θέμα της κατάστασης στην Τρίκλιτη Βασιλική της Αγίας Τριάδας;

2. Προτίθεται η Επιτροπή να λάβει δραστικά μέτρα για την διάσωση του θρησκευτικού και πολιτιστικού αυτού μνημείου που χρονολογείται από το 425 μ.Χ;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(26 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή δεν διαθέτει συγκεκριμένες πληροφορίες όσον αφορά την κατάσταση της εκκλησίας στην οποία αναφέρεται το Αξιότιμο Μέλος.

Η Επιτροπή αποδίδει μεγάλη σημασία στην διατήρηση της πολιτιστικής κληρονομιάς της Κύπρου.

Στο πλαίσιο αυτό και δεδομένης της κρίσιμης κατάστασης πολλών ιστορικών εκκλησιών στο βόρειο τμήμα της Κύπρου, το πρόγραμμα βοήθειας προς την τουρκοκυπριακή κοινότητα παρέσχε 2 εκατ. ευρώ το 2011 για τη στήριξη των δραστηριοτήτων της δικοινοτικής τεχνικής επιτροπής για την πολιτιστική κληρονομιά που τελεί υπό την αιγίδα των Ηνωμένων Εθνών. Βάσει του προγράμματος βοήθειας για το 2012, η ΕΕ έχει δεσμευθεί να συνεχίσει τη στήριξη των εργασιών της εν λόγω δικοινοτικής επιτροπής με περαιτέρω εισφορά ύψους 2 εκατ. ευρώ.

Η δικοινοτική τεχνική επιτροπή για την πολιτιστική κληρονομιά συστάθηκε τον Απρίλιο του 2008, μετά από συμφωνία μεταξύ των ηγετών των δύο κοινοτήτων. Η δικοινοτική επιτροπή είναι υπεύθυνη για τη διαφύλαξη της μεγάλης πολιτιστικής κληρονομιάς της νήσου. Είναι μια από τις πολυάριθμες τεχνικές επιτροπές που τελούν υπό την αιγίδα των Ηνωμένων Εθνών.

Όπως ενδέχεται να γνωρίζει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος, η δικοινοτική επιτροπή έχει ήδη καταρτίσει κατάλογο με 11 θρησκευτικά και μη μνημεία που χρήζουν προτεραιότητας για στήριξη σε αμφότερες τις κοινότητες, ο οποίος αποτελεί μέρος ενός ευρύτερου καταλόγου 40 μνημείων επί του οποίου συμφώνησαν οι ηγέτες αμφότερων των κοινοτήτων. Οι προτεραιότητες ιεραρχήθηκαν με βάση την κατάσταση των μνημείων και την ανάγκη επείγουσας παρέμβασης για την αποφυγή περαιτέρω καταστροφών. Η χρηματοδότηση από μέρους της ΕΕ θα στηρίξει έργα που θα επιλέξει η δικοινοτική επιτροπή.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008150/12
to the Commission
Sophocles Sophocleous (S&D)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: State of the historic Church of Aghia Triada in Cyprus

The historic Church of Aghia Triada in Turkish-occupied Gialousa forms part of the world's cultural heritage. In the past, it had apses which were covered with important geometric and figurative mosaics. After many centuries, however, only the mosaic floors remain and they are being gradually destroyed because of the indifference of the Turkish pseudo-state. The mosaics are gradually becoming unstuck from the floor, and their disappearance will complete the destruction of the church.

It should be noted that visitors to this historic monument are charged five Turkish liras, part of which is intended to cover maintenance costs, or so the occupying authorities maintain. However, the only work that is being done at the historic site of Aghia Triada is weeding.

In view of the above, the Commission say:

1. Is it aware of the state of the Church of Aghia Triada?

2. Will it take drastic measures to save this religious and cultural monument that dates back to 425 AD?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(26 October 2012)

The Commission does not have particular information on the state of the church to which the Honourable Member refers.

The Commission attributes great importance to the preservation of cultural heritage in Cyprus.

In this context and given the critical state of many of the historic churches in the northern part of Cyprus, the aid programme for the Turkish Cypriot community provided EUR 2 million in 2011 to support the activities of the bi-communal Technical Committee on Cultural Heritage operating under UN auspices. Under the 2012 aid programme, the EU is committed to continue supporting the work of this bi-communal committee with a further contribution of EUR 2 million.

The bi-communal Technical Committee on Cultural Heritage was established in April 2008, following an agreement between the leaders of the two communities. The bi-communal committee is responsible for the preservation of the island wide cultural heritage. It is one of the many technical committees operating under the auspices of the United Nations.

As the Honourable Member might be aware, the bi-communal Committee has already identified a list of 11 priority religious and non-religious monuments for support in both communities, part of the wider list of 40 monuments agreed by both leaders. They have been prioritised based on their state of conservation and the need for urgent intervention to avoid further deterioration. EU funding will support projects chosen by the bi-communal Committee.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008151/12
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: Neonicotinoids: Clothianidin and Thiamethoxam

The Commission will be aware of the public's concern about neonicotinoid pesticides. Two neonicotinoids, Clothianidin and Thiamethoxam, were recognised as active substances under Annex I of Directive 91/414/EEC in 2006 and 2007 respectively.

Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 sets out soil persistence levels of 120 days, whilst Annex VI of Directive 91/414/EEC, which preceded the regulation, suggests a 100-day ceiling, and guidance contained in a Commission working document of 12 July 2000 entitled 'Guidance Document on Persistence in Soil', issued by the Directorate-General for Agriculture, highlights similar limits.

However, numerous peer-reviewed and respected scientific papers note that neonicotinoids like Clothianidin have a half-life that can range from 148 days to in excess of 1 155 days depending on the soil type.

Notwithstanding the Commission's previous responses to Written Questions E-001297/2012, E-011166/2011 and E-001921/2012, could the Commission:

1. confirm it is satisfied that the assessments for (a) Clothianidin and (b) Thiamethoxam are compliant with EC law, including their soil persistence levels?

2. provide me with details on the approvals for (a) Clothianidin and (b) Thiamethoxam which include the scientific justifications as well as their assessed soil persistence levels?

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

1. The Commission can confirm that clothianidin and thiametoxam have been assessed according to the rules and satisfy the approval criteria laid down in Council Directive 91/414/EEC. Since 14 June 2011, Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 became applicable. This regulation lays down strict health and environmental criteria (Annex II of that regulation), which take persistence into account in view of the classification of active substances as persistent organic pollutant (POP), persistent bioaccumulative and toxic (PBT) or very persistent and very bioaccumulative substance (vPvB). As laid down in Recital 10 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009, for active substances already approved, the new criteria should be applied at the time of renewal or review of their approval.

2. The details on the approvals are available online ([1]) in the review reports for clothianidin and for thiametoxam, respectively documents SANCO/10533/05 and SANCO/10390/2002.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/sanco_pesticides/public/index.cfm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008152/12
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: Transferability of supplementary pensions

There is currently no common framework in the EU regulating the transferability of company supplementary pension rights. The difficulty citizens face in being unable to transfer supplementary occupational pension rights from one country to another remains a serious obstacle to the free movement of workers within the EU.

This was recognised in the Commission's 1997 Green Paper entitled 'Towards a single market for supplementary pensions'. Two years ago the possible need for this issue to be addressed was highlighted in the Green Paper entitled 'Towards adequate, sustainable and safe European pension systems' (COM(2010) 0365), and Parliament added its weight to reform through its resolution of 16 February 2011 with the same title ([1]).

Can the Commission confirm what progress has been made since then towards a common EU-wide framework for supplementary pensions?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(12 November 2012)

The Commission sought to tackle the issue of transfers of supplementary pensions with its 2005 ([2]) proposal. This proposal looked to set minimum standards for the acquisition, preservation and transfer of supplementary pension rights. Following discussions with Council and a first reading in the Parliament, the Commission issued a revised proposal in 2007 ([3]).

This revised proposal incorporated various amendments proposed by the Parliament, along with technical improvements that were the product of discussions with experts within Council working groups. The Commission dropped the transfer aspect in the revised proposal, given a variety of concerns expressed — including the formidable technical difficulties inherent in transfers. This change also acknowledged that providing pensions rights vest in a timely way and are subsequently preserved, barriers to free movement of workers can be tackled without recourse to transfers.

As the revised proposal could still not be agreed, the Commission consulted in a Green Paper ([4]) on the next steps. The outcome of this consultation ([5]) together with the formal opinions of the European institutions ([6]) reaffirmed that the focus of the Commission's approach should be based on setting minimum standards for the acquisition and preservation of supplementary pensions. Hence the White Paper ([7]) announced that work would resume along these lines and the Cypriot Presidency has agreed to re-open discussions on this dossier. The European Council reiterated its support for action in this area in June 2012, calling for 'the acquisition and preservation of cross-border pension rights and other social security rights for EU workers' to be strengthened ([8]).

([1]) Texts Adopted, P7_TA(2011)0058.
([2]) Proposal for a directive of the European parliament and of the Council on improving the portability of supplementary pension rights. COM(2005) 507 final 2005/0214 (COD) {SEC(2005) 1293}.
([3]) Amended proposal for a directive of the European parliament and of the Council on minimum requirements for enhancing worker mobility by improving the acquisition and preservation of supplementary pension rights. COM(2007) 603 final 2005/0214 (COD).
([4]) COM(2010) 365 final green paper towards adequate, sustainable and safe European pension systems SEC(2010) 830.
([5]) Summary of consultation responses to the green paper 'towards adequate, sustainable and safe European pension systems' Brussels, 7.3.2011.
([6]) European Parliament resolution of 16 February 2011 on 'Towards adequate, sustainable and safe European pension systems' (2010/2239(INI)) said 'considers that, with regard to cross-border issues, the clear focus of EU activity should be on developing minimum standards for the acquisition and preservation of pension rights and on facilitating the establishment of national tracing systems for those rights'.
([7]) COM(2012) 55 final white paper An Agenda for Adequate, Safe and Sustainable Pensions (Text with EEA relevance) {SWD(2012) 7 final} {SWD(2012) 8 final} Brussels, 16.2.2012.
([8]) Conclusions of the European Council of 28/29 June 2012. EUCO 76/12.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-008153/12
aan de Commissie
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(17 september 2012)

Betreft: Moslims vallen westerse doelen aan n.a.v. anti-islamfilm

Wraakzuchtige menigtes hebben gisteren door heel de moslimwereld westerse doelen met grof geweld aangevallen. De moslims zeggen wraak te nemen voor een Amerikaanse anti-islamfilm. De lijst van landen waar gisteren werd gedemonstreerd is eindeloos: Jordanië, Tunesië, Qatar, Jemen, Libanon, Koeweit, Soedan, Algerije, Egypte, Irak, Iran, Israël, de Gazastrook, India, Nigeria, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Afghanistan, Maleisië en Indonesië. Enkele voorbeelden van aanvallen:

— Inwoners van Bahrein verbrandden Amerikaanse en Israëlische vlaggen tijdens een protest tegen de film na het middaggebed in de stad Diraz.

— Duizenden Soedanezen vielen in de hoofdstad Khartoem de ambassades van Groot-Brittannië en Duitsland aan. Zij sloegen de ruiten van de Duitse ambassade in en staken het gebouw in brand.

— In Tunesië bestormde een grote menigte de Amerikaanse ambassade. Op het terrein werd brandgesticht. Vijf mensen kwamen om het leven. Elders in Tunis staken betogers een Amerikaanse school in brand.

— Ook in Jeruzalem braken na het middaggebed anti-Amerikaanse protesten uit. Even buiten de Oude Stad kwam het tot een botsing tussen woedende moslims en de oproerpolitie.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht „Moslims vallen over de hele wereld westerse doelen aan”? ([1])

2. Hoe ervaart de Commissie de (tot dusverre) door moslims gepleegde aanvallen op westerse doelen naar aanleiding van slechts één enkele anti-islamfilm? Veroordeelt de Commissie deze aanvallen? Zo neen, waarom niet?

3. Is de Commissie ertoe bereid stelling te nemen in dezen? Zo neen, waarom niet? Zo ja, kiest zij partij voor de gewelddadige moslims óf voor de vrijheid van meningsuiting waarvan de betreffende anti-islamfilm simpelweg een product is?

4. Wat denkt de Commissie van eventueel toekomstige aanvallen door moslims op EU-grondgebied naar aanleiding van de betreffende anti-islamfilm? Hoe gaat de Commissie dergelijke aanvallen op EU-grondgebied voorkomen / bestrijden?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(14 november 2012)

De EU heeft de gebeurtenissen die werden veroorzaakt door de trailer „Innocence of Muslims” en de cartoons van Charlie Hebdo nauw gevolgd. Deze hebben geleid tot geweld en protest in verschillende delen van de wereld met een moslimmeerderheid.

De hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter heeft in haar verklaring van 14 september 2012 het geweld veroordeeld. Ook heeft zij in een gezamenlijke verklaring van 20 september 2012 met de secretaris-generaal van de Organisatie van Islamitische Samenwerking, de secretaris-generaal van de Arabische Liga en de commissaris voor vrede en veiligheid van de Afrikaanse Unie krachtig gepleit voor vrede en verdraagzaamheid.

Er is geen rechtvaardiging voor geweld. In de delen van de wereld met een moslimmeerderheid hebben veel publieke en politieke leiders het geweld ook snel veroordeeld. Laten we ook niet vergeten dat de demonstraties in een aantal landen vredig zijn verlopen.

De EU veroordeelt elke oproep tot van religieuze haat die aanspoort tot vijandelijkheden en geweld. Het gedrag van kleine groepen mensen is niet representatief voor de grotere gemeenschappen waaruit deze afkomstig zijn, maar de schade die zij aanrichten kan wel aanzienlijk zijn.

([1]) De Telegraaf, 15.9.2012.

De EU moet er samen met de Organisatie van Islamitische Samenwerking, de Arabische Liga en de Afrikaanse Unie op toezien dat de recente gebeurtenissen de relatie van vertrouwen en respect die doorheen de jaren is opgebouwd tussen hun volkeren, gemeenschappen en staten niet ondermijnen. De internationale gemeenschap mag niet worden gegijzeld door extremisten, in eender welke maatschappij.

De recente gebeurtenissen benadrukken bovenal dat er dringend meer inspanningen moeten worden geleverd ter bevordering van verdraagzaamheid en respect, waarden die door iedereen moeten worden uitgedragen en aangemoedigd. De EU wil hiertoe binnen de Unie gebruikmaken van alle middelen die de Verdragen bieden, voor het bestrijden van elke vorm en uiting van racisme of vreemdelingenhaat, met inbegrip van religieus gemotiveerde vormen van geweld en haat ([2]).

([2]) Voor verdere informatie over het werk dat wordt uitgevoerd in dit gebied, zie bv.: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/racism-xenophobia/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008153/12
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: Muslims attack western targets in connection with anti-Islamic film

On 14 September 2012 revenge-seeking crowds employing crude violence attacked western targets throughout the Muslim world. The Muslims say that they are taking revenge for an American anti-Islamic film. The list of countries where demonstrations took place on 14 September is endless: Jordan, Tunisia, Qatar, Yemen, Lebanon, Kuwait, Sudan, Algeria, Egypt, Iraq, Iran, Israel, the Gaza Strip, India, Nigeria, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Afghanistan, Malaysia and Indonesia. Examples of such attacks include:

— People in Bahrain burned American and Israeli flags during a protest against the film after midday prayers in the town of Diraz.

— Thousands of Sudanese attacked the embassies of the United Kingdom and Germany in the capital Khartoum. They smashed the windows of the German Embassy and set the building on fire.

— In Tunisia a large crowd stormed the American Embassy. They started fires on the premises. Five people were killed. Elsewhere in Tunis demonstrators set fire to an American school.

— In Jerusalem, too, anti-American protests broke out after midday prayers. There were clashes just outside the Old City between angry Muslims and the riot police.

1. Is the Commission aware of the report entitled 'Muslims attack western targets across the world'? ([1])

2. What view does the Commission take of the attacks to date carried out by Muslims on Western targets caused by just one anti-Islamic film? Does the Commission condemn these attacks? If not, why not?

3. Is the Commission prepared to adopt a position on these matters? If not, why not? If so, does it take the side of the violent Muslims or of freedom of opinion, of which the anti-Islamic film concerned is simply a product?

4. What is the Commission's view on possible future attacks by Muslims on EU territory as a result of the anti-Islamic film in question? How does the Commission intend to prevent/combat such attacks on EU territory?

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

The EU has followed very closely recent events triggered by the trailer 'Innocence of Muslims' and the Charlie Hebdo cartoons which have resulted in violence and protests in many parts of the Muslim majority world.

The HR/VP has firmly condemned the violence in her statement of 14 September 2012 and she has sent a strong message of peace and tolerance in her joint statement with the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) Secretary General, League of Arab States (LAS) Secretary General and African Union (AU) Commissioner for Peace and Security of 20 September 2012.

There can be no justification for violence. Many leading public and political figures in the Muslim majority world have also been swift in their condemnation of the violence. One should not forget either that in a number of countries, the protests have been peaceful.

The EU condemns any advocacy of religious hatred that constitutes incitement to hostility and violence. The behaviour of small groups of people does not speak for the larger communities from which they hail, but the damage they can inflict can be considerable.

The EU must ensure together with the OIC, LAS and AU that recent events do not undermine the relationships of trust and respect built up over so many years among its people, communities and states. The international community cannot be held hostage to the acts of extremists in any society.

([1]) *De Telegraaf*, 15.9.2012.

If anything, these recent events underline the urgency of stepping up the effort to foster tolerance and respect, values which need to be practiced and encouraged by all. The EU intends to do so within the EU by making use of all means available under the Treaties to fight against all forms and manifestations of racism and xenophobia, including violence and hatred based on religion ([2]).

([2]) For further information on the work carried out in this field, see: e.g. http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/racism-xenophobia/index_en.htm

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-008155/12
aan de Commissie (Vicevoorzitter — Hoge Vertegenwoordiger)
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(17 september 2012)

Betreft: VP/HR — „Arabische Lente" = Arabische winter

De betogers van de „Arabische Lente" wisten drie dictators te verdrijven, maar zélf kwamen zij niet aan de macht. Zij hebben het afgelegd tegen een goed georganiseerde beweging die duidelijke ideeën heeft over de maatschappij en daarnaast ook nog de conservatieve waarden uitdraagt die door een groot deel van bevolking worden gedeeld. En dat zijn de radicale, fundamentalistische salafisten. Het zijn deze salafisten die in het Tunesische Sidi Bouzid een hotel bestormden en alle flessen alcohol tegen de muren kapot gooiden. En het zijn veelal salafisten die nu overal in de moslimwereld Amerikaanse doelen aanvallen, uit wraak voor een Amerikaanse anti-islamfilm. Het zijn hoogstwaarschijnlijk ook deze salafisten die verantwoordelijk zijn voor de aanval op het Amerikaanse consulaat in Libië, waarbij onder meer de Amerikaanse ambassadeur om het leven kwam.

Het is onder druk van de salafisten dat toch al radicale partijen als Ennahda in Tunesië en de Moslimbroederschap in Egypte nóg fundamentalistischer worden. Zo behaalde de salafistische partij Al-Nour maar liefst een kwart van de stemmen bij de parlementsverkiezingen.

1. Is de Vicevoorzitter/Hoge Vertegenwoordiger bekend met het bericht „Extremisten kapen Arabische Lente" ([1])?

2. Wat vindt de Vicevoorzitter/Hoge Vertegenwoordiger ervan dat het gevolg van de zogenaamde, tevens door haar zo geprezen, „Arabische Lente" is dat de radicale, fundamentalistische salafisten aan de macht komen, die louter verdere islamisering, onder andere door invoering van de sharia en verwerping van de democratie, voor ogen hebben?

3. Deelt de Vicevoorzitter/Hoge Vertegenwoordiger de mening dat de „Arabische Lente" een mislukking/farce is? Is de Vicevoorzitter/Hoge Vertegenwoordiger ertoe bereid voortaan van Arabische Winter te spreken? Zo neen, waarom niet? Zo neen, hoe kan de Vicevoorzitter/Hoge Vertegenwoordiger de „Arabische Lente", in het licht van recente verwerpelijke ontwikkelingen, nog verdedigen?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(20 november 2012)

Sinds het uitbreken van de opstand in december 2010 tegen het regime van Ben Ali in Tunesië hebben er zich een reeks opmerkelijke volksopstanden in het Midden-Oosten en Noord-Afrika voorgedaan. Soms ging het om geweldloze burgerlijke ongehoorzaamheid, in andere gevallen was er sprake van gewapende opstanden. Eisen voor waardigheid, volkssoevereiniteit en sociale rechtvaardigheid lagen aan de basis van elke opstand. Dit proces blijft aanhouden.

De EU en de hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter hebben snel betrekkingen aangeknoopt met het nieuwe politieke leiderschap in die landen waar de verkiezingen nieuwe leiders aan de macht hebben gebracht. Onze steun is cruciaal.

Wij hielden er rekening mee dat er zich moeilijkheden zouden voordoen en de huidige situatie is daar een voorbeeld van. We hebben vastgesteld dat een aantal groepen politiek actief zijn geworden die het herstel van waardigheid zien als een terugkeer naar vormen van vroomheid en „authenticiteit" die de versterking van de positie van de vrouw, de rechten van minderheden en culturele vrijheden afkeurt. De spanningen tussen enkele salafisten en de meer gematigde islamisten zijn op de voorgrond getreden. We moeten rekening houden met deze complexe relaties wanneer we de recente aanvallen die deels geïnspireerd zijn door de anti-islam film „Innocence of Muslims" analyseren.

Het idee van een opkomende Arabische Winter doet geen recht aan de huidige situatie op het terrein. Hoewel de angst begrijpelijk kan zijn, zeker in het licht van de recente gebeurtenissen, is deze paniekzaaierij misplaatst. Binnen de beweging van de islamisten is er een breed ideologisch en politiek spectrum, maar toch vormen radicale salafisten een hele kleine minderheid in Tunesië en zelfs in Egypte zijn de meer gematigde islamisten talrijker.

De nieuwe politieke leiders in Tunesië en Egypte wachten nog veel uitdagingen, vooral op financieel vlak. Zij moeten resultaten boeken of aftreden. De weg zoeken tussen een cultureel conservatief wereldbeeld en een sterke garantie voor een pluralistische en tolerante maatschappij zal een belangrijke test zijn.

([1]) De Telegraaf, 15 september 2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008155/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — 'Arab Spring' = Arab Winter

The 'Arab Spring' demonstrators succeeded in driving out three dictators, but they themselves did not come to power. They lost out against a well-organised movement which has clear ideas about society and, moreover, also propagates the conservative values that are shared by a large part of the population. And these people are the radical fundamentalist Salafists. It was the Salafists who stormed a hotel in the Tunisian town of Sidi Bouzid and smashed all the bottles of alcohol against the walls. And it is mostly Salafists who are now attacking American targets throughout the Muslim world in revenge for an American anti-Islamic film. In all probability, it was also these same Salafists who were responsible for the attack on the American consulate in Libya in which, among others, the American ambassador was killed.

It is under pressure from the Salafists that existing radical parties such as Ennahda in Tunisia and the Muslim brotherhood in Egypt are becoming even more fundamentalist. Thus the Salafist party Al-Nour won no less than a quarter of the votes in the Egyptian parliamentary elections.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the report entitled 'Extremists hijack Arab Spring' ([1])?

2. What is the Vice-President/High Representative's opinion on the fact that the outcome of the so-called 'Arab Spring' (which was moreover so highly praised by the Commission) is that the radical fundamentalist Salafists are coming to power, whose sole aim is further Islamisation, including, among other things, the introduction of Sharia law and the rejection of democracy?

3. Does the Vice-President/High Representative agree that the 'Arab Spring' is a failure/farce? Is the Vice-President/High Representative prepared to speak from now on of the Arab Winter? If not, why not? If not, how can the Vice-President/High Representative still defend the 'Arab Spring' in the light of recent deplorable developments?

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

Since December 2010, with the revolt against the Ben-Ali regime in Tunisia, the Middle East and North Africa have been swept by a remarkable series of popular uprisings. These have ranged from non-violent civil disobedience to armed insurrection. But each one has been driven by demands for dignity, popular sovereignty and social justice. The process continues to unfold.

The EU and HR/VP have been quick to engage the new political leadership in those countries where elections have brought to power new leaders. Our support is crucial.

We expected bumps along the road and the current situation is an example of this. We have witnessed the arrival on the political arena of groups for whom restoration of dignity means a return to forms of piety and 'authenticity' that frown upon women's empowerment, minority rights and cultural freedoms. The tensions between some Salafists and the more 'mainstream Islamists' have come to the forefront. We need to take these complex relationships into account when we analyse the recent attacks partly inspired by the anti-Islam film 'Innocence of Muslims'.

The idea of an approaching 'Arab Winter' does not do justice to the actual situation on the ground. While the fears may be understandable not least in light of recent events, this alarmism is misplaced. Islamists span a wide ideological and political spectrum, yet radical Salafists constitute a very small minority in Tunisia and even in Egypt they are outnumbered by the more moderate Islamists.

The new political leaderships in Tunisia and Egypt have a lot of challenges ahead, financial not least. They must deliver or leave. Steering the way between a culturally conservative world-view and a firm guarantee of a pluralistic and tolerant society will be an important test.

([1]) *De Telegraaf*, 15 September 2012.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-008156/12
до Комисията
Mariya Gabriel (PPE)
(17 септември 2012 г.)

Относно: Новите сортове растения

Селектирането на нови сортове растения спомага за оформянето на бъдещата международна хранителна верига и има своя принос за изхранването на населението, адаптирането към климатичните промени, запазването на биоразнообразието и устойчивото развитие на селското стопанство, градинарството и горите.

За да се развива селекционирането в нормални пазарни рамки, е важна не само ролята на селекционера като изобретател, но и на администрацията. Отношенията, свързани със създаването, закрилата и използването на новите сортове растения в България, се уреждат чрез Закона за закрила на новите сортове растения и породи животни. Той се прилага по отношение на създадени или открити и разработени сортове растения от всеки ботанически род и вид, в това число клон, линия, хибрид или подложка, независимо от метода на получаването им (изкуствен или естествен).

Новите идеи в ОСП и политиката в областта на земеделието на България отразяват напълно динамичността на процесите, свързани със запазването на биоразнообразието.

1. В тази връзка какви мерки предприема ЕК за защита на новите сортове растения и в кои директиви и регламенти на европейското законодателство се урежда техният статут?

2. Какви са възможностите за финансиране на тези нови сортове?

3. Как могат селекционерите на нови сортове растения да бъдат субсидирани в страните, в които подобни дейности не се финансират чрез Програмата за развитие на селските райони?

4. По какъв начин е засегнат въпросът с новите сортове растения в рамките на новата ОСП?

Отговор, даден от г-н Циолос от името на Комисията
(29 ноември 2012 г.)

Закрилата на сортовете растения се урежда с Регламент (ЕО) № 2100/94 на Съвета ([1]), в който се предвижда единна и хармонизирана правна закрила на доброволни начала за сортовете растения на територията на ЕС. В регламента се посочват правилата за подаване на заявка, тестване и одобрение на нови сортове и с него се осигурява закрила, валидна във всички държави членки, посредством процедурата за подаване на една-единствена заявка.

Държавите членки могат да предоставят държавна помощ на създателите на нови сортове съгласно разпоредбите на регламента за групово освобождаване в селскостопанския сектор ([2]), съгласно насоките за земеделския сектор ([3]) или в съответствие с регламента за помощите *de minimis* в селскостопанския сектор ([4]).

В европейските рамкови програми за научни изследвания се предвижда да се предоставя подкрепа за растениевъдството с оглед изготвянето на характеристика на генетичните ресурси, създаването на генетични и геномни средства за растениевъдство или разработването на новаторски подходи в растениевъдството с цел създаването на подобрени сортове растения. По линия на рамковата програма за научни изследвания и иновации „Хоризонт 2020“ също ще се предоставя подкрепа за иновациите в растениевъдството.

Съхранението на генетичните ресурси в селското стопанство е в основата на разработването на подобрени култури и сортове. Комисията си дава сметка за изключителното значение на генетичните ресурси, затова ги счита за приоритет.

([1]) ОВ L 227, 1.9.1994 г., стр. 1-30.
([2]) ОВ L 358, 16.12.2006 г., стр. 3-21.
([3]) ОВ C 319, 27.12.2006 г., стр. 1-33.
([4]) ОВ L 337, 21.12.2007 г., стр. 35-41.

Тази област ще е сред приоритетите на научните изследвания и иновации в селското стопанство след 2013 г. В рамките на общата селскостопанска политика (ОСП) развитието на селските райони ([5]) предвижда предоставянето на подкрепа за разработването на нови продукти, процеси и технологии, както и за провеждането на сътрудничество. В предложената от Комисията реформа на ОСП ([6]) е включено предоставянето на подкрепа за разработването на селскостопански продукти и за провеждането на сътрудничество между различните участници, в това число оперативните групи в рамките на Европейското партньорство за иновации. В предложението за „Хоризонт 2020“ ([7]) се предвижда предоставянето на значителни финансови средства за научни изследвания и иновации в селското стопанство. Опазването, подобряването и внедряването на различни сортове и видове в производствената верига ще представлява важна област на развитие.

([5]) ОВ L 277, 21.10.2005 г.
([6]) COM(20011) 627 окончателен 2.
([7]) COM(2011) 809 окончателен.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008156/12
to the Commission
Mariya Gabriel (PPE)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: New plant varieties

The selection of new plant varieties helps to build the international food chain of the future and contributes to food supply security, climate change adaptation, the preservation of biodiversity and the sustainable development of agriculture, horticulture and forestry.

Securing normal market conditions for the development of plant breeding depends not only on the plant breeder's creative role but also on how the sector is administered. In Bulgaria, matters related to the creation, protection and use of new plant varieties are regulated under the New Plant Varieties and Animal Breeds Protection Act, which covers the creation or discovery and the development of plant varieties of all botanical genera and species, including branches, lines, hybrids and stock thereof, irrespective of how they are obtained (i.e. artificially or naturally).

The new ideas in the common agricultural policy and agriculture-related policy in Bulgaria fully reflect the dynamic nature of the processes involved in preserving biodiversity.

1. What measures is the Commission taking in this regard to protect new plant varieties, and which EU directives and regulations will provide for their status?

2. What scope is there for funding such new varieties?

3. How can plant breeders be subsidised in countries where the sector is not funded under the rural development programme?

4. How is the question of new plant varieties affected by the new CAP?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(29 November 2012)

Plant varieties are protected by Regulation (EC) No 2100/94 ([1]), which provides voluntary, uniform and harmonised EU-wide plant variety rights. It sets out rules for the application, testing and approval of new varieties and provides protection effective in all Member States via a single application process.

Member States can give state aid for plant breeders according to the rules of the agricultural block exemption regulation ([2]), the rules of the Agricultural Guidelines ([3]) or under the agricultural *de minimis* regulation ([4]).

The European Research Framework Programmes provides support to the plant breeding sector to characterise genetic resources, create genetic and genomic breeding tools or to develop novel breeding approaches to develop improved plant varieties. The research programme 'Horizon 2020' will also support innovations in the breeding sector.

The conservation of genetic resources in agriculture is the basis for improved crops and breeds. The Commission, aware of their utmost importance, considers genetic resources a high priority.

This area will be one of the priorities for agricultural research and innovation post 2013. Within the CAP, rural development ([5]) foresees support for the development of new products, processes and technologies, as well as for cooperation. The Commission CAP reform ([6]) includes support for development of agricultural products and for cooperation between various actors, including for the operational groups in the European Innovation Partnership. Within the Horizon 2020 Proposal ([7]) significant funding is allocated to agricultural research and innovation. The conservation as well as the amelioration and the take up of various breeds and species in the production chain will be an important area of development.

([1]) OJ L 227, 1.9.1994, pp. 1-30.
([2]) OJ L 358 of 16.12.2006, pp. 3-21.
([3]) OJ C 319 of 27.12.2006, pp. 1-33.
([4]) OJ L 337 of 21.12.2007, pp. 35-41.
([5]) OJ L 277, 21.10.2005.
([6]) COM(20011) 627 final 2.
([7]) COM(2011) 809 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008157/12
alla Commissione
Marco Scurria (PPE)
(17 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Retroattività delle comunicazioni della Commissione

In data 24.8.2011 è stata pubblicata sulla Gazzetta Ufficiale dell'Unione europea una comunicazione della Commissione, nell'ambito dell'applicazione della direttiva 89/106/CEE, del Consiglio, del 21 dicembre 1988, relativa al ravvicinamento delle disposizioni legislative, regolamentari e amministrative degli Stati Membri concernenti i prodotti da costruzione, che stabiliva che la marcatura CEN EN 14081-1:2005+A1:2011 Strutture di legno — Legno strutturale con sezione rettangolare classificato secondo la resistenza — Parte 1: Requisiti generali, entrava in vigore l'1.10.2011 e fissava la data della fine del periodo di coesistenza al 1.10.2012.

In data 19.6.2012 è stata pubblicata un'altra comunicazione della Commissione nell'ambito dell'applicazione della direttiva 89/106/CEE, del Consiglio, del 21 dicembre 1988, relativa al ravvicinamento delle disposizioni legislative, regolamentari e amministrative degli Stati Membri concernenti i prodotti da costruzione, che stabiliva, come la precedente, che la marcatura CEN EN 14081-1:2005+A1:2011 Strutture di legno — Legno strutturale con sezione rettangolare classificato secondo la resistenza — Parte 1: Requisiti generali, entrava in vigore l'1.10.2011, ma ne anticipava tuttavia la scadenza del periodo di coesistenza al 31.12.2011, di fatto mettendo fuori legge tutte le attività e gli accordi pattuiti nel periodo gennaio-giugno 2012.

La Commissione ha facoltà di fissare in maniera retroattiva la data di scadenza del periodo di coesistenza tra norme comunitarie e legislazione nazionale con una comunicazione nell'ambito dell'applicazione di una direttiva?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(8 novembre 2012)

In linea con la procedura concordata con gli Stati membri e l'industria, la norma EN 14081-1 è stata per la prima volta indicata quale norma EN armonizzata nel giugno 2006 con un periodo iniziale di coesistenza che scadeva l'1.9.2007. In risposta alle successive richieste dell'industria, il periodo di coesistenza summenzionato è stato esteso per altre tre volte fino all'1/9/2012.

In seguito a una richiesta dell'industria presentata nel gennaio 2011 volta ad abbreviare il periodo di coesistenza e dopo aver consultato gli Stati membri, la Commissione ha comunicato agli Stati membri il 2.05.2011 che la scadenza del periodo di coesistenza per la norma EN 14081-1 sarebbe stato il 31.12.2011.

Per rendere pubblicamente accessibili questo tipo di informazioni la Commissione pubblica periodicamente una tabella contenente le norme armonizzate nel contesto di una comunicazione della Commissione pubblicata sulla GUUE, serie C, nonché sul sito web NANDO ([1]) che è lo strumento elettronico di notifica di cui all'articolo R23 della decisione 768/2008 ([2]) relativa a un quadro comune per la commercializzazione dei prodotti.

Il 3.05.2011 la Commissione ha aggiornato di conseguenza il sito web NANDO e ha pubblicato il 24.08.2011 sulla GUUE il periodo di coesistenza aggiornato per la norma EN 14081-1. A causa di un errore editoriale la scadenza del periodo di coesistenza per la versione riveduta della norma è stata indicata erroneamente quale 1.10.2012. Si è immediatamente attirata l'attenzione degli Stati membri e dell'industria sulla data corretta, che era il 31.12.2011, come indicato sul sito web NANDO.

Pertanto, nella più recente pubblicazione dell'elenco consolidato di norme EN armonizzate pubblicato nel luglio 2012, è indicata la data corretta del periodo di coesistenza (31.12.2011). Ciò può dar adito a un malinteso e far pensare a un'abbreviazione retroattiva del periodo di coesistenza, ma ciò non è avvenuto come si evince da quanto sopra.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/newapproach/nando/
([2]) Decisione n. 768/2008/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 9 luglio 2008, relativa a un quadro comune per la commercializzazione dei prodotti e che abroga la decisione 93/465/CEE, GU L 218 del 13.8.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008157/12
to the Commission
Marco Scurria (PPE)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: Retroactivity of Commission communications

On 24 August 2011 the *Official Journal of the European Union* published the 'Commission communication in the framework of the implementation of Council Directive 89/106/EEC of 21 December 1988 on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States relating to construction products'. This communication stipulated that the standard 'CEN | EN 14081-1:2005+A1:2011 Timber structures — Strength graded structural timber with rectangular cross section — Part 1: General requirements' was to enter into force on 1 October 2011 and set the date of 1 October 2012 as the end of the coexistence period.

On 19 June 2012 a further Commission communication was published 'in the framework of the implementation of the Council Directive 89/106/EEC of 21 December 1988 on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States relating to construction products', which stipulated, as above, that the standard 'CEN | EN 14081-1:2005+A1:2011 Timber structures — Strength graded structural timber with rectangular cross section — Part 1: General requirements' was to enter into force on 1 October 2011. However, it brought forward the end of the coexistence period to 31 December 2011, effectively outlawing all activities carried out and agreements made in the period January-June 2012.

Does the Commission have the right to establish retrospectively the date of expiry of the period of coexistence between Community law and national law with a communication in the framework of the implementation of a directive?

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

In line with the procedure agreed with Member States and industry, the standard EN 14081-1 was first quoted as a harmonised EN standard in June 2006 with an initial co-existence period until 1 September 2007. In response to subsequent industry requests, the above coexistence period has been extended three more times until 1 September 2012.

Following a request from industry in January 2011 to shorten the coexistence period and having consulted the Member States, the Commission communicated to the Member States on 2 May 2011 that the end of the coexistence period for EN 14081-1 would be 31 December 2011.

To make this information publicly available, the Commission periodically publishes a table with the harmonised standards in a Commission Communication in the OJEU Series C and also on the NANDO ([1]) website which is the electronic notification tool referred to in Article R23 of Decision 768/2008/EC ([2]) on a common framework for the marketing of products.

The Commission updated the NANDO website accordingly on 3 May 2011 and published on 24 August 2011 in the OJEU the updated coexistence period for EN 14081-1. Due to an editorial error, the end of the coexistence period for the revised version of the standard was incorrectly mentioned as 1 October 2012. The attention of the Member States and of industry was immediately drawn to the correct date of 31 December 2011 as indicated on the NANDO website.

Therefore, in the latest publication of the consolidated list of harmonised EN standards published in July 2012, the correct date of the end of the co-existence period is mentioned (31 December 2011). This could be misunderstood as 'retroactively shortening the coexistence period' but, as explained above, this is not the case.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/newapproach/nando/
([2]) Decision 768/2008/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 9 July 2008 on a common framework for the marketing of products, OJ L 218, 13.8.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008158/12
to the Commission
Fiona Hall (ALDE)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: Applicability of EU trade agreements if a Member State leaves the EU

If a Member State activated Article 50 of the Treaty on European Union in order to leave the European Union it would no longer form part of the customs territory of the EU.

1. Would that Member State cease to benefit from the preferential trade conditions under the EU's trade agreements with third countries?

2. What is the value of the EU's existing trade agreements with third countries? What value does the Commission estimate will come from the free trade agreements it is currently negotiating with third countries?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(24 October 2012)

The Commission takes the view that if a Member State were to leave the European Union it would no longer benefit from preferential arrangements included in EU trade agreements. In such circumstances, a Member State would not be subject to the Union's common commercial policy and could no longer benefit from agreements negotiated on that basis. Moreover, a third country offers concessions to the EU on a reciprocal basis, expecting market access to the Union as a whole. Third countries would be unlikely to offer as generous concessions to a Member State which has activated Article 50 that could only offer access to its own market.

The EU is one of the most important members of the WTO and has benefited tremendously from the rules-bases trade opening provided by 65 years of GATT-WTO. A quarter of EU bilateral trade already benefits from Free Trade Agreements (FTAs). Several further negotiations have been concluded but are still to enter into force (e.g. Colombia and Peru and Central America). Overall, about 30 million jobs in the EU, or more than 10% of the total workforce, depend on sales to the rest of the world, an increase of almost 50% since 1995. The Commission estimates that the potential agreements currently being negotiated or discussed with third countries could permanently add more than 2% to the EU's GDP or some EUR 275 billion annually. This is equivalent to adding a country as big as Austria or Denmark to the EU economy. In terms of jobs, these agreements could generate more than 2 million new jobs (equivalent to one tenth of the current number of unemployed). Further details are provided in the Commission Staff Working Document on 'External sources of growth' (18.07.2012) ([1]).

([1]) http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2012/july/tradoc_149807.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-008159/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Barbara Matera (PPE)
(17 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Violenza in Kenia

Dall'agosto 2012 gli scontri etnici tra la comunità agricola Pokomo e la comunità pastorizia Orma nella regione del fiume Tana in Kenia hanno causato 112 morti tra civili e poliziotti. La lotta ha le proprie origini in un conflitto fondamentale su risorse vitali come il cibo e l'acqua in una regione del paese che spicca per disuguaglianza. Le due tribù hanno una storia di scontri sulle risorse della regione, ma la lotta ha raggiunto negli ultimi mesi culmini ai quali il Kenia non aveva assistito dalla fine del 2007-inizi 2008. Benché lo scontro tra questi due gruppi non costituisca nulla di nuovo, l'introduzione di armi ha non solo rafforzato la gravità delle perdite umane, ma ha anche rafforzato i sospetti in merito alla motivazione alla radice degli attacchi e alla provenienza delle armi da fuoco. Molti temono che il Consiglio repubblicano di Mombasa, un movimento secessionista, abbia incitato la violenza nel tentativo di influenzare l'esito delle prossime elezioni in Kenia previste per il marzo 2013.

Il governo keniota è stato lento nel rispondere e la sua mancanza di azione è stata monitorata dai legislatori nell'intero paese. Tuttavia, anche dopo l'imposizione del coprifuoco nella regione da parte del Presidente Kibaki il 10 settembre 2012 — l'azione più incisiva che il governo abbia adottato dallo scoppio delle aggressioni tra i due gruppi il mese scorso — i combattimenti non sono cessati. Inoltre, la risposta delle squadre di polizia è stata ritardata e insufficiente per fermare gli attacchi a ciascun gruppo. Militari kenioti hanno riconosciuto che l'esercito potrebbe essere chiamato a controllare la situazione ma nessun passo è stato adottato in tale senso. Mentre alcuni militari hanno affermato che gli scontri stanno giungendo al termine, si sono registrati attacchi fino all'11 settembre 2012, costringendo i civili ad evacuare la regione nel timore di ulteriori violenze.

Si chiede quindi al Vice Presidente/Alto Rappresentante:

1. Quale azione ha adottato per ristabilire la pace nella regione del fiume Tana in Kenia?

2. La delegazione UE in Kenia è in contatto con funzionari del governo per determinare quali azioni stiano adottando per controllare e porre termine alla violenza nel distretto del fiume Tana? In caso positivo, l'UE intende offrire risorse o sostenere la polizia e le forze militari keniote?

3. Sono stati compiuti sforzi per individuare la provenienza delle armi fornite alle comunità Pokomo e Orma? In caso positivo, vi sono piani per fermare l'importazione di armi da fuoco nella regione?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(30 ottobre 2012)

L'Unione europea nutre profonde preoccupazioni per i violenti scontri nella provincia costiera del Kenya che, negli ultimi tempi, hanno causato più di un centinaio di vittime e migliaia di sfollati. La delegazione dell'UE ha rilasciato una dichiarazione ([1]) e ha invitato le parti coinvolte a porre fine a ogni forma di violenza e a intraprendere un dialogo al fine di appianare le divergenze.

Inoltre, i capi missione dell'UE stanno organizzando una visita nel delta del fiume Tana per incontrare le autorità locali e le popolazioni colpite.

Gli scontri hanno dimostrato quanto sia importante far progredire il programma di riforma e, in particolare, la riforma delle forze di polizia, in modo da garantire sicurezza e stato di diritto. L'UE incoraggia e sostiene tale programma, avviato nel 2008 in seguito alle violenze verificatesi dopo le elezioni del 2007.

L'UE sostiene altresì le iniziative del governo kenyota volte a risolvere parte delle problematiche alla radice dei conflitti, nello specifico promuovendo lo sviluppo economico e sociale delle zone aride e semiaride, ivi compresa la regione del fiume Tana.

([1]) http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/kenya/documents/press_corner/20120913.pdf

Per quanto concerne la disponibilità di armi leggere, la questione è strettamente connessa ai conflitti nei paesi vicini. Il contribuito dell'UE alle iniziative a favore dell'instaurazione della pace in Sudan, Sud Sudan e Somalia dovrebbe anche ridurre la disponibilità di armi leggere nella regione. Inoltre, l'UE contribuisce alla lotta contro la proliferazione di armi leggere e di piccolo calibro (SALW) in Africa sostenendo il centro regionale per le armi leggere e di piccolo calibro, con sede in Kenya. Il sostegno dell'UE mira principalmente ad aumentare le capacità di attuazione dei paesi e delle regioni partner del centro regionale per le armi leggere e di piccolo calibro in materia di SALW, nonché a sensibilizzarli al riguardo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008159/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Barbara Matera (PPE)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Violence in Kenya

Since August 2012, ethnic clashes between the Pokomo farming community and the Orma pastoralist community in the Tana River region of Kenya have resulted in 112 deaths of civilians and police officers. The fighting has its roots in a basic conflict over vital resources such as food and water in an area of the country that is rampant with inequality. The two tribes have a history of battling over the resources in the area, but the fighting over the past months has been some of the worst that Kenya has witnessed since late 2007 and early 2008. While the clash between these two groups is nothing new, the introduction of guns has not only increased the severity of the casualties, but has also raised suspicions as to the motivation behind the attacks and the source of the firearms. Many fear that the Mombasa Republican Council, a secessionist movement, has been inciting violence in an effort to influence the outcome of the forthcoming elections in Kenya, scheduled for March 2013.

The Kenyan Government has been slow to respond, and its lack of action has been scrutinised by lawmakers throughout the country. However, even after President Kibaki imposed a curfew in the region on 10 September 2012 — the most decisive action the government has taken since the outbreak of the aggression between the two groups last month — the fighting has not stopped. Additionally, the response from police teams has been delayed and insufficient to halt the attacks on each group. Kenyan military officials have recognised that the army may need to be deployed in order to control the situation, but no steps have been taken to do so. While some officials have stated that the fighting is coming to a close, attacks have occurred as recently as 11 September 2012, forcing civilians to evacuate the area in fear of further violence.

Accordingly, could the Vice-President/High Representative say:

1. what action she has taken to restore peace in the Tana River area of Kenya?

2. whether the EU Delegation to Kenya has been in contact with government officials to determine what action they are taking to control and end the violence in the Tana River District? If so, does the EU have plans to offer resources or support to the Kenyan police and military forces?

3. whether efforts have been made to determine the source of weapons supplied to the Pokomo and Orma communities? If so, are there plans in place to halt the import of firearms into the area?

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

The EU is very concerned by the violent clashes in Kenya's Coast Province that have recently killed over one hundred people and displaced thousands. The EU Delegation has issued a statement ([1]) and called upon all parties to cease violence and engage in dialogue in order to resolve their differences.

Moreover, EU Heads of Mission are planning a field trip to the Tana River Delta to meet with local authorities and the people affected.

The clashes have demonstrated the importance of taking forward the reform agenda and in particular the reform of the police in order to ensure security and rule of law. The EU has been encouraging and supporting this reform process which was launched in 2008 following the violence after the 2007 elections.

In addition, the EU has been supporting efforts by the Government of Kenya to address some of the underlying grievances of these conflicts notably by promoting economic and social development of the arid and semi-arid lands, including the Tana River Region.

As regards the availability of small arms, this issue is very much linked to the conflicts in neighbouring countries. The EU contribution to peacebuilding efforts in the Sudans and Somalia should also reduce the availability of small arms in the region. Moreover, the EU contributes to the fight against Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) proliferation in Africa by supporting the Regional Centre for Small Arms and Light Weapons (RECSA) based in Kenya. The main aim of the support is to increase implementing capacity and to raise awareness on SALW in RECSA partner countries and regions.

([1]) http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/kenya/documents/press_corner/20120913.pdf