

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 354 E/01)

Treść	Strona
E-000661/13 by Olga Sehnalová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Changing the VAT rate on nappies	
České znění	25
English version	26
E-000662/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Guinea-Bissau: possible postponement of future elections	
Versão portuguesa	27
English version	28
E-000663/13 by Catherine Bearder to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Guarantees for electrical goods	
English version	29
E-000664/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Misuse of corporate power by the Spanish state	
Versión española	30
English version	31
P-000665/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Another scandalous case of EU funds being paid to the mafia	
Versione italiana	32
English version	33
P-000666/13 by Erik Bánki to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Member States' best practices in the field of physical education	
Magyar változat	34
English version	35

E-000667/13 by Georgios Stavrakakis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Estimated payment requests for 2012 per policy area and per fund	
Ελληνική έκδοση	36
English version	37
E-000668/13 by Georgios Stavrakakis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Estimated payment requests for 2012 by Member State	
Ελληνική έκδοση	36
English version	37
E-000669/13 by Georgios Stavrakakis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Level of RALs from 2007 until 2012	
Ελληνική έκδοση	38
English version	39
E-000670/13 by Georgios Stavrakakis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Composition of RALs between 2007 and 2012	
Ελληνική έκδοση	38
English version	39
E-000671/13 by Georgios Stavrakakis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Estimated RAL projection for the first quarter of 2013	
Ελληνική έκδοση	40
English version	41
E-000672/13 by Franz Obermayr to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Case of Dr Cyril Karabus and human rights in the United Arab Emirates	
Deutsche Fassung	42
English version	43
E-000673/13 by Zbigniew Ziobro and Tadeusz Cymański to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Situation at the Leżajsk Machine Plant	
Wersja polska	44
English version	45
E-000674/13 by Marek Henryk Migalski to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Independent Belarusian journalist under threat of deportation	
Wersja polska	46
English version	47
E-000676/13 by Franz Obermayr to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Authorisation for genetically modified fish	
Deutsche Fassung	48
English version	49
E-000677/13 by Marina Yannakoudakis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> World Economic Forum Annual Meeting in Davos, 22-26 January 2013	
English version	50
E-000678/13 by Laurence J.A.J. Stassen to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European Emissions Trading System	
Nederlandse versie	51
English version	52
E-000679/13 by Laurence J.A.J. Stassen to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European climate policy	
Nederlandse versie	53
English version	54
E-000680/13 by Francesco Enrico Speroni to the Council	
<i>Subject:</i> Financial austerity policy and the American approach	
Versione italiana	55
English version	56

E-000681/13 by Francesco Enrico Speroni to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Financial austerity policy and the American approach	
Versione italiana	57
English version	58
E-000682/13 by Fiorello Provera to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Concerns regarding Tunisia's draft constitution	
Versione italiana	59
English version	60
P-000683/13 by Chris Davies to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> EU measures to combat terrorism and fight crime	
English version	61
P-000685/13 by Tomasz Piotr Poręba to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — The issue of Russia returning the wreckage of the presidential TU-154 aircraft	
Wersja polska	62
English version	63
P-000700/13 by Ryszard Antoni Legutko to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — The issue of Russia returning the wreckage of the presidential TU-154 aircraft	
Wersja polska	62
English version	63
E-000686/13 by Lucas Hartong to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European Development Fund (EDF) interim report	
Nederlandse versie	64
English version	65
E-000687/13 by Lucas Hartong to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Withholding of payment to Guyana	
Nederlandse versie	66
English version	67
E-000688/13 by Judith Sargentini to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Further questions regarding Dutch fees for residence permits	
Nederlandse versie	68
English version	69
E-001215/13 by Elisabeth Jeggle to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Hungarian legislation on the lease and sale of land	
Deutsche Fassung	70
English version	72
E-000689/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Acquisition of agricultural land by EU citizens	
Versiunea în limba română	71
English version	72
E-000690/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Protein content of wheat	
Versiunea în limba română	73
English version	74
E-000691/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Use of neonicotinoid pesticides in agriculture	
Version française	75
Versiunea în limba română	76
English version	77
E-000769/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Bee-killing pesticide: the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) report	
Version française	75
English version	77

E-000692/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Tendering process organised in Romania for the European Food Aid Programme for The Most Deprived	
Versiunea în limba română	78
English version	79
E-000693/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Measures to prevent the spread of African Swine Fever	
Versiunea în limba română	80
English version	81
E-000694/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Radioactivity levels of salt imported from Ukraine	
Versiunea în limba română	82
English version	83
E-000695/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Temporary restrictions imposed on the free movement of Romanian workers	
Versiunea în limba română	84
English version	85
E-000696/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Treatment with amoxicillin	
Versiunea în limba română	86
English version	87
E-000698/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Romania's use of EU funds in the second half of 2012	
Versiunea în limba română	88
English version	89
P-000699/13 by Anna Záborská to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Quality of food produced in Poland	
Slovenské znenie	90
English version	91
E-000701/13 by Franziska Katharina Brantner to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Law on strategic investment projects of the Republic of Croatia	
Deutsche Fassung	92
English version	94
E-000702/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Lack of transparency in financial bailout decisions	
Versión española	95
English version	97
E-000703/13 by Chris Davies to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Application of the VAT Directive to life-saving organisations	
English version	99
E-000704/13 by Pino Arlacchi to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Moroccan Government's democracy claims	
Versione italiana	100
English version	101
E-000705/13 by Adina-Ioana Vălean to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European emergency number 112	
Versiunea în limba română	102
English version	103
E-000706/13 by Marietta Giannakou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European Intergovernmental Organisations being sidelined in EU research planning	
Ελληνική έκδοση	104
English version	106

E-000707/13 by Theodoros Skylakakis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European programmes to combat unemployment in Greece	
Ελληνική έκδοση	108
English version	109
E-000708/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Milk price cap	
Ελληνική έκδοση	110
English version	111
E-000709/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Suicide of Aaron Swartz	
Versión española	112
English version	113
E-000710/13 by Ana Gomes to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — EU support for peacebuilding projects in Chin State, Burma/Myanmar	
Versão portuguesa	114
English version	115
E-000711/13 by Jens Rohde to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Electric cars	
Dansk udgave	116
English version	117
E-000712/13 by Jens Rohde to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Organic beekeeping in Denmark	
Dansk udgave	118
English version	119
E-000713/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Assessment of joint custody at European level	
Versione italiana	120
English version	121
E-000714/13 by Christel Schaldemose to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Requirements for mobile antennae and telephone networks	
Dansk udgave	122
English version	123
E-000715/13 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Possible money laundering in Spain in connection with the 'Eurovegas' project	
Versión española	124
English version	126
E-000716/13 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Right to information in Spain in respect of the Eurovegas project	
Versión española	128
English version	129
E-000717/13 by Monika Smolková to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Europe for Citizens, Measure 1.2 — Networks of Twinned Towns	
Slovenské znenie	130
English version	131
E-000719/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Commission support for technical innovation in the automotive industry	
Versione italiana	132
English version	133
E-000720/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The Commission should monitor American hedge funds in the EU	
Versione italiana	134
English version	136

E-000721/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Call for the Commission to review its parameters on pesticides	
Versione italiana	137
English version	138
E-000722/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Attack in Araucanía and militarisation of the region	
Versión española	139
English version	140
E-000723/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Military action by France in Mali	
Versión española	141
English version	142
E-000724/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Discrimination against women in Spanish pension legislation	
Versión española	143
English version	144
E-000725/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Mortality due to privatisations in Eastern Europe	
Versión española	145
English version	146
E-000726/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Implementing free software in the European institutions	
Versión española	147
English version	149
E-000727/13 by Ria Oomen-Ruijten and Ivo Belet to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Expiry of the right to an accrued Dutch State Pension	
Nederlandse versie	151
English version	152
E-000730/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Artificial guts made of hardened protein	
Versión española	153
English version	155
E-000732/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Artificial guts made from hardened protein II	
Versión española	153
English version	155
E-000733/13 by Zbigniew Ziobro, Jacek Włosowicz, Jacek Olgierd Kurski and Tadeusz Cymański to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Poland's traffic enforcement camera system	
Wersja polska	157
English version	158
E-000734/13 by Charles Tannock to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — The case of the Egyptian Coptic woman Nadia Mohamed Ali and her children	
English version	159
E-000735/13 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Repercussions on spaces included within the Natura 2000 network of a project involving a very high voltage power line	
Versión española	160
English version	161
E-000737/13 by João Ferreira and Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Using statistical data to negotiate and allocate the Structural Funds	
Versão portuguesa	162
English version	163

E-000738/13 by João Ferreira and Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> 2014 — International Year of Family Farming	
Versão portuguesa	164
English version	165
E-000739/13 by João Ferreira and Inês Cristina Zuber to the Council	
<i>Subject:</i> Portuguese flag at the Eurogroup meeting	
Versão portuguesa	166
English version	167
E-000740/13 by João Ferreira and Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Protecting and valuing Arte Xávega	
Versão portuguesa	168
English version	169
E-000741/13 by João Ferreira and Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Implementation of the Structural Funds by countries receiving EU-IMF bailouts	
Versão portuguesa	170
English version	171
E-000742/13 by João Ferreira and Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Reprogramming of the European Fisheries Fund — Portugal	
Versão portuguesa	172
English version	173
E-000743/13 by João Ferreira and Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Restrictions on the import and private ownership of endangered species	
Versão portuguesa	174
English version	175
E-000744/13 by João Ferreira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Investment in infrastructure to support small-scale fishing (Setúbal, Portugal)	
Versão portuguesa	176
English version	177
E-000745/13 by João Ferreira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Skate and ray fishing in Portugal (II)	
Versão portuguesa	178
English version	179
E-000746/13 by João Ferreira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Damage to fishing caused by the spread of algae (Setúbal, Portugal)	
Versão portuguesa	180
English version	181
E-000747/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Closure of public health night services in Castilla-La Mancha	
Versión española	182
English version	184
E-000748/13 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The Commission's position on water privatisation	
Deutsche Fassung	185
English version	187
E-000749/13 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Crisis countries should privatise their water supplies and water industries	
Deutsche Fassung	185
English version	187
E-000750/13 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Margo Jewish Cemetery in the Turkish occupied part of Cyprus	
Deutsche Fassung	188
English version	189

E-000752/13 by Nessa Childers to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Transparency register	
English version	190
E-000753/13 by Mojca Kleva Kekuš to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Rise in abortion of female foetuses in Europe	
Slovenska različica	191
English version	192
E-000754/13 by Saïd El Khadraoui to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Problems with the Fyra service on the Belgian and Dutch railways	
Nederlandse versie	193
English version	194
E-000755/13 by Giommaria Uggias, Andrea Zanoni, Lara Comi, Antonio Cancian, Ramon Tremosa i Balcells, Pino Arlacchi, Roberta Angelilli, Ivo Vajgl and Marian Harkin to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Proposal for an international cooperation agreement with southern hemisphere countries to exchange fire-fighting resources	
Versión española	195
Versione italiana	197
Slovenska različica	199
English version	200
E-000756/13 by Michael Cramer and Eva Lichtenberger to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> ÖBB debts and the Austrian federal budget	
Deutsche Fassung	201
English version	203
E-000757/13 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Fracking in La Garrotxa	
Versión española	205
English version	206
E-000758/13 by Crescenzo Rivellini to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Free movement of professionals and recognition of the legal profession in the Member States	
Versione italiana	207
English version	208
E-000759/13 by Bernd Lange to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Review of Regulation (EU) No 1025/2012 on European standardisation	
Deutsche Fassung	209
English version	210
E-000760/13 by Vilija Blinkevičiūtė to the Council <i>Subject:</i> Negotiations on the progress of the Posting of Workers Directive	
Tekstas lietuvių kalba	211
English version	212
E-000761/13 by Vilija Blinkevičiūtė to the Council <i>Subject:</i> Pensions portability directive	
Tekstas lietuvių kalba	213
English version	214
E-000762/13 by Vilija Blinkevičiūtė to the Council <i>Subject:</i> Future of the Working Time Directive	
Tekstas lietuvių kalba	215
English version	216
E-000763/13 by Fiona Hall to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Children in Senegal subjected to begging and abuse	
English version	217

E-000764/13 by Raimon Obiols to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Health system in Afghanistan	
Versión española	218
English version	219
E-000765/13 by Michael Cramer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Staff of the European Railway Agency (ERA)	
Deutsche Fassung	220
English version	221
E-000770/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Ineffective drugs and excessive consumption of medicinal products	
Version française	222
English version	223
E-000772/13 by Judith Sargentini, Sandrine Bélier and Bart Staes to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Net neutrality and Commissioner Kroes' statements in 'Libération'	
Version française	224
Nederlandse versie	226
English version	228
E-000773/13 by Laurence J.A.J. Stassen to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> EU control of national media	
Nederlandse versie	229
English version	230
E-000774/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Outcome of the Spanish tax amnesty	
Versión española	231
English version	232
E-000776/13 by Sir Graham Watson to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Freedom of religion in China: the case of Bishop James Su Zhimin (Su Zhemín)	
English version	233
E-000777/13 by Niki Tzavela to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The Troika's recipe for disaster	
Ελληνική έκδοση	234
English version	235
E-000778/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Electric cars: what safeguards and safety procedures in the event of an accident?	
Versione italiana	236
English version	237
E-000779/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Hospitalised paediatric patients: responding to the needs and difficulties of parents	
Versione italiana	238
English version	239
E-000780/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Organ donations and transplants: best practices in Europe	
Versione italiana	240
English version	241
E-000781/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> ECJ 'Traghetti del Mediterraneo' judgment: what prospects for recognition of liability for infringements attributable to the legislator?	
Versione italiana	242
English version	244

E-000782/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Anti-discrimination legislation as an EU access requirement: what solutions for ethnic and religious minorities?	
Versione italiana	246
English version	247
E-000783/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Airports and energy-saving measures	
Versione italiana	249
English version	250
E-000784/13 by Raúl Romeva i Rueda to the Council	
<i>Subject:</i> Youth unemployment in Spain in 2012	
Versión española	251
English version	253
E-000785/13 by Raúl Romeva i Rueda to the Council	
<i>Subject:</i> Unemployment in Spain	
Versión española	255
English version	256
E-000786/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Support for the creation of clusters	
Versão portuguesa	257
English version	259
E-000787/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Support for the expansion of European enterprises	
Versão portuguesa	260
English version	262
E-000788/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Young entrepreneurs and the success of the Erasmus first job programme	
Versão portuguesa	263
English version	265
E-000789/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Lack of competitiveness of European enterprises	
Versão portuguesa	266
English version	268
E-000790/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European venture capital funds	
Versão portuguesa	270
English version	272
E-000791/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Internationalisation of European enterprises	
Versão portuguesa	274
English version	275
E-000792/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European promotion of tourism	
Versão portuguesa	276
English version	278
E-000793/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Promoting a culture of entrepreneurship	
Versão portuguesa	280
English version	282
P-000794/13 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Hague Convention on Child Abduction (HCCA) and possible misinterpretation by the Member States	
Deutsche Fassung	283
English version	284

E-000795/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Sixth EU-Brazil Summit Joint Statement — trade and investment	
Versão portuguesa	285
English version	286
E-000796/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Sixth EU-Brazil Summit Joint Statement — culture	
Versão portuguesa	287
English version	288
E-000797/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VI Brazil-EU Summit Joint Statement — bilateral political dialogue	
Versão portuguesa	289
English version	290
E-000798/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Sixth EU-Brazil Summit Joint Statement — education	
Versão portuguesa	291
English version	292
E-000799/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VI Brazil-EU Summit Joint Statement — Energy	
Versão portuguesa	293
English version	294
E-000800/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VI Brazil-EU Summit Joint Statement — civil society	
Versão portuguesa	295
English version	296
E-000801/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Dissemination and study of the great books of European culture	
Versão portuguesa	297
English version	298
E-000802/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Tension between China and Japan: Diaoyu/Senkaku Islands	
Versão portuguesa	299
English version	300
E-000803/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> False advertising regarding the effects of cosmetics	
Versão portuguesa	301
English version	302
E-000804/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European Maritime Day — promotion and visibility	
Versão portuguesa	303
English version	304
E-000805/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Possible cuts in the EU budget for culture	
Versão portuguesa	305
English version	306
E-000806/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Security in Benghazi	
Versão portuguesa	307
English version	308
E-000807/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Arab Spring: state of play	
Versão portuguesa	309
English version	310

E-000808/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Equality — Denmark	
Versão portuguesa	311
English version	312
E-000809/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Equality — toys in Sweden	
Versão portuguesa	313
English version	314
E-000810/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Ryanair	
Versão portuguesa	315
English version	316
E-000811/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Lisbon Declaration — EU-Africa Summit 2007	
Versão portuguesa	317
English version	318
E-000812/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Active European Remembrance against totalitarianism	
Versão portuguesa	319
English version	320
E-000813/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European day of Remembrance for Victims of Stalinism and Nazism	
Versão portuguesa	321
English version	322
E-000814/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Speech by David Cameron	
Versão portuguesa	323
English version	324
E-000815/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Security of European overseas investments	
Versão portuguesa	325
English version	326
E-000816/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Obesity	
Versão portuguesa	327
English version	328
E-000817/13 by Jim Higgins to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Novel tobacco products	
English version	329
E-000818/13 by Jim Higgins to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Tourism as a means of economic growth	
English version	330
E-000819/13 by Jim Higgins to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The survival, promotion and future of the arts in Europe	
English version	332
E-000820/13 by Jim Higgins to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Cystic fibrosis research	
English version	333
E-000821/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Bans on imports into Russia	
Versiunea în limba română	334
English version	335

E-000822/13 by Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Holiday camps	
Versiunea în limba română	336
English version	337
E-000823/13 by Bernd Lange to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European standardisation of tourism services through Regulation (EU) No 1025/2012	
Deutsche Fassung	338
English version	339
E-000824/13 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Council	
<i>Subject:</i> Effects of austerity policies on health	
Versión española	340
English version	341
E-000825/13 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Effects of austerity policies on health	
Versión española	342
English version	344
E-000826/13 by Marian Harkin to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Income tax on employed and self-employed persons in Ireland	
English version	345
E-000827/13 by Franziska Keller to the Council	
<i>Subject:</i> EU's position on extension of WTO TRIPS Agreement transition period for Least Developed Countries	
Deutsche Fassung	346
English version	347
E-000828/13 by Franziska Keller to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> EU's position on extension of WTO TRIPS Agreement transition period for Least Developed Countries	
Deutsche Fassung	348
English version	349
E-000829/13 by Catherine Stihler to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Insolvency and consumer protection	
English version	350
E-000830/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Fever-reducing drugs and liver damage	
Versão portuguesa	351
English version	352
E-000831/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Statements by Commissioner László Andor on employment	
Versão portuguesa	353
English version	354
E-000872/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Two posts and two salaries — one from the EU and the other from the Italian Prime Minister's Office	
Versione italiana	355
English version	358
E-000832/13 by Lucas Hartong to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> National 'experts' on the Commission's payroll	
Nederlandse versie	356
English version	358
E-000915/13 by Daniël van der Stoep to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Mr Monti's spokeswoman	
Nederlandse versie	356
English version	358

E-000833/13 by Jim Higgins to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Environmental impact of tourism	
English version	360
E-000836/13 by Nikos Chrysogelos to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Risk of closure of Athens and Thessaloniki Centres for Education and Rehabilitation for the Blind	
Ελληνική έκδοση	361
English version	362
E-000839/13 by Anna Rosbach to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Prescription-free antibiotics	
Dansk udgave	363
English version	364
E-000840/13 by Anna Rosbach to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Parallel imports of pharmaceuticals	
Dansk udgave	365
English version	366
E-000841/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Major reduction in the funding of science in Spain	
Versión española	367
English version	368
E-000845/13 by Alyn Smith to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> 'Enough Food For Everyone If' campaign	
English version	369
E-000846/13 by Charles Tannock to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Potential for a serious negative impact on medical and scientific research of the Data Protection Regulation	
English version	370
E-000847/13 by Inês Cristina Zuber and João Ferreira to the Council <i>Subject:</i> End to the 'Common Position' on Cuba	
Versão portuguesa	371
English version	372
E-000848/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Graph Search and intrusions into private life	
Version française	373
English version	374
E-000849/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Data protection: Sony must be the subject of an investigation	
Version française	375
English version	376
E-000850/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Facebook searches through personal messages	
Version française	377
English version	378
E-000851/13 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> The smog problem in Greece	
Ελληνική έκδοση	379
English version	380
E-000852/13 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Health in sport/promoting information, prevention and examination in training and education establishments	
Ελληνική έκδοση	381
English version	382

E-000853/13 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Extent of firearm possession in the EU	
Ελληνική έκδοση	383
English version	384
E-000854/13 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Humanitarian crisis in Mali: wave of refugees	
Ελληνική έκδοση	385
English version	386
E-000855/13 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Additional information on Task Force for Greece expenses	
Ελληνική έκδοση	387
English version	388
E-000856/13 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Hidden charges for mobile applications	
Ελληνική έκδοση	389
English version	390
E-000857/13 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Capital flight	
Ελληνική έκδοση	391
English version	392
E-000858/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Aquaculture	
Versão portuguesa	393
English version	394
P-000859/13 by Britta Thomsen to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Ageing and women's health	
Dansk udgave	395
English version	396
E-000860/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Obstacles to obtaining residence visas for European citizens in Brazil	
Versão portuguesa	397
English version	398
E-000861/13 by Ana Miranda to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Planned rail link to the outer harbour of Ferrol (Coruña)	
Versión española	399
English version	400
P-000862/13 by Diane Dodds to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Persecution of Christians in Iran	
English version	401
P-000863/13 by Bogdan Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Legality of using unmanned aerial vehicles under EC law	
Wersja polska	402
English version	403
E-000864/13 by Ana Miranda to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Ensure the reopening of the Canfranc-Pau international railway line in 2020	
Versión española	404
English version	405
E-000865/13 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Penalty clauses for E65 motorway	
Ελληνική έκδοση	406
English version	407

E-000866/13 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Co-financed major works and bridge works in Greece	
Ελληνική έκδοση	408
English version	409
E-000867/13 by Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Rural development — involvement of local communities	
Versiunea în limba română	410
English version	411
E-000868/13 by Jim Higgins to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Cross-border energy trade	
English version	412
E-000869/13 by Nikos Chrysogelos to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Destruction of nature area in Commune of Livera-Kormakiti in Cyprus	
Ελληνική έκδοση	413
English version	415
E-000878/13 by Sophocles Sophocleous to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Environmental destruction in the community of Livera	
Ελληνική έκδοση	413
English version	415
E-000870/13 by Othmar Karas, Andrey Kovatchev and Patrizia Toia to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Socially fair development of Renewable Energy Policy in the internal energy market	
Българска версия	417
Deutsche Fassung	419
Versione italiana	421
English version	423
P-000871/13 by Corien Wortmann-Kool to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European budgetary rules and the establishment of national budgetary mechanisms in the Member States	
Nederlandse versie	425
English version	427
E-000875/13 by Anne Delvaux to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Impact of neonicotinoids on bee health	
Version française	429
English version	432
E-000934/13 by Christine De Veyrac to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Pesticides and bees in Europe	
Version française	429
English version	432
E-001281/13 by Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The effects of pesticide use on the bee population	
Wersja polska	431
English version	433
E-000877/13 by Diane Dodds to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Rwandan aid programmes	
English version	434
E-000879/13 by Aldo Patriciello to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Lending to private individuals	
Versione italiana	435
English version	436
E-000880/13 by Aldo Patriciello to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Microcredit	
Versione italiana	437
English version	438

E-000882/13 by Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Concerns regarding the Barbosa e Almeida Vidro Company	
Versão portuguesa	439
English version	440
E-000883/13 by Slavi Binev to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Dangerous waste dumps in Bulgaria in breach of EC law	
българска версия	441
English version	442
E-000884/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> IMF error regarding the effects of austerity in Europe	
Versión española	443
English version	444
E-000885/13 by Michael Cashman to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Investigation of the UK School Standards and Framework Act (SSFA) legislation	
English version	445
E-000886/13 by Jens Rohde to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Provisions concerning the qualitative status of water courses in the Water Framework Directive	
Dansk udgave	446
English version	447
E-000887/13 by Jim Higgins to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Implementation of the EU Transparency Directive and Accounting Directive	
English version	448
E-000888/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The EU's strategy for the Horn of Africa	
Version française	449
English version	450
E-000889/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Introduction of stability bonds	
Version française	451
English version	452
E-000890/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Intellectual property rights to genetic resources and biopiracy	
Version française	453
English version	454
E-000891/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Information and consultation for workers in the event of restructuring	
Version française	455
English version	456
E-000892/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Diane 35: off-label use	
Version française	457
English version	458
E-000893/13 by Diane Dodds to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Plight of Christians in Nigeria	
English version	459
E-000894/13 by Ryszard Antoni Legutko to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Promotion of public transport in Poland	
Wersja polska	460
English version	461

E-000895/13 by Zbigniew Ziobro to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Persecution of Christians in Egypt	
Wersja polska	462
English version	463
E-000896/13 by Zbigniew Ziobro and Jacek Olgierd Kurski to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The TV Belsat situation	
Wersja polska	464
English version	465
E-000897/13 by Phil Prendergast to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Data protection and Facebook's 'graph search'	
English version	466
E-000899/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> United Kingdom immigration	
Versão portuguesa	467
English version	468
E-000900/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Russian taxes	
Versão portuguesa	469
English version	470
E-000901/13 by Amelia Andersdotter to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Status of accredited assistants at the European Parliament	
Svensk version	471
English version	472
E-000902/13 by Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European Data Protection Day	
Versão portuguesa	473
English version	474
E-000903/13 by Ashley Fox to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Welsh Government's proposal to purchase Cardiff Airport	
English version	475
E-000904/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Son Reus incineration plant on the island of Majorca (Spain)	
Versión española	476
English version	477
E-000905/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Role of territorial development in cohesion policy	
Version française	478
English version	479
P-000906/13 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Bulgarian and Romanian citizens entering the UK	
English version	480
E-000907/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Benefits enjoyed by Turkish Cypriots	
Ελληνική έκδοση	481
English version	482
E-000908/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Cypriot banks and systemic risks in the eurozone	
Ελληνική έκδοση	483
English version	484

E-000909/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Erosion of welfare state	
Ελληνική έκδοση	485
English version	486
E-000910/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Annexation plan	
Ελληνική έκδοση	487
English version	488
E-000911/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Alarming rise in Euroscepticism	
Ελληνική έκδοση	489
English version	490
E-000912/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Youth guarantee schemes	
Ελληνική έκδοση	491
English version	492
E-000913/13 by Sophia in 't Veld and Rui Tavares to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Abrogation or review of 'liquids and body scanners' rules	
Nederlandse versie	493
Versão portuguesa	495
English version	497
E-000914/13 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Roma and benefits in the UK	
English version	499
P-000916/13 by Nils Torvalds to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Production aid for electricity from renewable energy sources on the Åland Islands, Finland	
Svensk version	500
English version	501
P-000917/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> New credit lines from the European Investment Bank	
Versão portuguesa	502
English version	503
E-000918/13 by Nikolaos Salavrakos to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Contempt for court judgments in Greece	
Ελληνική έκδοση	504
English version	505
E-000919/13 by Theodoros Skylakakis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Privatisation of OPAP (Greek Organisation of Football Prognostics) and its expansion into video lottery terminals (VLTs)	
Ελληνική έκδοση	506
English version	508
E-000939/13 by Theodoros Skylakakis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Court of Justice judgment and privatisation of OPAP (Greek Organisation of Football Prognostics Ltd.)	
Ελληνική έκδοση	506
English version	508
E-000920/13 by Mario Borghesio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Destruction of Timbuktu library: EU intervention	
Versione italiana	510
English version	511
E-001232/13 by Esther de Lange to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Use of the Diane-35 pill in Europe	
Nederlandse versie	512
English version	517

E-001000/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Deaths linked to contraceptive pill	
Versão portuguesa	514
English version	517
E-001339/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> France suspends Diane 35	
Versão portuguesa	514
English version	518
E-000921/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Side effects of contraceptive pills	
Versiunea în limba română	516
English version	517
E-000922/13 by Jorgo Chatzimarkakis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Miscalculation regarding austerity measures ('fiscal consolidation') for Greece	
Deutsche Fassung	520
English version	521
E-000923/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Recent capital increase for the European Investment Bank	
Versão portuguesa	522
English version	524
E-000924/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Portugal's return to the markets — I	
Versão portuguesa	526
English version	528
E-000925/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Portugal's return to the markets II	
Versão portuguesa	529
English version	531
E-000926/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European Union-Republic of South Africa relations	
Versão portuguesa	532
English version	534
E-000927/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> International Business Centre of Madeira: Madeira Free Zone	
Versão portuguesa	535
English version	537
E-000928/13 by Jim Higgins to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Mobile phone scam in Ireland	
English version	538
E-000929/13 by Jim Higgins to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Suicide rates among young people	
English version	539
E-000930/13 by Filip Kaczmarek to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Procedures for potentially contaminated milk powder	
Wersja polska	540
English version	541
E-000931/13 by Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Hazardous chemicals in clothing	
Versiunea în limba română	542
English version	543

E-000932/13 by Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Toxic waste in Ukraine	
Versiunea în limba română	544
English version	545
E-000933/13 by Christine De Veyrac to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Aviation carbon tax — windfall profits for certain airlines	
Version française	546
English version	547
E-000935/13 by Derek Roland Clark to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Road bridge design	
English version	548
E-000936/13 by Izaskun Bilbao Barandica to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Situation of language teachers in Italian universities	
Versión española	549
English version	550
E-000937/13 by Kerstin Westphal to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Improved under-run protective device for lorries	
Deutsche Fassung	551
English version	552
E-000938/13 by Theodoros Skylakakis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Connection between the ports of Burgas and Alexandroupolis and linking the latter to the road and rail network	
Ελληνική έκδοση	553
English version	554
E-000940/13 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Safety standards for nightclubs	
Versione italiana	555
English version	556
E-000941/13 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Taxing meat	
Versione italiana	557
English version	559
E-001558/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Swedish proposal for an EU tax on meat — a threat to livestock farming in Italy and the Veneto Region	
Versione italiana	557
English version	559
E-000942/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Estimation of the sums of money involved in the alleged rigging of Libor and Euribor rates	
Versión española	561
English version	563
E-000943/13 by Pavel Poc to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Limiting financial losses resulting from leakages of drinking water through public water mains	
České znění	564
English version	565
E-000944/13 by Anne Delvaux to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> EU steel industry	
Version française	566
English version	568
E-000945/13 by Werner Langen to the Council	
<i>Subject:</i> Vice-President of Eurojust	
Deutsche Fassung	569
English version	570

E-000946/13 by Werner Langen to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Vice-President of Eurojust	
Deutsche Fassung	571
English version	572
P-000947/13 by Andres Perello Rodriguez to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Approval of restructuring and capitalisation plans of Spanish banking groups and information for holders of preference shares	
Versión española	573
English version	574
E-000948/13 by Gay Mitchell to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Proposal for a regulation on periodic roadworthiness tests for motor vehicles and their trailers and repealing Directive 2009/40/EC	
English version	575
E-000950/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Monte Paschi scandal: failure to calculate the cost of derivatives deals	
Versione italiana	576
English version	577
E-000952/13 by Britta Reimers to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> LIFE + project LIFE09 NAT/DE/000010 'Aurinia'	
Deutsche Fassung	578
English version	579
E-000953/13 by Amelia Andersdotter to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Determination of intellectual property right status	
Svensk version	580
English version	584
E-000954/13 by Amelia Andersdotter to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Criteria for including trademark rights in list of intellectual property rights	
Svensk version	580
English version	584
E-001068/13 by Amelia Andersdotter to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Criteria for including rights related to copyright in list of IPRs	
Svensk version	580
English version	584
E-001091/13 by Amelia Andersdotter to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Criteria for including sui generis rights of database makers in list of intellectual property rights	
Svensk version	580
English version	584
E-001176/13 by Amelia Andersdotter to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Criteria for including the rights of the creator of the topographies of a semiconductor product in list of IPRs	
Svensk version	581
English version	585
E-001199/13 by Amelia Andersdotter to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Criteria for including trademark rights in list of IPRs	
Svensk version	581
English version	585
E-001235/13 by Amelia Andersdotter to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Criteria for including design rights in list of IPRs	
Svensk version	581
English version	585

E-001321/13 by Amelia Andersdotter to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Criteria for including patent rights, including rights derived from supplementary protection certificates, in list of IPRs	
Svensk version	581
English version	585
E-001378/13 by Amelia Andersdotter to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Criteria for including geographical indications in list of IPRs	
Svensk version	582
English version	586
E-001409/13 by Amelia Andersdotter to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Criteria for including utility model rights in list of intellectual property rights	
Svensk version	582
English version	586
E-001544/13 by Amelia Andersdotter to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Criteria for including trade names, in so far as these are protected as exclusive property rights in the national law concerned, in lists of intellectual property rights (IPRs)	
Svensk version	582
English version	586
E-001610/13 by Amelia Andersdotter to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Criteria for including plant variety rights in lists of intellectual property rights (IPRs)	
Svensk version	582
English version	586
E-001653/13 by Amelia Andersdotter to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Criteria for including copyright in lists of intellectual property rights (IPRs)	
Svensk version	583
English version	587
E-000955/13 by Carlos Coelho and José Manuel Fernandes to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Road safety	
Versão portuguesa	588
English version	589
P-001257/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> IP tracking, a practice which is contrary to consumers' interests	
Version française	590
English version	594
E-000956/13 by Claudio Morganti to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Problems relating to 'IP tracking'	
Versione italiana	592
English version	594
E-001574/13 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> IP tracking	
Versione italiana	592
English version	595
E-000957/13 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Selective negotiating efforts for qualifying industrial zones in Ukraine	
English version	596
E-000958/13 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Review of current arrangements with Iran in light of humanitarian concerns	
English version	597
E-000959/13 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Pan-EU rail market and steps to encourage stakeholders to embrace potential changes	
English version	598

E-000960/13 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Improving the state of groundwater bodies across Europe English version	599
E-000961/13 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Promotion and expansion of European Heritage Days English version	600
E-000962/13 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> EU funding in Serbia English version	601
E-000976/13 by Marielle de Sarnez to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> US Government ban on US aircraft operators participating in the EU Emissions Trading System (EU ETS) Version française	602
English version	603
E-000963/13 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> EU emissions trading scheme and the USA English version	603
E-000964/13 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> EU efforts to address global match-fixing English version	604
E-000965/13 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> 'eHealth' and accessibility for older generations English version	605
E-000966/13 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Cross-border university study programmes English version	606
E-000967/13 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Continuation of Erasmus and its potential expansion English version	607
E-000968/13 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Commission strategies for better management of urban waste water treatment English version	608
E-000969/13 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Commission proposals aimed at offering guarantees to young people English version	609
E-000970/13 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Commission monitoring of the 'quantitative status' of water across Europe English version	610
E-000971/13 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Commission monitoring methods for goods and services paid in cash English version	611

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-000661/13

Komisi

Olga Sehnalová (S&D)

(23. ledna 2013)

Předmět: Změna sazby DPH u dětských plen

Novelizací zákona o DPH byly v České republice s účinností od 1. ledna 2013 přeřazeny dětské pleny a některé zdravotní prostředky ze snížené sazby DPH do základní sazby DPH. Ministerstvo financí přeřazení plen a zdravotních prostředků oficiálně zdůvodnilo skutečností, že je podle názoru Evropské komise dosavadní zařazení zmíněných dvou skupin výrobků do snížené sazby DPH v rozporu s legislativou Evropské unie.

Jelikož se v diskuzi ohledně daňového zatížení na dětské pleny objevilo hned několik rozdílných interpretací a nespokojení spotřebitelé s malými dětmi tak čelí nejen podstatnému zdražení jednoho ze základních výrobků, ale také nedostatku relevantních informací, prosím Komisi o zodpovězení následujících otázek:

1. Bylo vůči České republice ze strany Komise zahájeno řízení o porušení Smlouvy o fungování Evropské unie a Komisí navrženo přeřazení těchto dvou skupin výrobků do základní sazby DPH?
2. Existují mezi členskými státy ty, které mají na DPH u dětských plen vyjednanou výjimku s ohledem na jejich zařazení do snížené sazby DPH, resp. nulovou sazbu, a které to jsou?
3. Je možné na dětské pleny jakožto pomůcku primárně určenou na inkontinenci uplatňovat sníženou sazbu DPH v souladu se stávající legislativní úpravou EU?

Odpověď pana Šemety jménem Komise

(5. března 2013)

1. Komise potvrzuje, že v roce 2006 bylo proti České republice zahájeno řízení pro porušení Smlouvy z důvodu uplatňování snížené sazby DPH na dětské pleny.
2. Spojené království a Irsko uplatňují na tyto výrobky nulovou sazbu DPH na základě článku 110 směrnice o DPH⁽¹⁾, jenž za určitých podmínek umožňuje členským státům, které k 1. lednu 1991 poskytovaly nulové sazby nebo snížené sazby nižší než 5 %, uplatňovat tyto sazby i nadále.
3. Pleny pro dospělé jsou určeny k léčbě zdravotních obtíží, a spadají tudíž do působnosti kategorie 3) přílohy III směrnice o DPH, která umožňuje uplatnění snížené sazby DPH na výrobky „obvykle užívané pro péči o zdraví, prevenci chorob a pro účely lékařské péče“. Naopak dětské pleny do této kategorie nespádají, protože je nosí všechny děti, zdravé i nemocné, a nejsou obecně spojovány s žádnými zdravotními obtížemi nebo nemocí dítěte.

V roce 2008 Komise předložila Radě návrh⁽²⁾, který umožňuje uplatňovat na dětské pleny sníženou sazbu DPH. Rada se však nemohla jednomyslně shodnout na novém navrhovaném znění a dále v rámci politické dohody ze dne 10. března 2009⁽³⁾ prohlásila, že:

- všechny členské státy by měly mít možnost prostřednictvím změny směrnice o DPH uplatňovat sníženou sazbu DPH na některé uvedené položky (dětské pleny nejsou uvedeny) a
- že všechny ostatní položky uvedené v návrhu (včetně dětských plen) nejsou pro sníženou sazbu DPH způsobilé.

Z toho je patrný záměr zákonodárné moci EU vyjmout tyto položky ze snížené sazby DPH.

⁽¹⁾ Směrnice Rady 2006/112/ES ze dne 28. listopadu 2006, Úř. věst. L 347, 11.12.2006.

⁽²⁾ KOM(2008) 428.

⁽³⁾ <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/cs/09/st07/st07048.cs09.pdf>

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000661/13
to the Commission
Olga Sehnalová (S&D)
(23 January 2013)

Subject: Changing the VAT rate on nappies

In accordance with a revision to the Czech VAT law, which entered into force on 1 January 2013, nappies have been moved from the reduced VAT rate band to the standard VAT rate band. The Czech Ministry of Finance's official justification for the reclassification of nappies and pharmaceuticals used for healthcare referred to the Commission's opinion that the inclusion of the two aforementioned product groups in the reduced VAT rate band was in breach of EC law.

Given that several different interpretations have arisen in the debate on the taxation of nappies, and given that anxious consumers with small children are now facing a significant increase in the price of a basic product as well as a lack of relevant information, I should like to put the following questions to the Commission:

1. Did the Commission launch a TFEU infringement procedure against the Czech Republic, and did it propose moving the two aforementioned product groups into the standard VAT rate band?
2. Have any Member States negotiated derogations on the inclusion of nappies in the reduced VAT rate band, i.e. the 0% VAT rate band? If so, which Member States?
3. Is it possible to apply the reduced VAT rate to nappies in the same way as it is applied to incontinence products under EC law?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(5 March 2013)

1. The Commission confirms that in 2006 an infringement procedure was launched against the Czech Republic on account of its applying a reduced VAT rate to infants' diapers.
2. The UK and Ireland apply a zero VAT rate to these items on the basis of Article 110 of the VAT Directive ⁽¹⁾ which, under certain conditions, allows Member States that, at 1 January 1991 were granting zero or reduced rates lower than 5%, to continue applying those rates.
3. Adults' diapers are intended to treat a health disorder and thus fall within the scope of Category (3) to Annex III of the VAT Directive, which allows for the application of a reduced VAT rate to products '*of a kind normally used for healthcare, prevention of illnesses and as treatment for medical purposes*'. By contrast, infants' diapers do not fall within that Category because they are worn by all infants, sick or healthy, and are as a general rule unrelated to any health disorder or illness of the child.

Finally, in 2008 a proposal ⁽²⁾ was submitted by the Commission to the Council which allowed for the application of a reduced VAT rate to infant's diapers. The Council, however, could not unanimously agree on the new wording proposed and further stated, in its political agreement of 10 March 2009 ⁽³⁾ that:

- all Member States, by amending the VAT Directive, should have the option to apply a reduced VAT rate to certain items listed therein (infants' diapers not included); and
- that all the other items of the proposal (infants' diapers included) are not eligible for a reduced VAT rate.

This shows the intention of the EU legislature to exclude a reduced VAT rate for these items.

⁽¹⁾ Council Directive 2006/112/EC of 28 November 2006 (OJ L 347, 11.12.2006).

⁽²⁾ COM(2008)428.

⁽³⁾ <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/09/st07/st07048.en09.pdf>

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000662/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)**

Diogo Feio (PPE)
(23 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Guiné-Bissau: possível adiamento das futuras eleições

Será importante para a resolução da grave crise que afeta a Guiné-Bissau que seja retomada a ordem constitucional e que, nesse contexto, possam ter lugar eleições legislativas e presidenciais. Não obstante, a sua realização dentro do prazo previsto no acordo de transição de maio de 2012 parece posta em causa. Segundo o representante especial do Secretário-Geral das Nações Unidas, «Tudo indica que não há meios para que as eleições se realizem no prazo previamente anunciado. Para que as eleições decorram com total transparência e normalidade há muitos passos a serem realizados no terreno, além dos aspetos técnicos e administrativos».

«Além do ato, tem de haver todo um processo de diálogo para que o resultado das eleições venha a ser aceite por todos (...) e isso vai levar mais algum tempo», referiu ainda José Ramos-Horta.

Assim, pergunto à Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante:

1. Que comentário lhe merecem as declarações de José Ramos-Horta?
2. Considera possível a realização de eleições dentro do prazo consignado no acordo de transição de maio de 2012?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão

(19 de março de 2013)

A AR/VP partilha da opinião do Representante Especial do Secretário-Geral das Nações Unidas, José Ramos-Horta, que será pouco provável que todas as condições e preparações necessárias se realizem de forma suficientemente atempada a fim de organizar eleições no prazo inicialmente previsto, ou seja, em abril de 2013. No entanto, tanto a Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente como o Representante Especial acreditam que as eleições devem ser realizadas o mais rapidamente possível, sem um prolongamento desnecessário da atual «transição» e, em qualquer dos cenários, muito antes do final do ano.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000662/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(23 January 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Guinea-Bissau: possible postponement of future elections

If the serious crisis affecting Guinea-Bissau is to be resolved, it is important to return to constitutional order and hold legislative and presidential elections. However, there appear to be doubts as to whether it will be possible to hold elections within the deadline laid down in the transition agreement of May 2012. According to the United Nations Secretary-General's special representative, all the signs are that it will not be possible to hold elections in line with the schedule previously announced, and many steps still need to be taken on the ground, in addition to the technical and administrative aspects, in order to ensure that elections can be conducted transparently and in accordance with the rules.

José Ramos-Horta also stressed the need for a lengthy process of dialogue to ensure that the election results will be accepted by all the parties, and this will still require some time.

1. How does the Vice-President/High Representative view José Ramos-Horta's statements?
2. Does she consider it possible for elections to be held within the deadline set in the transition agreement of May 2012?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(19 March 2013)

The HR/VP shares the opinion of the United Nations Secretary-General's Special Representative, Mr Ramos-Horta, that it will be highly unlikely that all the necessary conditions and preparations are in place in a sufficiently timely manner, in order to hold elections within the initially foreseen deadline, i.e. April 2013. Nevertheless, both the HR/VP and the Special Representative believe that elections must be held as soon as possible, without any unnecessary prolongation of the current 'transition' and in any case well before the end of the year.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000663/13
to the Commission
Catherine Bearder (ALDE)
(23 January 2013)**

Subject: Guarantees for electrical goods

Following correspondence with the Dyson corporation, I have been told that the two-year minimum guarantee for electrical goods in the single market does not extend across borders, thereby preventing goods being taken back to the same supplier trading in a different EU country to that in which they were purchased. In fact, I was informed that using the purchase across the border would invalidate any guarantee that was given with the goods, in this case a domestic vacuum cleaner.

Can the Commission confirm whether this is the case?

If so, does the Commission have any plans to address this issue? If it is not the case, will the Commission consider giving guidance to retailers and manufacturers as to their obligations?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2013)**

The right to a legal guarantee under Directive 1999/44/EC exists whenever the customer is residing; however, the faulty good has to be returned to the seller and not to the manufacturer or one of its branch.

The seller cannot refuse to take it back and must, under EC law, repair or replace it, as required by the consumer, or, if that is impossible or disproportionate, grant a price reduction or reimburse the purchase. The cost of the return may however need to be borne by the customer.

European Consumer Centres, co-financed by the European Commission, can advise customers who have an issue with a trader located in another EU country, Norway or Iceland on how to proceed in such cases. The list of ECCs can be founded at http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/ecc/contact_en.htm

Furthermore, the Commission will soon launch a European awareness-raising campaign to inform not only consumers, but also traders also about their rights and duties under EU consumer law, including on the legal guarantee.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000664/13
a la Comisión**

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)

(23 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: Uso indebido de poder corporativo por parte del Estado

En su respuesta E-005976/2012, la Comisión declaraba que «aunque los Estados miembros tengan participación de control en distintas empresas, éstas pueden considerarse independientes si guardan una capacidad de decisión autónoma». Ésta era la posición de la Comisión para valorar la pregunta sobre si BFA debía vender sus participaciones industriales después de su nacionalización. Destacaba además que «si la participación del Estado español no es de control o si las empresas mantienen una capacidad de decisión autónoma, no se plantea problema alguno en relación con la normativa sobre concentraciones».

Además, en su respuesta P-010226/2012 la Comisión decía: «No obstante, y en el contexto del plan de reestructuración de BFA/Bankia que la Comisión aprobó el 28 de noviembre de 2012, BFA/Bankia deberán vender sus participaciones industriales no estratégicas en un plazo de tiempo acordado».

Según fuentes próximas a los consejeros españoles de IAG, la ministra Pastor ha solicitado que no ratifiquen el ERE de Iberia. En este sentido, la ministra ha mantenido reuniones con distintos consejeros del *holding* para tratar de realizar este objetivo ⁽¹⁾.

A la luz de todo lo anterior:

1. ¿Piensa examinar la Comisión si el Gobierno español ha tratado de influir en las decisiones de IAG a través de sus consejeros españoles y las acciones de BFA/Bankia?
2. ¿Cuándo cree la Comisión que es necesario que BFA/Bankia venda sus participaciones industriales en IAG?

Respuesta del Sr. Almunia en nombre de la Comisión

(25 de marzo de 2013)

Un principio general del Derecho de la UE es la neutralidad en relación con la propiedad pública o privada de una empresa (artículo 345 del TFUE). Por consiguiente, está garantizada la igualdad de trato para las empresas públicas y privadas, sin ningún tipo de discriminación (artículo 106, apartado 1, del TFUE).

Por lo tanto, aunque las autoridades españolas hubieran intentado influir en la aprobación del Expediente de Regulación de Empleo (ERE) de Iberia a través del banco de propiedad estatal BFA/Bankia, la Comisión no está facultada para intervenir en la medida en que no existe una infracción de la legislación de la UE. La información que obra actualmente en poder de la Comisión no indica la existencia de una infracción. Basándose en la información facilitada, no parece haber ningún motivo para seguir examinando este asunto.

En el marco de su plan de reestructuración, BFA/Bankia tendrá que vender su cartera de participaciones industriales. El calendario y secuencia de este proceso de desinversión implica secretos comerciales sensibles desde el punto de vista empresarial del Grupo BFA. La divulgación de la información solicitada iría en detrimento de la protección de los intereses comerciales de la empresa, ya que poner esa información a disposición del público podría afectar a su posición competitiva y negociadora en el mercado.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.elconfidencial.com/economia/2013/01/23/el-gobierno-pide-a-los-consejeros-espanoles-de-iag-no-ratificar-el-ere-de-iberia-113411/>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000664/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(23 January 2013)**

Subject: Misuse of corporate power by the Spanish state

In its answer to Written Question E-005976/2012, the Commission stated that 'even if Member States have controlling interests in several companies, these companies can be considered as independent companies if they have an independent power of decision'. This was the Commission's position in response to the question of whether BFA should sell its industrial shareholdings following its nationalisation. The Commission also observed that 'if the stake of the Spanish state is non-controlling or the companies retain independent power of decision, no issue arises under the merger rules'.

Furthermore, in its response to Question P-010226/2012 the Commission said that 'nevertheless, and in the context of the restructuring plan of BFA/Bankia that the Commission has approved on the 28th of November 2012, BFA/Bankia will have to sell its non-strategic industrial participations within an agreed timetable'.

According to sources close to the Spanish advisers to the International Airlines Group (IAG), Spain's Minister of Public Works Ana Pastor has asked them not to ratify Iberia's workforce adjustment plan (ERE). The minister has held meetings with several of the holding's advisers with a view to achieving this objective ⁽¹⁾.

In light of the above:

1. Does the Commission intend to examine whether the Spanish Government has tried to influence IAG's decisions through its Spanish advisers and the shares held by BFA/Bankia?
2. At what point, in the Commission's view, should BFA/Bankia sell its industrial shareholdings in IAG?

**Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2013)**

A general principle of EC law is neutrality regarding private or public ownership of an undertaking (Article 345 TFEU). Therefore, equal treatment is assured to both public and private firms, without any kind of discrimination (Article 106(1) TFEU).

Thus, even if the Spanish authorities had attempted to influence the ratification of Iberia's workforce adjustment plan (ERE) through the state-owned BFA/Bankia, the Commission is not empowered to intervene as long as there is no breach of EC law. The information currently in the possession of the Commission does not indicate the existence of an infringement. Based on this information provided, there appears to be no grounds to pursue this matter.

In the context of its restructuring plan, BFA/Bankia will have to dispose of its portfolio of industrial stakes. The specific timing and sequence of this divestment process involves commercially sensitive business secrets of the BFA Group. Disclosure of the information requested would undermine the protection of the company's commercial interests, as putting this information in the public domain would affect its competitive and negotiating position on the market.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.elconfidencial.com/economia/2013/01/23/el-gobierno-pide-a-los-consejeros-espanoles-de-iag-no-ratificar-el-ere-de-iberia-113411/>

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-000665/13

alla Commissione

Mario Borghesio (EFD)

(23 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Altro scandalo di fondi europei percepiti dalla mafia

Dopo il caso eclatante dei fondi europei elargiti a Gaetano Riina, fratello del capo dei capi della mafia siciliana, è emerso il nuovo scandalo dei fondi UE percepiti da Giuseppe Spera, figlio del boss Benedetto Spera, uomo di fiducia di Bernardo Provenzano, per un totale di 230 000 EUR, ottenuti tra il 2004 e il 2009 tramite l'Agea, per terreni a suo tempo confiscati al boss Benedetto Spera.

Può la Commissione far sapere quali urgenti misure intende attuare per prevenire e impedire questi casi vergognosi di «finanziamenti europei alla mafia», che non potrebbero avvenire se non attraverso vergognosi e inconfessabili appoggi politici e burocratici?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloș a nome della Commissione

(20 febbraio 2013)

Il contesto dell'interrogazione scritta dell'onorevole Mario Borghesio è collegato a quello delle interrogazioni E-010645/2012 dello stesso onorevole ed E-010706/2012 dell'onorevole Claudio Morganti.

Di conseguenza, la Commissione rinvia alle risposte fornite alle richiamate interrogazioni scritte, e non ha niente di nuovo da aggiungere.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-000665/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(23 January 2013)**

Subject: Another scandalous case of EU funds being paid to the mafia

After the shocking case of EU funds going to Gaetano Riina, the brother of the Sicilian mafia's top boss, a new scandal has now emerged: Giuseppe Spera, the son of mafia boss Benedetto Spera, the right-hand man of Bernardo Provenzano, received a total of EUR 230 000 in EU funds between 2004 and 2009, via Italy's agricultural grants agency Agea, for land confiscated from mafia boss Benedetto Spera.

This would not have been possible without the disgraceful and disgusting support of politicians and bureaucrats. What urgent measures will the Commission take to prevent and put an end to these shameful cases of 'EU funds for the mafia'?

**Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission
(20 February 2013)**

The background of the question asked by the Honourable Member is related to the background of the question of the Honourable Member E-010645/2012 and the question of the Honourable Member Claudio Morganti E-010706/2012.

The Commission therefore refers to its respective answers given to the questions quoted, and has nothing new to add.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés P-000666/13
a Bizottság számára
Bánki Erik (PPE)
(2013. január 23.)

Tárgy: A tagállamok legjobb gyakorlatai a testnevelés területén

A WHO szerint az 5–17 év közötti gyermekeknek és fiataloknak naponta legalább 60 perc testmozgást kell végezniük szív- és légzőszervi, illetve izomrendszeri egészségük, valamint csontjaik egészségének javítása, és a szorongás és depresszió tüneteinek csökkentése érdekében ⁽¹⁾.

A testmozgás hiánya ugyanakkor nemcsak az egyén egészségére gyakorol káros hatást, hanem az egészségügyi rendszerekre és a gazdaság egészére is, hiszen a fizikai inaktivitás számottevő közvetlen és közvetett gazdasági költséget generál.

Az oktatás döntő szerepet játszik a gyermekek egészséges életmódra való felkészítésében, ami az egész társadalom számára hasznos.

Tud-e a Bizottság tájékoztatást nyújtani a tagállamok testneveléssel kapcsolatos legjobb gyakorlatainak jelenlegi helyzetéről, különös tekintettel a testnevelésórák rendszeres és kötelező jellegére az egész iskolarendszer – vagyis az általános iskolától a felsőoktatásig – vonatkozásában?

Andrula Vasziliu válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. február 19.)

Az egész életen át tartó tanuláshoz szükséges kulcskompetenciákról szóló 2006/962/EK ⁽²⁾ európai parlamenti és tanácsi ajánlás kitüntetett helyen említi a testnevelést, mint a szociális kompetenciához, valamint az egyéni és társadalmi jóléthez ugyanolyan hozzájáruló tényezőt.

Az EU 2008-ban összeállított, testmozgásra vonatkozó iránymutatása szerint a tagállamoknak ajánlatos lenne ágazatközi programokkal népszerűsíteni az egészségmegőrzésben fontos szerepet játszó testmozgást. Az iránymutatás ezzel kapcsolatban az oktatás területén is intézkedéseket javasolt a tagállamok számára. Az egészségvédő testmozgás népszerűsítésével kapcsolatban 2012-ben megfogalmazott tanácsi következtetések alapján a Bizottság pedig jelenleg tanácsi ajánlást készít elő a témában.

Felhívom a Tisztelt Képviselő Úr figyelmét arra, hogy az Európai Unió működéséről szóló szerződés 165. cikke szerint az oktatás és a képzés tartalmának – így többek között a tanterveknek – és az oktatás szervezeti felépítésének a kialakítása a tagállamok kizárólagos hatáskörébe tartozik. Az európai oktatással kapcsolatos legfrissebb adatok azt mutatják, hogy a testnevelésórák aránya az alapfokú oktatásban 5–15%, a középfokú oktatásban pedig 1–12% között mozog az egyes tagállamokban (lásd a Eurydice „Kulcsfontosságú adatok az európai oktatásról” című 2012-es kiadványát.)

A sport európai dimenziójának fejlesztéséről szóló közleményében ⁽³⁾ a Bizottság hangsúlyozta, hogy bár több tagállamban is gondot jelent a testnevelési programok színvonala, illetve az ezekben részt vevő pedagógusok képzettsége, mindez viszonylag alacsony költségek árán fejleszthető lenne. Az egész életen át tartó tanulási program révén számos nemzetközi projekt kapott támogatást a tantervek korszerűsítése, például a fogyatékosokkal élő tanulók általános testnevelés-oktatásba való bevonása érdekében.

⁽¹⁾ „Global Recommendations on Physical Activity for Health” (Általános ajánlások az egészség megőrzése érdekében végzett testmozgásról), WHO, 2010.

⁽²⁾ HL L 394., 2006.12.30.

⁽³⁾ COM(2011) 12 végleges

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-000666/13
to the Commission
Erik Bánki (PPE)
(23 January 2013)**

Subject: Member States' best practices in the field of physical education

According to the WHO, children and young people aged 5-17 should do at least 60 minutes' physical activity a day in order to improve their cardiorespiratory and muscular fitness and bone health and to reduce the symptoms of anxiety and depression ⁽¹⁾.

A lack of physical activity has detrimental effects not only on the health of individuals, but also on health systems and the economy at large, because of the significant direct and indirect economic costs of physical inactivity.

Education plays a crucial role in preparing children for a healthy lifestyle, which has benefits for society as a whole.

Can the Commission provide some information on the state of play and best practices with regard to physical education (PE) in the Member States, particularly as regards the regularity and mandatory nature of PE lessons throughout the schooling system, i.e. from primary schooling to higher education?

**Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(19 February 2013)**

The recommendation of the European Parliament and the Council on key competences for lifelong learning (2006/962/EC ⁽²⁾) highlighted the need for physical education by linking it strongly to social competence and personal and social well-being.

The 2008 EU Physical Activity Guidelines, which encourage Member States to develop cross-sectoral policies to promote health-enhancing physical activity, also call for action in the field of education. Following the 2012 Council conclusions on the promotion of health-enhancing physical activity, the Commission is preparing a proposal for a Council Recommendation in this field.

The Honourable Member will be aware that in accordance with Article 165 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the responsibility for the content and organisation of education and training systems — including curricula — rests entirely with Member States. Recent data on education in Europe show that the percentage of hours devoted to physical education in education varies between Member States from 5% to 15% of total curriculum time in primary education and from 1% to 12% in secondary education (Eurydice: Key Data on Education in Europe 2012).

In its communication 'Developing the European Dimension of Sport' ⁽³⁾ the Commission points out that the quality of physical education programmes and the qualifications of the teachers involved remain a concern in many Member States, but could be improved at relatively low cost. Through the Lifelong Learning Programme, several transnational projects have received support to modernise curricula including for example on how to include students with a disability in mainstream physical education.

⁽¹⁾ 'Global recommendation on physical Activity for Health', WHO, 2010.

⁽²⁾ OJL 394, 30.12.2006.

⁽³⁾ COM(2011) 12 final.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000667/13

προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(23 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Εκτιμώμενες αιτήσεις πληρωμών ανά τομέα πολιτικής και ανά ταμείο για το 2012

Στις διαπραγματεύσεις σχετικά με τον προϋπολογισμό της ΕΕ για το 2013 διαπιστώθηκε η διάσταση θέσεων μεταξύ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου. Τα δύο σκέλη της αρμόδιας για τον προϋπολογισμό αρχής δεν κατόρθωσαν να καταλήξουν σε συμφωνία όσον αφορά τον προϋπολογισμό της ΕΕ για το 2013, καθώς και άλλα στοιχεία του πακέτου διαπραγμάτευσης κατά το στάδιο παρεμβάσεως της επιτροπής συνδιαλλαγής, λόγω αδυναμίας του Συμβουλίου να καταλήξει σε συμφωνία σχετικά με το σχέδιο διορθωτικού προϋπολογισμού (ΣΔΠ) αριθ. 6/2012. Το γεγονός αυτό ανάγκασε την Επιτροπή να δημοσιεύσει νέο σχέδιο προϋπολογισμού στις 23 Νοεμβρίου 2012. Έπειτα από τη διευθέτηση ορισμένων ενστάσεων του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, βρέθηκε λύση την τελευταία στιγμή, και επιτεύχθηκε συμφωνία τόσο για το ΣΔΠ 6/2012 όσο και για τον προϋπολογισμό του 2013.

Παρά το ΣΔΠ 6/2012, εκτιμάται ότι οι αιτήσεις πληρωμών που δεν καταβλήθηκαν για το 2012 στο πλαίσιο της επιμερισμένης διαχείρισης για τον Νοέμβριο και Δεκέμβριο 2012 θα ανέλθουν περίπου στο ποσό των 16 δισ. ευρώ.

Θα μπορούσε να προσδιορίσει η Επιτροπή το πραγματικό ποσό των αιτήσεων πληρωμών που ελήφθησαν αλλά δεν κατεβλήθησαν το 2012, και να παράσχει λεπτομερή ανάλυση των εν λόγω αιτήσεων ανά τομέα πολιτικής και ανά ταμείο;

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000668/13

προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(23 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Εκτιμώμενες αιτήσεις πληρωμών ανά κράτος μέλος για το 2012

Στις διαπραγματεύσεις σχετικά με τον προϋπολογισμό της ΕΕ για το 2013 διαπιστώθηκε ο βαθμός απόκλισης μεταξύ των θέσεων του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου. Τα δύο σκέλη της αρμόδιας για τον προϋπολογισμό αρχής δεν κατόρθωσαν να καταλήξουν σε συμφωνία όσον αφορά τον προϋπολογισμό της ΕΕ για το 2013, ή άλλα στοιχεία του πακέτου διαπραγμάτευσης κατά το στάδιο παρεμβάσεως της επιτροπής συνδιαλλαγής, λόγω αδυναμίας του Συμβουλίου να καταλήξει σε συμφωνία σχετικά με το σχέδιο διορθωτικού προϋπολογισμού (ΣΔΠ) αριθ. 6/2012. Το γεγονός αυτό ανάγκασε την Επιτροπή να δημοσιεύσει νέο σχέδιο προϋπολογισμού στις 23 Νοεμβρίου 2012. Έπειτα από τη διευθέτηση ορισμένων ενστάσεων του Κοινοβουλίου, βρέθηκε λύση την τελευταία στιγμή, και επιτεύχθηκε συμφωνία τόσο για το ΣΔΠ 6/2012 όσο και για τον προϋπολογισμό του 2013.

Παρά το ΣΔΠ αριθ. 6/2012, εκτιμάται ότι οι αιτήσεις πληρωμών τις οποίες απέστειλαν τα κράτη μέλη για το 2012 και δεν καταβλήθηκαν στο πλαίσιο της επιμερισμένης διαχείρισης για τον Νοέμβριο και Δεκέμβριο 2012 θα ανέλθουν περίπου στο ποσό των 16 δισ. ευρώ.

Θα μπορούσε η Επιτροπή να παράσχει πληροφορίες σχετικά με το πραγματικό συνολικό ποσό αιτήσεων πληρωμών που ελήφθησαν αλλά δεν κατεβλήθησαν το 2012, μαζί με λεπτομερή ανάλυση των εν λόγω αιτήσεων ανά κράτος μέλος;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Lewandowski εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής

(8 Μαρτίου 2013)

Στις 30 Ιανουαρίου 2013, η Επιτροπή έστειλε στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο τις αιτούμενες πληροφορίες μέσω του σημειώματος ARES(2013)78000 που απευθύνεται στον πρόεδρο Lamassoure, με αντίγραφο στη γραμματεία της επιτροπής προϋπολογισμού του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου. Στο σημείωμα αυτό παρέχονται οι λεπτομέρειες σχετικά με τα 16,2 δισεκατ. ευρώ των εκκρεμουσών αιτήσεων πληρωμών ανά ταμείο (και, ως εκ τούτου, ανά τομέα πολιτικής) και ανά κράτος μέλος.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000667/13
to the Commission
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(23 January 2013)**

Subject: Estimated payment requests for 2012 per policy area and per fund

The negotiations on the 2013 EU budget revealed the divergence in positions between the European Parliament and the Council. The two arms of the budgetary authority were not able to reach an agreement on the 2013 EU budget and the other elements of the negotiating package at the Conciliation Committee stage owing to the inability of the Council to reach an agreement on Draft Amending Budget (DAB) No 6/2012. This led the Commission to issue a new draft budget on 23 November 2012. After addressing some of the European Parliament's concerns, at the last moment a solution was found and an agreement was reached on both DAB 6/2012 and on the 2013 budget.

Notwithstanding DAB 6/2012, it is estimated that the unpaid payment requests for 2012 under shared management for November and December 2012 will amount to around EUR 16 billion.

Could the Commission specify the actual amount of payment requests received but not paid in 2012 and provide a detailed breakdown of these requests per policy area and per fund?

**Question for written answer E-000668/13
to the Commission
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(23 January 2013)**

Subject: Estimated payment requests for 2012 by Member State

The negotiations on the 2013 EU budget revealed the extent of the divergence between the positions of Parliament and the Council. The two arms of the budgetary authority were not able to reach an agreement on the 2013 EU budget or the other elements of the negotiating package at the Conciliation Committee stage, owing to the inability of the Council to reach an agreement on Draft Amending Budget (DAB) No 6/2012. This led the Commission to publish a new draft budget on 23 November 2012. Some of Parliament's concerns having been addressed, at the last moment a solution was found and an agreement was reached on both DAB No 6/2012 and the 2013 budget.

Notwithstanding DAB No 6/2012, it is estimated that the unpaid payment requests sent by Member States for 2012 under shared management for November and December 2012 will total some EUR 16 billion.

Could the Commission provide information on the real total of payment requests received but not paid in 2012, together with a detailed breakdown of those requests by Member State?

**Joint answer given by Mr Lewandowski on behalf of the Commission
(8 March 2013)**

On 30 January 2013, the Commission sent to the European Parliament the requested information through the note ARES(2013)78000 addressed to President Lamassoure and copied to the Secretariat of the Budget Committee of the European Parliament. This note gives the detail of the EUR 16,2 billion of pending payment claims divided by fund (and hence by policy area) and by Member States.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000669/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(23 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Επίπεδο των υπολοίπων προς εκκαθάριση (RAL) από το 2007 έως το 2012

Τα υπόλοιπα προς εκκαθάριση (RAL, *reste à liquider*) περιλαμβάνουν όλες τις εκκρεμείς υποχρεώσεις οι οποίες παραμένουν ανεξόφλητες σε δεδομένη χρονική στιγμή και το γεγονός ότι αυτές ολοένα αυξάνονται συνιστά ένα εκ των σημαντικότερων ζητημάτων ανησυχίας στο πλαίσιο της εκτέλεσης του προϋπολογισμού της ΕΕ.

Θα μπορούσε η Επιτροπή να παράσχει λεπτομερή ανάλυση του επιπέδου των RAL από την αρχή του τρέχοντος πολυετούς δημοσιονομικού πλαισίου (2007) έως τα τέλη του 2012;

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000670/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(23 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Σύνθεση των υπολοίπων προς εκκαθάριση (RAL) από το 2007 έως το 2012

Η έννοια των υπολοίπων προς εκκαθάριση (RAL, *restes à liquider*) περιλαμβάνει όλες τις εκκρεμείς υποχρεώσεις οι οποίες παραμένουν ανεξόφλητες σε δεδομένη χρονική στιγμή και το γεγονός ότι αυτές ολοένα αυξάνονται συνιστά ένα εκ των σημαντικότερων ζητημάτων ανησυχίας στο πλαίσιο της εκτέλεσης του προϋπολογισμού της ΕΕ.

Θα μπορούσε η Επιτροπή να παράσχει λεπτομερή ανάλυση της σύνθεσης των RAL από την αρχή του τρέχοντος πολυετούς δημοσιονομικού πλαισίου (2007) έως τα τέλη του 2012;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Lewandowski εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(4 Μαρτίου 2013)

Η λεπτομερής ανάλυση του επιπέδου των υπολοίπων προς εκκαθάριση (RAL) από την αρχή του τρέχοντος πολυετούς δημοσιονομικού πλαισίου (2007) έως τα τέλη του 2012 περιέχεται στο Παράρτημα που διαβιβάστηκε απευθείας στο αξιότιμο μέλος και στη Γραμματεία του Κοινοβουλίου.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000669/13
to the Commission
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(23 January 2013)**

Subject: Level of RALs from 2007 until 2012

The RAL (*reste à liquider*) refers to all outstanding commitments which remain unpaid at a given point in time, and its increasing level is one of the most important areas of concern in the execution of the EU budget.

Could the Commission provide a detailed breakdown of the level of RALs from the beginning of the current multiannual financial framework (2007) until the end of 2012?

**Question for written answer E-000670/13
to the Commission
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(23 January 2013)**

Subject: Composition of RALs between 2007 and 2012

The term 'RALs' (*restes à liquider*) refers to all outstanding commitments which remain to be paid at a given point in time. The increasing level of RALs is one of the main issues of concern regarding the execution of the EU budget.

Could the Commission provide a detailed breakdown of the composition of RALs, from the beginning of the current multiannual financial framework (2007) up to the end of 2012?

**Joint answer given by Mr Lewandowski on behalf of the Commission
(4 March 2013)**

The detailed breakdown of the level of RALs from the beginning of the current multiannual financial framework (2007) until the end of 2012 is shown in the annex sent directly to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's Secretariat.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000671/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(23 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Προβλεπόμενα υπόλοιπα προς εκκαθάριση (RAL) για το πρώτο τρίμηνο του 2013

Τα υπόλοιπα προς εκκαθάριση (RAL, *reste à liquider*) περιλαμβάνουν όλες τις εκκρεμείς υποχρεώσεις οι οποίες παραμένουν ανεξόφλητες σε δεδομένη χρονική στιγμή και το γεγονός ότι αυτές ολοένα αυξάνονται συνιστά ένα εκ των σημαντικότερων ζητημάτων ανησυχίας στο πλαίσιο της εκτέλεσης του προϋπολογισμού της ΕΕ.

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τη σημαντική αύξηση των RAL από τα προηγούμενα έτη, θα μπορούσε η Επιτροπή να παράσχει μια εκτίμηση του επιπέδου και της σύνθεσης των RAL σε κάθε κράτος μέλος για το πρώτο τρίμηνο του 2013;

Απάντηση του κ. Lewandowski εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(25 Μαρτίου 2013)

Το σύνολο των εκκρεμών αναλήψεων υποχρεώσεων (RAL) στο τέλος ενός οικονομικού έτους αποτελεί προϊόν της εφαρμογής μιας σειράς ετήσιων προϋπολογισμών με αναλήψεις υποχρεώσεων και πληρωμές. Ωστόσο, σε κάθε οικονομικό έτος ο μηνιαίος ρυθμός δημοσιονομικών δεσμεύσεων και εκτέλεσης πληρωμών μπορεί να διαφέρει σημαντικά. Τα αριθμητικά στοιχεία των RAL κατά τη διάρκεια του έτους δεν μπορούν, συνεπώς, να συγκριθούν με αποδοτικό τρόπο με τα στοιχεία RAL στο τέλος του έτους. Μία εκτίμηση για το χρονικό διάστημα μέχρι το τέλος του πρώτου τριμήνου θα έπρεπε επιπρόσθετα να βασίζεται σε μια σειρά παραδοχών.

Για να διασφαλιστεί η συγκρισιμότητα με το σύνολο των αριθμητικών στοιχείων RAL που παρέχονται στην απάντηση της Επιτροπής στις ερωτήσεις E-000669/2013 και E-000670/2013 ⁽¹⁾ του Αξιότιμου Μέλους του Κοινοβουλίου, η ζητηθείσα κατανομή των RAL ανά κράτος μέλος παρέχεται για την περίοδο από τις 31 Δεκεμβρίου 2012.

Μία τέτοια κατανομή ανά κράτος μέλος είναι δυνατή μόνο για τις δράσεις των διαρθρωτικών ταμείων υπό επιμερισμένη διαχείριση στους τομείς 1β και 2 του δημοσιονομικού πλαισίου ⁽²⁾. Τα συνολικά ποσά ανά τομέα δεν περιλαμβάνουν δαπάνες οι οποίες δεν προορίζονται για συγκεκριμένα κράτη μέλη (λοιπά προγράμματα, τεχνική βοήθεια κ.λπ.).

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

⁽²⁾ ΕΤΠΑ, ΕΚΤ και ΤΣ στον τομέα 1β και ΕΓΤΑΑ, ΕΑΤ, ΕΓΤΠΕ-Τμήμα Προσανατολισμού και ΧΜΠΑ στον τομέα 2.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000671/13
to the Commission
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(23 January 2013)**

Subject: Estimated RAL projection for the first quarter of 2013

The RAL (*reste à liquider*) refers to all outstanding commitments which remain unpaid at a given point in time, and its increasing level is one of the most important areas of concern in the execution of the EU budget.

Given the significant accrual of RALs from previous years, could the Commission provide an estimated projection of the level and composition of RALs in each Member State for the first quarter of 2013?

**Answer given by Mr Lewandowski on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2013)**

Total outstanding commitments (RAL) at the end of a given financial year are the result of the implementation of a series of annual budgets in commitments and payments. Within each financial year the monthly rhythm of budget commitment and payment execution may however vary considerably. RAL figures during the year therefore cannot be compared in a meaningful way to end of year RAL figures. A projection up to the end of the first quarter would in addition have to be based on a series of assumptions.

In order to ensure the comparability with the overall RAL figures provided in the Commission's reply to the Honourable Member's questions E-000669/2013 and E-000670/2013 ⁽¹⁾, the requested breakdown of RAL by Member State is provided as of 31 December 2012.

Such a breakdown by Member State is only possible for structural actions funds under shared management in Headings 1b and 2 of the Financial Framework ⁽²⁾. The total amounts by Heading do not include expenditure that is not earmarked to specific Member States (other programmes, technical assistance etc).

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

⁽²⁾ ERDF, ESF and CF in Heading 1b and EAFRD, EFF, EAGGF-Guidance and FIFG in Heading 2

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000672/13
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin)**

Franz Obermayr (NI)

(23. Januar 2013)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Causa Dr. Cyril Karabus und Menschenrechte in den VAE

Dr. Cyril Karabus wird seit August 2012 in den VAE festgehalten, weil ihm der Tod eines Kindes im Jahre 2003 angelastet wird. Der 77 Jahre alte Kinderarzt Cyril Karabus hatte 2003 für vier Wochen in Abu Dhabi als Urlaubsvertretung auf der Kinderonkologie gearbeitet. Während dieses Aufenthalts starb ein Kind auf seiner Station. Nach seiner Rückkehr in seine Heimat erstattete der Vater des Kindes Anzeige; der Arzt hätte eine Transfusion nicht durchgeführt und sei deshalb für den Tod verantwortlich. Karabus hat von der Anzeige jahrelang nichts gewusst. Fast zehn Jahre später, im August 2012, als der südafrikanische Arzt nach einer Hochzeitsfeier seines Sohnes in Kanada über die VAE zurückflog und in Dubai zwischenlandete, wurde er festgenommen und sitzt seitdem im Gefängnis. 13 Verhandlungen sind laut Medienberichten über die Bühne gegangen. Die Geschichte ist sehr ähnlich gelagert wie der Fall des Oberösterreichers Eugen Adelsmayr; auch hier sind Krankenakten auf einmal nicht auffindbar. Und obwohl nichts gegen den Mediziner vorliegt, ist er zunächst einmal schuldig.

Der Fall findet international großes Interesse, und über ihn ist in „The Economist“, „The British Medical Journal“, etc. berichtet worden. Dr. Karabus befand sich auf dem Heimweg nach Südafrika von einer Hochzeit in Kanada, musste daher eine Nacht in Dubai verbringen und wurde am nächsten Morgen (18. August) bei der Passkontrolle einfach festgenommen. Medienberichten zufolge erhalten seine Anwälte keinen Zugang zu allen wichtigen Dokumenten, was seine Verteidigung fast unmöglich macht. Seine Frau, seine Tochter und sein Schwiegersohn mussten das Land verlassen, weil sie nur ein kurzfristiges Visum besaßen.

1. Kennt die Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin den Fall Dr. Karabus, und wenn ja, wie beurteilt sie seine überraschende Inhaftierung im August 2012 auf der Grundlage zweifelhafter Beweise?
2. Vielleicht gelingt es durch eine noch breitere Öffentlichkeit, Dr. Karabus zu helfen. Welche Möglichkeiten gäbe es nach Meinung der Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin, diesen Fall seitens der EU aktiv zu unterstützen?
3. Der südafrikanische Ärzteverband und die WHO warnen ihre Mitglieder angeblich bereits davor, in den Vereinigten Arabischen Emiraten als Ärzte zu arbeiten. Wie beurteilt die Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin die Empfehlungen?
4. Viele Krankenhäuser in den VAE werden von ausländischen Ärzten aus der ganzen Welt geleitet. Welche Empfehlungen für Ärzte und andere Arbeitskräfte aus Europa sind hier nach Meinung der Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin unter den vorherrschenden Sicherheitsbedingungen angebracht?

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

(22. April 2013)

Die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin hat den Fall Dr. E. Adelsmayr in den Vereinigten Arabischen Emiraten (VAE) von Anfang an in enger Zusammenarbeit mit den österreichischen Behörden verfolgt. Dem EAD ist das Schicksal des Dr. Karabus bekannt; er kann allerdings zu diesem Fall nicht Stellung nehmen, da es sich bei Dr. Karabus um einen Staatsangehörigen der Republik Südafrika handelt. Nach Kenntnisstand des EAD stehen die südafrikanischen Behörden in diesem Fall mit den Behörden der Vereinigten Arabischen Emirate auf Ministerebene in Kontakt.

Die EU hat für medizinisches Personal, das in den VAE arbeiten möchte, keine Empfehlung ausgesprochen. Die EU wird auch weiterhin einzelne Fälle von in den VAE inhaftierten oder angeklagten EU-Bürgern verfolgen und erforderlichenfalls mit den vor Ort vertretenen EU-Mitgliedstaaten zusammenarbeiten. Das Ziel und der Zweck des Rechts auf ein faires Verfahren sind fester Bestandteil des Grundsatzes der Rechtsstaatlichkeit und für den Schutz der Menschenrechte von wesentlicher Bedeutung. Daher wird sich der EAD auch weiterhin für die Achtung des humanitären Völkerrechts, einer fairen und unparteiischen Justiz und der Gleichheit vor dem Gesetz einsetzen.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000672/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Franz Obermayr (NI)

(23 January 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Case of Dr Cyril Karabus and human rights in the United Arab Emirates

Dr Cyril Karabus, a 77 year old South African paediatrician, has been held in the United Arab Emirates since August 2012 accused of causing the death of a child in 2003. In 2003 Cyril Karabus worked for four weeks in Abu Dhabi as a child oncology locum. During this time a child died on his ward. Having returned to his home town, the child's father reported the doctor to the authorities, saying that he had not carried out a transfusion and was therefore responsible for the child's death. Dr Karabus knew nothing about this for years. Almost 10 years later, in August 2012, Dr Karabus flew via the UAE on his way home from his son's wedding in Canada. He had a stopover in Dubai where he was arrested and has been in prison ever since. Media reports say that there have been 13 hearings so far. This story is very similar to the case of the Austrian Eugen Adelsmayr; once again, medical files suddenly cannot be found. And even though there is no evidence against Dr Karabus, he is being regarded as guilty.

The case has aroused great interest internationally, with reports in the Economist, the British Medical Journal, etc. Dr Karabus was on his way home to South Africa from a wedding in Canada, had to spend a night in Dubai and was arrested the next morning (18 August) during a passport check. According to media reports, his lawyer does not have access to all the important documents, which makes defending him nearly impossible. His wife, daughter and son-in-law have had to leave the country because they only had short stay visas.

1. Does the Vice-President/High Representative know about Dr Karabus' case? If so, what is her view of his unexpected imprisonment in August 2012 on the basis of dubious evidence?
2. It is possible that making the case more widely known would help Dr Karabus. How does the Vice-President/High Representative think the EU can be active in supporting his case?
3. The South African Medical Association and the WHO are apparently already warning their members against taking up posts as doctors in the UAE. What is the Vice-President/High Representative's opinion of this advice?
4. Many hospitals in the UAE are run by foreign doctors from around the world. In view of the prevailing security conditions, what advice does the Vice-President/High Representative think should be given to doctors and other workers from Europe?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(22 April 2013)

The HR/VP has followed the case of Dr E. Adelsmayr in the United Arab Emirates throughout, in close cooperation with the Austrian authorities. The EEAS is aware of the fate of Dr Karabus, but is not in a position to comment on the whereabouts of this case, since Dr Karabus is a South African national. The EEAS understands that the South African authorities have engaged the UAE authorities at Ministerial level on this case.

The EU has not issued any advice to medical practitioners wishing to work in the UAE. The EU will continue to follow individual cases of EU citizens imprisoned or charged in the UAE as and when necessary, in collaboration with EU Member States represented locally. The object and purpose of the right to a fair trial is enshrined in the principle of the rule of law and essential to safeguard human rights. Therefore, the EEAS will continue to promote observance of international humanitarian law, of fair and impartial administration of justice and of equality before the law.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000673/13
do Komisji**

Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD) oraz Tadeusz Cymański (EFD)

(23 stycznia 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Sytuacja w Fabryce Maszyn w Leżajsku

W ostatnim tygodniu z biura posła Kazimierza Ziobro z Rzeszowa dotarła do nas alarmująca wiadomość dotycząca ogłoszenia upadłości Fabryki Maszyn w Leżajsku. Jest to działający od ponad 40 lat, największy w Polsce zakład produkujący betoniarki hydrauliczne oraz podzespoły i części zamienne. Według informacji przekazanych przez posła Ziobro wypowiedzenia obejmą około 230 osób, co więcej większość z nich od czterech miesięcy nie otrzymywała wypłaty należnego wynagrodzenia.

1. Czy Komisja jest świadoma tragicznej sytuacji w Fabryce Maszyn w Leżajsku?
2. Czy Rząd Polski wystąpił już do Komisji o uruchomienie środków z Europejskiego Funduszu Dostosowania do Globalizacji (EFG) dla osób zwalnianych w leżajskich zakładach maszynowych? Kiedy Komisja może wpłacić środki pomocowe dla zwalnianych?
3. Jak Komisja zamierza wspierać powrót na rynek pracowników z sektorów przemysłu maszynowego zwalnianych ze względu na kryzys, szczególnie z części sektora tak silnie związanego z budownictwem jak zakłady w Leżajsku?
4. Zakłady maszynowe to jeden z największych i najważniejszych pracodawców w Leżajsku, wraz ze zwolnieniami znacznie pogarsza się sytuacja miasta dotkniętego już i tak wysokim bezrobociem (17,2 %). Czy w nowej perspektywie finansowej Komisja zamierza przeznaczyć dodatkowe środki na wsparcie dla miast takich jak Leżajsk, gdzie upadek zakładów przemysłowych prowadzi do strukturalnego bezrobocia?
5. Jaki wpływ na rynek maszynowy ma nieograniczony import maszyn z Chin?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza László Andora w imieniu Komisji

(21 marca 2013 r.)

1. Komisja jest zaniepokojona społecznymi i ekonomicznymi skutkami, jakie może wywołać ogłoszenie upadłości Fabryki Maszyn w Leżajsku.
- 2.–3. Komisja nie posiada informacji o jakimkolwiek wniosku o finansowanie z EFG ⁽¹⁾ przygotowywanym przez Polskę w związku ze zwolnieniami grupowymi, o których mowa w pytaniu. Osoba kontaktowa do spraw EFG w Polsce może udzielić informacji, czy planowane jest złożenie takiego wniosku ⁽²⁾. Poza EFG kluczowym źródłem wsparcia UE w zakresie poziomu kwalifikacji pracowników i perspektyw na rynku pracy jest EFS. W 2012 r. 135 pracowników Fabryki Maszyn w Leżajsku odbyło szkolenie współfinansowane ze środków EFS ⁽³⁾. Wojewódzki Urząd Pracy w Rzeszowie może przedstawić Szanownym Panom Posłom wszelkie szczegóły.
4. Wszystkie interwencje EFRR w ramach Regionalnego Programu Operacyjnego Województwa Podkarpackiego na lata 2007-2013, których suma wynosi łącznie niemal 1,45 miliarda EUR, przyczyniają się do zmniejszania problemów strukturalnych tego regionu. Ponadto odrębna oś priorytetowa RPO Podkarpackie poświęcona została zwiększaniu spójności wewnątrzregionalnej. W przyszłym okresie programowania Komisja będzie zachęcać regionalne władze województwa podkarpackiego do zwiększenia wsparcia dla obszarów zmagających się z poważnymi brakami strukturalnymi. Ponadto przystosowanie pracowników, przedsiębiorstw i przedsiębiorców do zmian jest jednym z priorytetów inwestycyjnych proponowanych w przyszłym rozporządzeniu w sprawie EFS.
5. Import maszyn przez UE z Chin, jak i z innych krajów trzecich należących WTO, jest dozwolony, o ile jest to zgodne z prawem UE. Szanowni Panowie Posłowie mogą zauważyć, że według badań przeprowadzonych przez Komisję w 2011 r. w sektorze maszyn UE nastąpił wzrost wydajności przewyższający ogólny wzrost w przemyśle wytwórczym UE, pomimo dotkliwych skutków poprzedniego kryzysu finansowego.

⁽¹⁾ Europejski Fundusz Dostosowania do Globalizacji.

⁽²⁾ Dane kontaktowe: <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=pl>

⁽³⁾ W ramach projektu: „Podniesienie adaptacyjności i konkurencyjności Fabryki Maszyn w Leżajsku poprzez specjalistyczne szkolenia związane z rozszerzeniem profilu działalności”.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000673/13
to the Commission
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD) and Tadeusz Cymański (EFD)
(23 January 2013)**

Subject: Situation at the Leżajsk Machine Plant

In the past week, we have received alarming news from Member of the Sejm Kazimierz Ziobro's office in Rzeszów concerning the announcement of the bankruptcy of the Leżajsk Machine Plant. Established over 40 years ago, it is the largest plant in Poland producing hydraulic cement mixers, sub-assemblies and spare parts. According to information provided by Mr Ziobro, approximately 230 people will be laid off. Furthermore, the majority of them have not received any pay for four months.

1. Is the Commission aware of the alarming situation at the Leżajsk Machine Plant?
2. Has the Polish Government asked the Commission to mobilise funds from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund to assist people laid off from the Leżajsk Machine Plant? When will the Commission be able to provide financial assistance to those laid off?
3. How does the Commission intend to help workers from the mechanical engineering sector laid off as a result of the crisis, particularly those workers from parts of the sector that are as closely tied to the construction industry as the plants in Leżajsk?
4. The machine plants are one of the largest and most important employers in Leżajsk, and the wave of redundancies will significantly aggravate the situation in a city already hard-hit by high levels of unemployment (17.2%). Does the Commission plan to allocate additional resources under the forthcoming multiannual financial framework to support cities like Leżajsk, where industrial decline is leading to structural unemployment?
5. What influence is the unrestricted importation of machines from China having on the machine market?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(21 March 2013)**

1. The Commission is concerned with the social and economic consequences that the bankruptcy of the Leżajsk Machine Plant may bring.
- 2-3. The Commission is not aware of any application for funding from the EGF ⁽¹⁾ being prepared by Poland related to the redundancies referred to in the question. The EGF Contact Person for Poland can be contacted to ask whether an application is being planned ⁽²⁾. Besides the EGF, the ESF is a key source of EU support to embrace people's skills and perspectives on the labour market. In 2012, 135 employees of the Leżajsk Machine Plant received training co-funded by ESF ⁽³⁾. The Voivodship Labour Office in Rzeszow can provide the Honourable Members with all details.
4. All ERDF interventions carried out under the Regional Operational Programme for Podkarpackie 2007-2013 amounting to almost EUR 1.45 billion, contribute to alleviating the structural problems of the region. Furthermore, ROP Podkarpackie has a dedicated priority axis designed to foster greater intraregional convergence. In the future programming period the Commission will encourage the regional authorities of Podkarpackie to strengthen support for areas suffering from severe structural deficiencies. Besides, the adaptation to change of workers, enterprises and entrepreneurs is one of the investment priorities proposed in the future ESF regulation.
5. EU imports of machines from China, like from other third country members of the WTO, are allowed as long as these comply with EC law. The Honourable Members may wish to note that, following a 2011 study by the Commission, the EU machinery sector has enjoyed a growth in productivity higher than in the EU manufacturing industry as a whole, despite being hit hard by the previous financial crisis.

⁽¹⁾ European Globalisation Adjustment Fund.

⁽²⁾ Contact details: <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=pl>

⁽³⁾ Under the project: 'Podniesienie adaptacyjności i konkurencyjności Fabryki Maszyn w Leżajsku poprzez specjalistyczne szkolenia związane z rozszerzeniem profilu działalności'.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000674/13
do Komisji**

Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)

(23 stycznia 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Białoruskiej niezależnej dziennikarce grozi deportacja

21 stycznia media poinformowały, że władze Szwecji odmówiły białoruskiej niezależnej dziennikarce Oldze Kłaskowskiej prawa na pobyt stały i zdecydowały, że wraz z 11-letnią córką zostanie deportowana z kraju. Sześciomiesięczny syn Olgi Kłaskowskiej – obywatel Szwecji – decyzją władz ma pozostać w Sztokholmie.

Kłaskowska na Białorusi działała w organizacji „Młody Front”, pracowała też w opozycyjnej gazecie „Narodnaja Wola”. Gdy za działalność opozycyjną wyrzucono ją ze studiów i zaczęły się pogroźki, zdecydowała się uciec z Mińska. Wyjechała do Polski, gdzie otrzymała azyl polityczny, a potem do Szwecji. Dziennikarka utraciła status uchodźcy politycznego, kiedy na początku 2011 r. wyjechała na Białoruś, aby wesprzeć brata, który po wyborach prezydenckich w 2010 r. został oskarżony o udział w masowych zamieszkach i skazany na 5 lat kolonii karnej o zastrzonym rygorze.

5 maja 2011 r. dziennikarka została dotkliwie pobita przez milicjantów na komisariacie w Mińsku, gdzie została przewieziona po aresztowaniu w mieszkaniu brata. Będąc pod presją prześladowań ze strony organów ścigania opuściła Białoruś latem 2011 r.

Zwracam się więc z zapytaniem, czy Komisja posiada informacje na temat decyzji szwedzkich władz odnośnie do prawa na pobyt stały dla niezależnej białoruskiej dziennikarki Olgi Kłaskowskiej i ma zamiar podjąć interwencję, by nie doprowadzić do jej deportacji?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Cecilję Malmström w imieniu Komisji

(27 marca 2013 r.)

Komisja nie zna okoliczności sprawy opisanej przez Szanownego Pana Posła.

Decyzje o przyznaniu ochrony międzynarodowej mogą zostać podjęte wyłącznie przez właściwe władze krajowe państw członkowskich UE, dla każdego przypadku z osobna i w zależności od indywidualnej sytuacji każdego wnioskodawcy, przy jednoczesnym zapewnieniu pełnej zgodności z dorobkiem prawnym UE w dziedzinie azylu. Podobnie poszczególne procedury powrotu są zarządzane na szczeblu krajowym, a władze krajowe są zobowiązane do sprawdzenia, czy wszystkie odpowiednie wymogi przewidziane w prawodawstwie UE, włącznie z poszanowaniem zasady *non-refoulement*, są spełnione.

Komisja nie jest organem odwoławczym w dziedzinie azylu, ani w kwestiach dotyczących powrotów imigrantów do krajów ich pochodzenia. Jest to przede wszystkim zadanie sądów krajowych. Komisja może jednak interweniować, jako strażnik prawa unijnego, jeśli można jasno dowieść, iż państwo członkowskie naruszyło prawa przyznane osobom fizycznym na mocy przepisów Unii. Zdarzenia, do których odnosi się Szanowny Pan Poseł, nie zawierają wystarczających danych wskazujących na to, że tak rzeczywiście jest. W związku z tym Komisja nie jest w stanie podjąć dalszych działań, ani zwrócić się z zaleceniem do władz Szwecji.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000674/13
to the Commission
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(23 January 2013)

Subject: Independent Belarusian journalist under threat of deportation

On 21 January 2013 it was reported in the media that the Swedish authorities had refused to grant the independent Belarusian journalist Olga Klaskovskaya the right to reside in Sweden and decided that she and her 11 year-old daughter should be deported from the country. They also decided that Ms Klaskovskaya's six month-old son, who is a Swedish citizen, is to remain in Stockholm.

Ms Klaskovskaya was a member of the Youth Front organisation in Belarus and worked for the opposition paper *Narodnaja Wola*. When, as a result of her opposition activities, she was expelled from university and started to receive threats, she decided to leave Minsk, travelling first to Poland, where she was granted political asylum, and then to Sweden. Ms Klaskovskaya lost her status as a political refugee when, in early 2011, she travelled to Belarus to help her brother who, following the presidential elections in 2010, was charged with involvement in mass riots and sentenced to five years' imprisonment in a high-security prison camp.

On 5 May 2011 Ms Klaskovskaya was severely beaten by officers at a Minsk police station to which she had been taken after being arrested at her brother's flat. In order to escape constant harassment by law enforcement agencies, she left Belarus in the summer of 2011.

Is the Commission aware of the Swedish authorities' decision not to grant the independent Belarusian journalist Olga Klaskovskaya the right to reside in Sweden, and does it intend to intervene to prevent her deportation?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2013)

The Commission is not aware of the circumstances behind the case referred to by the Honourable Member.

Decisions to grant international protection can only be adopted by the competent national authorities of the EU Member States, on a case by case basis and depending on the individual circumstances of each applicant, while ensuring full respect of the EU asylum *acquis*. Likewise individual return procedures are managed at national level and national authorities are obliged to check that all relevant requirements provided for in EU legislation, including respect of the principle of non-refoulement, are fulfilled.

The Commission is not an appeals body on asylum or return issues. This task is in the first place performed by national courts. As Guardian of Union law, the Commission may, however, intervene if it can be clearly demonstrated that a Member State has infringed rights accorded to individuals under Union law. The facts referred to by the Honourable Member do not contain sufficient indication that this is the case. The Commission is therefore not in a position to take further action or to address a recommendation to the Swedish authorities.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000676/13
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(23. Januar 2013)

Betrifft: Zulassung von gentechnisch verändertem Fisch

Die USA stehen, wie aus Medienberichten bekannt wurde, kurz davor der Welt zum ersten Mal gentechnisch veränderten Fisch zu präsentieren — nämlich einen mutierten Lachs, der Wildlachsbestände vernichten, aber auch eine Gefahr für die menschliche Gesundheit darstellen könnte. So hat ein US Unternehmen die DNA des Lachses dahin gehend manipuliert, dass der mutierte Fisch, auch „Frankenfisch“ genannt, angeblich doppelt so schnell wächst wie echter Lachs. Dieser Mutant der Biotech-Industrie ist deshalb besonders gefährlich, weil er den Weg für andere transgene Fisch- und Fleischsorten ebnet würde. Die Biotech-Industrie hat bereits große Summen in das Lobbying investiert, damit Regierungen ihre gentechnisch veränderten Zuchtprodukte zulassen. Die langfristigen Gesundheitsfolgen durch Verzehr dieses Mutanten sind bislang noch unbekannt. Überdies könnten diese Superlachse ganze Bestände ihrer wilden Artgenossen auslöschen, wenn einige dieser Tiere oder deren Eier in die freie Wildbahn gelangen. Der Mutantenfisch ist zudem angeblich kaum von echtem Lachs zu unterscheiden.

1. Wie beurteilt die Kommission diese Vorhaben in den USA? Teilt die Kommission die Bedenken gegen mutierten Lachs?
2. Wie kann sichergestellt werden, dass nicht alleine die Finanzkraft der Biotech-Unternehmen bestimmt, was wir in Zukunft essen werden?
3. Soll Fisch auch in Zukunft noch den gesunden bzw. unbedenklich zu konsumierenden Nahrungsmitteln angehören? Was denkt die Kommission darüber, und wie gedenkt man gegebenenfalls dafür Sorge zu tragen?
4. Der Verzehr des besagten Fisches soll jetzt für unbedenklich erklärt werden — auf der Grundlage von Studien, die von demselben Unternehmen finanziert wurden, das auch das gentechnisch veränderte Tier entwickelt hat. Kann nach Ansicht der Kommission bei einem solchen Interessenskonflikt den Studien — auch nur rudimentär — Vertrauen geschenkt werden?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(11. März 2013)

1.-3. Die Europäische Union hat im Rahmen von Rechtsvorschriften eigene strenge Sicherheitskriterien zur Risikobewertung und Zulassung von GVO festgelegt, die vollkommen unabhängig von den Zulassungsverfahren von Drittstaaten sind. Erst nachdem diese strenge Risikobewertung positiv ausgefallen ist, können GVO in die EU importiert und dort verwendet werden. Die Vorschriften über GVO stellen darüber hinaus auch sicher, dass die Verbraucher umfassend über das Vorhandensein von GVO in Futtermitteln und Lebensmitteln informiert sind, so dass sie eine bewusste Kaufentscheidung treffen können.

Im speziellen Fall von genetisch veränderten Tieren entwickelt die Europäische Behörde für Lebensmittelsicherheit derzeit einen Leitlinienentwurf zur Bewertung von Umweltrisiken genetisch veränderter Tiere (⁽¹⁾), einschließlich Fische, sowie ihrer Auswirkungen auf die Gesundheit von Mensch und Tier, um sich auf mögliche Anträge auf Marktzulassung in der Europäischen Union vorzubereiten.

Die US Food and Drug Administration hat einen Entwurf der Umweltverträglichkeitsprüfung ausgearbeitet, der sich auf ihre Risikobewertung des „AquAdvantage Salmon“, eines genetisch veränderten Lachses, bezieht und zur öffentlichen Konsultation ausgeschrieben wurde. Die Kommission wird innerhalb eines bestimmten Zeitraums Stellung dazu beziehen und Gewähr verlangen, dass die Lieferkettenkontrollen für die Ausfuhren von Fisch in die Europäische Union durchgeführt und geeignete Testverfahren verfügbar sind, damit sichergestellt wird, dass nur zugelassener Lachs in die EU importiert werden kann.

4. Innere Angelegenheiten von Drittstaaten kommentiert die Kommission grundsätzlich nicht.

(¹) <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/de/press/news/120621.htm>

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000676/13
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(23 January 2013)

Subject: Authorisation for genetically modified fish

Media reports have revealed that the USA is on the verge of presenting the world for the first time with a genetically modified fish. This is a mutated salmon, which has the potential not only to devastate wild salmon stocks, but also to endanger human health. An American firm has manipulated the salmon's DNA in such a way that the mutated fish, also called the 'Frankenfish', allegedly grows twice as fast as a real salmon. This biotech industry mutant is particularly dangerous because it would smooth the way for other transgenic fish and meat varieties. The biotech industry has already invested a huge amount in lobbying governments to approve their genetically modified breeding schemes. The long-term repercussions on our health of eating these mutants are still not known. What is more, these super-salmon could wipe out whole stocks of their wild cousins if one of them or their eggs were to escape into the wild. Furthermore it seems there is practically no difference in appearance between the mutant fish and a real salmon.

1. What is the Commission's opinion of these plans in the USA? Does the Commission share the misgivings regarding mutated salmon?
2. What guarantee is there that what we will be eating in the future will not be solely decided by the biotech industry's financial power?
3. Will fish continue in the future to be regarded as a healthy foodstuff, or at least one which is safe to eat? What does the Commission think and how, should this be necessary, does it propose to ensure that this is so?
4. It is now proposed that the aforementioned fish be declared safe to eat — on the basis of studies funded by the very firms that developed the genetically modified animal in the first place. In the light of this conflict of interest, does the Commission consider that any trust at all can be placed in these studies?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(11 March 2013)

1-3. The European Union has set in law its own strict safety criteria for risk assessment and authorisation of GMOs, which are fully independent of third countries' authorisation procedures. No GMO can be imported and used in the EU if it has not been granted an authorisation first, after successful completion of this stringent risk assessment process. Furthermore, the GMO legislation ensures that consumers are comprehensively informed on the presence of GMOs in feed and food, allowing them to make an informed purchasing choice.

As regards GM animals in particular, in order to prepare for possible future applications of this kind, the European Food Safety Authority is developing guidance on human and animal health and environmental risk assessment for GM animals ⁽¹⁾, including fish.

The US Food and Drug Administration has issued for public comment a draft environmental assessment related to the agency's review of an application concerning AquAdvantage Salmon, a genetically engineered Atlantic salmon. The Commission will comment within the specified period requesting assurances on the supply chain controls for fish exports to the European Union, and the availability of appropriate detection methods, to ensure that no unauthorised salmon can be imported to the EU.

4. It is Commission policy not to comment on the internal affairs of third countries.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/press/news/120621.htm>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000677/13
to the Commission**

Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR)

(23 January 2013)

Subject: World Economic Forum Annual Meeting in Davos, 22-26 January 2013

1. Can the Commission please confirm which Commissioners and how many Commission staff attended the World Economic Forum Annual Meeting in Davos on 22-26 January 2013?
2. Could the Commission please provide details of all the mission costs of the Commissioners and Commission staff who attended the meeting in Davos?
3. Can the Commission also please confirm the means of transport by which the Commissioners travelled to Davos, and if it was by chartered aircraft what was the justification for choosing this method over a scheduled flight?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission

(12 March 2013)

In total, 19 people travelled to Davos for the World Economic Forum Annual Meeting in January 2013; six of which are Commissioners.

The average cost of these missions was EUR 2.153, which includes travel by commercial airlines, accommodation costs and daily subsistence allowances. In addition, some missions were not only to Davos and back (more destinations combined) resulting in a higher cost.

There were no chartered aircrafts used for these missions.

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000678/13
aan de Commissie**

Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(23 januari 2013)

Betreeft: Europees systeem van emissiehandel

De Europese Commissie heeft aangegeven het aantal emissierechten te willen verminderen om zo kunstmatig de prijs van de emissierechten te verhogen. Al een jaar geleden hebben analisten van de Zwitserse bank UBS geconstateerd dat het emissiehandelssysteem (ETS) gewoonweg niet werkt. De EU wil bepalen hoeveel CO₂ bedrijven in de toekomst mogen uitstoten. Niemand weet echter hoe de economie zich in de toekomst zal ontwikkelen ⁽¹⁾. Het bedrijfsleven lijdt onder het ETS en degene die het meeste profiteren van het systeem zijn de financiële diensten ⁽²⁾. Het ETS is volgens de CEO van EON „a joke the whole world laughs about” ⁽³⁾. In 1997 was de EU nog tegen een systeem van handel in emissierechten ⁽⁴⁾.

1. Wat waren de redenen van de Commissie om af te wijken van haar oorspronkelijke positie ten opzichte van handel in emissierechten?
2. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat het de Commissie zou sieren om zich erbij neer te leggen dat het ETS niet werkt en ook in de toekomst niet zal werken?

Antwoord van mevrouw Hedegaard namens de Commissie

(13 maart 2013)

De Commissie heeft twee zaken voorgesteld, namelijk:

- 1) om het veilingschema van de EU-regeling voor de handel in emissierechten (ETS) zodanig te wijzigen dat in de eerdere jaren van fase 3 minder emissierechten worden geveild, en in latere jaren (2013-2020) ⁽⁵⁾ meer. Het gaat hierbij niet om het verminderen van de emissierechten in fase 3, het gaat erom op korte termijn iets te doen aan de grote en snel groeiende wanverhouding tussen vraag en aanbod in het EU-ETS. Naar verwachting zal dit geen dramatische gevolgen hebben voor de koolstofprijs, maar eerder stabiliserend werken op de korte termijn.
- 2) om alternatieven te overwegen voor de aanpak van de meer structurele problemen van het systeem, die worden veroorzaakt door het — in wezen vanwege de crisis opgebouwde — overschot aan emissierechten. De discussie over potentiële automatische stabiliseringsmechanismen die rekening houden met onzekerheden zoals in de vraag genoemd, maakt deel uit van deze overwegingen. Er is geen reden waarom het niet mogelijk zou zijn het ETS in de toekomst beter te laten werken, als de politieke wil daartoe er is.

Wat betreft de vragen van het geachte Parlementslid verwijst de Commissie het geachte Parlementslid naar haar antwoord op de eerdere schriftelijke vraag E-009943/2012 ⁽⁶⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.spiegel.de/international/business/hot-air-the-eu-s-emissions-trading-system-isn-t-working-a-815225.html>

⁽²⁾ <http://www.euractiv.com/specialreport-europe-industry-ha/industry-claims-emissions-trading-news-517228>

⁽³⁾ <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-01-18/eu-carbon-plunges-after-german-sale-canceled-on-low-bid-prices.html>

⁽⁴⁾ Ellerman, A. Danny and Barbara K. Buchner. 2007. The European Union Emissions Trading Scheme: origins, allocation, and early results. Association of Environmental and Resource Economics (1), 66-87.

⁽⁵⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/policies/ets/cap/auctioning/docs/20121112_com_en.pdf

⁽⁶⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+WQ+E-2012-009943+0+DOC+XML+V0//NL>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000678/13
to the Commission**

Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)

(23 January 2013)

Subject: European Emissions Trading System

The Commission has stated that it wishes to reduce the number of emission certificates in order to artificially raise their price. A year ago, analysts at the Swiss bank UBS already concluded that the Emissions Trading System (ETS) was simply not working. The EU wishes to determine how much CO₂ businesses may emit in future. However, no one knows how the economy will develop in future ⁽¹⁾. Industry is suffering from the ETS while it is financial services that derive the greatest benefit from the system ⁽²⁾. According to the CEO of EON, the ETS is 'a joke the whole world laughs about' ⁽³⁾. In 1997 the EU was still against an emissions trading system ⁽⁴⁾.

1. Why has the Commission decided to abandon its original position on emissions trading?
2. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that it would be to the Commission's credit if it accepted that the ETS is not working and will not work in future either?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission

(13 March 2013)

What the Commission has proposed is two things:

- 1) changing the timing of auctions for the EU Emissions Trading System (ETS), auctioning fewer allowances in early years and more in later years of phase 3 (2013-2020) ⁽⁵⁾. This is not about reducing the number of allowances in phase 3, but about addressing the large and rapidly growing supply-demand imbalance in the EU ETS in the short-term. It is not expected to have dramatic effects on the carbon price, but rather to have a stabilising effect in the short term;
- 2) to debate options for addressing the more structural problems of the system caused by the surplus of allowances built up in essence due to the crisis. To this debate belongs the discussion about potential automatic stabilisation mechanisms for taking into account uncertainties such as those referred to in the question. There is no reason why it should not be possible to make the ETS work better in the future if there is political will to do so.

In relation to Honourable Member's questions, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to her previous Written Question E-009943/2012 ⁽⁶⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.spiegel.de/international/business/hot-air-the-eu-s-emissions-trading-system-isn-t-working-a-815225.html>

⁽²⁾ <http://www.euractiv.com/specialreport-europe-industry-ha/industry-claims-emissions-trading-news-517228>.

⁽³⁾ <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-01-18/eu-carbon-plunges-after-german-sale-canceled-on-low-bid-prices.html>

⁽⁴⁾ Ellerman, A. Danny and Barbara K. Buchner. 2007. The European Union Emissions Trading Scheme: origins, allocation, and early results. Association of Environmental and Resource Economics (1), 66-87.

⁽⁵⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/ets/cap/auctioning/docs/20121112_com_en.pdf

⁽⁶⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bWQ%2bE-2012-009943%2b0%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2f%2fEN&language=EN>

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000679/13
aan de Commissie**

Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)

(23 januari 2013)

Betreft: Europees klimaatbeleid

De beantwoording van mijn eerdere vraag (E-009936/2012) geeft aanleiding tot de volgende vervolgvragen:

In het artikel van Stefan Boeters en Joris Koornneef genaamd *Supply of renewable energy sources and the cost of EU climate policy* ⁽¹⁾ geven de schrijvers aan dat de extra kosten van de „20 % hernieuwbare energie”-doelstelling, 6 % hoger zijn dan een beleid zonder deze doelstelling. De schrijvers zijn kritisch over de coëxistentie van subsidies voor hernieuwbare energie en bestaande belastingen op fossiele brandstoffen en stellen dat de 20 %-doelstelling voor hernieuwbare energie kan leiden tot aanzienlijk hogere sociale lasten. Het argument van de extra kosten van het EU klimaatbeleid wordt ook ondersteund door andere auteurs ⁽²⁾.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met de artikelen *Supply of renewable energy sources and the cost of EU climate policy* en *EU climate policy up to 2020: An economic impact assessment*? Zo ja, hoe reageert de Commissie op de bevindingen van dit wetenschappelijk onderzoek?
2. In het artikel wordt aangegeven dat vermindering van uitstoot van broeikasgassen ook kan worden bereikt door een efficiënter gebruik van fossiele brandstoffen en door het switchen van steenkool naar gas. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat deze methodes in acht moeten worden genomen alvorens over te gaan op dure en onrendabele investeringen in wind- en zonne-energie? Zo neen, waarom niet?
3. Door subsidiëring van onder andere windenergie forceert de EU de markt om meer van deze vorm van energie gebruik te maken dan in werkelijkheid efficiënt zou zijn. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat subsidiëring van windenergie in strijd is met EU doelstellingen betreffende energie-efficiëntie? Zo neen, waarom niet?

Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie

(15 maart 2013)

De Commissie is bekend met het rapport dat in de vraag wordt vermeld. Het rapport bevestigt de analyse ⁽³⁾ van de Commissie en het standaardmodelresultaat dat elke toevoeging aan een marktconform en kostenminimaliserend economisch instrument om de uitstoot van broeikasgassen te verminderen, een „verlies van welvaart” creëert.

Waar het in dit debat om gaat is dat het EU-beleid inzake energie uit hernieuwbare bronnen niet alleen bijdraagt tot het klimaatbeleid, maar dat het eveneens de energievoorzieningszekerheid van de EU verbetert en diversifieert. De investeringen in hernieuwbare energie in de EU hebben ook bijgedragen aan de creatie van een mondiale markt voor hernieuwbare energie en hebben de technologiekosten in die mate doen dalen dat landwind- en zonne-energie nu in sommige markten op rendabele wijze kunnen worden ingezet. Een en ander is dus niet in strijd met het beleid en de doelstellingen inzake energie-efficiëntie.

In sommige gevallen blijken de instrumenten die worden gebruikt om de doelstellingen op het gebied van hernieuwbare energie te bereiken, niet efficiënt te zijn. Het gaat dan met name om bepaalde nationale steunregelingen voor hernieuwbare energie. Om die reden werkt de Commissie aan richtsnoeren voor deze regelingen om ervoor te zorgen dat de doelstellingen op het gebied van hernieuwbare energie zo kostenefficiënt mogelijk worden bereikt.

⁽¹⁾ Boeters, Stefan en Joris Koornneef. 2011. *Supply of renewable energy sources and the cost of EU climate policy*. *Energy Economics* (33), 1024-1034.

⁽²⁾ Böhringer, Christoph, Andreas Löschel, Ulf Moslener en Thomas F. Rutherford. 2009. *EU climate policy up to 2020: An economic impact assessment*. *Energy Economics* (31), 295-305.

⁽³⁾ (SEC(2008)85).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000679/13
to the Commission**

Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)

(23 January 2013)

Subject: European climate policy

The answer to my previous question (E-009936/2012) gives rise to the following further questions:

In the article by Stefan Boeters and Joris Koornneef, *Supply of renewable energy sources and the cost of EU climate policy* ⁽¹⁾, the authors indicate that the excess costs of the '20% renewable energy' target are 6% as compared with the costs of a policy without this target. The authors criticise the coexistence of subsidies for renewable energy with existing taxes on fossil fuels, and state that the 20% target for renewable energy could lead to substantially greater social costs. The argument concerning the excess costs of the EU's climate policy is also supported by other authors. ⁽²⁾

1. Is the Commission familiar with the articles *Supply of renewable energy sources and the cost of EU climate policy* and *EU climate policy up to 2020: An economic impact assessment*? If so, what is the Commission's response to the findings of this research?
2. The article indicates that greenhouse gas emissions can also be reduced by using fossil fuels more efficiently and switching from coal to gas. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that these methods should be taken into account before resorting to costly and unviable investments in wind power and solar energy? If not, why not?
3. By subsidising wind power (*inter alia*), the EU compels the market to make more use of this form of energy than is genuinely efficient. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that subsidies for wind power run counter to EU energy efficiency targets? If not, why not?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission

(15 March 2013)

The Commission is familiar with the report mentioned in the question. The report confirms Commission analysis ⁽³⁾ and the standard modelling result that any addition to a market based, cost minimising economic instrument to reduce GHG emissions creates a 'welfare loss'.

The key point in this debate is that EU Renewable energy policy contributes to climate policy but also diversifies and improves the security of EU energy supplies. The renewable energy investments made in the EU have also helped to create a global renewable energy market and driven down technology costs in such a way that onshore wind and Photovoltaic can now be deployed viably in some markets. As such, it does not contradict energy efficiency policy and targets.

There are instances where the instruments used to achieve the renewable energy targets have not been efficient, in particular certain national renewable energy support schemes. It is for this reason that the Commission is preparing guidance on such schemes, to ensure that renewable energy targets are reached as cost effectively as possible.

⁽¹⁾ Boeters, Stefan and Joris Koornneef. 2011. Supply of renewable energy sources and the cost of EU climate policy. *Energy Economics* (33), 1024-1034.

⁽²⁾ Böhringer, Christoph, Andreas Löschel, Ulf Moslener and Thomas F. Rutherford. 2009. EU climate policy up to 2020: An economic impact assessment. *Energy Economics* (31), 295-305.

⁽³⁾ (SEC(2008)85).

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000680/13
al Consiglio**

Francesco Enrico Speroni (EFD)

(23 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Politica di rigore finanziario e approccio americano

Negli USA, per fronteggiare la crisi e stimolare l'economia e l'occupazione, si è raggiunto un accordo politico teso ad aumentare il limite del debito svincolandolo dai tagli alla spesa. Maggiori risorse finanziarie saranno così destinate a finanziare opere, progetti e spese che si suppone saranno utili ad allontanare gli effetti della crisi ed a rilanciare i consumi e l'economia americana. In Europa, al contrario, si prosegue nell'attuare una severa politica di rigore finanziario e di tagli alla spesa che sembra peggiorare le condizioni dell'economia, far perdere PIL ed aumentare la disoccupazione.

1. Non ritiene il Consiglio che il perseguimento di una tale politica di rigore possa produrre effetti deleteri per l'economia europea?
2. Come si spiega il Consiglio che il medesimo problema venga affrontato dal sistema americano in modo diametralmente opposto rispetto a quello europeo?
3. Con quali motivazioni si esclude che una maggiore spesa ed un innalzamento del tetto del debito possano avere conseguenze positive sull'economia europea?
4. Non ritiene il Consiglio che il semplice vantaggio di alcuni Stati membri non sia una motivazione sufficiente per perseverare in una politica di rigore dimostratasi sinora fallimentare?

Risposta

(15 aprile 2013)

Nelle conclusioni del 12 febbraio 2013, Il Consiglio ha sottolineato che permane la gravità della sfida in termini di crescita e di debito a cui è confrontata l'economia dell'UE e che, nell'attuale congiuntura, resta assolutamente prioritario migliorare la fiducia e rilanciare la crescita economica, garantendo la sostenibilità del debito e incrementando la competitività, con la creazione di condizioni favorevoli alla crescita sostenibile e all'occupazione nel più lungo periodo,

Il Consiglio ha inoltre sottolineato che un prerequisito della crescita e dell'aggiustamento consiste nel proseguire sulla via del risanamento di bilancio e delle riforme strutturali e invertire la frammentazione finanziaria, nel migliorare le condizioni di finanziamento per gli investitori soprattutto nei paesi vulnerabili e nel favorire l'afflusso e un'allocazione efficiente del capitale a sostegno dell'aggiustamento. A tal fine il Consiglio europeo del dicembre 2012 ha convenuto di mantenere gli attuali sforzi tesi a rafforzare la governance dell'UEM fondata su una maggiore integrazione e una solidarietà rafforzata nella zona euro. Tale processo sarà avviato con il completamento, il rafforzamento e l'attuazione della nuova governance economica rafforzata, nonché con l'adozione del meccanismo di vigilanza unico e delle nuove norme sul risanamento e la risoluzione delle crisi nel settore bancario e sulle garanzie dei depositi. Ciò sarà reso possibile dall'istituzione di un meccanismo di risoluzione unico.

Inoltre il Consiglio ha sottolineato che finanze pubbliche sane e sostenibili sono un prerequisito essenziale per la fiducia dei mercati e la stabilità economica e, di conseguenza, per la crescita. L'aggiustamento di bilancio deve continuare sulla via di una strategia di risanamento differenziato favorevole alla crescita, anche in considerazione di elevati livelli di debito e di sfide a medio e lungo termine per le finanze pubbliche.

Il Consiglio non ha discusso le altre questioni sollevate dall'onorevole parlamentare.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000680/13
to the Council**

Francesco Enrico Speroni (EFD)

(23 January 2013)

Subject: Financial austerity policy and the American approach

To cope with the crisis and boost its economy and employment, political agreement has been reached in the USA to raise the debt ceiling without reference to spending cuts. More funds will be available therefore to finance works, projects and purchasing which, it is assumed, will help ward off the effects of the crisis and kick-start consumption and the American economy. The European Union, on the other hand, is pursuing a rigorous policy of financial austerity and spending cuts, which appears to be producing even worse economic conditions, falling GDP and rising unemployment.

1. Does the Council not feel that sticking to this austerity policy may be detrimental to the EU economy?
2. How does the Council explain the fact that the USA is tackling the very same problem in a diametrically opposed way to the EU?
3. What are the grounds for dismissing the idea that higher spending and raising the debt ceiling may have positive repercussions on the EU economy?
4. While some Member States may benefit from the financial austerity policy surely this alone does not constitute sufficient grounds for persevering with this policy which has thus far proved to be disastrous. Does the Council agree?

Reply

(15 April 2013)

In its conclusions of 12 February 2013, the Council emphasised that the growth and debt challenges confronting the EU economy continued to be serious, and that improving confidence and reviving economic growth, ensuring debt sustainability and improving competitiveness, while creating conditions for sustainable growth and jobs in the longer-term, were the main priorities at the current juncture.

The Council also underlined that a prerequisite for growth and adjustment was to continue on the path of fiscal consolidation and structural reforms and to reverse financial fragmentation, to improve financing conditions for investors, especially in the vulnerable countries, and to encourage the inflow and efficient allocation of capital to support adjustment. To this end, the European Council in December 2012 agreed to maintain ongoing efforts to strengthen EMU governance based on deeper integration and reinforced solidarity in the euro area. This process will begin with the completion, strengthening and implementation of the new enhanced economic governance, as well as the adoption of the Single Supervisory Mechanism and of the new rules on recovery and resolution and on deposit guarantees. This will be made possible by the establishment of a single resolution mechanism.

Furthermore, the Council emphasised that sound and sustainable public finances were an essential prerequisite for market confidence and macroeconomic stability, and hence for growth. Fiscal adjustment had to continue along the path of a differentiated growth-friendly consolidation strategy, also in view of high debt levels and medium- to long-term challenges to public finances.

The Council has not discussed the other issues raised by the Honourable Member.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000681/13
alla Commissione**

Francesco Enrico Speroni (EFD)

(23 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Politica di rigore finanziario e approccio americano

Negli USA, per fronteggiare la crisi e stimolare l'economia e l'occupazione, si è raggiunto un accordo politico teso ad aumentare il limite del debito svincolandolo dai tagli alla spesa. Maggiori risorse finanziarie saranno così destinate a finanziare opere, progetti e spese che si suppone saranno utili ad allontanare gli effetti della crisi ed a rilanciare i consumi e l'economia americana. In Europa, al contrario, si prosegue nell'attuare una severa politica di rigore finanziario e di tagli alla spesa che sembra peggiorare le condizioni dell'economia, far perdere PIL ed aumentare la disoccupazione. L'interrogante ritiene che la principale motivazione di tale rigore stia nella volontà di alcuni Stati membri dell'UE che, maggiormente esposti per l'acquisto di titoli di Stato di paesi con minore liquidità, vogliono al più presto rientrare da una tale posizione.

1. Non ritiene la Commissione che il perseguimento di una tale politica di rigore possa produrre effetti deleteri per l'economia europea?
2. Come si spiega la Commissione che il medesimo problema venga affrontato dal sistema americano in modo diametralmente opposto rispetto a quello europeo?
3. Con quali motivazioni si esclude che una maggiore spesa ed un innalzamento del tetto del debito possano avere conseguenze positive sull'economia europea?
4. Non ritiene la Commissione che il semplice vantaggio di alcuni Stati membri non sia una motivazione sufficiente per perseverare in una politica di rigore dimostratasi sinora fallimentare?

Risposta di Olli Rehn a nome della Commissione

(28 febbraio 2013)

Nell'analisi annuale della crescita per il 2013, la Commissione promuove un approccio equilibrato per garantire la sostenibilità di bilancio e la stabilità macrofinanziaria e per stimolare una crescita e un'occupazione sostenibili. La Commissione è favorevole a un risanamento di bilancio differenziato, da attuare in modo da ridurre al minimo gli effetti negativi a breve termine sulla crescita. L'analisi annuale della crescita presenta inoltre altre importanti misure necessarie per rafforzare la crescita economica:

- per ripristinare l'erogazione di prestiti all'economia reale è indispensabile garantire la stabilità macrofinanziaria e limitare le turbolenze sul mercato del debito sovrano;
- a livello microfinanziario è necessario proseguire il risanamento, in particolare nel settore bancario, promuovendo al tempo stesso nuove fonti di finanziamento;
- occorrono riforme strutturali per migliorare le condizioni generali per la crescita e rafforzare la capacità di adeguamento delle nostre economie;
- le riforme del mercato del lavoro svolgono un ruolo importante;
- è necessaria un'amministrazione efficace ed efficiente per mettere in atto le riforme difficili nelle critiche condizioni economiche attuali.

I paesi che rischiano di perdere l'accesso al mercato non dispongono della possibilità di ritardare il risanamento né di aumentare i livelli di debito. Inoltre, oltre una certa soglia, stimata a circa il 90 % del PIL, il livello del debito pubblico tende a diventare un ostacolo per la stessa crescita.

Non vi è pertanto alcuna alternativa plausibile a un risanamento di bilancio favorevole alla crescita, differenziato tra i paesi a seconda della situazione nazionale.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000681/13
to the Commission**

Francesco Enrico Speroni (EFD)

(23 January 2013)

Subject: Financial austerity policy and the American approach

To cope with the crisis and boost its economy and employment, political agreement has been reached in the USA to raise the debt ceiling without reference to spending cuts. More funds will be available therefore to finance works, projects and purchasing which, it is assumed, will help ward off the effects of the crisis and kick-start consumption and the American economy. The European Union, on the other hand, is pursuing a rigorous policy of financial austerity and spending cuts, which appears to be producing even worse economic conditions, falling GDP and rising unemployment. In my view, the prime reason for this financial austerity lies in the resolve of certain EU Member States which, owing to their purchase of government bonds from countries with less liquidity, are now heavily exposed and want to withdraw from this position as fast as possible.

1. Does the Commission not feel that sticking to this austerity policy may be detrimental to the EU economy?
2. How does the Commission explain the fact that the USA is tackling the very same problem in a diametrically opposed way to the EU?
3. What are the grounds for dismissing the idea that higher spending and raising the debt ceiling may have positive repercussions on the EU economy?
4. While some Member States may benefit from the financial austerity policy surely this alone does not constitute sufficient grounds for persevering with this policy which has thus far proved to be disastrous. Does the Commission agree?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission

(28 February 2013)

In its Annual Growth Survey (AGS) 2013, the Commission is advocating a balanced approach to ensuring fiscal sustainability, macro-financial stability and to engender sustainable growth and jobs. The Commission supports a differentiated fiscal consolidation to be implemented in such a way that it minimises negative short-term effects on growth. The AGS also sets out other critical steps needed to bolster economic growth:

- To restore lending to the real economy, macro-financial stability is indispensable and the turbulences in the sovereign debt market have to be contained;
- At micro level, financial repair has to continue in particular in the banking sector, but also new sources of funding have to be promoted;
- Structural reforms are necessary to improve framework conditions for growth and to strengthen the adjustment capacity of our economies;
- Labour market reforms play an important role;
- Efficient and effective public administration is necessary to implement the difficult reforms in the current challenging economic conditions.

For countries at risk of losing market access the option of delaying consolidation, let alone increasing their debt levels, does not exist. Also, beyond a certain threshold estimated at around 90% of GDP, the level of public debt tends to become a drag on growth itself.

There is hence no credible alternative to a growth-friendly fiscal consolidation that is differentiated across countries, depending on their circumstances.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000682/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**

Fiorello Provera (EFD)

(23 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Preoccupazioni riguardanti il progetto di costituzione tunisina

Il 23 gennaio 2013 Human Rights Watch (HRW) ha dichiarato che l'Assemblea nazionale costituente della Tunisia (ANC) dovrebbe modificare una serie di disposizioni contenute nel nuovo progetto di costituzione nazionale, poiché potrebbero rappresentare una minaccia per i diritti umani. Il progetto è stato presentato il 14 dicembre 2012, anche se l'ANC sta ancora procedendo a un dibattito con cittadini e gruppi della società civile per decidere se modificare ulteriormente il testo prima di votare per la sua approvazione.

Sebbene l'ultima versione risulti migliorata sotto diversi aspetti, secondo il vicedirettore di HRW per il Medio Oriente e il Nordafrica resta comunque il fatto che «il testo presenta scappatoie e omissioni che giudici e legislatori potrebbero sfruttare per intaccare i diritti».

A destare particolare preoccupazione è l'articolo 15, che recita: «Le convenzioni internazionali devono essere rispettate, purché non contrarie alla Costituzione». HRW crede che ciò potrebbe consentire a giudici e legislatori di ignorare i trattati in questione, adducendo a pretesto il fatto che sono in contraddizione con la nuova costituzione. Tra le altre disposizioni che suscitano preoccupazione figurano inoltre quelle relative all'immunità giudiziaria per il presidente, garantitagli sia durante il periodo in carica sia successivamente, alla mancanza di garanzie adeguate in materia di indipendenza del potere giudiziario e all'accessibilità alla carica di presidente che, in maniera discriminatoria, è riservata ai soli cittadini di religione musulmana. Quest'ultima disposizione in particolare contraddice l'articolo 5, secondo cui: «Tutti i cittadini beneficiano di uguali diritti e doveri dinanzi alla legge, senza alcuna discriminazione».

Può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Può il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante far conoscere la sua posizione in merito al progetto di costituzione tunisina?
2. Qual è il ruolo dell'UE rispetto alla stesura della costituzione? Quale sostegno, se del caso, sta offrendo ai gruppi della società civile e agli altri gruppi interessati?
3. Alla luce di queste preoccupanti disposizioni nel progetto di costituzione, quali iniziative intende il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante adottare nel sollevare queste inquietudini con il governo tunisino?

Risposta dell'Alto Rappresentate/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione

(12 marzo 2013)

1. e 3. L'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente sta seguendo da vicino la stesura della nuova Costituzione. Nell'ambito del dialogo politico e nel pieno rispetto della sovranità tunisina, l'UE ha stabilito numerosi contatti e intrapreso iniziative diplomatiche per esprimere alle autorità e alle diverse forze politiche tunisine il suo punto di vista riguardo alcuni aspetti del progetto di testo che destano preoccupazione.

Oltre al dialogo politico, l'UE fornisce anche strumenti finanziari in diversi settori a sostegno della transizione democratica. Si pensi, ad esempio, alla riforma della giustizia, al supporto tecnico e politico al lavoro dell'Assemblea nazionale costituente tramite il PNUS, a cui partecipa anche il Parlamento europeo e alla prestazione di assistenza tecnica e consulenza attraverso il Consiglio d'Europa.

2. In linea con le comunicazioni congiunte del 2011 sulla nuova politica europea di vicinato, una delle priorità dell'UE nei confronti della Tunisia consiste nel sostenere la società civile, sempre più parte integrante del nostro dialogo politico. È inoltre in corso un rafforzamento dei finanziamenti destinati a tale priorità, in particolare mediante un programma sottoscritto recentemente del valore di 7 milioni di EUR.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000682/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(23 January 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Concerns regarding Tunisia's draft constitution

On 23 January 2013, Human Rights Watch (HRW) stated that the Tunisian National Constituent Assembly (NCA) should amend a series of provisions in the country's new draft constitution that could threaten human rights. The draft text was released on 14 December 2012, and the NCA is still in a process of deliberation with citizens and civil society groups to decide whether to make further amendments before voting on its adoption.

While the latest text contains many improvements, it remains the case, according to HRW's deputy director for the Middle East and North Africa, that there are 'loopholes and omissions in the text that judges and legislators might use to curb rights'.

The article that is causing concern is Article 15, which states: 'Respect for international conventions is compulsory if they do not contravene this constitution'. HRW believes this could allow judges and legislators to disregard those treaties on the pretext that they contradict the new constitution. Other worrying provisions include the following: judicial immunity for the president while serving and afterwards; inadequate guarantees of the independence of the judiciary; and a discriminatory provision that only a Muslim can become President. This last provision contradicts Article 5, which states: 'All citizens are equal in rights and obligations before the law, without discrimination of any kind'.

1. What is the position of the Vice-President/High Representative regarding Tunisia's draft constitution?
2. What is the role of the EU regarding the drafting of the constitution? What support, if any, is it giving to civil society groups and other relevant groups?
3. In light of these troubling provisions in the draft text, what steps is the Vice-President/High Representative prepared to take in raising these concerns with the Tunisian Government?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(12 March 2013)

1 and 3. The HR/VP is following closely the drafting of the new Constitution. In the framework of our political dialogue, and in full respect of Tunisian sovereignty, numerous contacts and discrete *démarches* have taken place to express to the authorities and to the different political forces the EU's point of view on some aspects of the draft text which have raised concern.

In addition to political dialogue, EU financial instruments are also used to support the democratic transition, in different fields, for example the reform of the judicial sector, technical and political support to the work of the National Constituent Assembly (through UNDP and in which the European Parliament is also involved), provision of technical assistance and expertise through the Council of Europe.

2. In line with 2011 Joint Communications on the new Neighbourhood Policy, support to civil society is a priority of EU engagement with Tunisia; civil society is increasingly involved in our political dialogue and financing to civil society is being reinforced *inter alia* through a recently signed programme worth EUR 7 million.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-000683/13
to the Commission
Chris Davies (ALDE)
(24 January 2013)**

Subject: EU measures to combat terrorism and fight crime

The UK Government is undertaking a review to assess whether it should opt out of some 135 EU measures relating to police and judicial cooperation. The Association of Chief Police Officers in the UK has said that only 29 of the measures assist law enforcement in practice.

A significant number of the measures are said to be effectively dormant and unused, while others have been overtaken and subsumed into subsequent agreements.

What steps are being taken by the Commission to review the measures with the aim of streamlining procedures, reducing unnecessary bureaucracy and ensuring that priority is attached to those shown to be of most value to the tasks of combating terrorism and fighting crime?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(25 February 2013)**

The Commission recently launched the Regulatory Fitness and Performance Programme (REFIT) aiming at eliminating unnecessary regulatory cost and ensuring that the body of the EU legislation remains fit for purpose. Even if this exercise is not linked to Protocol 36, one aim of this process is the simplification, codification, recast and consolidation of legal texts as well as reducing the volume of legislation by repealing obsolete provisions, including measures relating to police and judicial cooperation..

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-000685/13
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)**

Tomasz Piotr Poręba (ECR)

(24 stycznia 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Kwestia zwrotu wraku prezydenckiego Tu-154 przez Rosję

Według relacji służb prasowych Europejskiej Służby Działań Zewnętrznych, szefowa unijnej dyplomacji na marginesie grudniowego szczytu UE-Rosja w rozmowie z rosyjskim ministrem spraw zagranicznych Siergiejem Ławrowem poruszyła kwestię powrotu do Polski wraku Tu-154M. O interwencję w tej sprawie prosił wcześniej Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoką Przedstawiciel minister spraw zagranicznych Polski Radosław Sikorski.

Chcielibyśmy prosić o odpowiedź na następujące pytania:

1. Jakiej odpowiedzi udzielił minister Ławrow Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel?
2. Dlaczego kwestia zwrotu wraku została poruszona jedynie w kuluarach spotkania?
3. Czy w razie braku reakcji Rosji Polska może liczyć, że sprawa ta zostanie wpisana jako pełnoprawny punkt kolejnego szczytu UE-Rosja?

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-000700/13
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)**

Ryszard Antoni Legutko (ECR)

(24 stycznia 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Kwestia zwrotu wraku prezydenckiego Tu-154 przez Rosję

Według relacji służb prasowych Europejskiej Służby Działań Zewnętrznych, szefowa unijnej dyplomacji na marginesie grudniowego szczytu UE-Rosja w rozmowie z rosyjskim ministrem spraw zagranicznych Siergiejem Ławrowem poruszyła kwestię powrotu do Polski wraku Tu-154M. O interwencję w tej sprawie prosił wcześniej Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoką Przedstawiciel minister spraw zagranicznych Polski Radosław Sikorski.

Chcielibyśmy prosić o odpowiedź na następujące pytania:

1. Jakiej odpowiedzi udzielił minister Ławrow Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel?
2. Dlaczego kwestia zwrotu wraku została poruszona jedynie w kuluarach spotkania?
3. Czy w razie braku reakcji Rosji Polska może liczyć, że sprawa ta zostanie wpisana jako pełnoprawny punkt kolejnego szczytu UE-Rosja?

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

(19 marca 2013 r.)

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca Catherine Ashton wyraziła nadzieję, że toczące się rosyjskie dochodzenie zostanie wkrótce zakończone, a szczątki samolotu zostaną przekazane Polsce.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-000685/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Tomasz Piotr Poręba (ECR)

(24 January 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — The issue of Russia returning the wreckage of the presidential TU-154 aircraft

According to reports from the European External Action Service's press service, the EU's High Representative for Foreign Affairs raised the issue of returning the wreckage of TU-154M to Poland with the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Sergey Lavrov, on the sidelines of the December 2012 EU-Russia Summit. The Vice-President/High Representative had previously been asked to raise the issue by the Polish Minister of Foreign Affairs, Radosław Sikorski.

1. What was Minister Lavrov's response to the Vice-President/High Representative?
2. Why was the issue of returning the wreckage raised only on the sidelines of the summit?
3. If Russia fails to respond, can Poland count on the matter being included as a separate point on the agenda of the next EU-Russia Summit?

**Question for written answer P-000700/13
to the Commission**

Ryszard Antoni Legutko (ECR)

(24 January 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — The issue of Russia returning the wreckage of the presidential TU-154 aircraft

According to reports from the European External Action Service's press service, the EU's High Representative for Foreign Affairs raised the issue of returning the wreckage of TU-154M to Poland with the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Sergey Lavrov, on the sidelines of the December 2012 EU-Russia Summit. The Vice-President/High Representative had previously been asked to raise the issue by the Polish Minister of Foreign Affairs, Radosław Sikorski.

1. What was Minister Lavrov's response to the Vice-President/High Representative?
2. Why was the issue of returning the wreckage raised only on the sidelines of the summit?
3. If Russia fails to respond, can Poland count on the matter being included as a separate point on the agenda of the next EU-Russia Summit?

Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(19 March 2013)

The High Representative/Vice-President has expressed the wish that the ongoing Russian investigation will soon be concluded and that the wreckage of the airplane be handed over to Poland.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000686/13
aan de Commissie
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(24 januari 2013)

Betref: Europees Ontwikkelingsfonds (EOF) tussenrapportage

In de schriftelijke antwoorden van commissaris Piebalgs (kwijtingsprocedure 2011, hoorzitting 18 december 2012) staat op pagina 34/35 vermeld dat de tussenrapportage van het EOF medio 2012 is afgerond. De Commissie meldt dat „den tenuitvoerlegging in diverse regio's langzaam was”, met name in West-Afrika en Zuid-Afrika. In dat kader de volgende vragen:

1. Van de 597 miljoen euro bestemd voor West-Afrika is ruim 565 miljoen euro ongebruikt. In Zuid-Afrika ongeveer de helft. Kan de Commissie aangeven waarom dat zo is?
2. Kan de Commissie aan de belastingbetaler uitleggen waarom kennelijk veel te veel fondsen ter beschikking worden gesteld aan deze landen, terwijl er thuis een economische crisis woedt?
3. Wat gebeurt er met het deel van de fondsen dat niet aangesproken wordt?
4. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat onbestede gelden zo spoedig mogelijk dienen terug te vloeien naar de lidstaten?
5. Kan de Commissie aangeven welke projecten voor „duurzame energie” in deze landen bijdragen aan de doelstellingen van de Europese lidstaten? Met andere woorden: wat is de aantoonbare toegevoegde „Europese waarde” van deze EU-projecten boven die van de lidstaten?

Antwoord van de heer Piebalgs namens de Commissie
(14 maart 2013)

1. De financiële middelen voor de regionale programma's in West-Afrika en Zuidelijk Afrika worden gebruikt om de projecten te financieren die tijdens de tussentijdse evaluatie en in het kader van het initiatief „Duurzame energie voor iedereen” werden overeengekomen. De financiering van dit initiatief in de beide regio's en van de resterende activiteiten van het regionale programma in Zuidelijk Afrika werd in 2012 vastgelegd. De projecten voor West-Afrika bevinden zich op dit moment in de goedkeuringsfase. Om ervoor te zorgen dat de regionale fondsen zijn vastgelegd tegen 31 december 2013, heeft de Commissie in de conclusies van de tussentijdse evaluatie een reeks termijnen opgenomen. Alle projecten moesten worden vastgesteld tegen 30 september 2012 en de nodige documenten met de volledige beschrijving van de projecten moesten bij de Commissie worden ingediend voor 31 december 2012. Tegen 31 maart 2013 moeten de projecten zijn goedgekeurd. Tot nu toe zijn alle termijnen in acht genomen.

2.-4. Deze middelen maken deel uit van het tiende EOF en zijn vastgelegd voor de ACS-landen voor de periode 2008-2013. De Commissie heeft de nodige stappen ondernomen om de fondsen te gebruiken of over te hevelen naar landen die daar specifiek behoefte aan hebben in 2013. Overeenkomstig het intern akkoord voor het tiende EOF ⁽¹⁾ zal de Raad met eenparigheid van stemmen beslissen over het gebruik van de na 31 december 2013 resterende middelen van het tiende EOF.

5. De instrumenten voor de financiering van projecten op het gebied van hernieuwbare energie in ACS-landen liggen in de lijn van de „Europese consensus inzake ontwikkeling” ⁽²⁾.

Dit was in het bijzonder het geval voor de ACS-EU-Energiefaciliteit alsook voor de steun van de EU aan het initiatief „Duurzame energie voor iedereen” van VN-secretaris-generaal Ban Ki-moon, dat erop gericht is tegen 2030 duurzame energie voor iedereen beschikbaar te maken.

Beide initiatieven sluiten volledig aan bij het beginsel van het bevorderen van duurzame energie.

⁽¹⁾ PBL 247 van 9.9.2006, blz. 32.

⁽²⁾ 2006/C46/01.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000686/13
to the Commission
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(24 January 2013)**

Subject: European Development Fund (EDF) interim report

On pages 34/35 of Commissioner Piebalgs' written responses (discharge procedure 2011, hearing of 18 December 2012) it says that the EDF interim report for mid-2012 has been completed. The Commission reports that 'the implementation in various regions was slow', especially in West Africa and South Africa. This leads us to the following questions:

1. Of the 597 million euros earmarked for West Africa over 565 million euros remain unused. In South Africa, about half of the amount remains. Can the Commission explain why?
2. Can the Commission explain to the taxpayer why too many funds are apparently made available to these countries, while there is an economic crisis raging at home?
3. What happens to the unused portion of these funds?
4. Does the Commission agree with the PVV (Dutch Party for Freedom) that these unused funds should flow back to the Member States as quickly as possible?
5. Can the Commission indicate which projects for 'renewable energy' in these countries contribute to the objectives of the EU Member States? In other words, what is the demonstrable added 'European value' of the EU projects above those of the Member States?

**Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(14 March 2013)**

1. The financial allocations for the West and Southern Africa regional programmes are being used to fund the projects agreed during the Mid Term Review (MTR) and the Energy for All initiative. The financing for this initiative in both regions and the remainder of the Southern Africa regional programme were committed in 2012. For West Africa, the identified projects are currently going through the approval process. In order to ensure that regional funds are committed by 31 December 2013, the Commission has set a series of deadlines in the MTR conclusions. Therefore, all the projects had to be identified by 30 September 2012 and the necessary documents describing the full design of the projects had to be submitted to the Commission before 31 December 2012 and should be accepted by 31 March 2013. So far all these deadlines have been respected.

2-4. These funds are part of the 10th EDF and are foreseen for commitment for ACP countries over the period 2008-2013. The Commission has taken the necessary steps to absorb the funds or reallocate them to countries with special needs in the course of 2013. In accordance with the 10th EDF Internal Agreement ⁽¹⁾, the decision on the use of the balance of 10th EDF funds after 31 December 2013 shall be taken unanimously by the Council.

5. Instruments funding renewable energy projects in ACP countries are in line with 'The European Consensus on Development' ⁽²⁾.

That was, in particular, the case of the ACP-EU Energy Facility as well as the EU's support to the Sustainable Energy for All initiative launched by UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon to meet the goal of universal access to sustainable energy by 2030.

Both initiatives are fully in line with the principle of promoting of renewable energy.

⁽¹⁾ OJL 247/32, 9.9.2006.

⁽²⁾ 2006/C46/01.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000687/13
aan de Commissie
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(24 januari 2013)

Betref: Ingehouden betaling Guyana

In de schriftelijke antwoorden van commissaris Piebalgs (2011 kwijtingsprocedure, hoorzitting 18 december 2012) staat op pagina 1 vermeld dat in 2011 een betaling van 16,5 miljoen euro is ingehouden op Guyana.

1. Betreft het hier Brits-Guyana?
2. Zo ja, kan de Commissie aangeven welke projecten het hier precies betrof?
3. Wat was de exacte reden van inhouding van de betalingen?
4. Wat was de concrete rol van EuropAid in het signaleren van de onregelmatigheden?
5. Zijn adequate maatregelen genomen om herhaling te voorkomen en zo ja, welke zijn dat? Zo nee, wat garandeert dan de correcte besteding van Europees belastinggeld?

Antwoord van de heer Piebalgs namens de Commissie
(26 maart 2013)

In zijn schriftelijk antwoord op vraag nr. 2 (Kwijting voor het financiële beheer van het Europees Ontwikkelingsfonds (EOF) voor 2011) heeft commissaris Piebalgs verklaard dat in 2011 voor een totaal van 199,6 miljoen euro aan EU-begrotingssteun aan 16 staten in Afrika, het Caribische gebied en de Stille Oceaan (ACS-landen) is ingehouden. 6,5 miljoen euro daarvan (en niet 16,5 miljoen euro zoals het geachte Parlementslid in zijn vraag stelt) was bedoeld voor de voormalige Britse kolonie Guyana.

In het kader van de negende EOF-toewijzing voor Guyana is een programma voor algemene begrotingssteun voor armoedebestrijding ondertekend voor een maximumbedrag van 40,4 miljoen euro. Het doel van dit programma is het ondersteunen van het nationale ontwikkelingsplan van Guyana. De operatie bestaat uit vaste en variabele betalingen die afhankelijk zijn van het behalen van specifieke doelstellingen op het gebied van het beheer van overheidsfinanciën, gezondheid en sociale huisvesting.

Een van de belangrijkste criteria om in aanmerking te komen voor begrotingssteun is de inachtneming van de subsidiabiliteitscriteria: het bestaan van een stabiel macro-economisch kader, vooruitgang bij de uitvoering van een nationaal ontwikkelingsbeleid en bij de uitvoering van een hervormingsprogramma voor het beheer van de overheidsfinanciën.

De Commissie heeft in november 2011 besloten dat er onvoldoende vooruitgang is geboekt bij de uitvoering van het tweede strategisch programma voor armoedebestrijding (PRSP) en dat Guyana om die reden niet langer voldeed aan de subsidiabiliteitscriteria op het gebied van nationaal ontwikkelingsbeleid. Bijgevolg is de variabele tranche van 6,5 miljoen EUR ingehouden. Deze middelen zijn teruggekeerd naar de lidstaten na de afsluiting van het negende EOF.

Alle financiële steun van de Commissie aan Guyana en andere landen wordt beheerd volgens het Financieel Reglement van de Commissie dat het noodzakelijk kader en de nodige waarborgen biedt om ervoor te zorgen dat het geld van de Europese belastingbetaler correct wordt besteed.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000687/13
to the Commission
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(24 January 2013)**

Subject: Withholding of payment to Guyana

On page 1 of Commissioner Piebalgs' written responses (2011 discharge procedure, hearing on 18 December 2012) it says that a payment of 16.5 million euro is being withheld from Guyana.

1. Are we talking about British Guiana?
2. If yes, can the Commission indicate which projects they are talking about?
3. What were the exact reasons for withholding payment?
4. What was EuropAid's actual role in identifying irregularities?
5. Have appropriate measures been adopted to prevent recurrence, and if so, what are they? If not, how will they guarantee that European taxpayers' money is applied correctly?

**Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(26 March 2013)**

In his written response to question No 2 (2011 Discharge on the European Development Fund (EDF)), Commissioner Piebalgs stated that in 2011, EU budget support payments for a total of EUR 199.6 million were withheld in 16 African, Caribbean and Pacific states (ACP), EUR 6.5 million (and not EUR 16.5 million as stated in the Honourable Member's question) of which for Guyana, the former British colony.

Under the 9th EDF allocation for Guyana, a Poverty Reduction General Budget Support Programme was signed for a maximum amount of EUR 40.4 million. The objective of this programme is to support the Guyanese national development plan. The operation is composed of fixed and variable disbursements, related to the achievement of specific targets in the areas of public financial management, health and social housing.

One of the cornerstones for the provision of Budget Support is respect for the eligibility criteria: existence of a stable macroeconomic framework, progress in the implementation of a national development policy and in the implementation of a Public Financial Management Reform Programme.

In November 2011, the Commission decided that the lack of progress in the implementation of a second generation Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRSP) did not provide sufficient grounds to continue to consider Guyana eligible on the national development policy eligibility criteria. As a result, a variable tranche of EUR 6.5 million was not released. These resources were reverted to the Member States at the closing of the 9th EDF.

All Commission funding to Guyana and other countries is managed under the Commission's Financial Regulation which provides the necessary framework and safeguards to ensure that European taxpayers' money is properly used.

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000688/13
aan de Commissie**

Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE)

(24 januari 2013)

Betreft: Vervolgfragen Nederlandse leges voor verblijfsvergunningen

Op 9.10.2012 heeft de Afdeling bestuursrechtspraak van de Raad van State uitgesproken dat de beginselen die het Hof had vastgelegd in het arrest van 26.4.2012 in de zaak Commissie/Nederland (C-508/10) over de hoogte van de leges voor verblijfsvergunningen op grond van richtlijn 2003/109/EG, van overeenkomstige toepassing zijn op de leges voor verblijfsvergunningen op grond van richtlijn 2003/86/EG. Bij brief van 28.11.2012 heeft de Nederlandse regering aan de Tweede Kamer meegedeeld de leges voor gezinshereniging te gaan vaststellen op EUR 225 voor elk toe te laten gezinslid en de leges voor de EG-verblijfsvergunning voor langdurig ingezetenen derdelanders die naar aanleiding van het genoemde arrest van het Hof van Justitie waren verlaagd tot EUR 130 te verhogen tot EUR 150. In die brief wordt deze verhoging in verband gebracht met de verlaging van de leges voor gezinshereniging en de verwachting uitgesproken dat de nieuwe leges medio januari 2013 van kracht zullen worden.

De nieuwe leges (EUR 225) zijn bijna zes keer zo hoog als de leges die Unieburgers in Nederland moeten betalen (thans EUR 41,90). In het arrest van 26.4.2012 wees het Hof erop dat de leges die destijds voor de EG-verblijfsvergunning voor langdurig ingezetenen moesten worden betaald (EUR 201) zeven keer zo hoog waren als de toenmalige leges voor Unieburgers.

1. Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie het tarief van EUR 225 per gezinslid in het licht van de twee arresten van het Hof van Justitie over de Gezinsherenigingrichtlijn en het antwoord van commissaris Malmström van 24.8.12 op mijn eerdere vragen waarin zij het bedrag van EUR 130 voor verblijfsvergunningen op grond van richtlijn 2003/109/EG als „niet onevenredig” kwalificeerde (E-007316/2012)?
2. Voor ieder kind moeten bij toelating de volle leges worden betaald, dus voor overkomst van drie kinderen moet EUR 900 worden betaald. Zijn naar het oordeel van de Commissie dergelijke legesbedragen te verenigen met het doel van richtlijn 2003/86/EG?
3. Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie dat voor elke verlenging van de verblijfsvergunning volwassenen opnieuw EUR 225 en kinderen EUR 150 moeten betalen?
4. Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie de verhoging van de leges voor de EG-verblijfsvergunning voor langdurig ingezetenen derdelanders naar EUR 150 enkele maanden nadat die leges na het arrest van 26 april 2012 op EUR 130 waren vastgesteld?
5. Is het naar het oordeel van de Commissie met het doel van richtlijn 2003/109/EG te verenigen dat leges voor verblijfsvergunningen op grond van die richtlijn worden verhoogd in verband met een verlaging van de leges voor verblijfsvergunningen voor gezinshereniging?

Antwoord van mevrouw Malmström namens de Commissie

(21 maart 2013)

De Commissie heft de Nederlandse autoriteiten om toelichting verzocht over het nieuwe legesysteem en de manier waarop deze leges zullen worden toegepast krachtens de nationale wetgeving ter omzetting van de richtlijn inzake het recht op gezinshereniging.

De dialoog met de Nederlandse autoriteiten is nog aan de gang. Zodra de Commissie over alle gegevens beschikt, kan zij nagaan of er verdere stappen moeten worden ondernomen om de naleving van de EU-wetgeving te garanderen.

Op 1 februari is de Commissie in kennis gesteld van de mogelijke stijging van de leges voor langdurig ingezetenen. Uit de informatie die is verstrekt, kan niet worden afgeleid wanneer de nieuwe leges van toepassing zullen worden.

Op dit moment kan de Commissie de koppeling tussen de verschillende leges nog niet beoordelen aangezien de Nederlandse autoriteiten haar de nodige informatie daarover nog moeten verstrekken.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000688/13
to the Commission
Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE)
(24 January 2013)

Subject: Further questions regarding Dutch fees for residence permits

On 9 October 2012, the Administrative Jurisdiction Division of the Council of State ruled that the principles which the Court had laid down in the ruling on 26 April 2012 in the Commission/Netherlands case (C-508/10) on the level of fees for residence permits under Directive 2003/109/EC, shall apply to the fees for residence permits under Directive 2003/86/EC. In a letter dated 28 November 2012, the Dutch Government informed the Second Chamber that it would set the fee for family reunification at EUR 225 for each family member coming into the Netherlands, and that it would increase the residence permit fee for long-term residents from third countries to EUR 150 after it was reduced to EUR 130 as a result of the aforementioned Court of Justice ruling. In this letter, the increase was connected to the reduction in fees for family reunification and an expectation was expressed that these new fees would take effect mid-January 2013.

The new fees (EUR 225) are nearly six times higher than those fees imposed on EU citizens in the Netherlands (currently EUR 41). In its ruling dated 26 April 2012, the Court pointed out that the fee at that time for an EU residence permit for a long term resident (EUR 201) was seven times higher than EU citizen fees.

1. How does the Commission view the rate of EUR 225 per family member in light of the two rulings by the Court of Justice on the Family Reunification Directive and the reply from Commissioner Malmström on 24 August 12 to my earlier questions in which she deemed the amount of EUR 130 for residence permits under Directive 2003/109/EC as 'not disproportionate' (E-007316/2012)?
2. Each child has to pay the full residence fee, so if three children come to the Netherlands, EUR 900 has to be paid. Does the Commission feel that such fee levels can be reconciled with the objectives of Directive 2003/86/EC?
3. How does the Commission feel about the fact that each residence permit renewal requires adults to pay another EUR 225 and children EUR 150?
4. What does the Commission think of the residence permit fee increase for long-term residents from third countries to EUR 150, just a few months after the ruling on 26 April 2012 which set it at EUR 130?
5. Does the Commission agree that the objective of Directive 2003/109/EC is for a fee increase in residence permits under that directive to be linked to a fee reduction for family reunification residence permits?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(21 March 2013)

The Commission has contacted the Dutch authorities to ask some clarifications on the new system of fees and the way these fees would be applied under the national legislation that has transposed the Family Reunification Directive.

The dialogue with the Dutch authorities is ongoing. When the information at the Commission's disposal will be complete, it will be possible to assess if further steps are necessary to ensure compliance with EC law.

The Commission was informed on 1 February of the possible increase in the fees for long-term residents. From the information provided it is not clear when the new fees will be applied.

The assessment of the link between different fees cannot be made at the moment, as the Dutch authorities still have to provide the Commission with the necessary information in this regard.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001215/13
an die Kommission
Elisabeth Jeggle (PPE)
(6. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: Ungarische Gesetzgebung zu Pacht und Verkauf von Grundstücken

In Ungarn wurden offensichtlich in jüngster Zeit nationale Gesetze erlassen, die den Erwerb und die Pacht von Grundstücken in Ungarn durch nicht-ungarische Staatsbürger, also auch durch EU-Bürger aus anderen Mitgliedstaaten, unterbinden sollen.

1. Ist diese nationale ungarische Gesetzgebung mit europäischem Recht vereinbar?
2. Sollte dies nicht der Fall sein, was gedenkt die Kommission zu tun, um Ungarn zur Einhaltung von EU-Recht zu veranlassen?
3. Innerhalb welchen Zeitrahmens gedenkt die Kommission Maßnahmen einzuleiten, um Ungarn zu einer EU-konformen Gestaltung seiner Gesetze zu bewegen?
4. Wie sollen sich nicht-ungarische EU-Bürger verhalten, die von diesen Gesetzen betroffen sind?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Barnier im Namen der Kommission
(25. März 2013)

Die nationalen Rechtsvorschriften über den Erwerb von Land müssen mit dem EU-Recht vereinbar sein, insbesondere mit den Bestimmungen des AEUV über den freien Kapitalverkehr sowie mit der einschlägigen Rechtsprechung des EuGH. Allerdings kann Ungarn aufgrund einer im Beitrittsvertrag verankerten befristeten Ausnahmeregelung und des späteren Beschlusses 2010/792/EU der Kommission bis zum 1. Mai 2014 Verbote in seinen zum Zeitpunkt des Beitritts zur EU geltenden innerstaatlichen Rechtsvorschriften zum Erwerb landwirtschaftlicher Nutzflächen durch nicht in Ungarn ansässige EU-Bürger und alle juristischen Personen beibehalten ⁽¹⁾.

Am 17. Dezember 2012 verabschiedete das ungarische Parlament zwei Rechtsakte in diesem Bereich: (1) Die dritte Änderung des Grundgesetzes von Ungarn klassifiziert Rechtsvorschriften über den Erwerb und die Nutzung von Ackerland und Forstflächen als Grundlagengesetze, die einer Zweidrittelmehrheit bedürfen. (2) Das Gesetz Nr. CCXIII von 2012 änderte u. a. das Gesetz Nr. CXLI von 1994 über Ackerland und das Gesetz CXLI von 1997 über das Grundbuchamt mit dem erklärten vorrangigen Ziel, die Rückverfolgbarkeit und Verhinderung illegaler Kaufverträge (sog. „Taschenverträge“) zu verbessern.

Im Rahmen ihrer Beobachtungsaufgaben in diesem Bereich ist die Kommission dabei, die genannten ungarischen Maßnahmen zu prüfen. Hiervon ausgehend wird sie zu gegebener Zeit alle geeigneten und erforderlichen Schritte ergreifen, um zu gewährleisten, dass Ungarn das EU-Recht einschließlich seiner im Beitrittsvertrag verankerten Verpflichtungen vollständig einhält.

Bürger, die der Auffassung sind, dass ihre aus dem EU-Recht erwachsenden Rechte missachtet wurden, können sich mit einer Beschwerde an die Kommission wenden ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Näheres hierzu unter: http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/capital/faqs_en.htm, Frage 16.

⁽²⁾ Näheres siehe unter Frage 1 auf der oben genannten Website.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000689/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(24 ianuarie 2013)

Subiect: Achiziționarea terenurilor agricole de către cetățenii UE

Comisia este rugată să exprime un punct de vedere oficial cu privire la actul normativ aprobat de Parlamentul Republicii Ungare prin care a fost interzisă achiziționarea de terenuri de către cetățenii altor state, în data de 17 decembrie 2012.

Răspuns comun dat de Barnier în numele Comisiei
(25 martie 2013)

Comisia reamintește că legislația națională privind achiziționarea de terenuri trebuie să fie conformă cu legislația UE, în special cu dispozițiile din TFUE privind libera circulație a capitalurilor, precum și cu jurisprudența relevantă a CJUE. Cu toate acestea, o derogare temporară prevăzută în Tratatul de aderare și într-o decizie ulterioară a Comisiei (2010/792/UE) permite Ungariei să mențină, până la 1 mai 2014, în legislația sa națională, interdicțiile existente la momentul aderării la UE privind achiziționarea terenurilor agricole de către cetățenii nerezidenți și de către toate persoanele juridice ⁽¹⁾.

La 17 decembrie 2012, Parlamentul ungar a adoptat două acte legislative în acest domeniu: (1) a treia modificare a Legii fundamentale a Ungariei clasifică legislația privind achiziționarea și utilizarea terenurilor arabile și forestiere drept lege organică ce necesită o majoritate de 2/3; (2) Legea CCXIII din 2012 a modificat, printre altele, Legea LV din 1994 privind terenurile arabile și Legea CXLI din 1997 privind registrul de proprietăți imobiliare, cu obiectivul principal de a îmbunătăți trasabilitatea și prevenirea contractelor de vânzări ilegale.

În cadrul activităților sale de monitorizare în acest domeniu, Comisia examinează măsurile ungare menționate mai sus. Pe baza evaluării sale, Comisia va lua, în timp util și dacă este necesar, toate măsurile corespunzătoare pentru a se asigura că Ungaria respectă pe deplin legislația UE, precum și angajamentele consacrate în Tratatul de Aderare.

Cetățenii care consideră că drepturile lor garantate de legislația UE nu au fost respectate pot depune o plângere la Comisie ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Pentru mai multe informații: http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/capital/faqs_en.htm, întrebarea 16

⁽²⁾ A se vedea întrebarea 1 de pe site-ul de mai sus pentru detalii în acest sens.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000689/13
to the Commission
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(24 January 2013)**

Subject: Acquisition of agricultural land by EU citizens

Can the Commission express an official point of view on the legislative act approved by the Hungarian Parliament on 17 December 2012 that prohibits the acquisition of land by citizens of other states?

**Question for written answer E-001215/13
to the Commission
Elisabeth Jeggle (PPE)
(6 February 2013)**

Subject: Hungarian legislation on the lease and sale of land

It appears that in Hungary, national laws have been enacted recently to prevent anyone who is not a Hungarian citizen — and thus citizens of other EU Member States — leasing or purchasing land in Hungary.

1. Is Hungary's national legislation here compatible with EC law?
2. If not, what is the Commission proposing to do to ensure Hungary complies with EU legislation?
3. What is the Commission's timeframe for introducing measures to persuade Hungary to formulate its laws in line with EU requirements?
4. What action should non-Hungarian EU citizens affected by these laws take?

**Joint answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2013)**

The Commission recalls that national legislation on the acquisition of land has to comply with EC law, in particular the provisions of the TFEU on the free movement of capital as well as the relevant jurisprudence of the CJEU. However, a temporary derogation enshrined in the Accession Treaty and a subsequent Commission Decision (2010/792/EU) allows Hungary to maintain, until 1 May 2014, prohibitions in its national legislation existing at the time of the accession to the EU concerning the acquisition of agricultural land by non-resident citizens and all legal persons ⁽¹⁾.

On 17 December 2012, the Hungarian Parliament adopted two legislative acts in this field: (1) the third amendment of the Fundamental Law of Hungary classifies legislation on the acquisition and use of arable land and forestry as one of the cardinal acts requiring a two-thirds majority; (2) Act CCXIII of 2012 amended i.a. Act LV of 1994 on Arable Land and Act CXLI of 1997 on the Real Estate Registry, with the announced primary aim to improve the traceability and prevention of illegal sales ('pocket') contracts.

As part of its monitoring activities in this field, the Commission is scrutinising the abovementioned Hungarian measures. Based on its assessment, the Commission will take, in due time, all appropriate steps if needed to ensure that Hungary fully respects EC law, including its commitments enshrined in the Accession Treaty.

Citizens who feel that their rights under EC law have not been respected can lodge a complaint to the Commission ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ See more at http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/capital/faqs_en.htm, question 16.

⁽²⁾ See more this under question 1 on the above-quoted website.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000690/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(24 ianuarie 2013)

Subiect: Conținutul de proteină din grâu

Cercetătorii de la Universitatea din Göteborg, Suedia, au publicat recent un studiu potrivit căruia creșterea nivelului de dioxid de carbon în atmosferă are un efect negativ asupra conținutului de proteină din grâu și, implicit, afectează calitatea nutritivă a acestei cereale, cu efecte asupra alimentației umane și animale. Comisia este rugată să prezinte un punct de vedere oficial cu privire la această problemă.

Răspuns dat de dna Geoghegan-Quinn în numele Comisiei
(12 martie 2013)

Concluziile cercetătorilor de la Universitatea din Göteborg sunt, într-adevăr, de mare interes și merită o atenție deosebită, în special în contextul politicilor și cercetărilor privind securitatea alimentară.

Comisia nu face evaluări ale publicațiilor din domeniul cercetării și, prin urmare, nu are o poziție oficială privind rezultatele unor studii independente. Totuși, cercetarea în domeniul durabilității și securității alimentare trebuie să ia în considerare efectele și interacțiunile problemelor de mediu. Propunerea Comisiei în privința viitorului program de cercetare Orizont 2020 recunoaște necesitatea promovării de soluții pentru creșterea stabilității și adaptabilității culturilor și animalelor în contextul variabilității mediului.

Mai mult, Comisia sprijină Inițiativa statelor membre de programare comună privind agricultura și schimbările climatice (FACCE) ⁽¹⁾, care și-a publicat de curând Agenda strategică privind cercetarea ⁽²⁾. Una dintre temele centrale ale acestei strategii este adaptarea semințelor și a raselor, prin încrucișări convenționale și prin biotehnologie, la combinații noi de mediu și management, de exemplu la agresiuni abiotice sau la niveluri ridicate de CO₂.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.facejpi.com/>

⁽²⁾ <http://www.facejpi.com/Strategic-Research-Agenda>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000690/13
to the Commission**

Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)

(24 January 2013)

Subject: Protein content of wheat

Researchers at the University of Gothenburg, Sweden, have recently published a study, stating that the increasing level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere has a negative effect on the protein content of wheat, and, therefore, affects the nutritional quality of the grain, with consequences for human and animal nutrition. Can the Commission present an official point of view on this issue?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission

(12 March 2013)

The findings of researchers at Gothenburg University are indeed very interesting and deserve to be given special attention in particular in the context of policies and research for food security.

The Commission does not undertake assessments of research publications and has therefore no official position on outcomes of independent research. However, sustainability and food security research need to consider the effects and interactions of environmental challenges. The Commission's proposal for the forthcoming Horizon 2020 Research Programme acknowledges the need to promote solutions to increase the stability and adaptability of crops and animals vis-à-vis environmental variability.

Furthermore, the Commission is supporting the Member States' led Joint Programming Initiative on Agriculture and Climate Change (FACCE) ⁽¹⁾ which recently published its Strategic Research Agenda (SRA) ⁽²⁾. One of the core themes of this SRA is adapting seeds and breeds through conventional breeding and biotechnology to new combinations of environment and management: e.g. abiotic stresses, elevated CO₂.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.facejpi.com/>

⁽²⁾ <http://www.facejpi.com/Strategic-Research-Agenda>

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000691/13
à la Commission
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(24 janvier 2013)

Objet: Utilisation des pesticides néonicotinoïdes dans l'agriculture

Le Réseau des conservatoires d'abeilles et de pollinisateurs (France) a lancé une campagne contre une classe de pesticides neurotoxiques, les néonicotinoïdes, incriminés pour être à l'origine du déclin des abeilles. Cela vient d'être confirmé par une étude de l'INRA et du CNRS, qui prouve que les néonicotinoïdes désorientent et tuent les abeilles.

Le Réseau demande l'interdiction immédiate de l'utilisation de tous les néonicotinoïdes dans l'agriculture.

La Commission pourrait-elle communiquer au Parlement son point de vue officiel quant à cette demande?

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000769/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(25 janvier 2013)

Objet: Pesticide mortel pour les abeilles: le rapport de l'EFSA

Les trois insecticides d'enrobage des semences les plus vendus viennent d'être reconnus toxiques pour les abeilles par l'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments (EFSA). Depuis 15 ans, les polémiques n'ont jamais cessé à ce propos, expertises et contre-expertises se sont succédées à un rythme effréné, les apiculteurs ont vu leurs colonies d'abeilles s'effondrer, ils ont alerté les autorités sans relâche, attaqué en justice. Le travail des scientifiques de l'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments (EFSA) pourrait cette fois mettre un coup d'arrêt définitif à cette nouvelle génération d'insecticides pour les semences, très prisés du monde agricole. À la demande de la Commission, ces scientifiques ont évalué les risques pour les abeilles de trois insecticides de la famille des néonicotinoïdes: la chlothianidine, l'imidaclopride et le thiametoxame. Les conclusions sont accablantes.

Concernant l'exposition des abeilles via le pollen et le nectar, «seule l'utilisation de ces insecticides sur des cultures n'attirant pas les abeilles présente un risque faible». Des risques aigus sont en revanche identifiés sur des cultures qui les attirent. On pense évidemment au colza et au tournesol. L'exposition des abeilles a lieu aussi via les poussières produites par les graines ou les granulés lors des semis, et surtout via l'exsudation des cultures traitées, qui produit de minuscules gouttelettes d'eau imprégnées du pesticide. «Les études menées sur du maïs traité avec du thiamétoxame démontrent un effet aigu sur les abeilles.»

1. Vu que pour l'EFSA, la contamination des abeilles est bien réelle, la Commission va-t-elle prendre les décisions qui s'imposent pour interdire définitivement les insecticides d'enrobage des semences?
2. Les experts de l'EFSA ayant souligné dans le même rapport des lacunes importantes des tests et le manque de données présentées par les industriels dans les demandes d'homologation, la Commission peut-elle garantir que tous les autres pesticides sur le marché répondent aux critères européens?
3. Autrement dit, peut-elle garantir qu'aucun autre pesticide sur le marché ne met en danger la vie des abeilles et donc l'écosystème dont nous dépendons tous?

Réponse commune donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(25 mars 2013)

La Commission renvoie les Honorables Parlementaires à ses réponses aux questions écrites E-000450/2013 ⁽¹⁾, E-011166/2011 et E-00077/2013.

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

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000691/13
adresată Comisiei**

Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)

(24 ianuarie 2013)

Subiect: Utilizarea pesticidelor neonicotinoide în agricultură

Rețeaua rezervațiilor pentru albine și polenizatori (Franța) a lansat o campanie împotriva unei clase de pesticide neurotoxice, neonicotinoidele, care sunt acuzate că ar fi provocat declinul populațiilor de albine. Această afirmație a fost recent confirmată de un studiu efectuat de INRA și de CNRS, care a demonstrat că neonicotinoidele dezorientează șiucid albinele.

Rețeaua a cerut interzicerea imediată a utilizării tuturor neonicotinoidelor în agricultură.

Ar putea Comisia să comunice Parlamentului punctul său de vedere oficial cu privire la această cerere?

Răspuns comun dat de domnul Borg în numele Comisiei

(25 martie 2013)

Comisia le recomandă domnilor deputați să consulte răspunsul său la întrebările scrise E-000450/2013 ⁽¹⁾, E-011166/2011 și E-00077/2013.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000691/13
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(24 January 2013)

Subject: Use of neonicotinoid pesticides in agriculture

The French-based *Réseau des conservatoires d'abeilles et de pollinisateurs* [Network of bee and pollinator reserves] has launched a campaign against a class of neurotoxic pesticides, neonicotinoids, which are blamed for causing the decline in bee numbers. That claim has recently been borne out by a study undertaken by the French National Institute for Agricultural Research (INRA) and the French National Centre for Scientific Research (CNRS), which proves that neonicotinoids disorientate and kill bees.

The Network is calling for an immediate ban on the use of all neonicotinoids in agriculture.

Could the Commission inform Parliament of its official position on that call?

Question for written answer E-000769/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(25 January 2013)

Subject: Bee-killing pesticide: the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) report

The three highest-selling seed treatment insecticides have recently been found to be toxic to bees by EFSA. The controversies surrounding this issue have continued unabated for 15 years. Opinions and counter-opinions have come thick and fast. Beekeepers have seen their bee colonies collapse and have been relentlessly alerting the authorities and taking legal action. Now the work of EFSA scientists could, once and for all, spell the end for this new generation of seed insecticides, which are highly prized in the agricultural sector. At the Commission's request, these scientists have assessed the risks to bees of three neonicotinoid insecticides: clothianidin, imidacloprid and thiamethoxam. The conclusions are damning.

When it comes to bees' exposure via pollen and nectar, EFSA concludes that these insecticides pose a low risk only if they are used on crops that do not attract bees. However, there are acute risks when they are used on crops that do attract bees, with rape and sunflower being obvious examples. Bees are also exposed via the dust produced by seeds or granules during sowing, and especially via exudation from treated crops, which produces tiny water droplets impregnated with pesticide. EFSA concludes that the studies carried out on maize treated with thiamethoxam show an acute effect on bees.

1. Given EFSA's finding that bees really are being contaminated, will the Commission take the decisions necessary to ban seed treatment insecticides once and for all?
2. Since EFSA's experts have highlighted in the same report significant shortcomings in the tests carried out and a lack of data presented by manufacturers in type-approval applications, can the Commission guarantee that all the other pesticides on the market meet EU criteria?
3. In other words, can it guarantee that no other pesticide on the market endangers the lives of bees and hence the ecosystem on which we all depend?

Joint answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Members to its answer to Written Questions E-000450/2013 ⁽¹⁾, E-011166/2011 and E-00077/2013.

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

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000692/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(24 ianuarie 2013)

Subiect: Licitația organizată în România în cadrul Programului European de Ajutorare pentru persoanele defavorizate

În România, licitația pentru furnizarea de alimente în cadrul Programului European de Ajutorare pentru persoanele defavorizate (PEAD) a fost câștigată de o societate comercială din Bulgaria, în condiții care ridică multe semne de întrebare. Astfel, societatea câștigătoare a fost înregistrată la Registrul Comerțului cu numai cinci zile înainte de data licitației. În prezent, societatea în cauză a sistat furnizarea alimentelor, cu toate că a încasat deja o parte din banii aferenți.

Comisia este rugată să precizeze dacă are în vedere verificarea condițiilor în care s-a desfășurat licitația menționată.

Răspuns dat de dl Șemeta în numele Comisiei
(13 martie 2013)

Comisia împărtășește pe deplin preocupările distinsului membru privind posibilele nereguli comise împotriva bugetului UE în oricare dintre statele membre.

Ca răspuns la problemele semnalate, distinsul membru trebuie să aibă în vedere că, în conformitate cu normele generale ale gestiunii partajate care reglementează fondurile agricole, statele membre sunt primele responsabile de punerea în aplicare a măsurilor agricole, de efectuarea de audituri și controale referitoare la acestea, inclusiv de recuperarea sumelor plătite în mod necuvenit. În acest cadru, statele membre au, de asemenea, obligația legală de a transmite Comisiei, într-un anumit termen-limită, informații detaliate privind neregulile detectate.

Programul la care se referă distinsul membru intră în cadrul gestiunii partajate între Direcția Generală Agricultură și Dezvoltare Rurală a Comisiei Europene și autoritățile române competente.

Oficiul European de Luptă Antifraudă (OLAF) poate interveni în cazuri specifice ori de câte ori există suspiciuni suficient de grave de fraudă, corupție sau nereguli grave care prejudiciază bugetul UE. Cu toate acestea, în cazul de față, OLAF a informat Comisia că problema descrisă nu i-a fost transmisă spre examinare. Dacă distinsul membru poate oferi OLAF informații mai detaliate despre caz, OLAF îl va examina și va evalua măsurile care trebuie adoptate în continuare.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000692/13
to the Commission**

Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)

(24 January 2013)

Subject: Tendering process organised in Romania for the European Food Aid Programme for The Most Deprived

In Romania, the tendering process for the supply of food under the European Food Aid Programme for the Most Deprived (PEAD) has been won by a company from Bulgaria, in circumstances that raise many questions. The winning company was registered on the Commercial Register only five days before the tendering date. The company in question has currently stopped supplying food despite already receiving part of the money it was due.

Can the Commission specify whether it intends to verify the conditions under which the aforementioned tendering process took place?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission

(13 March 2013)

The Commission fully shares the Honourable Member's concerns regarding possible irregularities against the EU budget in any Member State.

In response to the issues raised, the Honourable Member will be aware that, under the general rules of shared management which govern Agricultural Funds, Member States are responsible in the first instance for the implementation of agricultural measures, their audit and control, including the recovery of any unduly paid amounts. In this framework the Member States also have a regulatory obligation to transmit detailed information on detected irregularities to the Commission within a certain time limit.

The programme to which the Honourable Member refers falls under the shared management of Directorate General for Agriculture and Rural Development of the European Commission and the competent Romanian authorities.

The European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) may intervene in specific cases whenever there are sufficiently serious suspicions of fraud, corruption or serious irregularities detrimental to the EU budget. However, in this instance, the Commission has been informed by OLAF that the matter described has not been reported to it for examination. If the Honourable Member would provide OLAF with more detailed information about the case, OLAF will examine it and assess the follow up to be given.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000693/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(24 ianuarie 2013)

Subiect: Măsuri pentru prevenirea răspândirii pestei porcine africane

Autoritățile italiene au informat Comisia Europeană că, datorită situației epidemiologice excepționale și riscului ridicat de răspândire a pestei porcine africane din Sardinia (Italia) în alte regiuni, ar fi nevoie de sprijin suplimentar în vederea asigurării punerii în aplicare a măsurilor sanitare prevăzute. Ca urmare, Comisia a arătat că „dacă boala nu este combătută în mod corespunzător în Sardinia, ar putea fi afectată întreaga Uniune Europeană, cu consecințe importante asupra sănătății și situației economice din toate statele membre”. Pentru aceasta, Comisia a anunțat că va aloca în 2013 suma de 1,4 milioane de euro pentru combaterea pestei porcine africane (ASF) pe insula italiană Sardinia.

Comisia este rugată să precizeze dacă intenționează să impună măsuri de limitare a deplasării porcinelor și produselor din carne de porc provenite din Republica Italia.

Răspuns dat de dl Borg în numele Comisiei
(5 martie 2013)

Comisia urmărește cu mare atenție situația din Sardinia în ceea ce privește pesta porcină africană (PPA). Situația epidemiologică este, de asemenea, discutată în mod regulat la reuniunile Comitetului permanent pentru lanțul alimentar și sănătatea animală. Ca urmare a unei creșteri semnificative în 2011 a numărului și amplitudinii teritoriale a focarelor de pestă porcină africană în șapte din opt provincii din Sardinia, care au afectat și mari exploatații comerciale de porcine, Decizia Comisiei 2005/363/CE ⁽¹⁾ privind anumite măsuri de protecție a sănătății animale împotriva PPA în Sardinia a fost modificată pentru a extinde zonele de risc și, prin urmare, restricțiile de circulație la întreaga regiune Sardinia.

În plus, în perioada 11-20 martie 2013, Oficiul Alimentar și Veterinar al Direcției Generale Sănătate și Consumatori a Comisiei va efectua un audit pentru a evalua punerea în aplicare a controalelor de sănătate animală privind pesta porcină africană, precum și funcționarea programului de eradicare a acestei boli în Sardinia. În lumina rezultatelor acestui audit, Comisia poate revizui restricțiile existente stabilite prin Decizia Comisiei 2005/363/CE.

⁽¹⁾ JO L 118, 5.5.2005, p. 39.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000693/13
to the Commission
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(24 January 2013)**

Subject: Measures to prevent the spread of African Swine Fever

The Italian authorities have informed the European Commission that, due to the exceptional epidemiological situation and the high risk of the spread of African Swine Fever from Sardinia (Italy) to other regions, it would need additional support to ensure the implementation of the stipulated sanitary measures. As a result, the Commission has pointed out that 'if the disease is not adequately tackled in Sardinia, the whole of the European Union could be affected, with important consequences for the health and the economic situations of all Member States'. This is why the Commission has announced that it will allocate EUR 1.4 million in 2013 to combat African Swine Fever (ASF) on the Italian island of Sardinia.

Can the Commission specify whether it intends to impose measures to restrict the movement of pigs and pork products originating from Italy?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(5 March 2013)**

The Commission is following very closely the African swine fever (ASF) situation in Sardinia. The epidemiological situation is also discussed regularly at the meetings of the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health. Following a significant increase in numbers and territorial extension of outbreaks of ASF in seven out of eight provinces of Sardinia, affecting also large commercial pig holdings, that occurred in 2011, Commission Decision 2005/363/EC⁽¹⁾ concerning animal health protection measures against ASF in Sardinia was amended to extend the risk areas and therefore the movement restrictions to the whole of the region of Sardinia.

In addition, the Food and Veterinary Office of the Commission's Health and Consumers Directorate General will carry out an audit to evaluate the implementation of the animal health controls on ASF and the operation of the eradication programme for this disease in Sardinia from 11 to 20 March 2013. In the light of the outcome of this audit, the Commission may review the existing restrictions laid down in Commission Decision 2005/363/EC.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 118, 5.5.2005, p. 39.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000694/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(24 ianuarie 2013)

Subiect: Nivelul radioactivității sării importate din Ucraina

Potrivit unor oficiali ai Comisiei Europene citați de presa română, România încalcă normele UE referitoare la controalele asupra importurilor de alimente și de hrană pentru animale. Recent, autoritățile române ar fi fost informate printr-o scrisoare oficială, dar care nu a fost făcută publică, în legătură cu declanșarea procedurii de sancționare.

Potrivit surselor menționate de presă, autoritățile române ar impune controale sistematice și ar cere buletine de analiză privind nivelul radioactivității pentru fiecare vagon de sare din Ucraina și numai ulterior ar încheia formalitățile vamale de import. Prin aceste practici, consideră Comisia, România ar încălca Regulamentul (CE) nr. 882/2004. Comisia este rugată să precizeze ce anume i se impută României în această privință.

Răspuns dat de dl Borg în numele Comisiei
(27 februarie 2013)

Comisia a inițiat o acțiune în constatarea neîndeplinirii obligațiilor împotriva României. Comisia consideră că autoritățile române nu își îndeplinesc obligațiile și împiedică aplicarea corespunzătoare a Regulamentului (CE) nr. 882/2004 privind controalele oficiale ⁽¹⁾, întrucât efectuează sistematic controale la import și solicită un buletin de analiză care să ateste că nivelul de contaminare radioactivă respectă anumite limite, ca o condiție pentru importul de sare din Ucraina și Belarus, fără o evaluare adecvată a riscurilor.

Informațiile generale referitoare la deciziile Comisiei privind aplicarea legislației UE, inclusiv privind inițierea acțiunilor în constatarea neîndeplinirii obligațiilor, sunt disponibilă pe site-ul internet Europa ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Regulamentul (CE) nr. 882/2004 al Parlamentului și al Consiliului din 29 aprilie 2004 privind controalele oficiale efectuate pentru a asigura verificarea conformității cu legislația privind hrana pentru animale și produsele alimentare și cu normele de sănătate animală și de bunăstare a animalelor (astfel cum a fost modificat), JO L 165, 30.4.2004.

⁽²⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/eu_law/eulaw/decisions/dec_20121121.htm#ro.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000694/13
to the Commission
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(24 January 2013)**

Subject: Radioactivity levels of salt imported from Ukraine

According to European Commission officials quoted by the Romanian press, Romania is violating EU rules on import controls of food and animal feed. The Romanian authorities were apparently recently informed of this through an official letter regarding the initiation of enforcement procedures, but this was not made public.

According to sources cited by the press, the Romanian authorities would impose systematic controls and would require radioactivity level analysis reports for each wagon of salt from Ukraine, and only later would conclude the customs import formalities. The Commission considers that, through these practices, Romania would be breaching Regulation (EC) No 882/2004. Can the Commission specify exactly what Romania is being accused of in this respect?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(27 February 2013)**

The Commission has started an infringement proceeding as regards Romania. The Commission takes the view that, by systematically carrying out import controls and requiring a certificate of analysis certifying that the radioactive contamination level is within certain limits as a condition for the import of salt from Ukraine and Belarus without a proper risk assessment, the Romanian authorities fail to fulfil their obligations and obstruct the proper application of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 on official controls ⁽¹⁾.

General information on Commission decisions on the application of EC law, including the starting of infringement proceedings, is available on the Europa website ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules (as amended), OJ L 165, 30.4.2004.

⁽²⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/eu_law/eulaw/decisions/dec_20121121.htm#ro.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000695/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(24 ianuarie 2013)

Subiect: Restricțiile temporare impuse liberei circulații a lucrătorilor români

Restricțiile temporare impuse liberei circulații a lucrătorilor români și bulgari ar trebui anulate în toate statele membre UE începând cu 1.1.2014. În prezent, acestea sunt aplicate total sau parțial de 9 state membre. Un stat membru a anunțat că dorește să găsească soluții pentru prelungirea restricțiilor pentru muncitorii români și bulgari.

Comisia este rugată să precizeze dacă un stat membru poate introduce unilateral restricții pe piața muncii și care sunt mijloacele de acțiune pe care le are în vedere pentru a împiedica o astfel de măsură.

Răspuns dat de dl Andor în numele Comisiei
(21 martie 2013)

Începând cu 1 ianuarie 2014, lucrătorii români și bulgari vor beneficia pe deplin de aplicarea dispozițiilor legislației UE privind libera circulație a lucrătorilor, la fel ca și ceilalți cetățeni ai UE, și statele membre nu vor putea să mențină sau să reinstituească măsuri generale pentru a restricționa accesul lucrătorilor români sau bulgari pe propria lor piață a muncii.

În cazul în care un stat membru ar aplica, după 31 decembrie 2013, măsuri pentru restricționarea accesului la piața muncii pentru lucrătorii români și bulgari, astfel de măsuri ar constitui o încălcare a obligațiilor asumate de acesta în temeiul tratatului, iar Comisia ar reacționa în același mod în care reacționează în raport cu alte încălcări ale dreptului UE.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000695/13
to the Commission**

Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)

(24 January 2013)

Subject: Temporary restrictions imposed on the free movement of Romanian workers

The temporary restrictions imposed on the free movement of Romanian and Bulgarian workers should be lifted in all EU Member States as of 1 January 2014. These are currently being applied fully or partially by nine Member States. One Member State has announced that it wishes to find ways to extend the restrictions on Romanian and Bulgarian workers.

Can the Commission specify whether a Member State can introduce unilateral restrictions on the labour market and what recourse does it have in mind to prevent such measures?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission

(21 March 2013)

As from 1 January 2014 Bulgarian and Romanian workers will enjoy the full benefit of EC law on free movement of workers in the same way as other EU nationals, and no Member State will be able to maintain or re-introduce general measures to restrict access of Romanian or Bulgarian workers to its labour market.

If a Member State were to take action after 31 December 2013 to restrict access to its labour market by Romanian or Bulgarian workers, such action would infringe its Treaty obligations, and the Commission would react in the same way as it does in relation to other infringements of EC law.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000696/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(24 ianuarie 2013)

Subiect: Tratamentul cu amoxicilină

Cercetătorii de la University of Southampton (Marea Britanie) au realizat recent un studiu, la care au participat peste 2000 de persoane din 12 țări ale UE, cu privire la efectele tratamentului cu amoxicilină. Conform rezultatelor, tratamentul cu amoxicilină nu ameliorează semnificativ simptomele infecțiilor respiratorii, însă poate provoca, în schimb, alte probleme de sănătate, dar și rezistența la medicamente.

Comisia are cunoștință de rezultatele acestui studiu? Are intenția de a propune unele măsuri legislative?

Răspuns dat de dna Geoghegan-Quinn în numele Comisiei
(12 martie 2013)

Comisia este pe deplin conștientă de rezultatele studiului publicat de cercetătorii de la Universitatea din Southampton.

Studiul de bază a făcut parte din proiectul GRACE ⁽¹⁾, finanțat prin cel de-al șaselea program-cadru pentru cercetare și dezvoltare tehnologică al UE (PC6, 2002-2006) — domeniul tematic „Științele vieții, genomică și biotehnologii pentru sănătate” — cu suma de 11,5 milioane de euro. La data publicării acestui studiu, Comisia a publicat un articol în care a subliniat importanța acestei lucrări ⁽²⁾.

Medicamentele antimicrobiene precum amoxicilina joacă un rol esențial în protejarea sănătății cetățenilor europeni, iar Comisia face o prioritate din abordarea problemelor asociate cu rezistența la antimicrobiene. Astfel, la 15 noiembrie 2011, Comisia a publicat un plan de acțiune împotriva riscului tot mai mare reprezentat de rezistența la antimicrobiene ⁽³⁾. Acest plan de acțiune cuprinde 12 acțiuni, printre care se numără consolidarea promovării unei utilizări corespunzătoare a antimicrobienelor în toate statele membre, precum și consolidarea cadrului de reglementare referitor la medicamentele de uz veterinar și furajele cu conținut medicamentos. În plus, el cuprinde acțiuni care vizează intensificarea eforturilor de cercetare pentru combaterea rezistenței la antimicrobiene.

Statele membre au acordat autorizații de introducere pe piață a medicamentelor care conțin amoxicilină, ceea ce a generat unele divergențe cu privire la utilizarea aprobată a acestora în UE. Informațiile de referință privind prescrierea produselor care conțin amoxicilină și acid clavulanic comercializate în EU au fost deja armonizate ⁽⁴⁾ în urma unei proceduri de sesizare inițiate de Comisie ⁽⁵⁾. Se estimează că în 2013 va fi inițiată o procedură similară având ca obiect medicamentele în compoziția cărora intră doar amoxicilină.

⁽¹⁾ Genomics to Combat Resistance against Antibiotics in Community-acquired LRTI in Europe (Genomică pentru combaterea rezistenței la antibiotice a infecțiilor comunitare ale căilor respiratorii inferioare în Europa).
<http://www.grace-lrti.org/portal/en-GB/homepage>.

⁽²⁾ http://cordis.europa.eu/fetch?CALLER=NEWSLINK_EN_C&RCN=35362&ACTION=D

⁽³⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0748:FIN:EN:PDF>

⁽⁴⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/html/refl_others.htm, Lista sesizărilor pentru medicamente de uz uman, Augmentin.

⁽⁵⁾ Articolul 30 punctul 2 din Directiva 2001/83/CE de instituire a unui cod comunitar cu privire la medicamentele de uz uman, JO L 311, 28.11.2001, astfel cum a fost modificată.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000696/13
to the Commission**

Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)

(24 January 2013)

Subject: Treatment with amoxicillin

Researchers at the University of Southampton (United Kingdom) have recently conducted a study on the effects of treatment with amoxicillin involving over 2 000 people in 12 EU countries. According to the findings, treatment with amoxicillin does not significantly improve the symptoms of respiratory infections, but can instead cause other health issues as well as resistance to drugs.

Is the Commission aware of the findings of this study? Does it intend to propose legislative measures?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission

(12 March 2013)

The Commission is fully aware of the research results that have been published by researchers of the University of Southampton.

The underlying study was part of the GRACE project ⁽¹⁾ which was funded with EUR 11.5 million via the Sixth Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP6, 2002-2006) under the 'Life Sciences, Genomics and Biotechnology for Health' theme. On the day of publication of this study, the Commission issued a news item to highlight this important work ⁽²⁾.

Antimicrobial drugs such as amoxicillin are crucial to safeguard the health of European citizens, and the Commission gives high priority to address the problems associated with antimicrobial resistance. The Commission has thus issued an action plan against the rising threats from antimicrobial resistance ⁽³⁾ on 15 November 2011. This action plan contains 12 actions including strengthening the promotion of appropriate use of antimicrobials in all Member States, as well as strengthening the regulatory framework on veterinary medicines and on medicated feed. In addition, it contains actions aimed at reinforcing research efforts to combat antimicrobial resistance.

Marketing authorisations for medicinal products containing amoxicillin have been granted by the Member States, what has led to divergencies in their approved use across the EU. The reference prescribing information for products containing amoxicillin and clavulanic acid in the EU has been already harmonised ⁽⁴⁾ as an outcome of a referral procedure initiated by the Commission ⁽⁵⁾. A similar procedure for amoxicillin-only medicinal products is expected to start in 2013.

⁽¹⁾ Genomics to Combat Resistance against Antibiotics in Community-acquired LRTI in Europe.
<http://www.grace-lrti.org/portal/en-GB/homepage>.

⁽²⁾ http://cordis.europa.eu/fetch?CALLER=NEWSLINK_EN_C&RCN=35362&ACTION=D.

⁽³⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0748:FIN:EN:PDF>.

⁽⁴⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/html/refh_others.htm, List of referrals for human medicinal products, Augmentin.

⁽⁵⁾ Article 30(2) of the directive 2001/83/EC on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use, OJ L 311, 28.11.2001, as amended.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000698/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(24 ianuarie 2013)

Subiect: Utilizarea fondurilor europene de către România în semestrul II al anului 2012

Autoritățile române au demarat o amplă campanie de publicitate televizată privind utilizarea fondurilor europene în România, constând în plata unor spoturi TV care reflectă ipotetice beneficii ale fondurilor structurale și de coeziune. În acest scop, s-a înființat și un site la adresa www.fonduri-ue.ro. Această campanie nu conține elemente de informare cu privire la oportunitățile disponibile cetățenilor sau societăților comerciale de a atrage fonduri UE, fiind o campanie de publicitate pentru Guvernul României. Campania se derulează în proximitatea temporală a alegerilor parlamentare, ridicând astfel unele semne de întrebare.

Având în vedere că rata de absorbție a fondurilor europene în România este cu mult sub așteptările cetățenilor români, că o parte dintre fonduri sunt suspendate din cauza corupției, că accesul la informații cu privire la utilizarea fondurilor UE este precară și anumite informații sunt chiar ascunse beneficiarilor, Comisia este rugată să precizeze:

1. Dacă are cunoștință care este suma alocată de Guvernul României pentru această campanie?
2. Dacă consideră că aceasta este o destinație potrivită pentru utilizarea fondurilor europene, în acord cu obiectivele UE de creștere?
3. Dacă CE încurajează o astfel de utilizare a banilor publici europeni?

Răspuns dat de dl Hahn în numele Comisiei
(13 martie 2013)

Comisia are cunoștință de faptul că planurile de comunicare ale Guvernului României includ campanii de publicitate televizată, dar nu poate face comentarii cu privire la cât de adecvat este momentul ales pentru campania în chestiune. Măsurile de informare și publicitate pentru fiecare program constituie o obligație în cadrul politicii de coeziune și trebuie să respecte dispozițiile reglementărilor din acest domeniu de politică. Activitățile de informare trebuie să respecte strict principiul bunei gestiuni financiare și pe cel al proporționalității.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000698/13
to the Commission**

Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)

(24 January 2013)

Subject: Romania's use of EU funds in the second half of 2012

The Romanian authorities have launched a wide-ranging television advertising campaign on the use of EU funds in Romania, consisting of paying for TV spots that reflect the hypothetical benefits of structural and cohesion funds. A website has also been set up for this purpose at www.fonduri-ue.ro. This campaign does not contain pieces of information on the opportunities available to citizens or companies to attract EU funds as it is an advertising campaign for the Romanian Government. The campaign is running only shortly in advance of parliamentary elections, which raises some questions.

Given that the absorption rate of EU funds in Romania is far below the expectations of Romanian citizens, that part of the funds are suspended because of corruption, that access to information regarding the use of EU funds is precarious and some information is even hidden from the beneficiaries:

1. Does the Commission know the amount allocated by the Romanian Government to this campaign?
2. Does the Commission consider that this is an appropriate end use of EU funds in line with EU growth targets?
3. Does the Commission encourage such use of EU public money?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission

(13 March 2013)

The Commission is aware that television advertising campaigns are part of the communication plans of the Romanian government but cannot comment on the appropriateness of the timing of this particular campaign. Information and publicity measures for each programme are an obligation under cohesion policy and have to follow the provisions of cohesion policy regulations. Information activities should observe strict sound financial management and proportionality principles.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie P-000699/13

Komisií

Anna Záborská (PPE)

(24. januára 2013)

Vec: Kvalita potravín vyrábaných v Poľsku

Potraviny vyrábané v Poľsku a vyvážené do ostatných členských štátov opakovane vyvolávajú medzi európskymi spotrebiteľmi rozhorčenie a obavy, pričom predmetom ich kritiky je nedostatočná kvalita týchto potravín (hydina, ryby a iné druhy mäsa) či skutočnosť, že obsahujú nebezpečné látky, napr. technickú soľ alebo len nedávno odhalený jed na potkany.

1. Môže Komisia potvrdiť, že kvalita potravín pochádzajúcich z Poľska sa výrazne nelíši od kvality potravín vyrábaných v iných členských štátoch?
2. Je Komisia presvedčená, že systém monitorovania kvality a bezpečnosti potravín v Poľsku predstavuje dostatočnú ochranu spotrebiteľov v EÚ pred zdravotnými rizikami spôsobenými nízkou kvalitou a kontamináciou potravín baktériami a nebezpečnými látkami?
3. Je Komisia pripravená pravidelne zverejňovať zoznam členských štátov, v ktorom sa porovná kvalita potravinárskej výroby na základe zistení orgánov zodpovedných za kontrolu potravín [prostredníctvom oznámení v rámci systému rýchleho varovania pre potraviny a krmivá (RASFF)]?

Odpoveď pána Borga v mene Komisie

(18. februára 2013)

Existuje komplexný súbor právnych predpisov na zaistenie bezpečnosti potravín umiestnených na trh v Európskej únii. Nariadenia (ES) č. 178/2002 ⁽¹⁾ a (ES) č. 882/2004 ⁽²⁾ sú dvomi hlavnými nástrojmi na dosiahnutie tohto cieľa.

Členské štáty sú zodpovedné za presadzovanie potravinového práva EÚ a prostredníctvom organizovania úradných kontrol overujú, či sú príslušné požiadavky na bezpečnosť zo strany podnikateľských subjektov splnené vo všetkých fázach. Úradné kontroly sa musia vykonávať pravidelne na základe rizika a s vhodnou frekvenciou a musia sa prijať vhodné opatrenia s cieľom odstrániť riziko a zabezpečiť presadzovanie potravinového práva EÚ. Na druhej strane je Európska komisia je zodpovedná za zabezpečenie toho, aby sa právne predpisy EÚ riadne vykonávali v rámci celej EÚ.

1. Komisia nemá k dispozícii informácie, ktoré naznačujú, že úroveň bezpečnosti potravín pochádzajúcich z Poľska je spravidla podstatne odlišná alebo nižšia ako kvalita potravín pochádzajúcich z iných členských štátov EÚ.
2. V nedávnom prípade, o ktorom sa zmieňuje vážená pani poslankyňa, umožnil systém oficiálnych kontrol, ktorý zaviedlo Poľsko, príslušným orgánom identifikovať problém, aby urýchlene vydali informácie o možných rizikách prostredníctvom systému rýchleho varovania pre potraviny a krmivá a aby okamžite prijali opatrenia.
3. Komisia nezhrmaďuje informácie o fungovaní členských štátov, pokiaľ ide o kvalitu výroby potravín.

⁽¹⁾ Nariadenie Európskeho parlamentu a Rady (ES) č. 178/2002 z 28. januára 2002, ktorým sa ustanovujú všeobecné zásady a požiadavky potravinového práva, zriaďuje Európsky úrad pre bezpečnosť potravín a stanovujú postupy v záležitostiach bezpečnosti potravín, Ú. v. ES L 31, 1.2.2002.

⁽²⁾ Nariadenie Európskeho parlamentu a Rady (ES) č. 882/2004 z 29. apríla 2004 o úradných kontrolách uskutočňovaných s cieľom zabezpečiť overenie dodržiavania potravinového a krmivového práva, a predpisov o zdraví zvierat a o starostlivosti o zvieratá, Ú. v. EÚ L 165, 30.4.2004.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-000699/13
to the Commission
Anna Záborská (PPE)
(24 January 2013)**

Subject: Quality of food produced in Poland

Repeatedly, food produced in Poland and exported to other Member States has caused scandals and anxiety among European consumers, and has been accused of being of insufficient quality (chicken, fish, meat) or of containing hazardous substances, such as technical salt or, just recently, rat poison.

1. Can the Commission confirm that the quality of food originating in Poland does not significantly differ from the food that is produced in other Member States?
2. In the Commission's opinion, does the monitoring system for food quality and safety in Poland sufficiently protect consumers in the EU from health risks caused by low quality and contamination of food with bacteria and hazardous substances?
3. Is the Commission prepared to publish, on a regular basis, a list of Member States comparing quality of food production based on the findings of the food control authorities (RASFF notifications)?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2013)**

There is a comprehensive body of legislation to ensure the safety of food placed on the market in the European Union. Regulations (EC) No 178/2002 ⁽¹⁾ and (EC) No 882/2004 ⁽²⁾ are two of the main tools used in order to achieve this objective.

Member States are responsible for the enforcement of EU food law and verify, through the organisation of official controls, that the relevant safety requirements are fulfilled by business operators at all stages. Official controls must be carried out regularly, on a risk basis, with appropriate frequency and appropriate measures must be taken to eliminate risk and ensure enforcement of EU food law. From its side, the European Commission has the responsibility to ensure that EU legislation is properly implemented across the whole EU.

1. The Commission is not in possession of information indicating that the level of safety of food originating from Poland is as a rule significantly different or lower than that of food originating from other EU Member States.
2. In the recent case referred to by the Honourable Member, the official controls system established by Poland has allowed the competent authorities to identify the problem, to promptly issue information about the possible risks through the Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed, and to take immediate action.
3. The Commission does not collect information on the Member States performances in terms of quality of food production.

⁽¹⁾ Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 of the Parliament and of the Council of 28 January 2002 laying down the general principles and requirements of food law, establishing the European Food Safety Authority and laying down procedures in matters of food safety, OJ L 31, 1.2.2002.

⁽²⁾ Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules, OJ L 165, 30.4.2004.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000701/13
an die Kommission**

Franziska Katharina Brantner (Verts/ALE)

(24. Januar 2013)

Betrifft: Gesetz über strategische Investitionsvorhaben der Republik Kroatien

Am 15. Januar 2013 legte das kroatische Wirtschaftsministerium einen Gesetzentwurf mit dem Titel „Entwurf für ein Gesetz über strategische Investitionsvorhaben in der Republik Kroatien“ (Prijedlog zakona o strateškim investicijskim projektima Republike Hrvatske) vor. Das Ministerium kündigte eine neuntägige öffentliche Konsultation an. Dieser Gesetzesentwurf wirft im Hinblick auf seine Vereinbarkeit mit dem Besitzstand der EU eine Reihe von Fragen auf:

1. Ist der Entwurf des Gesetzes über strategische Investitionsvorhaben mit dem Besitzstand der Union vereinbar, und zwar insbesondere im Hinblick auf die EU-Wettbewerbspolitik, die Regeln des Binnenmarkts und vor allem die EU-Umweltschutzpolitik?
2. Bestehen bei dem Gesetzesentwurf Risiken im Hinblick auf Erhaltung und Nachhaltigkeit öffentlicher Güter?
3. Hat die Kommission die kroatische Regierung in Zusammenhang mit den Beitrittsverhandlungen, den regelmäßigen Fortschrittsberichten und dem umfassenden Monitoring-Bericht über den Stand der Vorbereitungen Kroatiens auf die EU-Mitgliedschaft jemals aufgefordert, einen Entwurf für ein derartiges Gesetz über strategische Investitionen zu erarbeiten?
4. Gedenkt die Kommission, den Gesetzesentwurf im Zusammenhang mit ihrem für März erwarteten umfassenden Monitoring-Bericht über den Stand der Vorbereitungen Kroatiens auf die EU-Mitgliedschaft zu bewerten?
5. Welche Schlussfolgerungen zieht die Kommission aus einer kürzlich vorgelegten internen Studie, die ein externer Sachverständiger zu zwölf groß angelegten Investitionsvorhaben Kroatiens und ihrer Vereinbarkeit mit den Regeln und Grundsätzen der Umweltfolgenabschätzung verfasst hat? Haben die kroatischen Behörden die Umweltfolgenabschätzungen ausreichend berücksichtigt?
6. Unter Bezugnahme auf Frage 5: Welche Lehren wurden gezogen und wie beurteilt die Kommission die Frage, wenn es um groß angelegte und/oder strategische ausländische und nationale Investitionen in Kroatien und die entsprechenden Folgenabschätzungen zu den ökologischen und sozialen Auswirkungen geht? Welche Risiken hat dieser Entwurf eines Gesetzes über strategische Investitionen in Bezug auf Umweltfolgenabschätzungen?

Antwort von Herrn Füle im Namen der Kommission

(26. März 2013)

Die Kommission unterhält einen regelmäßigen Dialog mit Kroatien über die Reformprioritäten und hat in diesem Zusammenhang auch Anmerkungen zum Gesetzentwurf über strategische Investitionsvorhaben abgegeben. Der Gesetzentwurf wurde jedoch noch nicht vom Parlament verabschiedet. Die Kommission wird aufmerksam verfolgen, ob neu eingeführte Rechtsvorschriften mit den EU-Verpflichtungen, auch in Bezug auf Umweltverträglichkeitsprüfungen, konform sind.

Die Kommission hat mehrfach betont, dass Kroatien unbedingt weitere Anreize für Investitionen, die Verbesserung des Unternehmensumfelds und zur Steigerung der Wettbewerbsfähigkeit der kroatischen Wirtschaft geben muss. Sie hat Kroatien jedoch nicht zur Ausarbeitung dieses Gesetzentwurfs aufgefordert.

Der Schwerpunkt des Frühjahrs-Monitoringberichts, des letzten vor dem Beitritt, wird überwiegend auf den Beitrittsvorbereitungen Kroatiens in Bezug auf die Kapitel 8 „Wettbewerb“, 23 „Justiz und Grundrechte“ und 24 „Justiz, Freiheit und Sicherheit“ liegen. Nach dem Beitritt Kroatiens zur EU wird für das Land die gleiche Überwachung wie für alle EU-Mitgliedstaaten gelten, damit gewährleistet ist, dass die nationalen Rechtsvorschriften nicht gegen den Besitzstand der EU verstoßen.

Was schließlich die von der Frau Abgeordneten genannte interne Studie betrifft, so ist die Kommission nicht in der Lage, dazu Anmerkungen und Schlussfolgerungen abzugeben. Die Kommission hat jedoch eine Reihe von Mängeln betreffend die Qualität der Umweltverträglichkeitsprüfungen in Zusammenhang mit Wasservorschriften und Energievorhaben in Kroatien festgestellt. Diese wurden mit den kroatischen Behörden erörtert und die Kommission ist davon überzeugt, dass vor dem Beitrittstermin eine akzeptable Lösung gefunden wird.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000701/13
to the Commission**

Franziska Katharina Brantner (Verts/ALE)
(24 January 2013)

Subject: Law on strategic investment projects of the Republic of Croatia

On 15 January 2013 the Croatian Ministry of the Economy published a 'draft law on strategic investment projects of the Republic of Croatia' (Prijedlog zakona o strateškim investicijskim projektima Republike Hrvatske). The ministry announced a nine-day public consultation process. This draft law raises a number of questions regarding compatibility with the EU *acquis*:

1. Is the draft law on strategic investments in line with the EU *acquis*, particularly with regard to EU competition policy, internal market rules and, above all, EU policy on environmental protection?
2. Are there any risks associated with the proposed law with regard to the preservation and sustainability of public goods?
3. In the context of the accession negotiations, the Regular Progress Reports and the Commission's Comprehensive Monitoring Report on Croatia's state of preparedness for EU membership, did the Commission ever ask the Croatian Government to draft such a law on strategic investments?
4. Will the Commission assess the draft law in the context of its March Comprehensive Monitoring Report on Croatia's state of preparedness for EU membership?
5. What is the Commission's conclusion regarding a recent internal study drafted by an external expert on 12 large-scale investment projects in Croatia and their compliance with environmental impact assessments rules and principles? Have environmental impact assessments been sufficiently taken into account by the Croatian authorities?
6. In relation to question number 5, what are the lessons learned and what is the Commission's assessment when it comes to large-scale and/or strategic foreign or national investments in Croatia with regard to environmental and social impact assessments? What risks does this draft law on strategic investments pose with regard to environmental impact assessments?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission

(26 March 2013)

The Commission maintains a regular dialogue on reform priorities with Croatia and, in this context, also provided comments on the draft law on strategic investment projects. However, the draft law has not yet been adopted by parliament. The Commission will closely monitor that EU obligations, including on environmental impact assessments, are respected by newly introduced legislation.

The Commission has highlighted on several occasions the need for Croatia to further stimulate investments, enhance the business environment, and improve the competitiveness of the Croatian economy. However, the Commission has not asked Croatia to draft such a law.

The Spring Monitoring Report, the last one before accession, will mainly focus on Croatia's accession preparations in Chapters 8 'Competition', 23 'Judiciary and Fundamental rights' and 24 'Justice, Freedom and Security'. Following Croatia's accession to the EU, the country will be subject to the same monitoring as all EU Member States, in order to ensure that national laws do not infringe on the EU *acquis*.

Finally, with regard to the internal study referred to by the Honourable Member, the Commission is not in a position to provide comments or conclusions. However, the Commission has identified a number of shortcomings concerning the quality of environmental impact studies of water regulation and energy projects in Croatia. These have been the subject of discussion with the Croatian authorities and the Commission is confident that an acceptable solution will be in place for the date of accession.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000702/13
a la Comisión**

Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)

(24 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: Falta de transparencia en las decisiones sobre el rescate financiero

El pasado 20 de diciembre de 2012 la Dirección General de Competencia de la Comisión Europea publicó una nota sobre la contribución al programa de asistencia financiera a España. Dicha nota especifica los pasos que tendrán que dar tanto los bancos como las autoridades españolas para recibir finalmente los fondos para la reestructuración bancaria en el país.

La comisión especifica las cantidades que finalmente serán puestas a disposición del sector bancario, que resultan mucho menores de las inicialmente planteadas, así como un profundo análisis de la viabilidad de los bancos estableciendo cuales serán objetivo de la ayuda estatal. Los planes de reestructuración que los bancos españoles deben presentar a la Comisión, órgano garante de la ayuda prestada al sector, deben suponer el fin de las actividades de alto riesgo, transferir al también conocido como «banco malo» los activos más problemáticos, reducir su alcance geográfico y garantizar que su actividad se orienta al crédito minorista y a los préstamos a las PYME.

En la citada nota, se especifica que las decisiones serán publicadas en el sitio web de la Dirección General de Competencia: «Las decisiones de la Comisión aprobando los planes de reestructuración del grupo 1 y 2 de bancos serán publicadas una vez que las cuestiones confidenciales hayan sido revisadas por las autoridades españolas y los bancos». Esta cita supone un condicionamiento en la publicación de una información que debería ser pública y que atañe a todos los contribuyentes europeos y especialmente a propietarios de títulos de deuda subordinada y otros instrumentos similares que serán afectados por las citadas decisiones. Esta cita viola la Directiva 2004/109/CE al incumplir los requisitos de transparencia de cara a los tenedores de los instrumentos anteriormente citados.

El texto supone la introducción de una fuerte condicionalidad al funcionamiento del sector bancario, al menos a la parte «intervenida» del sector, pero carece de información con respecto a diversas cuestiones:

¿Cómo garantizará la Comisión el cumplimiento de la Directiva 2004/109/CE de cara tanto a los tenedores de instrumentos de deuda afectados como a los contribuyentes europeos si las autoridades y bancos españoles filtraran el texto de las decisiones?, ¿qué usos contempla la Comisión para los activos de la Compañía de Gestión de Activos, especialmente los bienes inmobiliarios que podrían solucionar problemas sociales del país como el de la vivienda?

¿Considera que este 30 % de la plantilla que exige despedir es culpable de la situación del banco?, ¿exigirá responsabilidades a los directivos?

Respuesta del Sr. Almunia en nombre de la Comisión

(15 de marzo de 2013)

La Comisión publica las versiones no confidenciales de sus decisiones y hace públicas detalladamente las razones que las motivan.

La Comisión debe omitir los secretos comerciales u otra información sensible en sus decisiones. Los Estados miembros indican los aspectos que consideren confidenciales ⁽¹⁾ y la Comisión evalúa la solicitud.

El objetivo de la Compañía de Gestión de Activos (SAREB) es deshacerse de la cartera de préstamos y activos inmobiliarios que adquiera de los bancos del grupo 1 y 2 en un plazo de 15 años, al tiempo que optimiza los niveles de valorización y preservación de valor, reduce al mínimo el impacto negativo en la economía, el mercado inmobiliario y el sector bancario españoles, y utiliza el capital de manera eficiente. Los detalles de la ejecución incumben a los órganos de gestión de SAREB.

⁽¹⁾ Tal como ello se define en la Comunicación de la Comisión C(2003) 4582, de 1 de diciembre de 2003, relativa al secreto profesional en las decisiones sobre ayuda estatal (DO C 297 de 09.12.2003, p. 6).

La reducción ordenada de los negocios del banco y la disminución consiguiente de su mano de obra se ajustan a los planes de reestructuración del banco aprobados, los cuales: i) deben traducirse en un restablecimiento de la viabilidad del banco o en su liquidación ordenada, ii) limitan la ayuda a lo estrictamente necesario e incluyen una contribución suficiente de los fondos propios del beneficiario, y iii) contemplan medidas suficientes para limitar el falseamiento de la competencia. Cuanta más ayuda reciba el banco, lo que se mide normalmente como porcentaje de sus activos ponderados en función del riesgo, mayor será la reestructuración necesaria.

La Comisión controla que los Estados miembros transpongan y apliquen correctamente el Derecho de la UE. La investigación acerca de posibles malas prácticas en la gestión de los bancos que hayan recibido ayudas estatales es competencia de las autoridades, los supervisores y los tribunales nacionales.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000702/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(24 January 2013)**

Subject: Lack of transparency in financial bailout decisions

On 20 December 2012, the Directorate General for Competition published a memo about the Commission's contribution to the Spanish financial assistance programme. It specified the steps that both the banks and the Spanish authorities would have to take before receiving the money required to restructure the country's banks.

The Commission specified the amounts of money that would be made available to the bank sector — much less than had previously been proposed — and announced a thorough evaluation of banks' viability in order to determine which banks would receive state aid. The restructuring plans that Spanish banks were required to present to the Commission, as the institution which approves the aid given to the sector, should put an end to high-risk trading activities and see banks transfer their most problematic assets to the so-called 'bad bank', reduce their geographical scope and guarantee that they will shift their banking activities towards retail credit and loans for SMEs.

The memo says that the Commission's decisions will be published on the Directorate General for Competition website: 'The Commission's decisions approving the restructuring plans of the group 1 and 2 banks will be published once confidentiality issues have been checked by the Spanish authorities and the banks.' This statement imposes a condition on the distribution of information that should be made public and which concerns all European tax payers, and especially those who hold subordinated debt or other similar instruments that will be affected by the Commission's decisions. As far as holders of these types of debt instruments are concerned, this statement breaches Directive 2004/109/EC by not fulfilling the requirements for transparency.

The text announces that strict conditions will be imposed on the functioning of the bank sector, at least for the banks that have been evaluated, but it leaves many questions unanswered:

How will the Commission guarantee compliance with Directive 2004/109/EC, in terms of making information accessible to both affected debt holders and European tax payers, if the Spanish authorities and banks filter the content of any decisions made? What does the Commission think should be done with the Asset Management Company's assets, in particular its property assets, which could be used to solve some of Spain's social problems such as the housing problem?

Does the Commission believe that the 30 % of staff that it has told banks to make redundant is responsible for the current banking situation? Will the Commission hold executives accountable?

**Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(15 March 2013)**

The Commission publishes non-confidential versions of its decisions, making public the full reasoning behind them.

The Commission must suppress business secrets or other sensitive information in its decisions. Member States indicate the aspects they consider confidential ⁽¹⁾ and the Commission assesses the request.

The objective of Assets' Management Company (SAREB) is to divest the portfolio of real estate loans and assets it acquires from Group 1 and 2 banks within 15 years, while optimizing levels of recovery and value preservation, minimising negative impact on the Spanish economy, real estate market and banking sector, and utilizing capital efficiently. Specifics of the implementation are up to SAREB's management.

The orderly reduction of the bank's business and consequent reduction of its workforce complies with the banks' approved restructuring plans, which: (i) must lead to restoring the bank's viability or its orderly winding-up, (ii) limit aid to the minimum necessary and include sufficient own-contribution by the beneficiary, and (iii) contain sufficient measures limiting competition distortion. The more aid the bank has received, normally measured as a percentage of its risk weighted assets, the bigger the restructuring needed.

⁽¹⁾ As defined in Commission communication C(2003) 4582 of 1 December 2003 on professional secrecy in state aid decisions, OJ C 297, 9.12.2003, p. 6.

The Commission monitors Member States' correct transposition and application of EC law. Investigation of possible malpractice in the management of state aided banks is the responsibility of national authorities, supervisors and courts.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000703/13
to the Commission
Chris Davies (ALDE)
(24 January 2013)

Subject: Application of the VAT Directive to life-saving organisations

The Commission was due to start preparatory work in 2009 on a review of the provisions of the VAT Directive (2006/12/EC) with regard to the treatment of public authorities and exemptions in the public interest.

Can the Commission state what the conclusions were of this review, or what progress has been made in undertaking it, and what opportunity there remains for individuals and organisations to make representations regarding the issues being considered?

Can the Commission state whether the scope of the review extends to the payment of VAT on goods purchased by voluntary life-saving organisations such as the UK's mountain rescue teams?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(5 March 2013)

The review of the VAT treatment of public bodies and the exemptions in the public interest has not yet been finalised. A direction for future action was given by the Commission in its communication of 6 December 2011 according to which the Commission committed itself to promoting a gradual approach in this field and indicated that a future legislative proposal would concentrate on activities with a greater degree of private sector involvement and a heightened risk of a distortion of competition.

There will be a conference held on 17-19 April 2013 in Italy for both representatives of Member States' tax administrations and other stakeholders which will give the opportunity for an exchange of views on the relevant issues. More information can be found on the Commission's website at the following address (under 'What's new'):
http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/index_en.htm

The review does not specifically concern the payment of VAT on goods purchased by voluntary life-saving organisations such as the UK's mountain rescue teams, but it encompasses the tax exemption in the public interest pursuant to Article 132 of the VAT Directive which could affect this issue.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000704/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**

Pino Arlacchi (S&D)

(24 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Affermazioni del governo marocchino sul tema della democrazia

Nel dicembre del 2012, la Commissione europea ha lanciato un programma da 2,8 milioni di EUR per sostenere il rispetto dei diritti umani in Marocco. Il programma può essere considerato una ricompensa per le riforme intraprese dal governo marocchino nel corso degli ultimi due anni. La nuova Costituzione del Marocco stabilisce infatti diversi principi che garantiscono il rispetto dei diritti umani e delle libertà fondamentali attraverso l'istituzionalizzazione dell'attività di svariati organi in questo campo. Tuttavia, molti contestatori iniziano a domandarsi se le affermazioni del governo marocchino sul tema della democrazia riflettano qualcosa di più di semplici modifiche di facciata. Il Marocco resta un paese impoverito a causa della concentrazione anomala di ricchezza nelle mani del re e del suo entourage. Sembra inoltre che il governo stia silenziosamente reprimendo l'attivismo politico. Nell'ottobre del 2012, le Nazioni Unite hanno riferito di un recente aumento dei casi di tortura denunciati in Marocco. Circa 70 dimostranti collegati con il movimento a favore della democrazia «20 febbraio» sono tuttora in prigione. A maggio un famoso rapper è stato condannato a un anno di detenzione per una canzone sulla corruzione della polizia, mentre a settembre, in occasione di un'udienza, sei attivisti politici hanno testimoniato di aver subito abusi fisici e sessuali dopo essere stati arrestati per aver protestato nel mese di luglio.

Può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. È il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante a conoscenza dei fatti suesposti?
2. Intende il SEAE analizzare l'effettivo impatto delle riforme che il governo marocchino afferma di aver messo in atto?

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

(15 marzo 2013)

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente è pienamente impegnata nel dialogo sui diritti umani con il Marocco sulla base di quanto previsto in proposito dall'accordo di associazione tra l'UE e il Marocco. Il rispetto dei diritti umani è costantemente affrontato in sede di riunione dei competenti organi congiunti istituiti nell'ambito dell'accordo di associazione tra l'UE e tale paese, e più precisamente nel quadro del sottocomitato UE-Marocco per i diritti umani, la governance e la democrazia.

Negli ultimi anni le relazioni tra l'Unione europea e il Marocco hanno compiuto notevoli progressi contribuendo a un ampio processo di riforma democratica del paese. Sviluppi positivi al riguardo sono rappresentati dal rafforzamento delle libertà fondamentali e dei principi democratici nella nuova Costituzione nonché dalla creazione e dal consolidamento del Consiglio nazionale per i diritti umani.

È necessario, tuttavia, compiere ulteriori progressi, come evidenziano i fatti descritti nell'interrogazione parlamentare. Nel quadro dello «status avanzato» concesso al Marocco, l'Unione europea terrà dunque sotto osservazione l'attuazione delle disposizioni della nuova Costituzione nel settore dei diritti umani e della democrazia.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000704/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Pino Arlacchi (S&D)
(24 January 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Moroccan Government's democracy claims

In December 2012, the Commission launched an EUR 2.8 million programme in support of respect for human rights in Morocco. That programme could be viewed as a reward for the reform efforts undertaken by the Moroccan Government over the past two years. Morocco's new Constitution indeed lays down a number of principles ensuring respect for human rights and fundamental liberties through the institutionalisation of the tasks of a number of bodies in this field. However, many critics are starting to wonder whether the Moroccan Government's democracy claims reflect anything more than cosmetic changes. Morocco is still an impoverished country because of the abnormal concentration of wealth in the hands of its king and his entourage. Moreover, it seems that the Government is quietly clamping down on political activists. In October 2012, the United Nations said there was evidence of a recent rise in reports of torture in Morocco. About 70 protesters associated with the pro-democracy February 20 Movement are still in prison. In May, a popular rapper was sentenced to a year in jail for a song about police corruption, while six political activists testified at a hearing in September that they had been physically — and sexually — abused after being arrested for protesting in July.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the facts described above?
2. Is the EEAS planning to analyse the real impact of the reforms that the Moroccan Government claims to have implemented?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(15 March 2013)

The HR/VP is fully engaged in the dialogue on human rights with Morocco on the basis of the relevant provisions of the EU-Morocco Association Agreement. Respect for human rights is regularly addressed in the meetings of the relevant joint bodies established under the EU Morocco Association Agreement, and more precisely in the framework of the EU-Morocco Sub-Committee on Human Rights, Governance and Democracy.

EU-Morocco relations have made significant progress in recent years and have contributed to a wide process of democratic reform in that country. The strengthening of fundamental freedoms and democratic principles in the new Constitution as well as the establishment and consolidation of the National Council for Human Rights are positive developments in this regard.

However, further progress is necessary, as evidenced by the facts described in the Parliamentary Question. In the framework of the 'Advanced Status' granted to Morocco, the EU will thus follow up the implementation of the provisions of the new Constitution in the area of human rights and democracy.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000705/13

adresată Comisiei

Adina-Ioana Vălean (ALDE)

(24 ianuarie 2013)

Subiect: Numărul european de urgență 112

Având în vedere dispozițiile articolului 26 alineatul (5) din Directiva 2009/136/CE (Directiva privind serviciul universal) referitoare la localizarea apelurilor efectuate către numărul european de urgență 112, ar trebui menționat că mai mulți operatori europeni de rețele de telefonie mobilă sunt echipați cu A-GPS, un sistem care, în anumite condiții, poate îmbunătăți performanța inițială a unui sistem GPS de poziționare bazat pe satelit.

Poate Comisia preciza în câte state membre informațiile de localizare oferite de sistemul A-GPS sunt furnizate către centrele de recepție a apelurilor de urgență?

Care este termenul până la care Comisia va face obligatorie utilizarea sistemului A-GPS, astfel încât acesta să poată contribui la salvarea de vieți omenești?

Răspuns dat de dna Kroes în numele Comisiei

(13 martie 2013)

Directiva privind serviciul universal prevede, pentru întreprinderea prin intermediul căreia se efectuează apelul, obligația de a furniza autorității care tratează apelurile de urgență informațiile privind localizarea apelantului. La același alineat, se specifică obligația autorităților de reglementare competente de a prevedea criteriile de acuratețe și fiabilitate ale informațiilor furnizate cu privire la localizarea apelantului. În consecință, este responsabilitatea statelor membre de a impune criteriile aplicabile localizării apelantului. Statele membre au precizat în raportul anual al COCOM privind implementarea numărului 112, publicat de Comisie la 11 februarie, că marea majoritate a întreprinderilor furnizează identificatorul celulei pentru localizarea apelantului.

Comisia nu deține informații privind folosirea sistemului A-GPS. Utilizarea datelor GNSS⁽¹⁾ ar putea oferi o poziționare mult mai precisă decât identificatorul celulei.

Comisia acordă o importanță majoră furnizării către serviciile de urgență a unor informații exacte privind localizarea. Prin urmare, în prezent, serviciile Comisiei poartă discuții cu statele membre, în cadrul Comitetului pentru comunicații, cu privire la necesitatea de a pune în aplicare criterii mai stricte privind localizarea apelantului.

(¹) Global Navigation Satellite System (Sistem global de navigație prin satelit).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000705/13
to the Commission**

Adina-Ioana Vălean (ALDE)

(24 January 2013)

Subject: European emergency number 112

With reference to Article 26(5) of Directive 2009/136/EC (Universal Service Directive), concerning the location of calls to the European emergency number 112, it should be noted that several European mobile networks operators are equipped with A-GPS, a system that under certain conditions can improve the start-up performance of a GPS satellite-based positioning system.

Can the Commission indicate the number of Member States in which A-GPS location information is made available to Public Safety Answering Points?

What is the Commission's timeframe for mandating the use of A-GPS so that it can contribute towards saving lives?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission

(13 March 2013)

The Universal Service Directive contains the obligation for undertakings providing the call to make caller location available to the authority handling emergency calls. The same paragraph provides that competent regulatory authorities shall lay down criteria for the accuracy and reliability of the caller location information provided. Consequently, it is for Member States to impose caller location criteria. Member States reported in the yearly COCOM implementation report which the Commission published on 11 February that the vast majority of undertakings provide cell ID as caller location.

The Commission does not hold information on the use of A-GPS technology. The use of GNSS ⁽¹⁾ data could provide a much more accurate positioning than Cell ID.

The Commission attaches much importance to the delivery of accurate location information to emergency services. Therefore, the Commission services are currently discussing with Member States in the communications Committee the necessity of implementing more stringent caller location criteria.

⁽¹⁾ Global Navigation Satellite System.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000706/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Marietta Giannakou (PPE)
 (24 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Παραμερισμός των ευρωπαϊκών διακρατικών οργανισμών στο σχεδιασμό της έρευνας στην ΕΕ

Ο εκπεφρασμένος στόχος της ΕΕ να καταστεί η Ευρώπη η ανταγωνιστικότερη και δυναμικότερη παγκοσμίως οικονομία της γνώσης, συνετέλεσε, μεταξύ άλλων, στη σταδιακή ανάπτυξη από πλευράς Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής, αρμοδίων διευθύνσεων αλλά και αυτονόμων κοινοτικών μηχανισμών σε θέματα έρευνας για το περιβάλλον, το κλίμα και το διάστημα.

Παρόλα αυτά, ερωτήματα γείρονται όσον αφορά στην αξιοποίηση των ήδη υπαρχόντων ευρωπαϊκών οργανισμών και τη συνεργασία τους με την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή, ιδιαίτερα κατά την λήψη αποφάσεων σχετικά με τη στρατηγική και στο σχεδιασμό της έρευνας στους εν λόγω τομείς.

Ευρωπαϊκοί επιστημονικοί οργανισμοί με μακροχρόνια προσφορά στους τομείς ευθύνης τους (όπως π.χ. European Organization for the Exploitation of Meteorological Satellites (EUMETSAT), European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF), European Space Agency (ESA), The European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN), The European Southern Observatory (ESO), The Economic Interest Grouping of National Meteorological Services of the European Economic Area (ECOMET), European Molecular Biology Laboratory (EMBL), EuroGeoSurveys (EGS), European Regional Association for weather, hydrology and climate (RA6/WMO)), φαίνεται ότι δεν αξιοποιούνται στη διαδικασία σχεδιασμού της έρευνας σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο παρά το τεράστιο επιστημονικό και ερευνητικό έργο τους και τη πολυετή επιχειρησιακή τους δράση.

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τα παραπάνω ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Σε ποίο βαθμό υπάρχει η απαιτούμενη συνεργασία με τους προαναφερόμενους ευρωπαϊκούς οργανισμούς, ιδιαίτερα κατά τη διαδικασία σχεδιασμού της έρευνας στους τομείς ευθύνης τους;
2. Έχουν παρουσιαστεί προβλήματα επικαλύψεων και συναρμοδιότητας και πώς αντιμετωπίστηκαν;
3. Υπάρχει θεσμική εκπροσώπηση των συγκεκριμένων οργανισμών κατά το προπαρασκευαστικό στάδιο των προτάσεων της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής σε θέματα που άπτονται του ερευνητικού και επιχειρησιακού πεδίου τους;
4. Δεδομένου ότι η χρηματοδότηση των εν λόγω διακρατικών οργανισμών καλύπτεται κυρίως από τα κράτη μέλη της Ένωσης, προτίθεται να προτείνει ένα διαφορετικό μοντέλο ενισχυμένης συνεργασίας για την αποφυγή διαπανηρών επικαλύψεων και περιττών επαναλήψεων;

Απάντηση της κ. Geoghegan-Quinn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
 (13 Μαρτίου 2013)

1, 3. Η συνεργασία με τους οργανισμούς που αναφέρει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου αποτελεί τον πυρήνα του Ευρωπαϊκού Χώρου Έρευνας (ΕΧΕ). Η Επιτροπή συνεργάζεται σε πολυμερές επίπεδο, μεταξύ άλλων μέσω του μνημονίου συμφωνίας που υπογράφηκε με το EIROforum⁽¹⁾, βάσει του οποίου καθίσταται δυνατή η πραγματοποίηση κοινών δραστηριοτήτων στον προγραμματισμό ερευνών, στην ανταλλαγή πληροφοριών, στην κατάρτιση των ερευνητών, στις ερευνητικές υποδομές, στην ανταλλαγή γνώσεων και στη διεθνή συνεργασία.

Η διμερής συνεργασία βασίζεται σε μνημόνια συμφωνίας⁽²⁾ ή στη Συνθήκη για τη Λειτουργία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης⁽³⁾, πλαισιωμένη από παράγωγο δίκαιο και συμφωνίες μεταβίβασης αρμοδιοτήτων που αφορούν ενωσιακά προγράμματα⁽⁴⁾. Σε αυτή τη βάση, πραγματοποιούνται συχνά διμερείς συναντήσεις, ενώ η Επιτροπή προσκαλείται να παραστεί, υπό την ιδιότητα του παρατηρητή, σε συνεδριάσεις του ΔΣ, ή υπαγόμενων σε αυτό οργάνων, σε ορισμένους οργανισμούς⁽⁵⁾. Ο ΕΟΔ (ESA) προσκαλείται στις συνεδριάσεις της επιτροπής προγράμματος, ως παρατηρητής⁽⁶⁾. Άλλοι οργανισμοί των ενδιαφερόμενων μερών⁽⁷⁾ παρεμβαίνουν, λόγου χάρη, μέσω δημόσιων διαβουλεύσεων ή συναντήσεων εργασίας.

⁽¹⁾ CERN (Ευρωπαϊκός Οργανισμός Πυρηνικών Ερευνών), EMBL (Ευρωπαϊκό Εργαστήριο Μοριακής Βιολογίας), Ευρωπαϊκής συμφωνίας για την ανάπτυξη της σύντηξης (EFDA), ESA (Ευρωπαϊκός Οργανισμός Διαστήματος), ESO, Ευρωπαϊκό Εργαστήριο Ακτινοβολίας Συγχρότρου (ESRF), Ινστιτούτο Laue Langevin (ILL) and the European XFEL (Ευρωπαϊκή Συσκευή Λέιζερ Ελευθέρων Ηλεκτρονίων).

⁽²⁾ CERN, EMBL, WMO (ΠΜΟ).

⁽³⁾ ΕΟΔ (ESA), άρθρο 189 ΣΛΕΕ.

⁽⁴⁾ Ευρωπαϊκά προγράμματα δορυφορικής ραδιοπλοήγησης (EGNOS και Galileo) κανονισμός (683/2008) και Παγκόσμια Παρακολούθηση του Περιβάλλοντος και της Ασφάλειας (GMES) κανονισμός (911/2010) και σχετικές συμφωνίες μεταβίβασης αρμοδιοτήτων.

⁽⁵⁾ Π.χ. CERN, EMBL, ESA, EUMETSAT, ECMWF.

⁽⁶⁾ Επιτροπή των ευρωπαϊκών προγραμμάτων GNSS, επιτροπή GMES, 7ο ΠΠ/επιτροπή διαστήματος.

⁽⁷⁾ ECOMET, EuroGeoSurveys που δεν είναι διακυβερνητικοί.

Αυτή η συνεργασία διευκολύνει τη συμπληρωματικότητα και την αποφυγή αλληλεπικαλύψεων. Παρέχει στους οργανισμούς τη δυνατότητα προκαταρκτικής συμβολής σε προτάσεις της Επιτροπής και σε προγράμματα ερευνητικών εργασιών στα αντίστοιχα πεδία των δραστηριοτήτων τους. Οι περισσότεροι οργανισμοί ⁽⁸⁾ έχουν συμμετοχή στο έβδομο πρόγραμμα πλαίσιο για την έρευνα και την τεχνολογική ανάπτυξη (7οΠΠ, 2007-2013) ⁽⁹⁾.

2, 4. Οι παραπάνω διαδικασίες, σε συνδυασμό με το ρόλο των κρατών μελών σε επιτροπές προγραμμάτων και σε διαβουλεύσεις με τους ενδιαφερόμενους, στηρίζουν σε μεγάλο βαθμό τη συμπληρωματικότητα και τις συνέργειες. Η δημόσια διαβούλευση στο πλαίσιο του ΕΧΕ όσον αφορά τη μελλοντική σχέση μεταξύ διακυβερνητικών οργανισμών και της ΕΕ κατέληξε στο συμπέρασμα ότι είναι προτιμότερο να βελτιστοποιηθεί η συνεργασία με τους οργανισμούς αυτούς αντί να ενσωματωθούν στην ΕΕ.

⁽⁸⁾ EFDA, CERN, EMBL, ESA, EUMETSAT, ECMWF.

⁽⁹⁾ Marie Curie, ερευνητικές υποδομές, Ευρωπαϊκό συμβούλιο έρευνας, υγεία, περιβάλλον, διάστημα.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000706/13
to the Commission
Marietta Giannakou (PPE)
(24 January 2013)**

Subject: European Intergovernmental Organisations being sidelined in EU research planning

The EU's stated objective of making Europe the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, has contributed, *inter alia*, to the gradual development of competent departments and autonomous Community instruments by the European Commission in the field of research on the environment, climate and space.

Nevertheless, questions have been raised concerning the use of existing European organisations and their cooperation with the European Commission, particularly in making decisions on research strategy and planning in these fields.

It seems that European scientific organisations providing long-term services in their areas of responsibility (such as The European Organisation for the Exploitation of Meteorological Satellites (EUMETSAT); The European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF); The European Space Agency (ESA); The European Organisation for Nuclear Research (CERN); The European Southern Observatory (ESO); The Economic Interest Grouping of National Meteorological Services of the European Economic Area (ECOMET); European Molecular Biology Laboratory (EMBL); EuroGeoSurveys (EGS); and the European Regional Association for weather, hydrology and climate (RA6/WMO)), are not being used in the research planning process on a European level, despite their huge scientific and research projects and multi-annual operational activity.

In view of the above, will the Commission answer the following:

1. How much cooperation is there with the aforementioned European organisations, particularly during the research planning process in their areas of responsibility?
2. Have there been any problems concerning overlaps and shared competence and how were these dealt with?
3. Are these organisations represented institutionally during the preparatory phase for European Commission proposals on matters concerning their fields of research and operation?
4. Given that funding for these intergovernmental organisations comes mainly from EU Member States, does the Commission intend to propose a different model for enhanced cooperation to avoid expensive overlapping and unnecessary repetition?

**Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(13 March 2013)**

1 and 3. Cooperation with the organisations mentioned by the Honourable Member is at the core of the European Research Area (ERA). The Commission cooperates multilaterally, among others through the Statement of Intent signed with EIROForum ⁽¹⁾ allowing for joint activities in research programming, information exchange, training of researchers, research infrastructures, knowledge sharing and international cooperation.

Bilateral cooperation is based on Memoranda of Understanding ⁽²⁾ or the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU ⁽³⁾, complemented by secondary legislation and delegation agreements for Union programmes ⁽⁴⁾. On this basis, there are frequent bilateral meetings and the Commission is invited to attend, as observer, meetings of Council, or subordinate bodies, of some organisations ⁽⁵⁾. ESA is invited to programme committee meetings as observer ⁽⁶⁾. Other stakeholder organisations ⁽⁷⁾ interact for instance through public consultations or workshops.

⁽¹⁾ CERN, EMBL, European Fusion Development Agreement (EFDA), ESA, ESO, European Synchrotron Radiation Facility (ESRF), Institut Laue Langevin (ILL) and the European XFEL (X-Ray Free-Electron Laser Facility).

⁽²⁾ CERN, EMBL, WMO.

⁽³⁾ ESA, Article 189, TFEU.

⁽⁴⁾ European Satellite Navigation Programmes (EGNOS and Galileo) Regulation (683/2008) and the Global Monitoring for Environment and Security Programme (GMES) Regulation (911/2010) and related delegation agreements.

⁽⁵⁾ e.g. CERN, EMBL, ESA, EUMETSAT, ECMWF.

⁽⁶⁾ European GNSS Programmes committee, GMES committee, FP7/Space committee.

⁽⁷⁾ ECOMET, EuroGeoSurveys which are not intergovernmental.

This cooperation facilitates complementarity and avoidance of overlaps. It allows the organisations to provide preliminary inputs to Commission proposals and research work programmes in their respective fields of activity. Most organisations ⁽⁸⁾ have been involved in the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013) ⁽⁹⁾.

2 and 4. The aforementioned processes coupled with the role of Member States in programme committees and stakeholder consultations underpin, to a large extent, complementarity and synergies. Public consultation in the frame of ERA concerning the future relationship between intergovernmental organisations and the EU concluded it was preferable to optimise cooperation with these organisations instead of integrating them to the EU.

⁽⁸⁾ EFDA, CERN, EMBL, ESA, EUMETSAT, ECMWF.

⁽⁹⁾ Marie Curie, Research Infrastructures, European Research Council, Health, Environment, Space.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000707/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(24 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ευρωπαϊκά προγράμματα για την καταπολέμηση της ανεργίας στην Ελλάδα

Τα ευρωπαϊκά προγράμματα για την καταπολέμηση της ανεργίας στην Ελλάδα θα έπρεπε να αποτελούν βασικό παράγοντα ενίσχυσης της απασχόλησης, δεδομένης μάλιστα της κατακόρυφης αύξησης της ανεργίας (μέσα στα τελευταία τέσσερα χρόνια καταργήθηκαν περίπου 950 000 θέσεις εργασίας, δηλαδή όσες είχαν δημιουργηθεί μέσα σε μία 17ετία). Σύμφωνα με πρόσφατο δημοσίευμα του ελληνικού τύπου⁽¹⁾, όλα αυτά τα χρόνια έχουν παρατηρηθεί φαινόμενα σκανδαλώδους κατασπατάλησης χρημάτων για σκοπούς άσχετους με το αντικείμενο των προγραμμάτων. Μεταξύ άλλων, σύμφωνα με το σχετικό δημοσίευμα, έχουν καταγραφεί: διαγωνισμός που ανέδειξε την εταιρεία που θα ανέλαμβανε και το προεκλογικό πακέτο υπουργού, χρησιμοποίηση 5-10% των χρημάτων για την προεκλογική εκστρατεία πολιτικών, έμμεση εξαγορά εταιρειών οι ενστάσεις των οποίων απερρίφθησαν, προγράμματα αξιολόγησης που ποτέ δεν ελήφθησαν υπόψη κατά τον σχεδιασμό, παραμονή συμβούλων επί μία 20ετία σε κομβικές θέσεις ροής τεχνογνωσίας προς την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή κ.λπ.

Με δεδομένα τα ανωτέρω ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Γνωρίζει πώς ακριβώς γίνεται η διαχείριση των σχετικών προγραμμάτων στην Ελλάδα, εάν δηλαδή γίνεται με τρόπο που να αξιοποιεί τα διατιθέμενα χρήματα για την επίτευξη των αρχικών στόχων; Χρησιμοποιούνται χρήματα των Ευρωπαίων φορολογουμένων για την εξυπηρέτηση πολιτικών σκοπιμοτήτων;
2. Προτίθεται να ερευνήσει τις σχετικές καταγγελίες που έγιναν επώνυμα από μια από τις πιο σοβαρές εφημερίδες της χώρας και με ποιο τρόπο;
3. Θεωρεί ότι οι περιπτώσεις που αναφέρονται παραπάνω εμπίπτουν στην αρμοδιότητα του OLAF;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(21 Μαρτίου 2013)

1. Η διαχείριση του προϋπολογισμού των Ευρωπαϊκών Διαρθρωτικών Ταμείων υπόκειται στους κανόνες της συνδιαχείρισης⁽²⁾. Σύμφωνα με τους εν λόγω κανόνες, την ευθύνη για τη διαχείριση και υλοποίηση των προγραμμάτων της ΕΕ φέρουν τα κράτη μέλη, ενώ η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί την πρόοδο της υλοποίησής τους και την επίτευξη των στόχων τους, κυρίως μέσω των σχετικών συνεδριάσεων της επιτροπής παρακολούθησης, των ετήσιων εκθέσεων υλοποίησης και των ετήσιων συνεδριάσεων επανεξέτασης. Βάσει της εν λόγω παρακολούθησης, η Επιτροπή εκτιμά ότι, η Ελλάδα, ύστερα από τις αρχικές καθυστερήσεις στην υλοποίηση των προγραμμάτων, ακολουθεί πλέον σταθερή πορεία και ότι τα κονδύλια διατίθενται για την επίτευξη των αρχικών στόχων. Τα πορίσματα των ετήσιων εκθέσεων ελέγχου του Ευρωπαϊκού Ελεγκτικού Συνεδρίου και των ελέγχων της ίδιας της Επιτροπής κατά τα τελευταία χρόνια στην Ελλάδα δεν έχουν αποκαλύψει καμία κατάχρηση των Ευρωπαϊκών Κοινοτικών Ταμείων.

2 και 3. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Υπηρεσία Καταπολέμησης της Απάτης (OLAF) μπορεί να παρεμβαίνει σε συγκεκριμένες περιπτώσεις, όταν υπάρχουν αρκούντως σοβαρές υπόνοιες απάτης, διαφθοράς ή σοβαρές παρατυπίες, επιζήμιες για τον προϋπολογισμό της ΕΕ. Ωστόσο, στην προκειμένη περίπτωση, η Επιτροπή πληροφορήθηκε από την OLAF ότι το εν λόγω ζήτημα δεν παρατέμφθηκε σ' αυτήν προς εξέταση. Η OLAF θα το εξετάσει και θα αποφανθεί εάν εμπίπτει στο πεδίο αρμοδιότητάς της.

⁽¹⁾ «Οι γκρίζες ζώνες στα κοινοτικά προγράμματα ανεργίας», Καθημερινή, 20.1.2013.

⁽²⁾ Κανονισμός (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1083/2006 του Συμβουλίου, της 11ης Ιουλίου 2006, περί καθορισμού γενικών διατάξεων για το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης, το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο και το Ταμείο Συνοχής και την κατάργηση του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1260/1999 (ΕΕ L 210 της 31.7.2006).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000707/13
to the Commission
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(24 January 2013)

Subject: European programmes to combat unemployment in Greece

European programmes to combat unemployment in Greece should be an important factor in fostering employment, given the sharp increase in unemployment (in the last four years, approximately 950 000 jobs have been cut, i.e. all of the jobs created in a 17-year period). According to a recent article in the Greek press ⁽¹⁾, these years have seen the scandalous wasting of money on purposes which are unrelated to the programmes. This particular article records, amongst other things, a competition where the name of the company funding the ministerial electoral campaign package was revealed; 5-10 % of the funds were used for the political electoral campaign; the indirect acquisition of companies, challenges to which were rejected; evaluation programmes that were never taken into consideration in the planning stage; the retention of advisors who held key positions for twenty years providing expertise to the European Commission, etc.

In view of the above, will the Commission answer the following:

1. Does the Commission know exactly how these programmes are administered in Greece, i.e. whether the programmes' budget is being used to achieve the initial objectives? Is European taxpayers' money being used for political expediency?
2. Does it intend to investigate these accusations made by one of the country's most important newspapers and how?
3. Does it believe that the situations described above fall within the jurisdiction of OLAF?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(21 March 2013)

1. The management of the European Structural Funds budget is subject to the rules of shared management ⁽²⁾. Under these rules, the management and implementation of the EU programmes falls under the responsibility of the Member States, while the Commission monitors the progress of their implementation and the achievement of their objectives mainly through their relevant Monitoring Committee Meetings, the Annual Implementation Reports and the Annual Review Meetings. On the basis of this monitoring, the Commission can say that, after initial delays in the implementation of the programmes in Greece, they are now on track and the funds are being used to achieve the initial objectives. The findings of the annual control reports by the European Court of Auditors and by the Commission's own audits during the last years in Greece have not revealed any misuse of European Social Funds.

2 and 3. The European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) may intervene in specific cases whenever there are sufficiently serious suspicions of fraud, corruption or serious irregularities detrimental to the EU budget. However, in this instance, the Commission has been informed by OLAF that the matter described has not been reported to it for examination. OLAF will examine it and decide if it falls within its mandate for action.

⁽¹⁾ 'Grey areas in Community unemployment programmes', Kathimerini, 20.1.2013.

⁽²⁾ Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 of 11 July 2006 laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999, OJ L 210, 31.7.2006.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000708/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(24 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Πλαφόν στην τιμή του γάλακτος

Το Υπουργείο Εμπορίου της Κύπρου με διάταγμα επέβαλε πλαφόν στη λιανική και χονδρική τιμή του παστεριωμένου γάλακτος, μετά από τη διαπίστωση ότι η τιμή του σημείωνε μεγάλη αύξηση, με αποτέλεσμα να πλησιάζει στο 1,50 ευρώ ανά λίτρο και να είναι η πιο υψηλή, με διαφορά, στις χώρες της ΕΕ.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Είναι η πιο πάνω τιμή του γάλακτος στην Κύπρο υπόψη της Επιτροπής;
2. Αν ναι, πώς μπορεί να δικαιολογηθεί μια τόσο μεγάλη διαφορά στις τιμές σε μια υποτιθέμενη ενιαία αγορά;
3. Ποια είναι η γνώμη της Επιτροπής ως προς την επιβολή πλαφόν για συγκράτηση των τιμών; Είναι η επιβολή πλαφόν σύμφωνη με τις πολιτικές της ΕΕ;
4. Πιστεύει η Επιτροπή ότι η επιβολή πλαφόν θα βοηθήσει στην εξομάλυνση των τιμών και της αγοράς του γάλακτος στην Κύπρο;
5. Υπάρχουν μέτρα που μπορεί να λάβει ή να εισηγηθεί η Επιτροπή προς όφελος των καταναλωτών και προς αποτροπή του φαινομένου της υπέρμετρης αύξησης της τιμής ενός βασικού προϊόντος, όπως είναι το γάλα;

Απάντηση του κ. Ciołosz εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(25 Μαρτίου 2013)

1. Το παστεριωμένο γάλα δεν περιλαμβάνεται στον κατάλογο των προϊόντων για τα οποία τα κράτη μέλη οφείλουν να υποβάλλουν εβδομαδιαία κοινοποίηση τιμών στην Επιτροπή. Ωστόσο, η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί στενά την εξέλιξη της αγοράς γάλακτος στην ΕΕ.

2. Η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει την ύπαρξη αποκλίσεων στις τιμές ομοειδών προϊόντων σε διάφορα κράτη μέλη. Οι διαφορές αυτές οφείλονται σε παράγοντες όπως οι προτιμήσεις των καταναλωτών, το εισόδημα, η ρύθμιση της αγοράς εργασίας και προϊόντων, τα έξοδα μεταφοράς, κ.λπ.

3. Ο καθορισμός μέγιστων τιμών δεν συνιστά αφεαυτού μέτρο ισοδύναμου αποτελέσματος προς ποσοτικούς περιορισμούς, υπό την προϋπόθεση ότι δεν οδηγεί, νομικά ή πραγματικά, σε διάκριση έναντι προϊόντων άλλων κρατών μελών⁽¹⁾.

Όσον αφορά στους κανόνες ανταγωνισμού της ΕΕ, αυτοί εφαρμόζονται στη συμπεριφορά των επιχειρήσεων και όχι στα νομοθετικά μέτρα των κρατών μελών, εκτός της περίπτωσης στην οποία ένα κράτος μέλος επιβάλλει, διευκολύνει ή ενισχύει τη σύναψη περιοριστικής για τον ανταγωνισμό συμφωνίας, ή μεταθέτει σε ιδιώτες επιχειρηματίες την ευθύνη λήψης αποφάσεων περί παρεμβάσεως σε οικονομικά θέματα και, ως εκ τούτου, καθιστά τους κανόνες ανταγωνισμού αναποτελεσματικούς⁽²⁾, πράγμα που δεν φαίνεται να ισχύει εδώ.

4. Οι Αρχές Ανταγωνισμού παρακολουθούν την κατάσταση στον γαλακτοκομικό τομέα (βλ. την πρόσφατη έκθεση του ΕΔΑ σχετικά με τις δραστηριότητες στον τομέα των τροφίμων). Η Κυπριακή Αρχή Ανταγωνισμού διεξάγει έρευνα σχετικά με εικαζόμενη καταχρηστική συμπεριφορά στον τομέα του νοπού γάλακτος. Μια αύξηση στην τιμή, όπως αυτή που οδήγησε στην έκδοση του διατάγματος, μπορεί να αποτελεί συνέπεια αντιανταγωνιστικής συμπεριφοράς επιχειρήσεων και θα μπορούσε να αξιολογηθεί βάσει των γενικών κανόνων ανταγωνισμού.

5. Η Επιτροπή είναι διατεθειμένη να εξετάσει τα πραγματικά και νομικά στοιχεία που τέθηκαν υπόψη της σχετικά με εικαζόμενη αντιανταγωνιστική συμπεριφορά, όπως υπέρμετρη τιμολόγηση στον τομέα των τροφίμων.

⁽¹⁾ Συμπεριλαμβανομένης της περίπτωσης στην οποία η μέγιστη τιμή καθορίζεται σε τέτοιο επίπεδο που να καθιστά την πώληση εισαγόμενων προϊόντων δυσχερέστερη από εκείνη των εθνικών προϊόντων, αν όχι αδύνατη.

⁽²⁾ Βλ. Υπόθεση C-35/96 Επιτροπή κατά Ιταλίας (Συλλογή 1998, σ. I-3851).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000708/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(24 January 2013)**

Subject: Milk price cap

The Ministry of Commerce in Cyprus has issued a decree putting a cap on the retail and wholesale price of pasteurised milk after discovering that the price of milk had increased by a large amount, to EUR 1.50 per litre, making it the highest of all EU countries.

In view of the above, will the Commission answer the following:

1. Is the Commission aware of the price of milk in Cyprus?
2. If so, how can such a large difference in prices in an alleged single market be justified?
3. What is the Commission's opinion on the price cap? Does this price cap comply with EU policies?
4. Does the Commission believe that price capping will help to regulate milk prices and the milk market in Cyprus?
5. Are there any measures that the Commission could introduce to help consumers and prevent excessive increases in the price of a basic product such as milk?

**Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2013)**

1. Pasteurised milk is not included in the list of products for which the Member States have to submit to the Commission a weekly price notification. Nevertheless, the Commission closely monitors the development of the milk market in EU.
2. The Commission is aware of the existence of price divergences for similar products in different Member States. These differences are caused by factors such as consumer preferences, income, labour and product market regulation, transport costs etc.
3. Setting of maximum prices does not in itself constitute a measure having an effect equivalent to quantitative restrictions provided that there is no in law or in fact discrimination against products from other Member States ⁽¹⁾.

Regarding EU competition rules, they apply to the behaviour of companies and not to national laws except where Member State 'requires, favours or reinforces an anti-competitive agreement between undertakings or where it delegates to private operators the responsibility for taking decisions affecting the economic sphere and renders thereby competition rules ineffective' ⁽²⁾, which does not seem to be the case here.

4. The Competition Authorities follow the situation in the milk sector (see the recent ECN Report on the activities in the food sector). The Cypriot competition authority investigates an alleged abusive behaviour in the raw milk sector. A price increase as the one at the origin of the adoption of the Decree may be the consequence of an anticompetitive behaviour by companies and could be assessed under the general competition rules.
5. The Commission stands ready to carefully look into factual and legal issues brought to its attention with respect to any alleged anti-competitive behaviour such as excessive pricing in the food sector.

⁽¹⁾ Including the case where the maximum price is fixed at such a level that the sale of imported products becomes more difficult than of domestic products, if not impossible.

⁽²⁾ See Case C-35/96 *Commission v Italy* [1998] ECR I-3851.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000709/13
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(24 de enero de 2013)**

Asunto: VP/HR — Suicidio de Aaron Swartz

El pasado 11 de enero el joven activista y programador informático Aaron Swartz se quitaba la vida en su apartamento de Nueva York. Este controvertido y brillante joven alcanzó la fama por haber colaborado a la edad de 14 años en importantísimos proyectos informáticos que aún hoy continúan utilizándose. Más allá de su fama como genio de la programación, especialmente en el área de las aplicaciones de Internet, este joven se hizo famoso por su activismo en favor de la libre circulación de la información en la red.

Son muchas las contribuciones de este joven programador a la circulación de información en la red. Su trabajo estuvo marcado por el desarrollo de aplicaciones que facilitasen la producción y circulación de información en la red, entre ellas RSS, Reddit, Markdown, etc. Esta vertiginosa carrera como programador lo llevó a involucrarse en el ciberactivismo como única forma de defender la libertad de expresión, información y comunicación en la red.

Su currículum como activista lo llevó muy pronto a tomar conciencia de los peligros que suponen para la libertad de comunicación de la información las nuevas leyes SOPA y PIPA aprobadas en Estados Unidos. Su activismo le llevó a realizar acciones que le pondrían en riesgo, ya en 2008 fue arrestado por el FBI pero dejado en libertad sin cargos por publicar documentos judiciales públicos por los que se cobraba en un sitio web.

En julio de 2011 fue arrestado por intentar hacer públicos más de 4 millones de artículos académicos publicados por la compañía JSTOR, que no paga nada a los académicos que los escriben, siendo estos financiados con dinero público. Tras su detención por dicho acto de desobediencia, el sistema judicial de EE.UU. comenzó el proceso acusándole por crímenes con una pena de más de 30 años de prisión y más de 1 millón de dólares de fianza. Esta gravísima condena supone un proceso de persecución política que la familia ha denunciado en un comunicado acusando a los jueces y al MIT, institución donde estudiaba y donde cometió el supuesto delito, del suicidio de su joven familiar, denunciando que su muerte es «el producto de un sistema de justicia penal plagado de extralimitaciones en intimidación y persecución».

En virtud de las relaciones transatlánticas UE-Estados Unidos, ¿se ha dirigido la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante a las autoridades Estadounidenses para expresar su preocupación y rechazo a procesos judiciales intimidatorios como éste por delitos a favor de la libertad de expresión y comunicación?

**Respuesta de la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(27 de marzo de 2013)**

La Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta ha tenido conocimiento de la trágica muerte del Sr. Aaron Swartz y se hace plenamente cargo del dolor de su familia. Sin embargo, no tiene ninguna información concreta acerca de los procedimientos judiciales en este caso y, por lo tanto, no ha abordado el asunto en sus conversaciones con los Estados Unidos. Además, por regla general, la UE no interviene en los procedimientos judiciales de este tipo en terceros países como los Estados Unidos.

En lo que se refiere a la posición de la UE sobre la libertad de expresión en Internet, la Alta Representante y la Comisión adoptaron conjuntamente una propuesta de estrategia de ciberseguridad de la UE el 7 de febrero de 2012. La estrategia propuesta indica claramente el compromiso de la UE con un ciberespacio abierto y gratuito.

Esta estrategia señala que, para que el ciberespacio se mantenga abierto y gratuito, los valores, normas y principios fundamentales de la UE también se deben aplicar en Internet. También hace hincapié en que la UE espera que los ciudadanos observen también en línea los deberes cívicos, las responsabilidades sociales y las leyes a las que están sujetos en el mundo físico.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000709/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(24 January 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Suicide of Aaron Swartz

On 11 January this year, the young activist and computer programmer Aaron Swartz took his own life in his apartment in New York. This controversial and brilliant young man was famous for having worked at the age of 14 on very important computer projects still in use today. Beyond his reputation as a programming genius, particularly in the area of Internet applications, this young man became famous for his activism in defence of the free circulation of information online.

The young programmer made a great many contributions to the circulation of information on the Internet. His work was marked by the development of applications that facilitated the production and circulation of information online, including RSS, Reddit, Markdown. His dizzying career as a programmer led him to become involved in cyberactivism as the only way to defend freedom of expression, information and communication on the Internet.

Early on, his career as an activist led him to become aware of the dangers posed to the freedom of information and communication by the new SOPA and PIPA laws adopted in the United States. His activism drove him to carry out actions that would place him at risk, and in 2008 the FBI arrested him — but released him without charges — for publishing public court documents for which payment was required on a website.

In July 2011, he was arrested for trying to publish more than 4 million academic articles published by the company JSTOR, which pays nothing to the academics who write them, supported by public funding. Following his arrest for this act of disobedience, the United States legal system opened a trial, accusing him of crimes with a sentence of more than 30 years in prison and more than USD 1 million for bail. This extremely heavy sentence was an act of political persecution that his family condemned in a statement blaming the judges and MIT — the institution where he studied and committed the alleged crime — for the suicide of the young member of their family, claiming that his death was 'the product of a criminal justice system rife with intimidation and prosecutorial overreach'.

By virtue of the transatlantic relations between the EU and the United States, has High Representative/Vice-President Ashton addressed the United States authorities in order to express her concern and opposition to intimidating legal proceedings such as this for crimes committed in defence of freedom of expression and communication?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2013)

The HR/VP has learnt about the tragic death of Mr Aaron Swartz and fully understands the sorrow of his family. However, she does not have any particular information regarding the legal proceedings in this case and she has therefore not discussed it with the US. Moreover, as a general rule, the EU does not intervene in judicial proceedings of this kind in third countries such as the United States.

As regards the EU position on freedom of expression on the Internet, the High-Representative and the Commission jointly adopted a proposal for an EU Cybersecurity Strategy on 7 February 2012. The proposed strategy clearly articulates the commitment of the EU to a free and open cyberspace.

It stresses that for cyberspace to remain open and free, the EU core values, norms, and principles must also apply online. It also stresses that the EU expects citizens to respect civic duties, social responsibilities and laws online as much as in the physical world.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000710/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Ana Gomes (S&D)
(24 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Apoio da UE a projetos destinados a estabelecer a paz no Estado Chin, Birmânia/Mianmar

Na Birmânia/Mianmar foram concluídos os primeiros acordos de cessar-fogo com 10 grupos étnicos armados e o diálogo permanente com alguns grupos conduziu à assinatura de acordos adicionais, nomeadamente um acordo de 14 pontos com a União Nacional Karen, em abril de 2012, e um acordo preliminar de 5 pontos com o Partido Novo do Estado Mon, em fevereiro e abril de 2012. Em dezembro de 2012, foi assinado também um novo acordo de 28 pontos entre a Frente Nacional Chin e o Governo da Birmânia/Mianmar. Segundo as informações recebidas, o Grupo de Apoio de Doadores para a Paz (Peace Donor Support Group) — que engloba agências de ajuda da União Europeia, do Reino Unido, da Austrália e da ONU, assim como a Iniciativa de Apoio à Paz em Mianmar liderada pela Noruega (Myanmar Peace Support Initiative (MSPI)) — comprometeu-se a disponibilizar cerca de 30 milhões de dólares US para apoiar o processo de consolidação da paz nas comunidades afetadas por conflitos. Em 3 de novembro, o Presidente da Comissão Europeia, José Manuel Barroso, assistiu à cerimónia de inauguração do Centro para a Paz da Birmânia/Mianmar, em Rangum, estabelecido por meio de um Decreto Presidencial assinado pelo Presidente Thein Sein e apoiado por um financiamento de 700 000 euros da UE. Não obstante, algumas organizações da sociedade civil da Birmânia/Mianmar manifestaram a sua preocupação quanto ao financiamento do processo de consolidação da paz. As principais preocupações assentam no facto de este processo ter sido realizado de forma precipitada, sem terem sido realizadas consultas efetivas e participativas com uma amostra representativa da sociedade civil (incluindo refugiados e pessoas deslocadas), bem como na ausência de transparência e responsabilização.

Poderia a Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante prestar esclarecimentos sobre os seguintes pontos:

1. Que avaliação fazem os representantes da Comissão da situação dos direitos humanos no Estado Chin?
2. Que montantes serão disponibilizados pela União Europeia em 2013-2014 para apoiar os esforços de estabelecimento da paz, e qual a percentagem dos fundos destinada ao Estado Chin? Que projetos de consolidação da paz financiados pela UE serão executados no Estado Chin?
3. De que forma pretende a UE dar resposta às preocupações manifestadas pelos grupos da sociedade civil, em particular no que respeita à realização de consultas participativas com uma amostra representativa da sociedade civil (incluindo refugiados e pessoas deslocadas) e à garantia de transparência e responsabilização?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(15 de março de 2013)

A União Europeia tem acompanhado de perto as mudanças que estão em curso em Mianmar/Birmânia, embora reconheça que será necessário tempo para que as reformas sejam aplicadas e produzam resultados. A UE está plenamente consciente de que o avanço do processo de reconciliação nacional deve ser acompanhado de esforços para reforçar o Estado de direito e o respeito dos direitos humanos. É por isso que Alto Comissariado para os Direitos Humanos (ACDH) recebe apoio da UE para permitir que a recém-criada Comissão dos Direitos Humanos birmanesa (MHCR) possa funcionar como uma instituição independente, eficaz e eficiente. A UE também foi a principal promotora da resolução de 2012 da Assembleia Geral das Nações Unidas sobre a situação dos direitos humanos em Mianmar/Birmânia. O facto inédito de essa resolução ter sido adotada por consenso mostra que existe um entendimento comum entre a comunidade internacional e o Governo de Mianmar/Birmânia, tanto quanto às realizações passadas como aos desafios futuros. Entre os desafios futuros incluem-se as violações dos direitos humanos que subsistem, em especial nas zonas habitadas por minorias étnicas.

Em matéria de ajuda ao desenvolvimento, as prioridades de financiamento a partir de 2014 ainda estão a ser revistas, tendo sido afetado um montante de 150 milhões de euros para 2012 e 2013. Além do apoio ao Centro birmanês para a Paz, está em preparação um programa de apoio à consolidação da paz, com um orçamento até 25 milhões de euros. A UE tem vários projetos em curso financiados a nível bilateral no Estado de Chin, centrados na saúde maternoinfantil. A UE é um dos principais contribuintes para os fundos fiduciários multidoadores (educação, saúde e meios de subsistência). Um grupo composto pelas várias partes interessadas (incluindo a população local e organizações da sociedade civil) está atualmente a discutir a forma de realizar uma avaliação conjunta, com vista a identificar as necessidades prioritárias no Estado de Chin. Com base nesta consulta das partes interessadas, a Comissão terá capacidade para determinar a nossa resposta no Estado de Chin, incluindo a favor da consolidação da paz.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000710/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Ana Gomes (S&D)

(24 January 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — EU support for peacebuilding projects in Chin State, Burma/Myanmar

Initial ceasefire agreements have been reached with 10 ethnic armed groups in Burma/Myanmar and continuing dialogue with some groups has resulted in additional agreements, including a 14-point agreement with the Karen National Union in April 2012 and a preliminary five-point agreement with the New Mon State Party in February and April. A new 28-point agreement was also signed in December 2012 between the Chin National Front and the government of Burma/Myanmar. According to information received, the Peace Donor Support Group — which includes aid agencies from the European Union, the UK, Australia and the UN, as well as the Norwegian-led Myanmar Peace Support Initiative (MSPI) — has pledged nearly USD 30 million to support peacebuilding in conflict-affected communities. On 3 November, Commission President José Manuel Barroso attended the opening of the Myanmar Peace Centre in Yangon/Rangoon, established by presidential decree of President Thein Sein and supported by EUR 700 000 funding from the EU. However, some Burma/Myanmar civil society organisations have expressed concerns about funding in support of peacebuilding. Key concerns are that the process has been rushed, without effective, participatory consultations with a broad cross-section of civil society (including IDPs and refugees), and lacks transparency and accountability.

Could the Vice-President/High Representative clarify the following points:

1. What assessment have representatives of the Commission made of the human rights situation in Chin State?
2. How much funding will be provided from the European Union in 2013-2014 as part of support for peacebuilding efforts, and what percentage will be earmarked for Chin State? What are the EU-funded peacebuilding projects to be undertaken in the Chin State?
3. How does the EU plan to address concerns expressed by civil society groups, particularly with regard to conducting participatory consultations with a broad cross-section of civil society (including refugees and IDPs) and ensuring transparency and accountability?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(15 March 2013)

The EU has followed with closely the changes taking place in Myanmar/Burma while recognising that reforms will take time to implement and bear fruit. The EU is fully conscious that moving forward in the national reconciliation process must be coupled with endeavours to strengthen the rule of law and the respect of human rights. That is why the OHCHR receives EU support to enable the newly established Myanmar Human Rights Commission (MHRC) to work as an independent, effective and efficient institution. The EU was again the main sponsor of the United Nations General Assembly resolution on the situation of human rights in Myanmar in 2012. The fact that the resolution was adopted by consensus for the first time shows the common understanding between the international community and the Government of Myanmar/Burma, of both achievements and challenges ahead. The latter include remaining human rights violations, in particular in ethnic areas.

Concerning development assistance, for 2014 onwards funding priorities are still be reviewed, and for 2012 and 2013 a package of EUR 150 million has been allocated. In addition to support for the Myanmar Peace Centre, an up to EUR 25 million peacebuilding support programme is under preparation. The EU has several ongoing projects funded bilaterally in Chin focusing on child and maternal health. The EU is a major contributor to the multi-donor trust funds (education, health and livelihoods). A multi-stakeholder group (including the local population and civil society organisations) is currently discussing how to conduct a joint assessment to identify priority needs in Chin. Based on this stakeholder consultation we will be able to determine our response in Chin State, including for peacebuilding.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-000711/13
til Kommissionen
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(24. januar 2013)

Om: Elbiler

Der kommer flere og flere elbiler, og i den forbindelse arbejdes der løbende fra EU's side på at sikre en standardisering af både batterier, opladere og opladesystemer, således at biler på tværs af fabrikanter kan oplades de samme steder med det samme udstyr.

I denne forbindelse er der imidlertid blevet overset et vigtigt aspekt af standardiseringsprocessen i forhold til sikkerheden af bilernes konstruktion.

Grundet de mange strømførende ledninger og højspænding i bilen kan det være særdeles farligt at skulle klippe fastklemte personer ud af disse biler i ulykkesituationer. Der har for eksempel i Danmark været flere tilfælde, hvor redningsmandskabet har været nødsaget til at lade biler brænde ud, fordi det har været for risikabelt at skære i bilen for at redde en person ud.

På den baggrund ville det være brugbart med fælles standarder, således at redningspersonalet ved, hvor højspændingskablerne, batterierne etc. er placeret, samt at diverse ledninger til samme formål eksempelvis havde samme farve.

1. Er Kommissionen bekendt med ovennævnte problemstilling og de alvorlige sikkerhedsmæssige konsekvenser heraf?
2. Er Kommissionen villig til at inkludere dette aspekt i sit standardiseringsarbejde vedrørende elbiler?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Antonio Tajani
(8. marts 2013)

Kommissionen er opmærksom på de sikkerhedsmæssige konsekvenser af anvendelsen af elbiler. Den har derfor taget de nødvendige skridt for at sikre beskyttelsen af personer i eldrevne køretøjer, både under kørslen og i tilfælde af en ulykke.

I denne forbindelse har Kommissionen været involveret i udformningen af tekniske krav til sikkerheden for batterier monteret i elbiler inden for rammerne af en arbejdsgruppe inden for De Forenede Nationers Økonomiske Kommission for Europa (UNECE). Disse bestemmelser blev vedtaget i november 2012 af den kompetente arbejdsgruppe under UNECE (WP29) som ændringsserie 2 til det eksisterende regulativ nr. 100 om ensartede forskrifter for godkendelse af elektriske batteridrevne køretøjer for så vidt angår specifikke krav til konstruktion og funktionel sikkerhed.

Der er således på nuværende tidspunkt regulativer i kraft, der garanterer sikkerheden for elbiler som helhed og for batterier som komponenter heri.

Desuden forhindrer vedtagelsen af ovennævnte krav ikke medlemsstaterne i at vedtage supplerende foranstaltninger med henblik på at sikre effektiviteten af indsatser foretaget af beredskabstjenesters personale, f.eks. ved specifikke uddannelser, der bidrager til hurtig identificering af køretøjets højspændingsdele og de mest hensigtsmæssige foranstaltninger i en konkret situation. I denne forbindelse skal det understreges, at de myndigheder, der har ansvaret for beredskabstjenesterne, kan variere fra den ene medlemsstat til den anden, og at disse tjenester varetages på lokalt, regionalt eller nationalt plan.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000711/13
to the Commission
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(24 January 2013)**

Subject: Electric cars

As more and more electric cars are coming on to the market, the EU is working constantly to ensure standardisation of batteries, chargers and charging systems, so that cars made by all manufacturers can be charged at the same charging stations with the same equipment.

However, one important aspect of this standardisation process has been overlooked, concerning the safety of the car's construction.

Because of the many electric cables and the high voltage in these cars, it can be very dangerous to cut people out of the car when they are trapped in an accident. In Denmark, for example, there have been a number of cases in which the rescue team were obliged to let the car burn out, because it was too risky to cut into the car to rescue a person trapped inside.

That being so, it would be useful to have common standards so that rescue personnel know where the high voltage cables, batteries etc. are located, and it would also be helpful for different cables with the same purpose to be the same colour, for example.

1. Is the Commission aware of the above problem and its serious safety implications?
2. Is the Commission prepared to consider this aspect in its work on the standardisation of electric cars?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(8 March 2013)**

The Commission is aware of the safety implications involved in the operation of electric vehicles. It has therefore been taking the necessary steps in order to ensure the protection of the occupants of vehicles running with electric power, both during driving and in case of an accident.

In this respect, the Commission has been involved in the definition of technical requirements with respect to the safety of batteries fitted in electric vehicles, in the framework of a working group within the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE). These provisions were adopted in November 2012 by the competent working party of the UNECE (WP29), as a second series of amendments to the already existing Regulation No 100 on uniform provisions concerning the approval of battery electric vehicles with regard to specific requirements for the construction and functional safety.

Hence, regulations are currently in force ensuring the safe behaviour of electric vehicles as a whole and also of batteries as a component.

Furthermore, the adoption of the abovementioned requirements does not preclude Member States from adopting additional measures in order to guarantee an effective operation by emergency services personnel, for instance, through specific training helping to quickly recognise the high voltage parts of the vehicle and the most appropriate measures to be undertaken in any specific situation. In this respect, it should be emphasised that the authorities responsible for emergency services may vary from one Member State to another, and are handled either at local, regional or national level.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-000712/13
til Kommissionen
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(24. januar 2013)

Om: Økologisk biavl i Danmark

I den danske »Vejledning om økologisk jordbrugsproduktion« udgivet af Ministeriet for Fødevarer, Landbrug og Fiskeri, juli 2012, er der anført følgende bestemmelse vedrørende økologisk biavl:

»Du skal placere bigården i et område, hvor nektar- og pollenkilderne i en radius på 3 km fra bigården hovedsagelig består af økologiske afgrøder, vild bevoksning eller bevoksning på arealer, som bliver behandlet efter miljøskånsomme metoder, som ikke påvirker biavlens økologiske status. Dette kan f.eks. være visse arealer, som er omfattet af MVJ-tilsagn, eller Natura 2000 områder. Bigården må ikke være i nærheden af forureningskilder, som kan medføre forurening af honning eller forringe biernes sundhed — f.eks. industriområder, byområder og motorveje.«

Ifølge Danmarks Biavlerforening betyder den danske vejledning i praksis, at det er umuligt at drive økologisk biavl i Danmark. Derudover står indholdet i vejledningen også i modsætning til eksempelvis præmisserne for den øvrige danske økologiske fødevarerproduktion. Økologisk dansk planteavl foregår i Danmark side om side med konventionel planteavl og er dermed udsat for påvirkning i form af blandt andet afdrift af sprøjtemidler og luftbåren nitrat.

1. Finder Kommissionen, at den danske vejledning er i overensstemmelse med forordning (EF) nr. 889/2008 af 5. september, artikel 13, om regulering af økologisk biavl?
2. Såfremt den danske vejledning er i overensstemmelse med forordningen, er det da Kommissionens opfattelse, at de lovgivningsmæssige rammer for økologisk biavl i Danmark ikke sidestiller økologisk biavl med andre former for økologisk fødevarerproduktion i Danmark, f.eks. i forhold til krav hvad angår mulig påvirkning fra dyrkningsmetoder knyttet til konventionel planteavl?
3. Kan Kommissionen oplyse, hvorledes andre medlemslande administrerer den pågældende forordning, og om forordningen i disse lande har samme konsekvenser for økologisk biavl, som det er tilfældet i Danmark?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Dacian Cioloș
(13. marts 2013)

1. Indholdet af den danske vejledning, der henviser til i spørgsmålet, er i overensstemmelse med både artikel 13 i Kommissionens forordning (EF) nr. 889/2008 ⁽¹⁾ og artikel 14 i Rådets forordning (EF) nr. 834/2007 ⁽²⁾.
2. EU-lovgivningen om økologisk produktion forskelsbehandler ikke økologiske biavlere i forhold til andre producenter af økologiske fødevarer. En række videnskabelige undersøgelser har vist, at bier normalt samler pollen i en radius af 3 km fra bigården, og dette særlige forhold skal der tages hensyn til, når der fastlægges regler for økologisk biavl.
3. Det er vigtigt at bemærke, at medlemsstaterne i henhold til artikel 13, stk. 2, i Kommissionens forordning (EF) nr. 889/2008 kan udpege regioner eller områder, hvor der ikke kan drives biavl i overensstemmelse med reglerne for økologisk produktion. På dette grundlag kan de danske myndigheder fastsætte begrænsninger for, i hvilke områder bigårde kan opnå økologisk certificering.

⁽¹⁾ Kommissionens forordning (EF) nr. 889/2008 af 5. september 2008 om gennemførelsesbestemmelser til Rådets forordning (EF) nr. 834/2007 om økologisk produktion og mærkning af økologiske produkter, for så vidt angår økologisk produktion, mærkning og kontrol, EUT L 250 af 18.9.2008.

⁽²⁾ Rådets forordning (EF) nr. 834/2007 af 28. juni 2007 om økologisk produktion og mærkning af økologiske produkter og om ophævelse af forordning (EØF) nr. 2092/91, EUT L 189 af 20.7.2007.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000712/13
to the Commission
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(24 January 2013)

Subject: Organic beekeeping in Denmark

The 'Vejledning om økologisk jordbrugsproduktion' (guidelines on organic farming) published by the Danish Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Fisheries sets forth the following provision regarding organic beekeeping:

'You must place the apiary on a site where the nectar and pollen sources within a radius of 3 km from the apiary consist mainly of organically produced crops, spontaneous vegetation or vegetation on land which is being treated with low environmental impact methods that do not affect the qualification of beekeeping production as being organic. This may, for example, be certain areas covered by agri-environmental commitments or Natura 2000 areas. The apiary should not be in the vicinity of sources of pollution, which can lead to the contamination of honey or impair the health of the bees — e.g. industrial or urban areas and motorways.'

According to the Danish Beekeepers' Association, the Danish guidelines mean in practice that it is impossible to carry out organic beekeeping in Denmark. In addition, the content of these guidelines is also contrary, for example, to the premises governing other Danish organic food production. Organic crop production takes place in Denmark side by side with conventional crop production and is thus exposed to external effects, *inter alia* in the form of spray drift and airborne nitrates.

1. Does the Commission consider that the Danish guidelines are in line with Article 13 of Regulation (EC) No 889/2008 of 5 September 2008 regulating organic beekeeping?
2. If the Danish guidelines are in line with the regulation, does the Commission consider that the legislative framework for organic beekeeping in Denmark does not treat organic beekeeping in the same way as other forms of organic food production in Denmark, for example as regards the requirements concerning the possible effects of farming methods associated with conventional cultivation?
3. Can the Commission indicate how other Member States apply this regulation, and if the regulation has the same impact on organic beekeeping in these countries as it does in Denmark?

Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission
(13 March 2013)

1. The text of the Danish guidelines taken up in the question is in line with both Article 13 to Commission Regulation (EC) No 889/2008 ⁽¹⁾ and Article 14 to Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 ⁽²⁾.
2. The European organic legislation does not discriminate the organic beekeepers compared to the other organic producers. Several scientific studies show that bees have a specific behaviour by gathering pollen around their apiary within a radius of 3 km, and this specific issue has to be taken into account when considering rules for organic apiculture.
3. It is important to note that, in accordance with Article 13(2) of Commission Regulation (EC) No 889/2008, Member States may designate regions or areas where beekeeping complying with organic production rules is not practicable. Based on that, the Danish authorities may restrain the areas where the apiary can be organically certified.

⁽¹⁾ Commission Regulation (EC) No 889/2008 of 5 September 2008 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products with regard to organic production, labelling and control, OJ L 250, 18.9.2008.

⁽²⁾ Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 (O.J. L 189, 20/07/2007).

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000713/13
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(24 gennaio 2013)**

Oggetto: Valutazione dell'affidamento condiviso a livello europeo

I bambini sono i soggetti più esposti in caso di tensioni e conflitti familiari.

In base all'articolo 24 della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea ogni bambino ha diritto di intrattenere regolarmente relazioni personali e contatti diretti con entrambi i genitori.

Ciò dovrebbe concretarsi, in caso di separazione o divorzio, in un rapporto equilibrato e continuativo del minore con i due genitori.

Dalle informazioni disponibili sul sito della Rete giudiziaria europea, sono molti gli Stati membri che prevedono l'affido condiviso, che, se applicato rigorosamente, può comportare maggiori benefici per i figli. Eppure, al di là della sottrazione internazionale di minori, esistono moltissimi casi di figli nati dall'unione di persone con la stessa nazionalità che in seguito a separazione si trovano a non avere più contatti regolari con un genitore.

Si tratta di un fenomeno sommerso che porta migliaia di bambini a non avere più relazioni non solo con uno dei due genitori, ma anche con i relativi rami parentali.

Poiché alla tutela dell'interesse supremo del minore è speculare il diritto/dovere di entrambi i genitori di crescere, educare e mantenere la prole, con pari dignità e pari diritti, si prega la Commissione di chiarire:

- se esistono dati a livello degli Stati membri sulle percentuali di affidamento dei minori ai padri, alle madri o in regime di affidamento condiviso;
- se esistono studi sulla effettiva attuazione dell'affido condiviso e se questi evidenziano, come all'interpellante risulta da più fonti, disparità importanti nell'applicazione del medesimo nei confronti dei minori di differenti Stati;
- se esistono studi che individuano le migliori pratiche a tutela della bi-genitorialità;
- se è a conoscenza di organizzazioni o reti di organizzazioni che tutelano le relazioni genitori-figli nel caso di separazioni.

**Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(7 marzo 2013)**

La Commissione concorda pienamente con il parere espresso dall'onorevole parlamentare sul fatto che i bambini siano i soggetti più esposti in caso di conflitti familiari e che i loro diritti sanciti dall'articolo 24 della Carta dei diritti fondamentali debbano essere tutelati.

La definizione di affidamento condiviso appartiene al diritto sostanziale di famiglia e, in quanto tale, non rientra nell'ambito di competenza dell'UE, ma esclusivamente in quello degli Stati membri. Ciò spiega le eventuali disparità tra i sistemi nazionali per quanto riguarda la definizione di affidamento condiviso e la sua effettiva attuazione.

La Commissione non è a conoscenza di studi, migliori prassi o dati riguardanti la custodia condivisa dei figli o la bi-genitorialità. Tuttavia, con il sostegno finanziario del Parlamento europeo, il 1° settembre 2012 la Commissione ha lanciato uno studio della durata di due anni per raccogliere dati sulla partecipazione dei minori nei procedimenti penali, amministrativi e giudiziari civili nei 27 Stati membri dell'UE e in Croazia.

Nell'ambito delle consultazioni sulla politica in materia di diritti del bambino, la Commissione è venuta a conoscenza di organizzazioni che tutelano le relazioni genitori-figli nel caso di separazioni, quali l'*International Social Service*.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000713/13
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(24 January 2013)

Subject: Assessment of joint custody at European level

Children are the most vulnerable ones in situations of family tension and conflict.

Under Article 24 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, every child has ‘the right to maintain on a regular basis a personal relationship and direct contact with both of his or her parents.’

In practice, in the event of separation or divorce, this should mean a balanced and continuing relationship for the child with both parents.

From the information available on the website of the European Judicial Network, many Member States have made provision for joint custody, which, if rigorously applied, can be extremely beneficial for the children. However, quite apart from international child abduction, there are very many cases of children born to parents of the same nationality, who, following a separation, no longer have regular contact with one parent.

This is a hidden issue that results in thousands of children losing contact not only with one of the two parents, but also with their relatives on that side of the family.

In terms of safeguarding the child's best interests, both parents have the same right/duty to raise, educate and support their offspring, with equal status and rights.

Can the Commission answer the following:

- Is there any data at Member State level on the percentages of children in the custody of the father and of the mother, as well as the percentage of children in joint custody?
- Are there any studies into the effective implementation of joint custody? If so, do these studies show — as the questioner has heard from various sources — major disparities in the implementation of this system for children from different Member States?
- Are there any studies that identify best practices for safeguarding co-parenting?
- Is it aware of any organisations, or networks of organisations, that safeguard parent-child relations in the event of a separation?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(7 March 2013)

The Commission fully shares the views expressed by the Honourable Member that children are the most vulnerable parties in the event of family conflicts and that their rights as enshrined in Article 24 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights need to be protected.

The definition of joint custody belongs to substantive family law. As such, it does not fall within the EU's competence but remains under the sole responsibility of the Member States. This explains why there may be differences in the national systems as regards the definition of joint custody and how it works in practice.

The Commission is not aware of any studies, best practices or data collected in respect of children in joint custody or co-parenting. However, with the financial support of the European Parliament, the Commission launched on 1 September 2012, a two-year study to collect data on children's involvement in criminal, administrative and civil judicial proceedings in the 27 Member States of the EU and in Croatia.

The Commission is aware of organisations that safeguard parent-child relations in the event of a separation, such as The International Social Service, as a result of the consultations it conducts concerning its rights-of-the-child policy.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-000714/13
til Kommissionen
Christel Schaldemose (S&D)
(24. januar 2013)

Om: Krav til mobilantenner og telefonnet

I maj 2012 stillede jeg Kommissionen et spørgsmål om dårlige antenner i mobiltelefoner. Svaret fra Kommissionen lød dengang, at Kommissionen ikke ville gøre noget, men at »man fulgte udviklingen« på området.

Der er nu kommet ny viden frem, og det giver efter min mening anledning til at revurdere behovet for handling på EU-plan.

Den danske tv-kanal TV2 har sammen med flere forskere undersøgt dækningen af telefonnettet i Danmark ⁽¹⁾. Denne grundige undersøgelse viser, at dækningen er katastrofal. Forskere fra Aalborg Universitet har ligeledes undersøgt forskellige — herunder de populære smartphones — mobiltelefoners antenner. Også her viser der sig at være ringe resultater, idet antennerne ofte ikke er tilstrækkelige til at kunne fange svagere signaler.

Uanset om det er teleselskaberne eller mobiltelefonproducenterne, der bør oppe sig, så rammer det forbrugerne. Jeg vil derfor gerne spørge Kommissionen:

Hvad er Kommissionens kommentar til de seneste oplysninger?

Deler Kommissionen min holdning til, at der bør ske en bedre informering af forbrugerne igennem en EU-mærkningsordning om antennestyrker? Hvis man som forbruger bor i et område med en mindre god dækning, er det jo værd at gå efter en telefon med en særlig god antenne. En mærkningsordning kan derfor hjælpe forbrugerne på vej.

Vil Kommissionen genoverveje at stille krav til en ny minimumsstandard for mobilantenner på det europæiske marked?

Jeg beder derfor om, at Kommissionen vil revurdere behovet for politisk handling set i lyset af de nye oplysninger. Jeg vedlægger links til relevante oplysninger fra TV2s dækning af sagen ⁽²⁾⁽³⁾⁽⁴⁾.

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Antonio Tajani
(18. marts 2013)

Krav til mobiltelefonantenners modtagelsesevne (følsomhed) er allerede indført på grundlag af R&TTU-direktivet ⁽⁵⁾. Det ville være kompliceret at indføre obligatorisk mærkning med angivelse af, hvilken slags antenner, der findes i smartphones, svarende til forskellige frekvensbånd og funktionaliteter (2G, 3G, 4G og WiFi), og det ville ikke nødvendigvis være forståelig for forbrugerne. Kommissionen finder det derfor ikke på nuværende tidspunkt hensigtsmæssigt at indføre yderligere krav med hensyn til en sådan EU-mærkningsordning. Kommissionen vil rejse spørgsmålet for offentlige myndigheder, fabrikanter og forbrugerrepræsentanter på et kommende møde i ekspertgruppen vedrørende gennemførelse af R&TTU-direktivet, og Kommissionen vil også overveje, om en uafhængig undersøgelse vil være nyttig for bedre at kunne vurdere situationen.

Krav til mobilnets dækning er ikke harmoniserede på EU-plan, men afhænger af de licensbetingelser, som medlemsstaterne har fastsat for operatørerne. F.eks. har Danmark, for mobiltjenester i 800 MHz-båndet, fastsat krav til dækning af tæt befolkede områder, som vil sikre en bedre dækning, end det for eksempel er påkrævet for universelle mobile telekommunikationstjenester, som opererer i 2100 MHz-båndet.

Kommissionen støtter foranstaltninger, der fremmer konkurrencedygtige mobilmarkeder, og mener, at indførelsen af dækningsforpligtelser tjener de mål vedrørende bredbånd, der er opstillet i Kommissionens digitale dagsorden for Europa til støtte af øget økonomisk og social velfærd.

⁽¹⁾ <http://opensignal.com/reports/denmark-notspots-jan-2013.php>.

⁽²⁾ <http://ing.dk/artikel/135280-ny-undersogelse-antenneri-smartphones-er-gaaet-fra-daarlige-til-chokerende-ringe>.

⁽³⁾ <http://ing.dk/artikel/135294-apples-og-samsungs-storsaelgende-flagskibe-har-de-vaereste-mobilantenner>.

⁽⁴⁾ <http://www.teleindu.dk/mobilkortlaegning-den-oplevede-daekning-afhaenger-af-din-telefon/>.

⁽⁵⁾ Europa-Parlamentets og Rådets direktiv 1999/5/EF af 9. marts 1999 om radio- og teleterminaludstyr samt gensidig anerkendelse af udstyrets overensstemmelse.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000714/13
to the Commission
Christel Schaldemose (S&D)
(24 January 2013)

Subject: Requirements for mobile antennae and telephone networks

In May 2012, I put a question to the Commission about poor antennae in mobile phones. In its answer, the Commission said it would not do anything, but that it was following developments in the area.

New knowledge has now appeared which, in my opinion, gives cause for a reassessment of the need for action at EU level.

The Danish television channel TV2, together with a number of researchers, conducted a study into telephone network coverage in Denmark ⁽¹⁾. This thorough study shows that coverage is catastrophic. Researchers from Aalborg University have also investigated different mobile phone antennae — including those of popular smartphones. Here too the results have been poor, as the antennae are often unable to capture weaker signals.

Regardless of whether it is the telecom companies or the mobile phone manufacturers who should be making an effort, it is the consumer that suffers.

What is the Commission's response to this latest information?

Does the Commission agree that consumers should be better informed through an EU labelling system on antenna strength? If a consumer lives in an area with less good coverage, is there any point in going for a phone with a very good antenna? A labelling system can therefore help consumers make their choice.

Will the Commission reconsider introducing requirements for a new minimum standard for mobile antennae in the European market?

Will the Commission therefore reassess the need for political action in light of this new information. I enclose links to relevant information from TV2's coverage of this matter ⁽²⁾ ⁽³⁾ ⁽⁴⁾.

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(18 March 2013)

Requirements for reception capability (sensitivity) of antennas in mobile phones are already in place on the basis of the R&TTE Directive ⁽⁵⁾. Introduction of compulsory labelling for the variety of antennas present within smartphones, corresponding to various bands and functionalities (2G, 3G, 4 G, WiFi), would be complex in its implementation and would not necessarily be understood by consumers. Therefore the Commission does not currently consider it appropriate to introduce additional requirements with regard to such an EU labelling system. The Commission will bring the matter to the attention of public authorities, manufacturers and consumer representatives within a future meeting of the expert group for the implementation of the R&TTE Directive, and will also consider whether an independent study would be helpful in order to better assess the situation.

Regarding requirements for coverage of mobile networks, they are not harmonised at EU level but depend on the licensing conditions set by Member States for operators. For example, for mobile services in the 800 MHz band, Denmark has set requirements for coverage of densely populated areas which will ensure a better coverage than required for example of Universal Mobile Telecommunication Services operating in the 2100 MHz band.

The Commission supports measures reinforcing competitive mobile markets and considers that the imposition of coverage obligations serves the broadband targets set out in its Digital Agenda for Europe strategy in support of increasing economic and social welfare.

⁽¹⁾ <http://opensignal.com/reports/denmark-notspots-jan-2013.php>.

⁽²⁾ <http://ing.dk/artikel/135280-ny-undersogelse-antenner-i-smartphones-er-gaaet-fra-daarlige-til-chokerende-ringe>.

⁽³⁾ <http://ing.dk/artikel/135294-apples-og-samsungs-storsaelgende-flagskibe-har-de-vaerste-mobilantenner>.

⁽⁴⁾ <http://www.teleindu.dk/mobilkortlaegning-den-oplevede-daekning-afhaenger-af-din-telefon/>.

⁽⁵⁾ Directive 1999/5/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 9 March 1999 on radio equipment and telecommunications terminal equipment and the mutual recognition of their conformity.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000715/13
a la Comisión**

Raúl Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)

(24 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: Posible blanqueo de capitales en España en relación al proyecto «Eurovegas»

El Gobierno de la Comunidad de Madrid ha aprobado a través de la Ley 8/2012, de 28 de diciembre, de Medidas Fiscales y Administrativas de la Comunidad de Madrid una serie de reformas para favorecer la implantación del macroproyecto «Eurovegas» en la Comunidad de Madrid. Por otro lado, la legislación estatal (Ley 10/2010, de 28 de abril, de prevención del blanqueo de capitales y de la financiación del terrorismo), establece determinadas medidas de prevención del blanqueo de capitales, que sujeta a las obligaciones establecidas en dicha Ley a «*las personas físicas o jurídicas que ejerzan aquellas otras actividades profesionales o empresariales particularmente susceptibles de ser utilizadas para el blanqueo de capitales*», considerando expresamente entre ellas a «*los casinos de juego*», en transposición conforme a la previsión contenida en el artículo 2, apartado 1, letra f), de la Directiva 2005/60/CE ⁽¹⁾.

Las modificaciones aprobadas por la nueva Ley 8/2012 introducen la figura de los Centros Integrados de Desarrollo con nuevas condiciones con respecto al juego:

- Permiten que los operadores de casinos y otros establecimientos de juego en Centros Integrados de Desarrollo puedan conceder «*operaciones de crédito a jugadores*» (artículo 24 de la Ley antedicha), sin concretar las condiciones de transparencia e información de tales operaciones. En el mismo sentido insiste con un nuevo artículo 8, apartado 6, de la Ley 6/2001, de 3 de julio, del Juego de la Comunidad de Madrid, cuando expresamente dispone que «*las empresas titulares de Casinos de Juego podrán conceder préstamos, créditos o cualquier otra modalidad equivalente de financiación a los jugadores (...)*».
- Se incorpora también la posibilidad de que dentro de los casinos se desarrollen actividades de mediación para la promoción del juego, requiriéndose una aclaración sobre sus consecuencias ya que podría suponer la legalización del sistema de intermediarios (*junkers*).
- Se introduce también la capacidad —previa comunicación a la Comisión del Juego introducida en esta Ley— para implementar nuevos juegos, aunque no estén especificados en la solicitud inicial. Por todo ello, se pregunta a la Comisión:

¿Considera que los cambios introducidos en la legislación de la Comunidad de Madrid a través de la Ley 8/2012 garantizan el cumplimiento de la Directiva 2005/60/CE?

¿Piensa requerir nueva información a las autoridades españolas y a las regionales de la Comunidad de Madrid para reanudar la investigación preliminar abierta a raíz de la Petición 0555/2012 al Parlamento Europeo sobre el macroproyecto «Eurovegas».

Respuesta del Sr. Barnier en nombre de la Comisión

(2 de abril de 2013)

La Ley n° 10/2010 española incorpora la Directiva 2005/60/CE ⁽²⁾ al ordenamiento jurídico nacional y somete a los casinos a las obligaciones de la Directiva contra el blanqueo de capitales (DBC), tales como la detección, comprobación y notificación de las transacciones sospechosas. La nueva propuesta de DBC ⁽³⁾ amplía el ámbito de aplicación de la misma a fin de contemplar todos los servicios de juegos de azar, además de los casinos.

La Directiva 2005/60/CE se basa en una armonización mínima y el Derecho nacional puede hacer frente de diferentes maneras a los riesgos más amplios asociados a otras formas de juegos de apuestas y a los riesgos específicos existentes en un territorio. Los cambios introducidos por la nueva Ley 8/2012 en relación con el juego no parecen afectar a las obligaciones establecidas en la DBC y la legislación española, que se siguen aplicando a los casinos. En la medida en que se considerase que las actividades de los distintos mediadores para la promoción del juego (*junkets*) pueden entrañar un riesgo elevado, las autoridades españolas estarían autorizadas a establecer controles efectivos como, por ejemplo, mecanismos de reglamentación, de concesión de licencias o de supervisión para hacer frente a los posibles riesgos.

⁽¹⁾ Directiva 2005/60/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 26 de octubre de 2005, relativa a la prevención de la utilización del sistema financiero para el blanqueo de capitales y para la financiación del terrorismo.

⁽²⁾ DO L 309 de 25.11.2005, pp. 15-22.

⁽³⁾ COM/2013/045 final — 2013/0025 (COD), adoptado el 5 de febrero de 2013.

De la información disponible se desprende que ningún proyecto del carácter expuesto por Su Señoría está siendo autorizado por las autoridades españolas. La Comisión no puede determinar si el Derecho de la UE se ha aplicado correctamente o no en relación con un posible proyecto futuro y, por lo tanto, en el presente asunto, no puede intervenir en una fase tan temprana, en la que las disposiciones pertinentes del Derecho de la UE todavía no son aplicables. A falta de un proyecto o de cualquier indicación de que las autoridades españolas no vayan a aplicar correctamente la legislación pertinente de la UE, de solicitarse la autorización para cualquier proyecto de ese tipo, la Comisión considera que este asunto no justifica por el momento que se recabe información de las autoridades españolas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000715/13
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(24 January 2013)

Subject: Possible money laundering in Spain in connection with the 'Eurovegas' project

The Government of the Autonomous Community of Madrid, by Law 8/2012, of 28 December, on Fiscal and Administrative Measures of the Autonomous Community of Madrid, has adopted a series of reforms to promote the implementation of the 'Eurovegas' macro-project in the Autonomous Community of Madrid. In addition, national legislation — Law 10/2010, of 28 April, on the prevention of money laundering and terrorist financing — provides for certain measures to prevent money laundering by which 'natural or legal persons who carry out those other professional or business activities particularly likely to be used for money laundering' are subject to the obligations laid down in this Law, explicitly including among them 'gambling casinos', as transposed in accordance with the provision contained in Article 2(1)(f) of Directive 2005/60/EC. ⁽¹⁾

The changes adopted in the new Law 8/2012 introduce Integrated Development Centres with new conditions in relation to gambling:

- They allow operators of casinos and other gambling establishments in Integrated Development Centres to grant 'credit operations to gamblers' (Article 24 of the aforementioned Law), without specifying the conditions of transparency and information of such operations. Similarly, it insists on including Article 8, paragraph 6 (new) of Law 6/2001, of 3 July, on Gambling in the Autonomous Community of Madrid, when it explicitly provides that 'companies owning Gambling Casinos shall be allowed to grant loans, credit or any other equivalent method of financing to gamblers'.
- It also includes the possibility that within casinos intermediary activities shall take place to promote gambling; clarification on the consequences of this is required, given that it could lead to the legalisation of a system of intermediaries ('junkers').
- It also introduces the capacity — with prior notification to the Gaming Commission introduced in this Law — to implement new gambling games, although these are not specified in the original application. Therefore, the Commission is asked:

Does it consider that the changes made to the law in the Autonomous Community of Madrid by Law 8/2012 will ensure compliance with Directive 2005/60/EC?

Is it considering requesting further information from the national authorities and regional authorities of the Autonomous Community of Madrid in order to resume the preliminary enquiry opened following Petition 0555/2012 submitted to the European Parliament on the 'Eurovegas' macro-project?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2013)

Spanish Law Act 10/2010 transposes Directive 2005/60/EC ⁽²⁾ and subjects casinos to Anti Money Laundering Directive (AMLD) obligations such as identification and verification and reporting of suspicious transactions. The new proposal of AMLD ⁽³⁾ broadens the scope of the directive beyond casinos to cover all gambling services.

Directive 2005/60/EC is based on minimum harmonisation and national law can address the broader risks associated with other forms of gambling and the specific existing risks in a jurisdiction in different ways. The changes included by the new Law 8/2012 in relation to gambling do not seem to affect the obligations laid down in the AMLD and the Spanish Act which continue to apply to casinos. Insofar as junket operators' activities are identified as potentially high-risk, the Spanish authorities would be entitled to put in place effective controls such as regulatory, licensing or supervision mechanisms to address the potential risk implied.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 2005/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council, of 26 October 2005, on the prevention of the use of the financial system for the purpose of money laundering and terrorist financing.

⁽²⁾ OJL 309, 25.11.2005, p 15-22.

⁽³⁾ COM/2013/045 final — 2013/0025 (COD) adopted on 5 February 2013.

It appears from the available information that no project of the nature described by the Honourable Member is currently in the process of being authorised by the Spanish authorities. The Commission cannot determine whether or not EU legislation has been correctly applied in relation with a possible future project and, therefore, cannot intervene in this case at this early stage, when the relevant provisions of EC law are not yet applicable. In view of the absence of a project or any indication that the Spanish authorities would not correctly apply the relevant EU legislation, should authorisation for any such project be sought, the Commission considers that this case does not warrant, at present, a request of information from the Spanish authorities.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000716/13
a la Comisión**

Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)

(24 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: Derecho a la información en España en relación al proyecto Eurovegas

En el proceso para la instalación del complejo «Eurovegas» en la Comunidad de Madrid se están vulnerando presumiblemente los derechos a una buena administración y la transparencia reconocidos y garantizados por la legislación europea, por ejemplo, mediante la Directiva 2003/4/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 28 de enero de 2003, relativa al acceso del público a la información medioambiental o la Directiva 2003/35/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 26 de mayo de 2003, por la que se establecen medidas para la participación del público en la elaboración de determinados planes y programas relacionados con el medio ambiente.

Pese a la obligatoriedad derivada del Derecho comunitario de ofrecer garantías de acceso a la información al público y, en especial, dado el impacto que tendrá el desarrollo de un proyecto de tales características en numerosos sectores, la falta de información sobre las reformas legales de toda índole que ha acometido la Comunidad de Madrid es más que notoria. Así, todo el proceso de negociaciones previas para la futura instalación del macroproyecto «Eurovegas» en la Comunidad de Madrid se ha producido en ausencia total de transparencia, sin las mínimas garantías de información. Finalmente, el 29 de diciembre de 2012 se publicaba en el Boletín Oficial de la Comunidad de Madrid la Ley 8/2012, de 28 de diciembre, de Medidas Fiscales y Administrativas, mediante la cual y con un proceso de aprobación acelerada se aprobaban numerosas medidas tendentes a materializar los compromisos adquiridos con el promotor de «Eurovegas», Sheldon Adelson, incluyendo trascendentes reformas en el régimen fiscal, urbanístico y del juego cuyo fin último es facilitar la instalación del proyecto «Eurovegas» en la Comunidad de Madrid. Se sigue así una política de hechos consumados, totalmente opaca y que puede generar indefensión de la ciudadanía. Por todo ello:

¿Cree la Comisión que en todo el proceso que se está desarrollando para la instalación futura —pero cada vez más patente, como demuestran las medidas aprobadas por la Ley 8/2012— del macroproyecto, destinado en su parte principal a casinos de juego, se están respetando los derechos a una buena administración, transparencia e información a la ciudadanía conforme a la legislación europea?

¿Ha requerido la Comisión información a España sobre las normativas aprobadas con respecto al futuro proyecto «Eurovegas» para su incorporación a la investigación preliminar abierta a raíz de la Petición 0555/2012 al Parlamento Europeo?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión

(26 de marzo de 2013)

De la información facilitada por Su Señoría se desprende que, en la actualidad, las autoridades españolas no están tramitando la autorización de tal proyecto.

Habida cuenta de tal circunstancia, la Comisión no está en condiciones de solicitar información a las autoridades españolas sobre este asunto.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000716/13
to the Commission**

Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)

(24 January 2013)

Subject: Right to information in Spain in respect of the Eurovegas project

In the process to install the 'Eurovegas' complex in the Autonomous Community of Madrid there is an ostensible violation of the rights to transparency and good administration, recognised and guaranteed under such European legislation as Directive 2003/4/EC, dated 28 January 2003, of the European Parliament and of the Council, regarding public access to environmental information, and Directive 2003/35/EC, dated 26 May 2003, of the European Parliament and of the Council, providing for public participation in respect of the drawing up of certain plans and programmes relating to the environment.

Despite the obligation under Community law to provide the public with guarantees of access to information and given, in particular, the impact that development of a project of this nature will have on many sectors, the lack of information about legal reforms of all kinds carried out by the Autonomous Community of Madrid is quite flagrant. The entire negotiating process prior to future installation of the 'Eurovegas' macro-project in the Autonomous Community of Madrid has thus taken place with a complete lack of transparency and without the minimum guarantees of information. Finally, Law 8/2012, of 28 December 2012, on Fiscal and Administrative Measures, was published on 29 December 2012 in the Official Bulletin of the Madrid Autonomous Community. Under this law, by means of a fast-track approval procedure, many measures were adopted to deliver on the commitments made to the 'Eurovegas' promoter, Sheldon Adelson, including very significant reforms to the tax, town planning and gaming systems, with the ultimate aim of facilitating installation of the 'Eurovegas' project in the Autonomous Community of Madrid. This is a *fait accompli* policy, totally lacking in transparency and threatening to leave the public in a defenceless situation. In view of the above:

Does the Commission believe that the entire process being pursued for a future, but — as seen in the measures adopted by Law 8/2012 — ever more likely, installation of this macro-project, comprising mainly gaming casinos, complies with the rights to good administration, transparency and public information in accordance with European law?

Has the Commission demanded information from Spain on the regulations approved in relation to the future 'Eurovegas' project, with a view to including them in the preliminary enquiry to be made as a result of Petition 0555/2012 to the European Parliament?

Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission

(26 March 2013)

It appears from the information provided by the Honourable Member that no such project is currently in the process of being authorised by the Spanish authorities.

Given this, the Commission is not in the position to request information from the Spanish authorities on this subject.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000717/13

Komisií

Monika Smolková (S&D)

(24. januára 2013)

Vec: Európa pre občanov, opatrenie 1.2 – siete medzi partnerskými mestami

V rámci programu Európa pre občanov, opatrenie 1.2 – siete medzi partnerskými mestami v roku 2012 bolo z 21 podporených projektov päť z jednej krajiny – Talianska, ďalšie tri z Maďarska a zo Slovenska ani jeden.

Prečo sa granty nerozdeľujú proporcionálne medzi jednotlivé štáty a aké kritéria boli použité, keď Taliansku boli pridelené finančné prostriedky na päť projektov a Slovensku ani na jeden?

Odpoveď pani Redingovej v mene Komisie

(22. marca 2013)

Komisia by chcela zdôrazniť, že granty v rámci programu Európa pre občanov sa pridávajú na základe zásad transparentnosti, rovnakého zaobchádzania a nediskriminácie ⁽¹⁾. Počas výberového konania každý projektový návrh hodnotia dvaja nezávislí odborníci, ktorí sa vyberajú prostredníctvom verejnej výzvy na vyjadrenie záujmu. Projekty sa potom zoraďujú podľa kvalitatívnych a kvantitatívnych kritérií na vyhodnotenie ponúk, ktoré sú jasne opísané v programovej príručke ⁽²⁾. Po zohľadnení dostupného rozpočtu vo vzťahu k počtu žiadostí sa schváli financovanie iba tým projektom, ktoré dosiahli najvyššie hodnotenie.

Pokiaľ ide konkrétne o Slovensko, Komisia by chcela zdôrazniť, že zo Slovenska prichádza v rámci programu „Európa pre občanov“ piaty najvyšší počet žiadostí spomedzi všetkých krajín. V roku 2012 slovenskí uchádzači predložili v rámci programu Európa pre občanov približne 260 žiadostí o financovanie projektov, z ktorých získalo podporu približne 18 %, pričom miera úspešnosti Talianska predstavovala 12 % a Maďarska 16 %.

⁽¹⁾ http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/index_en.php

⁽²⁾ http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/programme/programme_guide_en.php

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000717/13
to the Commission
Monika Smolková (S&D)
(24 January 2013)**

Subject: Europe for Citizens, Measure 1.2 — Networks of Twinned Towns

In 2012, 21 projects received support under the Europe for Citizens programme's Measure 1.2 — Networks of Twinned Towns. Five of these projects were in just one country — Italy, while Hungary had three projects and Slovakia had none.

Why are these grants not distributed proportionally among the Member States?

What criteria were applied given that Italy was allocated funding for five projects and Slovakia did not receive funding for any projects?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(22 March 2013)**

The Commission wishes to highlight that the attribution of grants under the Europe for Citizens Programme is organised following the principles of transparency, equal treatment and non-discrimination ⁽¹⁾. Throughout the selection procedures project proposals undergo a double evaluation by independent experts who are selected on the basis of an open call for expression of interest. Projects are then ranked according to the qualitative and quantitative award criteria clearly stated in the Programme Guide ⁽²⁾. Taking into consideration the available budget in relation to the number of applications, only the projects having reached the highest score can be retained for funding.

Regarding the specific situation of Slovakia, the Commission wishes to underline that Slovakia is the 5th applying country within the 'Europe for Citizens' programme. In 2012, about 260 applications were submitted by Slovak stakeholders within the Europe for Citizens Programme, from which about 18% of projects were granted, whereas the success rates for Italy and Hungary were 12% and 16% respectively.

⁽¹⁾ http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/index_en.php

⁽²⁾ http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/programme/programme_guide_en.php

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000719/13
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(24 gennaio 2013)**

Oggetto: Sostegno dell'innovazione tecnologica automobilistica da parte della Commissione

Le automobili europee presentano uno svantaggio temporale rispetto alle tecnologie informatiche in uso, con un ritardo nella loro applicazione dovuto al ciclo di costruzione di 4-5 anni rispetto alle evoluzioni della tecnologia informatica che segue un ciclo di circa sei mesi.

1. Ha la Commissione analizzato se le tecnologie digitali applicate negli Stati membri seguendo le direttive comunitarie, in particolare nel settore della sicurezza dei trasporti, siano in qualche modo inficiate da questo gap tecnologico?
2. Come intende promuovere la Commissione una migliore cooperazione fra settore innovativo e tecnologico e settore automobilistico per rilanciare il mercato automobilistico europeo e renderlo competitivo rispetto alle produzioni extraeuropee?

**Risposta di Neelie Kroes a nome della Commissione
(13 marzo 2013)**

Il Piano d'azione della Commissione per la diffusione di sistemi di trasporto intelligenti in Europa ⁽¹⁾ è stato sviluppato per garantire una più rapida diffusione delle tecnologie digitali nell'Unione europea, in particolare per la sicurezza dei trasporti su strada. Attualmente è in corso la revisione intermedia del Piano d'azione, che dovrebbe portare a una nuova proposta legislativa volta ad evitare ritardi nella realizzazione del Piano riconducibili ai diversi cicli di sviluppo delle tecnologie dell'informazione e della comunicazione (TIC) e dell'industria automobilistica. La revisione prenderà in esame anche altri impedimenti che rallentano lo sviluppo di tecnologie avanzate basate sulle TIC per la sicurezza dei trasporti su strada e della mobilità. La Commissione ha sostenuto la cooperazione tra i due settori nell'ambito dei programmi di lavoro per la ricerca sulle TIC e del partenariato pubblico-privato nell'iniziativa europea per le auto verdi.

Nella sua proposta di decisione del Consiglio che stabilisce un programma specifico recante attuazione del programma quadro di ricerca e innovazione (2014-2020) — Orizzonte 2020 ⁽²⁾, la Commissione intende sostenere le attività nei settori della mobilità connessa e dell'automazione, nei quali si prevede una pronta adozione delle TIC da parte dei produttori di automobili, degli operatori dei trasporti e delle comunità interessate.

La piattaforma iMobility Forum continuerà ad agevolare la cooperazione tra i soggetti portatori di interesse. Le imprese propongono di proseguire l'iniziativa europea per le auto verdi puntando più decisamente sui veicoli elettrici nell'ambito del programma «Orizzonte 2020». Infine, il partenariato europeo per l'innovazione «Città e comunità intelligenti» ⁽³⁾ offrirà opportunità per una più stretta collaborazione tra il settore delle TIC e quello automobilistico.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2008)886.

⁽²⁾ COM(2011)811 definitivo.

⁽³⁾ COM(2012)4701.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000719/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(24 January 2013)**

Subject: Commission support for technical innovation in the automotive industry

European motor cars suffer from a temporal disadvantage with regard to the information technologies used, with a delay in their application caused by the four-to-five-year construction cycle, compared with the evolution of the information technologies themselves, which follows a cycle of approximately six months.

1. Has the Commission analysed whether the digital technologies applied in the Member States in accordance with Community directives, particularly in the transport safety sector, are invalidated to some degree by this technology gap?
2. How does the Commission intend to encourage better cooperation between the innovation and technology sector and the automotive industry in order to boost the European automotive market and make it competitive with non-EU production?

**Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(13 March 2013)**

The Commission's Intelligent Transport Systems Action Plan (ITS Action Plan) ⁽¹⁾ has been developed to ensure faster deployment of digital technologies in the European Union in particular for the sake of road transport safety. At present the ITS Action Plan is undergoing its mid-term review. The review is expected to comprise a new legislative proposal on how to avoid delays in ITS deployment caused by different development cycles in Information and Communication technologies (ICT) and automotive industries. It will also touch upon other obstacles, which delay rolling-out of advanced ICT-based safety technologies for road transport and mobility. The Commission has supported cooperation between both sectors under the ICT research work programmes and the European Green Cars Initiative public-private partnership.

In its proposal for a Council Decision establishing a Specific Programme Implementing Horizon 2020 — The framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020) ⁽²⁾, the Commission plans to support activities in the areas of connected mobility and automation — areas in which swift take-up of ICT by vehicle manufacturers, transport operators and communities is expected.

The iMobility Forum stakeholder platform will continue facilitating cooperation between the involved parties. The continuation of the Green Cars Initiative with a strong focus on electro-mobility is being proposed by industrial stakeholders under Horizon 2020. Furthermore the Smart Cities and Communities European Innovation Partnership ⁽³⁾ will offer opportunities for closer cooperation between the ICT and automotive sector.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2008)886.

⁽²⁾ COM(2011)811 final.

⁽³⁾ COM(2012)4701.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000720/13
alla Commissione
Mario Borghesio (EFD)
(24 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: La Commissione deve sorvegliare gli hedge fund americani nell'UE

Gli hedge fund americani, a dispetto di quanto avvenuto nel 2008, continuano a non essere regolamentati dalla SEC, la commissione di controllo della borsa di New York, ma anzi hanno diminuito il loro grado di trasparenza diventando ancora più pericolosi, generando scandali e spesso andando in dissesto, con una perdita media registrata nel 2011 del 5 %. Il problema è dato dal fatto che gli hedge fund americani manovrano una cifra pari a 2.000 miliardi di dollari e, proprio a causa della mancanza di regolamentazione sui mercati finanziari americani, sono in costante aumento.

1. Ciò premesso, può la Commissione far sapere quali azioni ha intrapreso per evitare shock di mercato nell'UE dovuti a manovre speculative da parte di questi fondi?
2. La Commissione intende avviare un dialogo con gli Stati Uniti in merito a una regolamentazione, almeno de minimis, su tali fondi?
3. La Commissione ha esaminato il loro impatto sulle borse europee e ne può dare documentazione?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(19 marzo 2013)

La Commissione cerca di assicurare che la cooperazione tra le autorità di vigilanza competenti dell'UE porti a individuare e affrontare l'esposizione degli istituti di importanza sistemica agli *hedge fund*. Possono anche essere imposte misure come le restrizioni alla leva finanziaria, qualora esse contribuiscano ad accrescere il rischio sistemico o il rischio di turbolenze sui mercati.

I gestori degli *hedge fund* americani non ricevono il passaporto europeo per commercializzare i loro fondi nell'Unione europea fino a quando la Commissione non ha ricevuto parere positivo dall'AESFEM⁽¹⁾ e accertato che siano garantiti gli obiettivi della direttiva sui GEFIA⁽²⁾, ossia la tutela dell'integrità del mercato e la risposta al rischio sistemico. La Commissione collaborerà strettamente con le autorità americane nel controllo degli *hedge fund* che operano in Europa.

Anche in assenza di passaporto europeo, la direttiva sui GEFIA dispone che i gestori degli *hedge fund* americani osservino gli obblighi di trasparenza e di segnalazione per commercializzare i loro fondi nei singoli Stati membri. Nel caso in cui ricevano il passaporto europeo, i gestori di *hedge fund* americani saranno tenuti a ottenere l'autorizzazione per commercializzare i fondi nell'UE e a osservare le principali disposizioni della direttiva sui GEFIA. Tali misure permetteranno alla Commissione e alle autorità competenti dell'UE di esercitare una migliore vigilanza degli *hedge fund* nei mercati finanziari e di intervenire quando necessario.

Durante i lavori preparatori e nei documenti di accompagnamento dell'iniziativa legislativa relativa ai GEFIA⁽³⁾, la Commissione ha individuato ed esaminato l'impatto degli operatori del mercato rientranti nel campo di applicazione dell'iniziativa, inclusi gli *hedge fund* americani.

(1) Autorità europea degli strumenti finanziari e dei mercati («AESFEM») istituita dal regolamento (UE) n. 1095/2010 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 24 novembre 2010, che istituisce l'Autorità europea di vigilanza (Autorità europea degli strumenti finanziari e dei mercati), che modifica la decisione n. 716/2009/CE e abroga la decisione 2009/77/CE della Commissione, GU L 331 del 15.12.2010, pag. 120.

(2) Direttiva 2011/61/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, dell'8 giugno 2011, sui gestori di fondi di investimento alternativi, che modifica le direttive 2003/41/CE e 2009/65/CE e i regolamenti (CE) n. 1060/2009 e (UE) n. 1095/2010, GU L 174 dell'1.7.2011, pag. 1 («direttiva sui GEFIA»).

(3) La valutazione di impatto per la direttiva sui GEFIA è disponibile al seguente indirizzo:
http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/investment/docs/alternative_investments/fund_managers_impact_assessment.pdf
Altri documenti preparatori sono disponibili al seguente indirizzo:
http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/investment/alternative_investments/index_en.htm

Le norme sulle vendite allo scoperto e sui *credit default swap* (CDS) (*) sono divenute applicabili dal 1° novembre 2012 e si applicano agli *hedge fund* americani nel caso di vendita allo scoperto di strumenti finanziari o di debito sovrano dell'UE. Queste norme consentono di far fronte al rischio di turbolenze sui mercati derivante dalle vendite allo scoperto.

(*) Regolamento (UE) n. 236/2012 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 14 marzo 2012, relativo alle vendite allo scoperto e a taluni aspetti dei contratti derivati aventi ad oggetto la copertura del rischio di inadempimento dell'emittente (credit default swap) (GU L 86 del 24.3.2012, pag. 1).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000720/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(24 January 2013)**

Subject: The Commission should monitor American hedge funds in the EU

Despite the events of 2008, American hedge funds are still not regulated by the SEC, the regulatory authority for the New York Stock Exchange, but have actually reduced their level of transparency and become even more dangerous, causing scandals and often falling into ruin, with an average loss of 5% recorded in 2011. The problem is caused by the fact that American hedge funds handle a total of USD 2 000 billion and, precisely because of the lack of regulation on the American financial markets, they are constantly growing.

1. Can the Commission state what actions it has taken to avoid market shocks in the EU caused by speculative manoeuvrings by these funds?
2. Does the Commission intend to open a dialogue with the United States concerning the regulation, even if minimal, of these funds?
3. Has the Commission examined their impact on the European stock markets, and can it provide documentation for this?

**Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(19 March 2013)**

The Commission seeks to ensure that supervisory cooperation between EU competent authorities identifies and addresses the exposure of systemically important institutions to hedge funds. Measures, such as restrictions on leverage, may also be imposed if leverage leads to the build-up of systemic risk or risks of disorderly markets.

Managers of US hedge funds are not given an EU passport to market their funds in the EU until the Commission has received positive advice from ESMA ⁽¹⁾ and has ensured that the objectives of the AIFMD ⁽²⁾, such as ensuring market integrity and addressing systemic risk, have been achieved. The Commission will cooperate closely with US authorities in supervising hedge funds that operate in Europe.

Even in the absence of an EU passport, the AIFMD requires US hedge fund managers to comply with disclosure and reporting requirements in order to market their funds in individual Member States. In the event that an EU passport should become available for such managers, US hedge fund managers will also be required to obtain authorisation in the EU and comply with all key provisions of the AIFMD. These measures will allow the Commission and EU competent authorities to better supervise hedge funds in the financial markets and intervene when necessary.

The Commission identified and examined the impact of the market participants falling within the scope of this legislative initiative, including US hedge funds, in its preparatory work and in the documents accompanying this initiative ⁽³⁾.

The rules on short selling and CDS ⁽⁴⁾ entered into application on 1 November 2012 and apply to US hedge funds when they short sell EU financial instruments or sovereign debt. These rules address the risk of disorderly markets with regard to short selling.

⁽¹⁾ The European Securities and Markets Authority ('ESMA') established by Regulation (EU) No 1095/2010 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 November 2010 establishing a European Supervisory Authority (European Securities and Markets Authority), amending Decision No 716/2009/EC and repealing Commission Decision 2009/77/EC, OJ L 331.

⁽²⁾ Directive 2011/61/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 8 June 2011 on Alternative Investment Fund Managers and amending Directives 2003/41/EC and 2009/65/EC and Regulations (EC) No 1060/2009 and (EU) No 1095/2010, OJ L 174 (AIFMD).

⁽³⁾ The Impact Assessment for the AIFMD is available at:
http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/investment/docs/alternative_investments/fund_managers_impact_assessment.pdf
Other preparatory work is available at: http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/investment/alternative_investments/index_en.htm

⁽⁴⁾ Regulation (EU) No 236/2012 of the European Parliament and the Council of 14 March 2012 on short selling and certain aspects of Credit Default Swaps (OJ L 86/1).

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000721/13
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(24 gennaio 2013)**

Oggetto: La Commissione riveda i suoi parametri sui pesticidi

Il documento tecnico presentato dalla direzione generale Salute e Consumatori (DG Sanco) della Commissione Europea porta a una sottostima sistematica dei tassi di pesticidi residui rilevati sugli alimenti, imponendo di dimezzare, in caso di incertezza, il valore minore rilevato. Di fatto, questo comporterebbe che i residui di pesticidi sarebbero rilevati solo qualora superassero di due volte i valori previsti. Le soglie previste in passato erano già considerate eccessive dai servizi sanitari: tale ulteriore riduzione rischia di compromettere la salute dei cittadini europei.

1. La Commissione non ritiene che tale algoritmo crei un rischio serio per la salute dei cittadini?
2. La Commissione intende rivedere questi parametri?

**Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(11 marzo 2013)**

La Commissione desidera rassicurare l'onorevole deputato sul fatto che gli algoritmi usati per interpretare le misure dei residui di pesticidi non presentano un rischio per i consumatori. Tali algoritmi variano a seconda delle finalità, vale a dire la valutazione del rischio per i consumatori o il rispetto del livello massimo di residui (LMR).

Il superamento di un LMR non significa che vi sia una criticità a carico dei consumatori. Gli LMR per i pesticidi non sono fissati al livello più alto di esposizione accettabile per gli umani, ma al più basso livello raggiungibile in linea con le buone pratiche agricole. Pertanto, il superamento di un LMR non porta, nella maggior parte dei casi, ad un rischio per i consumatori.

Per tutelare i consumatori, all'atto di calcolare l'esposizione dei consumatori e i rischi tossicologici, i laboratori usano il valore misurato e non il valore che si ricava sottraendo l'incertezza di misura.

Di converso, all'atto di dimostrare un mancato rispetto dell'LMR a fini repressivi, è necessario avere un margine di confidenza che è offerto dall'incertezza di misura.

Il documento orientativo della DG SANCO sulle procedure di convalida dei metodi e di controllo della qualità suggerisce per ciascun laboratorio, per l'interpretazione dei risultati a fini repressivi, l'applicazione di un'incertezza di misura per difetto pari al 50 % in assenza di un calcolo più preciso. Nella pratica, molti laboratori applicano un fattore più ridotto, a seconda del loro rendimento.

L'applicazione dell'incertezza di misura è un requisito essenziale della norma internazionale sull'accreditamento dei laboratori (ISO/IEC 17025). La legislazione UE sui controlli ufficiali fa obbligo ai laboratori di controllo nazionali di ottemperare a tale norma.

Per tali motivi la Commissione non intende per ora rivedere tali parametri.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000721/13
to the Commission**

Mario Borghezio (EFD)

(24 January 2013)

Subject: Call for the Commission to review its parameters on pesticides

The technical document presented by the European Commission's Directorate General for Health and Consumers (DG Sanco) involves a systematic underestimation of the levels of pesticide residues identified in foodstuffs, calling for a halving, in the event of any uncertainty, of the lowest value identified. This would mean that the pesticide residues would be identified only if they were double the established values. The thresholds previously in force were already regarded as excessive by the health services, and this further reduction risks compromising the health of European citizens.

1. Does the Commission not believe that this algorithm would create a serious risk for citizens' health?
2. Does the Commission intend to review these parameters?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission

(11 March 2013)

The Commission would like to reassure the Honourable Member that the algorithms used for interpreting measurements of pesticide residues do not present a risk for consumers. These algorithms differ depending on the purpose, i.e. consumer risk assessment or maximum residue level (MRL) compliance.

The exceedance of an MRL does not mean that there is a consumer concern. Pesticide MRLs are not set at the highest level of acceptable exposure for humans but at the lowest achievable level consistent with good agricultural practice. Therefore, an MRL exceedance will in most cases not lead to any consumer risk.

To protect consumers, when calculating the consumer exposure and the toxicological risks, laboratories use the value as measured and not the value less the measurement uncertainty.

In contrast, when demonstrating MRL non-compliances for enforcement purposes, it is necessary to have a margin of confidence, which is offered by the measurement uncertainty.

The SANCO Guidance document on Method Validation and Quality Control Procedures suggests, for the interpretation of results for enforcement purposes, the application of a default measurement uncertainty of 50%, in the absence of a more precise calculation for each single laboratory. In practice many laboratories apply a lower factor, depending on their performance.

The application of the measurement uncertainty is a key requirement of the international standard on laboratory accreditation (ISO/IEC 17025). The EU legislation on official controls requires national control laboratories to comply with this standard.

For these reasons, the Commission does currently not intend to review the guidance.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000722/13
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(24 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: VP/HR — Atentado en Araucanía y militarización de la zona

El pasado 4 de enero se produjo un ataque que incendió la casa de la familia terrateniente Luchsinger — McKay produciendo la muerte del matrimonio. Dicho ataque ha permitido al Gobierno chileno establecer la militarización de la región de la Araucanía con 400 carabineros. Se está señalando indirectamente como autores a los movimientos mapuches que llevan años reclamando sus tierras ancestrales.

El convenio 169 de la OIT sobre los derechos de los pueblos indígenas y tribales en Estados independientes recoge varios artículos sobre el derecho a la tierra que los Estados deben garantizar para estas comunidades. En el caso de la comunidad mapuche de Chile, este convenio no está siendo puesto en práctica por el Gobierno de Chile. El artículo 14.3 promulga que «Deberán instituirse procedimientos adecuados en el marco del sistema jurídico nacional para solucionar las reivindicaciones de tierras formuladas por los pueblos interesados» y esto no se cumple a luz de los hechos presentados. Chile, como país firmante del Convenio 169, está incumpliendo su compromiso con el Derecho internacional.

Dichos movimientos mapuches han sido golpeados previamente por la estrategia de criminalización del Estado chileno, que con una represiva Ley Antiterrorista mantiene encarcelados a cientos de activistas del pueblo mapuche. Con este último hecho violento el Gobierno pretende militarizar la zona y aplicar la Ley Antiterrorista para «garantizar la seguridad», lo que supondrá un inevitable incremento de la violencia en la región. El Estado chileno debe tratar de aplicar la justicia con igualdad y no utilizar el Estado de Derecho para mantener ocupaciones de tierras contrarias al Derecho internacional.

Muchas fuerzas políticas del país aprovechan el atentado para identificar la causa mapuche con dicho atentado, mientras que sin una negociación amparada en el cumplimiento del Derecho internacional no podrá haber una salida que no lleve a un incremento de la violencia en la Araucanía.

1. ¿Piensa interceder la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante para evitar una mayor militarización de la zona que agrave el conflicto mapuche?
2. ¿Se está supervisando el cumplimiento del convenio 169 de la OIT o el establecimiento de negociaciones al respecto para que el Gobierno chileno cumpla la cláusula segunda del Acuerdo de Asociación de la UE con Chile?

Respuesta de la Alta Representante/Vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(15 de marzo de 2013)

1. La Comisión lamenta el incendio provocado del pasado 4 de enero, que se saldó con la muerte de Bernard Luchsinger y Vivianne Mackay, así como otros incendios provocados en la región de Araucanía. La violencia no contribuirá a hacer avanzar los derechos de los mapuches y otros pueblos indígenas chilenos y todas las partes deberían entablar un diálogo pacífico para encontrar soluciones políticas a agravios antiguos. La Comisión entiende que se están llevando a cabo esfuerzos para buscar soluciones políticas en asuntos fundamentales como la restitución de tierras ancestrales, el agua y otros derechos. El Instituto Nacional de Derechos Humanos de Chile está investigando actualmente presuntas violaciones de los derechos humanos e interviene oportunamente ante las autoridades. La Delegación de la UE sigue de cerca la situación.

2. La cuestión del cumplimiento del Convenio n° 169 de la OIT incumbe a la Organización Internacional del Trabajo. No obstante, la Comisión informa a Su Señoría de que los derechos de los pueblos indígenas, incluida la aplicación del Convenio n° 169 de la OIT, se tratan normalmente en las conversaciones entre la UE y Chile, especialmente en el marco del diálogo sobre derechos humanos locales y las reuniones del Comité de Asociación UE-Chile. Se ha mantenido un diálogo sobre estas cuestiones con organizaciones de la sociedad civil y otros organismos pertinentes, tales como el Instituto Nacional de Derechos Humanos. La Comisión seguirá dialogando con las autoridades chilenas sobre una serie de temas, incluidos los derechos humanos y, en particular, los derechos humanos de los mapuches y otros indígenas chilenos, en el marco y el espíritu del artículo 12 del Acuerdo de Asociación.

Además de los cambios periódicos de impresiones con las autoridades chilenas, la UE financia varios proyectos en el ámbito de la democracia y los derechos humanos.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000722/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(24 January 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Attack in Araucanía and militarisation of the region

On 4 January, an attack took place setting fire to the house of the landowning Luchsinger–McKay family and causing the couple's death. This attack allowed the Chilean government to militarise the Araucanía region with 400 police officers. The Mapuche movements, which have been claiming their ancestral lands for years, are being blamed indirectly.

International Labour Organisation (ILO) Convention 169, concerning the rights of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries, includes several Articles on the right to land that States must guarantee these communities. This Convention is not being implemented by the Chilean Government in the case of the Mapuche community in Chile. Article 14.3 states that 'Adequate procedures shall be established within the national legal system to resolve land claims by the peoples concerned'. The facts presented show a failure to comply with this article. Chile, as a signatory of Convention 169, is failing to comply with its commitment to international law.

The Mapuche movements have already been hit by the Chilean State's criminalisation strategy, which uses a repressive Anti-terrorist Law to keep hundreds of indigenous Mapuche activists in jail. This latest violent episode is being used by the Government to militarise the region and to apply the Anti-terrorist Law in order to 'guarantee security', causing an inevitable increase in violence in the region. The Chilean State must endeavour to apply justice with equality and not use the rule of law to maintain land occupations contrary to international law.

Many political groupings in the country are taking advantage of the attack to identify it with the Mapuche cause, but without negotiations under international law, the outcome can only lead to increased violence in Araucanía.

1. Does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to intercede to avoid a greater militarisation of the region which would aggravate the Mapuche conflict?
2. Is there monitoring of compliance with ILO Convention 169, or the establishment of negotiations in this respect, to ensure that the Chilean Government complies with Article 2 of the Association Agreement between the EU and Chile?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(15 March 2013)

1. The Commission regrets the arson attack of 4 January, which resulted in the deaths of Bernard Luchsinger and Vivianne Mackay, and other subsequent arson attacks in the Araucanía region. Violence will not help to advance the rights of the Mapuche and other indigenous Chileans, and all sides should engage in peaceful dialogue to build political solutions to long-standing grievances. The Commission understands that efforts are now underway to find political solutions to key issues such as the restitution of ancestral lands, water and other rights. Chile's National Institute for Human Rights is currently investigating alleged human rights abuses and making relevant interventions with the authorities. The EU Delegation is following the situation.

2. The question of compliance with ILO Convention 169 is a matter for the International Labour Organisation. The Commission wishes to inform the Honourable Member, nevertheless, that indigenous rights, including the implementation of ILO Convention 169, are discussed by the EU and Chile on a regular basis, notably through the local Human Rights Dialogue and the meetings of the EU-Chile Association Committee. Discussions on these matters have also been held with civil society organisations and other relevant bodies such as the National Institute for Human Rights. The Commission will continue to engage in dialogue with the Chilean authorities on a range of issues including human rights and in particular the human rights of the Mapuche and other indigenous Chileans, in the framework and spirit of Article 12 of the Association Agreement.

In addition to the regular exchanges of views with the Chilean authorities, a number of projects funded by the EC in the field of democracy and human rights.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000723/13
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)**

Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)

(24 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: VP/HR — Intervención militar de Francia en Mali

El pasado 20 de diciembre el Consejo de Seguridad de la ONU aprobó una resolución en la que se solicitaba la intervención de una fuerza militar internacional en el norte de Mali. El Gobierno de Mali solicitó formalmente la intervención de la Comunidad Económica de Estados del África Occidental (Cedeao) el pasado septiembre para atacar la zona norte del país, controlada por diferentes grupos armados.

La situación política de Mali se encuentra en una encrucijada, dado que el actual Gobierno interino, llegado tras el golpe de Estado del pasado marzo, no es capaz de controlar a los grupos tuareg y yihadistas que han tomado el control de la región norte del país. La incapacidad del Gobierno para controlar la región fue la razón argumentada por los militares en el pasado golpe de Estado; pese a haberse instalado un nuevo Gobierno, la región continúa sin estar controlada. Con una inestable situación política y la sombra del temido yihadismo islámico, la intervención occidental, en este caso por parte de Francia, no se ha hecho esperar.

El Gobierno francés decidió comenzar la intervención militar en apoyo del actual Gobierno interino de Mali el pasado 11 de enero, continuando con la tradición colonial del país en el continente africano. Las fuerzas militares francesas nunca han «terminado» de abandonar el continente y en los últimos años han intervenido en prácticamente todos los conflictos en el continente. Esta situación de militarización del continente solo produce un agravamiento de las condiciones para una estabilización de las diferentes regiones. En el caso de África Occidental, la intervención en Libia, también iniciada con la intervención del ejército francés, ha supuesto el recrudecimiento de la situación en Mali; numerosos grupos tuareg vinculados al antiguo gobierno del General Gaddafi participaron en el conflicto y tras el fin de las operaciones militares en territorio libio pasaron la frontera y reclaman la liberación del Azawad, territorio al norte del país.

Esta extensión de los conflictos en el continente africano responde al incremento de la intervención militar occidental. Resulta obvio que, como los grupos rebeldes de Mali han comenzado a incrementar su fuerza tras la intervención en Libia, la nueva intervención en Mali solo servirá para extender dicho conflicto hacia nuevas fronteras.

¿Estudia la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante las consecuencias que tendrá la intervención francesa en Mali y la desestabilización que traerá en la región? Considerando que el país dispone de un Gobierno interino fruto de un golpe de Estado ¿considera a éste legítimo para solicitar una intervención militar a la comunidad internacional? ¿Qué medidas impulsará la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante para restablecer un gobierno democrático en Mali?

Respuesta de la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión

(3 de abril de 2013)

Desde el inicio de la crisis de Mali, la UE actúa en estrecha colaboración con la Cedeao, la UA y la Organización de las Naciones Unidas.

En este contexto y de acuerdo con la mediación francesa, son reconocidas como autoridades legítimas de la transición el Presidente en funciones Dioncounda Traoré y su gobierno de unidad nacional, que tienen la responsabilidad de aplicar la hoja de ruta para el restablecimiento del orden constitucional, además de un marco de diálogo nacional con vistas a la resolución de la crisis del norte del país.

Mientras tenía lugar este proceso de negociación, las fuerzas de Mali sufrieron un ataque de grupos terroristas, que supuso una amenaza para el propio Estado de Mali, los países vecinos y ciudadanos europeos. En sus conclusiones de 17 de enero, el Consejo manifestó de inmediato su apoyo a la respuesta, a petición de Mali, de Francia en el marco de la legalidad internacional, en particular, la Resolución 2085 del CSNU. Este planteamiento es compartido por la UA y por el Grupo internacional de Apoyo y Seguimiento a Mali, que se reunió en Bruselas el 5 de febrero.

Más allá de la gestión de la urgencia en términos de seguridad, la UE está decidida a apoyar un proceso de retorno al orden constitucional lo más rápido posible e impulsó como condición para la reanudación de su cooperación, congelada tras el golpe de Estado (con excepción de la ayuda directa a la población), la reciente adopción de la hoja de ruta, que implica la celebración rápida de elecciones. Dicha reanudación será gradual y dependerá del avance real en este proceso. Asimismo, mediante la misión EUTM, la UE prevé prestar apoyo a la reestructuración del Ejército de Mali.

La UE es plenamente consciente de la dimensión regional de la crisis. En el marco de la «Estrategia de la UE para la seguridad y el desarrollo en el Sahel», ha reforzado enormemente su ayuda humanitaria, al desarrollo y la seguridad.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000723/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(24 January 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Military action by France in Mali

On 20 December the United Nations Security Council adopted a Resolution calling for the intervention of an international military force in northern Mali. The Malian Government formally requested the intervention of the Economic Community of West African States (Ecowas) in September to deal with the situation in the northern part of the country, which is controlled by different armed groups.

The political situation in Mali is at a crossroads because the current interim government, in power since the coup d'état in March, is incapable of controlling the Tuareg and jihadist groups that have taken control of the northern part of the country. The government's inability to control the region was the reasoning used by the military forces in the previous coup d'état; despite having installed a new government, the region is still not controlled. With an unstable political situation, and under the shadow of the feared Islamist jihadism, Western intervention — in this case by France — has not been slow to come.

The French Government decided to begin military intervention to support Mali's interim government on 11 January, continuing the country's colonial tradition in the African continent. France's military forces have never 'completely' left the continent and in recent years they have intervened in practically every conflict there. This 'militarisation' of the continent only serves to exacerbate the conditions preventing stabilisation of the different regions. In the case of West Africa, the intervention in Libya, which also began with the intervention of the French army, has made the situation in Mali even worse; numerous Tuareg groups linked to General Gaddafi's former government took part in the conflict and, after the end of the military operations in Libyan territory, they crossed the border and demanded the liberation of Azawad, an area in the north of the country.

This spread of conflicts in the African continent is a reflection of the West's increasing military intervention. It is obvious that, just as Mali's rebel groups became more powerful after the intervention in Libya, the most recent intervention in Mali will only serve to extend this conflict to new areas.

Is the Vice-President/High Representative examining the consequences of the French intervention in Mali and the destabilisation that it will entail in the region? Given that Mali has an interim government that is the result of a coup d'état, does she feel that it is sufficiently legitimate to request military intervention from the international community? What measures will the Vice-President/High Representative promote in order to restore a democratic government in Mali?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante Ashton au nom de la Commission
(3 avril 2013)

Depuis le début de la crise au Mali, l'UE agit en étroite coordination avec la Cedeao, l'UA et l'ONU.

Dans ce cadre, et en ligne avec la médiation africaine, sont reconnus comme autorités légitimes de la Transition le Président par interim, Dioncounda Traoré et son gouvernement d'union nationale, qui ont la responsabilité de mettre en œuvre la Feuille de Route pour le retour à l'ordre constitutionnel mais aussi un cadre de dialogue national en vue de résoudre la crise au nord du pays.

Alors qu'il était engagé dans ce processus de négociation, les forces maliennes ont subi une attaque des groupes terroristes, menaçant l'État malien, les pays voisins et ressortissants européens. Dans ses conclusions du 17 janvier, le Conseil a immédiatement marqué son soutien à la réponse faite dans le cadre de la légalité internationale, notamment la résolution 2085 du CSNU, par la France, sur demande du Mali. Cette appréciation est partagée par l'UA et le Groupe international de suivi et de soutien au Mali qui s'est réuni à Bruxelles le 5 février.

Au-delà de la gestion de l'urgence sécuritaire, l'UE est déterminée à soutenir un processus de retour à l'ordre constitutionnel le plus rapide possible. Elle a conditionné la reprise de sa coopération gelée depuis le coup d'État (hors aide directe aux populations), à l'adoption récente de la Feuille de Route, qui comporte la tenue rapide d'élections. Cette reprise sera graduelle et fonction de progrès effectifs sur ce processus. De même, par la mission EUTM, l'UE envisage son appui à la restructuration de l'armée malienne.

L'UE est pleinement consciente de la dimension régionale de la crise. Dans le cadre de la «Stratégie de l'UE pour la sécurité et le développement au Sahel», elle a ainsi massivement renforcé son assistance humanitaire, de développement et sécuritaire.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000724/13
a la Comisión**

Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(24 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: Discriminación de la mujer en la legislación española en materia de pensiones

La pasada sentencia del Tribunal de Justicia de la Unión Europea referente al asunto C-385/11 dictamina que la legislación española en materia de jubilación contributiva es discriminatoria con las mujeres al contradecir la Directiva 79/7/CEE del Consejo, de 19 de diciembre de 1978, relativa a la aplicación progresiva del principio de igualdad de trato entre hombres y mujeres en materia de seguridad social.

El caso fue presentado por Isabel Elbal Moreno, trabajadora de la limpieza a tiempo parcial, que trabajó durante 18 años a tiempo parcial en una comunidad de propietarios española, cotizando 4 horas semanales. Según la legislación española, pese a haber trabajado tanto tiempo, la Sra. Elbal solo había cotizado 3 años, al ser solo computadas las horas de trabajo y no el periodo total; debería haber trabajado más de 100 años para alcanzar el derecho a recibir una pensión mínima. Esto supone requerir a los trabajadores que ostenten este tipo de contratos una cantidad proporcional de horas mayor que a los trabajadores fijos para alcanzar una pensión de jubilación para los trabajadores a tiempo parcial en España. Esta discriminación entre contratos fijos y a tiempo parcial sería legal si no existiese el principio de discriminación indirecta por el cual esta norma perjudica especialmente a las mujeres españolas.

El Tribunal de Justicia de la Unión Europea sostiene que existe este tipo de discriminación indirecta cuando una norma nacional, pese haber sido formulada de manera neutral, afecta de hecho a un número mucho mayor de mujeres que de hombres. En el caso de los contratos a tiempo parcial en España, esto se confirma de una manera clara al suponer las mujeres más de un 80 % de las personas con este tipo de contratos en el país. Teniendo en cuenta estos datos, el Tribunal ha confirmado la discriminación indirecta que sufren las mujeres españolas frente a los hombres en el mercado laboral, debido a la dificultad mayor para poder alcanzar la cotización mínima que supone tener acceso a una pensión de jubilación.

Ante esta situación de discriminación de la mujer en el mercado laboral español:

1. ¿Qué medidas está llevando a cabo la Comisión para obligar a España a cumplir la Directiva 79/7/CEE?
2. ¿Contempla la Comisión la posibilidad de que este tipo de discriminación de la mujer se pueda estar llevando a cabo en los Estados miembros que tienen una alta feminización del trabajo a tiempo parcial? ¿Está actuando al respecto?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión

(25 de marzo de 2013)

Según el principio de cooperación leal consagrado por el artículo 4 del Tratado de la Unión Europea, «los Estados miembros adoptarán todas las medidas generales o particulares apropiadas para asegurar el cumplimiento de las obligaciones derivadas de los Tratados o resultantes de los actos de las instituciones de la Unión». Por lo tanto, las autoridades españolas, incluidos los tribunales y el poder legislativo, están obligadas a ejecutar correctamente la sentencia mencionada.

En este momento, la Comisión no tiene motivos para creer que las autoridades españolas no estén dando cumplimiento a la sentencia del Tribunal. Si fuera el caso, la Comisión, en su calidad de garante de los tratados, tomaría las medidas necesarias para solucionar el problema.

En cuanto a la situación en otros Estados miembros en general, la Comisión está estudiando este tema y va a tomar una decisión sobre si hacen falta o no nuevas medidas en este momento. Además, si llegan al conocimiento de la Comisión situaciones concretas en que pueda existir esta clase de discriminaciones contra las mujeres, se pondrá en contacto con el Estado miembro correspondiente para resolver el asunto.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000724/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(24 January 2013)

Subject: Discrimination against women in Spanish pension legislation

The recent judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union in Case C-385/11 ruled that Spanish legislation on contributory pensions discriminates against women and is thus contrary to Council Directive 79/7/EEC of 19 December 1978 on the progressive implementation of the principle of equal treatment for men and women in matters of social security.

The case was brought by Isabel Elbal Moreno, who worked for 18 years as a cleaner for a residents' association on a part-time basis for four hours a week. Under Spanish legislation, despite having worked for such a long time, Mrs Elbal had only accrued three years of contributions as only the hours worked are taken into account, not the total period; she would have had to work for more than 100 years to obtain the right to a minimum pension. This means that workers subject to part-time contracts require a proportionally greater contribution period than full-time workers to qualify for a retirement pension. This discrimination between part-time and full-time workers would be legal if it were not for the principle of indirect discrimination, according to which this rule harms Spanish women in particular.

The Court of Justice of the European Union states that this type of indirect discrimination exists where a national measure, albeit formulated in neutral terms, works to the disadvantage of far more women than men. In the case of part-time contracts in Spain, this is indisputable given that more than 80 % of part-time workers in the country are women. In light of this information, the Court confirmed the existence of indirect discrimination against Spanish women in the labour market, given that it is more difficult for them to complete the minimum period of contribution required to obtain a retirement pension.

Given this discrimination against women in the Spanish labour market:

1. What measures is the Commission taking to force Spain to comply with Directive 79/7/EEC?
2. Does the Commission believe that this type of discrimination against women may exist in Member States that have a high proportion of women in part-time work? Is it taking any action in this regard?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2013)

According to the principle of loyalty inscribed in Article 4 of the Treaty on European Union, 'Member States shall take any appropriate measure, general or particular, to ensure fulfilment of the obligations arising out of the Treaties or resulting from the acts of the institutions of the Union'. Therefore, Spanish authorities, including Spanish courts and legislator, are under the obligation to implement appropriately the abovementioned judgment.

At this moment, the Commission has no reason to believe that the Spanish authorities will not comply with the Court's judgment. Should that be the case, the Commission, as guardian of the treaties, will take the necessary measures to correct the problem.

As to the situation in other Member States in general, the Commission is now looking into this matter and will decide whether or not further action is necessary at this stage. In addition, if the Commission is made aware of specific situations where this type of discrimination against women may exist, the Commission will contact the relevant Member State to address this issue.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000725/13
a la Comisión**

Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)

(24 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: Mortalidad a causa de las privatizaciones en Europa del Este

Según el estudio «*The human cost of economic policy*» publicado en 2009 en la revista *The Lancet*, la privatización de los servicios públicos en los países pertenecientes a la antigua Unión Soviética tras la caída del muro produjo un coste humano de más de un millón de muertes de personas en edad de trabajar.

El estudio, dirigido por la Universidad de Oxford, sostiene que el proceso de privatizaciones masivas dado en los países del bloque soviético en la década de los 90 produjo un incremento en el número de muertes del 13 % de la población. El estudio toma los datos demográficos de 25 países y estudia la correlación de sus tasas de mortalidad con la agresiva política de privatización también conocida como la *Terapia de Shock*. Esta política económica supuso un incremento sin precedentes del desempleo al mismo tiempo que se desintegraban los servicios públicos básicos, desapareciendo la fuente de ingresos y los medios de supervivencia de los hogares.

El equipo de investigación tomó en cuenta el estudio de los datos referentes a las tasas de mortalidad de hombres en edad de trabajar disponibles en la Organización Mundial de la Salud al mismo tiempo que los disponibles en el Banco Europeo de Reconstrucción y Desarrollo, entidad que apoyó las políticas de privatización masiva de estos países.

1. ¿Está la Comisión teniendo en cuenta el citado estudio a la hora de elaborar las Recomendaciones específicas propuestas a los Estados miembros?
2. Teniendo en cuenta que las políticas de austeridad llevadas a cabo por los Estados miembros se asemejan a la citada *Terapia de Shock*, ¿qué coste en vidas humanas estima la Comisión que tendrá el desarrollo de sus Recomendaciones?

Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión

(18 de marzo de 2013)

La Comisión toma nota de la información presentada y de las preguntas planteadas por Su Señoría.

La Comisión tiene en cuenta los aspectos relativos a la justicia en la reforma, así como el posible coste humano de la política económica, y destaca la necesidad de minimizar el impacto de la reforma y de proteger a los más vulnerables.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000725/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(24 January 2013)**

Subject: Mortality due to privatisations in Eastern Europe

According to the study entitled 'The human cost of economic policy' published in the journal *The Lancet* in 2009, the privatisation of public services in the countries of the former Soviet Union after the fall of the wall had a human cost of more than one million deaths of working-age people.

This study, led by the University of Oxford, argues that the process of mass privatisations that occurred in the countries of the Soviet bloc during the 1990s produced an increase of 13 % in the number of deaths in the population. The study takes demographic data from 25 countries and studies the correlation between their rates of mortality and the aggressive privatisation policy also known as Shock Therapy. This economic policy gave rise to an unprecedented increase in unemployment at a time when basic public services were disintegrating, with the loss, for households, of their source of income and means of survival.

The research team took into consideration the study of data concerning rates of mortality amongst working age men available from the World Health Organisation and data from the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the body which supported these countries' mass privatisation policies.

1. Is the Commission taking account of the aforementioned study when drawing up its specific recommendations for the Member States?
2. Bearing in mind the fact that the austerity policies followed by the Member States are similar to the aforementioned Shock Therapy, what cost in human lives, in the Commission's view, will following its recommendations have?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(18 March 2013)**

The Commission takes note of the information provided and questions posed by Honourable Member.

The Commission takes into consideration the equity aspects of reform and the potential human cost of economic policy, emphasising the need to minimise the reform impact and protect the most vulnerable.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000726/13
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(24 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: Implementación del Software libre en las Instituciones Europeas

Durante los últimos años el desarrollo de aplicaciones informáticas se ha desarrollado de una manera exponencial, llegando a alcanzarse una verdadera democratización del acceso a la informática. Gran parte de este resultado ha sido gracias al desarrollo del Software Libre por parte de numerosos participantes que prefieren compartir las aplicaciones que desarrollan.

Los diferentes programas desarrollados con Software Libre han alcanzado el nivel de competir sin ningún tipo de desventaja con las aplicaciones desarrolladas por los grandes «monstruos» de la informática, tales como la empresa Microsoft. Dicha empresa, que abusa continuamente de su posición de mercado, como ha declarado la propia Comisión que ha abierto un expediente sancionador contra la misma por incumplir un acuerdo alcanzado en 2009, continúa suministrando la práctica totalidad del software básico (sistemas operativos, hojas de cálculo, editores de texto...) de todas las instituciones europeas.

Dicho software privativo es perfectamente sustituible por Software Libre que es capaz de cumplir la gran mayoría de las exigencias de los usuarios de las instituciones europeas. Si bien existe software privativo específico que resulta indispensable para desarrollar la actividad de algunos servicios, la gran masa de licencias que las instituciones europeas adquieren son de software básico y de baja especialización que requieren los funcionarios para desarrollar su trabajo habitual.

La Comisión Europea se ha pronunciado a favor del Software Libre en diversas ocasiones y ha desarrollado diferentes proyectos como el OSOR o el EUPL y otros tantos proyectos. Pero, en la práctica, los trabajadores de las instituciones europeas se encuentran en la obligación de usar el sistema operativo de Microsoft e incluso se actualizan con nuevas licencias cuyos costes deben suponer millones de euros. En tiempo en los que se exige austeridad a gran parte de la población europea imponer el uso de un Software Libre para ahorrar millones de euros sin perder aplicaciones debería ser una obligación sin menoscabo de la adquisición de programas necesarios que no tengan sustitutos libres.

1. ¿Por qué la Comisión y el resto de instituciones europeas usan software como Microsoft Windows, Microsoft Office, etc existiendo aplicaciones gratuitas como Linux, Open Office, etc?
2. ¿Está la Comisión actuando para sustituir el software básico empleado en las instituciones europeas por Software Libre?

Respuesta del Sr. Šeřčovič en nombre de la Comisión
(8 de marzo de 2013)

La Comisión remite a Su Señoría a las respuestas a otras preguntas escritas y orales ⁽¹⁾ que plantearon problemas similares. Estas respuestas pueden resumirse como sigue:

- La infraestructura informática de la Comisión se basa en una amplia y diversificada cartera de productos informáticos, en la que coexisten sin problemas el software comercial y el software de código abierto. La Comisión, por su parte, es una organización líder en el mundo en lo que respecta a la adopción de software de código abierto ⁽²⁾.
- La Comisión sigue una rigurosa metodología para seleccionar la configuración del software adecuado en términos de aptitud para el uso y coste total derivado de la propiedad, garantizando al mismo tiempo la buena gestión financiera y el cumplimiento de las normas de contratación pública. Las decisiones adoptadas se revisan periódicamente ⁽³⁾.

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

⁽²⁾ Preguntas O-000169/2011, P-003807/2011, E-007553/2010, E-003622/2008 y E-001487/2008.

⁽³⁾ Preguntas E-004447/2012, O-000169/2011, E-003906/2011 y E-000507/2011.

- En este contexto, es importante señalar que el software de código abierto no puede asimilarse a programas informáticos sin coste, y que cualquier comparación de costes entre software de código abierto y otros modelos empresariales debe basarse en el coste total derivado de la propiedad de cada solución; esto no solo incluye el coste de las licencias, sino también el de creación, mantenimiento, apoyo, formación y otros costes ⁽⁴⁾.
- La configuración de referencia a disposición del personal de la Comisión debe mantenerse lo más homogénea posible para controlar los costes de mantenimiento de la infraestructura informática corporativa y mantener sus elementos de seguridad ⁽⁵⁾.
- Las sanciones impuestas a Microsoft como consecuencia de sus infracciones de las normas de competencia de la UE no impide a esta compañía participar en los procedimientos de contratación ⁽⁶⁾.

La Comisión reexamina su estrategia ofimática periódicamente y en estrecho contacto con los departamentos informáticos de las demás instituciones de la UE, incluido el Parlamento Europeo, ya que prácticamente todos ellos están utilizando actualmente los mismos contratos marco en este ámbito.

⁽⁴⁾ Preguntas E-004447/2012, P-003807/2011, E-007553/2010 y E-003622/2008.

⁽⁵⁾ Preguntas E-001523/2009 y E-001487/2008.

⁽⁶⁾ Pregunta E-000507/2011. Véase también Pregunta E-002295/2008.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000726/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(24 January 2013)**

Subject: Implementing free software in the European institutions

There has been a boom in software development in recent years that has genuinely opened up access to IT. This wider access to IT has been largely thanks to the creation of free software programs by a large number of software development collaborators who prefer to share their applications with others.

The various free software programs are now able to compete on a level playing field with computer applications developed by IT giants such as Microsoft. This company, which continually abuses its market position, as the Commission itself has stated and against which it has opened infringement proceedings for non-compliance with a 2009 agreement, still provides almost all the basic software (operating systems, spreadsheets, text editors, etc.) used by the European institutions.

The proprietary software used by the institutions is perfectly replaceable with free software, which is capable of meeting the vast majority of user requirements in the EU institutions. Although some specific proprietary software is essential for the work of some services, the bulk of software licences acquired by the EU institutions are for basic and general purpose software that civil servants use to carry out their daily work.

The Commission has declared itself in favour of free software on a number of occasions, and it has launched various projects, including the OSOR and EURL projects and many others. However, in reality, staff at the European institutions find themselves obliged to use the Microsoft operating system, and when it is updated new licences are purchased that must cost millions of euros. At a time when austerity has been imposed on a large proportion of people living in Europe, implementing free software as a way of saving millions of euros without reducing functionality should be imperative, even though this should not prevent the EU institutions from acquiring necessary software for which no free substitutes exist.

1. Why do the Commission and the other EU institutions use software such as Microsoft, Windows, Microsoft Office, etc. when free applications, such as Linux, Open Office, etc., are available?
2. Is the Commission taking any steps to replace basic software used in the EU institutions with free software?

**Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(8 March 2013)**

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answers to other written and oral questions ⁽¹⁾ which raised similar issues. Those answers can be summarised as follows:

- The Commission's IT infrastructure is based on a large, well-diversified portfolio of software products, in which commercial and Open Source Software (OSS) coexist smoothly. The Commission is itself a world-leading organisation as regards the adoption of OSS ⁽²⁾.
- The Commission follows a rigorous methodology to select the appropriate software configuration in terms of fitness-for-purpose and Total Cost of Ownership (TCO), while ensuring sound financial management and complying with the public procurement rules. Any choices made are reviewed regularly ⁽³⁾.
- In that context, it is important to appreciate that OSS cannot be equated with cost-free software, and that any comparison of costs between OSS and other business models must be based on the TCO of each solution; this does not only include the cost of the licences but also setup, maintenance, support, training and other costs ⁽⁴⁾.
- The Reference Configuration made available to Commission staff needs to be kept as homogeneous as possible in order to control the costs of supporting the corporate IT infrastructure and to maintain its security features ⁽⁵⁾.

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

⁽²⁾ Questions O-000169/2011, P-003807/2011, E-007553/2010, E-003622/2008 and E-001487/2008.

⁽³⁾ Questions E-004447/2012, O-000169/2011, E-003906/2011 and E-000507/2011.

⁽⁴⁾ Questions E-004447/2012, P-003807/2011, E-007553/2010 and E-003622/2008.

⁽⁵⁾ Questions E-001523/2009 and E-001487/2008.

- The sanctions imposed to Microsoft as a result of its breaches of the EU competition rules do not prevent this company from participating in procurement procedures ⁽⁶⁾.

The Commission reassesses its office automation strategy periodically, and in close contact with the IT departments of the other EU institutions, including the European Parliament, since virtually all of them are currently using the same framework contracts in this area.

⁽⁶⁾ Question E-000507/2011. See also Question E-002295/2008.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000727/13

aan de Commissie

Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE) en Ivo Belet (PPE)

(24 januari 2013)

Betreeft: Vervallen van het recht op opgebouwd Nederlands wettelijk pensioen

Nederland verhoogt haar wettelijke (AOW) pensioenleeftijd tot 67 jaar. De pensioenopbouw voor inwoners wordt berekend vanaf 17 t/m 67 jaar (max. 50 jaar 2 % per jaar) en niet meer van 15 t/m 65 jaar.

Er zijn Belgische grensarbeiders, die vanaf 15 t/m 17 jaar in Nederland hebben gewerkt en voor die jaren AOW-premie hebben betaald. De wettelijke pensioenleeftijd in België bedraagt 65 jaar. Als deze grensarbeiders op die leeftijd met pensioen gaan, ontvangen zij gedurende 2 jaar (nog) geen Nederlands AOW-pensioen. Als zij vervolgens op 67-jarige leeftijd wel Nederlands pensioen ontvangen, dan wordt de AOW opgebouwd tijdens het 15e en 16e levensjaar (2 x 2 %) waarvoor zij premies hebben betaald — niet uitbetaald. Inwoners van Nederland, die geen gebruik gemaakt hebben van „het vrij verkeer van werknemers” ontvangen als zij met 67 jaar met pensioen gaan altijd het volledige AOW-pensioen (50 x 2 %).

1. Verzetten het EU-recht (art. 45 VWEU, beginsel van loyale samenwerking) en het arrest Leyman (C-3/08) zich tegen de nieuwe Nederlandse regeling, die er toe leidt dat een grensarbeider/migrerende werknemer

- gedurende 2 jaar een pensioenhiaat heeft én
- vervolgens ook nog eens vanaf het 67e jaar geen of een lager (-4 %) Nederlands AOW-pensioen ontvangt?

2. Is de Nederlandse wetgeving niet in strijd met het EU-recht resp. het arrest Piatkowski (rechtsoverweging 36 van C-493/04) die verbieden dat er premies voor sociale verzekeringen worden betaald zonder dat zij recht geven op een tegenprestatie? ⁽¹⁾

3. Is de nieuwe Nederlandse AOW-wetgeving voor wat betreft grensarbeiders/ migrerende werknemers niet in strijd met artikel 1 van het Eerste Protocol (EP) bij het EVRM? ⁽²⁾

Antwoord van de heer Andor namens de Commissie

(20 maart 2013)

1. De Commissie is van mening dat een uitgesteld recht op een AOW-pensioen, overeenkomstig de door het geachte Parlementslid vermelde rechtspraak, op zich niet onverenigbaar is met de artikelen 45 en 48 VWEU, op voorwaarde dat een werknemer daardoor niet wordt benadeeld ten opzichte van diegenen die hun winstgevendende activiteiten alleen in die lidstaat uitoefenen en dat daardoor geen socialezekerheidsbijdragen worden betaald die geen recht geven op een uitkering. Voor inwoners van Nederland die met pensioen gaan op de leeftijd van 65 jaar en die hun winstgevendende activiteiten alleen in die lidstaat uitoefenen, worden de tijdvakken van arbeid tussen hun 15e en hun 17e levensjaar niet meegerekend voor hun recht op een AOW-pensioen.

2. De Commissie is van mening dat er een verschil is tussen deze situatie en die in de zaak Piatkowski ⁽³⁾, waar het ging over de dubbele heffing van socialezekerheidsbijdragen over hetzelfde inkomen.

3. Artikel 1 van het eerste Protocol bij het Europees Verdrag tot bescherming van de rechten van de mens en de fundamentele vrijheden waarborgt geen recht op een pensioen als zodanig. Het ouderdomspensioen op deze manier verminderen of niet toekennen impliceert geen regulering van het gebruik van eigendom noch een ontnemen van eigendom, indien er een juist evenwicht wordt gevonden tussen het algemeen belang van de gemeenschap en de verplichting om de grondrechten van het individu te respecteren ⁽⁴⁾. De verhoging van de pensioengerechtigde leeftijd tot 67 jaar in Nederland — die is ingevoerd in het algemeen belang om de pensioengerechtigde leeftijd te koppelen aan de levensverwachting en om de duurzaamheid van de overheidsfinanciën te waarborgen — zal geleidelijk in een periode van zeven jaar geschieden zodat men voldoende tijd heeft om zich daarop voor te bereiden.

⁽¹⁾ Zie ook rechtsoverweging 57 in de conclusie van Advocaat-Generaal P. Mengozzi van 10 januari 2013 in de zaak C-443/11 (Jeltes e.a. tegen UWV).

⁽²⁾ Opmerking: artikel 1 van het EP (EVRM) biedt niet alleen bescherming tegen de ontneming van AOW-pensioen dat al verworven is, maar biedt ook bescherming tegen de inbreuk op legitieme verwachtingen, waarvoor men premies betaald heeft.

⁽³⁾ Zaak C-493/04 (Piatkowski), Jurispr. 2006, blz. I-2369.

⁽⁴⁾ Zie onder meer zaak 6223/04, Banfield/Verenigd Koninkrijk, Europees Hof voor de rechten van de mens (2005-XI).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000727/13
to the Commission
Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE) and Ivo Belet (PPE)
(24 January 2013)

Subject: Expiry of the right to an accrued Dutch State Pension

The Netherlands is increasing its statutory retirement (AOW — basic state pension) age to 67. The accrued pension benefits are calculated for residents from the age of 17 up and to 67 years (maximum 50 years 2% per year) and no longer from 15 to 65.

There are Belgian cross-border workers that have been working in the Netherlands between the ages of 15 and 17 and who have paid their AOW contributions during that time. The statutory retirement age in Belgium is 65. If these workers retire at 65, they will not receive a Dutch AOW pension for two years. When they do start receiving a Dutch pension at the age of 67, then their pension accruals for the 15th and 16th year of their lives (2 x 2%) and for which they have paid contributions, are not paid out to them. Dutch residents, who have not made use of the free movement of workers right, receive their full AOW pension at the retirement age of 67 (50 x 2%).

1. Is EC law (Art. 45 TFEU, principle of loyal cooperation) and the Leyman ruling (C-3/08) contrary to this new Dutch legislation that results in a cross-border/migrant worker
 - not receiving a pension for 2 years
 - and then receiving from his 67th year, no pension or a lower (-4%) Dutch AOW pension?
2. Is Dutch law not contrary to EC law in respect to the Piatkowski ruling (Article 36 of C-493/04) that stated that social security contributions should not be made without a person being entitled to a contribution? ⁽¹⁾
3. Is the new Dutch AOW legislation with regard to cross-border workers and migrant workers not in breach of Article 1 of the First Protocol of the ECHR? ⁽²⁾

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(20 March 2013)

1. The Commission is of the opinion that the mere fact that the right to an AOW pension takes effect on a later date, in accordance with the case-law mentioned by the Honourable Member, is not incompatible with Articles 45 and 48 TFEU, provided that this does not put a worker at a disadvantage compared with those who carry out their gainful activities solely within that Member State and it does not result in the payment of social security contributions on which there is no return. The entitlement to an AOW pension of residents of the Netherlands who retire at the age of 65 and who carry out their gainful activities solely within that Member State does not take account of periods worked by them from their 15th to their 17th birthdays.
2. The Commission is of the opinion that this situation is different from that in the Piatkowski ⁽³⁾ case, where the issue concerned the levying of social security contributions twice on the same income.
3. Article 1 of the first Protocol to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms does not guarantee the right to a pension as such. A retirement pension reduced or forfeited in this manner involves neither the control of use of property nor the depriving of a possession if a fair balance is struck between the general interest of the community and the requirement to protect the individual's fundamental rights ⁽⁴⁾. The increase in the pensionable age to 67 in the Netherlands, which has been introduced in the general interest to link the pensionable age with life expectancy and to ensure that public finances remain sustainable, is to take place gradually over seven years to allow individuals time to take measures in anticipation.

⁽¹⁾ See also paragraph 57 of the opinion of Advocate General P. Mengozzi of 10 January 2013 in C-443/11 (*Jeltes and others v UWV (Dutch Institute for Employee Insurance)*).

⁽²⁾ Note: Article 1 of the FP (ECHR) provides protection not only against the non-payment of an AOW pension already accrued, but also provides protection against the infringement of legitimate expectations, for which contributions have been made.

⁽³⁾ Case C-493/04 (*Piatkowski*) [2006] ECR I-2369.

⁽⁴⁾ See, *inter alia*, Case 6223/04 *Banfield v the United Kingdom*, European Court of Human Rights (2005-XI).

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000730/13
a la Comisión**

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(24 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: Tripas artificiales de proteínas endurecidas

Sabiendo que el producto 3917 10 10 «tripas artificiales de proteínas endurecidas (derivadas de productos animales)» actúa únicamente como cobertura de embutidos con una actividad de agua muy inferior a los productos cárnicos, acidez inferior a PH3, humedades absolutas muy bajas, sin contaminaciones cruzadas, siendo proteínas fibrosas químicamente tratadas con ácidos y álcalis agresivos que confieren al producto una vida útil muy superior al resto de derivados cárnicos y siendo la tripa de colágeno prácticamente imperecedera, no necesitando conservación (manteniéndose perfectamente en condiciones de temperatura ambiente), no precisando cadena de frío, atmósferas controladas, envase al vacío, etc. para mantener intactas sus propiedades:

A la luz de lo anterior,

¿Cree la Comisión que se debería proceder a la posible consideración de exclusión del producto 3917 10 10 «tripas artificiales de proteínas endurecidas (derivadas de productos animales)» del anexo (a la Decisión 2012/31/UE) de productos que han de someterse a control veterinario fronterizo, especialmente si se trata de un producto fabricado en la Unión Europea y únicamente exportado a un país extracomunitario (Turquía) para su plisado y envasado?

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000732/13
a la Comisión**

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(24 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: Tripas artificiales de proteínas endurecidas II

Como medida para ser competitivas, algunas empresas europeas mandan tripas artificiales de proteínas endurecidas (derivadas de productos animales) para su plisado y envasado y su posterior reenvío a Europa. A partir de la entrada en vigor de la Decisión 2012/31/UE, el mencionado producto está sujeto a control en los puestos de inspección fronterizos, necesitando de un certificado sanitario que de momento FME no puede emitir. A partir de este momento, dicha empresa no puede importar el material producido en sus instalaciones, por considerarse de origen turco al ser plisado y envasado en la Zona Franca Turca. Este hecho perjudica y puede perturbar seriamente la actividad comercial y económica de dichas empresas. Teniendo en cuenta que:

- en los considerandos de la Decisión 2012/31/UE se toman como referencia las mismas Directivas (91/496/CEE; 97/78/CE y 97/496/CE), y que la propia Decisión, en su Considerando 5, indica que el objeto de la Decisión es una adaptación «de la terminología» y en la «nomenclatura»,
- la descripción del producto «tripas artificiales de proteínas endurecidas (derivadas de productos animales)» se ha mantenido sin variación alguna entre la fecha de la Decisión modificada 2007/275/CE y la fecha de la Decisión 2012/31/UE, habiéndose producido únicamente un cambio en el código NC (que antes tenía 4 dígitos y ahora es el 3917 10 10),

¿podría explicar la Comisión qué nuevo hecho, debate, riesgo o decisión ha provocado el cambio de criterio entre el anexo (a la Decisión 2007/275/CE) y el anexo (a la Decisión 2012/31/UE) de los productos que han de someterse a control veterinario fronterizo para que el producto «tripas artificiales de proteínas endurecidas (derivadas de productos animales)», que antes no requería el control en los puestos de inspección fronterizos, ahora sí precise de dicho control?

Respuesta conjunta del Sr. Borg en nombre de la Comisión*(11 de marzo de 2013)*

El modelo de certificado sanitario para las importaciones de colágeno destinado al consumo humano se establece en el anexo VI, sección III, parte A, del Reglamento (CE) n° 2074/2005 ⁽¹⁾. De conformidad con este certificado, el código de mercancía 3504 ⁽²⁾, que se define en la legislación aduanera de la UE, debería utilizarse para el colágeno. Dicho código figura en el anexo I de la Decisión 2007/275/CE ⁽³⁾, por la que se establece la lista de productos de origen animal que tienen que someterse a controles veterinarios en los puestos de inspección fronterizos autorizados de la UE (lista positiva).

Tras la consulta de los representantes de los Estados miembros y las partes interesadas en relación con los intercambios comerciales de tripas de colágeno, la Comisión llegó a la conclusión de que el código de mercancía 3504 no puede utilizarse para estos productos. El código de mercancía correcto para las tripas de colágeno es el código NC 3917 10 10, que, en consecuencia, ha sido incluido en la lista positiva mediante la Decisión 2012/31/UE de la Comisión ⁽⁴⁾. Dicha inclusión garantiza que las tripas de colágeno exportadas de terceros países se presentan en los controles fronterizos veterinarios para comprobar que su producción, transformación y distribución son conformes con los requisitos de higiene de la UE.

Los requisitos de la UE para este producto no se han modificado y la Comisión no tiene la intención de excluir las tripas de colágeno de los controles veterinarios fronterizos. Tales controles son también aplicables a los productos de la UE que se exportan para su transformación y redistribución a terceros países con el fin de reintroducirlos de nuevo en la EU, ya que la aplicación de los requisitos de higiene de la UE establecidos en el Reglamento (CE) n° 852/2004 ⁽⁵⁾ se aplican a todas las fases de la producción, la transformación y la distribución de alimentos.

⁽¹⁾ Reglamento (CE) n° 2074/2005 de la Comisión, de 5 de diciembre de 2005, por el que se establecen medidas de aplicación para determinados productos con arreglo a lo dispuesto en el Reglamento (CE) n° 853/2004 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo y para la organización de controles oficiales con arreglo a lo dispuesto en los Reglamentos (CE) n° 854/2004 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo y (CE) n° 882/2004 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, se introducen excepciones a lo dispuesto en el Reglamento (CE) n° 852/2004 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo y se modifican los Reglamentos (CE) n° 853/2004 y (CE) n° 854/2004 (DO L 338 de 22.12.2005, p. 2).

⁽²⁾ Nomenclatura Combinada (NC) establecida en el Reglamento (CEE) n° 2658/87, de 23 de julio de 1987, relativo a la nomenclatura arancelaria y estadística y al arancel aduanero común (DO L 256 de 7.9.1987, p. 1).

⁽³⁾ Decisión 2007/275/CE de la Comisión, de 17 de abril de 2007, relativa a las listas de animales y productos que han de someterse a controles en los puestos de inspección fronterizos con arreglo a las Directivas del Consejo 91/496/CEE y 97/78/CE (DO L 116 de 4.5.2007, p. 9).

⁽⁴⁾ Decisión de Ejecución 2012/31/UE de la Comisión, de 21 de diciembre de 2011 por la que se modifica el anexo I de la Decisión 2007/275/CE, relativa a las listas de animales y productos que han de someterse a controles en los puestos de inspección fronterizos con arreglo a las Directivas del consejo 91/496/CEE y 97/78/CE (DO L 21 de 24.1.2012, p. 1).

⁽⁵⁾ Reglamento (CE) n° 852/2004 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 29 de abril de 2004, relativo a la higiene de los productos alimenticios (DO L 139 de 30.4.2004, p. 1), versión corregida en el DO L 226 de 25.6.2004, p. 3.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000730/13
to the Commission**

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(24 January 2013)

Subject: Artificial guts made of hardened protein

Product 39171010 — artificial guts of hardened protein derived from animal products — is used solely as sausage casing and has a much lower water activity than meat products, acidity below Ph3, very low absolute humidity and no cross contamination, being made up of fibrous proteins chemically treated with aggressive alkali and acids which gives the product a far longer shelf life than other meat-derived products, as collagen casing is virtually non-perishable and requires neither conservation (it keeps perfectly at room temperature) nor refrigeration, a controlled environment or vacuum packing, etc., in order to maintain its properties.

In light of the above:

Does the Commission believe that it is time to consider the exclusion of product 39171010 — artificial guts of hardened protein derived from animal products — from the list of products subject to border veterinary checks contained in Annex I to Decision 2007/275/EC (amended by Commission implementing Decision 2012/31/EU), particularly in view of the fact that the product in question is manufactured in the EU and only exported to one non-EU country (Turkey) for folding and packaging?

**Question for written answer E-000732/13
to the Commission**

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(24 January 2013)

Subject: Artificial guts made from hardened protein II

In order to be competitive, some European firms send artificial guts made from hardened protein (derived from animal products) to Turkey for folding and packaging, after which they are returned to Europe. With the entry into force of Commission implementing Decision 2012/31/EU, this product became subject to checks at border inspection posts and requires a health certificate which FME is not at present able to issue. From this point on, the firm is unable to import the material produced at its facilities, as it is deemed to be of Turkish origin, having been folded and packaged in the Turkish free zone. This situation is prejudicial to and may seriously disrupt the commercial and economic activity of the firms involved.

Bearing in mind that:

- the recitals of Commission implementing Decision 2012/31/EU refer back to the same directives (91/496/EEC, 97/78/EC and 97/496/EC) and the decision itself, in Recital 5 thereof, states that its aim is to adapt the 'terminology' and 'references';
- the product description of 'artificial guts made from hardened protein deriving from animal products' has undergone no change between the date of the amended Decision 2007/275/EC and that of implementing Decision 2012/31/EU. The only change is in the NC code, which previously had four digits and is now 3917 10 10;

could the Commission explain what new circumstance, debate, risk or decision has caused the change in criteria between the original annex (to Decision 2007/275/EC) and the new one (to Decision 2012/31/EU) concerning products subject to veterinary border control which has led to the product classified as 'artificial guts made from hardened protein deriving from animal products' becoming subject to such control, when this was not previously the case?

Joint answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission*(11 March 2013)*

The model health certificate for imports of collagen intended for human consumption is laid down in Part A of Appendix III to Annex VI to Regulation (EC) No 2074/2005 ⁽¹⁾. In accordance with this certificate, Commodity code 3504 ⁽²⁾, which is defined in EU Customs legislation, should be used for collagen. That code is listed in Annex I to Decision 2007/275/EC ⁽³⁾ laying down the list of products of animal origin which have to be presented for veterinary controls to EU approved border inspection posts (positive list).

Following consultation of Member States' representatives and stakeholders in relation to the existing trade of collagen casings, the Commission concluded that Commodity code 3504 cannot be used for these products. The correct Commodity code for collagen casings is CN code 3917 10 10, which — as a consequence — has been included in the positive list by Commission Decision 2012/31/EU ⁽⁴⁾. That inclusion ensures that collagen casings exported from non-EU countries are presented for veterinary border controls to verify that their production, processing and distribution is in line with the EU hygiene requirements.

EU requirements for this commodity have not been changed and the Commission does not have the intention to exclude collagen casings from veterinary border controls. Such controls are also applicable if EU products are exported for further processing and re-distribution to non-EU countries with the aim to re-introduce them into the EU as the application of the EU hygiene requirements laid down in Regulation (EC) No 852/2004 ⁽⁵⁾ apply during all stages of production, processing and distribution of food.

⁽¹⁾ Commission Regulation (EC) No 2074/2005 of 5 December 2005 laying down implementing measures for certain products under Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council and for the organisation of official controls under Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council and Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council, derogating from Regulation (EC) No 852/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council and amending Regulations (EC) No 853/2004 and (EC) No 854/2004, OJ L 338, 22.12.2005, p. 2.

⁽²⁾ Combined Nomenclature (CN) as provided for in Council Regulation (EEC) No 2658/87 of 23 July 1987 on the tariff and statistical nomenclature and on the Common Customs Tariff, OJ L 256, 7.9.1987, p. 1.

⁽³⁾ Commission Decision 2007/275/EC of 17 April 2007 concerning lists of animals and products to be subject to controls at border inspection posts under Council Directives 91/496/EEC and 97/78/EC, OJ L 116, 4.5.2007, p. 9.

⁽⁴⁾ Commission Implementing Decision 2012/31/EU of 21 December 2011 amending Annex I to Decision 2007/275/EC concerning the lists of animals and products to be subject to controls at border inspection posts under Council Directives 91/496/EEC and 97/78/EC, OJ L 21, 24.1.2012, p. 1.

⁽⁵⁾ Regulation (EC) No 852/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the hygiene of foodstuffs, OJ L 139, 30.4.2004, p. 1 and re-published in OJ L 226, 25.6.2004, p. 3.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000733/13
do Komisji**

Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD), Jacek Włosowicz (EFD), Jacek Olgierd Kurski (EFD) oraz Tadeusz Cymański (EFD)

(24 stycznia 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: W przedmiocie tworzonego systemu fotoradarów w Polsce

W ostatnim czasie w polskich mediach trwa burzliwa dyskusja na temat zasadności tworzonego w Polsce systemu sieci fotoradarów. Do początku stycznia przy polskich drogach ustawionych zostało 300 takich urządzeń. Po drogach porusza się 29 nieoznakowanych samochodów Inspekcji Transportu Drogowego, również wyposażonych w urządzenie rejestrujące wykroczenie drogowe. Dodatkowo Inspekcja Transportu Drogowego planuje stworzyć system odcinkowego pomiaru prędkości na polskich drogach.

Trudno polemizować z twierdzeniami, że należy robić wszystko, żeby podejmować działania służące poprawie bezpieczeństwa na polskich drogach. I w tym zakresie wydawać by się mogło bezzasadnym jest kwestionowanie powyższych działań.

Jednak Ministerstwo Finansów zapisało w budżecie 1,5 mld zł przychodu w roku 2012 z tytułu wpływów z mandatów za wykroczenia drogowe. Staje się to zatem podstawą do postawienia pytania: czy nie jest to forma swego rodzaju ukrytego podatku, który płacić będą kierowcy.

Bowiem, biorąc pod uwagę, że po polskich drogach porusza się 10 mln samochodów, łatwo można wyliczyć, że średnio na każdy samochód przypadając będzie kwota 150 zł, jaką średnio w ciągu roku posiadający pojazd wpłacić będzie musiał na rzecz skarbu Państwa.

W związku z powyższym pragniemy zapytać:

1. Czy pozbawienie przez Inspekcję Transportu Drogowego możliwości wglądu do zdjęcia z fotoradaru w sytuacji, gdy właściciel pojazdu ma wątpliwości przy ustaleniu rzeczywistego sprawcy wykroczenia rejestrującego wykroczenie jest zgodne z dyrektywą 2011/82/EU?
2. Czy inicjatywa ta jest finansowana ze środków europejskich? Jeśli tak, to czy przy widocznym deficycie autostrad i dróg ekspresowych w Polsce, złym stanie dróg już istniejących, zasadnym jest przeznaczanie ogromnych środków finansowych na system fotoradarowy w Polsce, zamiast te, póki co, przeznaczać na budowę czy remonty dróg już istniejących?
3. Czy zdaniem Komisji Europejskiej powyżej przedstawione podejście polskich służb do problemu uwzględnia najlepsze praktyki w zakresie poprawiania bezpieczeństwa ruchu drogowego?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Siima Kallasa w imieniu Komisji

(27 marca 2013 r.)

Dyrektywa 2011/82/UE wprowadza ułatwienia w zakresie transgranicznej wymiany informacji dotyczących przestępstw lub wykroczeń związanych z bezpieczeństwem ruchu drogowego⁽¹⁾. Państwo członkowskie popełnienia przestępstwa lub wykroczenia może poinformować domniemanego sprawcę przestępstwa lub wykroczenia związanego z bezpieczeństwem ruchu drogowego za pomocą pisma informacyjnego, którego wzór jest określony w dyrektywie. Nie przesądza ona jednak, czy sprawca powinien mieć dostęp do zdjęcia. Co więcej, dyrektywa nie przewiduje harmonizacji przepisów dotyczących charakteru przestępstw lub wykroczeń lub systemu kar za sprawstwo. Decyzja dotycząca ustanowienia takich przepisów należy zasadniczo do kompetencji poszczególnych państw członkowskich. Dlatego też Komisja nie może skomentować informacji na temat nowego systemu egzekwowania prędkości wprowadzonego w Polsce zgodnie z opisem przedstawionym przez Szanownych Panów Posłów.

Komisja potwierdza, że w ramach środków bezpieczeństwa ruchu drogowego pewne projekty współfinansowane przez UE obejmują zakup kamer na potrzeby egzekwowania przepisów ruchu drogowego (w ramach osi priorytetowej VIII „Bezpieczeństwo transportu i krajowe sieci transportowe” programu operacyjnego „Infrastruktura i Środowisko”).

⁽¹⁾ Dz.U. L 288 z 5.11.2011.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000733/13
to the Commission**

Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD), Jacek Włosowicz (EFD), Jacek Olgierd Kurski (EFD) and Tadeusz Cymański (EFD)
(24 January 2013)

Subject: Poland's traffic enforcement camera system

A heated debate has recently been playing out in the Polish media on whether the traffic enforcement camera system currently being set up in Poland is justifiable. By the start of January 2013, 300 traffic enforcement cameras had been placed alongside roads in Poland. Some 29 unmarked road transport inspectorate vehicles equipped with devices to record traffic offences are also circulating on Polish roads. Additionally, the road transport inspectorate plans to put a system in place to measure average speeds along stretches of road.

It is hard to disagree with the statement that we must do all we can to improve safety on Poland's roads. In this context, it may appear unjustifiable to question the measures described above.

However, Polish Ministry of Finance figures show that fines imposed for traffic offences brought in revenues of PLN 1.5 billion for the national budget. This begs the question: is this not a form of hidden taxation imposed on drivers?

There are 10 million vehicles on Poland's roads, and it is reasonable to estimate that every car owner will end up paying the treasury PLN 150 in fines in an average year.

In this connection:

1. The Polish road transport inspectorate does not allow people to see photographs taken by traffic enforcement cameras in cases where the vehicle owner disputes the identity of the offender captured on the photograph. Is this in accordance with Directive 2011/82/EU?
2. Does this initiative receive EU funding? If so, in view of the glaring lack of motorways and high-speed roads in Poland and the poor state of repair of existing roads, does it make sense to invest such large amounts of money in a traffic enforcement camera system instead of in constructing new or repairing existing roads?
3. In the Commission's opinion, does the Polish authorities' approach to the issue as described above take account of best practices as regards improving road safety?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission

(27 March 2013)

Directive 2011/82/EU facilitates the cross-border exchange of information on road safety related traffic offences ⁽¹⁾. The Member State of the offence may inform the presumed offender of the road safety related traffic offence by information letter whose template is set out in the directive, but it does not prescribe whether the offender should have access to the photograph or not. The directive moreover does *not* harmonise rules concerning the nature of the offences or the penalty scheme for the offences. The decision to set such rules lies in principle within the competence of the Member States concerned. Therefore, the Commission cannot comment on the details of the new speed enforcement scheme reportedly introduced in Poland as described by the Honourable Members.

The Commission confirms that in the framework of road safety measures, some projects co-financed by the EU include the purchase of traffic enforcement cameras (within the Priority Axis VIII 'Transport safety and national transport network' of the Operational Programme Infrastructure and Environment).

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 288, 5.11.2011.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000734/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(24 January 2013)**

Subject: VP/HR — The case of the Egyptian Coptic woman Nadia Mohamed Ali and her children

Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the disturbing case of Mrs Nadia Mohamed Ali, an Egyptian woman who, along with her 7 children, has been sentenced to 15 years of imprisonment for converting back to Christianity?

Mrs Nadia Mohamed Ali was a Coptic Christian before marriage, converted to Islam when she married her husband, and then chose to return to Christianity after her husband's death in 2004.

The Egyptian Government, which actively encourages the conversion of Christians to Islam, not only denies the same right to Muslims who want to become Christians but punishes them with criminal sanctions in order to force them to comply with Islamic Sharia law. This is increasingly becoming a threat to the Coptic Christian minority and to converts to Christianity.

Can the Vice-President/High Representative make an appeal through the EU delegation in Cairo for clemency to be exercised and for Mrs Ali and her children to be released from prison?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(18 June 2013)**

The EU is aware and concerned about the constraints that different religious minorities face in Egypt and condemns all forms of intolerance, discrimination and violence against persons because of their religion or belief, wherever it takes place and regardless of the religion. The HR/VP repeatedly called on the Egyptian authorities to ensure freedom of religion or belief in the country.

Regarding the specific case of Nadia Mohamed Ali, the EU Delegation in Cairo confirms that the Egyptian Coptic woman has been sentenced to fifteen years imprisonment for changing her religion status on her identity document. Despite EEAS' inquiry in the country, at the moment we cannot confirm whether she is in prison or not. The EU will continue to follow closely the case and monitor the situation on the ground in order to provide additional information.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000735/13
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(24 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: Repercusiones en espacios incluidos en la Red Natura 2000 de un proyecto relativo a una línea de muy alta tensión

La red Eléctrica de España (REE) proyecta instalar una línea eléctrica de doble circuito de 400 kv. en la provincia de Castellón (España). La línea de «muy alta tensión» (MAT) irá desde el municipio de Almassora hasta el de Morella, cruzando 17 términos municipales, contará con torres de más de 70 metros de altura, tendrá una envergadura de casi 30 m (con cortafuegos de 50 m) y la distancia media entre las torres será de 450 metros.

El trazado afecta a lugares emblemáticos de Castellón y a zonas de gran interés medioambiental. Atraviesa zonas pobladas sin respetar la distancia mínima de seguridad actualmente recomendada (1 metro por kilovoltio). Esta línea transcurre, parcialmente, por el lugar de importancia comunitaria (LIC) «Alt Maestrat de Castelló» y podría afectar al LIC del «Riu Bergantes» y a la Zona de Especial Protección para las Aves (ZEPA) de «L'Alt Maestrat, Tinença de Benifassà, Turmell i Vallivana», zonas incluidas en la Red Natura 2000, así como a importantes zonas de paso de aves migratorias. Además, afectará a importantes zonas donde vive el águila azor perdiguera (*Hieraaetus fasciatus*), especie en peligro según el Catálogo Español de Especies Amenazadas, el Catálogo Valenciano de Especies de Fauna Amenazadas, y que está recogida en los anexos II de los Convenios de Berna y Bonn, así como en el anexo I de la Directiva de Aves.

El anteproyecto y la evaluación de impacto medioambiental se encuentran en la actualidad en el Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente para su examen y para que éste emita la declaración de impacto medioambiental. A continuación, esta documentación se remitirá al Ministerio de Industria para que conceda una autorización administrativa. Hasta que no se disponga de la declaración de impacto medioambiental y de la autorización administrativa, no se hará pública para la presentación de alegaciones tanto por parte de organismos como de particulares.

1. ¿Está la Comisión informada sobre la construcción de esta línea de muy alta tensión?
2. ¿Conoce la Comisión el procedimiento por el que se está llevando a cabo la declaración de impacto ambiental?
3. ¿Qué medidas tiene intención de adoptar la Comisión para garantizar que este proyecto no tenga repercusiones en zonas definidas como Lugares de Importancia Comunitaria (LIC) y Zonas de Especial Protección de las Aves (ZEPA) incluidas en la Red Natura 2000?
4. ¿Podría la Comisión intervenir con carácter preventivo a fin de evitar que la autorización administrativa sea favorable teniendo en cuenta las repercusiones en los LIC y la ZEPA a los que se ha hecho referencia anteriormente?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(7 de marzo de 2013)

La Comisión remite a Su Señoría a la respuesta dada a la pregunta escrita E-011356/2012 ⁽¹⁾, realizada por D. Willy Meyer.

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

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000735/13
to the Commission**

Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)

(24 January 2013)

Subject: Repercussions on spaces included within the Natura 2000 network of a project involving a very high voltage power line

Red Eléctrica Española (the Spanish Power Grid) plans to install a 400 kV double-circuit power line in the province of Castellón (Spain). The Very High Voltage (VHV) line will stretch from the municipality of Almassora to that of Morella, crossing 17 municipal districts; with towers over 70 m tall and almost 30 m across — with 50 m firewalls — separated by an average distance of 450 m.

The route affects symbolic sites in Castellón and areas of major environmental interest. It cuts through populated areas and fails to respect the current recommended minimum safety distance of 1 m/kV. The line partially crosses the 'Alt Maestrat de Castelló' site of Community importance (SCI) and may affect the 'Riu Bergantes' SCI and the 'L'Alt Maestrat, Tinença de Benifassà, Turmell i Vallivana' Special Birds Protection Area (SPA), which are areas included within the Natura 2000 network, as well as important transit areas for migratory birds. Furthermore, it will affect important areas that are habitats for the Bonelli's eagle (*Hieraetus fasciatus*), an endangered species according to the Spanish Catalogue of Endangered Species and the Valencian Catalogue of Endangered Species of Fauna, and listed in Annex II of both the Berne and Bonn Conventions and in Annex I of the Birds Directive.

The preliminary design and environmental impact assessment are currently under consideration at the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Environment so that it may issue the environmental impact statement. Next, the documentation will be forwarded to the Ministry of Industry so that it may grant administrative authorisation. Until the environmental impact statement and administrative approval are available, the documentation will not be made public for complaints to be submitted by organisations and individuals.

1. Has the Commission been informed about the construction of this VHV line?
2. Is the Commission aware of the procedure by which the environmental impact statement is being carried out?
3. What measures does the Commission intend to adopt to ensure that this project does not have repercussions in areas designated as Sites of Community Importance (SCI) and Special Birds Protection Areas (SPA) included in the Natura 2000 network?
4. Could the Commission intervene to prevent the administrative authorisation from being issued, bearing in mind the repercussions on the aforementioned SCIs and SPA?

Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission

(7 March 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to written question E-011356/2012 ⁽¹⁾ by Mr Willy Meyer.

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

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000737/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(24 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Dados estatísticos de base para negociação e repartição dos fundos estruturais

Tendo em conta a definição do próximo Quadro Financeiro Plurianual 2014-2020, e a negociação e repartição dos fundos estruturais que lhe está associada, a existência de dados estatísticos fiáveis e atualizados reveste-se da maior importância. É importante, desde logo, que esses dados traduzam fielmente a evolução profundamente negativa ocorrida nalguns países, como Portugal, onde se registam quebras consecutivas do PIB, e em especial nalgumas regiões menos desenvolvidas.

Assim, solicitamos à Comissão que nos informe sobre que dados estatísticos — referentes a que anos — servirão de base à negociação e repartição supracitadas, para os diferentes países e regiões (incluindo as Regiões Ultraperiféricas).

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(12 de março de 2013)

A repartição das dotações baseia-se nos dados harmonizados mais recentes, disponibilizados quando a proposta da Comissão do Quadro Financeiro Plurianual foi elaborada. Esta informação inclui os dados referentes ao PIB por regiões e à população no período compreendido entre 2007-2009.

Para os restantes indicadores, os anos de referência são 2008-2010. Tal é o caso relativamente aos dados do RNB a nível nacional e aos dados regionais sobre desemprego, taxa de emprego, taxa de abandono precoce do ensino e da formação e o grau de instrução da população com idades entre os 30 e os 34 anos (indicadores da estratégia «Europa 2020»).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000737/13
to the Commission**
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(24 January 2013)

Subject: Using statistical data to negotiate and allocate the Structural Funds

Updated and reliable statistics are of the utmost importance in defining the next Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-2020 and in negotiating and allocating the corresponding Structural Funds. First and foremost, it is important that these data accurately reflect the significant downturn experienced by some countries, such as Portugal, which has seen a successive decline in GDP, particularly in some less developed regions.

Can the Commission therefore state which statistics — on which years — will be used to negotiate and allocate the Structural Funds to the various countries and regions (including the outermost regions)?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(12 March 2013)

The allocation distribution is based on the most recent available harmonised data, available when the Commission proposal for the multi-annual financial framework was drafted. This data includes regional GDP and population figures for 2007-2009.

For the other indicators, the reference years are 2008-2010. This is the case for GNI data at national level, and for regional data on unemployment, employment rate, early leavers from education and training, and the educational level of the population aged 30-34 (Europe 2020 indicators).

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000738/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(24 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: 2014 — Ano Internacional da Agricultura Familiar

Por decisão da Assembleia-Geral das Nações Unidas, 2014 será o Ano Internacional da Agricultura Familiar. Esta decisão visa reconhecer a contribuição da agricultura familiar para a segurança alimentar e para a erradicação da pobreza no mundo. O objetivo é promover, em todos os países, políticas públicas que favoreçam o desenvolvimento sustentável de sistemas de produção agrícola baseados em unidades familiares, fornecer orientações para pôr em prática essas políticas, incentivar a participação de organizações de agricultores e, em geral, assinalar a importância de apoiar a agricultura familiar.

Tendo em conta a necessária antecedência com que o Ano Internacional da Agricultura Familiar deve ser preparado, solicitamos à Comissão Europeia que nos informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Que iniciativas estão já previstas no âmbito do Ano Internacional da Agricultura Familiar?
2. Que estudos vai desenvolver tendo em vista uma melhor caracterização da agricultura familiar na UE?
3. Quando pensa ter um calendário de preparação desta iniciativa e quais os momentos mais importantes do mesmo?
4. Tem alguma previsão para o lançamento de processos de candidatura a iniciativas, projetos, estudos, etc., associados ao Ano Internacional da Agricultura Familiar?

Resposta dada por Damian Ciołoz em nome da Comissão
(13 de março de 2013)

A Comissão está ativamente implicada na preparação do Ano Internacional da Agricultura Familiar 2014, nomeadamente nas deliberações do Comité Diretor Internacional Informal (CIT), instituído pela Organização das Nações Unidas para a Alimentação e Agricultura (FAO) e que se reuniu pela primeira vez em novembro de 2012, estando implicada também nas atividades de sensibilização com as partes interessadas europeias e externas. Na primeira reunião do ISC os participantes foram convidados a, com base nas informações existentes, colaborar com as instituições regionais e nacionais para a elaboração de produtos regionais/nacionais orientados para as grandes diferenças ecológicas, sociais e políticas. A segunda reunião deve ser organizada no final de fevereiro/março.

A FAO, como promotora do processo, tem as suas atividades (que incluem diversos projetos e estudos) planeadas principalmente para 2014. A Comissão decidiu, no entanto, assumir um papel ativo no processo e organizará uma conferência em outubro/novembro de 2013, em Bruxelas, com a participação de instituições e Estados-Membros da UE, assim como de outros países e organizações. Os resultados da conferência serão integrados na conferência regional da FAO, a realizar em abril de 2014, em Bucareste, na Roménia. Está planeado que os serviços da Comissão, em estreita colaboração com outras instituições da UE, compilarão a totalidade das informações e dados necessários. Não se iniciará qualquer estudo específico, mas parte da conferência facultará uma análise tipológica das explorações agrícolas da UE na UE-27/28.

Aproximadamente em abril de 2013 será disponibilizado um calendário de eventos pormenorizado, à escala da UE, no qual estará incluída a Conferência da Comissão.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000738/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(24 January 2013)

Subject: 2014 — International Year of Family Farming

The United Nations General Assembly has declared 2014 as the International Year of Family Farming. This decision aims to recognise family farming's contribution to food security and poverty eradication throughout the world. It also aims to promote public policies in all countries that foster the sustainable development of agricultural production systems based on family farms, to provide guidance on implementing these policies, to encourage the participation of farmers' organisations and to generally highlight the importance of supporting family farming.

Given that preparations for the International Year of Family Farming must begin well in advance, can the Commission state:

1. What initiatives are already planned as part of the International Year of Family Farming?
2. What studies will it undertake to better characterise family farming in the EU?
3. When will it draw up a timetable to prepare for this initiative and what will be the most important dates on it?
4. Does it plan to launch application procedures for, *inter alia*, initiatives, projects and studies related to the International Year of Family Farming?

Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission
(13 March 2013)

The Commission is actively involved in the run-up to the International Year of Family Farming 2014, especially in the deliberations of the Informal International Steering Committee (ISC) launched by the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), which met for the first time in November 2012, and the outreach activities with the European and external stakeholders. The first meeting of the ISC invited participants to build on existing information, and to collaborate with regional and national institutions to develop regional/national products targeted to the large ecological, social, political differences. The second meeting is to be organised in late February/March.

FAO, as a facilitator of the process, plans its activities (including various projects and studies) mainly in 2014. However, the Commission decided to take a pro-active role in the process and will organise a conference in October/November 2013 in Brussels with the participation of EU institutions and Member States and as well as other countries and organisations. The outcome of the conference will feed into the Regional FAO conference scheduled in April 2014 in Bucharest (Romania). It is planned that all the necessary data and information will be collated by Commission's services in close collaboration with other EU institutions. No specific study will be launched, although part of the conference will provide an analysis of the typology of EU farms in the EU-27/28.

A detailed timeframe of events at EU level, including the Commission's conference, will be available around April 2013.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000739/13
ao Conselho
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(24 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Bandeira de Portugal na reunião do Eurogrupo

As cores da bandeira nacional portuguesa são o vermelho, o verde, o amarelo, o branco, o azul e o preto. A bandeira tem no seu centro, sobre um fundo verde e vermelho, uma esfera armilar onde assenta o símbolo do escudo português, ladeado por sete castelos, que representam outras tantas batalhas da História de Portugal.

Constatámos, com estupefação, que a bandeira nacional da República Portuguesa exposta na última reunião do Eurogrupo foi adulterada, já que em vez dos sete castelos encontramos o que parecem ser sete pagodes. Uma adulteração que não deixa de ser irónica à luz da recente alienação ao capital estrangeiro de importantes (estratégicas e lucrativas) empresas públicas portuguesas do setor energético, na sequência dos processos de privatização promovidos e apoiados pela UE e pelo FMI. Mas que nem por isso é menos inadmissível.

Assim, perguntamos ao Conselho:

1. A que se deve esta adulteração da Bandeira de Portugal presente na reunião do Eurogrupo?
2. Que medidas serão tomadas para corrigir prontamente esta situação?

Resposta
(25 de março de 2013)

1. As bandeiras expostas na entrada VIP do Conselho foram oferecidas por uma Presidência anterior há quase uma década. O erro lamentável na bandeira portuguesa exposta não foi detetado nessa ocasião.
 2. Todas as bandeiras foram entretanto retiradas e substituídas por um novo conjunto que foi devidamente verificado. O Secretariado-Geral do Conselho lamenta o sucedido.
-

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000739/13
to the Council
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(24 January 2013)

Subject: Portuguese flag at the Eurogroup meeting

The colours of the flag of Portugal are red, green, yellow, white, blue and black. At the centre of the flag, against a green and red background, is an armillary sphere over which lies the Portuguese shield, surrounded by seven castles, representing battles in the history of Portugal.

We were astonished to note that at the last Eurogroup meeting, the national flag of the Portuguese Republic had been altered, so that in the place of the seven castles were what appeared to be seven pagodas. This is nothing if not ironic in the light of the recent sale of major (strategic and profitable) Portuguese public energy corporations to foreign investors, following privatisation processes promoted and backed by the EU and IMF. This does not, however, make it any more acceptable.

We ask the Council:

1. What was the reason for this adulteration of the Portuguese flag at the Eurogroup meeting?
2. What measures will be taken to rectify the situation forthwith?

Reply
(25 March 2013)

1. The flags displayed at the Council's VIP entrance were a gift from a previous Presidency, nearly a decade ago. The regrettable error in the Portuguese flag displayed was not spotted at the time.
 2. The whole set of flags has meanwhile been removed and replaced by a new, verified set. The General Secretariat of the Council expresses its regret for this error.
-

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000740/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(24 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Defesa e valorização da Arte Xávega

A Arte Xávega é uma arte de pesca com séculos de tradição em Portugal. Praticada ao longo da costa atlântica portuguesa é característica de várias comunidades costeiras, sendo parte importante do património histórico-cultural dessas comunidades, que importa preservar e valorizar.

Nesta arte, as redes são puxadas a partir de terra. Antigamente, tal era feito com recurso a animais ou à força braçal, sendo esta prática hoje apoiada por meios mecânicos. Tipicamente, a época de pesca é curta. Sendo uma arte «cega», já que no primeiro lance nunca se sabe o que virá à rede, os pescadores têm vindo a defender a possibilidade de todo esse lance ser vendável, incluindo o pescado que possa não cumprir os tamanhos mínimos, não desperdiçando assim nenhum peixe. As quantidades capturadas, em todo o caso, nunca são substanciais.

A profunda crise económica e social que afeta o setor da pesca em Portugal tem afetado de modo muito particular a Arte Xávega. Entre os principais problemas que os pescadores enfrentam estão o custo dos fatores de produção, em especial os combustíveis (a gasolina — que muitas embarcações têm de utilizar por razões de segurança que se prendem com a necessária capacidade de resposta dos motores em zonas perigosas — ao contrário do gasóleo, não é apoiada), e a insuficiente valorização do preço de primeira venda do pescado.

Perguntamos à Comissão:

De que forma podem as especificidades desta arte de pesca secular ser reconhecidas, defendidas e valorizadas ao nível da UE?

Resposta dada por Maria Damanakiem em nome da Comissão
(13 de março de 2013)

A Comissão reconhece plenamente a importância da pequena pesca, de que a Arte Xávega é um exemplo, bem como o papel vital que desempenha no tecido social e na identidade cultural de muitas regiões costeiras da Europa.

As artes e as práticas de pesca individuais não são protegidas enquanto tal pela UE. Por conseguinte, conquanto a Arte Xávega seja, reconhecidamente, um método de pesca pouco prejudicial para o ambiente, à semelhança de outros tipos de artes de cercar, como as redes de cerco dinamarquesas ou as redes envolventes-arrastrantes de alar para a praia, a arte utilizada seria classificada como uma arte ativa, sujeita a todas as medidas técnicas de conservação pertinentes, entre as quais as relativas à malhagem, à construção de artes de pesca, à composição das capturas e aos tamanhos mínimos de desembarque.

Os pescadores são livres de diferenciar os seus produtos, recorrendo a regimes de certificação, valorizando-os e promovendo-os enquanto pescado capturado de forma responsável. Nesta matéria, o Fundo Europeu das Pescas (FEP) ⁽¹⁾ prevê a possibilidade de os Estados-Membros concederem assistência financeira a um determinado número de medidas especificamente orientadas para a promoção de produtos capturados na pequena pesca. Está disponível financiamento para a promoção de produtos obtidos por métodos pouco prejudiciais para o ambiente, bem como para a certificação da qualidade, incluindo a criação de rótulos e a certificação de produtos capturados através de métodos de produção respeitadores do ambiente. A pesca com a Arte Xávega poderia ser elegível para esse tipo de auxílios.

⁽¹⁾ JO L 223 de 15.8.2006.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000740/13
to the Commission**
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(24 January 2013)

Subject: Protecting and valuing Arte Xávega

Arte Xávega is a fishing gear with centuries of tradition in Portugal. Practised along the Portuguese Atlantic coast, it is characteristic of several coastal communities and forms an important part of their historical and cultural heritage, which it is important to protect and value.

This gear involves hauling nets from the shore. In the past, this was done by animals or manually using brute force; nowadays it is done mechanically. The fishing season is typically short. Arte Xávega is a 'blind' gear, since the nets are cast without knowing what will be caught; as such, fishermen have been advocating the opportunity to sell the entire catch, including fish that do meet minimum size requirements, in order to eliminate waste. In any case, substantial quantities are never caught.

The deep economic and social crisis affecting the fisheries sector in Portugal has affected Arte Xávega in particular. Among the main problems facing fishermen are the cost of production factors, particularly fuel (petrol — which many vessels must use for safety reasons linked to the necessary response capacity of motors in hazardous areas — unlike diesel, is not supported), and low first sale fish prices.

How can the specific characteristics of this centuries-old fishing gear be recognised, protected and valued at EU level?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(13 March 2013)

The Commission fully recognises the importance of small-scale fisheries such as Arte Xávega, which play a vital role in the social fabric and the cultural identity of many of Europe's coastal regions.

At EU level individual fishing practices and gears are not protected as such. Therefore, while the Arte Xávega is recognised as a low impact fishing method similar to other types of encircling gears such as Danish seines or beach seines, the gears used would be classified as an active gear which would be subject to all relevant technical conservation measures. These would include mesh size, rules governing gear construction, catch composition and minimum landing sizes.

Fishermen are free to differentiate through certification schemes, add value and promote their products as responsibly caught. In this regard the European Fisheries Fund (EFF) ⁽¹⁾ provides the possibility for Member States to grant financial assistance for a number of measures specifically targeted towards promoting products caught in small-scale fisheries. Funding is available for the promotion of products obtained using methods with low impact on the environment; as well as quality certification, including label creation and the certification of products caught using environmentally friendly production methods. Fisheries using the Arte Xávega could be eligible for such grant aid.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L223, 15.8.2006.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000741/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(24 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Execução dos fundos estruturais por parte dos países alvo de intervenção UE-FMI

Em 2011, a Comissão Europeia propôs a aplicação de um complemento de dez pontos percentuais às taxas de cofinanciamento aplicáveis aos fundos estruturais da UE para os países alvo de intervenção UE-FMI.

Os chamados programas de assistência financeira, da responsabilidade da UE e do FMI, estão a conduzir os países alvo de intervenção para uma dramática e profunda recessão económica, com destruição de uma parte importante do tecido económico e social, afetando tanto a capacidade de investimento privado (em especial, das PME) como o investimento público — reduzido, nalguns casos, a níveis historicamente baixos.

Perguntamos à Comissão:

1. Que avanços se verificaram na execução de cada um dos fundos desde a aplicação do complemento de dez pontos percentuais às taxas de cofinanciamento?
2. Considera a Comissão que esta medida, efetivamente, proporcionou «aos Estados-Membros em causa os fundos necessários para o apoio a projetos e a recuperação da economia», conforme era intenção expressa da sua proposta?
3. Considera a possibilidade de reduzir ainda mais as exigências de cofinanciamento nacional?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(18 de março de 2013)

A Comissão não concorda com a maneira como a pergunta caracteriza os programas de assistência financeira da UE. Os programas de assistência financeira prestam apoio aos países que deixaram de ter acesso aos mercados financeiros em condições aceitáveis e, assim, ajudam a facilitar o necessário processo de ajustamento económico. A Comissão considera que a recessão económica teria sido muito mais longa e grave se estes programas não existissem.

1. Depois de aplicado o complemento às taxas de cofinanciamento para a Grécia, Portugal, a Roménia, a Hungria e a Irlanda, foram pagos a estes países 1,9 mil milhões de euros provenientes do Fundo Europeu de Desenvolvimento Regional, do Fundo Social Europeu, do Fundo Europeu Agrícola de Desenvolvimento Rural e do Fundo Europeu das Pescas, como indicado no anexo.

Estes montantes deram aos países a liquidez necessária para prosseguir a aplicação dos programas financiados pela UE num momento em que os recursos nacionais disponíveis diminuía.

2. A medida de aplicação do complemento tem sido muito eficaz para ajudar estes Estados-Membros a enfrentar os efeitos da crise, uma vez que os montantes pagos depois de aplicado o complemento foram utilizados para a execução de projetos prioritários que contribuiram para a competitividade das regiões, para gerar crescimento e criar empregos.

3. A Comissão não pretende reduzir ainda mais as exigências de cofinanciamento nacional.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000741/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(24 January 2013)

Subject: Implementation of the Structural Funds by countries receiving EU-IMF bailouts

In 2011, the Commission proposed increasing the co-financing rates applicable to the EU Structural Funds by 10 percentage points, for countries receiving EU-IMF bailouts.

The so-called financial assistance programmes, managed by the EU and the IMF, are plunging the bailed-out countries into a deep and severe economic recession, destroying an important part of the social and economic fabric and affecting both private investment capacity (of SMEs in particular) and public investment capacity which, in some cases, has plummeted to historically low levels.

1. What progress has been made regarding the implementation of each fund since increasing the co-financing rates by 10 percentage points?
2. Does the Commission believe that this measure has effectively provided 'the Member States concerned with the funds necessary to support projects and the recovery of the economy', as expressly intended in its proposal?
3. Will it consider further reducing the national co-financing requirements?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(18 March 2013)

The Commission does not agree with the characterisation of the EU financial assistance programmes set out in the question. The financial assistance programmes provide support to those countries which no longer have access to financial markets at acceptable terms and thus help to smooth the necessary adjustment process. The Commission considers that the economic downturn would have been much longer and more severe in the absence of the programmes.

1. Following the application of the top-up of the co-financing rates for Greece, Portugal, Romania, Hungary and Ireland, EUR 1.9 billion has been paid out from the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund, the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development and the European Fisheries Fund to these countries as indicated in the annex.

These amounts have provided much needed liquidity and enabled the countries to continue implementing their EU funded programmes at a time when available national resources were decreasing.

2. The top-up measure has been very effective in helping these Member States to deal with the effects of the crisis, since the amounts paid as a result of the top-up were used to implement priority projects that contribute to the competitiveness of regions and generate growth and create jobs.
 3. The Commission does not intend to further reduce the national co-financing requirements.
-

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000742/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(24 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Reprogramação do Fundo Europeu das Pescas — Portugal

Tendo em conta a reprogramação dos fundos estruturais para Portugal, relativamente ao Fundo Europeu das Pescas (FEP), perguntamos à Comissão:

1. Tem conhecimento de quais os montantes globais, por região, afetados diretamente à atividade da pesca e a outras atividades associadas ao meio marinho?
2. Que verbas do FEP estão ainda por utilizar por Portugal? Até quando terão essas verbas de ser utilizadas, sob pena de se perderem?

Resposta dada por Maria Damanakiem em nome da Comissão
(13 de março de 2013)

O montante atribuído a Portugal proveniente do Fundo Europeu das Pescas (FEP) para o período 2007-2013 ascende a 246,4 milhões de euros, repartidos do seguinte modo: 223,9 milhões de euros para as regiões do Objetivo da Convergência (Açores e Continente, à exceção de Lisboa) e 22,5 milhões de euros para as regiões do Objetivo não ligado à Convergência (Lisboa e Madeira). A repartição destas verbas dentro destes dois tipos de região é decidida de acordo com as prioridades dos Estados-Membros, no respeito das condições do FEP e da política comum das pescas.

O orçamento afetado ao FEP é executado com base num plano estratégico elaborado pelos Estados-Membros. Esse plano define as prioridades, os objetivos e as estimativas e prazos das despesas públicas de acordo com os objetivos do FEP, apresenta a perspetiva de longo prazo dos Estados-Membros relativamente à evolução das suas políticas da pesca e da aquicultura entre 2007 e 2013 e justifica o cumprimento dos objetivos da PCP através do plano. Este é executado através de um programa operacional que descreve mais pormenorizadamente o modo como as autoridades nacionais pretendem concretizar as oportunidades oferecidas pelo FEP. Tanto o plano como o programa operacional são preparados em estreita consulta com os parceiros sociais e económicos, aos níveis regional e local.

De acordo com a declaração de despesas de 31 de dezembro de 2012, 66 % das dotações totais para Portugal para o período 2007-2013 foram afetados a projetos aprovados pelas autoridades portuguesas. Apenas 38 % das dotações totais tinham sido executados e pagos aos beneficiários. O prazo para autorização e pagamento dos fundos do FEP aos beneficiários termina em 31 de dezembro de 2015.

Para mais informações sobre o Programa Operacional Português, remetem-se os Senhores Deputados para as autoridades portuguesas de gestão ⁽¹⁾, responsáveis pela sua gestão e execução.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.promar.gov.pt/>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000742/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(24 January 2013)**

Subject: Reprogramming of the European Fisheries Fund — Portugal

In view of the reprogramming of the Structural Funds allocated to Portugal, namely the European Fisheries Fund (EFF), we would ask the Commission:

1. Is it aware of the overall amounts, by region, directly allocated to fishing activity and to other activities related to the marine environment?
2. Which EFF funds remain unused by Portugal? When is the deadline for using these funds?

**Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(13 March 2013)**

The amount allocated to Portugal from the European Fisheries Fund (EFF) during the period 2007-2013 is EUR 246.4 million divided into EUR 223.9 million for the Convergence objective regions (Azores and Mainland except Lisbon) and EUR 22.5 million for the Non-Convergence objective regions (Lisbon and Madeira). The allocation inside each of the two types of objective regions is decided according to Member State priorities in respect of the EFF conditions and the common fisheries policy.

The budget allocated to the EFF is implemented on the basis of a strategic plan drawn up by the Member State which defines priorities, objectives, public spending estimates and deadlines in line with EFF objectives and gives a long-term view of how they see the development of their fisheries and aquaculture policy between 2007 and 2013, and explaining how this meets the CFP's objectives. This plan is implemented by way of an Operational Programme describing in more detail the way the national authorities intend to translate the opportunities offered by the EFF into practice. Both are prepared in close consultation with regional and local economic and social partners.

According to the statement of expenditure on 31 December 2012, 66% of the total appropriations for Portugal for the period 2007 to 2013 were committed to projects approved by the Portuguese authorities. Only 38% of the total allocations had been executed and paid to the beneficiaries. The deadline to commit and pay EFF funding to the beneficiaries is 31 December 2015.

For more information on the Portuguese Operational Programme, the Honourable Member is invited to refer to the Portuguese Managing Authorities ⁽¹⁾, responsible for managing and implementing the Operational Programme.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.promar.gov.pt/>

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000743/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(24 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Restrições à importação e posse privada de espécies ameaçadas

Em abril de 2012, o Parlamento Europeu aprovou um relatório relativo à Estratégia da UE sobre a Biodiversidade até 2020. Neste relatório refere-se a «necessidade de assegurar que o comércio de espécies ameaçadas incluídas na Lista Vermelha elaborada pela União Internacional para a Conservação da Natureza fique sujeito a restrições crescentes e, designadamente, a uma regulamentação estrita». Ademais, alerta-se a Comissão Europeia para a necessidade de avaliar e apresentar propostas tendentes à proibição da captura de animais selvagens para venda como animais de estimação.

Perguntamos à Comissão:

1. Admite a necessidade de maiores restrições à importação e posse privada de espécies ameaçadas, como primatas, répteis e anfíbios?
2. Que avaliações e propostas elaborou no sentido de dar seguimento às recomendações supramencionadas?

Resposta dada por Janez Potočnik em nome da Comissão
(18 de março de 2013)

Na União Europeia, há já diversas disposições que condicionam a importação e a posse privada de espécies ameaçadas.

Em particular, os regulamentos relativos ao comércio da fauna e da flora selvagens — que aplicam na UE a Convenção sobre o Comércio Internacional das Espécies de Fauna e Flora Selvagens ameaçadas de Extinção (CITES) — preveem as condições de importação e detenção das espécies em causa, exigindo, nomeadamente, licenças de importação. Antes de os pedidos de importação serem aprovados, é necessário confirmar que a introdução na União Europeia não terá efeito nocivo no estado de conservação das espécies. Por outro lado, os regulamentos preveem a possibilidade de as importações serem suspensas se o comércio de uma determinada espécie não for considerado sustentável e incluem também regras para a posse e a circulação de espécimes vivos. Os regulamentos são analisados regularmente, tendo em conta novos dados científicos, como avaliações publicadas pela União Internacional para a Conservação da Natureza, a fim de incluir novas disposições decorrentes da CITES e com vista a uma melhor aplicação da legislação.

Neste contexto, a Comissão está a ponderar opções para a prevenção e a gestão da entrada na UE e da posse de espécies invasivas exóticas, no âmbito de uma proposta legislativa em preparação.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000743/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(24 January 2013)

Subject: Restrictions on the import and private ownership of endangered species

In April 2012, the European Parliament adopted a resolution on the EU biodiversity strategy to 2020. The resolution mentions the 'need to ensure that trade in threatened species — included in the Red List drawn up by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature — is subject to increased restrictions and, in particular, strict regulation'. Furthermore, it alerts the Commission to the need to assess and make proposals for a ban on wild-caught animals for the pet trade.

We ask the Commission:

1. Does it accept the need for greater restrictions on the import and private ownership of endangered species, such as primates, reptiles and amphibians?
2. What assessments and proposals has it made further to the abovementioned recommendations?

Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission
(18 March 2013)

Within the EU, there are already a number of requirements in place applying to the import and private ownership of endangered species.

In particular, the EU Wildlife Trade Regulations which implement the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) in the EU, provide for the conditions for import and holding of such species. The regulations require import permits. Before import applications are approved, it has to be established that the introduction into the Union would not have a harmful effect on the conservation status of the species. In addition, the regulations provide the possibility for import suspensions if the trade in a species is not considered sustainable. The regulations also include rules governing keeping and movement of live specimens. They are reviewed on a regular basis, taking into consideration new scientific information such as assessments published by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature, to include new provisions under CITES and with a view to better implement the legislation.

In this context, the Commission is evaluating options to prevent and manage the entry into the EU and ownership of exotic invasive species within its framework of a forthcoming legislative proposal.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000744/13

à Comissão

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)

(24 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Investimentos em infraestruturas de apoio à pesca de pequena escala (Setúbal, Portugal)

No concelho de Setúbal, diversas entidades ligadas à pesca têm vindo a chamar a atenção para a importância de alguns investimentos em infraestruturas de apoio à pesca, que poderiam apoiar o desenvolvimento quer da pesca de pequena escala local quer de um conjunto de atividades associadas. Entre outros investimentos, tem sido referida a importância da construção de estaleiros de reparação naval, que atualmente não existem, e da melhoria das condições da lota local, por exemplo ao nível da produção de gelo, de forma a valorizar o pescado e contribuindo para a sua boa conservação.

Em face do exposto, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que fundos da UE podem apoiar a construção de estaleiros de reparação naval de apoio à pesca de pequena escala local e qual o cofinanciamento comunitário previsto?
2. Que fundos da UE podem apoiar a melhoria das condições da lota de Setúbal, nomeadamente investindo em capacidade de produção de gelo própria, e qual o cofinanciamento comunitário previsto?

Resposta dada por Maria Damanaki em nome da Comissão

(12 de abril de 2013)

A Comissão está ciente da importância das atividades relacionadas com a pesca para o desenvolvimento local das zonas de pesca. Neste sentido, o eixo 4 do Fundo Europeu das Pescas (FEP) ⁽¹⁾ visa apoiar a sua diversificação mediante a criação de postos de trabalho e domínios de atividade. Neste contexto, Portugal pode considerar a concessão de apoio à construção de um estaleiro de reparação naval uma atividade artesanal empreendida por pessoas que desejam diversificar o setor da pesca e inovar, se tal for compatível com a estratégia do grupo de ação local nas pescas (FLAG), abrangida pelo eixo 4 do FEP, para a região de Setúbal.

No respeitante às lotas, Portugal poderia ponderar a possibilidade de prestar apoio, nos termos do artigo 39.º do Regulamento FEP, à melhoria das condições nos portos de pesca para o abastecimento em combustível, gelo, alimentação de água e eletricidade.

Enquanto instrumento de gestão partilhada, o FEP é gerido de acordo com as prioridades e as medidas estabelecidas pelos Estados-Membros. Para mais informações, o Senhor Deputado é convidado, por conseguinte, a contactar a autoridade de gestão portuguesa ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Regulamento (CE) n.º 1198/2006 do Conselho, de 27 de julho de 2006 (JO L 223 de 15.8.2006).

⁽²⁾ <http://www.promar.gov.pt/>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000744/13
to the Commission**

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)

(24 January 2013)

Subject: Investment in infrastructure to support small-scale fishing (Setúbal, Portugal)

Several fishing organisations in the municipality of Setúbal have drawn attention to the importance of investing in fishing-support infrastructure, which could promote the development of both local small-scale fishing and a series of associated activities. Among other investments, they have highlighted the importance of building boat-repair yards — of which there are currently none — and improving conditions at the local fish market, for example in terms of ice production, with a view to increasing the value of the fish and contributing to its proper storage.

I ask the Commission:

1. What EU funds could support the construction of boat-repair yards in support of local small-scale fishing, and what Community co-financing provision is there?
2. What EU funds could support improvements to conditions at the Setúbal fish market, namely by investing in its capacity for ice production, and what Community co-financing provision is there?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission

(12 April 2013)

The Commission is aware of the importance of activities related to fisheries in the local development of fisheries areas. In this sense the Axis 4 of the European Fisheries Fund ⁽¹⁾ (EFF) aims to support their diversification by creating jobs and business areas. In this context, Portugal could consider granting aid for the establishment of a boat-repair yard as an artisanal activity initiated by people wishing to diversify the fishing sector and to innovate, if this would be compatible with the strategy of the Fisheries Local Action Group (FLAG) covered by Axis 4 of the EFF for Setubal region.

For the fish markets, Portugal could consider providing support under Article 39 the EFF Regulation for the improvement of conditions in fishing ports to provide fuel, ice, water and electricity.

As a shared management tool, the EFF is spent according to priorities and measures established by the Member States. For further information the Honourable Member is therefore invited to contact the Portuguese managing authority ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Council Regulation (EC) No 1198/2006 of 27 July 2006, OJ L 223, 15.8.2006.

⁽²⁾ <http://www.promar.gov.pt/>

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000745/13

à Comissão

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)

(24 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Pesca de raias em Portugal (II)

Na resposta à pergunta E-000207/2012, a Comissão Europeia afirma que «a principal quota portuguesa de raias (todos os rajiformes) ao abrigo dos TAC (totais admissíveis de capturas) fixados pelo Conselho diz respeito às subzonas CIEM VIII e IX. Para 2012, foi atribuída a Portugal uma quota de 1 298 toneladas, de um TAC de 4 222 toneladas. No entanto, esta quantidade só abrange capturas de espécies de raia que não: Raia-curva (*Raja undulata*); Raia-oirega (*Dipturus batis*); Raia-taigora (*Rostroraja alba*).»

Solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Qual o ponto de situação para 2013 relativamente à quota portuguesa de raias?
2. Mantém-se a interdição da pesca das espécies supracitadas ou de algumas outras espécies de raias?
3. Qual a evolução dos respetivos stocks desde a interdição?

Resposta dada por Maria Damanaki em nome da Comissão

(12 de março de 2013)

As raias são capturadas conjuntamente em pescarias mistas e geridas no âmbito de um total admissível de capturas comum (TAC). Embora algumas espécies sejam relativamente abundantes e permitam um aumento das capturas, outras estão depauperadas e precisam de ser protegidas. Em 2012, o Conselho Internacional de Exploração do Mar (CIEM) elaborou, pela primeira vez, recomendações ⁽¹⁾ sobre a alteração, em percentagem, das capturas de cada uma das principais espécies comerciais. Em relação à maior parte das espécies no golfo da Biscaia e nas águas atlânticas da Península Ibérica, o CIEM preconizou uma diminuição das capturas de 20 %.

Para 2013, do TAC (Total Admissível de Capturas) de 3 800 toneladas, foi atribuída a Portugal uma quota de raias (*Rajiformes*) nas zonas CIEM VIII, IX de 1 168 toneladas ⁽²⁾.

A proibição de pescar raia-curva (*Raja undulata*), raia-oirega (*Dipturus batis*) e raia-taigora (*Raja alba*) permanece em vigor, não tendo sido acrescentadas outras espécies nas referidas zonas CIEM. De acordo com o CIEM, as unidades populacionais das espécies que são objeto de uma proibição de pesca continuam depauperadas. O Comité Científico, Técnico e Económico das Pescas (CCTEP) concorda ⁽³⁾ com o parecer do CIEM.

⁽¹⁾ Parecer do CIEM, 2012, Livro 7.

⁽²⁾ Regulamento (UE) n.º 39/2013, de 21 de janeiro de 2012, que fixa, para 2013, as possibilidades de pesca de determinadas unidades populacionais de peixes e grupos de unidades populacionais de peixes, que não são objeto de negociações ou acordos internacionais, disponíveis para os navios da UE.

⁽³⁾ Análise do parecer científico para 2013, parte 2 (CCTEP-12-08).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000745/13
to the Commission**

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)

(24 January 2013)

Subject: Skate and ray fishing in Portugal (II)

In its reply to Written Question E-000207/2012, the Commission states that 'Portugal holds its main quota for fishing rays (all rajiformes) under the TAC (Total Allowable Catches) set by the Council for ICES Areas VIII and IX. For 2012, Portugal has been allocated a quota of 1 298 tonnes, out of the TAC of 4 222 tonnes. However, this tonnage can only comprise catches of ray species other than the following: Undulate ray (*Raja undulata*); Common skate (*Dipturus batis*); White skate (*Rostroraja alba*).'

Could the Commission please provide the following information:

1. What is the current position for 2013 concerning the Portuguese quota for fishing skates and rays?
2. Does the ban on fishing the abovementioned species and some other species of skates and rays remain in force?
3. How have these species' stocks evolved since the ban?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission

(12 March 2013)

Skates and rays are caught together in mixed fisheries and managed under a common Total allowable catch (TAC). While some species are relatively abundant allowing increased catches, others are depleted and need to be protected. In 2012 for the first time the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) advised ⁽¹⁾ on the percentage change in catch for each of the main commercial species. For most of these species in the Bay of Biscay and Atlantic Iberian waters ICES advised to decrease catches by 20%.

For 2013 Portugal has been allocated a quota for skates and rays (*Rajiformes*) in ICES areas VIII and IX of 1,168 tonnes, out of a TAC (Total Allowable Catches) of 3,800 tonnes ⁽²⁾.

The ban on fishing undulate ray (*Raja undulata*), common skate (*Dipturus batis*) and white skate (*Raja alba*) remains in force and no other species were added in the aforementioned ICES areas. According to ICES the stocks of banned species are still depleted. The Scientific Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) agrees ⁽³⁾ with ICES advice.

⁽¹⁾ ICES Advice 2012, book 7.

⁽²⁾ Council Regulation (EU) No 39/2013 of 21 January 2013 fixing for 2013 the fishing opportunities available to EU vessels for certain fish stocks and groups of fish stocks which are not subject to international negotiations or agreements.

⁽³⁾ Review of Scientific Advice for 2013, Part 2 (STECF-12-08).

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000746/13

à Comissão

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)

(24 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Prejuízos para a pesca resultantes da proliferação de algas (Setúbal, Portugal)

Numa visita recente ao porto de pesca de Setúbal, fui alertado pelos pescadores locais para o problema da proliferação de algas castanhas na região (cujo nome comum entre os pescadores é «pele-de-batata»). As algas têm provocado sérios prejuízos nas artes de pesca e quebras acentuadas no rendimento da pesca de pequena escala, agravando uma situação já de si precária. Não se conhece, até à data, a origem deste fenómeno, mas a sua persistência, desde há vários meses, vem preocupando a comunidade pesqueira local.

Em face do exposto, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que medidas podem ser tomadas, ao nível da UE, para apoiar os pescadores em situações como a descrita?
2. Qual o ponto de situação relativamente ao projeto-piloto para criação de um sistema de seguro público para acontecimentos imprevisíveis no setor das pescas?
3. Poderia, no futuro, este sistema apoiar os pescadores em situações como a descrita?

Resposta dada por Maria Damanaki em nome da Comissão

(2 de abril de 2013)

A Comissão está plenamente consciente do impacto que os acontecimentos imprevisíveis podem ter nas atividades piscatórias e nos rendimentos do setor das pescas. Poderia ser concedido apoio financeiro no quadro do programa operacional elaborado pelas autoridades portuguesas e adotado pela decisão da Comissão para a aplicação do Fundo Europeu das Pescas (FEP) ⁽¹⁾ em Portugal.

O FEP pode contribuir para o financiamento de medidas de auxílio à cessação temporária das atividades de pesca afetadas por planos de ajustamento do esforço de pesca, ou, de acordo com o artigo 24.º, n.º 1, alínea vii), do Regulamento FEP, em caso de encerramentos de pescarias decididos pelos Estados-Membros por motivos de saúde pública ou de outros acontecimentos extraordinários não resultantes de medidas de conservação dos recursos. A Comissão não dispõe de nenhuma informação relativa ao projeto-piloto para a criação de um sistema de seguro público, mas convida o Senhor Deputado a contactar a autoridade portuguesa de gestão ⁽²⁾.

Para o período compreendido entre 2014 e 2020, a proposta da Comissão relativa ao Fundo Europeu dos Assuntos Marítimos e das Pescas (FEAMP) ⁽³⁾ está neste momento a ser discutida no Parlamento Europeu e no Conselho.

⁽¹⁾ Regulamento (CE) n.º 1198/2006 do Conselho.

⁽²⁾ <http://www.promar.gov.pt/>

⁽³⁾ Proposta de regulamento do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativa ao Fundo Europeu dos Assuntos Marítimos e das Pescas (COM(2011) 804).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000746/13
to the Commission**

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)

(24 January 2013)

Subject: Damage to fishing caused by the spread of algae (Setúbal, Portugal)

On a recent visit to the fishing port of Setúbal, local fishermen alerted me to the problem of the spread of brown algae in the region (commonly known among the fishermen as *pele-de-batata* [potato skin]). The algae have caused serious damage to fishing activities and a sharp drop in income from small-scale fishing, thus worsening an already insecure situation. It is not known at present what is behind the phenomenon, but its persistence over recent months is causing concern within the local fishing community.

In view of the above, I ask the Commission:

1. What measures can be taken at EU level to support fishermen in the situation described?
2. What is the current state of the pilot project to create a public insurance policy for unforeseeable events in the fishing industry?
3. In future, might this system be able to support fishermen in the situation described?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission

(2 April 2013)

The Commission is well aware of the impact that unpredictable situations can have on the fisheries activities and on the income of fisheries industry. In this sense, financial support could be granted in the framework of the national operational programme drawn up by Portugal and adopted by Commission decision for the implementation of the European Fisheries Fund ⁽¹⁾ (EFF) in Portugal.

The EFF may contribute to the financing of aid measures for the temporary cessation of fishing activities affected by fishing effort adjustment plans, or according to Article 24(1) vii) of the EFF Regulation in case of closure of the fishery for reasons of public health or other exceptional occurrence which is not the result of resources conservation measures. The Commission does not have any information regarding the pilot project on public insurance but would invite the Honourable Member to contact the Portuguese managing authority ⁽²⁾.

For the period 2014 to 2020, the Commission proposal for the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) ⁽³⁾ is currently under discussion in the European Parliament and the Council.

⁽¹⁾ Council Regulation (EC) No 1198/2006.

⁽²⁾ <http://www.promar.gov.pt/>

⁽³⁾ COM(2011) 804, Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000747/13
a la Comisión**

Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(24 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: Cierre de servicios de salud pública nocturna en Castilla-La Mancha

El Gobierno autonómico regional de Castilla-La Mancha en España ha comenzado el año continuando su política de austeridad que está llevando al desastre a su economía. Esta política, nefasta para el crecimiento, amenaza también gravemente a los servicios de salud pública, puesto que el Gobierno autonómico ha comenzado a disolver servicios en áreas poco pobladas de la región al calificarlos como poco eficientes.

El Gobierno autonómico ha decidido clausurar el servicio de 24 horas en 21 Puntos de Atención Continuada (PAC), afectando a decenas de municipios de Castilla-La Mancha. Esta medida supone exponer a alrededor de unas 100 000 personas de las comarcas menos pobladas a la anulación del servicio de urgencias y los obliga a desplazarse hasta durante 52 minutos en algunos casos para alcanzar un PAC.

En Castilla-La Mancha vivían en 2011, según los datos del Servicio de Estadística de Castilla-La Mancha, 122 080 ciudadanos de otros Estados miembros de la Unión Europea. Estos ciudadanos europeos residentes en dicha comunidad autónoma deben ser tratados por los servicios de salud pública regionales según lo dispuesto en la Directiva sobre asistencia sanitaria transfronteriza (Directiva 2011/24/UE del Parlamento Europeo y el Consejo). Esta Directiva dispone que los ciudadanos de otros Estados miembros deben recibir una asistencia sanitaria «segura y de alta calidad» por parte de los servicios nacionales. Si los ciudadanos de otros Estados miembros que viven en Castilla-La Mancha habitan las zonas donde se han clausurado los servicios nocturnos de los PAC, podría suponer que para recibir atención primaria deban viajar hasta 52 minutos. El tiempo que transcurre entre una urgencia y su atención primaria supone uno de los principales aspectos para garantizar la calidad de la asistencia sanitaria frente a una urgencia. Con la supresión de la atención nocturna en 21 PAC se expone a parte de la población a tiempos de espera hasta la atención de una urgencia, lo que puede implicar la reducción de la calidad de la asistencia sanitaria.

¿Dispone la Comisión de información sobre si existen residentes de otros Estados miembros en Castilla-La Mancha en las comarcas donde se han suprimido los servicios nocturnos de los PAC?

En caso afirmativo, ¿actuará la Comisión para garantizar el cumplimiento de la Directiva 2011/24/UE?

¿Considera posible una atención sanitaria de alta calidad con los tiempos de espera para las urgencias que supondrá la supresión del servicio nocturno de los 21 PAC?

Respuesta del Sr. Borg en nombre de la Comisión

(11 de marzo de 2013)

Las normas que rigen el acceso a la asistencia sanitaria en el Estado miembro en el que reside una persona no son las establecidas en la Directiva 2011/24/UE ⁽¹⁾, sino las establecidas en los Reglamentos relativos a la coordinación de los sistemas de seguridad social [Reglamentos (CE) n° 883/2004 ⁽²⁾, (CE) n° 987/2009 ⁽³⁾ y (CE) n° 1231/2010 ⁽⁴⁾]. Por lo tanto, no se plantea la cuestión del cumplimiento de dicha Directiva.

Cada Estado miembro puede determinar libremente los detalles de su propio régimen de seguridad social, pero en consonancia con el principio de no discriminación establecido en dichos Reglamentos (y en la Directiva 2011/24/UE en lo que respecta a la asistencia sanitaria recibida fuera del Estado miembro de residencia), las personas de un Estado miembro deben ser tratadas de la misma manera que los nacionales del Estado miembro en el que se recibe el tratamiento a condición de que respeten los requisitos de la legislación nacional. No hay ninguna disposición ni en la Directiva ni en los Reglamentos que obligue a los Estados miembros a prestar determinados servicios, o a configurar esos servicios de una determinada manera (con excepción de los servicios sometidos a la legislación de la Unión en materia de normas de seguridad en los ámbitos de los órganos y sustancias de origen humano, sangre y derivados de la sangre).

⁽¹⁾ DO L 88 de 4.4.2011.

⁽²⁾ DO L 166 de 30.4.2004.

⁽³⁾ DO L 284 de 30.10.2009.

⁽⁴⁾ DO L 344 de 29.12.2010.

Asimismo conviene señalar que el artículo 168 del Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea dispone que «la acción de la Unión en el ámbito de la salud pública respetará las responsabilidades de los Estados miembros por lo que respecta a la definición de su política de salud, así como a la organización y prestación de servicios sanitarios y atención médica». Estas responsabilidades incluyen la gestión de los servicios de salud y de atención médica, así como la asignación de los recursos que se destinan a dichos servicios.

Por consiguiente, según la legislación de la UE, corresponde claramente a los Estados miembros decidir qué servicios se prestan, y la forma en que estos servicios están configurados y se suministran.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000747/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(24 January 2013)

Subject: Closure of public health night services in Castilla-La Mancha

The Government of the autonomous region of Castilla-La Mancha, in Spain, has begun the year by continuing with its austerity policy, which is proving disastrous for the local economy. While this policy is detrimental to growth, it also seriously threatens public health services, as the autonomous government has begun to close services in sparsely populated areas of the region, alleging that the former are inefficient.

The autonomous government has decided to close the 24-hour service in 21 Continuous Care Points (PACs), affecting dozens of municipalities in Castilla-La Mancha. Around 100 000 people in the least populated districts are affected by the closure of these emergency services, and are obliged to travel for up to 52 minutes to reach a PAC.

According to data from Castilla-La Mancha's Statistical Service, 122 080 citizens of other European Union Member States were living in Castilla-La Mancha in 2011. The European citizens living in this autonomous community should be treated by the regional public health services under the provisions of the Directive on cross-border healthcare (Directive 2011/24/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council). This Directive states that national services must provide 'safe and high-quality' healthcare to citizens of other Member States. Any citizens of other Member States living in areas of Castilla-La Mancha where PAC night services have been closed may need to travel up to 52 minutes to receive initial care. The time lapsed between an emergency arising and initial treatment is one of the main factors involved in ensuring good quality healthcare in response to an emergency. The closure of night care in 21 PACs increases the waiting times for emergency care for part of the population and this may involve lowering the quality of healthcare.

Does the Commission have information on whether citizens of other Member States are resident in districts of Castilla-La Mancha where PAC night services have been closed?

If this is the case, will the Commission act to guarantee compliance with Directive 2011/24/EU?

Does it consider high quality healthcare to be possible given the waiting times for emergency care that result from closure of night service in the 21 PACs?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(11 March 2013)

The rules governing access to healthcare in the Member State in which a person resides are not those set out in Directive 2011/24/EU ⁽¹⁾, but rather those set out in the regulations on the coordination of social security systems (Regulations (EC) No 883/2004 ⁽²⁾, 987/2009 ⁽³⁾, and 1231/2010 ⁽⁴⁾). Therefore the question of compliance with that directive does not arise.

Each Member State remains free to determine the details of its own social security system, but in line with the principle of non-discrimination set out in those Regulations (and of Directive 2011/24/EU with regard to healthcare received outside the Member State of residence), persons from one Member State should be treated on the same basis as the nationals of the Member State in which the treatment is received as long as they meet the requirements of the national law. There is no provision in either the directive or the regulations which obliges Member States to provide certain services, or to configure those services in a given way (with the exception of services subject to Union legislation on safety standards in the areas of organs and substances of human origin, blood and blood derivatives).

It should also be noted that Article 168 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union states that 'Union action shall respect the responsibilities of the Member States for the definition of their health policy and for the organisation and delivery of health services and medical care'. These responsibilities 'shall include the management of health services and medical care and the allocation of the resources assigned to them'.

Within EC law, it is therefore clearly for Member States to decide which services they provide, and how those services are configured and delivered.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 88, 4.4.2011.

⁽²⁾ OJ L 166, 30.4.2004.

⁽³⁾ OJ L 284, 30.10.2009.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ L 344, 29.12.2010.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000748/13

an die Kommission

Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)

(24. Januar 2013)

Betrifft: Die Haltung der EU-Kommission gegenüber der Wasserprivatisierung

Wasser wird zum Wirtschafts- und Spekulationsgut, wie die Medien berichten. Die Interviews mit betroffenen Bürgerinnen und Bürgern, die von Preissteigerungen beim Kauf von Trinkwasser um die 400 % in wenigen Jahren berichten, lassen die Öffentlichkeit — verständlicherweise — skeptisch werden angesichts der Vorgehensweise bzw. der passiven Haltung der EU.

1. Wie schätzt die Kommission die Folgen für die Bewohner und Bewohnerinnen betroffener Länder und Regionen ein?
2. Wie bewertet die Kommission die Tatsache, dass das Ansehen der Kommission und der Union bei den Bürgerinnen und Bürgern sinkt und die Bürgerinnen und Bürger ihr Vertrauen verlieren, da sie von der Kommission und der Union erwarten, dass sie zumindest versuchen, den Zugang zu grundlegenden Ressourcen, wie zum Beispiel frischem Trinkwasser, für alle EU-Bürgerinnen und -Bürger zu gewährleisten?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000749/13

an die Kommission

Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)

(24. Januar 2013)

Betrifft: Krisenländer sollen ihre Wasserreserven und -wirtschaft privatisieren

In ihrer Antwort vom 24. Mai 2012 auf die Anfrage vom 3. April 2012 zum Thema „Wasserwirtschaft und Privatisierung von Wasser“ (E-003561/2012) schreibt die Kommission: „Gemäß Artikel 345 des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union (AEUV) lassen die Verträge die Eigentumsordnung in den verschiedenen Mitgliedstaaten unberührt. Die Entscheidung darüber, ob die Wasserversorgung privatisiert werden sollte oder nicht, liegt daher bei den Mitgliedstaaten, und die Kommission hat sich zu dieser Frage nicht geäußert.“

1. Wie beurteilt die Kommission die Tatsache, dass in Medienberichten sowie in verschiedenen Social-Media-Seiten seit Mitte Dezember 2012 mehr und mehr der Eindruck entsteht, die Europäische Union zwingt die Krisenstaaten Europas dazu, ihre Wasserreserven zu privatisieren?
2. Inwieweit trifft dieser Vorwurf der Öffentlichkeit zu, dass die Troika angeblich die Regierungen speziell dazu drängt, Wasserwerke und öffentliche Wasserreserven zu verkaufen, um den Haushalt zu konsolidieren?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Barnier im Namen der Kommission

(25. März 2013)

Die Kommission möchte der Frau Abgeordneten mitteilen, dass sie keine politischen Maßnahmen zur direkten oder indirekten Privatisierung der Wasserversorgung oder anderer Dienstleistungen in den Mitgliedstaaten setzt.

Die Kommission hat Kenntnis von einigen Berichten in deutschen und österreichischen Medien, in denen fälschlicherweise behauptet wird, dass die Kommission eine Privatisierung der Wasserversorgung anstrebe. Es handelt sich dabei um ein fehlerhaftes Verständnis des Legislativvorschlags zur Vergabe von Konzessionsverträgen. Die Kommission weist diese Behauptungen zurück und stellt klar, dass sie Wasser als öffentliches Gut ansieht, das für Bürger lebensnotwendig ist, und dass die Bewirtschaftung der Wasserressourcen in die Zuständigkeit der Mitgliedstaaten fällt. Die Kommission hat sichergestellt, dass ihr Vorschlag für eine Richtlinie über die Konzessionsvergabe die Autonomie der kommunalen Unternehmen hinsichtlich der Erbringung und Organisation der Dienstleistungen von allgemeinem wirtschaftlichem Interesse (einschließlich der Wasserversorgung) vollständig respektiert und fördert.

Die Kommission vertritt in Einklang mit Artikel 345 AEUV eine neutrale Position hinsichtlich der Frage, ob Wasserversorgungsunternehmen in privatem oder öffentlichem Besitz sind. EU-weit sind viele verschiedene Modelle vorhanden und es steht den nationalen Behörden frei, zu entscheiden, ob sie Dienstleistungen direkt oder über einen Dritten, insbesondere über einen privaten Wirtschaftsteilnehmer, anbieten möchten.

Der Wasserpreis in den Mitgliedstaaten wird nicht durch EU-Recht festgesetzt. Die EU-Wasserrahmenrichtlinie verpflichtet die Mitgliedstaaten lediglich zur Umsetzung einer Wasserpreispolitik, die ausreichende Anreize für eine effiziente Wassernutzung schafft. Den Mitgliedstaaten steht es frei, soziale, ökologische und wirtschaftliche Folgen sowie geographische und klimatische Bedingungen der betroffenen Region bzw. Regionen zu berücksichtigen.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000748/13
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(24 January 2013)**

Subject: The Commission's position on water privatisation

According to media reports, water is becoming a commodity which is subject to speculation. Interviews with citizens who report increases of around 400 % in the price of drinking water over a few years mean that that public is becoming understandably sceptical of the EU's course of action, or rather its lack of action.

1. What does the Commission believe the consequences will be for those living in the countries and regions affected?
2. What is the Commission's view of the fact that the reputation of the Commission and the EU is being damaged in the eyes of the citizens, and that these citizens are losing their confidence in the Commission and the EU, since they expect them to at least attempt to ensure access for all EU citizens to basic resources such as fresh drinking water?

**Question for written answer E-000749/13
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(24 January 2013)**

Subject: Crisis countries should privatise their water supplies and water industries

In its answer on 24 May 2012 to the question on 3 April 2012 on 'Water industry and the privatisation of water' (E-003561/2012), the Commission states that: 'Article 345 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) establishes that the Treaties shall in no way prejudice the rules in Member States governing the system of property ownership. Therefore, it is for Member States to decide whether water supply should be privatised or not, and the Commission has expressed no view on this matter.'

1. What view does the Commission take of the argument, heard increasingly often in media reports and on various social media sites since mid-December 2012, that the European Union is forcing the European crisis countries to privatise their water supplies?
2. To what extent is the public right to accuse the Troika of placing particular pressure on governments to sell waterworks and public water supplies in order to consolidate their budgets?

**Joint answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2013)**

The Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that it does not pursue any policy on the direct or indirect privatisation of water services or of any other services in Member States.

The Commission is aware of several reports in German and Austria media, wrongly alleging that the Commission intends to privatise the distribution of water, following an erroneous reading of the legislative proposal on the award of concession contracts. The Commission rejects such allegations and makes it clear that it recognises that water is a public good which is vital to citizens and that the management of water resources is a competence of Member States. The Commission made sure that its proposal for a directive on the award of concession contracts fully recognises and supports the autonomy of local authorities regarding the provision and organisation of services of general economic interest, including water.

The Commission position is neutral concerning the choice of a regime of public or private property of water utilities, in accordance with Article 345 of the TFEU, and EU-wide experience offers a variety of different models. National authorities, remain free to choose whether they provide the services directly or via a third party, notably a private economic operator.

The price of water in the Member States is not fixed under EC law. The EU Water Framework Directive only requires Member States to implement water pricing policies that provide an adequate incentive to an efficient water use. Member States are free to take into consideration social, environmental and economic effects as well as geographic and climatic conditions of the region or regions affected.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000750/13

an die Kommission

Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)

(24. Januar 2013)

Betrifft: Jüdischer Friedhof in Margo im türkisch besetzten Teil Zyperns

Der jüdische Friedhof in Margo liegt im türkisch besetzten Teil Zyperns; es handelt sich allerdings auch um ein militärisches Sperrgebiet, und der Zugang ist der Öffentlichkeit seit 1992 verwehrt.

Neuere Fotos des Friedhofs zeugen davon, dass dieser Teil des Kulturerbes der Insel immer mehr verfällt.

Kann die Kommission eine ausführliche Antwort auf folgende Fragen erteilen:

1. Hat die Kommission Kenntnis vom dem gegenwärtigen Zustand dieses Friedhofs?
2. Was gedenkt die Kommission (gegebenenfalls) zu unternehmen, um diesen Bestandteil des kulturellen Erbes wiederherzustellen, vor allem um den jüdischen Menschen, die dort begraben liegen, ein ehrendes Gedenken zu bewahren?
3. Beabsichtigt die Kommission, zur Restaurierung des Friedhofs mit Mitteln beizutragen, die dem Technischen Ausschuss für das kulturelle Erbe, in dem beide Volksgruppen vertreten sind, gewährt wurden? Wenn ja, welcher Betrag ist genau vorgesehen?
4. Wird die Kommission gegenüber der Türkei die Frage zur Sprache bringen, ob es erforderlich ist, ihre Streitkräfte aus diesem Bereich abzuziehen, damit jüdische Menschen den Friedhof im Einklang mit den grundlegenden Menschenrechten der Bewegungsfreiheit und der Freiheit der Religionsausübung wieder betreten können?

Antwort von Herrn Füle im Namen der Kommission

(21. März 2013)

Der Kommission ist der Zustand des Jüdischen Friedhofs in Margo, auf den die Frau Abgeordnete hinweist, nicht bekannt.

Nach Auffassung der Kommission tragen die Bemühungen beider Gemeinschaften zum Schutz des reichen Kulturerbes der Insel dazu bei, Vertrauen und Aussöhnung in Zypern zu fördern. Grundlage für die Bereitstellung der EU-Mittel, mit denen die Maßnahmen des unter der Schirmherrschaft der Vereinten Nationen tätigen Gemeinsamen Technischen Ausschusses für das kulturelle Erbe finanziert werden, ist eine Liste von elf bedeutenden religiösen und nicht-religiösen Kulturstätten, die von dem Ausschuss ausgewählt wurden. Der Jüdische Friedhof in Margo steht nicht auf der Liste.

Die von der Frau Abgeordneten angesprochene Thematik zeigt erneut, dass rasch eine umfassende Lösung der Zypern-Frage gefunden werden muss. In ihrer im Oktober 2012 veröffentlichten Mitteilung „Erweiterungsstrategie und wichtigste Herausforderungen für den Zeitraum 2012-2013“⁽¹⁾ hat die Kommission hervorgehoben, dass die Verhandlungen wiederaufgenommen werden müssen, um sie zu einem raschen Abschluss zu bringen und die Türkei zu ermutigen, sich stärker an den Gesprächen zu beteiligen und sich konkret für diese zu engagieren.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_de.htm

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000750/13
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(24 January 2013)**

Subject: Margo Jewish Cemetery in the Turkish occupied part of Cyprus

The Margo Jewish Cemetery is in the Turkish-occupied part of Cyprus but is also in a military zone, meaning that access to it is barred and has been since 1992.

Recent pictures of the cemetery show the worsening condition of this piece of the island's cultural heritage.

1. Is the Commission aware of the current status of this cemetery?
2. What does the Commission intend to do, if anything, to restore this piece of cultural heritage, with particular regard to respect for the memory of the Jewish people who are buried there?
3. Does the Commission have plans to contribute to the restoration of the cemetery through the funds allocated to the Bi-Communal Technical Committee on Cultural Heritage? If so, what will be the exact sum foreseen?
4. Will the Commission raise with Turkey the question of the need to withdraw its army from the area so that the cemetery is accessible to Jewish people, in accordance with respect for the fundamental human rights of the freedom of movement and religion? Please be specific in your response.

**Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(21 March 2013)**

The Commission is not aware of the current condition of the Margo Jewish Cemetery the Honourable Member refers to.

The European Commission considers that efforts by both communities to protect the island's rich cultural heritage contribute to trust and reconciliation in Cyprus. The EU funds allocated for the activities of the bi-Communal Technical Committee on Cultural Heritage operating under UN auspices are based on a list of 11 priority religious and non-religious monuments agreed by the Committee. The Margo Jewish Cemetery is not part of that list.

The issue raised by the Honourable Member once again underlines the need to reach a rapid comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem. In its October 2012 Communication ⁽¹⁾ on the Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2012-2013, the Commission underlined the necessity to re-launch the negotiations with the aim of reaching a swift conclusion of the talks and encouraged Turkey to increase in concrete terms its commitment and contribution to the talks.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000752/13
to the Commission
Nessa Childers (S&D)
(24 January 2013)**

Subject: Transparency register

According to the terms of the interinstitutional agreement of June 2011 on the establishment of a Commission/Parliament Joint Transparency Register, the register shall be subject to a review no later than two years following its entry into operation.

1. Can the Commission clarify when this review is scheduled to take place and what the process will be?
2. Will the Commission commit itself to fully involve and consult Parliament and its committees in this regard?
3. How does the Commission intend to ensure that Parliament's opinions and suggestions for improvement can fully be expressed and taken into account in the forthcoming review of the current system, in particular as regards the recommendations made in the resolution presented by Parliament in May 2011 for a mandatory register requiring detailed financial disclosure, including the names of lobbyists ⁽¹⁾?
4. What will the Commission do, in accordance with the wishes of Parliament as expressed in its May 2011 resolution, to overcome the obstacles identified in the past to making registration mandatory?
5. Reports by NGOs have documented serious shortcomings in the current register, noting that a large number of companies and lobby groups remain unregistered and that the financial information provided in the register is imprecise and unreliable. This points to the need for major changes in line with Parliament's May 2011 resolution, which calls for a mandatory register with more detailed financial disclosure requirements. Can the Commission confirm that such changes will require amendments to the interinstitutional agreement between the Commission and Parliament? Will the Commission, in the context of the review, initiate a discussion with Parliament and its committees on the changes needed to be made in the interinstitutional agreement?

**Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(14 March 2013)**

1. The joint EP-COM secretariat of the register made a public consultation in 2012 and subsequently published the first annual report on the operations of the register. Targeted stakeholder dialogue meetings with umbrella European wide organisations took place to discuss the report and to prepare a stakeholder meeting with the two Vice-Presidents in charge of transparency in the Parliament and the Commission.
 2. The review exercise is a joint exercise between the Parliament and the Commission.
 3. It is not for the Commission to determine how Parliament will organise the review process.
- 4 and 5. Any answer to questions 4 and 5 would prejudice the analysis and the reflection to be developed as part of the review process and therefore cannot be answered at this stage.

⁽¹⁾ European Parliament resolution of 8 May 2008 on the development of the framework for the activities of interest representatives (lobbyists) in the European institutions (2007/2115(INI)), OJ C 271 E, 12.11.2009, p. 48.

(Slovenska različica)

Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-000753/13
za Komisijo
Mojca Kleva Kekuš (S&D)
(24. januar 2013)

Zadeva: Povečanje števila splavov fetusov ženskega spola v Evropi

V začetku leta 2013 so mediji poročali o tem, da se v Evropi splavi več ženskih fetusov, kakor se je doslej domnevalo, ta težava pa je najbolj očitna v balkanskih državah.

Študija, ki jo je nedavno opravil Sklad Združenih narodov za prebivalstvo, ugotavlja, da se taka selekcija na podlagi spola opravlja v Albaniji, na Kosovu in v Črni gori. To se dogaja zlasti zaradi tradicionalne delitve vlog po spolu, kjer še vedno obstaja predstava, da so moški v privilegiranem položaju. Torej so ženske diskriminirane še pred rojstvom.

Glede na to, da so Albanija, Črna gora in Kosovo države kandidatke in morebitne države kandidatke za pristop k Evropski uniji, je to vprašanje, ki zadeva EU.

1. Ali je Komisija seznanjena s to težavo?
2. Bo to vprašanje vplivalo na pristopna pogajanja?

Odgovor g. Füleja v imenu Komisije
(20. marec 2013)

Komisija je v boju proti vsem oblikam nasilja nad ženskami zavezana k močnemu političnemu odzivu, kot je zapisano v Stockholmskem programu in Strategiji za enakost žensk in moških (2010–2015) ⁽¹⁾.

Komisija je seznanjena z nedavnim poročilom UNFPA z naslovom „Neravnovesje med spoloma pri rojstvu: trenutni trendi, posledice in vpliv na politike“ ter s problemom domnevno po spolu selektivnih splavov v nekaterih državah širitve.

Medtem ko EU na področju kazenskega prava v zvezi s splavom nima pristojnosti, so popolno spoštovanje človekovih pravic, pravic žensk in enakost spolov osnova pristopnega procesa kot del pristopnih pogajanj in strukturnega dialoga z državami ter tudi v smislu finančne in tehnične pomoči državam širitve.

Komisija si bo tudi z dviganjem ozaveščenosti še naprej prizadevala za dosledno spoštovanje temeljnih pravic, predvsem pa pravic žensk in za enakost spolov.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2010) 491 final.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000753/13
to the Commission**

Mojca Kleva Kekuš (S&D)

(24 January 2013)

Subject: Rise in abortion of female foetuses in Europe

At the beginning of 2013, it was reported in the media that more female foetuses were being aborted in Europe than previously thought, with the problem being particularly apparent in the Balkan countries.

A recent study by the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) found that this form of gender selection was occurring in Albania, Kosovo and Montenegro. This is largely due to traditional gender roles, where men are still considered to be in a privileged position. Women are therefore discriminated against even before birth.

As Albania, Montenegro and Kosovo are candidate countries and potential candidate countries to join the European Union, this is an issue which also affects the EU.

1. Is the Commission aware of this problem?
2. Will this issue have any influence on the accession negotiations?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission

(20 March 2013)

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⁾.

The Commission is aware of the recent UNFPA report entitled 'Sex imbalances at birth : current trends, consequences and policy implications' and the fact that there is reportedly a problem of sex-selective abortions in some of the enlargement countries.

While the EU has no competence in the area of criminal law relating to the issue of abortion, the full respect of human rights, women's rights and gender equality is at the heart of the accession process, both as part of the structural dialogues with the countries and the accession negotiations, as well as in terms of financial and technical assistance provided to the enlargement countries.

The Commission is committed to pursuing its efforts, including through awareness-raising campaigns, to ensure the full respect of fundamental rights in general and women's rights and gender equality in particular.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2010) 491 final.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000754/13

aan de Commissie

Saïd El Khadraoui (S&D)

(24 januari 2013)

Betreft: Problemen met de FYRA op de Belgische en Nederlandse spoorwegen

Sinds 9 december 2012 rijdt de nieuwe hogesnelheidstrein FYRA tussen Amsterdam en Brussel. Het project kwam tot stand door een samenwerking tussen de Belgische spoorwegoperator NMBS en de Nederlandse spoorwegen NS. De treinen die de voorbije weken tussen de twee bestemmingen spoorden waren eigendom van NS. Maar de NMBS heeft ook treinstellen besteld bij dezelfde fabrikant, het Italiaanse bedrijf AnsaldoBreda. Vanaf de start bleek de FYRA geconfronteerd te worden met zeer veel operationele problemen, wat leidde tot veel vertragingen, uitgevallen treinen en ontevreden reizigers. Op de koop toe blijkt er ook een probleem met de veiligheid te zijn. De Belgische veiligheidsinstantie DVIS heeft de FYRA verboden nog in België te rijden nadat er stukken van het onderstel van de trein loskwamen tijdens het rijden, mogelijk door het koude weer. Momenteel rijdt de FYRA niet meer en wordt gezocht naar een alternatieve oplossing voor de reizigers.

Deze gebeurtenissen roepen vragen op over de kwaliteit van de constructeur, de certificering van deze treinen en de bevoegdheden op Europees niveau op dit terrein.

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van de problemen die de hogesnelheidstrein FYRA heeft gekend de voorbije weken in België en Nederland? Is de Commissie op de hoogte van gelijkaardige situaties met dezelfde of andere fabrikanten in de EU?
2. Is de Commissie van mening dat de certificering van het rollend materieel correct gebeurd is door de bevoegde Belgische en Nederlandse instanties? Indien ja, wat is er dan wel fout gegaan?
3. Heeft de Commissie een toezichthoudende rol in deze certificering, zeker met betrekking tot het veiligheidsaspect?

Antwoord van de heer Kallas namens de Commissie

(13 maart 2013)

1. Ja. De Commissie is op de hoogte van dit probleem, waarover de jongste weken uitvoerig is bericht in de pers. In de media werd ook verwezen naar vergelijkbare problemen in andere landen. De Commissie is via de officiële kanalen echter niet in kennis gesteld van die problemen.
2. De Commissie beschikt niet over de nodige informatie om te kunnen beoordelen of de vergunningsprocedure correct is toegepast. Bij die procedure zijn, naast de nationale veiligheidsinstanties, ook de spoorwegondernemingen, de infrastructuurbeheerders (voor eventuele testen op het net), de fabrikanten en de conformiteitsbeoordelingsinstanties betrokken.
3. Het proces voor de goedkeuring van spoorvoertuigen wordt op EU-niveau geregeld door Richtlijn 2008/57/EG inzake de interoperabiliteit van het spoorwegsysteem in de Gemeenschap. In die richtlijn wordt in de vergunningsprocedure geen toezichthoudende rol toegekend aan de Commissie of het Europees Spoorwegbureau. De Commissie heeft in het kader van het vierde spoorwegpakket⁽¹⁾ echter voorgesteld om de rol van het Europees Spoorwegbureau in de vergunningsprocedure te versterken.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/kallas/headlines/news/2013/01/fourth-railway-package_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000754/13
to the Commission
Saïd El Khadraoui (S&D)
(24 January 2013)

Subject: Problems with the Fyra service on the Belgian and Dutch railways

The new high speed train service Fyra has been running between Amsterdam and Brussels since December 9, 2012. The project was the result of a collaboration between the Belgian railway operator NMBS and the Dutch Railway Company NS. The trains being used in recent weeks between the two destinations are owned by NS. However, the NMBS has also ordered trains from the same manufacturer, the Italian company AnsaldoBreda. Right from the start, Fyra has encountered many operational problems which led to many delays, cancelled trains and disgruntled travellers. On top of that, there also appear to be safety-related issues. The Belgian security regulator, DVIS, has banned Fyra from operating in Belgium after parts of the undercarriage fell off the train while it was in motion, possibly due to the cold weather. Fyra is therefore not currently operating and an alternative solution is being sought for travellers.

These events have raised questions about the quality of the manufacturer, the certification of these trains and the responsibilities at a European level in this field.

1. Is the Commission aware of the problems that the high speed Fyra train service has faced in recent weeks in Belgium and the Netherlands? Is the Commission aware of similar situations with the same or other manufacturers in the EU?
2. Is the Commission of the opinion that the certification of rolling stock was done correctly by the relevant Belgian and Dutch authorities? If yes, what went wrong?
3. Does the Commission play a supervisory role in this certification process, especially when it comes to the safety aspect?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(13 March 2013)

1. Yes. The Commission is aware of this problem as it was extensively reported by the press in the last weeks. The press also mentioned similar problems in other countries. However, these problems were not notified to the Commission through the official channels.
2. The Commission does not have the elements to judge about the correctness of the authorisation process, which by the way involves not only the national safety authorities, but also the railway undertaking, the infrastructure manager (for on-site testing, if needed), the manufacturer and the conformity assessment bodies.
3. The authorisation process of railway vehicles is regulated at EU level by Directive 2008/57/EC on the interoperability of the rail system in the Community. Such Directive does not give to the Commission or the European Railway Agency any supervisory role in the authorisation process. However, a reinforced role of the European Railway Agency in the authorisation process has been proposed by the Commission in the context of the 4th railway package ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/kallas/headlines/news/2013/01/fourth-railway-package_en.htm

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000755/13
a la Comisión**

Giommaria Uggias (ALDE), Andrea Zaroni (ALDE), Lara Comi (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE), Pino Arlacchi (S&D), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE) y Marian Harkin (ALDE)

(25 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: Propuesta de acuerdo de cooperación internacional con los países del hemisferio sur para el intercambio de dispositivos de lucha contra incendios

En los últimos días, se ha registrado en Australia una ola de incendios forestales que ha afectado principalmente a la zona más poblada del país, a saber, los estados de Nueva Gales del Sur y de Victoria, así como al estado de Tasmania. Debido a las elevadas temperaturas, que han batido récords, y a los fuertes vientos, las llamas han calcinado más de 350 000 hectáreas de bosques, cultivos y pastos, y amenazan la seguridad de la población civil.

El fenómeno de los incendios forestales también afecta muy de cerca a Europa y, en particular, a la región del Mediterráneo, en la que, según los datos del EFFIS (Sistema europeo de información sobre incendios forestales), se han registrado en los últimos 30 años 1 494 219 incendios que han calcinado un total de casi 15 millones de hectáreas de tierra. La dimensión transfronteriza de los incendios forestales ha llevado a las autoridades de los Estados miembros a poner en marcha una serie de acciones coordinadas y multilaterales en el marco del Mecanismo Comunitario de Protección Civil, que es un instrumento de la Unión Europea diseñado para atender las emergencias que se producen tanto dentro como fuera de la Unión Europea además de los 27 Estados miembros, forman parte del Mecanismo otros países como Noruega, Islandia, Liechtenstein, Croacia y Macedonia mediante la puesta en común de los recursos de todos los Estados miembros.

La proliferación de incendios forestales se concentra en los meses de verano y la llegada de la estación estival en el hemisferio sur coincide con el comienzo del invierno en el hemisferio norte y viceversa.

Los Estados miembros de la UE disponen de una importante flota aérea, en concreto Canadair, que apenas se utiliza durante el invierno.

Estos aviones de lucha contra incendios, de acuerdo con los especialistas del sector, podrían viajar de un hemisferio a otro en cuestión de unos pocos días

Habida cuenta de lo que antecede.

1. ¿Podría indicar la Comisión si estima oportuno promover un acuerdo de cooperación internacional con los países del hemisferio sur afectados por el fenómeno de los incendios forestales que prevea un suministro mutuo de dispositivos de lucha contra incendios, como, por ejemplo, los aviones Canadair, así como el intercambio de personal cualificado y especializado en el ámbito de la extinción de incendios?
2. ¿Podría considerarse dicho acuerdo de cooperación mutua como una ampliación extraterritorial del Mecanismo Comunitario de Protección Civil, de modo que pueda beneficiarse de los procedimientos de coordinación adoptados sobre la base de dicho instrumento?

Respuesta de la Sra. Georgieva en nombre de la Comisión

(7 de marzo de 2013)

El 1 de septiembre de 2008, la Comisión Europea y el Departamento de Gestión de Emergencias de la Fiscalía General de la Commonwealth de Australia suscribieron un acuerdo administrativo de cooperación en el ámbito de la protección civil. El acuerdo queda limitado al intercambio de información y buenas prácticas y no abarca la cooperación operativa en la gestión de catástrofes.

La UE está negociando asimismo con Australia un acuerdo marco a través del cual ambas partes tienen previsto impulsar la gestión de catástrofes y cooperar como proceda a fin de incrementar la resiliencia de la sociedad y de las infraestructuras.

La cuestión de la puesta en común de recursos aéreos por parte de Europa y del Hemisferio Sur aprovechando la alternancia de sus respectivas estaciones estivales ya había sido explorada parcialmente en un estudio ⁽¹⁾ realizado en 2011, en el que se señalaron algunos problemas de orden práctico (relacionados, en particular, con las diferencias existentes entre los tipos de avión utilizados, los tipos de incendio a combatir y los tipos de paisaje) y se identificó una serie de medidas previas que era preciso adoptar (por ejemplo, la inversión previa en formación común para los pilotos, el intercambio de conocimientos tácticos en materia de técnicas de supresión, etc). La Comisión seguirá estudiando estas cuestiones en el marco de la aplicación de la nueva legislación sobre protección civil.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/echo/civil_protection/civil/prote/pdffdocs/future/Wildfire_Final_Report.pdf

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000755/13
alla Commissione**

Giommaria Uggias (ALDE), Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Lara Comi (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE), Pino Arlacchi (S&D), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE) e Marian Harkin (ALDE)

(25 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Proposta di accordo di cooperazione internazionale con i Paesi dell'emisfero australe per lo scambio di mezzi antincendio

Nei giorni scorsi l'Australia è stata attraversata da un'ondata di incendi boschivi che hanno interessato prevalentemente la parte più popolosa del Paese, cioè gli Stati del New South Wales e Victoria, oltre che la Tasmania. Alimentati dalle temperature record e dai forti venti, i roghi hanno incenerito oltre 350.000 ettari di foreste, colture e pascoli, minacciando l'incolumità della popolazione civile.

Il fenomeno degli incendi boschivi interessa da vicino anche l'Europa, in particolare l'area mediterranea, dove secondo i dati EFFIS (Sistema di informazione europeo per gli incendi boschivi) i roghi negli ultimi 30 anni sono stati 1.494.219, per un totale di quasi 15 milioni di ettari di terra andati in fumo. La dimensione transfrontaliera degli incendi boschivi ha indotto le autorità degli Stati membri a porre in essere interventi coordinati e multilaterali nell'ambito del Meccanismo europeo di protezione civile, strumento dell'Unione europea predisposto per rispondere alle emergenze che si verificano in territorio europeo e extraeuropeo (oltre ai 27 Stati membri, ne fanno parte anche Norvegia, Islanda, Liechtenstein, Croazia e Macedonia), attraverso la condivisione delle risorse di tutti gli Stati membri.

Considerato che il proliferare di incendi boschivi si concentra nei mesi estivi e che l'avvento della stagione estiva nell'emisfero australe coincide con l'inizio dell'inverno nell'emisfero boreale e viceversa; che gli Stati membri dell'UE dispongono di una consistente flotta aerea, soprattutto Canadair, che durante l'inverno rimane pressoché inutilizzata e che tali velivoli antincendio, secondo gli addetti ai lavori, sarebbero in grado di viaggiare da un emisfero ad un altro nel giro di pochi giorni;

può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se ritiene utile promuovere un accordo di cooperazione internazionale con i Paesi dell'emisfero australe interessati dal fenomeno degli incendi boschivi che preveda la fornitura reciproca di mezzi antincendio quali i Canadair, nonché lo scambio di personale qualificato e di competenze specializzate nel campo dello spegnimento degli incendi;
2. se tale accordo di mutua cooperazione possa configurarsi come un'estensione extraterritoriale del Meccanismo europeo di protezione civile, così da poter beneficiare delle procedure di coordinamento adottate sulla base di tale strumento?

Risposta di Kristalina Georgieva a nome della Commissione

(7 marzo 2013)

Il 1° settembre 2008 la Commissione e il Dipartimento dell'Attorney General per la gestione delle emergenze del Commonwealth dell'Australia hanno firmato un accordo amministrativo in materia di cooperazione nel settore della protezione civile. L'accordo è limitato allo scambio di informazioni e di migliori prassi e non riguarda la cooperazione operativa nella gestione delle catastrofi.

L'UE sta inoltre negoziando con l'Australia un accordo quadro in cui entrambe le parti dovrebbero impegnarsi nel rafforzamento della gestione delle catastrofi e, ove opportuno, nella cooperazione volta a migliorare le capacità di resilienza da parte della società e delle infrastrutture.

La questione dello scambio dei mezzi aerei tra l'Europa e l'emisfero meridionale durante le rispettive stagioni estive è stata parzialmente esaminata in un studio ⁽¹⁾ del 2011. In questo studio sono stati individuati una serie di problemi pratici (in particolare in relazione ai diversi tipi di velivoli utilizzati e ai diversi tipi di incendio e di territori interessati) e di eventuali misure che andrebbero adottate (ad esempio investimenti preliminari nella formazione comune dei piloti, scambio di conoscenze tecniche per le tattiche di spegnimento, ecc.). La Commissione continuerà a esaminare tali questioni nell'ambito dell'attuazione della nuova legislazione in materia di protezione civile.

(1) http://ec.europa.eu/echo/civil_protection/civil/prote/pdffdocs/future/Wildfire_Final_Report.pdf

(Slovenska različica)

**Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-000755/13
za Komisijo**

Giommaria Uggias (ALDE), Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Lara Comi (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE), Pino Arlacchi (S&D), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE) in Marian Harkin (ALDE)

(25. januar 2013)

Zadeva: Predlog mednarodnega sporazuma o sodelovanju z državami južne poloble za izmenjavo protipožarnih sredstev

V minulih dneh je Avstralijo zajel val gozdnih požarov, zlasti najbolj naseljeni zvezni državi Novi Južni Wales in Viktorijo ter Tasmanijo. Ognjeni zublji so zaradi visokih temperatur in močnega vetra uničili več kot 350 000 hektarov gozdov, obdelanih površin in pašnikov ter ogrožali civilno prebivalstvo.

Gozdni požari so pojav, ki ga dobro pozna tudi Evropa, zlasti sredozemska območja, kjer je bilo po podatkih Evropskega informacijskega sistema za gozdne požare (EFFIS) v zadnjih 30 letih zabeleženih 1 494 219 požarov, v katerih je bilo uničenih skoraj 15 milijonov hektarov površin. Čezmejna razsežnost gozdnih požarov je spodbudila oblasti držav članic, da so s skupno uporabo sredstev vseh držav članic začele izvajati usklajene in večstranske ukrepe v okviru evropskega mehanizma za civilno zaščito, instrumenta Evropske unije za odziv na izredne okoliščine, do katerih pride na evropskem ozemlju ali zunaj njega (poleg 27 držav članic sodelujejo tudi Norveška, Islandija, Lihtenštajn, Hrvaška in Makedonija).

Ker so gozdni požari pogostejši v poletnih mesecih in ker poletje na južni polobli sovпада z zimo na severni polobli in obratno, ker imajo države članice EU dokaj veliko floto, zlasti kanaderje, ki so v zimskem času skoraj neuporabljeni, in ker bi lahko glede na mnenje strokovnjakov ta protipožarna letala pripotovala z ene poloble na drugo v nekaj dneh,

ali Komisija lahko navede:

1. ali meni, da bi bilo treba spodbuditi dejavnosti za sklenitev mednarodnega sporazuma o sodelovanju z državami južne poloble, ki jih prizadenejo gozdni požari, ki bi predvideval vzajemno dobavo protipožarnih sredstev, kot so kanaderji, ter izmenjavo kvalificiranega osebja, posebej usposobljenega za gašenje požarov;
2. ali bi se sporazum vzajemnega sodelovanja lahko oblikoval v sklopu zunajozemeljske razsežnosti evropskega mehanizma za civilno zaščito, da bi lahko izkoristil postopke usklajevanja, sprejete na podlagi tega instrumenta?

Odgovor Kristaline Georgieva v imenu Komisije

(7. marec 2013)

Komisija in oddelek za krizno upravljanje, ki deluje v okviru avstralskega vrhovnega tožilstva, sta 1. septembra 2008 podpisala upravni dogovor o sodelovanju na področju civilne zaščite. Dogovor je omejen na izmenjavo informacij in dobrih praks ter ne vključuje operativnega sodelovanja pri obvladovanju nesreč.

EU se poleg tega z Avstralijo pogaja tudi o okvirnem sporazumu, v skladu s katerim bi obe strani spodbujali ukrepe na področju obvladovanja nesreč in po potrebi sodelovali z namenom povečanja odpornosti družbe in infrastrukture.

Vprašanje izmenjave zračnih plovil med evropskimi državami in državami južne poloble v poletnih oz. zimskih mesecih je bilo delno obravnavano v študiji iz leta 2011 ⁽¹⁾, v kateri so bili navedeni številni praktični pomisleki (zlasti zaradi različnih vrst uporabljenih zračnih plovil, različnih vrst požarov in različnih pokrajin oz. reliefa) ter ukrepi, ki bi jih bilo treba sprejeti pred začetkom takega sodelovanja (npr. predhodne naložbe v skupno usposabljanje pilotov, izmenjava taktičnega znanja in izkušenj o tehnikah gašenja požarov ipd.). Komisija bo ta vprašanja še naprej proučevala v okviru izvajanja nove zakonodaje s področja civilne zaščite.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/echo/civil_protection/civil/prote/pdfdocs/future/Wildfire_Final_Report.pdf

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000755/13
to the Commission**

Giommaria Uggias (ALDE), Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Lara Comi (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE), Pino Arlacchi (S&D), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE) and Marian Harkin (ALDE)
(25 January 2013)

Subject: Proposal for an international cooperation agreement with southern hemisphere countries to exchange fire-fighting resources

Over the last few days, Australia has been struck by a wave of forest fires that have mainly affected the most populous part of the country, namely the states of New South Wales and Victoria, as well as Tasmania. Fed by record temperatures and strong winds, the fires have incinerated more than 350 000 hectares of forests, crops and pastures, threatening the civil population's safety.

The issue of forest fires also closely concerns Europe, particularly the Mediterranean area, where, according to data from EFFIS (European Forest Fire Information System) there have been 1 494 219 fires over the last 30 years, with a total of almost 15 million hectares going up in smoke. The cross-border dimension of forest fires has led the authorities of the Member States to implement coordinated and multilateral measures within the framework of the European Civil Protection Mechanism, a system set up by the European Union to respond to emergencies both within and outside the EU (in addition to the 27 Member States, Norway, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Croatia and Macedonia are also members), by sharing the resources of all the Member States.

The proliferation of forest fires mainly occurs in the summer months, and the start of the summer season in the southern hemisphere coincides with the start of winter in the northern hemisphere and vice versa. The Member States of the EU possess a sizeable air fleet, particularly Canadair, which remains almost unused during the winter, and those who work in the industry say that these fire-fighting aircraft could travel from one hemisphere to the other in just a few days.

Can the Commission answer the following:

1. Does it consider it useful to bring about an international cooperation agreement with southern hemisphere countries affected by forest fires that provides for the reciprocal supply of fire-fighting resources such as Canadair, as well as the exchange of qualified and competent personnel specialised in extinguishing fires?
2. Could such a mutual cooperation agreement be set up as an extension of the European Civil Protection Mechanism, so as to benefit from the coordination procedures adopted on the basis of this instrument?

Answer given by Ms Georgieva on behalf of the Commission

(7 March 2013)

The Commission and the Attorney-General's Department of Emergency Management of the Commonwealth of Australia have signed on 1st September 2008 an Administrative Arrangement on cooperation in the field of Civil Protection. The Arrangement is limited to the exchange of information and best practice and does not cover operational cooperation in disaster management.

The EU is also negotiating with Australia a Framework Agreement, in which both parties are expected to agree to promote Disaster Management and to cooperate as appropriate to increase the resilience of society and infrastructures.

The question of sharing aerial assets between Europe and the Southern hemisphere in alternating summer seasons has been partially explored in a 2011 study⁽¹⁾ which identified a number of practical concerns (in particular relating to the different types of aircraft used, the different types of fires involved and the different types of landscapes involved) and prior steps to be taken (e.g. prior investment in common training for pilots, exchange of tactical knowhow on suppression techniques, etc.). The Commission will continue to explore these issues within the framework of the implementation of the new civil protection legislation.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/echo/civil_protection/civil/prote/pdfdocs/future/Wildfire_Final_Report.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000756/13
an die Kommission
Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE) und Eva Lichtenberger (Verts/ALE)
 (25. Januar 2013)

Betrifft: Schulden der ÖBB und der Bundeshaushalt Österreichs

Die anhaltende Staatsschuldenkrise hat in aller Deutlichkeit die Wichtigkeit einer wahrheitsgemäßen Abbildung der Schulden der öffentlichen Hand gezeigt. Eurostat hat deshalb im Herbst 2010 das „Manual on Government Deficit and Debt“ (MGDD — Handbuch zum Defizit und Schuldenstand des Staates) revidiert. Diese Revision hatte auch für den Haushalt der Republik Österreich Bedeutung. So wurden in der Folge bislang nicht im laufenden Defizit bzw. im Schuldenstand ausgewiesene Schulden der Österreichischen Bundesbahnen (ÖBB) teilweise neu verbucht. Nicht zum Schuldenstand hinzugerechnet wurden jedoch die mit dem Bahnausbau bis zum Jahr 2007 eingegangenen Schulden. Dies wurde damit begründet, dass erst im Jahr 2007 der Bund eine formelle Verpflichtung übernommen hatte, zumindest 70 % der Finanzverbindlichkeiten über die Laufzeit hinweg zu übernehmen ⁽¹⁾.

Kann die Kommission dazu folgende Fragen beantworten:

1. Ist es mit den geltenden europäischen Regeln, insbesondere dem „Manual on Government Deficit and Debt“, vereinbar, dass die vor 2007 eingegangenen Schulden nicht im Staatshaushalt der Republik Österreich berücksichtigt werden, obwohl in der Vergangenheit — zuletzt im Jahr 2004 in Höhe von 6,1 Mrd. EUR — spätere Schuldenübernahmen durch die öffentliche Hand erfolgt sind und der Geschäftsbericht der ÖBB den Vorbehalt beinhaltet, „dass der Konzernabschluss zum 31. Dezember 2006 unter der Annahme erstellt ist, dass seitens der Republik Österreich im Zeitablauf jedenfalls Zuschüsse gem. § 43 Abs. 2 Bundesbahngesetz in einer dem effektuierten Investitionsvolumen jeweils angepassten Höhe geleistet werden und daher kein Erfordernis besteht, Vorsorgen für nicht erlösgedeckte Aufwendungen zu bilden ⁽²⁾“?
2. Von den laufenden Haftungen für Schulden der ÖBB werden nur 70 % dem Bund zugerechnet, die restlichen 30 % soll die ÖBB aus dem Betrieb finanzieren. In welcher Form prüft Eurostat die Fähigkeit eines Unternehmens wie der ÖBB, Schulden und Zinsen bezahlen zu können, sowie die daraus resultierenden Risiken für den Staatshaushalt?
3. Die von Eurostat formulierten Regeln verlangen explizit eine Zuordnung der Schulden aufgrund der *de facto* und nicht lediglich *de iure* eingegangenen Verpflichtungen. Wie wird Eurostat diesen Anspruch im oben beschriebenen Falle durchsetzen?
4. Wie plant Eurostat, künftig sogenannte „Haftungen“ der Gebietskörperschaften bei der Berechnung des Schuldenstandes zu berücksichtigen, und welche Auswirkungen hätte dies im oben genannten Fall?

Antwort von Herrn Šemeta im Namen der Kommission

(19. März 2013)

In Reaktion auf die Fragen der Frau und des Herrn Abgeordneten ist zu betonen, dass Eurostat zusammen mit den österreichischen statistischen Behörden über mehrere Jahre hinweg die Sektorzuordnung der ÖBB Infrastruktur AG, die statistische Behandlung ihrer Verbindlichkeiten und die Verbuchung von Transaktionen zwischen dem Unternehmen und dem Staat aufmerksam verfolgt hat. Die endgültigen Ergebnisse dieser Beobachtungen wurden von Eurostat nach Besuchen in Österreich und einer bilateralen Beratung veröffentlicht und können auf der Eurostat-Webseite Finanzstatistik des Sektors Staats (GFS) ⁽³⁾ eingesehen werden.

1. In Eurostats Beratungsschreiben vom Februar 2011 an die österreichischen Behörden ⁽⁴⁾ wurde eine statistische Analyse der Schulden auf Grundlage der statistischen Regeln des ESVG 95 und der Bestimmungen im Handbuch zum Defizit und Schuldenstand des Staates vorgelegt ⁽⁵⁾. Die österreichischen Behörden haben bestätigt, dass die ÖBB Infrastruktur AG nach den statistischen Regeln des ESVG 95 nicht dem Sektor Staat zugerechnet ist.

⁽¹⁾ Siehe: http://www.parlament.gv.at/PAKT/VHG/XXIV/AB/AB_08655/fname_228152.pdf

⁽²⁾ Siehe: http://konzern.oebb.at/de/Presse/Publikationen/07050_OEBB_GB06_final.pdf

⁽³⁾ http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/government_finance_statistics/introduction

⁽⁴⁾ http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/government_finance_statistics/documents/Austria%20-%20Treatment%20of%20the%20debt%20of%20the%20Austrian%20railway.pdf (auf Englisch).

⁽⁵⁾ Siehe: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/product_details/publication?p_product_code=KS-RA-13-001

2. Das Handbuch zum Defizit und Schuldenstand des Staates stellt restriktive Bedingungen für die Zurechnung staatlich garantierter Schulden öffentlicher Kapitalgesellschaften zum Schuldenstand des Staates auf ⁽⁶⁾. Wie in Eurostats Beratungsschreiben dargelegt, wurde in diesem Fall festgestellt, dass der österreichische Staat für eine Teilrückzahlung der Schulden verantwortlich sein würde. Die darauf folgende Analyse der österreichischen Behörden ergab, dass der restliche Teil nicht als de facto-Verbindlichkeit des Staates anzusehen sei.

3. Siehe oben.

4. Wie oben erklärt, wurden die einschlägigen statistischen Regeln in diesem Fall im Einklang mit ihrer Anwendung in den EU-Mitgliedstaaten angewendet. An dieser Stelle soll betont werden, dass Eurostat zwecks Datenüberprüfung übermittelte Informationen zu staatlichen Bürgschaften, Beteiligungen des Staates an öffentlichen Kapitalgesellschaften und den Schulden öffentlicher Kapitalgesellschaften erfasst und verwendet ⁽⁷⁾.

⁽⁶⁾ Nach dem ESVG 95 werden Bürgschaften wie Eventualverbindlichkeiten behandelt und als solche nicht dem öffentlichen Schuldenstand zugerechnet, es sei denn, es ergibt sich die Schlussfolgerung, dass der Staat die Schulden zurückzahlt oder zurückzahlen wird.

⁽⁷⁾ Im Kontext der Anwendung der Richtlinie 2011/85/EU des Rates vom 8. November 2011 über die Anforderungen an die haushaltspolitischen Rahmen der Mitgliedstaaten werden demnächst Vergleichsdaten für alle Mitgliedstaaten veröffentlicht.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000756/13
to the Commission
Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE) and Eva Lichtenberger (Verts/ALE)
(25 January 2013)**

Subject: ÖBB debts and the Austrian federal budget

The ongoing public debt crisis has clearly highlighted the importance of accurately reporting public debts. It was for this reason that Eurostat revised its Manual on Government Deficit and Debt (MGDD) in autumn 2010, which had significant consequences *inter alia* for the budget of the Republic of Austria. For example, it meant that debts incurred by the Austrian State Railways (ÖBB) which had previously been omitted from the running deficit or government debt were in some instances reclassified. However, debts incurred before 2007 for rail expansion projects were not added to the government debt. The reason given for this was that it was only in 2007 that the federal government undertook formally to take on at least 70 % of financial liabilities over the entire term of such liabilities ⁽¹⁾.

Can the Commission answer the following:

1. Can it be regarded as compatible with current European rules, in particular the Manual on Government Deficit and Debt, that debts incurred before 2007 are not included in the national budget of the Republic of Austria, even though the government has subsequently taken on such debts in the past — to the tune of EUR 6.1 000 000 000 on the last occasion in 2004 — and the ÖBB's annual report contains the proviso that, 'the consolidated accounts of 31 December 2006 have been compiled on the assumption that the Republic of Austria will grant subsidies over time pursuant to Article 43(2) of the Federal Rail Act according to the actual volume of investment and that it is therefore unnecessary to make provision for expenditure not covered by revenues' ⁽²⁾?
2. Only 70 % of current liabilities for debts incurred by the ÖBB are assigned to the federal government, and the ÖBB is supposed to service the remaining 30 % from its own operations. How does Eurostat assess whether a company such as the ÖBB is able to repay its debts and interest and the associated risks to the national budget?
3. The rules formulated by Eurostat expressly require debts to be assigned on the basis of commitments undertaken in fact rather than merely in law. How will Eurostat enforce this requirement in the abovementioned case?
4. How is Eurostat planning to take account of similar 'liabilities' of public authorities when calculating government debt in future, and what impact would this have on the abovementioned case?

**Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(19 March 2013)**

In response to the questions raised by the Honourable Members of Parliament, it is to be underlined that Eurostat has closely followed with the Austrian statistical authorities over a number of years the sector classification of ÖBB Infrastruktur AG, the statistical treatment of its liabilities and recording of transactions between the company and government. These discussions have been published by Eurostat in its final findings of visits to Austria and in its bilateral advice, available on Eurostat's government finance statistics website ⁽³⁾.

1. Eurostat's February 2011 letter of advice to the Austrian authorities ⁽⁴⁾ sets out the statistical analysis of its debt, based on ESA95 statistical rules and the provisions in the Manual on Government Deficit and Debt (MGDD) ⁽⁵⁾. The Austrian authorities have confirmed that, under ESA95 statistical rules, ÖBB Infrastruktur AG is not classified to the general government sector.

⁽¹⁾ Cf. http://www.parlament.gv.at/PAKT/VHG/XXIV/AB/AB_08655/fname_228152.pdf

⁽²⁾ Cf. http://konzern.oebb.at/de/Presse/Publikationen/07050_OEBB_GB06_final.pdf

⁽³⁾ http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/government_finance_statistics/introduction

⁽⁴⁾ http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/government_finance_statistics/documents/Austria%20-%20Treatment%20of%20the%20debt%20of%20the%20Austrian%20railway.pdf

⁽⁵⁾ See http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/product_details/publication?p_product_code=KS-RA-13-001

2. The MGDD sets out restrictive conditions on the attribution of the government-guaranteed debts of public corporations to government debt ⁽⁶⁾. As described in the Eurostat letter of advice, in this case it was ascertained that Austrian government would take responsibility for repaying a portion of the debt. The subsequent analysis of the Austrian authorities is that the remainder should not be considered as a de facto government liability.

3. See the above.

4. As explained above, the relevant statistical rules have been applied in the case, in line with their application across EU Member States. It may be underlined that Eurostat collects, and uses for the purpose of data verification, reported information on government guarantees, government participations in public corporations, and the debt of public corporations ⁽⁷⁾.

⁽⁶⁾ Under ESA95, guarantees are treated as contingent liabilities, and as such do not increase the stock of government debt, unless it can be concluded that government is repaying or will repay the debt.

⁽⁷⁾ In the context of the implementation of Council Directive 2011/85/EU of 8 November 2011 on requirements for budgetary frameworks of the Member States, comparable data should be published for all Member States in the future.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000757/13
a la Comisión**

Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)

(25 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: Fracking en la Garrotxa

En la respuesta a la pregunta E-010456/2012 del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión (24 de enero de 2013) sobre la concesión de permisos de extracción de gas de esquisto en Osona, se indica que «de conformidad con la Directiva 2011/92/UE, también llamada Directiva de evaluación del impacto ambiental (EIA), los proyectos de perforación a gran profundidad se contemplan en el anexo II, punto 2, letra d), lo que implica que están sujetos a un control por parte de las autoridades competentes a fin de determinar si es necesaria una EIA, con arreglo al artículo 4, apartados 2 a 4, y sobre la base de los criterios que figuran en el anexo III de la Directiva. La decisión de control también debe tener en cuenta los principios de precaución y prevención».

La Generalitat de Catalunya ha autorizado el inminente comienzo de prospecciones para buscar hidrocarburos en la comarca de la Garrotxa, bajo el llamado proyecto Ripoll impulsado por la firma Teredo Oils Limited, que cuenta con los permisos de la Generalitat desde el mes de octubre y que afecta a 51 000 hectáreas de una veintena de pueblos del Ripollès, Osona y la Garrotxa.

Estas inspecciones están impulsadas por el elevado precio del petróleo, por las nuevas técnicas como el *fracking* y por el conocimiento previo de la existencia de gas y petróleo en la zona. El uso de técnicas como el *fracking* u otras técnicas de «estimulación» viola tajantemente los principios de precaución y prevención de la Directiva mencionada.

Considerando que las autoridades locales y los vecinos afectados no han recibido la información correspondiente sobre estas prospecciones,

1. ¿Recabará la Comisión información sobre dichos permisos a la empresa Teredo Oils Limited?
2. ¿Considera que la Generalitat de Cataluña (y el Estado español) está violando el principio de cautela, así como los principios de precaución y prevención?
3. ¿Qué medidas tomará la Comisión para frenar, al menos temporalmente, el proyecto con la empresa Teredo Oils Limited hasta que no se hagan los pertinentes estudios de impacto medioambiental?
4. ¿Considera que la Generalitat está violando el derecho a la buena administración, la transparencia y la información a la ciudadanía, conforme a la legislación europea?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión

(6 de marzo de 2013)

La Comisión no dispone de datos suficientes sobre el proyecto para responder a las cuestiones planteadas por Su Señoría, por lo que va a tomar contacto con las autoridades españolas competentes para recabar más información.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000757/13
to the Commission**

Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)

(25 January 2013)

Subject: Fracking in La Garrotxa

In the answer given on 24 January 2013 to Written Question E-010456/2012, regarding the granting of licenses for shale gas extraction in Osona, Mr Potočník, on behalf of the Commission, states that, 'as per Directive 2011/92/EU, also known as the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Directive, deep drilling projects are included in Annex II.2.d, which implies that they are subject to a screening by the competent authorities to determine whether an EIA is required, in accordance with Article 4(2)-(4), and on the basis of the criteria listed in Annex III of Directive. The screening decision must also take into account the precautionary and prevention principles'.

The Autonomous Government of Catalonia has authorised imminent commencement of prospecting for hydrocarbons in the La Garrotxa region. This is part of the 'Ripoll project', promoted by the company known as Teredo Oils Limited, with permits granted by the Autonomous Government of Catalonia in October, and affecting an area of 51 000 hectares in some 20 municipalities in the Ripollès, Osona and La Garrotxa regions.

These surveys are driven by high oil prices, by new techniques like fracking, and by prior knowledge of the existence of oil and gas in the area. The use of fracking and other 'stimulation techniques' clearly violates the abovementioned Directive's principles of precaution and prevention.

In view of the fact that the local authorities and residents affected have not received appropriate information regarding these prospecting activities,

1. Will the Commission request information regarding the permits granted to Teredo Oils Limited?
2. Does it consider that the Autonomous Government of Catalonia (and that of Spain) is violating the principle of caution, and the principles of precaution and prevention?
3. What measures will the Commission take to halt, at least temporarily, the project involving Teredo Oils Limited, until the appropriate environmental impact studies have been carried out?
4. Does it consider the Autonomous Government of Catalonia to be violating the right to good administration, transparency and public information, as provided for under European legislation?

Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission

(6 March 2013)

The Commission does not have sufficient details on the project referred to in order to respond to the questions raised by the Honourable Member. It will contact the competent Spanish authorities for further information.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000758/13
alla Commissione
Crescenzo Rivellini (PPE)
(25 gennaio 2013)**

Oggetto: Circolazione dei professionisti e riconoscimento negli Stati membri della professione forense

La libera circolazione delle professioni è da considerarsi uno dei pilastri del diritto comunitario, in quanto è in particolare salvaguardata la facoltà dei professionisti comunitari di esercitare la propria professione in uno Stato membro. L'Italia ha recepito la disciplina comunitaria per quanto attiene l'esercizio della professione di avvocato tramite il decreto legislativo 96 del 2001 in ottemperanza alla direttiva 98/5/CE.

Recentemente il Parlamento italiano ha approvato la riforma forense stabilendo chiaramente, tra le altre cose, la necessità di istituire presso ciascun consiglio dell'ordine una sezione speciale per avvocati stabiliti. Tuttavia professionisti di diversi Paesi (in particolare Spagna, Lussemburgo e Francia) riferiscono che in Italia la situazione è piuttosto eterogenea.

Può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se ritiene corretta la pratica posta in essere da taluni consigli dell'ordine in Italia che rifiutano la formazione di sezioni speciali per l'iscrizione di professionisti comunitari, impedendo di fatto non solo l'esercizio ma il riconoscimento stesso delle professionalità comunitarie presenti in Italia e quali azioni possono essere intraprese per evitare tale pratica;
2. se ritiene conforme ai principi e alle norme rilevanti in materia la subordinazione, operata da taluni ordini forensi provinciali, ad un requisito numerico (numero di atti minimo da compiere annualmente durante i tre anni di stabilimento) come criterio pregiudiziale per l'assimilazione al professionista dello Stato membro ospitante, se tale requisito non limita gli scopi della direttiva, eliminando di fatto ogni valutazione circa l'effettività e regolarità della pratica forense introducendo un ulteriore previo giudizio di merito, mai contemplato dal legislatore comunitario e, essendo tale requisito imposto solo da taluni ordini provinciali, se si produce una disparità di trattamento all'interno di uno stesso spazio economico, rischiando di operare una distorsione del mercato?

**Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(11 marzo 2013)**

La questione fa riferimento al requisito, stabilito nella recente riforma giuridica italiana (legge n. 247 del 2012), di istituire una serie di elenchi e sezioni speciali che dovranno essere mantenuti dai consigli dell'ordine, compresa una sezione speciale per gli avvocati stabiliti di cui all'articolo 6 del decreto legislativo n. 96 del 2001 (che recepisce la direttiva sullo stabilimento degli avvocati⁽¹⁾). La direttiva prevede l'obbligo di registrazione presso le autorità competenti dello Stato membro ospitante, che incombe agli avvocati che intendono esercitare la professione in uno Stato membro diverso da quello in cui essi hanno acquisito le loro qualifiche professionali; essa non stabilisce però le disposizioni relative al tipo di registro o se i consigli istituiscono e mantengono un registro speciale a tal fine. In questo contesto spetta agli Stati membri e alle loro autorità competenti decidere come disciplinare la questione, garantendo comunque una reale possibilità di registrazione come richiesto dal diritto dell'UE.

La direttiva prevede l'integrazione nella professione di avvocato nello Stato membro ospitante dopo un periodo di almeno tre anni di attività effettiva e regolare. L'autorità competente dello Stato membro ospitante ha il diritto di esigere tutte le informazioni e documenti utili, in particolare sulle pratiche trattate dal richiedente. Tuttavia sarebbe incompatibile con il diritto dell'UE un obbligo nazionale che fissi un numero minimo di pratiche o di atti trattati, la cui inosservanza comporterebbe un diniego della domanda di assimilazione all'avvocato dello Stato membro. La Commissione ha già preso contatto con le autorità italiane per quanto riguarda tali obblighi imposti da alcuni ordini degli avvocati (ad esempio, l'ordine di Pordenone); a seguito del suo intervento, tali obblighi sono stati eliminati.

⁽¹⁾ Direttiva 98/5/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 16 febbraio 1998, volta a facilitare l'esercizio permanente della professione di avvocato in uno Stato membro diverso da quello in cui è stata acquisita la qualifica (GU L 77 del 14.3.1998, pag. 36).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000758/13
to the Commission
Crescenzo Rivellini (PPE)
(25 January 2013)

Subject: Free movement of professionals and recognition of the legal profession in the Member States

The free movement of professionals must be regarded as one of the pillars of Community law, particularly because it safeguards the ability of European Union professionals to practise their profession in a Member State. Italy transposed the Community rules concerning the practice of the profession of lawyer with Legislative Decree 96 of 2001, in accordance with Directive 98/5/EC.

The Italian Parliament recently approved the legal reform bill, which clearly established, among other things, the need to establish a special section for in-house lawyers at each Bar Association. However, professionals from various countries (particularly Spain, Luxembourg and France) report that the situation in Italy is rather mixed.

1. Does it regard as proper the behaviour of certain Italian Bar Associations, which are refusing to create special sections for the registration of EU professionals, thus preventing not only the practice of the profession, but also the recognition of professional expertise in Italy? What measures can be taken to prevent this behaviour?
2. Does it believe that the relevant industry principles and standards are being complied with when, as is the case with some provincial Bar Associations, a numerical requirement (minimum number of deeds to be produced annually during the three years of in-house service) is imposed as a prejudicial criterion for the assimilation of a professional by the host Member State? Does this requirement not limit the goals of the directive, by effectively eliminating any assessment of the effectiveness and lawfulness of the legal practice and introducing an additional prior judgment of fitness to practise that was never envisaged by the EU legislator? Since this requirement is being imposed only by certain provincial Bar Associations, does this produce a disparity of treatment within the same economic space, thus risking a distortion of the market?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(11 March 2013)

The question refers to the requirement set forth in the recently adopted Italian legal reform law (Law 247 of 2012) that a number of special lists and sections shall be established and maintained at each bar council, including a special section for established lawyers as referred to at Article 6 of Legislative Decree 96 of 2001 (transposing the Lawyers' Establishment Directive⁽¹⁾). While the directive stipulates the requirement for registration with the competent authority in the host Member State incumbent upon lawyers wishing to practise in a Member State other than that in which they obtained their professional qualification, it does not lay down any provisions relating to the type of register, or indeed whether the bars shall establish and maintain any special registers for this purpose. In this context, it is for Member States and their competent authorities to decide how to regulate this matter, subject to ensuring an actual possibility for registration as required by EC law.

The directive provides for integration into the profession of lawyer in the host Member State following a period of at least three years of effective and regular practice. The host Member State's competent authority is entitled to require any relevant information and documentation, in particular on the matters that the applicant has dealt with. However, a domestic requirement stipulating a minimum number of matters or acts dealt with, failure to comply with which would automatically result in rejection of the application, would be inconsistent with EC law. The Commission has already been in contact with the Italian authorities concerning such requirements applied by some bars (e.g., the Pordenone bar) as a result of which these requirements were removed.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 98/5/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 February 1998 to facilitate practice of the profession of lawyer on a permanent basis in a Member State other than that in which the qualification was obtained (OJ L 77, 14.3.1998, p. 36).

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000759/13
an die Kommission
Bernd Lange (S&D)
(25. Januar 2013)

Betrifft: Revision der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1025/2012 zur europäischen Normung

Am 25.10.2012 haben die Kommission und das Europäische Parlament die Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1025/2012 zur europäischen Normung angenommen. Sie ist zum 1.1.2013 in Kraft getreten.

In Artikel 25 wird eine Überprüfung der Auswirkungen der Verordnung durch die Kommission für den 2.1.2015 vorgeschrieben.

Es mehren sich die Anfragen, dass eine Revision schon zum 1.1.2014 abgeschlossen sein soll. Damit verbunden sind Bedenken über ein zu kleines Zeitfenster, das eine rechtzeitige Umsetzung und Wirkung der aus der Verordnung resultierenden Maßnahmen verhindert.

Kann die Kommission dazu folgende Fragen beantworten:

1. Wie sieht der Zeitplan für die Revision zur Verordnung aus?
2. Welchen Mindestzeitraum für die Umsetzung der Verordnung hält die Kommission für möglich?
3. Welche Beweggründe kann die Kommission haben, um vom ursprünglich angedachten Zeitplan abzuweichen?
4. Auf welche Weise wird die Kommission die Interessenträger bei ihrer Entscheidung angemessen beteiligen?

Antwort von Herrn Tajani im Namen der Kommission
(21. März 2013)

1. Gemäß Artikel 25 der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1025/2012 bewertet die Kommission die Auswirkungen des in Artikel 10 vorgesehenen Verfahrens auf den Zeitbedarf für die Erteilung von Normungsaufträgen. Die Kommission legt die Ergebnisse der Bewertung in einem Bericht an das Europäische Parlament und den Rat vor. Die Kommission wird den Bericht, wie in Artikel 25 der Verordnung vorgesehen, spätestens bis zum 2. Januar 2015 vorgelegen.

Des Weiteren wird die Kommission, wie im Anhang des Arbeitsprogramms der Kommission für 2013⁽¹⁾ angekündigt, im Jahr 2013 eine unabhängige Überprüfung durchführen, in der die Fortschritte bei der Verwirklichung der strategischen Ziele ermittelt und die Ergebnisse der gegenwärtigen Steuerung des europäischen Normungssystems bewertet werden sollen.

2. Artikel 30 der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1025/2012 bezieht sich auf das Inkrafttreten der Verordnung. Diese Verordnung trat am 4. Dezember 2012 in Kraft und gilt seit dem 1. Januar 2013.

3. Die Kommission beabsichtigt nicht, von dem in Artikel 25 der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1025/2012 festgelegten Zeitplan abzuweichen.

4. In der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1025/2012 ist eine gewisse Reihe an Mechanismen vorgesehen, die sicherstellen sollen, dass bei den Normungsverfahren die Interessenträger angemessen vertreten sind. Darin eingeschlossen sind das Notifizierungssystem für alle Interessenträger gemäß Artikel 12, die Zusammenarbeit der europäischen Normungsorganisationen, die von der Union finanziert werden, mit dem gemäß Artikel 22 gegründeten Ausschuss und die Verpflichtung europäischer Normungsorganisationen gemäß Artikel 5, eine angemessene Vertretung aller einschlägigen Interessenträger und deren wirkungsvolle Beteiligung an ihren Normungstätigkeiten zu fördern und zu erleichtern. Die Kommission wird gewährleisten, dass solche Mechanismen in Übereinstimmung mit der Verordnung wirksam angewendet werden.

⁽¹⁾ KOM(2012)629 endg.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000759/13
to the Commission
Bernd Lange (S&D)
(25 January 2013)

Subject: Review of Regulation (EU) No 1025/2012 on European standardisation

On 25 November 2012 the Commission and the European Parliament adopted Regulation (EU) No 1025/2012 on European standardisation, which came into force on 1 January 2013.

Article 25 stipulates that the Commission is to evaluate the impact of the regulation by 2 January 2015.

There have been an increasing number of calls for the review to be completed by 1 January 2014 instead, due to concerns that the timeframe could be too short to allow the proper implementation and functioning of the measures resulting from the regulation.

Can the Commission answer the following:

1. What is the current timetable for reviewing the regulation?
2. What does the Commission believe is the minimum period within which the regulation could be implemented?
3. On what grounds would the Commission deviate from the original timetable?
4. How will the Commission ensure that stakeholders play an appropriate role in the decision-making process?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(21 March 2013)

1. Article 25 of Regulation (EU) No 1025/2012 stipulates that the Commission is to evaluate the impact of the regulation on the timeframe for issuing standardisation requests pursuant to Article 10 of the regulation and to present its conclusions in a report to the European Parliament and to the Council. The Commission will present the report by 2 January 2015 at the latest, as required by Article 25 of the regulation.

In addition, as foreseen in the annex to the Commission's Work Programme 2013 ⁽¹⁾ an independent review will be launched by the Commission in 2013 to assess progress against strategic objectives and evaluate the performance of the current governance in the European standardisation system.

2. Article 30 of Regulation (EU) No 1025/2012 refers to the entry into force of the regulation. This regulation entered into force on 4 December 2012 and is applicable from 1 January 2013.

3. The Commission does not intend to deviate from the timetable set out in Article 25 of Regulation (EU) No 1025/2012.

4. Regulation (EU) No 1025/2012 provides for a number of mechanisms to ensure an appropriate representation of stakeholders in standardisation processes. These include the notification system for all stakeholders pursuant to Article 12, the cooperation of the European stakeholder organisations receiving Union financing with the Committee set up pursuant to Article 22 and the obligation for European standardisation organisations to encourage and facilitate an appropriate representation and effective participation of all relevant stakeholders in their standardisation activities pursuant to Article 5. The Commission will ensure the effective application of such mechanisms in accordance with the regulation.

(1) COM(2012) 629 final.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-000760/13

Tarybai

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D)

(2013 m. sausio 25 d.)

Tema: Derybų dėl komandiruojamų darbuotojų direktyvos eiga

Kada ES Tarybai pirmininkaujanti Airija planuoja pradėti trišalius dialogus su Europos Parlamentu dėl pasiūlymo dėl Tarybos direktyvos 96/71/EB dėl darbuotojų komandiravimo paslaugų teikimo sistemoje vykdymo užtikrinimo?

Dar Airijos pirmininkavimo laikotarpiu Europos Parlamentas tikisi balsuoti dėl šio dokumento savo plenarinėje sesijoje.

Atsakymas

(2013 m. kovo 18 d.)

Danijos ir Kipro pirmininkavimo laikotarpiais Taryba padarė didelę pažangą ir pasiekė rezultatų nagrinėdama įvairius klausimus, susijusius su pasiūlymu dėl Direktyvos 96/71/EB dėl darbuotojų komandiravimo paslaugų teikimo sistemoje vykdymo užtikrinimo⁽¹⁾; pavyzdžiui, aiškesnė „komandiravimo“ sąvokos apibrėžtis pasitelkiant komandiravimo atvejų tikrumo vertinimo kriterijus, geresnis darbuotojų ir bendrovių informavimas apie teises bei pareigas ir sustiprintas nacionalinių valdžios institucijų bendradarbiavimas, taip pat tarpvalstybinio administracinių baudų bei sankcijų, skirtų už reikalavimų nesilaikymą, vykdymo užtikrinimas įdiegus savitarpio pagalbos ir pripažinimo sistemą.

Pirmininkaujanti Airija yra visapusiškai įsipareigojusi remtis šiais rezultatais ir siekti sukurti pagrindą galimybei 2013 m. birželio mėn. Tarybos posėdyje susitarti dėl bendro požiūrio.

Tuo pačiu Taryba tinkamai apsvarstys Europos Parlamento poziciją, kuri turi būti priimta per pirmąjį svarstymą, kad kuo labiau būtų sumažinta šių dviejų institucijų nuomonių skirtumų.

⁽¹⁾ Dok. 8040/12.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000760/13
to the Council**

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D)

(25 January 2013)

Subject: Negotiations on the progress of the Posting of Workers Directive

When does the Irish Presidency of the Council of the EU plan to begin a triologue with the European Parliament on the proposal on the enforcement of Directive 96/71/EC concerning the posting of workers in the framework of the provision of services?

The European Parliament expects to vote on this document in plenary before the end of the Irish Presidency.

Reply

(18 March 2013)

Under the Danish and Cyprus Presidencies, the Council has moved forward substantially and achieved results on various issues relating to the proposal for a directive on the enforcement of Directive 96/71/EC concerning the posting of workers in the framework of the provision of services⁽¹⁾; for example, a clearer definition of the notion of 'posting' through criteria for assessing the genuineness of posting cases, better information of workers and companies concerning their rights and obligations and enhanced cooperation between national authorities, as well as cross-border enforcement of administrative fines and penalties imposed for non-compliance through the introduction of a system of mutual assistance and recognition.

The Irish Presidency is fully committed to building on these results with a view to paving the way for a general approach to be reached by the Council in June 2013.

At the same time, the Council will give due consideration to the European Parliament's position to be adopted at first reading with a view to possibly reducing the scope for divergence between the two institutions.

⁽¹⁾ 8040/12.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-000761/13

Tarybai

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D)

(2013 m. sausio 25 d.)

Tema: Pensijų perkėlimo direktyva

Kokią derybų eigą planuoja ši pusmetį ES Tarybai pirmininkaujanti Airija ir kokių tikisi rezultatų Pensijų perkėlimo direktyvos priėmimo klausimu. Jau keletą metų šios direktyvos projektas Taryboje užstrigęs dėl kai kurių valstybių narių nepritarimo.

Atsakymas

(2013 m. balandžio 15 d.)

Pirmininkaujanti Airija yra pasiryžusi tęsti darbą nagrinėjant iš dalies pakeistą pasiūlymą dėl Europos Parlamento ir Tarybos direktyvos dėl teisių į papildomą pensiją perkėlimo gerinimo darbuotojų judumo didinimo būtiniausių reikalavimų gerinant teisių į papildomą pensiją įgijimą ir išsaugojimą ⁽¹⁾.

Pirmasis už šį dokumentą atsakingos darbo grupės posėdis jau įvyko 2013 m. sausio 30 d., vėliau suplanuota surengti kitus posėdžius.

Tačiau Taryba negali numatyti vykstančių diskusijų rezultatų ar jų trukmės.

⁽¹⁾ Dok. 13857/1/07 REV 1.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000761/13
to the Council**

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D)

(25 January 2013)

Subject: Pensions portability directive

What progress does Ireland, which holds the Council Presidency in the first half of 2013, plan to make in negotiations and what results does it expect as regards the adoption of a pensions portability directive? For several years a draft of this directive has been stuck in Council because of the objections of some Member States.

Reply

(15 April 2013)

The Irish Presidency is determined to continue the work on progressing the 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 ⁽¹⁾.

A first meeting of the Working Party, which is responsible for this file, already took place on 30 January 2013, and further meetings will follow in due course.

However, the Council is not in a position to anticipate the outcome or the duration of the ongoing negotiations.

⁽¹⁾ 13857/1/07 REV 1.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-000762/13

Tarybai

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D)

(2013 m. sausio 25 d.)

Tema: Darbo laiko direktyvos ateitis

Iki šiol socialiniai partneriai nesutarė dėl Darbo laiko direktyvos. Ar šį pusmetį ES Tarybai pirmininkaujanti Airija kartu su Komisija ims kokių nors veiksmų, kad būtų atnaujintos derybos dėl šios direktyvos?

Atsakymas

(2013 m. kovo 18 d.)

Kaip gerbiamoji Parlamento narė žino, Komisija 2010 m. konsultavosi su Europos socialiniais partneriais dėl galimų Darbo laiko direktyvos pakeitimų ⁽¹⁾. SESV 154 straipsnyje nustatyta, kad Komisija ES lygmeniu konsultuojasi su administracija ir darbuotojais dėl galimos Sąjungos veikimo linkmės socialinės politikos srityje. Tai taikoma ir teikiant pasiūlymus dėl esamo socialinės srities teisės akto pakeitimų. Pagal 155 straipsnio 1 dalį administracijos ir darbuotojų dialogas Sąjungos lygmeniu gali baigtis sutartiniais santykiais, įskaitant susitarimus.

2011 m. lapkričio 14 d. ES socialiniai partneriai informavo Komisiją, kad jie kartu nusprendė pradėti derybas dėl Darbo laiko direktyvos peržiūros. Praėjus iš pradžių suteikto devynių mėnesių laikotarpiui pratęsimui, derybos turėjo baigtis 2012 m. gruodžio 31 d.

2012 m. gruodžio 14 d. trys darbdavių organizacijos – BUSINESSEUROPE, Europos viešąsias paslaugas teikiančių darbdavių ir įmonių centras (CEEP) ir Europos amatų, mažų ir vidutinių įmonių asociacija (UEAPME) – padarė pareiškimą, kuriame jos pareiškė apgailėstą, kad Europos profesinių sąjungų konfederacija (ETUC) nesugeba tęsti derybų.

Atsižvelgdama į Europos socialinių partnerių derybų rezultatus, Taryba laukia, kad Komisija pateiktų padėties įvertinimą ir pasiūlymų dėl tolesnių veiksmų.

⁽¹⁾ 2003 m. lapkričio 4 d. Europos Parlamento ir Tarybos direktyva 2003/88/EB dėl tam tikrų darbo laiko organizavimo aspektų, OL L 299, 2003 11 18, p. 9.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000762/13
to the Council**

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D)

(25 January 2013)

Subject: Future of the Working Time Directive

Social partners have yet to agree on the Working Time Directive. Will Ireland, which holds the Council Presidency in the first half of 2013, together with the Commission, take any action to renew negotiations on this directive?

Reply

(18 March 2013)

As the Honourable Member is aware, the Commission consulted the European social partners during 2010 about possible changes to the Working Time Directive ⁽¹⁾. It is laid down in Article 154 TFEU that the Commission shall consult management and labour at EU level on the possible direction of Union action in the social policy field. This includes proposing changes to existing social legislation. Under Article 155(1), the dialogue between management and labour at Union level may lead to contractual relations, including agreements.

On 14 November 2011, the EU social partners informed the Commission that they had jointly decided to launch negotiations on reviewing the Working Time Directive. Following an extension of the period of nine months originally provided, the negotiations were to end on 31 December 2012.

On 14 December 2012, the three employers' organisations BUSINESSEUROPE, the European Centre of Employers and Enterprises providing Public Services (CEEP) and the European Association of Craft, Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (UEAPME) made a statement in which they regretted that the European Trade Unions Confederation (ETUC) was not able to continue negotiations.

Following the outcome of the European social partners' negotiations, the Council looks forward to the Commission's assessment of the situation and its suggestions on action to be taken.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 2003/88/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 4 November 2003 concerning certain aspects of the organisation of working time, OJ L 299, 18.11.2003, p. 9.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000763/13
to the Commission
Fiona Hall (ALDE)
(25 January 2013)**

Subject: Children in Senegal subjected to begging and abuse

On 15 June 2010, the Commission answered a parliamentary question (E-2988/10) submitted by Lorenzo Fontana MEP concerning the living conditions in Senegal's Koranic schools (daaras).

The Commission stated that it was aware of the report produced by Human Rights Watch on children in Senegal being subjected to forced begging and abuse by their Koranic schools, and that this issue was being regularly monitored by the EU mission in Senegal as part of its activities in the area of human rights. In addition, the Commission stated that it was willing to use the principle of political dialogue under Article 8 of the Cotonou Agreement to draw the attention of the authorities to the EU's concerns in this area, to encourage them to take measures to ensure that the activity of daaras does not lead to abuses of children's rights and to inform them of the EU's readiness to support their efforts in this area.

1. Will the Commission therefore provide an update on its efforts with respect to the children in Senegal that are forced to beg and are subject to abuse by Koranic schools, with respect to the measures and means described in its previous answer in June 2010?
2. In addition, does the Commission have any evidence of progress made regarding this issue?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(21 March 2013)**

The EU follows closely the situation of children in Koranic schools in Senegal, in some of which children face abuses such as child labour, forced begging, exploitation and sexual abuse. Some of the children are trafficked into Senegal from other countries in West Africa. Malnutrition, precarious living conditions and its consequences on children's health and inaccessibility to formal education are deplorable.

Children's rights have been regularly discussed in the political dialogue under Article 8 of the Cotonou Agreement that the EU Delegation and the Ambassadors of Member States hold with Senegalese authorities. The exploitation of children and forced begging were discussed in July 2012 in the first meeting with Senegal's then newly appointed Government, who intends to take measures to curb child abuses and to improve child protection. The EU encouraged the authorities to continue efforts to implement the Convention on the Rights of the Child and relevant national legislation as well as recommendations formulated at Senegal's last Universal Periodical Review in 2009 concerning child protection and right to education.

The rights of the child have been identified as one of the priorities for EU action in the area of human rights in Senegal. The EU and several of its Member States implement concrete projects in Senegal aiming at improving child protection and raising awareness among journalists, local authorities, civil society organisations and community leaders on the phenomena of child begging and trafficking. Support to the civil society organisations in improving their advocacy capacities on children's rights is also provided.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000764/13
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Raimon Obiols (S&D)
(25 de enero de 2013)**

Asunto: VP/HR — Sistema sanitario de Afganistán

Afganistán se enfrenta a enormes necesidades de reconstrucción después de años de guerras y conflictos civiles. Entre sus máximas prioridades se encuentra el desarrollo de un sistema sanitario nacional que ha quedado totalmente debilitado por la inestabilidad del país y que, a día de hoy, no puede responder a las necesidades de la ciudadanía.

Cabe recordar que Afganistán cuenta con una de las tasas de mortalidad infantil y mortalidad materna más elevadas del mundo. La falta de medios médicos y de infraestructuras contribuye a aumentar estas tasas, así como otros problemas derivados de la pobreza extrema y la malnutrición.

Ante esta delicada situación hay que tener presente que los hospitales en el territorio afgano no se encuentran presentes de manera homogénea. Pese a que cada provincia cuenta con un hospital y un ambulatorio, las estadísticas muestran que existen doce camas por cada 10 000 habitantes en la provincia de Kabul, a diferencia de las dos camas de promedio por cada 10 000 habitantes existentes en el resto de provincias.

1. Ante esta realidad, ¿qué esfuerzos realiza el SEAE para contribuir a la reconstrucción del sistema sanitario afgano?
2. ¿Qué planificación existe para la construcción y reconstrucción de hospitales y ambulatorios en el país?
3. ¿Se están tomando medidas para mejorar la preparación del personal médico y sanitario afgano?

**Respuesta del Sr. Piebalgs en nombre de la Comisión
(15 de marzo de 2013)**

La Comisión remite a Su Señoría a la respuesta a la pregunta escrita E-006058/2012 ⁽¹⁾, que aborda un problema similar.

Desde 2001, la UE ha venido apoyando en una serie de provincias la prestación de servicios básicos de asistencia sanitaria (341 millones EUR): Conjunto Básico de Servicios Sanitarios [*Basic Package of Health Services* (BPHS)] y Conjunto Básico de Servicios Hospitalarios [*Essential Package of Hospital Services* (EPHS)]. El BPHS y el EPHS han recibido un amplio reconocimiento por los progresos en la situación sanitaria observados desde 2003. La mejora de la cobertura, la accesibilidad, la utilización, la calidad de los servicios y la supervisión siguen siendo fundamentales para mejorar la situación sanitaria de los afganos.

La UE apoya también la estrategia 2011-2015 del Ministerio de Salud Pública (MSP) y el Programa de Prioridad Nacional «Salud para Todos los Afganos» mediante el programa «Mejorar el Sistema de Salud en Situaciones de Transición» [*System Enhancement for Health Action in Transition* (SEHAT)], adoptado en 2012. La estrategia del MSP incluye intervenciones prioritarias para aumentar el personal de salud comunitaria y para capacitar y poner a trabajar a más comadronas y enfermeras. Una estrecha colaboración entre el Ministerio de Salud Pública y el Ministerio de Enseñanza Superior (MES) garantizará un mayor número de médicos y personal sanitario afganos cualificados.

La construcción y reconstrucción de las instalaciones sanitarias es parte del apoyo que presta la UE al BPHS y al EPHS, especialmente en zonas remotas donde no existe ninguna otra fuente de financiación (por ejemplo, en Ghor, Laghman y Daikundi).

Para más información, la Comisión remite a Su Señoría al documento *State of Play on EU Afghanistan Cooperation* ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2012-006058&language=ES>

⁽²⁾ http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/afghanistan/documents/page_content/eu_afghanistan_state_of_play_0712_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000764/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Raimon Obiols (S&D)
(25 January 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Health system in Afghanistan

Afghanistan is facing major reconstruction needs after years of wars and civil conflicts. Among its top priorities is development of the national health system, which has been wholly weakened by the country's instability and cannot meet the needs of its citizens today.

It should be remembered that Afghanistan has one of the highest infant mortality and maternal mortality rates in the world. The lack of medical facilities and infrastructure serves to increase these rates, as well as other problems related to extreme poverty and malnutrition.

Given this fragile situation, it is important to bear in mind that hospitals inside Afghan territory are not uniformly present. Although each province has a hospital and a clinic, statistics show that there are 12 beds per 10 000 inhabitants in the province of Kabul, as opposed to the average of two beds per 10 000 inhabitants in the other provinces.

1. Given this situation, what efforts is the European External Action Service (EEAS) making to help rebuild the Afghan health system?
2. What planning is there for the construction and reconstruction of hospitals and clinics in the country?
3. Are measures being taken to improve the training of Afghan medical and health workers?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(15 March 2013)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to the answer to Written Question E-006058/2012 ⁽¹⁾ which deals with a similar issue.

Since 2001, the EU has supported the provision of basic healthcare services (EUR 341 million) — 'Basic Package of Health Services' (BPHS) and the 'Essential Package of Hospital Services' (EPHS) — in a number of provinces. BPHS and EPHS are widely credited for the improvements in health status observed since 2003. Improving coverage, accessibility, utilisation, quality of services and monitoring remain critical to further improving the health status of Afghans.

The EU also supports the Ministry of Public Health's (MoPH) strategy 2011-2015 and the National Priority Programme 'Health for All Afghans' through the programme 'System Enhancement for Health in Transition' (SEHAT), adopted in 2012. MoPH's strategy includes priority interventions to increase the number of community health workers and train and deploy increased numbers of midwives and female nurses. Closer collaboration between MoPH and the Ministry of Higher Education (MoHE) will ensure a greater number of trained Afghan medical and health workers.

Construction and reconstruction of Health Facilities is part of the EU's support to the BPHS and EPHS, particularly in remote areas, where no other sources of funding are available (e.g. in Ghor, Laghman and Daikundai).

For additional information, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the State of Play on EU Afghanistan Cooperation ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2012-006058&language=EN>

⁽²⁾ http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/afghanistan/documents/page_content/eu_afghanistan_state_of_play_0712_en.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000765/13
an die Kommission**

Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE)

(25. Januar 2013)

Betrifft: Personal der Europäischen Eisenbahnagentur (ERA)

Die Europäische Eisenbahnagentur (ERA) spielt bei der Schaffung des Einheitlichen Europäischen Eisenbahnraums eine zentrale Rolle und übernimmt in diesem Zusammenhang eine wachsende Zahl von Verantwortlichkeiten. Auch für das 4. Eisenbahnpaket wurde die Zuweisung zusätzlicher Zuständigkeiten angekündigt.

Zugleich sieht sich die Agentur mit Schwierigkeiten bei der Personalpolitik konfrontiert, da sie die Arbeitsverträge erfahrener Experten aufgrund bestehenden Rechts, namentlich der Verordnung 1335/2008, nicht verlängern kann. Gerade in einer Phase der Reifung und Konsolidierung ist die ERA mit einem hohen Abfluss an strategischem Know-How konfrontiert, der die Implementierung der erarbeiteten Grundlagen enorm erschwert. Gleichzeitig erschweren die ständig steigenden Effizienzanforderungen den Wissenstransfer.

Andere EU-Agenturen, wie die Europäische Agentur für Flugsicherheit (EASA), verfügen über großzügigere Regeln bei der Personalpolitik.

Kann die Kommission dazu folgende Fragen beantworten:

1. Welche Maßnahmen hält sie für erforderlich, um der Europäischen Eisenbahnagentur kurzfristig eine Reaktion auf kritische Situationen bei der Personalausstattung zu ermöglichen?
2. Welche mittel- und langfristigen Lösungen sieht sie für das oben genannte Problem?

Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission

(6. März 2013)

Der Kommission ist bewusst, dass die Europäische Eisenbahnagentur (ERA) in den kommenden Jahren voraussichtlich viele Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeiter ersetzen muss und dass es für die kontinuierliche Arbeit und das Wissensmanagement der Agentur entscheidend ist, hochqualifiziertes Personal zu gewinnen und zu halten. Zu den Fragen des Herrn Abgeordneten gibt sie daher folgende Stellungnahme ab:

1. Die Kommission hält die von der Leitung der Agentur bei der letzten Sitzung des Verwaltungsrats der ERA (am 27. November 2012) vorgeschlagenen Maßnahmen für angemessen. Dazu gehören ein früher Beginn der Auswahlverfahren, eine verstärkte Unterstützung im Bereich Personalmanagement (unter anderem in Bezug auf die Übertragung von Akten, die Schulung von Nachfolgerinnen und Nachfolgern, Leitlinien sowie ein Muster für eine Übergabeakte) sowie ein verstärktes Wissensmanagement durch Qualitätsbeauftragte und Referatsleiter/innen. Das Thema soll bei den Sitzungen des Verwaltungsrats der ERA regelmäßig erörtert werden, und die Kommission wird die Lage systematisch überwachen.
2. Die von der Kommission im Rahmen des 4. Eisenbahnpakets vorgeschlagene neue Agenturverordnung⁽¹⁾ (die vom Kollegium am 30. Januar 2013 angenommen wurde) enthält in Artikel 61 überarbeitete Bestimmungen hinsichtlich des Personals der Agentur, wonach die in der derzeitigen Grundverordnung vorgesehenen Beschränkungen entfallen sollen. Die Kommission hält diesen flexibleren Ansatz für eine geeignete mittel- und langfristige Lösung.

⁽¹⁾ KOM(2013)27 endg.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000765/13
to the Commission**

Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE)

(25 January 2013)

Subject: Staff of the European Railway Agency (ERA)

The European Railway Agency (ERA) plays a key role in establishing a single European railway area, and is taking on an ever greater number of responsibilities in this connection. It has been announced that it will also be given additional responsibilities under the Fourth Railway Package.

At the same time, however, the Agency is facing problems linked to its personnel policy, since it is unable to extend the employment contracts of experienced experts on the basis of existing legislation, in particular Regulation (EC) No 1335/2008. This means that the ERA is experiencing significant losses of strategic know-how during this development and consolidation phase, making it much more difficult for the foundations which have been established to be implemented. The constant demands for increased efficiency are also making it difficult to transfer knowledge.

The personnel policies of other EU agencies, such as the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA), are subject to more generous rules.

Can the Commission answer the following:

1. What steps does it believe need to be taken in order to allow the European Railway Agency to respond promptly to critical staffing problems?
2. What does it propose in terms of mid-term and long-term solutions to the abovementioned problem?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission

(6 March 2013)

The Commission is aware of the expected high replacement rate of ERA staff in the coming years, and that recruiting and retaining high-quality personnel is crucial for business continuity and knowledge management of the Agency. In light of the above, the answers to the questions of the Honourable Member are the following:

1. Commission considers the mitigating measures presented by the management of the Agency at the last Administrative Board meeting of ERA (27 November 2012) as appropriate to deal with the issue. They include: early start of selection procedures, reinforced HR assistance (regarding, *inter alia*, transfer of files, training of successors, guidelines and a template of a hand-over file), reinforced knowledge management process by a Quality Officer and Heads of Units. This subject will become a regular point on the agenda of the Board meetings of ERA and the Commission will systematically assess the situation.
2. The new ERA Regulation ⁽¹⁾, proposed by the Commission as part of the 4th Railway Package (adopted by the College on 30 January 2013), includes in its Article 61 revised provisions in relation to the staff of the Agency, without the limitations present in the current basic Regulation. The Commission considers this more flexible approach as the appropriate mid- and long-term solution.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2013)27 final.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000770/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(25 janvier 2013)

Objet: Médicaments inutiles et surconsommation médicamenteuse

Selon un livre écrit par un ancien ministre français de la santé, un médicament sur deux est inutile. Ce livre relance un vif débat autour de l'efficacité de certains médicaments et leur utilisation par des milliers de personnes. Dans ce guide, les auteurs s'attaquent ainsi tout particulièrement aux statines. Ces traitements contre le cholestérol «avalés par 3 à 5 millions de Français», qui coûtent «à la France 2 milliards d'euros par an», les auteurs les jugent «complètement inutiles». Toujours selon les auteurs, pour régler le problème du manque d'argent dans le domaine de la santé et du déficit de l'assurance maladie, «il suffit donc de retirer du marché les médicaments dangereux, inutiles ou inefficaces»; l'industrie pharmaceutique y est considérée comme étant «la plus lucrative, la plus cynique, la moins éthique de toutes les industries» assurant qu'en «3 ans et demi elle double son capital et elle le quadruple en sept ans». Plus précisément, le livre recenserait «50 % de médicaments inutiles, 20 % de mal tolérés, 5 % de “potentiellement très dangereux”, mais dont, incroyable paradoxe, 75 % sont remboursés». Selon les auteurs, leur déremboursement rapporterait entre 10 à 15 milliards d'euros à la Sécurité sociale. Une liste noire de médicaments, qui comprend notamment des médicaments cardiovasculaires, des anti-inflammatoires et des pilules contraceptives y est dressée.

L'ouvrage ayant été largement relayé par les médias et les différents acteurs liés au dossier, cet ouvrage alarme, inutilement ou non, les citoyens européens et risque de les conduire à arrêter de leur propre chef des traitements pourtant adaptés aux maladies dont ils souffrent”.

1. La Commission s'est-elle penchée sur cet ouvrage et compte-t-elle réagir sous une forme ou une autre?
2. La Commission possède-t-elle des statistiques et des pourcentages concernant des médicaments inutiles? Que répond-elle à la phrase: «50 % de médicaments inutiles, 20 % de mal tolérés, 5 % de “potentiellement très dangereux”, mais dont, incroyable paradoxe, 75 % sont remboursés»?
3. Quelles sont les statistiques pour l'Europe et aussi par États membres sur la surconsommation de médicaments?
4. La Commission entreprend-elle ou compte-t-elle entreprendre quelque chose pour endiguer cette surconsommation?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(11 mars 2013)

1.-2. La Commission a connaissance du livre mentionné. Elle ne peut pas confirmer les chiffres auxquels se réfère l'Honorable Parlementaire. La législation de l'UE sur les médicaments, modifiée récemment dans le domaine de la pharmacovigilance (2010 et 2012), offre un cadre solide pour garantir que les médicaments ne sont mis à la disposition des patients de l'UE que s'ils répondent à des normes élevées de qualité, de sécurité et d'efficacité. En particulier, le rapport entre les avantages et les risques du produit doit être positif, sinon celui-ci n'est pas autorisé. La Commission n'a pas l'intention de répondre spécifiquement au livre.

3.-4. Conformément à l'article 168, paragraphe 7, du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne, les États membres sont responsables en ce qui concerne la définition de leur politique de santé ainsi que l'organisation et la fourniture de services de santé et de soins médicaux. Cela inclut notamment les mesures destinées à influencer sur la consommation des médicaments et le budget correspondant consacré aux soins de santé. Cependant, il convient de souligner que l'un des principes clés de la législation pharmaceutique européenne est l'utilisation rationnelle des médicaments. De plus, l'UE soutient les États membres au moyen de diverses actions telles que l'utilisation de méthodes d'évaluation des technologies de la santé permettant d'évaluer la valeur thérapeutique ajoutée des produits de santé.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000770/13
to the Commission**

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(25 January 2013)

Subject: Ineffective drugs and excessive consumption of medicinal products

According to a book written by a former French health minister, one in two medicinal products is ineffective. The book has reignited a lively debate on the efficacy of certain drugs and their use by thousands of people. In their guide, the authors are particularly critical of statins. They regard these anti-cholesterol drugs, which are taken by 3 to 5 million French people and cost France EUR 2 billion per year, as completely ineffective. They also maintain that, in order to solve the problem of budget shortfalls in the health sector and the health insurance deficit, dangerous, useless or ineffective drugs should simply be taken off the market. The pharmaceutical industry is described in the book as being the most lucrative, the most cynical and the least ethical of all industries, ensuring that it doubles its capital in three and a half years and quadruples it in seven years. More specifically, the book finds that 50 % of drugs are ineffective, 20 % are poorly tolerated and 5 % are 'potentially very dangerous', but the incredible paradox is that 75 % of them are paid for by the state. According to the authors, savings of EUR 10 to 15 billion would be made in the social security budget if they were no longer paid for by the state. The book draws up a blacklist of medicinal products, including in particular cardiovascular drugs, anti-inflammatories and contraceptive pills.

Having been widely reported on by the media and the various stakeholders involved in the issue, this book has, rightly or wrongly, alarmed the European public and may lead them to take it upon themselves to stop taking medication that is nonetheless right for their illnesses.

1. Has the Commission studied this book and does it intend to respond in any way?
2. Does the Commission have any figures and percentages relating to ineffective drugs? What is its response to the assertion that 50 % of drugs are ineffective, 20 % are poorly tolerated and 5 % are 'potentially very dangerous', but the incredible paradox is that 75 % of them are paid for by the state?
3. What are the figures for excessive consumption of medicinal products at EU and Member State level?
4. Is the Commission doing anything, or does it plan to do anything, to curb this excessive consumption?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission

(11 March 2013)

1 and 2. The Commission is aware of the book mentioned. It cannot confirm the figures referred to by the Honourable Member. The EU's legislation on medicinal products, amended recently in the area of pharmacovigilance in 2010 and 2012, provides for a strong framework in order to ensure that the medicines are made available to patients in the EU only if they are of high standards of quality, safety and efficacy. In particular, the ratio between the benefits of the product and its risk must be positive, otherwise it will not be authorised. The Commission does not intend to respond specifically to the book.

3 and 4. In accordance with Article 168(7) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Member States are responsible for the definition of their health policy and for the organisation and delivery of health services and medical care. This includes in particular measures to influence the consumption of medicinal products and the relevant healthcare budget. However, it needs to be stressed that one of the key principles of European pharmaceutical legislation is the rational use of medicines. In addition, the EU supports Member States through various actions such as on the use of Health-Technology Assessment allowing to assess the added therapeutic value of healthcare products.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000772/13
à la Commission
Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE), Sandrine Bélier (Verts/ALE) et Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
(25 janvier 2013)

Objet: Neutralité de l'internet et déclarations de la commissaire Kroes à Libération

Dans un article publié le 16 janvier 2013 par le quotidien *Libération*, la commissaire Kroes déclare proposer une initiative qui permettrait aux fournisseurs d'accès d'offrir des formes moins chères mais limitées de services internet, pour lesquelles certaines parties du réseau des réseaux seraient inaccessibles.

À plusieurs reprises, le Parlement européen a affirmé, comme position de principe, que le maintien de la neutralité du Net était d'une extrême importance, notamment dans sa résolution du 26 octobre 2012 sur l'achèvement du marché unique numérique ⁽¹⁾.

1. La Commission pourrait-elle confirmer qu'elle planifie une nouvelle initiative touchant la liberté sur l'internet, ainsi que l'évoque l'article cité dans *Libération*?
2. Envisage-t-elle d'autoriser, sous certaines conditions, les fournisseurs d'accès à l'internet à proposer des services à contenu limité (à la fois pour l'internet fixe et mobile)?
3. Dans l'affirmative, a-t-elle médité les diverses résolutions adoptées par le Parlement européen, dans lesquelles il rejette absolument une telle conception du marché pour l'internet? Comment imagine-t-elle concilier une telle proposition avec lesdites résolutions?
4. Cette proposition de la Commission va-t-elle limiter ou atteindre les interdictions de violer la neutralité du Net que certains États membres ont mises en place ou proposent de mettre en place?
5. La Commission a-t-elle étudié les effets possibles des mesures qu'elle prévoit sur l'innovation dans le domaine des services internet? Si c'est le cas, accepterait-elle d'en partager les leçons avec le Parlement européen?
6. Est-elle prête à se désolidariser des commentaires de la commissaire Kroes dans *Libération*?
7. Quand le Parlement européen peut-il espérer une initiative de la part de la Commission pour inscrire la neutralité du Net dans le droit européen?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Kroes au nom de la Commission
(15 mars 2013)

La Commission partage entièrement l'avis du Parlement, selon lequel un internet ouvert est essentiel pour une société pluraliste, ainsi que pour le développement socio-économique et l'innovation. Elle prendra en considération les résolutions du Parlement lors de l'élaboration des initiatives et des mesures visant à contribuer à la réalisation de ces objectifs.

Se fondant sur les résultats d'une enquête sur la gestion du trafic, réalisée par l'Organe des régulateurs européens des communications électroniques (ORECE), la Commission entend proposer des orientations aux autorités réglementaires nationales (ARN) en vue de promouvoir la concurrence, l'innovation, la sécurité juridique et l'autonomisation des consommateurs, notamment en matière de transparence (vitesses de connexion réelles, plafonds de données, etc.), ce qui facilitera le changement de fournisseur et l'utilisation responsable des outils de gestion du trafic. En vertu du cadre réglementaire de l'UE, les ARN disposent déjà des instruments pour garantir la qualité du service et la neutralité de l'internet. Les orientations devraient dès lors contribuer au développement d'approches cohérentes entre les États membres et ainsi éviter la fragmentation du marché unique qui en découlerait si les États membres mettaient en œuvre des politiques distinctes.

⁽¹⁾ 2012/2030(INI) — textes adoptés de cette date, P7_TA(2012)0468.

Soucieuse de favoriser un débat public éclairé, la vice-présidente et membre de la Commission responsable de la stratégie numérique a récemment présenté dans le cadre d'un article paru dans *Libération* un certain nombre d'éléments essentiels qui pourraient sous-tendre une approche positive et prospective de la neutralité de l'internet, compte tenu du fait que la technologie et les modèles économiques évoluent rapidement. À la suite d'une consultation publique menée à l'automne dernier, la Commission procède actuellement à une analyse d'impact afin de déterminer la solution qui répond le mieux aux objectifs politiques tout en respectant les principes d'amélioration de la réglementation. Elle prévoit de présenter son projet d'orientations d'ici à l'été.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000772/13
aan de Commissie
Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE), Sandrine Bélier (Verts/ALE) en Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
(25 januari 2013)

Betreft: Neutraliteit op het net en de uitspraken van commissaris Kroes in *Libération*

In een op 16 januari 2013 in de Franse krant *Libération* verschenen artikel verklaart commissaris Kroes een initiatief voor te stellen dat internetproviders het recht geeft goedkopere maar beperktere internetdiensten aan te bieden. Daarmee zouden bepaalde sites ontoegankelijk worden.

Bij diverse gelegenheden heeft het Parlement verklaard groot belang te hechten aan waarborging van neutraliteit op het net, onder meer in zijn resolutie van 26 oktober 2012 inzake het voltooiën van de digitale interne markt ⁽¹⁾.

1. Kan de Commissie bevestigen of zij van plan is een nieuw initiatief te nemen dat gevolgen heeft voor de vrijheid op internet, zoals commissaris Kroes verklaart in bovengenoemd opinieartikel in het Franse dagblad *Libération*?
2. Kan de Commissie bevestigen of zij overweegt om internetproviders onder bepaalde voorwaarden internetdiensten met beperkte inhoud te laten aanbieden (zowel voor mobiel als voor vast internet)?
3. Zo ja, is het de Commissie bekend dat het Parlement diverse resoluties heeft aangenomen waarin deze interpretatie van de internetmarkt volstrekt wordt afgewezen? Hoe denkt de Commissie een dergelijk voorstel in overeenstemming te brengen met deze resoluties?
4. Wordt het verbod op schending van neutraliteit op het net dat geldt in sommige lidstaten of dat sommige lidstaten beogen in te voeren geraakt of ingeperkt door dit voorstel van de Commissie?
5. Heeft de Commissie onderzocht of de door haar beoogde maatregelen gevolgen hebben voor innovatie op het gebied van internetdiensten? Zo ja, is zij bereid de uitkomsten van dit onderzoek te delen met het Parlement?
6. Is de Commissie bereid de uitspraken van commissaris Kroes in *Libération* te herroepen?
7. Wanneer kan het Parlement een initiatief tegemoet zien waarmee de Commissie de neutraliteit op het net inbedt in Europese wetgeving?

Antwoord van mevrouw Kroes namens de Commissie
(15 maart 2013)

De Commissie is het volledig eens met het Parlement dat een open internet van essentieel belang is voor een pluralistische samenleving en voor socio-economische ontwikkeling en innovatie. Zij zal rekening houden met de resoluties van het Parlement bij de formulering van initiatieven en maatregelen om deze doelstellingen te ondersteunen.

Op basis van de resultaten van een onderzoek naar gegevensverkeersbeheer door het Orgaan van Europese regelgevende instanties voor elektronische communicatie (BEREC) wil de Commissie voor meer concurrentie, innovatie en rechtszekerheid zorgen en de positie van de consument verbeteren door de NRI's richtsnoeren te bieden, onder meer inzake transparantie (werkelijke internetsnelheden, datalimieten enz.), het eenvoudiger overstappen naar een andere provider en een verantwoord gebruik van instrumenten voor gegevensverkeersbeheer. Op grond van het regelgevingskader van de Europese Unie beschikken de NRI's reeds over de instrumenten om de kwaliteit van de dienstverlening en netneutraliteit te garanderen. Daarom moeten de richtsnoeren bijdragen aan een coherente benadering in alle lidstaten en zo de versnippering van de eengemaakte markt voorkomen. Dat zou namelijk het resultaat zijn als elke lidstaat een ander beleid zou hanteren.

⁽¹⁾ 2012/2030(INI) — Aangenomen teksten, P7_TA(2012)0468.

Om bij te dragen aan een geïnformeerd publiek debat heeft de vicevoorzitter van de Commissie, die tevens verantwoordelijk is voor de Digitale Agenda, onlangs in *Libération* enkele pijlers beschreven voor een positieve en toekomstgerichte benadering van netneutraliteit die rekening houdt met de snel veranderende technologie en bedrijfsmodellen. In het verlengde van een openbare raadpleging die vorig najaar is gehouden, werkt de Commissie op dit moment aan een effectbeoordeling om na te gaan met welke optie de doelstellingen het best kunnen worden verwezenlijkt met inachtneming van de beginselen van betere regelgeving. De Commissie verwacht haar ontwerpsrichtsnoeren uiterlijk deze zomer te kunnen voorstellen.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000772/13
to the Commission**

Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE), Sandrine Bélier (Verts/ALE) and Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
(25 January 2013)

Subject: Net neutrality and Commissioner Kroes' statements in 'Libération'

In an article published in the French newspaper 'Libération' on 16 January 2013, Commissioner Kroes states that she is proposing an initiative that would grant Internet providers the right to offer cheaper but restricted types of Internet services, under which certain parts of the Internet would not be accessible.

Parliament has on several occasions affirmed the position that upholding net neutrality is of the utmost importance, as in its resolution of October 26 2012 on completing the Digital Single Market ⁽¹⁾.

1. Could the Commission confirm whether it is planning a new initiative affecting Internet freedom, as referred to in the above op-ed article in the French daily 'Libération'?
2. Could the Commission confirm whether it is considering allowing Internet providers, subject to certain conditions, the option of offering content-limited Internet services (for both mobile and fixed-line Internet)?
3. If so, is the Commission familiar with the various resolutions adopted by Parliament in which such an interpretation of the Internet market is totally rejected? How does the Commission envision bringing such a proposal into line with those resolutions?
4. Will this Commission's proposal limit or affect the prohibitions on violation of net neutrality that some Member States have in place or propose to have in place?
5. Has the Commission investigated the possible effects of its planned measures on innovation in the field of Internet services? If so, would it be willing to share the outcomes of this research with Parliament?
6. Would the Commission be prepared to withdraw the comments made by Commissioner Kroes in 'Libération'?
7. When may Parliament expect an initiative from the Commission to embed net neutrality in European law?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission

(15 March 2013)

The Commission fully agrees with the Parliament that an open Internet is essential for a pluralistic society, and for socioeconomic development and innovation. It will take the resolutions of the Parliament into account as it formulates initiatives and measures to support these goals.

Based on the results of a traffic management investigation carried out by the Body of European Regulators for Electronic Communications (BEREC), the Commission intends to propose guidance to National Regulatory Authorities (NRAs) with a view to promoting competition, innovation, legal certainty and consumer empowerment, including on transparency (actual Internet speeds, data caps, etc.), facilitating switching between providers and responsible use of traffic management tools. Under the EU regulatory framework, NRAs already have the tools to ensure quality of service and net neutrality. Guidance should therefore contribute to coherent approaches across Member States and thus avoid fragmentation of the Single Market which would result if each Member State implemented distinct policies.

In order to contribute to an informed public debate, the Vice-President and Member of the Commission responsible for Digital Agenda has recently set out in 'Libération' a number of key elements which could underpin a positive, forward-looking approach to net neutrality, taking account of the fact that technology and business models are changing fast. Following a public consultation conducted last autumn, the Commission is currently carrying out an impact assessment to identify the option that best meets the policy objectives while respecting Better Regulation principles. It expects to present its draft guidance by the summer.

⁽¹⁾ 2012/2030(INI) — Texts adopted, P7_TA(2012)0468.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000773/13

aan de Commissie

Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)

(25 januari 2013)

Betref: EU-controle van nationale media

Afgelopen week is er een rapport uitgebracht met aanbevelingen voor „vrije en pluralistische media” in Europa. De aanbevelingen doen juist vrezen voor het tegenovergestelde, namelijk dat de vrijheid van de lidstaten om mediavrijheid te garanderen door EU-inmenging wordt beknot. Op pagina drie zegt het rapport bijvoorbeeld: „The EU should be considered competent to act to protect media freedom and pluralism at State level [...]” Op pagina 21 stelt het rapport: „The national media councils should follow a set of European-wide standards and be monitored by the Commission to ensure that they comply with European values.”

1. Kan de Commissie uiteenzetten, waarom zij veronderstelt dat de EU beter in staat zou zijn dan de lidstaten om de vrijheid en pluriformiteit van de nationale media te garanderen?
2. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat het de verantwoordelijkheid is van nationale lidstaten om nationale mediavrijheid te garanderen? Zo neen, waarom niet?
3. Op pagina vijf in het rapport wordt voorgesteld dat het agentschap voor fundamentele rechten rapporten uitbrengt over het medialandschap op nationaal niveau, die vervolgens door het Europees Parlement worden beoordeeld. Het Europees Parlement kan ook maatregelen voorstellen.

Vraag: is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat het Europees Parlement zich niet dient te bemoeien met nationaal mediabeleid en niets te zeggen moet hebben over eventuele maatregelen gericht tegen nationale staten? Zo neen, waarom niet?

4. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat Europese inmengingen met mediabeleid binnen lidstaten, juist de vrijheid en pluriformiteit van de lidstaten ondermijnt? Zo neen, waarom niet?
5. Het rapport stelt: „The EU should not only act to protect media freedom and pluralism within its own Member States but also beyond its borders [...]”

Vraag: moet hieruit worden opgemaakt dat de EU voornemens is mediabeleid, uiteraard op basis van de eigen maatstaven, op te leggen aan de rest van de wereld?

Antwoord van mevrouw Kroes namens de Commissie

(13 maart 2013)

Het rapport dat de groep op hoog niveau inzake vrijheid en pluriformiteit van de media op 21 januari 2013 heeft uitgebracht, is in volledige onafhankelijkheid tot stand gekomen en geeft geen officieel standpunt van de Europese Commissie weer.

Vrije en pluralistische media zijn een van de fundamentele pijlers van de democratie in Europa en verankerd in het Europees Handvest van de grondrechten. De Commissie heeft op 10 maart 2011 van het Europees Parlement de uitnodiging gekregen om een wetgevingsinitiatief te nemen inzake mediavrijheid, pluriformiteit en onafhankelijke governance. Daarnaast is er het Europees initiatief voor pluriformiteit van de media, dat de Europese instellingen oproept het recht op onafhankelijke en pluralistische informatie te vrijwaren. Er is bijgevolg behoefte aan een ruimer, open debat over de rol van de EU in een snel evoluerend medialandschap — een debat dat met volledige inachtneming van de grenzen van de EU-bevoegdheden, zoals vastgelegd in het Verdrag, wordt gevoerd.

De Europese Commissie zal binnenkort de volgende stappen in het debat over mediavrijheid en pluriformiteit in de Europese Unie aankondigen. Het gaat er daarbij om te zorgen voor een breed overleg.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000773/13
to the Commission**

Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(25 January 2013)

Subject: EU control of national media

A report was published last week with recommendations for 'Media Freedom and Pluralism' in Europe. We fear that these recommendations do the opposite by curtailing each Member State's right to ensure media freedom through EU interference. For example, page three of the report states: 'The EU should be considered competent to act to protect media freedom and pluralism at State level ...' Page 21 of the report says: 'The national media councils should follow a set of European-wide standards and be monitored by the Commission to ensure that they comply with European values.'

1. Can the Commission explain why it assumes that the EU is better placed than the Member States to ensure the freedom and pluralism of the national media?
2. Does the Commission agree with the PVV (Dutch Party for Freedom) that it is the responsibility of national Member States to guarantee national media freedom? If not, why not?
3. Page five of the report proposes that the Agency for Fundamental Rights prepares a report on the media landscape at national level, which can then be reviewed by the European Parliament. The European Parliament can also propose measures.

Question: Does the Commission agree with the PVV that the European Parliament should not interfere with national media policy and should not have any say in possible measures affecting individual countries? If not, why not?

4. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that European interference with media policy within Member States actually undermines the freedom and pluralism of the Member States? If not, why not?
5. The report states: 'The EU should not only act to protect media freedom and pluralism within its own Member States but also beyond its borders ...'

Question: Does this statement lead one to conclude that the EU intends to impose its media policy based on its own measures, of course, on the rest of the world?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(13 March 2013)

The High-Level Group on Media Freedom and Pluralism presented its report on 21 January 2013. The report was prepared in full independence and it does not represent the official position of the European Commission.

Media freedom and pluralism are fundamental pillars of democracy in Europe, enshrined in the European Charter of Fundamental Rights. On 10 March 2011, the European Parliament called on the Commission to propose a legislative initiative on media freedom, pluralism and independent governance. Another example is the European Initiative for Media Pluralism which calls on the European institutions to safeguard the right to independent and pluralistic information. Hence, there is a need for a wider and open debate about the EU's proper role in a rapidly evolving media landscape — a debate which is conducted in full recognition of the limits which are set to EU competences by the Treaty.

The European Commission will announce soon the next steps to be taken in the debate on media freedom and pluralism in the European Union. The aim of the next steps will be to ensure the broad consultation on those topics.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000774/13
a la Comisión**

Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)

(25 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: Resultados de la amnistía fiscal española

El Gobierno español abrió un proceso de amnistía fiscal para facilitar el afloramiento de capitales procedentes de dinero negro, garantizando que no se investigaría su procedencia. Esta amnistía ha durado desde el 30 de marzo hasta el 30 de noviembre de 2012 y, según las recientes declaraciones del Ministro de Hacienda español, se han declarado aproximadamente 40 000 millones de euros.

Una amnistía fiscal de estas características supone la regularización de capitales procedentes de actividades ilegales sobre las cuales no se dispone de información. De esta manera, todo tipo de fondos sobre los que no existe información de procedencia resultan premiados, tributando este ridículo 10 % frente a casi un 50 % que afecta de media a la renta de las personas físicas.

Más allá de las importantísimas acusaciones de corrupción que se han lanzado sobre esta amnistía, el Ministro de Hacienda sostuvo en sus declaraciones que, de estos 40 000 millones declarados, se habían recaudado para las arcas públicas aproximadamente unos 1 193 millones de euros. Esta cantidad supondría una tributación de un 3 % sobre los capitales aflorados, que contrasta con el 10 % que sostuvo en marzo cuando inició la amnistía fiscal. Esto implicaría que los planes de recaudación eran erróneos y que se ha ofrecido otro tipo de acuerdos a los defraudadores o que ha aflorado una cantidad menor de fondos que la publicitada por el Gobierno. Según el ministro, la amnistía no implica que se borren los datos sobre los defraudadores, pero no ha dado ningún tipo de información sobre cómo se investigarán y qué consecuencias legales concretas tendrán estos 40 000 millones que pueden proceder de todo tipo de actividades delictivas en cualquier lugar del mundo. Sin olvidar la cuestión de la procedencia de los fondos legalizados, el tipo al que han tributado dichos fondos puede suponer una competencia fiscal perniciosa, con respecto al resto de sistemas fiscales de la Unión.

¿Considera la Comisión que la regularización fiscal ejecutada por el Gobierno español puede considerarse una «mejor práctica» para la cooperación fiscal y que respeta el principio de «proporcionalidad» contra medidas abusivas según los términos establecidos en la comunicación COM(2007)0785? ¿Considera que dicha regularización se adapta a lo establecido en la comunicación COM(2012)0722? ¿Solicitará información al Gobierno español para comprobar su voluntad de acogerse a lo establecido en estas comunicaciones?

Respuesta del Sr. Šemeta en nombre de la Comisión

(22 de mayo de 2013)

La Comisión toma nota de la reciente introducción de un proceso de amnistía fiscal en España. La Comisión no propugna estas medidas, cuya introducción, en ausencia de armonización de la UE en esta área o de infracciones de las normas del Tratado, es un asunto que corresponde a los Estados miembros considerar y del que a ellos les compete asumir la responsabilidad. La Comisión comparte la opinión de que se debe incrementar el cumplimiento de las obligaciones fiscales. Por ejemplo, en el plan de acción expuesto en la Comunicación de 6 de diciembre de 2012 se propone elaborar un código del contribuyente europeo con ese fin. En esa fecha la Comisión adoptó también dos recomendaciones, sobre planificación fiscal agresiva y sobre medidas encaminadas a fomentar la aplicación, por parte de terceros países, de normas mínimas de buena gobernanza. La reciente creación de una plataforma de buena gobernanza fiscal ayudará a la Comisión, en concreto al informar sobre la aplicación de estas dos recomendaciones por los Estados miembros.

La finalidad de las amnistías fiscales es animar a los contribuyentes a informar de rentas o patrimonio que no habían declarado antes y, como tales, no son medidas contra las prácticas abusivas como las mencionadas en la Comunicación COM(2007)785, que se refiere a las medidas contra prácticas abusivas que pueden restringir el ejercicio de las libertades fundamentales amparadas por el Tratado de la UE. La necesidad de evitar la evasión fiscal (o el abuso) puede constituir una razón imperiosa de interés general capaz de justificar esas restricciones, siempre que las medidas restrictivas no excedan de lo necesario para lograr el objetivo que persiguen (es decir, el principio de proporcionalidad que se expone en la Comunicación).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000774/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(25 January 2013)

Subject: Outcome of the Spanish tax amnesty

The Spanish Government introduced a tax amnesty scheme to help regularise capital, stating that the origins of undeclared money would not be investigated. This scheme ran from 30 March to 30 November 2012, and the Spanish Finance Minister recently stated that some EUR 40 000 million had been declared.

A tax amnesty of this nature involves the regularisation of capital from illegal activities about which no information is available. This means that all sorts of money from unknown sources has been awarded a premium in the form of a ridiculous 10% tax rate, as opposed to the rate of almost 50% on average that ordinary people have to pay on their earnings.

Despite the extremely serious allegations of corruption that have been made in connection with this amnesty, the Finance Minister maintained that, of the EUR 40 000 million that had been declared, approximately EUR 1 193 million had been collected for the public purse. This amount would represent a 3% tax contribution on the regularised capital, in contrast to the 10% the Minister mentioned in March, when he launched the tax amnesty. This implies that the collection plans were false and that the defrauders had been offered other arrangements, or that less money has been regularised than the government suggests. The Finance Minister maintains that the amnesty does not mean that data on defrauders is being deleted, but he has given no information on how they will be investigated or what the specific legal consequences will be as regards the EUR 40 000 million in question, which may include the proceeds of all kinds of crimes committed all over the world. In addition to the issues surrounding the origin of regularised capital, the rate at which they have been taxed may constitute unfair tax competition by comparison with other tax systems in the EU.

Does the Commission take the view that the tax regularisation carried out by the Spanish Government could possibly be considered to constitute 'best practice' where tax cooperation is concerned? Does it comply with the principle of proportionality laid down as an anti-abuse measure in Commission Communication COM(2007)0785? Does the Commission take the view that this regularisation is in line with Commission Communication COM(2012)0722? Will the Commission be requesting information from the Spanish Government in order to ascertain its willingness to comply with the two communications mentioned above?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(22 May 2013)

The Commission takes note of the recent introduction of a tax amnesty scheme in Spain. The Commission does not advocate such measures, the introduction of which, in the absence of EU harmonisation in the area or indeed infringements of Treaty rules, is a matter for the Member States to consider and to take responsibility for. The Commission shares the view that tax compliance should be enhanced. For instance, the action plan included in the communication of 6 December 2012 proposes the development of a European taxpayer's code to that end. On that date, the Commission also adopted two recommendations, regarding aggressive tax planning and measures to encourage third countries to apply minimum standards of good governance. The newly created Platform for Tax Good Governance will assist the Commission, notably in reporting on the application of the two recommendations by Member States.

Tax amnesties are designed to encourage taxpayers to report previously undeclared income or assets and, as such, they are not anti-abuse measures as referred to in the communication COM(2007)785 which deals with questions related to anti-abuse measures that may restrict the exercise of the fundamental EU Treaty freedoms. The need to prevent tax avoidance (or abuse) can constitute an overriding reason in the public interest capable of justifying such restrictions, provided that the restrictive measures do not go beyond what is necessary to achieve the objective sought by them (i.e. the principle of proportionality, as discussed in the communication).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000776/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)

(25 January 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Freedom of religion in China: the case of Bishop James Su Zhimin (Su Zhemin)

Bishop Su (born 1932) has been held in detention in Baoding since 8 October 1997. Before then, he had been arrested at least five times, and has spent almost 27 years in prison. He was imprisoned following failed attempts to force him to join the Chinese Patriotic Catholic Association.

The only record of his existence since the 1997 arrest is a hospitalisation report released in November 2003. He has been kept under strict surveillance during this time and his family has been denied visits and not given any further information. Since then, the whereabouts of Bishop Su are still unknown, and prison authorities deny his presence at the facility.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of this case?
2. What action does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to take in order to find out the whereabouts and the condition of Bishop James Su Zhimin?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(11 March 2013)

1. The EU is particularly concerned by restrictions on freedom of religion and harassment of people in relation to expressing their beliefs in China. These concerns have been reiterated at the EU-China human rights dialogue on 29 May 2012. The EU also regularly voices its concerns related to the situation of freedom of religion and belief in China at the UN Human Rights Council.
 2. The Vice-President/High Representative is aware of the case of Bishop James Su Zhimin. Together with other individual cases of persecution, the EU intends to raise his case with the Chinese authorities at the next round of the EU-China human rights dialogue.
 3. In the meantime, the EU will continue to engage China on the issue of freedom of religion, via demarches and in the framework of high level political meetings, including in contacts by the EU Special Representative on Human Rights.
-

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000777/13

προς την Επιτροπή
Niki Tzavela (EFD)
(25 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Η καταστροφική συνταγή της τρόικας

Σύμφωνα με δημοσιεύματα στον ελληνικό τύπο, το στέλεχος του ΔΝΤ και εμπνευστής του καταστροφικού πολλαπλασιαστή, Ολιβιέ Μπλανσάρ, είπε τα εξής:

Η «εσωτερική υποτίμηση» ήταν η λάθος συνταγή που ακολούθησε η τρόικα κατά την εφαρμογή της πολιτικής λιτότητας στην Ελλάδα και στην Πορτογαλία. Ο Ολιβιέ Μπλανσάρ παραδέχεται στην έκθεσή του το τραγικό λάθος. Ο κ. Μπλανσάρ δεν μπόρεσε να μην παραδεχθεί ότι «η δημοσιονομική προσαρμογή δεν ήταν αυτό που ελπίζαμε». Μπορεί να αναιθεώρησαν τη δημοσιονομική πολιτική καταφεύγοντας σε αυτόματους σταθεροποιητές, αλλά τίποτα δεν άλλαξε για την Ελλάδα και την Πορτογαλία. Απλώς μετέθεσαν χρονικά τους στόχους για να διαπιστώσουν ότι «όσο πιο αργά προσαρμόζεσαι δημοσιονομικά τόσο μεγαλύτερη χρηματοδότηση απαιτείται», για να συμπληρώσει χαρακτηριστικά ο κ. Μπλανσάρ ότι «και αυτή δεν είναι ατελείωτη».

Με βάση αυτές τις δηλώσεις, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Πως κρίνει τη πορεία του μεταρρυθμιστικού προγράμματος στις χώρες του Ευρωπαϊκού νότου και αν είναι ικανοποιημένη με τα αποτελέσματά της τη στιγμή που όλο και περισσότεροι αξιωματούχοι του ΔΝΤ, σε δηλώσεις τους, κάνουν λόγο για αδιέξοδο στις μεταρρυθμιστικές προσπάθειες των κρατών του Νότου.

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής

(4 Μαρτίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή αξιολογεί τακτικά την πρόοδο στα οικονομικά προγράμματα προσαρμογής της Πορτογαλίας και της Ελλάδας.

Η αξιοπιστία των πρόσφατων μελετών σχετικά με τον δημοσιονομικό πολλαπλασιαστή περιορίζεται από τον βραχυπρόθεσμο χρονικό ορίζοντα και άλλους παράγοντες που ενδεχομένως είχαν επιπτώσεις στην ανάπτυξη σε σύγκριση με ό,τι αναμενόταν. Στους παράγοντες αυτούς περιλαμβάνονται οι επιπτώσεις εμπιστοσύνης που υλοποιούνται τώρα και από τις οποίες επωφελούνται οι ευάλωτες χώρες. Εάν ληφθεί υπόψη η απώλεια της εμπιστοσύνης των επενδυτών που εκφράζεται με την αύξηση των αποδόσεων των κρατικών ομολόγων, έχει αποδειχθεί ότι τα στοιχεία δεν είναι ασύμβατα με έναν μικρότερο της μονάδας μέσο πολλαπλασιαστή, όπως χρησιμοποιείται στα συνήθη μακροοικονομικά πρότυπα.

Οι πρόσφατες μελέτες έχουν ιδιαίτερα μικρή χρηστική αξία στην περίπτωση της Ελλάδας, άποψη που εκφράστηκε και σε άρθρο του επικεφαλής οικονομολόγου του Διεθνούς Νομισματικού Ταμείου που δημοσιεύτηκε στον ελληνικό τύπο.

Το 2009, το δημοσιονομικό έλλειμμα ανήλθε σε 15,6% του ΑΕΠ και οι αγορές δεν ήταν πλέον πρόθυμες να χρηματοδοτήσουν τα υψηλά επίπεδα χρέους της Ελλάδας. Αυτό οδήγησε στη δρομολόγηση του προγράμματος χρηματοδοτικής ενίσχυσης, την άνοιξη του 2010. Ωστόσο, κατά τα πρώτα έτη του προγράμματος υπήρξε συνεχής αβεβαιότητα και προβλήματα εφαρμογής. Από το καλοκαίρι του 2012, το ελληνικό πρόγραμμα επανήλθε αποφασιστικά στην κανονική του πορεία. Με τη συμφωνία της Ευρωμάδας, τον Δεκέμβριο του 2012, άρθηκε η καταστροφική αβεβαιότητα που επικρατούσε όσον αφορά την Ελλάδα για τόσο μεγάλο διάστημα και άνοιξε ο δρόμος για την αποκατάσταση της εμπιστοσύνης. Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, οι εταίροι της Ευρωζώνης συμφώνησαν να παραταθεί η προθεσμία για τη δημοσιονομική προσαρμογή κατά δύο έτη.

Εναπόκειται τώρα στις ελληνικές αρχές να διασφαλίσουν, μέσω της αποφασιστικής εφαρμογής του μεταρρυθμιστικού προγράμματος, ότι η εμπιστοσύνη αυτή θα συνεχίσει να αυξάνεται.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000777/13
to the Commission
Niki Tzavela (EFD)
(25 January 2013)**

Subject: The Troika's recipe for disaster

According to the Greek press, IMF executive Olivier Blanchard, who was behind the disastrous fiscal multiplier decision, has acknowledged that the 'internal devaluation' policy adopted by the Troika for the implementation of austerity measures in Greece and Portugal was a mistake. In his report he was forced to concede that, owing to a disastrous miscalculation, the financial adjustment measures had failed to produce the hoped-for results, while a subsequent change of direction with recourse to stability mechanisms failed to alter the situation for Greece and Portugal. Deadlines were extended simply for it to be discovered that, the slower the process of economic adjustment, the greater the funding required and, as Mr Blanchard so rightly added, funds are not unlimited.

In view of this:

What is the Commission's assessment of the achievements of the reform programme in the countries of southern Europe? Is it satisfied with the results obtained, in view of the opinion being voiced by a growing number of IMF officials that attempted reforms in these countries are becoming hopelessly bogged down?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(4 March 2013)**

The Commission regularly assesses progress with the economic adjustment programmes of Portugal and Greece.

The robustness of recent studies on the fiscal multiplier is limited by their short time horizon and other factors that may have impacted on growth compared with what was expected. They include the confidence effects that are materialising now and from which the vulnerable countries are benefiting. If one takes into account the loss of investor confidence expressed by rising government bond yields, it has been shown that the evidence is not inconsistent with an average multiplier smaller than one, as used in common macroeconomic models.

Recent studies are of particularly limited use when it comes to Greece, a view which was echoed in an opinion piece published in the Greek press by the International Monetary Fund Chief Economist.

In 2009, the fiscal deficit had reached 15.6% of GDP and markets were no longer willing to finance Greece's high debt levels. It led to the launch of the financial assistance programme in the spring of 2010. However, uncertainty and problems with implementation persisted in the first years of the programme. Since the summer 2012, the Greek programme has been brought decisively back on track. The agreement in the Eurogroup in December 2012 has removed the damaging uncertainty that had been hanging over Greece for too long, and paved the way for a return of confidence. In this context, the Euro area partners agreed to extend the timeline for fiscal adjustment by two years.

It is now up to the Greek authorities to ensure through determined implementation of the reform programme that this confidence continues to grow.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000778/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(25 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Automobili elettriche: quali tutele e quali procedure di sicurezza in caso d'incidente

Automobili elettriche, ibride, a metano e a benzina sono le tipologie di mezzi che circolano sulle nostre strade: alcune inquinano di più, altre di meno. Le statistiche di vendita di auto elettriche sono al rialzo, dopo una falsa partenza nel 2011, anno in cui sono stati immatricolati appena 60mila nuovi autoveicoli elettrici nel mondo, in tutta Europa meno di 11mila, tra cui appena 305 unità in Italia. In controtendenza i primi quattro mesi del 2012, dove le auto «verdi» vendute in Italia erano già 164, in crescita dell'85 % rispetto allo stesso periodo del 2011.

Quanto agli incidenti che coinvolgono vetture ibride o elettriche, una ricerca condotta in America ha dimostrato che, a causa del peso maggiore di questi veicoli, i rischi di incidenti si riducono. L'economia nella gestione del carburante va di pari passo con lo sviluppo di una carrozzeria molto pesante e il peso delle vetture ibride è circa il 10 per cento in più rispetto alle auto a motore termico, per cui tali veicoli sono considerati sicuri, anche più di quelli a combustione. E' stato dimostrato che nell'arco di dieci anni chi guida una macchina ibrida in genere ha il 25 per cento in meno di probabilità di essere coinvolto in un incidente stradale.

La Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE), ente di normazione nel campo dell'industria aerospaziale, automobilistica e veicolistica, ritiene che le auto ibride ed elettriche devono essere etichettate in modo chiaro e trasparente, per mettere in allerta chi si occupa degli interventi in casi di emergenza e identificare la posizione dei componenti ad alta tensione di cui sono forniti. La SAE propone di introdurre nuove etichette standardizzate da porre su entrambi i lati della vettura e sulla parte posteriore che siano visibili da almeno 15 metri di distanza.

Con il progetto «CARS2020» i fondi dell'Unione saranno disponibili per la ricerca e l'innovazione, oltre che per la gestione della riduzione della capacità produttiva, e con il diffondersi dei veicoli elettrici nel mercato è sempre più necessario riconoscere le migliori pratiche in grado di facilitare operazioni sicure quando i mezzi stessi sono coinvolti in un incidente. È opportuno quindi che i soccorritori possano identificarli in maniera rapida e semplice, così da poter seguire le procedure che garantiscano una maggiore sicurezza a loro stessi e agli occupanti dei veicoli coinvolti.

Può la Commissione far sapere se intende proporre linee guida che possano consentire ai soccorritori di tutti gli Stati membri di comportarsi adeguatamente al fine di tutelare la propria sicurezza e quella degli occupanti dei veicoli interessati?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(8 marzo 2013)

La Commissione sta prendendo le misure necessarie per assicurare la protezione degli occupanti dei veicoli con motore elettrico, sia durante il normale funzionamento che in caso di incidente.

In proposito, la Commissione ha partecipato di recente alla definizione dei requisiti tecnici per quanto concerne la sicurezza delle batterie montate sui veicoli elettrici, nel quadro di un gruppo di lavoro in seno alla Commissione economica per l'Europa delle Nazioni Unite (UNECE). Queste disposizioni sono state adottate nel novembre 2012 dal competente gruppo di lavoro dell' UNECE (WP29), quale seconda serie di modifiche al già esistente regolamento n. 100 recante disposizioni uniformi relative ai requisiti specifici di costruzione e sicurezza funzionale ai fini dell'omologazione di veicoli elettrici a batteria.

Pertanto, sono attualmente in vigore regolamenti che assicurano la sicurezza dei veicoli elettrici nel loro insieme ed anche quella delle batterie in quanto componente degli stessi.

Per quanto concerne il personale dei servizi d'emergenza, si noti che l'adozione delle disposizioni summenzionate non osta a che gli Stati membri adottino ulteriori misure al fine di garantire la protezione del personale dei servizi d'emergenza allorché questo interviene a soccorrere gli occupanti di un veicolo elettrico. In proposito, si ribadisce che le autorità responsabili dei servizi d'emergenza possono essere diverse da uno Stato membro all'altro, in quanto possono agire a livello locale, regionale o nazionale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000778/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(25 January 2013)

Subject: Electric cars: what safeguards and safety procedures in the event of an accident?

Electric cars, hybrids, natural gas and petrol engine cars are the types of vehicles on our roads: some of these pollute more than others. Statistics show that sales of electric cars are on the rise, after a false start in 2011, when barely 60 000 new electric vehicles were registered around the world, fewer than 11 000 in Europe and only 305 in Italy. The first four months of 2012 bucked the trend, with 164 'green' cars sold in Italy — an increase of 85 % compared with the same period in 2011.

With regard to accidents involving hybrid and electric cars, a study conducted in America has shown that there is a reduced risk of accidents because of the greater weight of these vehicles. Fuel economy goes hand-in-hand with the development of an extremely heavy chassis, and the weight of hybrid cars is around 10 % greater than that those with an internal combustion engine, which is why these vehicles are considered safe, even more so than their combustion-engine counterparts. It has been shown that over a period of 10 years, drivers of hybrid cars are generally 25 % less likely to be involved in a road accident.

The Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE), a standards organisation for the aerospace, automotive and commercial vehicle industries, believes that hybrid and electric cars should be clearly and transparently labelled, so as to alert those providing assistance in the event of an emergency and to identify the positions of the high-voltage components with which they are fitted. The SAE proposes introducing new standardised labels to be displayed on both sides and the rear of the vehicle, which will be visible from a distance of at least 15 metres.

With the 'CARS2020' project, EU funds will be available for research and innovation, as well as for managing the reduction in production capacity. With the growing numbers of electric vehicles on the market it is becoming increasingly necessary to identify best practices for facilitating safety operations when these vehicles are involved in an accident. Emergency services personnel should therefore be able to identify them quickly and easily, so as to be able to follow procedures that will ensure greater safety for themselves and the occupants of the vehicles involved.

Can the Commission state whether it intends to propose guidelines to enable emergency services personnel in all Member States to take appropriate steps to protect themselves and the occupants of the vehicles involved?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(8 March 2013)

The Commission has been taking the necessary steps to ensure the protection of the occupants of vehicles running with electric power, both during operation and in case of an accident.

In this respect, the Commission has been recently participating in the definition of technical requirements with respect to the safety of batteries fitted in electric vehicles, in the framework of a working group within the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE). These provisions were adopted in November 2012 by the competent working party of the UNECE (WP29), as a second series of amendments to the already existing Regulation No 100 on uniform provisions concerning the approval of battery electric vehicles with regard to specific requirements for the construction and functional safety.

Hence, regulations are currently in force ensuring the safe behaviour of electric vehicles as a whole and also of batteries as a component.

As regards emergency services personnel, it should be pointed out that the adoption of the abovementioned requirements does not preclude Member States from adopting further measures in order to guarantee the protection of the emergency service personnel when taking care of occupants of an electric vehicle. In this respect, it should be emphasised that the authorities responsible for emergency services may vary from one Member State to another, and are handled either at local, regional or national level.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000779/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(25 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Pazienti pediatrici ricoverati: accoglienza per i bisogni e le difficoltà dei genitori

Alcune malattie possono essere curate solo presso centri specializzati e questo comporta anche difficoltà pratiche per i familiari che assistono il malato; il tutto diventa ancora più complesso se la persona che necessita cure specifiche è un bambino. Nella famiglia nasce un profondo senso di smarrimento, aggravato dalla complessità dei percorsi terapeutici e burocratici. I genitori vivono una condizione delicata, la loro stretta vicinanza al minore è di fondamentale importanza per il progresso delle cure mediche, che spesso richiedono lunghi tempi di permanenza presso ospedali specializzati.

Una nuova opportunità di accoglienza per mamme e papà con figli lungodegenti è stata proposta da una convenzione a livello italiano: si intende dare la possibilità ai genitori di pernottare in strutture alberghiere convenzionate, al fine di creare una rete di collaborazione e solidarietà sul territorio in cui sono dislocati i servizi di cura necessari. In quest'ottica non è curato solo il minore, ma vengono accolti anche i bisogni e le difficoltà dei genitori stessi. L'Italia, infatti, ha un alto tasso di ospedalizzazione pediatrica: nella fascia 0-14 anni è del 75 per mille e tra le cause principali fino a un anno dopo la nascita ci sono le complicanze che possono insorgere post-partum, mentre negli anni successivi sono le malattie dell'apparato respiratorio, traumi, avvelenamenti e disturbi dell'apparato digerente a destare maggiore preoccupazione, tanto da indurre i medici a scegliere il ricovero.

Considerato che: — i bambini e gli adolescenti italiani vengono ricoverati in ospedale più spesso rispetto ai loro coetanei e consumano molti farmaci, spesso in maniera inappropriata; — quando la malattia di un figlio irrompe nella vita di una famiglia, gli equilibri del quotidiano si infrangono e i punti di riferimento della «normalità» sfumano, se non addirittura svaniscono nel cercare di offrire tutte le cure al bambino malato;

Sono a chiedere alla Commissione se intenda:

- promuovere in tutti i Paesi membri pratiche di accoglienza presso centri pediatrici specializzati che possano accogliere i familiari e supportarli materialmente e psicologicamente durante un periodo della vita così delicato;
- creare sinergie con strutture sanitarie o associative già esistenti al fine di cooperare al superamento della situazione di solitudine ingenerata dalla malattia favorendo la comunicazione fra le famiglie e gli enti che hanno in carico il bambino.

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(12 marzo 2013)

In risposta alle questioni sollevate dall'onorevole parlamentare, la Commissione intende sottolineare che, ai sensi dell'articolo 6 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea, la competenza dell'Unione nell'ambito della protezione e del miglioramento della salute umana si limita a sostenere, coordinare o completare l'azione degli Stati membri. Ai sensi dell'articolo 168 del trattato, l'Unione rispetta le competenze degli Stati membri nell'ambito dell'organizzazione e della fornitura di servizi sanitari e di assistenza medica.

Non compete perciò alla Commissione prendere iniziative atte a promuovere forme di accoglienza nei pressi di centri di specializzati in pediatria negli Stati membri al fine di ospitarvi le famiglie.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000779/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(25 January 2013)

Subject: Hospitalised paediatric patients: responding to the needs and difficulties of parents

Some illnesses can only be treated in specialised centres, and this also poses practical difficulties for family members visiting the patient. Everything becomes even more complicated if it is a child who needs special treatment. Families start to feel completely bewildered, and the complexity of the medical and bureaucratic procedures makes things even worse. Parents find themselves in a difficult situation, since staying as close as possible to the child is essential to the progress of the medical treatment, which often requires long periods in specialised hospitals.

A new opportunity for parents of children with long-term illnesses has been offered by an agreement signed nationally. The objective is to give parents the chance to stay in specially designated hotels, in order to create a collaborative network in the area where the necessary treatment services are located. This means that not only is the child treated, but the parents' needs and difficulties are also addressed. Italy has a high rate of in-patient paediatric treatment: 7.5 % in the 0-14 age range. Among the main causes of treatment for children less than 12 months are post-partum complications, while in later years, respiratory system diseases, traumas, poisonings and digestive diseases arouse the greatest concern and lead doctors to opt for hospitalisation.

Italian children and adolescents are hospitalised more often than their contemporaries and take a great deal of medication, often inappropriately. When a child's illness disrupts the life of a family, the everyday balance is shattered and the 'normal' points of reference become unclear or even disappear completely, as the family strive to provide all the care that the sick child needs.

Can the Commission answer the following:

- Does it intend to promote hospitality practices at specialised paediatric centres in all Member States to accommodate families and provide them with material and psychological support during such a difficult period of their lives?
- Does it intend to cooperate with existing health organisations or associations to overcome the sense of isolation caused by the illness, by fostering communication between the families and the agencies looking after the child?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(12 March 2013)

In reply to the Honourable Member's questions, the Commission would like to point out that according to Article 6 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the competence of the Union is limited to supporting, coordinating or supplementing actions of the Member States to protect and improve human health. According to Article 168 of the Treaty, the Union shall respect the responsibilities of the Member States for the organisation and delivery of health services and medical care.

It is therefore not within the competence of the Commission to take action to promote hospitality practices at specialised paediatric centres in the Member States to accommodate families.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000780/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(25 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Donazioni e trapianti di organi: le «best practice» in Europa

In Italia trapianti e donazioni di organi occupano un ruolo importante tra le pratiche mediche, i donatori di organi sono 21,8 per milione di abitanti e l'Italia è al terzo posto tra i Paesi europei. In totale sono stati eseguiti 2921 trapianti, di cui 1591 di rene, 992 di fegato, 238 di cuore, 115 di polmone, 14 di pancreas, 56 di rene e pancreas. In particolare nel periodo 2010-2012 sono stati raccolti i dati riguardanti l'uso di sistemi meccanici di assistenza alla circolazione (MCS) e dispositivi di assistenza ventricolare (VAD).

Nel triennio sono stati registrati 188 impianti su adulti e 33 su bambini, con una sopravvivenza pari al 68 % dei casi, che di gran lunga si distacca dai dati relativi al solo trattamento medico che implica una sopravvivenza complessiva stimata al 40 %-50 %. Nel 33 % dei casi il VAD è stato considerato come terapia sostitutiva — definitiva, alternativa al trapianto di cuore, nel 58 % dei casi come ponte verso il trapianto e nel 9 % dei casi il VAD è stato utilizzato in pazienti in condizioni cliniche gravi, per i quali non era possibile determinare l'idoneità al trapianto cardiaco o che presentavano temporanee controindicazioni alla sua realizzazione. Inoltre, il 18 % dei pazienti sottoposti a un impianto di VAD ha concluso l'iter con il trapianto di cuore e con buone prospettive di sopravvivenza.

Considerata l'importanza clinica di terapie mirate che permettano ai pazienti una migliore qualità di vita, sono a chiedere alla Commissione se intenda:

- promuovere la ricerca medica al fine di raggiungere standard terapeutici sempre più elevati e competitivi e se preveda la creazione di un network di «best practice» tra le varie realtà di eccellenza europee.

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(12 marzo 2013)

La ricerca sul trapianto di organi è stata finanziata nell'ambito di vari programmi quadro dell'UE per la ricerca e l'innovazione. Recentemente, il programma in materia di sanità del settimo programma quadro per la ricerca e lo sviluppo tecnologico (7° PQ, 2007-2013) ha lanciato un invito specifico a presentare proposte dal titolo «approcci innovativi per il trapianto di organi solidi» (HEALTH.2012.1.4-1). Grazie a tale iniziativa, cinque progetti di ricerca su temi quali l'ampliamento del pool di donatori, il conseguimento di migliori risultati nei trapianti di organi e la prevenzione delle infezioni, sono ora in fase di avviamento e riceveranno un contributo finanziario complessivo da parte dell'UE di circa 26,6 milioni di euro.

La proposta della Commissione per l'iniziativa Orizzonte 2020 — il programma quadro per la ricerca e l'innovazione (2014-2020), prevede un ulteriore sostegno alla ricerca nel settore dei trapianti di organi ⁽¹⁾.

La Commissione aiuta inoltre i paesi dell'UE nel miglioramento della qualità e della sicurezza dei trapianti (elemento essenziale del mandato giuridico dell'UE), grazie alla normativa UE ⁽²⁾ adottata nel 2010 e nel 2012. La direttiva del 2010 istituisce una rete di autorità nazionali competenti, che consente agli Stati membri di condividere le esperienze acquisite in questo campo.

Sebbene non abbia la facoltà di promuovere l'uso di determinati dispositivi nell'Unione europea, la Commissione incoraggia lo scambio volontario di buone pratiche fra i paesi europei attraverso il piano di azione per la donazione e il trapianto di organi, ⁽³⁾ i cui obiettivi principali consistono nell'aumentare la disponibilità di organi, sostenere i sistemi di trapianto e migliorarne la qualità e la sicurezza. In tale contesto, la Commissione sostiene i progetti realizzati nell'ambito del programma dell'UE in materia di sanità ⁽⁴⁾.

I progressi e i risultati dei progetti finanziati dall'UE vengono regolarmente presentati alla rete delle autorità nazionali competenti responsabili della donazione e del trapianto di organi.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2011)811 del 30.11.2011.

⁽²⁾ GUL 207 del 6.8.2010 e GUL 275 del 10.10.2012.

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/health/archive/ph_threats/human_substance/oc_organ/docs/organs_action_it.pdf

⁽⁴⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/health/blood_tissues_organ/projects/index_it.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000780/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(25 January 2013)

Subject: Organ donations and transplants: best practices in Europe

In Italy organ transplants and donations play an important role in medical practice; there are 21.8 organ donors per million inhabitants, and Italy is ranked third among EU Member States. In total 2 921 transplants have been carried out, including 1 591 kidney transplants, 992 liver transplants, 238 heart transplants, 115 lung transplants, 14 pancreas transplants, and 56 kidney and pancreas transplants. In particular, during the period 2010-2012 data were collected on the use of mechanical circulatory support (MCS) systems and ventricular assist devices (VADs).

Over the three-year period 188 implants were recorded for adults and 33 for children, with a 68 % survival rate. This is a far cry from the data on medical treatment alone, where patients' estimated overall survival rate is 40-50 %. In 33 % of the cases VADs were considered to be a definitive replacement therapy, or an alternative to a heart transplant; in 58 % of the cases they were regarded as a stopgap until a transplant could be carried out; and in 9 % of the cases they were used for patients in serious clinical condition, whose suitability for a heart transplant could not be determined or who presented temporary contraindications to a transplant procedure. Furthermore, 18 % of the patients who received a VAD implant ended up having a heart transplant, with good chances of survival.

Given the clinical importance of targeted therapies which offer patients a better quality of life, can the Commission say whether it intends to promote medical research in order to achieve even higher and more competitive therapeutic standards and whether it foresees the creation of a network of best practices among Europe's range of excellent facilities?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(12 March 2013)

Organ transplantation research has been supported in successive EU Framework Programmes for research and innovation. Most recently, the Health programme of the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013) launched a specific call for proposals entitled 'Innovative approaches to solid organ transplantation' (HEALTH.2012.1.4-1). As a result of this, five research projects on topics such as widening the donor pool, improving outcome of organ transplantation and preventing infection are now in the start-up phase and will receive a total EU financial contribution of around EUR 26.6 million.

The Commission proposal for Horizon 2020 — the framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020) envisages further support to the organ transplantation research field ⁽¹⁾.

The Commission also supports EU countries improving quality and safety of transplantation (core EU legal mandate) via an EU legislation ⁽²⁾ adopted in 2010 and in 2012. The 2010 Directive establishes a network of national competent authorities, allowing Member States to share experience gained in the field.

The Commission has no power to promote the use of any device within the European Union. However, the Commission promotes the voluntary exchange of best practices between European countries through the action plan on Organ Donation and Transplantation ⁽³⁾. The main objectives are to increase organ availability, to support transplant systems and to improve quality and safety. Here, the Commission supports relevant projects under EU Health Programme ⁽⁴⁾.

The progress and results of EU-funded projects are regularly presented to the network of national competent authorities in charge of organ donation and transplantation.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2011)811, 30.11.2011.

⁽²⁾ OJ L 207, 6.8.2010 and L 275, 10.10.2012.

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/health/archive/ph_threats/human_substance/oc_organ/docs/organs_action_en.pdf

⁽⁴⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/health/blood_tissues_organ/projects/index_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000781/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(25 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Sentenza della CGUE «Traghetti del Mediterraneo»: quali prospettive per il riconoscimento di una responsabilità per violazione imputabile al legislatore

Con il caso «Traghetti del Mediterraneo» la Corte di giustizia ha avuto occasione di precisare la portata del principio di responsabilità dello Stato membro per i danni causati in caso di violazione del diritto comunitario, imputabile ad una decisione di una giurisdizione suprema. La decisione mette in luce la volontà di Lussemburgo di proseguire con le precedenti decisioni in materia. In questo caso, però, la Corte di giustizia si spinge sino a dichiarare la manifesta violazione del diritto comunitario affermando che quest'ultimo «osta ad una legislazione nazionale che escluda, in maniera generale, la responsabilità dello Stato membro per i danni arrecati ai singoli a seguito di una violazione del diritto comunitario imputabile a un organo giurisdizionale di ultimo grado per il motivo che la violazione controversa risulta da un'interpretazione delle norme giuridiche o da una valutazione dei fatti e delle prove operate da tale organo giurisdizionale» e che «il diritto comunitario osta altresì ad una legislazione nazionale che limiti la sussistenza di tale responsabilità ai soli casi di dolo o colpa grave del giudice, ove una tale limitazione conducesse ad escludere la sussistenza della responsabilità dello Stato membro interessato in altri casi in cui sia stata commessa una violazione manifesta del diritto vigente» (paragrafo 46 della sentenza in oggetto).

Diversa è, dunque, l'ipotesi fatta propria dal Tribunale di Roma a seguito della sentenza Kobler, con la pronuncia del 28 giugno 2001, secondo la quale l'esistenza, nell'ordinamento interno, di una disciplina che si occupa specificamente del delicato tema della responsabilità dei magistrati avrebbe impedito al giudice di disapplicarla ove ritenuta non conforme al quadro comunitario, integrando così le forme ed i modi di tutela del privato al di fuori delle quali non è configurabile alcuna azione risarcitoria nei confronti dello Stato.

La Corte di giustizia afferma, come anche nella sentenza Kobler aveva già precisato, che incombe sul legislatore interno l'obbligo di rispettare il principio della c.d. effettività della tutela. La domanda cui la Corte ha dato risposta è volta a capire se le restrizioni poste dalla legislazione italiana rientrano o meno nei limiti fissati dalla giurisprudenza comunitaria circa la possibilità di far valere o meno la responsabilità di uno Stato per fatto imputabile ad un organo giudiziario. Occorre, però, notare che la Corte non ha approfittato dell'occasione per mettere l'accento sulla possibilità di far valere la responsabilità dello Stato per il mancato rinvio pregiudiziale operato da una corte suprema, che in base alla giurisprudenza Cilfit è obbligatorio.

Può pertanto la Commissione far sapere quale orientamento assume rispetto alla responsabilità dello Stato per violazione imputabile al legislatore, già riconosciuta nei casi di mancata trasposizione delle direttive o di violazione diretta di una giurisprudenza del giudice comunitario?

Risposta di José Manuel Barroso a nome della Commissione
(12 marzo 2013)

La responsabilità di uno Stato membro per i danni causati in caso di violazione del diritto dell'Unione è stata stabilita definitivamente nella sentenza *Franovich* del 19 novembre 1991, in cui la Corte di giustizia ha stabilito che «[d]a tutto quanto precede risulta che il diritto comunitario impone il principio secondo cui gli Stati membri sono tenuti a risarcire i danni causati ai singoli dalle violazioni del diritto comunitario ad essi imputabili.»

La Corte ha precisato il principio della responsabilità dello Stato nelle due sentenze *Brasserie du Pêcheur*⁽¹⁾ e *Factortame*⁽²⁾, pronunciandosi sulla portata di tale responsabilità come segue: «Ne consegue che il principio ha valore in riferimento a qualsiasi ipotesi di violazione del diritto comunitario commessa da uno Stato membro, qualunque sia l'organo di quest'ultimo la cui azione od omissione ha dato origine alla trasgressione. (...) Conseguentemente, si deve rispondere ai giudici nazionali che il principio in forza del quale gli Stati membri sono tenuti a risarcire i danni causati ai singoli dalle violazioni del diritto comunitario ad essi imputabili trova applicazione allorché l'inadempimento contestato è riconducibile al legislatore nazionale.»⁽³⁾ In relazione al risarcimento dei danni, la Corte ha stabilito tre condizioni, ossia: «(...) che la norma giuridica violata sia preordinata a conferire diritti ai singoli, che si tratti di violazione sufficientemente caratterizzata e, infine, che esista un nesso causale diretto tra la violazione dell'obbligo incombente allo Stato e il danno subito dai soggetti lesi.»⁽⁴⁾

⁽¹⁾ Causa C-46/93.

⁽²⁾ Causa C-48/93.

⁽³⁾ Cause riunite C-46/93 e C-48/93, punti 32 e 36.

⁽⁴⁾ Ibid. punto 51.

Per quanto riguarda le cause *Köbler* ⁽⁵⁾ e *Traghetti* ⁽⁶⁾, pur confermando la precedente giurisprudenza, la Commissione sottolinea che tali cause non trattano la responsabilità dello Stato per una violazione che può essere contestata al legislatore, bensì la responsabilità da addebitare a uno Stato membro per una violazione del diritto dell'Unione derivante da una sentenza del giudice nazionale che si pronuncia in ultima istanza.

⁽⁵⁾ (Causa — 224/01).

⁽⁶⁾ (Causa — 173/03).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000781/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(25 January 2013)

Subject: ECJ 'Traghetti del Mediterraneo' judgment: what prospects for recognition of liability for infringements attributable to the legislator?

With the 'Traghetti del Mediterraneo' case, the Court of Justice had the opportunity to specify the scope of the principle of Member State liability for damage caused in the event of an infringement of Community law attributable to a decision from a supreme court. The decision highlights Luxembourg's desire to uphold previous decisions in this field. However, in this case the Court of Justice went so far as to declare a manifest breach of Community law, stating that the latter 'precludes national legislation which excludes State liability, in a general manner, for damage caused to individuals by an infringement of Community law attributable to a court adjudicating at last instance by reason of the fact that the infringement in question results from an interpretation of provisions of law or an assessment of facts or evidence carried out by that court' and that 'Community law also precludes national legislation which limits such liability solely to cases of intentional fault and serious misconduct on the part of the court, if such a limitation were to lead to exclusion of the liability of the Member State concerned in other cases where a manifest infringement of the applicable law was committed' (paragraph 46 of the judgment in question).

This therefore differs from the hypothesis adopted by the Court of Rome in the wake of the Kobler judgment, with its ruling of 28 June 2001, whereby the existence, within national law, of legislation which specifically concerns the delicate subject of the liability of the magistrates would prevent the judge from disapplying it when it is deemed not to comply with the Community framework, thus integrating the forms and methods of safeguarding the rights of the individual outside of which no claim for damages can be made against the State.

The Court of Justice states — as had already been set forth in the Kobler judgment — that the internal legislator has an obligation to respect the principle of 'effective protection'. The purpose of the question to which the Court responded was to understand whether the restrictions imposed by Italian legislation are within the limits set by Community law concerning the possibility of holding a State liable for a fact attributable to a judicial body. However, it should be noted that the Court did not take this opportunity to highlight the possibility of holding a State liable for a supreme court's failure to refer a question for a preliminary ruling, which, on the basis of the Cilfit judgment, is mandatory.

Can the Commission therefore state its position with regard to the liability of a State for an infringement attributable to the legislator that has already been recognised, in the event of a failure to transpose directives or a direct violation of a judgment by the Community judiciary?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(12 March 2013)

A Member State's liability following a breach of Union law was set out definitively in the Francovich judgment of 19 November 1991. In this judgment the Court ruled as follows: 'It follows from all the foregoing that it is a principle of Community law that the Member States are obliged to make good loss and damage caused to individuals by breaches of Community law for which they can be held responsible.'

The ECJ refined the principle of State liability in two judgments, *Brasserie du Pêcheur* ⁽¹⁾/*Factortame* ⁽²⁾ cases. The Court stated with regard to the scope of State liability: 'It follows that that principle holds good for any case in which a Member State breaches Community law, whatever be the organ of the State whose act or omission was responsible for the breach. (...) Consequently, the reply to the national courts must be that the principle that Member States are obliged to make good damage caused to individuals by breaches of Community law attributable to the State is applicable where the national legislature was responsible for the breach in question' ⁽³⁾. When it comes to the reparation of damages, the Court laid down three conditions: '(...) the rule of law infringed must be intended to confer rights on individuals; the breach must be sufficiently serious; and there must be a direct causal link between the breach of the obligation resting on the State and the damage sustained by the injured parties' ⁽⁴⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Case C-46/93.

⁽²⁾ Case C-48/93.

⁽³⁾ Joined Cases C-46/93 and C-48/93, §32 and 36.

⁽⁴⁾ *Ibid.*, §51.

Regarding the Köbler ⁽⁵⁾ and Traghetti ⁽⁶⁾ cases, while confirming the previous case-law, the Commission underlines that these cases don't deal with State liability for an infringement attributable to the legislator, but with liability of a Member State for a breach of Community law arising from a decision by a national court adjudicating at last resort.

⁽⁵⁾ (Case — 224/01).

⁽⁶⁾ (Case — 173/03).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000782/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(25 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Normativa di non discriminazione come requisito di accesso per l'UE: quali soluzioni per le minoranze etniche e religiose

Il 10 ottobre 2012 la Commissione ha adottato il «pacchetto per l'allargamento», una raccolta di documenti riguardanti, da un lato, le strategie e le linee guida da seguire nel processo di allargamento dell'UE e, dall'altro, i rapporti sui progressi fatti dai paesi candidati in merito ai criteri di valutazione utili per l'ammissione. I documenti inclusi nel pacchetto sono in particolare: la carta strategica per l'allargamento; i rapporti di avanzamento riguardanti i singoli paesi in cui si fa un bilancio della loro situazione interna; lo studio di fattibilità su un accordo di stabilizzazione e associazione con il Kosovo e il rapporto di monitoraggio completo sulla Croazia. Nel pacchetto figurano documenti che corrispondono a differenti fasi di attuazione del processo di adesione e a differenti approcci. Indipendentemente dallo stato di avanzamento nel percorso d'integrazione o dall'area geografica di appartenenza, si osserva che le valutazioni operate dalla Commissione sui diversi paesi sono informate a criteri minimi richiesti dai valori fondamentali dell'UE. In particolare, il rapporto individua i diritti civili, politici e sociali e la protezione dei diritti delle minoranze come questioni fondamentali nella maggior parte dei paesi interessati dal processo di allargamento.

I settori d'intervento enunciati come essenziali sono il sistema giudiziario, la corruzione, la lotta al crimine organizzato, la riforma della pubblica amministrazione, i diritti fondamentali e la tutela della libertà di espressione. Inoltre, il rapporto rileva come persistano lacune normative, ad esempio a livello di legislazione antidiscriminatoria, e che le commissioni nazionali per i diritti umani (come l'Ombudsman) spesso richiedono un rafforzamento significativo per poter esercitare un ruolo effettivo, essenziale anche per tutti gli organi che garantiscono l'applicazione della normativa in materia di crimini d'odio e violenza di genere.

Considerato che la normativa antidiscriminatoria è uno degli indici privilegiati in questo processo di valutazione per l'osservazione del livello di tutela garantito ai diritti ed alle libertà fondamentali, può la Commissione far sapere quali azioni intende intraprendere soprattutto nei confronti di quei Paesi candidati, come la Turchia, in cui il contesto normativo al momento non è in linea con l'acquis comunitario, poiché persistono le discriminazioni individuali su basi etniche e religiose verso i gruppi più vulnerabili come le minoranze (curdi e ciprioti) e le persone con disabilità, fermi restano gli innumerevoli casi denunciati di violazione del diritto alla vita, tortura, maltrattamenti e violenza sessuale e le carenze investigative nel perseguimento di tali reati nei confronti di persone con diverso orientamento sessuale o identità di genere che hanno provocato l'impunità dei colpevoli?

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(27 marzo 2013)

Ai sensi degli articoli 2 e 6 del TUE, i diritti fondamentali, così come sono garantiti dalla Convenzione europea dei diritti dell'uomo (CEDU) e quali risultano dalle tradizioni costituzionali comuni agli Stati membri, costituiscono i principi generali del diritto dell'Unione. I diritti fondamentali e il principio di non discriminazione sono aspetti importanti dei criteri politici di Copenaghen e devono essere rispettati dai paesi che intendono entrare a far parte dell'UE.

Se i diritti fondamentali sono ampiamente garantiti all'interno dei paesi interessati dal processo di allargamento, il loro quadro giuridico non è sempre in linea con l'acquis, inclusa la normativa antidiscriminazione. Inoltre, poiché vi sono ancora problemi riguardanti l'attuazione di tale normativa, le discriminazioni individuali persistono, in particolare quelle basate sull'origine etnica, sulla religione e sull'orientamento sessuale.

Nella stesura delle relazioni annuali sui progressi, la Commissione valuta gli sforzi compiuti in termini di recepimento, attuazione e conformità all'acquis dell'UE (anche nei capitoli 19 e 23). Nelle relazioni la Commissione attribuisce importanza ai diritti di diversi gruppi (donne, disabili, LGBT, ecc.) ma anche di minoranze nazionali ed etniche (come i Rom) e fa riferimento ai progressi compiuti in questi settori.

La Commissione sta monitorando da vicino la situazione nei paesi candidati e mantiene particolarmente alta l'attenzione nel caso si verificano violazioni dei diritti umani. Tali questioni vengono affrontate anche in occasione di dialoghi formali ed informali, dei negoziati di adesione e nell'ambito dell'assistenza tecnica e finanziaria.

La Commissione continuerà ad impiegare i mezzi a sua disposizione per incoraggiare ulteriori progressi in questi paesi, in particolare per quanto riguarda l'effettiva attuazione e applicazione degli standard europei, inclusa la normativa antidiscriminazione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000782/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(25 January 2013)

Subject: Anti-discrimination legislation as an EU access requirement: what solutions for ethnic and religious minorities?

On 10 October 2012, the Commission adopted the 'enlargement package', a collection of documents concerning, on the one hand, the strategies and guidelines to be followed in the EU enlargement process and, on the other, the reports on the progress made by the candidate countries in terms of the assessment criteria used for admission. The documents included in the package are as follows: the Enlargement Strategy Paper; the progress reports for the individual countries, which include a review of their internal situation; the feasibility study on a Stabilisation and Association Agreement with Kosovo; and the complete monitoring report on Croatia. The package includes documents corresponding to various implementation phases of the accession process and to a range of approaches. Regardless of the state of advancement of the integration process and the geographical area to which the country belongs, the assessments conducted on the various countries by the Commission are based on the minimum criteria required by the fundamental values of the EU. In particular, the report identifies civil, political and social rights and the protection of the rights of minorities as fundamental issues for most of the countries concerned in the enlargement process.

The areas of activity identified as essential are the judicial system, corruption, the fight against organised crime, public administration reform, fundamental rights and the protection of freedom of expression. Furthermore, the report notes that regulatory gaps persist, for example in terms of anti-discrimination legislation, and national human rights committees (as well as the Ombudsman) frequently call for significant reinforcement of the regulatory framework so that they can play an effective role. This is also essential for bodies that ensure the application of legislation on hate crimes and gender violence.

Anti-discrimination legislation is one of the primary indicators in this assessment process for observing the guaranteed level of protection of rights and fundamental freedoms.

In some candidate countries, such as Turkey, the current legislative framework is not in line with the *acquis communautaire*, since there is still individual discrimination based on religion or ethnicity against the most vulnerable groups such as minorities (Turkish Kurds and Cypriots) and people with disabilities. There are also still countless reported cases of violation of the right to life, torture, maltreatment and sexual violence, as well as failures to investigate such offences properly when they are committed against persons of a different sexual orientation or gender identity, resulting in the guilty parties escaping justice.

What measures does the Commission intend to take in this regard?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2013)

Under Articles 2 and 6 TEU, fundamental rights as guaranteed by the European Convention of Human Rights (ECHR) and as they result from the constitutional traditions common to the Member States, constitute general principles of the Union's law. Fundamental rights and non-discrimination are important aspects of the Copenhagen political criteria that have to be met by countries aspiring to join the European Union.

While fundamental rights are broadly guaranteed in the enlargement countries, the legal framework is not always in line with the *acquis*, including on anti-discrimination legislation. Moreover, issues concerning implementation persist and discrimination remains, in particular against individuals based on ethnicity, religion and sexual orientation.

While drafting the annual progress reports, the Commission assesses the efforts undertaken in view of the transposition, implementation and compliance with the *acquis communautaire* (including in Chapters 19 and 23). In the reports we attach importance to the rights of various groups (women, disabled, LGBT, etc.) but also of national or ethnic minorities (such as the Roma) and refer to the particular advances achieved in these fields.

The Commission is closely monitoring the situation in the enlargement countries and remains especially vigilant when violations of human rights occur. These issues are also raised in formal and informal dialogues, accession negotiations and in the framework of financial and technical assistance.

The Commission will continue to use the tools at its disposal to encourage further progress in these countries, in particular regarding the effective implementation and application of European standards, including anti-discrimination legislation.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000783/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(25 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Strutture aeroportuali e misure di risparmio energetico

Il principale aeroporto del Piemonte sta percorrendo con successo la strada del risparmio energetico attraverso tante piccole azioni coordinate di ottimizzazione degli impianti ed è finora l'unico scalo al mondo che ha ottenuto la certificazione ISO 50001 rilasciata dall'ente di certificazione Tuv-Italia per il sistema di gestione dell'energia. L'aeroporto, rinnovato in occasione delle Olimpiadi invernali del 2006, è in grado di accogliere fino a 5,5-6 milioni di passeggeri l'anno e negli ultimi anni ne ha accolti oltre 3,5 milioni. Sulla superficie aziendale di 172.980 metri quadri il consumo energetico nel 2010 è stato di 23.786.435 kWh, il consumo di metano di 1.044.253 metri cubi e di 212.992 metri cubi quello di gasolio per riscaldamento.

La spesa energetica totale è stata di 3.174.715 euro, di cui l'80 % per energia elettrica, mentre la quota dell'energia termica è del 16,7 % e di acqua del 3,3 %. Il taglio del 7 % del consumo di energia elettrica e termica è l'obiettivo per il primo anno, ma già dai dati relativi all'anno solare 2012 emerge un risparmio in linea con il programma grazie ad un 10 % di riduzione nei consumi di energia elettrica. Gli sforzi compiuti dalla società che gestisce la struttura hanno valenza sia economica sia ambientale: consumare meno energia, infatti, significa anche ridurre le emissioni in atmosfera.

Considerato che gli aeroporti europei si trovano ad affrontare una crisi di capacità di gestione dei passeggeri in transito, è necessario migliorare la qualità e l'efficienza dei servizi aeroportuali, in quanto la qualità generale dei servizi di assistenza a terra spesso non riesce a soddisfare le esigenze, soprattutto in termini di affidabilità, resistenza, flessibilità e sicurezza.

Può Commissione far sapere se intende promuovere l'adozione di misure di risparmio energetico anche per altri aeroporti, al fine di rendere questi crocevia di transito luoghi competitivi e a misura di utente, con uno sguardo attento all'impatto sull'ambiente, già fortemente provato da inquinamento acustico ed atmosferico indotto dagli aeromobili?

Risposta di Siim Kallas a nome della Commissione
(6 marzo 2013)

La Commissione segue un approccio olistico in materia di riduzione dell'impatto del trasporto aereo sull'ambiente e, conformemente alle proprie competenze e al principio di sussidiarietà, ha incoraggiato l'adozione di misure di risparmio energetico favorevoli all'ambiente nei pertinenti settori ambientale, energetico e dei trasporti aerei in passato, e continuerà a farlo in futuro.

Per quanto riguarda l'impatto ambientale degli aeroporti, secondo la direttiva sulla valutazione dell'impatto ambientale (85/337/CEE, modificata) gli aeroporti con piste di decollo e di atterraggio lunghe almeno 2100 m sono sottoposti a valutazione d'impatto ambientale prima del rilascio dell'autorizzazione di costruzione o ricostruzione. Per gli altri aerodromi, spetta allo Stato membro decidere se sottoporli alla stessa procedura di valutazione ⁽¹⁾.

Quanto all'efficienza energetica, in base alla direttiva 2010/31/UE ⁽²⁾ sulla prestazione energetica nell'edilizia, aeroporti compresi, gli Stati membri sono tenuti a fissare norme minime di prestazione energetica degli edifici a livello ottimale in funzione dei costi e a creare sistemi per la loro certificazione energetica. Gli aeroporti di nuova costruzione o già esistenti devono seguire le norme nazionali in materia ⁽³⁾.

Infine, ma non meno importante, per quanto riguarda la legislazione specifica dei trasporti aerei, si attira l'attenzione dell'onorevole deputato sul pacchetto di misure «Migliorare gli aeroporti» proposto dalla Commissione nel dicembre 2011, contenente disposizioni — ad esempio nella fornitura di servizi di assistenza a terra e nella riduzione del rumore prodotto dai velivoli — che affrontano il problema dell'impatto ambientale degli aeroporti ⁽⁴⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Per maggiori informazioni: <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/eia/eia-legalcontext.htm>

⁽²⁾ Direttiva 2010/31/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 19 maggio 2010, sulla prestazione energetica nell'edilizia (GU L 153 del 18.6.2010, pag. 13).

⁽³⁾ Per maggiori informazioni: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/efficiency/buildings/buildings_en.htm

⁽⁴⁾ Cfr.: http://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/air/airports/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000783/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(25 January 2013)

Subject: Airports and energy-saving measures

Piedmont's main airport is successfully pursuing an energy-saving strategy through many small, coordinated measures to optimise its facilities, and is so far the only airport in the world to have obtained ISO 50001 certification, issued by Tuv-Italia for its energy management system. The airport, which was renovated for the 2006 Winter Olympics, can handle up to 5.5-6 million passengers a year, and over the last few years has handled more than 3.5 million. Over its surface area of 172 980 square metres, its energy consumption was 23 786 435 kWh in 2010; methane consumption was 1 044 253 cubic metres, while 212 992 cubic metres of diesel oil were used for heating.

The total energy cost was EUR 3 174 715, of which 80 % was for electrical energy, with 16.7 % for thermal energy and 3.3 % for water. A reduction of 7 % in electrical and thermal energy is the goal for the first year, but already 2012's data shows a saving in line with the programme, thanks to a 10 % reduction in electricity consumption. The efforts made by the airport operating company have both economic and environmental value, since consuming less energy also means reducing emissions into the atmosphere.

Since European airports are facing a crisis in terms of passenger handling capacity, there is a need to improve the quality and efficiency of airport services. The general quality of ground handling services often fails to meet requirements, particularly in terms of reliability, robustness, flexibility and safety.

Does the Commission intend to encourage the adoption of energy-saving measures for other airports, in order to make these transit hubs competitive and user-friendly, with particular attention to the impact on the environment, which already suffers greatly from noise and air pollution caused by aircraft?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(6 March 2013)

The Commission takes a holistic approach to reducing the impact of air transport on the environment and, in accordance with its competences and the principle of subsidiarity, has encouraged the adoption of environment friendly and energy-saving measures in the relevant policy fields of environment, energy and aviation in the past, and will continue to do so in the future.

Regarding the environmental impact of airports, according to the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive (85/337/EC as amended) 'airports with a basic runway length of 2 100 m or more are subject to an environmental assessment before authorisation is given' for their construction or reconstruction. In case of other airfields it is up to an individual Member State to decide whether they shall undergo the same assessment ⁽¹⁾.

As regards to energy efficiency, Directive 2010/31/EU ⁽²⁾ on the energy performance of buildings, including the premises of airports, already obliges Member States to set minimum standards on the energy performance of buildings on a cost-optimal level and to create systems for their energy certification. Airports newly built or already existing have to follow these national standards concerning the energy performance ⁽³⁾.

Last but not least, regarding aviation specific legislation, we would like to bring the Honourable Member's attention to the 'Better Airports' package proposed by the Commission in December 2011, which also contains provisions — e.g. related to the provision of groundhandling services and reduction of aircraft noise —, which address the environmental impact of airports ⁽⁴⁾.

⁽¹⁾ For more information see: <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/eia/eia-legalcontext.htm>

⁽²⁾ Directive 2010/31/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 May 2010 on the energy performance of buildings, OJ L 153, 18.6.2010, p. 13-35.

⁽³⁾ For further details: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/efficiency/buildings/buildings_en.htm

⁽⁴⁾ See: http://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/air/airports/index_en.htm

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000784/13
al Consejo
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(25 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: Desempleo juvenil en España en 2012

El 24 de enero de 2013 se hizo pública la Encuesta de Población Activa (EPA) del mercado laboral español para 2012, así como los datos del Instituto Nacional de Estadística (INE). Estos datos revelan que, al acabar 2012, el paro juvenil era del 55,13 % entre los menores de 25 años y alcanzaba el 74 % en el colectivo de 16 a 19 años.

En las recomendaciones específicas del Semestre Europeo hechas a España en junio de 2012 ⁽¹⁾, se señala como objetivo prioritario la lucha contra el desempleo juvenil. Pero las recomendaciones del Consejo parecen no haber servido de nada para otorgar un futuro a la llamada «generación perdida».

1. ¿Qué opinión tiene el Consejo al respecto?
2. ¿Reconoce el Consejo la corresponsabilidad política en la realidad que sufre la juventud en España?
3. ¿Cree el Consejo que el hecho de recortar partidas del presupuesto europeo, como las destinadas al programa Erasmus, favorece a los y las jóvenes que se ven abocados al desempleo?
4. ¿No considera el Consejo que el programa Erasmus es útil para favorecer la movilidad de trabajadores en la EU?
5. ¿Qué opciones considera el Consejo que ofrece la UE al 55 % de los y las jóvenes que se encuentran en situación de desempleo?
6. ¿Cómo piensa aplicar el Consejo la garantía juvenil en España, cuando esta carece de fondos públicos?
7. ¿Seguirá el Consejo abogando por la austeridad?

Respuesta
(4 de abril de 2013)

Como sabe Su Señoría, el Consejo, en consonancia con las prioridades del Consejo Europeo ⁽²⁾, ha expresado en numerosas ocasiones su preocupación por el desempleo juvenil en la EU. En octubre de 2012, el Consejo adoptó sus conclusiones «Hacia una recuperación generadora de empleo que ofrezca mejores oportunidades a los jóvenes de Europa», en las que exhortaba a los actores pertinentes al cumplimiento de sus compromisos ⁽³⁾.

Siendo el empleo competencia de los Estados miembros, el Título IX del Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea establece que la Unión Europea contribuirá a un alto nivel de empleo mediante el fomento de la cooperación entre los Estados miembros, así como apoyando y, en caso necesario, complementando sus respectivas actuaciones ⁽⁴⁾. En este contexto, el Consejo Europeo pidió a los Estados miembros que establecieran, dentro de sus programas nacionales de reforma, medidas concretas para que no se destruyan puestos de trabajo y se creen nuevos empleos («Planes nacionales de empleo»), con el fin, entre otras cosas, de ofrecer alternativas a los jóvenes desempleados ⁽⁵⁾. Dentro de estos planes nacionales de empleo, se anima a los Estados miembros a que haga uso, en su caso, de la Iniciativa sobre Empleo Juvenil, recientemente lanzada por el Consejo Europeo en su reunión de 7 y 8 febrero de 2013, y que se va a desarrollar en un futuro próximo, con el fin de apoyar los planes de Garantía Juvenil ⁽⁶⁾.

En el contexto del Semestre Europeo, el Consejo aprueba, a propuesta de la Comisión Europea, recomendaciones específicas por países. En julio de 2012, el Consejo adoptó una Recomendación sobre el Programa Nacional de Reforma de 2012 de España, en la que se recomendaba a España que adoptara una serie de medidas, en particular respecto de la lucha contra el desempleo juvenil ⁽⁷⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/es/12/st11/st11273.es12.pdf>

⁽²⁾ EUCO 76/12.

⁽³⁾ En el doc. 14426/12, entre otros, se presenta la posición del Consejo al respecto, como se expone en el presente párrafo.

⁽⁴⁾ Artículo 147.1 del TFUE.

⁽⁵⁾ Declaración de los Miembros del Consejo Europeo, de 30 de enero de 2012, SN 5/1/12.

⁽⁶⁾ EUCO 37/13, apartados 59 y 60.

⁽⁷⁾ 11273/12.

En cuanto al programa de «Aprendizaje permanente», del que «Erasmus» es una parte importante, el Consejo Europeo de 7 y 8 de febrero de 2013 consideró que su programa sucesor, «Erasmus para todos», brindaba grandes posibilidades de contribuir a la consecución de los objetivos de la Estrategia Europa 2020, y propuso que se aumentara su financiación en términos reales en comparación con el nivel de 2013 ⁽⁸⁾. El Parlamento Europeo y el Consejo aún no han acordado el último nivel de financiación. Este aumento propuesto es coherente con el objetivo de priorizar y reforzar las inversiones en educación, garantizando la eficiencia de dicho gasto, como se reafirma en el Estudio Prospectivo Anual sobre el Crecimiento 2013 ⁽⁹⁾, y también con el de reorientar el gasto hacia sectores que brindan grandes posibilidades de contribuir al logro de los objetivos de Europa 2020.

⁽⁸⁾ EUCO 37/13, apartados 13 y 14.
⁽⁹⁾ 16669/12.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000784/13
to the Council
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(25 January 2013)

Subject: Youth unemployment in Spain in 2012

On 24 January 2013, the 2012 Labour Force Survey (LFS) of the Spanish labour market was published, together with data from the Spanish National Institute for Statistics (INE). The figures revealed that at the end of 2012 youth unemployment stood at 55.13 % for those under 25 and at 74 % for the 16-19 age group.

The European Semester's specific recommendations for Spain in June 2012 ⁽¹⁾ identified the fight against youth unemployment as a priority objective. However, the Council's recommendations do not seem to have done anything towards providing a future to what is being termed the 'lost generation'.

1. How does the Council view this situation?
2. Does the Council recognise any political responsibility for the situation being endured by young people in Spain?
3. Does the Council consider that cutting back areas of the European budget, such as allocations to the Erasmus programme, is in the interests of young people, who find themselves heading towards unemployment?
4. Does the Council not consider the Erasmus programme to be useful in promoting workers' mobility within the EU?
5. What alternatives does the Council believe the EU has to offer the 55 % of young people who are currently unemployed?
6. How does the Council intend to implement the youth guarantee in Spain, when the country is without public funds?
7. Does the Council intend to continue to back austerity policies?

Reply
(4 April 2013)

As the Honourable Member is aware, the Council, in line with European Council priorities ⁽²⁾, has expressed on numerous occasions its concern regarding youth unemployment in EU. In October 2012, the Council adopted its Conclusions 'Towards a job-rich recovery and giving a better chance to Europe's youth', in which it called upon the relevant actors to act on their commitments ⁽³⁾.

Employment being a Member State competence, Title IX of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union states that the European Union shall contribute to a high level of employment by encouraging cooperation between Member States and by supporting and, if necessary, complementing their action ⁽⁴⁾. In this context, the European Council called upon Member States to set out, within their National Reform Programmes, concrete measures to keep people in work and create jobs ('National Job Plans'), with a view to, inter alia, offering alternatives for unemployed youth ⁽⁵⁾. Within these National Job Plans, Member States are encouraged to make use, where relevant, of the Youth Employment Initiative, recently launched by the European Council at its meeting of 7-8 February 2013, and which is to be developed in the near future, in order to support youth guarantee schemes ⁽⁶⁾.

In the context of the European Semester, country-specific recommendations are adopted by the Council on a proposal from the European Commission. In July 2012, the Council adopted a recommendation on the National Reform Programme 2012 of Spain, in which several recommendations were issued to Spain, including on the fight against youth unemployment ⁽⁷⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/12/st11/st11273.en12.pdf>

⁽²⁾ EUCO 76/12, *inter alia*.

⁽³⁾ 14426/12, *inter alia*, presents the Council position on this matter, as expressed in this paragraph.

⁽⁴⁾ Article 147(1) TFEU.

⁽⁵⁾ Statement of the Members of the European Council, 30 January 2012, SN 5/1/12.

⁽⁶⁾ EUCO 37/13, paragraphs 59 and 60.

⁽⁷⁾ 11273/12.

Concerning the 'Life Long Learning' programme, of which 'Erasmus' is an important part, the European Council of 7-8 February 2013 considered that its successor programme, 'Erasmus for All', has a high potential to contribute to the fulfilment of the Europe 2020 strategy, and proposed to increase its funding in real terms as compared to the 2013 level⁽⁸⁾. The final level of funding is yet to be agreed between the European Parliament and the Council. This proposed increase is consistent with the objective of prioritising and strengthening investments in education whilst ensuring the efficiency of such expenditure, as reaffirmed in the 2013 Annual Growth Survey⁽⁹⁾, and also with that of redirecting spending towards areas which have a high potential to contribute towards the achievement of the Europe 2020 goals.

⁽⁸⁾ EUCO 37/13, paragraphs 13 and 14.

⁽⁹⁾ 16669/12.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000785/13
al Consejo
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(25 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: Desempleo en España en 2012

El 24 de enero de 2013 se hizo pública la Encuesta de Población Activa (EPA) del mercado laboral español para 2012, así como los datos del Instituto Nacional de Estadística (INE). La EPA indica que el desempleo aumentó en 187 300 personas durante el cuarto trimestre de 2012 y la tasa de paro alcanzó el 26,02 %.

Los datos del INE reflejan que la ocupación sigue disminuyendo, ya que 363 300 personas, unas 3 000 al día, se quedaron sin empleo en el cuarto trimestre de 2012, lo que ha reducido la ocupación a 16 957 100 personas, su nivel más bajo desde 2003. En todo el ejercicio el empleo ha bajado en 850 000 personas. Además, aumenta el número de trabajadores a tiempo parcial, cuyo porcentaje asciende al 15,33 % del total, y la tasa de temporalidad se sitúa en el 23 %.

En las recomendaciones específicas del Semestre Europeo hechas a España en junio de 2012 ⁽¹⁾, se señalaba como objetivo prioritario la lucha contra el desempleo. Sin embargo, la administración española y los barómetros utilizados por la UE para valorar públicamente la evolución de la economía española parecen anteponer los objetivos de déficit y deuda pública. Las recomendaciones del Consejo parecen no haber servido de nada a la hora de frenar la sangría social y económica que supone el desempleo en España.

1. ¿Qué opinión tiene el Consejo al respecto?
2. ¿Cree el Consejo que las cifras de la EPA y el INE mencionadas tendrán mayor influencia que la calificación de la deuda pública o la prima de riesgo a la hora de elaborar las próximas recomendaciones del Semestre Europeo?
3. ¿Reconoce el Consejo la corresponsabilidad política en la realidad que sufre la población en España?
4. ¿Seguirá el Consejo abogando por la austeridad?

Respuesta

(4 de abril de 2013)

Como bien sabe Su Señoría, en consonancia con las prioridades del Consejo Europeo ⁽²⁾, el Consejo adoptó prioridades de actuación en materia de política social y de empleo, en las que hacía hincapié en que la situación en el mercado laboral europeo suscitaba una honda preocupación en los ciudadanos y solicitaba una acción inmediata a nivel europeo y de los Estados miembros ⁽³⁾.

El empleo sigue siendo competencia de los Estados miembros; el Título IX del Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea dispone que «la Unión contribuirá a un alto nivel de empleo mediante el fomento de la cooperación entre los Estados miembros, así como apoyando y, en caso necesario, complementando sus respectivas actuaciones» ⁽⁴⁾. En este contexto, el Consejo Europeo pidió a los Estados miembros que estableciesen, en sus programas nacionales de reforma, medidas concretas para mantener el empleo y crear puestos de trabajo («Planes nacionales de empleo»), y decidió que su aplicación sería objeto de una estrecha supervisión en el marco del Semestre Europeo ⁽⁵⁾.

En el contexto del Semestre Europeo, el Consejo adoptó recomendaciones específicas por países, a propuesta de la Comisión Europea. En julio de 2012, el Consejo adoptó una Recomendación sobre el Programa Nacional de Reforma de España de 2012 en la que se formularon varias recomendaciones a España en relación con la lucha contra el desempleo ⁽⁶⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/es/12/st11/st11273.es12.pdf>

⁽²⁾ Conclusiones del Consejo Europeo, 1 y 2 de marzo de 2012, EUCO 4/3/12.

⁽³⁾ doc. 6601/12.

⁽⁴⁾ Artículo 147.1 del TFUE.

⁽⁵⁾ Declaración de los miembros del Consejo Europeo, 30 de enero de 2012, SN 5/1/12.

⁽⁶⁾ doc. 11273/12.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000785/13
to the Council**

Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)

(25 January 2013)

Subject: Unemployment in Spain

On 24 January 2013, the 2012 Labour Force Survey (LFS) of the Spanish labour market was published, together with data from the Spanish National Institute for Statistics (INE). The survey indicates that the number of unemployed increased by 187 000 during the last quarter of 2012 and the unemployment rate rose to 26.02%.

The INE statistics show that employment continues to decline, with 363 300 people — around 3 000 a day — having lost their jobs in the last quarter of 2012, reducing the numbers in employment to 16 957 100 people, the lowest level since 2003. The figures for the whole year show a drop in employment of 850 000. Furthermore, the number of part-time workers is on the rise, and now accounts for 15.33% of the workforce, with temporary workers accounting for 23% of the total.

The European Semester's June 2012 specific recommendations for Spain ⁽¹⁾ identified combating unemployment as a priority objective. However, the Spanish administration and the barometers used by the EU to publicly evaluate the Spanish economy's evolution appear to give precedence to the deficit and public debt objectives. The Council's recommendations seem to have had no effect in terms of staunching the social and economic bloodletting caused by unemployment in Spain.

1. How does the Council view this situation?
2. Does the Council believe that the above-quoted LFS and INE figures will have more impact than the public debt and risk premium ratings when it comes to drafting the next set of European Semester recommendations?
3. Does the Council recognise any political responsibility for the situation being endured by the people of Spain?
4. Does the Council intend to continue to back austerity policies?

Reply

(4 April 2013)

As the Honourable Member is aware, in line with European Council priorities ⁽²⁾, the Council adopted priorities for action in the areas of employment and social policy, where it stressed that the situation in Europe's labour markets was of major concern to citizens and called for immediate action at Member State and European level ⁽³⁾.

Employment being a Member State competence, Title IX of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union states that 'the European Union shall contribute to a high level of employment by encouraging cooperation between Member States and by supporting and, if necessary, complementing their action' ⁽⁴⁾. In this context, the European Council called upon Member States to set out, within their National Reform Programmes, concrete measures to keep people in work and create jobs ('National Job Plans'); and decided that implementation will be subject to enhanced monitoring in the framework of the European Semester ⁽⁵⁾.

In the context of the European Semester, country-specific recommendations are adopted by the Council on a proposal from the European Commission. In July 2012, the Council adopted a recommendation on the National Reform Programme 2012 of Spain in which several recommendations were issued to Spain concerning the fight against unemployment ⁽⁶⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/12/st17/st17172.en08.pdf>

⁽²⁾ Conclusions of the European Council, 1/2 March 2012, EUCO 4/3/12.

⁽³⁾ 6601/12.

⁽⁴⁾ Article 147(1) TFEU.

⁽⁵⁾ Statement of the Members of the European Council, 30 January 2012, SN 5/1/12.

⁽⁶⁾ 11273/12.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000786/13

à Comissão

Nuno Teixeira (PPE)

(25 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Apoio à criação de Clusters

Tendo em conta que:

- A Comissão apresentou a proposta que estabelece o Quadro Financeiro Plurianual para o período 2014-2020, tendo sido definido um orçamento de 1 033 mil milhões de euros, repartido por vários eixos estratégicos. No orçamento em causa, o eixo estratégico 1a) «Competitividade para o Crescimento e o Emprego» inclui o financiamento para a área de Investigação, Desenvolvimento e Inovação e apoio às Pequenas e Médias Empresas, intitulando-se «Horizonte 2020»;
- No próximo período financeiro estará em vigor o novo «Programa para a Competitividade das Empresas e Pequenas e Médias empresas (2014-2020)» (COSME) que substitui o atual «Programa para a Competitividade e Inovação» (PCI);
- O COSME visa reforçar a competitividade e a sustentabilidade das empresas, promover o espírito empresarial, melhorar o acesso das PME ao financiamento e incentivar o acesso aos mercados da União Europeia e mundiais;
- Segundo a proposta apresentada, serão reforçados alguns setores empresariais, na área da indústria e serviços, e serão selecionados setores em que exista uma percentagem elevada de PME;
- Na resposta à pergunta por mim efetuada a 26 de janeiro de 2012 sobre «Setores estratégicos de Portugal a longo prazo» (E-000981/2012), o Comissário Europeu da Política Regional, Johannes Hahn, referiu que «ao abrigo do Programa Competitividade e Inovação, já foi desenvolvido um certo número de atividades de identificação de clusters, a European Cluster Collaboration Platform, uma plataforma de colaboração europeia para o reforço da cooperação entre clusters europeus».

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Quais são os setores empresariais em que existe uma percentagem elevada de PME e que assim receberão um incentivo adicional ao abrigo do programa COSME?
2. Tem a intenção de, no novo programa COSME, continuar a apoiar a criação de clusters e plataformas de colaboração à escala europeia conforme foi prática habitual no Programa para a Competitividade e Inovação (PCI)?
3. Da experiência do apoio prestado ao abrigo do PCI, quais são os setores empresariais com maior potencial à escala europeia?

Resposta dada por Antonio Tajani em nome da Comissão

(13 de março de 2013)

1. O programa COSME irá apoiar a constituição na Europa de um conjunto sólido, diversificado e competitivo de PME, proporcionando oportunidades de financiamento para estas empresas em todos os setores. Trata-se sobretudo de instrumentos financeiros que serão disponibilizados por intermediários financeiros com base na procura do mercado e que facilitarão o acesso ao crédito e ao financiamento em capital próprio⁽¹⁾. O programa também visa facilitar as ações concertadas ao nível europeu em setores com uma elevada concentração de PME que têm de responder a desafios globais⁽²⁾ e apoiará os esforços das PME para melhorar a sua eficiência energética e de recursos.

(1) Para mais informações, consultar: http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/finance/cip-financial-instruments/index_en.htm

(2) Designadamente os setores do design e do turismo.

2. A Comissão propôs que o programa COSME apoiasse ações de promoção do desenvolvimento de *clusters* de classe mundial e de redes de empresas. Para tal, continuará a ser promovida a excelência dos *clusters*. O programa vai também promover a cooperação entre *clusters*, a fim de melhorar o acesso das PME às cadeias de valor e aos mercados internacionais.

3. A competitividade da indústria transformadora e dos serviços na UE é anualmente objeto de uma extensa análise no âmbito do Relatório da Competitividade. Merecem também destaque os esforços empreendidos pelo Observatório Europeu dos Clusters, para identificar e analisar atividades emergentes, como as indústrias criativas, os serviços móveis e as indústrias da mobilidade, as ciências da vida, as eco-indústrias e os dispositivos médicos avançados, bem como para analisar o papel dos *clusters* no apoio a estas atividades emergentes ⁽³⁾.

⁽³⁾ Mais informações:
http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/industrial-competitiveness/competitiveness-analysis/european-competitiveness-report/index_en.htm
www.clusterobservatory.eu

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000786/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(25 January 2013)

Subject: Support for the creation of clusters

The Commission has presented its proposal establishing the multiannual financial framework for the period 2014-2020, for which a budget was set of EUR 1 033 billion, divided among several strategic areas. In this budget, strategic area 1a (Competitiveness for growth and employment) includes funding for research, development and innovation and support to small and medium-scale enterprises under the heading 'Horizon 2020'.

During the next financial period the new Programme for the competitiveness of enterprises and small and medium-sized enterprises (2014-2020) (COSME) will come into force, replacing the current Competitiveness and Innovation Programme (CIP).

The aim of COSME is to strengthen the competitiveness and sustainability of enterprises, promote entrepreneurial spirit, improve access by SMEs to funding and encourage access to EU and world markets.

According to the proposal presented, a number of industry and service-related business sectors will be strengthened, with sectors being chosen in which there are a high percentage of SMEs.

In his answer to my written question of 26 January 2012 entitled Portugal — strategic sectors for the long term (E-000981/2012), European Commissioner for regional policy Johannes Hahn said that 'under the Competitiveness and Innovation Programme, a number of instruments have already been developed (...) for promoting cluster mapping activities, (...) the European Cluster Collaboration Platform for strengthening cooperation between European clusters'.

1. In which business sectors are there a high percentage of SMEs, enabling them to receive extra funding under the COSME programme?
2. Does the Commission intend to use the new COSME programme to continue to support the creation of clusters and collaboration platforms at European level, as was the case under the Competitiveness and Innovation Programme?
3. Based on the experience of support provided under the CIP, which are the business sectors with most potential at European level?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(13 March 2013)

1. The COSME Programme will support a strong, diversified and competitive SME base in Europe, and will thus provide funding opportunities for SMEs in all sectors. This applies particularly to the financial instruments which will be provided by financial intermediaries on a market-demand basis that shall facilitate access to loans and equity finance ⁽¹⁾. The programme also aims to facilitate concerted action at Union level in sectors with a high proportion of SMEs that face global challenges ⁽²⁾ and will support SMEs' improvements of their energy and resource efficiency.

2. The Commission proposed that COSME should support actions promoting the development of world class clusters and business networks. For that purpose, cluster excellence would continue to be promoted. COSME would also support, through cluster cooperation, better access for SMEs to global value chains and international markets.

3. The competitiveness of manufacturing and service sectors in the EU is extensively analysed on an annual basis by the Competitiveness Report. Furthermore, recent efforts under the European Cluster Observatory focused on identifying and analysing emerging industries, such as creative industries, mobile and mobility industries, life sciences, eco industries, and advanced medical devices, and analysing the role of clusters in supporting such emerging industries ⁽³⁾.

⁽¹⁾ For further information, see at: http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/finance/cip-financial-instruments/index_en.htm

⁽²⁾ Such as the design and the tourism sectors.

⁽³⁾ See further information at:

http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/industrial-competitiveness/competitiveness-analysis/european-competitiveness-report/index_en.htm
and www.clusterobservatory.eu

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000787/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(25 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Apoio à expansão das empresas europeias

Tendo em conta que:

- A Comissão apresentou a proposta que estabelece o Quadro Financeiro Plurianual para o período 2014-2020, tendo sido definido um orçamento de 1 033 mil milhões de euros, repartido por vários eixos estratégicos. No orçamento em causa, o eixo estratégico 1a) «Competitividade para o Crescimento e o Emprego» inclui o financiamento para a área de Investigação, Desenvolvimento e Inovação e apoio às Pequenas e Médias Empresas, intitulando-se «Horizonte 2020»;
- No próximo período financeiro estará em vigor o novo «Programa para a Competitividade das Empresas e Pequenas e Médias Empresas (2014-2020)» (COSME) que substitui o atual «Programa para a Competitividade e Inovação» (PCI);
- O COSME visa reforçar a competitividade e a sustentabilidade das empresas, promover o espírito empresarial, melhorar o acesso das PME ao financiamento e incentivar o acesso aos mercados da União Europeia e mundiais;
- Um dos desafios das PME é a capacidade limitada que têm de se expandirem para mercados fora da UE, mas também para mercados dentro da UE;
- Segundo a proposta apresentada, o COSME irá apoiar a Rede Europeia de Empresas que, por sua vez, prestará serviços de apoio às empresas orientadas para o crescimento, a fim de facilitar a expansão dentro e fora do mercado único;
- No entanto, e apesar de ser um dos desafios elencados na proposta, o COSME não irá apoiar as empresas que se pretendam expandir (e não deslocalizar a produção) para outros mercados europeus, apoiando apenas a sua internacionalização para mercados fora da UE.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Quais são os motivos que a levam a apoiar apenas a Rede Europeia de Empresas e não outras empresas (e.g.: consultoras) que prestam serviços de internacionalização e que são fundamentais nos apoios que dão às empresas europeias?
2. Como é que pretende apoiar as empresas europeias que se pretendem expandir para outros mercados europeus conforme salientado ser uma necessidade premente?

Resposta dada por Antonio Tajani em nome da Comissão
(27 de março de 2013)

No âmbito do programa COSME, os membros da Enterprise Europe Network serão selecionados através de um convite à apresentação de propostas durante o primeiro semestre de 2014. Este convite à apresentação de propostas será aberto à participação de qualquer organização capaz de fornecer serviços de apoio de qualidade às PME.

Um dos principais objectivos do programa COSME é melhorar o acesso aos mercados no interior da União e a nível mundial.

O principal objectivo do apoio prestado através da Enterprise Europe Network, no âmbito do anterior programa PCI era facilitar a expansão das PME europeias no mercado único. Esta continuará a ser a tarefa essencial e o objectivo principal da rede, tal como previsto no programa COSME. Outros mercados europeus que não fazem parte da União Europeia são igualmente abrangidos pela rede.

Para além do apoio à Enterprise Europe Network, o programa COSME prevê a concessão de apoio às PME em mercados fora da UE através de outros meios. De acordo com o actual projecto de proposta a ser examinado pelo Conselho e pelo Parlamento Europeu, podem ser previstas medidas específicas nos domínios das normas e dos direitos de propriedade intelectual em países terceiros prioritários. Serão também incluídas ações para promover a cooperação industrial internacional, incluindo o diálogo industrial e regulamentar com parceiros estratégicos, com o objectivo de reduzir as diferenças regulamentares e melhorar o ambiente empresarial.

Além disso, a Comissão apoia um certo número de iniciativas em curso tendentes a ajudar as PME da UE na sua internacionalização. A Comissão financia um certo número de Centros da UE para as PME que aconselham as empresas sobre a forma de investir e tirar partido das oportunidades de negócio na China, Índia e Tailândia. Estes centros são complementados pelo Helpdesk China DPI e o Helpdesk DPI ASEAN PME, a ser criado em breve.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000787/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(25 January 2013)**

Subject: Support for the expansion of European enterprises

The Commission has presented its proposal establishing the multiannual financial framework for the period 2014-2020, for which a budget was set of EUR 1 033 billion, divided among several strategic areas. In this budget, strategic area 1a (Competitiveness for growth and employment) includes funding for research, development and innovation and support to small and medium-scale enterprises under the heading 'Horizon 2020'.

During the next financial period the new Programme for the Competitiveness of Enterprises and Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (2014-2020) (COSME) will come into force, replacing the current Competitiveness and Innovation Programme (CIP).

The aim of COSME is to strengthen the competitiveness and sustainability of enterprises, promote entrepreneurial spirit, improve access by SMEs to funding and encourage access to EU and world markets.

One of the obstacles faced by SMEs is their limited capacity for expansion into markets not only outside the EU, but also within it.

According to the proposal as presented, COSME will support the Enterprise Europe Network, which will in turn provide support services to growth-oriented enterprises, to facilitate their expansion within and beyond the single market.

Nevertheless, although this is one of the two challenges listed in the proposal, COSME will not provide support to enterprises wishing to expand (without relocating production) into other European markets, since it will only support their international expansion into non-EU markets.

1. Why does this programme only support the Enterprise Europe Network and not other enterprises (e.g. consultancies) which offer internationalisation services and play a fundamental role in supporting European enterprises?
2. How does it intend to support European enterprises wishing to expand into other European markets, in line with this objective being identified as of urgent necessity?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2013)**

In the framework of the COSME programme the members of the Enterprise Europe Network will be selected through an open call for proposals during the first half of 2014. This call for proposals will be open to any organisation able to deliver quality support services to SMEs.

One of the main objectives of COSME is to improve access to markets inside the Union and more globally.

The main focus of the support provided through the Enterprise Europe Network under the preceding CIP programme was to facilitate expansion of European SMEs within the Single market. This will remain the core task and the major goal of the Network under the COSME programme. Other European markets that are not part of the European Union are also covered by the Network.

In addition to supporting the Enterprise Europe Network, the COSME programme foresees the provision of support to SMEs in markets outside the EU through other means. According to the current draft proposal being examined by the Council and European Parliament specific measures in the areas of standards and intellectual property rights may be envisaged in priority third countries. This will also include actions for fostering international industrial cooperation, including industrial and regulatory dialogues with strategic partners, with the objective of reducing regulatory differences and improving the business environment.

Moreover the Commission supports a number of ongoing initiatives helping EU SMEs to internationalise. A number of EU SME Centres that advise enterprises on how to invest and take advantage of business opportunities in China, India and Thailand are financed by the Commission. These are complemented by the IPR China Helpdesk and the ASEAN IPR SME Helpdesk due to be set up shortly.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000788/13

à Comissão

Nuno Teixeira (PPE)

(25 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Empreendedorismo jovem e sucesso do Programa Erasmus primeiro emprego

Tendo em conta que:

- A Comissão apresentou a proposta que estabelece o Quadro Financeiro Plurianual para o período 2014-2020, tendo sido definido um orçamento de 1 033 mil milhões de euros, repartido por vários eixos estratégicos. No orçamento em causa, o eixo estratégico 1a) «Competitividade para o Crescimento e o Emprego» inclui o financiamento para a área de Investigação, Desenvolvimento e Inovação e apoio às Pequenas e Médias Empresas, intitulando-se «Horizonte 2020»;
- No próximo período financeiro estará em vigor o novo «Programa para a Competitividade das Empresas e Pequenas e Médias empresas (2014-2020)» (COSME), substituindo o atual «Programa para a Competitividade e Inovação» (PCI);
- O COSME visa promover o espírito empresarial, tendo em especial atenção os jovens empresários, novos empresários e grupos-alvo específicos, como é o caso do empreendedorismo feminino;
- Alguns Estados-Membros têm vindo a apoiar as atividades de empreendedorismo jovem e a Comissão Europeia lançou recentemente o programa «Erasmus primeiro emprego»;
- O Programa COSME visa prestar «particular atenção a jovens empresários»;
- Outro fator que afeta a competitividade é o fraco espírito empresarial que caracteriza a União. Só 45 % dos cidadãos da União (e menos de 40 % das mulheres) gostariam de ser trabalhadores por conta própria, em comparação com 55 % da população nos Estados Unidos e 71 % na China;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Como é que pretende estimular o empreendedorismo jovem ao abrigo do programa COSME?
2. Qual o balanço que faz do programa Erasmus primeiro emprego? Quantas pessoas foram abrangidas pelo programa, quais os principais países aderentes e que áreas setoriais têm sido predominantemente escolhidas pelos jovens empreendedores?

Resposta dada por António Tajani em nome da Comissão

(27 de março de 2013)

O Plano de Ação «Empreendedorismo 2020» ⁽¹⁾ define uma estratégia para a Comissão e para os Estados-Membros nos próximos anos, colocando uma forte tónica no empreendedorismo jovem. O primeiro eixo do Plano de Ação incide no ensino e na formação no domínio do empreendedorismo para apoiar o desenvolvimento de competências empresariais, bem como o crescimento e a criação de empresas. O programa COSME apoiará a execução de ações relacionadas com este eixo de atuação. O Plano de Ação vincula a Comissão a reforçar a cooperação e o intercâmbio das melhores práticas a nível europeu, traçando objetivos ambiciosos para os Estados-Membros. Visa igualmente orientar novas iniciativas para apoiar as empresas na fase inicial de desenvolvimento e ajudar os jovens desempregados a criarem as suas próprias empresas.

O Erasmus para Jovens Empreendedores é presentemente um programa consolidado. Oferece oportunidades únicas a quem pretenda criar a sua própria empresa ou a quem a tenha criado recentemente, sendo possível receber tutoria e aconselhamento em primeira mão de um empresário experiente. O programa ajuda igualmente os jovens empreendedores participantes a expandirem os seus mercados, a estabelecerem contactos no estrangeiro e a cooperarem entre si.

⁽¹⁾ Plano de ação «Empreendedorismo 2020» Relançar o espírito empresarial na Europa, COM(2012) 795 final de 9 de janeiro de 2013.

As reações dos jovens empresários são extremamente positivas: 94 % afirmam que o programa contribuiu para desenvolver a sua ideia de negócio. Até agora, o número total de intercâmbios é de cerca de 1 800. Os países preferidos para o intercâmbio foram o Reino Unido (23 %) e a Espanha (12 %), enquanto os países de origem da maior parte dos jovens empresários foram a Espanha (23 %) e a Itália (22 %). Os principais setores escolhidos para o intercâmbio foram:

- Publicidade, promoção e meios de comunicação social
 - Ensino e formação
 - Serviços de arquitetura, construção, engenharia e inspeção
 - Hotelaria, restauração, turismo, viagens e serviços de bem-estar.
-

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000788/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(25 January 2013)**

Subject: Young entrepreneurs and the success of the Erasmus first job programme

The Commission has presented its proposal establishing the multiannual financial framework for the period 2014-2020, for which a budget was set of EUR 1 033 billion, divided among several strategic areas. In this budget, strategic area 1a (Competitiveness for growth and employment) includes funding for research, development and innovation and support to small and medium-scale enterprises under the heading 'Horizon 2020'.

During the next financial period the new Programme for the Competitiveness of Enterprises and Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (2014-2020) (COSME) will come into force, replacing the current Competitiveness and Innovation Programme (CIP).

COSME aims to promote entrepreneurship, with particular focus on young entrepreneurs, new entrepreneurs and specific target groups, such as women entrepreneurs.

A number of Member States have supported youth entrepreneurship and the Commission recently launched the Erasmus first job programme.

Under the COSME Programme, 'particular attention shall be paid to young entrepreneurs'.

Another factor affecting competitiveness is the relatively weak entrepreneurial spirit in the Union. Only 45 % of Union citizens (and less than 40 % of women) would like to be self-employed, as compared to 55 % of the population in the United States and 71 % in China.

1. How does the Commission intend to promote young entrepreneurship within the context of the COSME programme?
2. What is the Commission's assessment of the Erasmus first job programme? How many people have taken part in the programme, which are the main participating countries and which sectoral areas have mainly been chosen by the young entrepreneurs?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2013)**

The Entrepreneurship 2020 Action Plan (EAP) ⁽¹⁾ sets out a strategy for the Commission and for Member States in the coming years, and has a strong focus on youth entrepreneurship. The first Pillar of the EAP deals with entrepreneurship education and training, to support development of entrepreneurial skills as well as encourage business creation. The COSME programme will support the implementation of relevant actions in this pillar. The action plan engages the Commission in reinforcing cooperation and exchange of best practice at European level, and sets ambitious targets for the Member States. It also aims to steer new initiatives to support businesses in the initial phase of development and help unemployed young people to start their own business.

Erasmus for Young Entrepreneurs is now an established programme. It offers unique opportunities to those who wish to create their company or have recently done so: they can receive coaching and first-hand advice from an experienced entrepreneur. The programme also helps participating entrepreneurs to expand their markets, to establish contacts abroad and to cooperate.

The feedback from young entrepreneurs is extremely positive: 94% state that the programme helped develop their business idea. So far the total number of exchanges is about 1 800. Preferred countries for the exchange were the UK (23%) and Spain (12%), while the top countries of origin of young entrepreneurs were Spain (23%) and Italy (22%). Main sectors chosen for the exchange have been:

- Advertising, promotion and media
- Education and training
- Architectural, construction, engineering and inspection services
- Hotel, restaurant, tourism, travel and wellness

⁽¹⁾ Entrepreneurship 2020 Action Plan, Reigniting the entrepreneurial spirit in Europe, COM(2012) 795 final, 9 January 2013.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000789/13

à Comissão

Nuno Teixeira (PPE)

(25 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Falta de competitividade das empresas europeias

Tendo em conta que:

- A Comissão apresentou a proposta que estabelece o Quadro Financeiro Plurianual para o período 2014-2020, tendo sido definido um orçamento de 1 033 mil milhões de euros, repartido por vários eixos estratégicos. No orçamento em causa, o eixo estratégico 1a) «Competitividade para o Crescimento e o Emprego» inclui o financiamento para a área de Investigação, Desenvolvimento e Inovação e apoio às Pequenas e Médias Empresas, intitulando-se «Horizonte 2020»;
- No próximo período financeiro estará em vigor o novo «Programa para a Competitividade das Empresas e Pequenas e Médias empresas (2014-2020)» (COSME) que substitui o atual «Programa para a Competitividade e Inovação» (PCI);
- O COSME visa reforçar a competitividade e a sustentabilidade das empresas, promover o espírito empresarial, melhorar o acesso das PME ao financiamento e incentivar o acesso aos mercados da União Europeia e mundiais;
- Segundo salientou o Vice-Presidente da Comissão Europeia Antonio Tajani, responsável pela Indústria e pelo Empreendedorismo, «Facilitar às PME o acesso ao financiamento, aos mercados e às políticas de empreendedorismo é a chave para ultrapassar a crise. Este programa ajudará a libertar o potencial de crescimento das empresas, concentrando-se em promover a economia real. Vamos reforçar a competitividade das empresas, vamos criar novos empregos e vamos reforçar o potencial de crescimento da economia da UE»;
- Na proposta apresentada, é salientado que «As empresas da União Europeia enfrentam o desafio da competitividade à escala mundial. São, no entanto, travadas por deficiências do mercado que comprometem a sua capacidade de competir com os seus homólogos nas outras partes do mundo.»

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Quais as deficiências de mercado identificadas pela Comissão e que afetam a competitividade das empresas europeias?
2. Quais as ações que a União Europeia deverá realizar para apoiar as empresas a melhorarem os seus rácios de competitividade à escala global?

Resposta dada por António Tajani em nome da Comissão

(27 de março de 2013)

1. A avaliação de impacto do programa COSME identificou as seguintes deficiências do mercado que distorcem a competitividade das empresas da UE:
 - dificuldade de acesso ao financiamento (29 % das PME que pediram um empréstimo bancário em 2010 não obtiveram qualquer crédito ou receberam um montante inferior ao solicitado);
 - baixos níveis de criação de PME e um fraco desempenho (20-40 % das novas empresas não vão além dos primeiros dois anos, enquanto apenas 40-50 % sobrevivem após o sétimo);
 - problemas de especialização industrial, tais como uma capacidade limitada para assumir os riscos e os custos da incorporação de conceitos criativos;
 - internacionalização limitada das PME, tanto no interior como no exterior da UE (apenas 13 % das PME exportam para fora da UE e apenas 25 % exportam para fora do seu próprio Estado-Membro);

- um fraco espírito empresarial (só 45 % dos cidadãos europeus gostariam de trabalhar por conta própria, em comparação com 55 % dos cidadãos americanos), e
 - um ambiente empresarial que não é propício ao arranque e ao crescimento.
2. Para apoiar as empresas da UE a tornarem-se mais competitivas a nível mundial, a Comissão propõe que o programa COSME se baseie na melhoria das condições-quadro da competitividade e do desenvolvimento sustentável das empresas da UE, na promoção do espírito empresarial e na melhoria do acesso ao financiamento e aos mercados.

As ações específicas para melhorar o acesso aos mercados incluem manter o apoio à Enterprise Europe Network, a prestação de informações e atividades de sensibilização, bem como medidas destinadas a facilitar o acesso das PME aos mercados fora da UE e reforçar os serviços de apoio nesses mercados (por exemplo, o centro de contacto das PME para defesa dos DPI na China). Além disso, o programa COSME pode promover a cooperação industrial internacional, incluindo o diálogo industrial e regulamentar com países terceiros.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000789/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(25 January 2013)**

Subject: Lack of competitiveness of European enterprises

The Commission has presented its proposal establishing the multiannual financial framework for the period 2014-2020, for which a budget was set of EUR 1 033 billion, divided among several strategic areas. In this budget, strategic area 1a (Competitiveness for growth and employment) includes funding for research, development and innovation and support to small and medium-scale enterprises under the heading 'Horizon 2020'.

During the next financial period the new Programme for the Competitiveness of Enterprises and Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (2014-2020) (COSME) will come into force, replacing the current Competitiveness and Innovation Programme (CIP).

COSME aims to strengthen the competitiveness and sustainability of enterprises, promote entrepreneurship, improve access to funding by SMEs and encourage access to EU and world markets.

European Commission Vice-President Antonio Tajani, responsible for enterprises and industry, said that 'easing SMEs access to finance, markets and entrepreneurship policies, is key to overcome the crisis. This programme will help to unlock the growth potential of enterprises focusing on boosting the real industry. We will strengthen competitiveness of businesses and create new jobs, and ultimately reinforce the growth potential of the EU economy.'

The proposal presenting the COSME programme notes that 'Union enterprises face the challenge of being competitive on a global scale. However, they are hindered by market failures that undermine their capacity to compete with counterparts in other parts of the world.'

1. What market failures affecting the competitiveness of European enterprises has the Commission identified?
2. What action should the EU take to support enterprises so that they can become more competitive at global level?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2013)**

1. The COSME Impact Assessment identified the following market failures undermining the competitiveness of EU enterprises:
 - problematic access to finance (29% of SMEs that applied for a bank loan in 2010 did not get any credit or got less than they applied for);
 - low levels of SME creation and poor performance (20-40% of start-up firms fail in the first two years, while only 40-50% survive beyond the seventh);
 - issues in industry specialisation, such as a limited capacity to take up the risks and costs of incorporating creative concepts;
 - limited internationalisation of SMEs inside and outside the EU (only 13% of SMEs export outside the EU and only 25% export outside their own MS);
 - a weak entrepreneurial spirit (only 45% of Europeans would like to be self-employed compared to 55% of US citizens); and
 - a business environment which is not conducive to start-up and growth.

2. To support EU enterprises becoming more competitive at a global level, the Commission is proposing that COSME focuses on improving framework conditions for the competitiveness and sustainability of EU businesses, promoting entrepreneurship, and improving access to finance and access to markets.

The specific actions to improve access to markets include maintaining the support for the Enterprise Europe Network, carrying out information provision and awareness-raising activities, as well as measures to facilitate SMEs access to markets outside the EU, and strengthening support services in those markets (e.g. China Intellectual Property Rights SME helpdesk). In addition, COSME may foster international industrial cooperation, including industrial and regulatory dialogues with third countries.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000790/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(25 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Fundos de capital de risco europeus

A Comissão apresentou a proposta que estabelece o Quadro Financeiro Plurianual para o período 2014-2020, tendo sido definido um orçamento de 1 033 milhões de euros, repartido por vários eixos estratégicos. No orçamento em causa, o eixo estratégico 1a), «Competitividade para o Crescimento e o Emprego», inclui o financiamento para a área de Investigação, Desenvolvimento e Inovação e apoio às Pequenas e Médias Empresas, intitulando-se «Horizonte 2020».

No próximo período financeiro estará em vigor o novo «Programa para a Competitividade das Empresas e pequenas e médias empresas (2014-2020)» (COSME), substituindo o atual «Programa para a Competitividade e Inovação» (PCI). O COSME visa promover o espírito empresarial, tendo em especial atenção os jovens empresários, novos empresários e grupos-alvo específicos, como é o caso do empreendedorismo feminino.

Outro fator que afeta a competitividade é o fraco espírito empresarial que caracteriza a União. Só 45 % dos cidadãos da União (e menos de 40 % das mulheres) gostariam de ser trabalhadores por conta própria, em comparação com 55 % da população nos Estados Unidos e 71 % na China.

O Fundo Europeu de Investimento (FEI) já investiu em 19 fundos de capital de risco que foram apoiados pelo Programa de Competitividade e Inovação (PCI), tendo obtido mais de 1,4 mil milhões de euros de investimento nas PME com potencial de crescimento. Os instrumentos de capital de risco complementarão os que se encontram previstos no novo programa de investigação e inovação intitulado «Horizonte 2020».

Tendo em conta o acima exposto, solicito à Comissão que responda ao seguinte:

1. Quantas empresas foram apoiadas pelos 19 fundos de capital de risco, qual o número de novos empregos criados e em que áreas estratégicas se concentrou a maioria dos apoios?
2. Como se irá articular o Programa COSME com o Programa Horizonte 2020 no que diz respeito aos fundos de capital de risco?
3. Existirá alguma forma efetiva de diferenciar os apoios prestados às empresas de capital de risco ou estas poderão ter acesso a financiamento duplo (COSME e Horizonte 2020) para os projetos que posteriormente irão apoiar?

Resposta dada por Antonio Tajani em nome da Comissão
(21 de março de 2013)

Em 30 de setembro de 2012, o Fundo Europeu de Investimento (FEI) assinou acordos com 32 fundos de capital de risco no âmbito do mandato do mecanismo a favor das PME Inovadoras e de Elevado Crescimento (MIC) do PCI ⁽¹⁾. Foram 263 as empresas que beneficiaram dos investimentos realizados por esses fundos, que se centram principalmente no setor das TIC, das Tecnologias Limpas e das Ciências da Vida.

Informações recentes mostram-nos que os fundos de capitais de risco com acordos com o FEI investiram em empresas que aumentaram a sua força laboral em 28 % num período de 3 anos, o que significa um aumento de cerca de 1 000 trabalhadores.

As propostas da Comissão no âmbito dos programas COSME e Horizonte 2020, apresentadas em novembro de 2011, incluem dois mecanismos relativos ao capital: o mecanismo de capital próprio no quadro do Horizonte 2020, que permite investimentos, nas fases iniciais, em PME inovadoras e nas pequenas empresas de média capitalização e o mecanismo de Capital Próprio para o Crescimento (EFG) no quadro do programa COSME, que permite os investimentos em PME orientadas para o crescimento na sua fase de expansão e desenvolvimento.

⁽¹⁾ Programa-Quadro para a Competitividade e a Inovação 2007-2013.

Porém, o EFG no âmbito de COSME permite investimentos em empresas numa fase precoce das empresas em conjunto com o mecanismo de capital próprio no âmbito de Horizonte 2020. Neste caso, o investimento do EFG não pode exceder 20 % do total do investimento da UE, exceto nos casos de investimentos conjuntos em fundos multi-fases, onde o financiamento do EFG e do mecanismo de capital próprio para I&I serão fornecidos proporcionalmente, consoante a política de investimento de cada fundo ⁽²⁾.

O financiamento dos fundos de capital de risco no âmbito de COSME e de Horizonte 2020 será atribuído sob forma de investimentos de capitais próprios e não sob a forma de empréstimos. Dependendo do seu ponto focal de investimentos, os fundos de capital de risco só poderão receber financiamento de um dos programas (ou COSME ou Horizonte 2020), ou de ambos os programas em simultâneo. Neste último caso, a contribuição de cada programa deverá ficar devidamente identificada.

⁽²⁾ O mesmo se aplica ao mecanismo de capital próprio para a I&I, que permite investimentos em empresas em fase de expansão e crescimento em conjunto com o EFG.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000790/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(25 January 2013)

Subject: European venture capital funds

The Commission has presented its proposal establishing the multiannual financial framework for the period 2014-2020, setting out a budget of EUR 1 033 billion, divided among several strategic areas. In this budget, strategic area 1a (Competitiveness for growth and employment) includes funding for research, development and innovation and support to small and medium-scale enterprises under the heading 'Horizon 2020'.

During the next financial period the new Programme for the Competitiveness of Enterprises and Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (2014-2020) (COSME) will come into force, replacing the current Competitiveness and Innovation Programme (CIP). COSME aims to promote entrepreneurship, with particular focus on young entrepreneurs, new entrepreneurs and specific target groups, such as women entrepreneurs.

Another factor which affects competitiveness is the relatively weak entrepreneurial spirit in the Union. Only 45% of Union citizens (and less than 40% of women) would like to be self-employed, as compared to 55% of the population in the United States and 71% in China.

The European Investment Fund (EIF) has already invested in 19 venture capital funds which were supported by the Competitiveness and Innovation Programme (CIP), with an investment of over EUR 1.4 billion in SMEs with growth potential. The venture capital instruments will complement those provided under the new Horizon 2020 framework programme for research and innovation.

In light of the above, can the Commission answer the following:

1. How many enterprises were supported by the 19 venture capital funds, how many new jobs were created, and in which strategic areas was most of the support concentrated?
2. How will the COSME programme be linked with the Horizon 2020 programme with regard to venture capital funds?
3. Will there be any effective means of differentiating loans made to venture capital funds, or will the latter be able to have access to dual funding (under both COSME and Horizon 2020) for the projects they intend to support?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(21 March 2013)

As of 30 September 2012, the European Investment Fund (EIF) signed agreements with 32 venture capital funds under the CIP ⁽¹⁾ High Growth and Innovative SME Facility (GIF) mandate. The number of enterprises that benefited from investments made by these funds was 263. The main sectors on which the funds focus are ICT, Clean Technology and Life Sciences.

Latest available data show that venture capital funds with agreements with EIF invested in enterprises which increased their employment by 28% during a 3-year period. This means an increase with almost 1000 employees.

The Commission proposals on COSME and Horizon 2020 presented in November 2011 include two equity facilities: the Equity Facility for R&I under Horizon 2020 allows for investments in early stage, innovative SMEs and small mid-caps; the Equity Facility for Growth (EFG) under COSME allows for investments in growth-oriented SMEs in their expansion and growth stage.

However, the EFG under COSME allows for investments in early stage enterprises in conjunction with the Equity Facility under Horizon 2020. In this case, the investment from EFG shall not exceed 20% of the total EU investment except in cases of joint investments in multi-stage funds, where funding from EFG and the Equity Facility for R&I will be provided on a pro rata basis, based on each fund's investment policy ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme 2007-2013.

⁽²⁾ The same applies to the Equity Facility for R&I, which allows for investments in expansion and growth stage enterprises in conjunction with the EFG.

Financing of venture capital funds under COSME and Horizon 2020 will be provided in the form of equity investments and not in the form of loans. Depending on their investment focus, venture capital funds may receive funding from one programme only (either COSME or Horizon 2020) or from both programmes. In the latter case, the contribution from each programme should be clearly identified.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000791/13

à Comissão

Nuno Teixeira (PPE)

(25 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Internacionalização das empresas europeias

A Comissão apresentou a proposta que estabelece o Quadro Financeiro Plurianual para o período 2014-2020, tendo sido definido um orçamento de 1 023 milhões de euros, repartido por vários eixos estratégicos. No orçamento em causa, o eixo estratégico 1a), «Competitividade para o Crescimento e o Emprego», inclui o financiamento para a área de Investigação, Desenvolvimento e Inovação e apoio às Pequenas e Médias Empresas, intitulando-se «Horizonte 2020». As PME são uma importante fonte de crescimento económico e criação de emprego na União, uma vez que representam mais de 67 % dos postos de trabalho do setor privado e são responsáveis por mais de 58 % do volume total de negócios na UE.

No próximo período financeiro estará em vigor o novo «Programa para a Competitividade das Empresas e pequenas e médias empresas (2014-2020)» (COSME), substituindo o atual «Programa para a Competitividade e Inovação» (PCI). O COSME visa reforçar a competitividade e a sustentabilidade das empresas, promover o espírito empresarial, melhorar o acesso das PME ao financiamento e melhorar o acesso aos mercados da União Europeia e mundiais.

Na proposta apresentada, salienta-se que um dos principais desafios das PME é a «capacidade limitada das PME para se expandirem para mercados fora do seu país de origem, tanto no mercado único como para além dele». Segundo algumas estimativas apresentadas pela Comissão Europeia, apenas 25 % das PME da União Europeia exportam anualmente ou exportaram alguma vez nos últimos três anos, mas só 13 % exportam para fora da UE numa base regular e só 2 % investiram fora do seu país de origem.

Tendo em conta o acima exposto, solicito à Comissão que responda ao seguinte:

1. Quais as medidas que tenciona adotar com vista a apoiar o reforço da internacionalização das empresas europeias?
2. Que apoios estão disponíveis para as empresas europeias que pretendam investir fora do mercado europeu e assim expandir a economia europeia à escala global?

Resposta dada por António Tajani em nome da Comissão

(27 de março de 2013)

O programa COSME terá como objetivo melhorar o acesso aos mercados na União Europeia e mais globalmente.

A Comissão manterá o seu apoio à *Enterprise Europe Network* (rede europeia de empresas). De acordo com o atual projeto de proposta, podem ser consideradas em países terceiros prioritárias medidas específicas nos domínios das normas e dos direitos de propriedade intelectual. Estão previstas também ações destinadas a promover a cooperação industrial a nível internacional, com o objetivo de reduzir as diferenças em, matéria de regulação e melhorar o ambiente empresarial.

Alguns centros empresariais da UE que aconselham as PME sobre como investir e aproveitar oportunidades comerciais na China, na Índia e na Tailândia são financiados pela Comissão. Estas iniciativas são complementadas pelo Helpdesk China DPI e pelo Helpdesk DPI PME ASEAN, a criar em breve. A Comissão apoia igualmente a cooperação entre *clusters* transnacionais e internacionais através da *European Cluster Collaboration Platform* e da organização de eventos para encontros para determinar afinidades entre *clusters* em países terceiros.

A Comissão promove fortemente a internacionalização das PME através do seu programa de «missões para o crescimento» para países terceiros.

Em conformidade com a sua Comunicação ⁽¹⁾, a Comissão está a proceder a um exercício de mapeamento, que permitirá um inventário das medidas de apoio existentes a compilar com base nesse exercício. Nesta base, serão formuladas recomendações políticas. Será criado um portal para orientar as PME para programas disponíveis, a fim de as ajudar nos esforços de internacionalização.

⁽¹⁾ «Pequenas empresas, grande mundo — uma nova parceria para ajudar as PME a aproveitar as oportunidades à escala mundial» — Comunicação da Comissão ao Parlamento Europeu, ao Conselho, ao Comité Económico e Social Europeu e o Comité das Regiões, adotada em 8 de novembro de 2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000791/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(25 January 2013)

Subject: Internationalisation of European enterprises

The Commission has presented its proposal establishing the multiannual financial framework for the period 2014-2020, for which a budget was set of EUR 1 023 billion, divided among several strategic areas. In this budget, strategic area 1a (Competitiveness for growth and employment) includes funding for research, development and innovation and support to small and medium-scale enterprises under the heading 'Horizon 2020'. SMEs are a major source of economic growth and job creation in the EU, accounting for more than 67 % of private sector jobs and providing more than 58 % of total turnover in the EU.

During the next financial period the new Programme for the Competitiveness of Enterprises and Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (2014-2020) (COSME) will come into force, replacing the current Competitiveness and Innovation Programme (CIP). COSME aims to strengthen the competitiveness and sustainability of enterprises, promote entrepreneurship, improve access by SMEs to funding and improve access to markets within the EU and worldwide.

The proposal emphasises that one of the main challenges facing SMEs is the 'limited capacity of SMEs to expand to markets beyond their home country, both within the single market and beyond'. According to several estimates presented by the Commission, only 25 % of SMEs in the EU annually export or exported at some time during the last three years, only 13 % regularly exported outside the EU, and only 2 % invested outside their country of origin.

In light of the above, can the Commission answer the following:

1. What measures does the Commission intend to take in order to support or strengthen the internationalisation of SMEs?
2. What support is available for European enterprises wishing to invest outside the European market and thereby expand the European economy at global level?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2013)

The COSME will aim to improve access to markets inside the European Union and more globally.

The Commission will maintain its support for the Enterprise Europe Network. According to the current draft proposal specific measures in the areas of standards and intellectual property rights may be envisaged in priority third countries. It will also involve actions for fostering international industrial cooperation, with the objective of reducing regulatory differences and improving the business environment.

A number of EU business Centres that advise SMEs on how to invest and take advantage of business opportunities in China, India and Thailand are financed by the Commission. These initiatives are complemented by the IPR China Helpdesk and the ASEAN IPR SME Helpdesk due to be set up soon. The Commission also supports transnational and international cooperation between clusters, through the European Cluster Collaboration Platform and the organisation of international cluster match-making events in third countries.

The Commission strongly promotes SME internationalisation through its programme of 'Missions for Growth' to third countries.

In line with its communication ⁽¹⁾, the Commission is conducting a mapping exercise which will enable an inventory of the existing support measures to be compiled on the basis of this. Based on this, policy recommendations will be developed. A portal will be set up to guide SMEs to programmes available to assist them with internationalisation.

⁽¹⁾ 'Small Business, Big World — a new partnership to help SMEs seize global opportunities' — Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, adopted on 8 November 2011.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000792/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(25 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Promoção turística europeia

Tendo em conta que:

- A Comissão apresentou a proposta que estabelece o Quadro Financeiro Plurianual para o período 2014-2020, tendo sido definido um orçamento de 1 033 mil milhões de euros, repartido por vários eixos estratégicos. No orçamento em causa, o eixo estratégico 1a) «Competitividade para o Crescimento e o Emprego» inclui o financiamento a favor da área de Investigação, Desenvolvimento e Inovação e o apoio às Pequenas e Médias Empresas, intitulando-se «Horizonte 2020»;
- No próximo período financeiro estará em vigor o novo «Programa para a Competitividade das Empresas e Pequenas e Médias Empresas (2014-2020)» (COSME), substituindo o atual «Programa para a Competitividade e Inovação» (PCI);
- O COSME visa reforçar a competitividade e a sustentabilidade das empresas, promover o espírito empresarial, melhorar o acesso das PME ao financiamento e melhorar o acesso aos mercados da União Europeia e mundiais;
- A área de turismo tem grande destaque neste novo programa de financiamento europeu, evidenciando-se que as medidas adotadas ao nível da UE têm um claro valor acrescentado, sobretudo na análise da procura e oferta e no desenvolvimento de estratégias transnacionais conjuntas para a promoção da Europa como destino turístico de elevada qualidade;
- Salienta-se ainda a premência de a época turística ser alargada, podendo ser possível alcançar tal desiderato estratégico caso exista maior cooperação entre os diversos Estados-Membros.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Quais as medidas que tem vindo a adotar, a nível europeu e em mercados externos, com vista à promoção integrada do turismo europeu?
2. Quais os investimentos que pretende realizar nos anos vindouros para promover de forma efetiva e eficaz as potencialidades turísticas do continente europeu?
3. Como é que o programa COSME poderá potencializar essa comunicação integrada?
4. Como é que as regiões de turismo de cada Estado-membro poderão colaborar mais entre si para criar economias de escala ao nível da promoção turística?

Resposta dada por Antonio Tajani em nome da Comissão
(26 de março de 2013)

1. Nos últimos anos, a Comissão adotou várias medidas de suporte à promoção do turismo. É especialmente importante mencionar a campanha de comunicação internacional, «Europa — Em todos os momentos» ⁽¹⁾, lançada, em 2012, para manter a Europa no centro das atenções dos turistas internacionais e destacar o seu diverso património cultural e natural. Para além disso, a Comissão concedeu uma subvenção de 18 meses à Comissão Europeia do Turismo ⁽²⁾ (CET) para a promoção do «Destino Europa», em mercados de países terceiros.

⁽¹⁾ A campanha de comunicação será lançada entre setembro de 2012 e dezembro de 2013 e é projetada especialmente para lembrar os turistas, em especial os do Brasil, da Rússia, da Índia, da China, do Chile e da Argentina, a descoberta do velho continente e a desfrutarem da viagem da sua vida. Para mais informações:

http://europa.eu/readyforeurope/index_pt.htm

⁽²⁾ O CET é uma organização que coordena as organizações nacionais de turismo na Europa, responsáveis pela comercialização do «Destino Europa» além-mar.

2. A Comissão continuará a promover o potencial turístico da Europa nos próximos anos, entre outros, ao continuar a sua parceria com a CET, mas também através de convites específicos à apresentação de propostas de projetos que facilitem a promoção de produtos turísticos transnacionais, Itinerários Culturais Europeus e Destinos Europeus de Excelência emergentes, agregando assim valor às atividades de promoção dos Estados-Membros e da indústria europeia do turismo ⁽³⁾.
3. Na sua proposta para o programa COSME ⁽⁴⁾, a Comissão sugeriu uma repartição indicativa das dotações operacionais e a distribuição do orçamento entre as ações propostas, incluindo uma dotação orçamental adequada para iniciativas relacionadas com o turismo, que entre outras, devem incluir o financiamento adequado para a comunicação e a sensibilização integradas, em relação à Europa como destino.
4. As regiões europeias deviam capitalizar melhor as oportunidades de projetos de turismo macrorregionais oferecidas pela Comissão, a fim de trocar boas práticas, partilhar conhecimento e estabelecer estratégias conjuntas de promoção do turismo. As estratégias da região do Mar Báltico ⁽⁵⁾ e da região do Danúbio ⁽⁶⁾ oferecem importantes oportunidades de cooperação, incluindo em termos de promoção e comercialização do turismo.

⁽³⁾ Para além disto, os esforços da Comissão para atrair turistas de países emergentes também incluem ações destinadas a facilitar os procedimentos de visto, a melhorar a oferta turística em termos de sustentabilidade, diversidade, bem como de qualidade e, por último, mas não menos importante, a combater a sazonalidade.

⁽⁴⁾ COM(2011) 809 final de 30.11.2011. O Programa para a Competitividade das Empresas e das Pequenas e Médias Empresas (COSME), visa melhorar o acesso das PME ao financiamento e aos mercados, incentivar uma cultura empresarial na Europa e melhorar as condições-quadro para a competitividade e a sustentabilidade das empresas, incluindo no setor do turismo.

⁽⁵⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/cooperate/baltic/index_en.cfm

⁽⁶⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/cooperate/danube/index_en.cfm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000792/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(25 January 2013)

Subject: European promotion of tourism

— The Commission has presented its proposal establishing the multiannual financial framework for the period 2014-2020, with a budget of EUR 1 033 billion divided among several strategic areas. In this budget, strategic area 1a (Competitiveness for growth and employment) includes funding for research, development and innovation and support to small and medium-scale enterprises under the heading 'Horizon 2020'.

— During the next financial period the new Programme for the Competitiveness of Enterprises and Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (2014-2020) (COSME) will come into force, replacing the current Competitiveness and Innovation Programme (CIP).

— COSME aims to strengthen the competitiveness and sustainability of enterprises, promote entrepreneurship, improve access by SMEs to funding and improve access to markets within the EU and worldwide.

— The area of tourism features strongly in this new European funding programme, demonstrating that measures adopted at European level have a definite added value, particularly when it comes to the supply and demand and development of joint transnational strategies to promote Europe as a high quality tourism destination.

— Emphasis is also placed on the urgent need to extend the tourist season, a strategic objective which could be achieved through increasing cooperation among the Member States.

Can the Commission say:

1. What measures has it adopted, at European level and in external markets, to support the promotion of tourism?
2. What investments does it intend to make over the next few years to effectively and efficiently promote Europe's touristic potential?
3. How will the COSME programme be able to make the most of this integrated communication?
4. In what ways can the tourist regions of each Member State collaborate more closely with each other to create economies of scale when promoting tourism?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(26 March 2013)

1. In the recent years, the Commission has adopted several measures to support the promotion of tourism. It is especially worth mentioning the international communication campaign, 'Europe — Whenever you're ready' ⁽¹⁾ which was launched in 2012 to keep Europe in the spotlight for international tourists and highlight Europe's diverse cultural and natural heritage. Further to this, the Commission awarded an 18-month grant to the European Travel Commission ⁽²⁾ (ETC) for the promotion of 'Destination Europe' in third country markets.

2. The Commission will keep promoting Europe's touristic potential over the next years, amongst others, by continuing its partnership with ETC, but also through specific calls for proposals for projects which facilitate the promotion of transnational tourism products, European Cultural Itineraries and emerging European Destinations of Excellence, thereby adding value to promotional activities of Member States and the European tourism industry ⁽³⁾.

⁽¹⁾ The communication campaign will be rolled out between September 2012 and December 2013 and is particularly designed to remind tourists, in particular from Brazil, Russia, India, China, Chile and Argentina, to discover the old continent and to enjoy a travel experience of a lifetime. For further information: <http://europa.eu/readyforeurope/>

⁽²⁾ ETC is the umbrella organisation for National Tourism Organisations in Europe responsible for marketing 'Destination Europe' overseas.

⁽³⁾ Further to this, the Commission's efforts to attract tourists from emerging countries also include, actions aimed at facilitating visa procedures, at improving tourism offer in terms of sustainability, diversity as well as quality, and last but not least at combating seasonality.

3. In its proposal for the COSME programme ⁽⁴⁾, the Commission suggested an indicative split of operational appropriations and budget distribution for the proposed actions, including an adequate budget allocation for tourism-related initiatives, which *inter alia* should include appropriate funding for integrated communication and awareness-raising with regard to Europe as a destination.

4. European regions should better capitalise on the Commission's macro-regional tourism project opportunities in order to exchange best practices, share knowledge and set up joint tourism promotion strategies. The Baltic Sea Region ⁽⁵⁾ and Danube Region ⁽⁶⁾ strategies offer important opportunities for cooperation, including in terms of tourism promotion and marketing.

⁽⁴⁾ COM(2011) 834 final of 30.11.2011. The Programme for the Competitiveness of Enterprises and Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (COSME) has as objectives to improve access to finance and to markets for SMEs, to encourage an entrepreneurial culture in Europe, and to improve framework conditions for the competitiveness and sustainability of enterprises including in the tourism sector.

⁽⁵⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/cooperate/baltic/index_en.cfm

⁽⁶⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/cooperate/danube/index_en.cfm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000793/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(25 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Fomentar uma cultura de empreendedorismo

Tendo em conta que:

- A Comissão apresentou a proposta que estabelece o Quadro Financeiro Plurianual para o período 2014-2020, tendo sido definido um orçamento de 1 033 mil milhões de euros, repartido por vários eixos estratégicos. No orçamento em causa, o eixo estratégico 1a) «Competitividade para o Crescimento e o Emprego» incluiu o financiamento a favor da área de Investigação, Desenvolvimento e Inovação e o apoio às Pequenas e Médias Empresas, intitulando-se «Horizonte 2020»;
- No próximo período financeiro estará em vigor o novo «Programa para a Competitividade das Empresas e pequenas e médias empresas (2014-2020)» (COSME), substituindo o atual «Programa para a Competitividade e Inovação» (PCI);
- O COSME visa promover o espírito empresarial, tendo em especial atenção os jovens empresários, novos empresários e grupos-alvo específicos, como é caso do empreendedorismo feminino;
- Outro fator que afeta a competitividade é o fraco espírito empresarial que caracteriza a União. Só 45 % dos cidadãos da União (e menos de 40 % das mulheres) gostariam de ser trabalhadores por conta própria, em comparação com 55 % da população nos Estados Unidos e 71 % na China;
- Existe uma grande falta de cultura de risco nas populações europeias, levando a que os cidadãos não arrisquem desenvolver novos produtos e serviços, criando empresas para os comercializar;
- Alguns municípios ou até regiões europeias estão a criar redes de apoio ao empreendedorismo, incentivando a criação de um Ecossistema Empreendedor que reúna instituições de ensino superior, centros tecnológicos, entidades públicas municipais, empresas de capital de risco e *business angels*.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Tendo em conta que o Programa COSME visa estimular o espírito empresarial, que medidas irá a Comissão desenvolver para fomentar uma nova cultura de empreendedorismo?
2. Existe alguma rede europeia especificamente direcionada para o apoio aos novos empresários e que possa ser utilizada pelos cidadãos europeus?

Resposta dada por António Tajani em nome da Comissão
(13 de março de 2013)

O Plano de Ação «Empreendedorismo 2020»⁽¹⁾, que delinea uma estratégia para a Comissão e os Estados-Membros nos próximos anos, centra-se predominantemente na promoção da cultura do empreendedorismo, começando pelos jovens. Essa e outras iniciativas preconizadas no referido plano de ação serão implementadas no quadro do programa COSME. O eixo 1 do plano de ação visa desenvolver o ensino no domínio do empreendedorismo nas escolas e universidades para apoiar o crescimento e a criação de empresas. Vincula a Comissão a reforçar a cooperação e o intercâmbio das melhores práticas a nível europeu, traçando objetivos ambiciosos para os Estados-Membros. A este respeito, com base na Comunicação «Repensar a Educação»⁽²⁾, a Comissão publicará, em 2013, orientações políticas para apoiar a melhoria da qualidade e a prevalência da educação para o desenvolvimento do espírito empresarial em toda a UE.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2012) 795 final, 9 de janeiro de 2013.

⁽²⁾ COM(2012) 669 final, 20 de novembro de 2012.

Uma das iniciativas destinadas a apoiar novos empresários (e os já existentes) é a *Enterprise Europe Network* (Rede de Empresas Europa), que abrange 600 organizações parceiras a nível regional. A rede pode ajudar os novos empresários a aceder aos fundos da União, a obter financiamento para os seus projetos ou aconselhamento sobre a legislação e os programas da UE. A rede pode contribuir para que encontrem parceiros comerciais em 54 países e gere uma base de dados para a cooperação e transferência de tecnologia entre empresas (*Business Cooperation and Technology Transfer Database*), que inclui 15 mil propostas de parcerias ⁽³⁾.

O Erasmus para Jovens Empreendedores ⁽⁴⁾ é presentemente um programa consolidado. Oferece oportunidades únicas a quem pretenda criar a sua própria empresa ou a quem a tenha criado recentemente, sendo possível receber tutoria e aconselhamento em primeira mão de um empresário experiente. O programa ajuda igualmente os jovens empreendedores participantes a expandirem os seus mercados, a estabelecerem contactos no estrangeiro e a cooperarem. Até à data, este programa de intercâmbio contou já com a participação de cerca de 3 600 empresários.

⁽³⁾ <http://portal.enterprise-europe-network.ec.europa.eu/>

⁽⁴⁾ <http://www.erasmus-entrepreneurs.eu/index.php?lan=pt>

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000793/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(25 January 2013)

Subject: Promoting a culture of entrepreneurship

The Commission has presented its proposal establishing the multiannual financial framework for the period 2014-2020, for which a budget was set of EUR 1 033 billion, divided among several strategic areas. In this budget, strategic area 1a (Competitiveness for growth and employment) includes funding for research, development and innovation and support to small and medium-scale enterprises under the heading 'Horizon 2020'.

During the next financial period the new Programme for the Competitiveness of Enterprises and Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (2014-2020) (COSME) will come into force, replacing the current Competitiveness and Innovation Programme (CIP).

COSME aims to promote entrepreneurship, with particular focus on young entrepreneurs, new entrepreneurs and specific target groups, such as women entrepreneurs.

Another factor which affects competitiveness is the relatively weak entrepreneurial spirit in the Union. Only 45 % of Union citizens (and less than 40 % of women) would like to be self-employed, as compared to 55 % of the population in the United States and 71 % in China.

There is a real lack of any culture of risk-taking in Europe, which means that people do not venture into developing new products and services, or creating enterprises to market them.

Some European municipalities and even regions are setting up networks to support entrepreneurship and are promoting the creation of an entrepreneurial ecosystem linking higher education institutions, technological centres, municipal public bodies, venture capital enterprises and business angels.

1. In view of the fact that the COSME programme aims to encourage an entrepreneurial spirit, what steps does the Commission intend to take to promote a new culture of entrepreneurship?
2. Is there any European network specifically aimed at supporting new entrepreneurs, which can be made use of by European citizens?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(13 March 2013)

The Entrepreneurship 2020 Action Plan (EAP) ⁽¹⁾, which sets a strategy for the Commission and for the Member States in the coming years, has a strong focus on promoting an entrepreneurial culture, starting from young people. This and other actions under the EAP will be implemented under the framework of the COSME programme. The first Pillar of the EAP deals with entrepreneurial education at school and university, and training to support business creation. It engages the Commission in reinforcing cooperation and the exchange of best practice at European level, and sets ambitious targets for the Member States. In this respect, building on its communication 'Rethinking Education' ⁽²⁾, the Commission will in 2013 publish policy guidance to support extending and improving entrepreneurship education across the EU.

One of the initiatives to support new (and existing) entrepreneurs is the Enterprise Europe Network, counting on 600 regional partner organisations. The Network can help new entrepreneurs on access to EU financing, obtain funding for their projects or advice on EU legislation and programmes. The Network can help them to find business partners in 54 countries and operates a Business Cooperation and Technology Transfer Database with 15 000 partnerships proposals ⁽³⁾.

Erasmus for Young Entrepreneurs ⁽⁴⁾ is now an established programme. It offers unique opportunities to those who wish to create their company or have recently done so: they can receive coaching and first-hand advice from an experienced entrepreneur. The programme also helps participating entrepreneurs to expand their markets, to establish contacts abroad and to cooperate. So far around 3 600 entrepreneurs have participated in this exchange programme.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2012) 795 final, 9 January 2013.

⁽²⁾ COM(2012) 669 final, 20 November 2012.

⁽³⁾ <http://portal.enterprise-europe-network.ec.europa.eu/>

⁽⁴⁾ <http://www.erasmus-entrepreneurs.eu/index.php>

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-000794/13
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(28. Januar 2013)

Betrifft: HKÜ und mögliche Falschauslegungen durch die Mitgliedstaaten

Das HKÜ geht auf den 25. Oktober 1980 zurück und definiert sich als ein multilaterales Abkommen im Rahmen der Haager Konferenz für Internationales Privatrecht.

Die jüngsten Entführungsfälle, unter anderem in Österreich, haben gezeigt, dass es bei der Auslegung und dem Verfahrensprozedere zu großen Missverständnissen kommen kann und sich hier ein Freiraum für unterschiedliche Auslegungen öffnet.

In dem unlängst bekannt gewordenen Fall wurde bereits bei der Einreichung des HKÜ-Antrages in dem Land, in welches das Kind verbracht wurde, nicht entsprechend den Kriterien (u. a. Berücksichtigung des bisherigen gewöhnlichen Wohnsitzes/Aufenthaltsortes) vorgegangen, sondern die Entführung wurde erst zu einer „Besuchsrechtssache“ und in der weiteren Folge zum „Obsorgeverfahren“ erklärt.

Diese Erklärung erfolgte, obwohl der betroffene Elternteil nicht nur eine Rückführung nach dem HKÜ und dem KSU beantragt hatte, sondern und vor allem auch obwohl der betroffene Elternteil schon von Anfang an das Sorgerecht für das Kind hatte; genau dieses Sorgerecht darf in einer HKÜ-Angelegenheit wohl nicht zum tragen kommen.

Kann die Kommission eine ausführliche Antwort auf die nachstehenden Fragen erteilen:

1. Ist der Kommission das Problem bekannt?
2. Was gedenkt die Kommission zu unternehmen, um hier eindeutiger und vor allem auch verbindliche Kriterien für alle Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union zu schaffen?
3. Was gedenkt die Kommission zu unternehmen, um die Rechte der betroffenen Kinder zu achten und zu schützen?

Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(26. Februar 2013)

Das Haager Übereinkommen von 1980 über internationale Kindesentführungen wird von den Mitgliedstaaten nur in ihren Beziehungen zu Drittstaaten angewandt. Die Beziehungen zwischen den Mitgliedstaaten werden seit dem 1. März 2005 durch die Verordnung (EG) Nr. 2201/2003 des Rates vom 27. November 2003 über die Zuständigkeit und die Anerkennung und Vollstreckung von Entscheidungen in Ehesachen und in Verfahren betreffend die elterliche Verantwortung⁽¹⁾ geregelt, die strengere Vorschriften bei Kindesentführung durch einen Elternteil enthält.

Gemäß dem den EU-Verträgen beigefügten Protokoll 22 findet die Verordnung keine Anwendung auf Dänemark.

Die Kommission setzt sich für eine korrekte Anwendung und Auslegung des Übereinkommens von 1980 ein. Eine damit befasste Sonderkommission tagte im Juni 2011 und Januar 2012 mit Beteiligung der EU und der Mitgliedstaaten in Den Haag. Als Orientierungshilfe für eine ordnungsgemäße Anwendung des Übereinkommens hat das Ständige Büro der Haager Konferenz für Internationales Privatrecht fünf praktische Leitfäden ausgearbeitet und veröffentlicht.

Nach dem institutionellen Rahmen der Haager Konferenz ist es nicht möglich, dass nationale Entscheidungen von einer übergeordneten Behörde (wie dem Europäischen Gerichtshof in der EU) überprüft werden, da es zwischen ihren Mitgliedern keine entsprechende Übereinkunft gibt.

⁽¹⁾ ABl. L 338 vom 23.12.2003, S. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000794/13
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(28 January 2013)

Subject: Hague Convention on Child Abduction (HCCA) and possible misinterpretation by the Member States

The HCCA dates back to 25 October 1980 and is defined as a multilateral agreement within the framework of the Hague Conference on Private International Law.

Recent cases of abduction, such as those in Austria, have shown that serious misunderstandings can arise when it comes to interpretation and procedural methods, allowing scope for different interpretations.

In the case that came to light recently, the criteria were not respected even at the point of the submission of the application for HCCA assistance in the country in which the child was held (including consideration of the State in which the child was previously habitually resident), but the abduction was initially declared to be a 'visiting rights case' and subsequently as a 'custody procedure'.

This statement was made even though the parent concerned had not just applied for the child to be returned under the HCCA and the Hague Child Protection Convention (HCPC) but also, and above all, even though the parent concerned had custody of the child from the outset; it is this very issue of custody that should not be brought to bear in an HCCA case.

1. Is the Commission aware of this problem?
2. What does the Commission intend to do to establish clearer and, above all, binding criteria for all Member States of the European Union in this field?
3. What does the Commission intend to do to respect and protect the rights of the children concerned?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(26 February 2013)

The 1980 Convention on International Child Abduction is applied by Member States only in their relationships with third states. Relationships between Member States are regulated, since 1 March 2005, by Council Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003 of 27 November 2003 concerning jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in matrimonial matters and the matters of parental responsibility ⁽¹⁾ which has introduced stricter rules on parental child abduction.

This regulation is not applicable to Denmark, pursuant to Protocol 22 to the EU Treaties.

The Commission is committed to ensuring a correct application and interpretation of the 1980 Convention. A Special Commission devoted to this end was held in The Hague in June 2011 and January 2012 with the participation of the EU and of the Member States. Five Practical Guides on the application of the 1980 Convention have been developed and published by the Permanent Bureau of The Hague Conference on Private International Law to help practitioners in the correct application of the Convention.

The institutional framework of The Hague Conference does not allow national decisions to be revised by a superior authority (as it is the case in the European Union with its Court of Justice) as there is no agreement on the matter between Hague Members.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 338, 23.12.2003, p. 1.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000795/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(28 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Declaração conjunta VI Cimeira Brasil-União Europeia — comércio e investimento

No ponto 5 da Declaração conjunta aprovada por ocasião da VI Cimeira Brasil-União Europeia afirma-se o seguinte: «Destacaram a importância de reforçar ainda mais os contactos entre as respetivas comunidades de negócios, com vistas a promover o comércio e os investimentos bilaterais, assim como os intercâmbios em inovação, pesquisa e desenvolvimento. Nesse sentido, tomaram nota das recomendações do VI Encontro Empresarial Brasil-UE, realizado em Brasília, em 23 de janeiro de 2013, que enfatizou a necessidade de apoiar micro, pequenas e médias empresas.»

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

- Por que formas e através de que meios concretos tenciona promover o reforço dos contactos entre as respetivas comunidades de negócios, com vista a promover o comércio e os investimentos bilaterais, assim como os intercâmbios em inovação, pesquisa e desenvolvimento com o Brasil?
- Em particular, como apoiará as micro, pequenas e médias empresas que pretendam investir no Brasil?

Resposta dada por Karel De Gucht em nome da Comissão

(7 de março de 2013)

Na última cimeira UE-Brasil, os líderes acordaram na criação de uma comissão bilateral *ad-hoc* para analisar de forma mais sistemática o potencial de reforço dos laços económicos, nos domínios do investimento, da competitividade e do comércio de bens e serviços, entre outros.

No que respeita ao apoio às pequenas e médias empresas (PME), a Comissão está a estudar a possibilidade de instituir um serviço de assistência às PME no domínio dos direitos de propriedade intelectual na região do Mercosul, e procede atualmente à identificação de dois projetos para a América Latina, ao abrigo do Instrumento dos Países Industrializados (IPI+). Um projeto visa apoiar a criação de um centro de conhecimento e o outro a prestação de serviços de apoio às empresas, designadamente, às PME.

A Comissão crê, além disso, que as PME da UE poderiam tirar grande partido das condições comerciais mais favoráveis que seriam propiciadas por um acordo de associação ambicioso e abrangente entre a UE e o Mercosul. Na Reunião Ministerial UE-Mercosul, realizada em Santiago em 26 de janeiro de 2013, dois dias depois da Cimeira UE-Brasil, os ministros reiteraram o seu pleno empenho em concluir essas negociações.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000795/13
to the Commission**

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(28 January 2013)

Subject: Sixth EU-Brazil Summit Joint Statement — trade and investment

Paragraph 5 of the Joint Statement adopted at the Sixth EU-Brazil Summit states: 'They stressed the importance of further strengthening contacts between their business communities, with a view to promoting bilateral trade and investment, as well as exchanges in innovation, research and development. In that regard, they took note of the recommendations of the VI EU-Brazil Business Summit, held in Brasilia on 23 January 2013, which emphasised the need to support micro, small and medium enterprises.'

What specific measures will the Commission take and how does it intend to promote the strengthening of contacts between the EU and Brazilian business communities, with a view to promoting bilateral trade and investment, as well as exchanges in innovation, research and development with Brazil?

In particular, how will it support micro-, small and medium-sized enterprises that want to invest in Brazil?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission

(7 March 2013)

At the last EU-Brazil Summit, Leaders agreed to create an ad-hoc bilateral commission to analyse more systematically the potential for further strengthening economic ties, including in the areas of investment, competitiveness, and trade in goods and services.

As regards support to small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), the Commission is exploring the possibility of setting up a Helpdesk for SMEs on Intellectual Property Rights in the Mercosur region, and is in the process of identifying two projects for Latin America under the Industrialised Countries Instrument (ICI+). One project would support the creation of a Knowledge Centre and the other would provide business support services, particularly to SMEs.

In addition, the Commission believes that EU SMEs would greatly benefit from the improved business conditions that an ambitious and comprehensive EU-Mercosur Association Agreement would promote. At the EU-Mercosur Ministerial meeting in Santiago on 26 January 2013, two days after the EU-Brazil Summit, Ministers recalled their full commitment to strive for a conclusion of these negotiations.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000796/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(28 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Declaração conjunta VI Cimeira Brasil-União Europeia — cultura

No ponto 45 da Declaração conjunta aprovada por ocasião da VI Cimeira Brasil-União Europeia afirma-se o seguinte: «Os Líderes enfatizaram a herança cultural comum do Brasil e da UE e reafirmaram seu compromisso com o fortalecimento da cooperação cultural em benefício de seus povos, no âmbito da Declaração Conjunta sobre Cultura assinada pelo Ministério da Cultura do Brasil (MinC) e a Comissão Europeia em maio de 2009. Manifestaram expectativa positiva no tocante à continuidade das ações de cooperação ao abrigo do Programa Conjunto sobre Cultura 2011-2014, assinado à margem da V Cúpula Brasil-UE, em 2011.»

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

- Por que formas e através de que meios concretos tenciona fortalecer a cooperação cultural com o Brasil?
- Existem obstáculos à continuidade das ações de cooperação ao abrigo do Programa Conjunto sobre Cultura 2011-2014, assinado à margem da V Cimeira Brasil-UE em 2011? Quais são eles?
- Crê que a expectativa manifestada poderá redundar na efetiva continuidade daquelas ações? Está disposta a empenhar-se para que assim seja?

Resposta dada por Androulla Vassiliou em nome da Comissão

(15 de março de 2013)

Na Declaração Conjunta aprovada na Sexta Cimeira UE-Brasil, foi dada ênfase ao património cultural comum do Brasil e da UE, tendo-se reafirmado o compromisso de reforçar a cooperação cultural no quadro da Declaração Conjunta sobre a Cultura e através de atividades de cooperação no âmbito do Programa Conjunto no domínio da Cultura para o período 2011-2014.

A Comissão está plenamente empenhada em prosseguir a cooperação com o Brasil no domínio da cultura no âmbito do programa conjunto. O programa proporciona um enquadramento para o intercâmbio de experiências em áreas prioritárias, que foram identificadas de comum acordo.

As iniciativas tomadas até à data incluem um diálogo entre personalidades ativas no domínio da cultura da UE e do Brasil sobre o papel e o lugar da cultura em ambas as sociedades, bem como sobre as perspetivas da cooperação cultural entre ambas as partes, para além de uma conferência sobre a economia criativa e as possibilidades de cooperação neste domínio.

Em maio de 2013, será organizado, em Brasília, um seminário conjunto sobre cultura e desenvolvimento sustentável, com vista a promover o diálogo sobre as iniciativas de apoio à diversidade das expressões culturais e a reforçar a cultura no contexto da governação mundial. Além disso, estão previstos, numa base *ad hoc*, intercâmbios a nível de políticas e missões de caráter técnico sobre as diferentes vertentes das políticas culturais. O património cultural deve ser objeto de um intercâmbio deste tipo em 2014, desde que os recursos necessários possam ser assegurados.

Com efeito, a realização destas atividades conjuntas e, conseqüentemente, a evolução do diálogo em matéria de adoção de políticas estão dependentes da disponibilidade de recursos financeiros. Até à data, foi assegurado apoio no âmbito do Mecanismo de apoio ao diálogo político, que é gerido pela Delegação da UE no Brasil.

As futuras atividades estarão sujeitas a concurso, previsto por esse instrumento.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000796/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(28 January 2013)

Subject: Sixth EU-Brazil Summit Joint Statement — culture

Paragraph 45 of the Joint Statement adopted at the Sixth EU-Brazil Summit states: 'The Leaders stressed the common cultural heritage of Brazil and the EU and reaffirmed their commitment to strengthening cultural cooperation for the benefit of their peoples, within the framework of the Joint Declaration on Culture signed by the Ministry of Culture of Brazil and the European Commission in May 2009. They expressed positive expectations regarding the continuity of the cooperation activities under the Joint Programme on Culture 2011-2014, signed on the sidelines of the V Brazil-EU Summit in 2011.'

- What specific measures will the Commission take and how does it intend to strengthen cultural cooperation with Brazil?
- Are there any obstacles to the continuity of the cooperation activities under the Joint Programme on Culture 2011-2014, signed on the sidelines of the Fifth EU-Brazil Summit in 2011? What are they?
- Does it believe that the expectations expressed could result in the effective continuity of those activities? Is it prepared to commit to ensuring that continuity?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(15 March 2013)

The Joint Statement adopted at the Sixth EU-Brazil Summit stressed the common cultural heritage of Brazil and the EU and reaffirmed the commitment to strengthen cultural cooperation within the framework of the Joint Declaration on Culture and through the cooperation activities under the Joint Programme on Culture 2011-2014.

The Commission is fully committed to furthering cooperation with Brazil in the field of culture, in line with the Joint Programme. The Programme provides a framework to exchange experiences in priority areas which have been jointly identified.

Initiatives undertaken so far include a dialogue between EU and Brazilian personalities active in the field of culture on the role and place of culture in our respective societies and on perspectives of cultural cooperation between the two sides; and a conference on the creative economy and possibilities of cooperation in this field.

A joint seminar on culture and sustainable development will be organised in Brasilia in May 2013 to promote a dialogue on initiatives supporting the diversity of cultural expressions and strengthening culture in global governance. In addition, policy exchanges and technical missions on different aspects of cultural policy-making are envisaged on an ad-hoc basis. Cultural heritage should be the subject of such an exchange in 2014, provided that resources can be secured.

Indeed, the realisation of these joint activities, and hence the progress of the policy dialogue, is subject to the availability of resources. Until now, support has been secured under the Policy Dialogue Support Facility managed by the EU Delegation in Brazil. Future activities will be subject to a competitive process foreseen by this instrument.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000797/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(28 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Declaração conjunta VI Cimeira Brasil-União Europeia — diálogo político bilateral

No ponto 2 da declaração conjunta aprovada por ocasião da VI Cimeira Brasil-União Europeia afirma-se que «As partes concordaram em estreitar ainda mais o diálogo político bilateral, de modo a promover a convergência de pontos de vista sobre temas da agenda global, e favoreceram a aproximação de posições nos foros internacionais.»

1. De que formas e através de que meios concretos tenciona a Comissão promover o estreitamento do diálogo político bilateral com o Brasil?
2. Quais são, em seu entender, as áreas nas quais esse estreitamento é mais necessário?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão

(18 de março de 2013)

No contexto da Parceria Estratégica UE-Brasil, são realizadas reuniões regulares de diálogo político a nível ministerial e de altos funcionários com a Comissão. A nível ministerial, a próxima reunião de diálogo político realizar-se-á em Bruxelas no segundo semestre de 2013. A nível de altos funcionários, as reuniões dos diretores políticos têm lugar numa base anual. No seguimento da VI Cimeira UE-Brasil, serão convocadas outras reuniões de diálogo político sobre a «Paz e Segurança Internacionais», as «Questões relacionadas com a Droga» e «Assuntos gerais relacionados com a ONU».

A tónica dos intercâmbios continuará a ser sobre as questões de paz e segurança internacionais, em especial o processo de paz no Médio Oriente, a situação na Síria, a questão nuclear iraniana, a África do Norte e Ocidental, bem como em matéria de desarmamento e de não-proliferação, direitos humanos, droga e tráfico de seres humanos. A situação nas respetivas vizinhanças e os processos de integração da América Latina, bem como a dinâmica dos BRICS ⁽¹⁾ serão igualmente analisados com os homólogos brasileiros.

⁽¹⁾ BRICS = Brasil, Rússia, Índia, China e África do Sul.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000797/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(28 January 2013)**

Subject: VI Brazil-EU Summit Joint Statement — bilateral political dialogue

Point 2 of the VI Brazil-EU Summit Joint Statement states: 'The parties agreed to further strengthen their bilateral political dialogue, in order to promote their convergence of views on issues of the global agenda and favoured the rapprochement of positions in international fora.'

1. How in practical terms does the Commission plan to strengthen bilateral political dialogue with Brazil?
2. In the Commission's understanding, which areas most require strengthening?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(18 March 2013)**

In the context of the EU-Brazil Strategic Partnership, regular political dialogue meetings are held at Ministerial and Senior Officials level with the Commission. At the Ministerial level, the next political dialogue meeting should be held in Brussels in the second half of 2013. At Senior Officials level, annual meetings of Political Directors take place on a yearly basis. As a follow-up to the VI EU-Brazil Summit, further political dialogue meetings on 'International Peace and Security', 'Drugs-related Matters', and 'General UN Matters' will be convened.

The focus of the exchanges will continue to be on international peace and security issues, in particular the Middle East Peace Process, the situation in Syria, the Iran nuclear issue, North and West Africa as well as disarmament and non-proliferation, human rights, drugs and human trafficking. The situation in the respective neighbourhoods and Latin America's integration processes, as well as the BRICS⁽¹⁾ dynamics, will also be analysed with the Brazilian counterparts.

(1) BRICS = Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000798/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(28 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Declaração conjunta VI Cimeira Brasil-União Europeia — educação

No ponto 42. da Declaração conjunta aprovada por ocasião da VI Cimeira Brasil-União Europeia afirma-se que «[Os Líderes] Concordaram em consolidar a parceria Brasil-UE em educação, especialmente por meio do fortalecimento e da expansão das plataformas de mobilidade académica. Também manifestaram satisfação com as ações tomadas no âmbito dos Programas “Erasmus Mundus” e “Marie Curie”, da UE.»

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

- Por que formas e através de que meios concretos tenciona promover o fortalecimento e a expansão das plataformas de mobilidade académica com o Brasil?
- Como avalia o atual estado a mobilidade académica entre a União Europeia e o Brasil?

Resposta dada por Androulla Vassiliou em nome da Comissão

(5 de abril de 2013)

A Comissão tem todo o interesse em aprofundar a cooperação com o Brasil em termos de ensino superior. Os Estados-Membros da UE e o Brasil estão empenhados em garantir a internacionalização e a excelência dos respetivos sistemas de ensino superior, em melhorar a mobilidade dos estudantes, investigadores e pessoal académico e em modernizar as suas universidades. Entre outras medidas específicas, foi concluído em finais de 2012 um estudo conjunto sobre a cooperação existente e os obstáculos à mobilidade. Está prevista a realização em 2013 de um seminário conjunto de peritos de alto nível com vista a superar os obstáculos identificados pelo estudo. O seminário tem o potencial para se tornar numa plataforma para o diálogo de peritos sobre a cooperação entre o Brasil e a UE no domínio do ensino superior, em consonância com os objetivos da declaração conjunta.

Ao longo dos últimos anos, a cooperação e a mobilidade académicas entre a UE e o Brasil têm aumentado de forma constante, graças aos programas de cooperação académica da UE (tais como os programas Erasmus Mundus, Marie Curie e Alfa) e aos programas bilaterais entre o Brasil e Estados-Membros da União Europeia, incluindo o novo programa de mobilidade brasileiro «Ciência sem Fronteiras». Este último tem por base as relações que as instituições de ensino superior têm desenvolvido no âmbito dos programas da UE existentes. A mobilidade estudantil nos dois sentidos ajuda a desenvolver laços duradouros entre os países europeus e o Brasil. É bem conhecido que a mobilidade na aprendizagem tem geralmente um impacto positivo, não apenas para o desenvolvimento e a empregabilidade das pessoas, mas também para as instituições que são incentivadas a desenvolver melhores serviços para enviar e receber estudantes estrangeiros, comparar e modernizar os programas académicos, melhorar o ensino e reforçar a sua liderança e gestão institucionais.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000798/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(28 January 2013)**

Subject: Sixth EU-Brazil Summit Joint Statement — education

Paragraph 42 of the Joint Statement adopted at the Sixth EU-Brazil Summit states: '[The Leaders] agreed to consolidate the EU-Brazil partnership in education, especially through the strengthening and expansion of academic mobility platforms. They also expressed satisfaction with the actions taken under the Erasmus Mundus and Marie Curie Programmes of the EU.'

— What specific measures will the Commission take and how does it intend to promote the strengthening and expansion of academic mobility platforms with Brazil?

— What view does it take of the current state of academic mobility between the European Union and Brazil?

**Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(5 April 2013)**

The Commission has a strong interest in deepening higher education cooperation with Brazil. The EU Member States and Brazil are committed to ensuring the internationalisation and excellence of their respective higher education systems, to improving mobility of students, researchers and academic staff and to modernising their universities. Among other specific measures, a joint study on existing cooperation and obstacles to mobility was completed in late 2012. A joint high level expert seminar is expected to take place in 2013 with a view to overcoming the obstacles identified by the study. The seminar has the potential to develop into a platform for expert dialogue on higher education cooperation between Brazil and the EU, in line with the objectives of the Joint Statement.

Over the past years academic cooperation and mobility between the EU and Brazil have increased steadily thanks to the academic cooperation programmes of the EU (such as Erasmus Mundus, Marie Curie and Alfa) and bilateral programmes between Brazil and EU Member States, including the new Brazilian mobility scheme 'Science without Borders'. The latter builds on relations higher education institutions have developed under the existing EU programmes. Two-way student mobility helps to develop lasting links between European countries and Brazil. It is well established that learning mobility generally has a positive impact not only on the development and employability of individuals, but also on institutions which are stimulated to develop better services to send and receive foreign students, compare and upgrade curricula, improve teaching and strengthen their institutional leadership and management.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000799/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(28 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Declaração conjunta da VI Cimeira Brasil-União Europeia — Energia

No ponto 18 da Declaração conjunta aprovada por ocasião da VI Cimeira Brasil-União Europeia afirma-se que: «Os líderes saudaram os resultados do IV Encontro sob o Diálogo Regular em Políticas de Energia entre o Brasil e a UE. Chamaram a atenção, em particular, para as possibilidades de expansão da cooperação bilateral em pesquisa e desenvolvimento de energias renováveis e iniciativas conjuntas em eficiência energética».

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

- De que formas e através de que meios concretos tenciona fortalecer a cooperação com o Brasil em termos energéticos?

Resposta dada por Günther Oettinger em nome da Comissão

(19 de março de 2013)

A cooperação com o Brasil no domínio da energia, discutida por ocasião do IV Diálogo UE-Brasil sobre Política Energética (22 de janeiro de 2013) abrange prioritariamente os seguintes temas: cooperação em matéria de sustentabilidade dos biocombustíveis e biomassa no âmbito de um grupo técnico para a elaboração de normas, atividades conjuntas de investigação e desenvolvimento no domínio das energias renováveis e da eficiência energética (particularmente no setor da construção, rotulagem e normas aplicáveis aos produtos consumidores de energia), intercâmbio de informações em reuniões de peritos sobre as questões relacionadas com os mercados da eletricidade, segurança da exploração de gás e petróleo *offshore* e gás não convencional.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000799/13
to the Commission**

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(28 January 2013)

Subject: VI Brazil-EU Summit Joint Statement — Energy

Paragraph 18 of the Joint Statement adopted at the VI Brazil-EU Summit states that: 'The Leaders welcomed the results of the IV Meeting under the Regular Dialogue on Energy Policy between Brazil and the EU. They highlighted in particular the possibilities of expanding bilateral cooperation in research and development in renewable energy [and] joint initiatives in energy efficiency.'

— How in practical terms does the Commission plan to enhance cooperation with Brazil in the field of energy?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission

(19 March 2013)

The cooperation with Brazil in the field of energy as discussed at the Fourth EU-Brazil Energy Policy Dialogue (22 January 2013) covers the following topics as priorities: cooperation on the sustainability of biofuels and biomass through a joint technical group on standards, joint R&D activities in the field of renewable energy and energy efficiency (particularly in the building sector and labelling and standards for energy using products), exchange of information through expert meetings on the issues related to electricity markets, gas and oil offshore safety and non-conventional gas.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000800/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(28 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Declaração conjunta VI Cimeira Brasil-União Europeia — sociedade civil

No ponto 43 da declaração conjunta aprovada por ocasião da VI Cimeira Brasil-União Europeia afirma-se que «Os Líderes notaram a importância de continuar a envolver a sociedade civil no diálogo bilateral».

De que formas e através de que meios concretos tenciona a Comissão envolver a sociedade civil no diálogo bilateral com o Brasil?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão

(14 de março de 2013)

Na sequência do estabelecimento da Parceria Estratégica UE-Brasil em 2007 e do respetivo Plano de Ação Conjunto (PAC) em 2009, estabeleceu-se uma colaboração concreta entre o Comité Económico e Social Europeu (CESE) e o Conselho de Desenvolvimento Económico e Social (CDES) brasileiro desde 2009, através das reuniões bianuais da Mesa Redonda da Sociedade Civil Brasil-UE. Este organismo conjunto constitui um fórum permanente de diálogo a nível da sociedade civil sobre todos os aspetos que são debatidos no âmbito da Parceria UE-Brasil. As suas recomendações são dirigidas às cimeiras entre a UE e o Brasil. Visa promover a cooperação e o intercâmbio de experiências e de boas práticas entre associações empresariais, sindicatos, agricultores e outras organizações da sociedade civil de ambas as partes. Desde a sua constituição, em 2009, cumpriu amplamente os objetivos estabelecidos no PAC.

Na sequência das primeiras 5 reuniões realizadas em Bruxelas (2009), Belém (2010), Antuérpia (2010), Brasília (abril de 2011), e Porto (novembro de 2011) foi realizada uma sexta reunião no Rio de Janeiro, em junho de 2012, imediatamente antes da fase de alto nível da Conferência Rio+20 da ONU sobre desenvolvimento sustentável. A Mesa-Redonda apresentou um relatório em que descrevia os progressos realizados a nível do diálogo neste domínio dos trabalhos e salientava as áreas de consenso entre os agentes económicos e sociais e as demais organizações da sociedade civil. A sétima reunião teve lugar em Bruxelas nos passados dias 22 e 23 de janeiro (2013). Foram realizadas sessões de trabalho sobre os seguintes temas: i) Situação social, económica e política na União Europeia e no Brasil e ii) A mobilidade das pessoas e bens.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000800/13
to the Commission**

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(28 January 2013)

Subject: VI Brazil-EU Summit Joint Statement — civil society

In point 43 of the VI Brazil-EU Summit Joint Statement it states: 'The Leaders noted the importance of continuing to involve the civil society in the bilateral dialogue.'

How in practical terms does the Commission plan to involve civil society in the bilateral dialogue with Brazil?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(14 March 2013)

Based upon the establishment of the EU-Brazil Strategic Partnership in 2007 and its Joint Action Plan (JAP) in 2009, a concrete collaboration has developed between the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC) and the Brazilian Council on Economic and Social Development (CDES) since 2009 through bi-annual meetings of the Brazil-EU civil society Round Table. This joint body is conceived as a permanent forum of dialogue at civil society level on all the issues that are discussed within the EU-Brazil Partnership. Its recommendations are addressed to the EU-Brazil Summits. It aims to promote cooperation, exchanges of experience and good practices between business associations, trade unions, farmers, and other civil society organisations from both parties. Since its constitution in 2009, it has largely met the objectives set out in the JAP.

Following the first five meetings held in Brussels (2009), Belém (2010), Antwerp (2010), Brasilia (April 2011), and Porto (November 2011) a sixth meeting was held in Rio de Janeiro in June 2012, just ahead of the High-level segment of the UN Rio+20 Conference on Sustainable development. The Round Table produced a report outlining the progress made by in the dialogue in this topical area of work and highlighting areas of consensus among economic and social players and other civil society organisations. The seventh meeting took place in Brussels last 22-23 January (2013). Working sessions were held on the following subjects: i) Social, economic and political situations in the European Union and Brazil and ii) Mobility of people and goods.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000801/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(28 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Grandes livros da cultura europeia — divulgação e estudo

À União Europeia compete promover a melhoria do conhecimento e da divulgação da cultura e da história dos povos europeus. Estas encontram-se marcadas por grandes obras e grandes autores. Sem o conhecimento e divulgação de tais obras, em particular junto dos mais jovens, não é possível uma compreensão adequada da cultura e história europeias. Este desconhecimento acarreta uma incompreensão muito prejudicial acerca da própria tradição, história e cultura de cada povo e da Europa como um todo.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

- Está disponível para promover especificamente a divulgação e o estudo das grandes obras literárias da cultura europeia como sejam, nomeadamente, *Ilíada* e *Odisseia* de Homero, *Oresteia* de Ésquilo, *Antígona* de Sófocles, *As Bacantes* de Eurípides, a *Apologia* de Sócrates de Platão, a *Eneida* de Virgílio, as *Metamorfoses* de Ovídio, as *Confissões* de Santo Agostinho, os *Contos de Cantuária* de Chaucer, *Henrique V* e *Hamlet* de Shakespeare, *Os Lusíadas* de Camões, *Dom Quixote* de Cervantes, *O Paraíso Perdido* de Milton, *Os Pensamentos* de Pascal, *Fedra* de Racine, *Fausto* de Goethe?

Resposta dada por Androulla Vassiliou em nome da Comissão

(12 de março de 2013)

Em conformidade com o Tratado sobre o Funcionamento da União Europeia, os Estados-Membros são os únicos responsáveis pela organização e pelo conteúdo dos sistemas de ensino. Cabe, portanto, a cada Estado-Membro decidir quais as obras literárias que devem ser estudadas nos estabelecimentos de ensino. No entanto, a Comissão está empenhada em promover a divulgação das obras literárias da cultura europeia.

Enquanto principal ponto de acesso digital ao património cultural da Europa, o portal Europeana⁽¹⁾ fornece atualmente acesso a mais de 23 milhões de bens culturais pertencentes a mais de 2 200 instituições culturais por toda a Europa. Esses bens representam aspetos diversos da cultura, incluindo os primeiros exemplares impressos de livros antigos e grandes clássicos, como *Os Lusíadas* de Camões e *Dom Quixote de La Mancha* de Cervantes, mencionados pelo Senhor Deputado.

A Recomendação sobre a digitalização e a acessibilidade em linha de material cultural e a preservação digital convida os Estados-Membros a disponibilizarem os seus conteúdos digitais através do portal Europeana e a garantir que todas as obras-primas que sejam do domínio público estarão acessíveis nesse portal até 2015.

Paralelamente, a Comissão está a lançar um diálogo entre as partes interessadas sobre «Licenças para a Europa», a fim de ajudar o setor a encontrar soluções inovadoras para um melhor acesso aos conteúdos em linha, incluindo os livros. Deverá apresentar as suas conclusões e soluções até ao final de 2013.

O programa Cultura procura estimular a circulação da literatura na Europa de várias formas. O programa financia a tradução de obras literárias de uma língua oficial para outra⁽²⁾, com uma verba de cerca de três milhões de euros por ano. O Prémio da UE para a Literatura, também apoiado ao abrigo do programa Cultura, é atribuído a novos autores europeus.

(1) <http://www.europeana.eu/portal/>

(2) Além do latim e do grego clássico.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000801/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(28 January 2013)**

Subject: Dissemination and study of the great books of European culture

The European Union has a duty to promote the improvement of the knowledge and dissemination of the culture and history of the European peoples. That culture and history are defined by their great works and great authors. If those works are not circulated and people, particularly young people, are not familiar with them, then they are not adequately equipped to understand European culture and history. That gap in knowledge breeds a very damaging ignorance of the traditions, history and culture of each of the peoples of Europe and of Europe as a whole.

— Is the Commission prepared specifically to promote the dissemination and study of the great literary works of European culture such as Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, Aeschylus' *Oresteia*, Sophocles' *Antigone*, Euripides's *Bacchae*, Plato's *Apology of Socrates*, Virgil's *Aeneid*, Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Saint Augustine's *Confessions*, Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, Shakespeare's *Henry V* and *Hamlet*, Camões' *Lusiads*, Cervantes' *Don Quixote*, Milton's *Paradise Lost*, Pascal's *Pensées*, Racine's *Phèdre* or Goethe's *Faust*?

**Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(12 March 2013)**

In accordance with the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Member States have the sole responsibility for the organisation and content of education systems. It is therefore up to each Member State to decide which literary works to study at school. However, the Commission is committed to promoting the dissemination of literary works of European culture.

As the main digital access point to Europe's cultural heritage, Europeana ⁽¹⁾ currently provides access to over 23 m cultural objects held by more than 2 200 cultural institutions from across Europe. These objects represent diverse aspects of culture, including early printed books and great classics such as Camões' *The Lusiads* and Cervantes' *Don Quixote* mentioned by the honourable member.

The recommendation on the digitisation and the online accessibility of cultural material and digital preservation invites Member States to make their digitised material accessible through Europeana and ensure that all public domain masterpieces will be accessible there by 2015.

In parallel, the Commission has launched a stakeholder dialogue on 'Licences for Europe' to help the industry deliver innovative solutions for better access to online content, including books. It should deliver its conclusions and solutions by the end of 2013.

The Culture Programme seeks to stimulate the circulation of literature across Europe in several ways. The programme funds the translation of literary works from one official language ⁽²⁾ to another with about 3 million EUR annually. The EU Prize for Literature, also supported in the framework of the Culture Programme, is awarded to emerging European authors.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.europeana.eu/portal/>
⁽²⁾ plus Latin and ancient Greek.

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000802/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)**

Diogo Feio (PPE)
(28 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Tensão entre a China e o Japão — ilhas Diaoyu/Senkaku

Notícias recentes dão conta do aumento de tensão entre a China e o Japão relativamente às ilhas denominadas Diaoyu pela China e Senkaku pelo Japão com acusações cruzadas de invasão do respetivo território e espaço aéreo.

Assim, pergunto à Vice Presidente/Alta Representante:

- Tem contactado as autoridades destes países a este respeito?
- Estaria na disposição de oferecer os seus bons ofícios para promover uma aproximação entre as partes?
- Em seu entender, tendo em conta o direito internacional, qual a melhor solução para esta questão?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(2 de abril de 2013)

A situação no mar da China Oriental é extremamente preocupante, sobretudo na sequência dos acontecimentos de setembro último. Na altura, a AR/VP emitiu uma declaração em nome da UE em que manifestava as nossas preocupações em relação à situação nas zonas marítimas da Ásia Oriental e exortava todas as partes a chegarem a um compromisso a fim de encontrar soluções pacíficas e de cooperação.

A UE não se pronuncia sobre a legitimidade/legalidade das reivindicações quanto às ilhas Diaoyu/Senkaku, mas preocupa-se fortemente que um erro de cálculo ou um acidente possam dar lugar a uma escalada perigosa das tensões. Com a exacerbação da situação, corre-se o risco de um grave impacto na segurança regional e na economia mundial. Uma tal situação afetaria os interesses da UE, uma vez que tem grandes interesses comerciais, económicos e políticos na região e uma parceria estratégica tanto com a China como com o Japão.

Por conseguinte, a UE recorre a todos os meios disponíveis para instar ambos os países a evitarem qualquer ato de provocação e exorta-os a envidarem todos os esforços possíveis para desanuviar a tensão. A UE defende que se deve procurar uma resolução a longo prazo das diferenças entre os dois países através de um diálogo construtivo e de negociações baseadas na lei internacional, em particular na Convenção das Nações Unidas sobre o Direito do Mar (CNUDM). A UE também manifestou a sua disponibilidade para apoiar meios pacíficos de resolver os problemas e criar um clima de confiança entre ambas as partes. Nos nossos futuros contactos com as autoridades chinesas e japonesas, incluindo o diálogo estratégico a alto nível entre a UE e a China e a próxima cimeira UE-Japão, a União continuará a tentar dialogar com as duas partes sobre este assunto e incentivá-las a gerir a situação de uma forma que traga estabilidade, previsibilidade e prosperidade à região.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000802/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(28 January 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Tension between China and Japan: Diaoyu/Senkaku Islands

Recent reports reveal increased tension between China and Japan regarding the islands known as Diaoyu in China and Senkaku in Japan, with both sides accusing the other of invading their respective territory and airspace.

Has the Vice-President/High-Representative contacted the Chinese and Japanese authorities about this matter?

Would she be willing to offer her good offices to foster a rapprochement between the two countries?

Having regard to international law, what does she believe is the best way to resolve this issue?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(2 April 2013)

The situation in the East China Sea has become of deep concern especially following developments last September. At the time, the HR/VP had issued a Statement on behalf of the EU expressing our concerns regarding developments in East Asia's maritime areas and calling for commitment from all sides to finding peaceful and cooperative solutions.

The EU takes no view regarding the legitimacy/legality of the respective claims over the Diaoyu/Senkaku islands, but is deeply concerned that a miscalculation or an accident could lead to a dangerous escalation of tensions. Further exacerbation risks severe impact on the regional security and the global economy. This would also affect EU's interests, since it has a high commercial, economic and political stake region, and a strategic partnership with both China and Japan.

The EU therefore uses all available means to urge both countries to avoid any provocative action and encourages them to make every effort to de-escalate tension. The EU promotes the view that a long-term resolution of the differences between the two countries should be sought through constructive dialogue and negotiation and based on international law, in particular Unclos. The EU has also expressed its readiness to support peaceful means to resolve the issues or to build confidence between the two sides. In our upcoming contacts with the Chinese and Japanese sides, including the EU-China High Level Strategic Dialogue and the next EU-Japan Summit, the EU will continue to engage with both sides on this issue, and encourage them to manage the situation in a way which is conducive to stability, predictability and prosperity in the region.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000803/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(28 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Produtos Cosméticos — publicidade enganosa quanto aos seus efeitos

Segundo a comunicação social portuguesa, a Autoridade do Medicamento (Infarmed) ordenou a suspensão da comercialização e a retirada do mercado do produto cosmético para o cabelo Velform Hair Grow Plus por alegações enganosas em relação à sua eficácia para tratamento da queda de cabelo.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

- Dispõe de informações quanto a este tipo de produtos e ao modo como são publicitados?
- Não considera que ainda subsistem múltiplas situações análogas à identificada em Portugal, em que determinados produtos deste tipo são anunciados como tendo resultados milagrosos e quase garantidos, iludindo deste modo os consumidores?
- Que medidas tomou ou prevê tomar de modo a impedir que situações destas se repitam?

Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão
(27 de março de 2013)

Apesar de a Comissão não ter conhecimento da questão relacionada com produtos para o cabelo em Portugal, informa-se o Senhor Deputado de que já existe legislação da UE que protege os consumidores contra a publicidade enganosa.

A Diretiva 2005/29/CE ⁽¹⁾ obriga os comerciantes a não induzir os consumidores em erro, por exemplo, sobre os benefícios, os riscos e os resultados esperados da utilização do produto ou do serviço oferecido para venda. Além disso, a diretiva proíbe (em todas as circunstâncias) a prática de alegar falsamente que um produto é capaz de curar doenças, disfunções e malformações (anexo I n.º 17).

Os Estados-Membros são responsáveis pela criação de meios adequados e eficazes para lutar contra as práticas comerciais desleais. No entanto, a experiência tem demonstrado a necessidade de uma maior coordenação da aplicação da legislação, em especial quando um problema recorrente surge em diferentes Estados-Membros. Por conseguinte, a Agenda do Consumidor Europeu ⁽²⁾, da Comissão, determina que a aplicação efetiva da legislação da UE de defesa do consumidor é uma questão prioritária para os próximos anos. A Comissão adotou em 14 de março de 2013 um relatório sobre a aplicação da Diretiva 2005/29/CE, que apresenta uma lista das práticas comerciais desleais mais comuns encontradas nos Estados-Membros.

No caso dos produtos cosméticos, o artigo 20.º do regulamento relativo aos produtos cosméticos estipula que na rotulagem, na disponibilização no mercado e na publicidade dos produtos cosméticos, o texto, as denominações, as marcas, as imagens ou outros sinais, figurativos ou não, não podem ser utilizados para atribuir a esses produtos características ou funções que não possuem. No entanto, com base nas suas características e alegações, alguns produtos para o tratamento da queda de cabelo podem ser qualificados como medicamentos, estando sujeitos a uma legislação diferente ⁽³⁾, que prevê autorização prévia à colocação no mercado.

⁽¹⁾ JO L 149 de 11.6.2005.

⁽²⁾ COM(2012) 225.

⁽³⁾ Diretiva 2001/83/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 6 de novembro de 2001, que estabelece um código comunitário relativo aos medicamentos para uso humano, JO L 311 de 28.11.2001.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000803/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(28 January 2013)**

Subject: False advertising regarding the effects of cosmetics

According to the Portuguese media, the National Authority of Medicines (Infarmed) has ordered that Velform Hair Grow Plus products be withdrawn from the market and that advertising for these products be suspended following misleading claims about their effectiveness in treating hair loss.

- Does the Commission have any information on these kinds of products and how they are advertised?
- Does it not believe that there are still many cases, similar to that in Portugal, where certain cosmetics are advertised as having miraculous and almost guaranteed results, thereby misleading consumers?
- What measures has it taken or will it take to prevent these situations from recurring?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2013)**

Although the Commission is not aware of a problem with hair products in Portugal, the Honourable Member should be aware that there is already Union legislation which protects consumers against misleading advertising.

Directive 2005/29/EC ⁽¹⁾ requires traders not to mislead consumers, for instance, about the benefits, risks and results to be expected from the use of the product or service offered for sale. Furthermore, the directive prohibits (in all circumstances) the practice of falsely claiming that a product is able to cure illnesses, dysfunction or malformations (Annex I n. 17).

Member States are responsible for setting up adequate and effective means to combat unfair commercial practices. However experience has shown a need for improving coordinated enforcement, in particular where a recurring problem arises in different Member States. The Commission's Consumer Agenda ⁽²⁾ therefore states that effective enforcement of EU consumer law is a priority issue for the next years. The Commission adopted a report on the application of Directive 2005/29/EC on 14 March 2013 which provides a list of the most common unfair commercial practices encountered in the Member States.

In the case of cosmetics, Article 20 of the Cosmetics Regulation stipulates that in the labelling, making available on the market and advertising of cosmetic products, text, names, trademarks, pictures and figurative or other signs shall not be used to imply that these products have characteristics or functions which they do not have. However, based on their characteristics and the claims, some hair growth products may be qualified as medicinal products, which are subject to a different legislation ⁽³⁾, which foresees pre-market authorisation.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 149, 11.6.2005.

⁽²⁾ COM(2012) 225.

⁽³⁾ Directive 2001/83/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 November 2001 on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use, OJ L 311, 28.11.2001.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000804/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(28 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Dia Europeu do Mar — divulgação e visibilidade

A União Europeia dispõe de uma dimensão marítima excepcional que o extenso litoral, as ilhas e as regiões ultraperiféricas lhe conferem. Para realçar a importância do mar enquanto elemento fundamental da sociedade e da economia europeias, a União Europeia comemora anualmente, a 20 de maio, o «Dia Europeu do Mar».

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

- Está disponível para aumentar a divulgação e visibilidade do «Dia Europeu do Mar», em particular junto dos mais jovens, e estudar novas formas de o tornar mais apelativo enquanto modo de dar a conhecer a história e cultura marítimas dos povos da União Europeia e promover o respeito e proteção do ambiente e biodiversidade marinhos, bem como as múltiplas utilizações e potencialidades práticas do espaço marítimo europeu?

Resposta dada por Maria Damanakion em nome da Comissão

(8 de abril de 2013)

A celebração de um Dia Europeu do Mar foi introduzida em 2008 para promover a sensibilização acerca da dimensão marítima da Europa e das oportunidades oferecidas pelos nossos mares e oceanos. Estes temas estão no âmago das discussões realizadas durante a Conferência do Dia Europeu do Mar, em que têm lugar debates políticos de alto nível lado a lado com intercâmbios de cariz mais prático entre as partes interessadas do setor marítimo. Trata-se de uma oportunidade única de reunir toda a comunidade marítima num único fórum para debater as melhores práticas e novas ideias.

Realizam-se cada ano muitos eventos públicos a nível local e a nível europeu, por toda a Europa, sob os auspícios do Dia Europeu do Mar. Estes eventos públicos marítimos permitem-nos ilustrar, promover, debater e celebrar o valor da longa tradição marítima nas regiões costeiras da Europa.

Durante estes eventos, os estudantes e os jovens são convidados a descobrir a variedade de atividades relacionadas com a vida marinha e marítima.

Este ano, em Malta, um milhar de estudantes são convidados a participar nesses eventos e a descobrir o porto de La Valeta. A Comissão está a trabalhar sobre esses eventos com o Ministério das Infraestruturas, Transportes e Comunicações maltês, bem como com o Ministério do Turismo, Cultura e Ambiente maltês.

A Comissão Europeia tem um sítio Web específico, organiza reuniões de informação das partes interessadas e promove o evento junto dos EM. O apoio do Parlamento Europeu seria acolhido com agrado para as próximas edições.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000804/13
to the Commission**

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(28 January 2013)

Subject: European Maritime Day — promotion and visibility

The European Union's maritime dimension is exceptional due to its extensive coastline, islands and outermost regions. To highlight the sea's fundamental importance for the EU's economy and its citizens, the Union celebrates 'European Maritime Day' on 20 May each year.

Is the Commission prepared to enhance the promotion and visibility of 'European Maritime Day', particularly amongst young people, and to explore new ways of making it a more appealing way to raise awareness about the EU's maritime history and culture, to encourage respect for and the protection of the marine environment and its biodiversity, and to promote the multiple and potential uses for European maritime space?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission

(8 April 2013)

The celebration of a European Maritime Day was introduced in 2008 to raise awareness about the maritime dimension of Europe and the opportunities offered by our seas and oceans. These topics are at the heart of discussions during the annual European Maritime Day Conference, where high-level political debates take place next to more practical exchanges between maritime stakeholders. It is a unique opportunity to gather the whole maritime community into one forum to discuss best practices and new ideas.

Each year there are many local and European public events taking place everywhere in Europe under the flag of the European Maritime Day. These maritime public events enable us to showcase, promote, discuss and celebrate the value of long standing maritime tradition in the coastal regions of Europe.

During these events, students and young people are welcome to discover the variety of activities related to the marine and maritime life.

This year in Malta, a thousand of students are invited to participate in such events and discover the port of Valletta. The Commission is working on these events with the Maltese Ministry for Infrastructure, Transport and Communications and the Maltese Ministry for Tourism, Culture and the Environment.

The European Commission maintains a dedicated website, organises stakeholders' information meetings and promotes the event at MS level. The support of the European Parliament would be welcomed for the next editions.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000805/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(28 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Possíveis cortes nos fundos para a cultura na UE

Notícias recentes dão conta que a senhora Comissária Androulla Vassiliou terá instado os líderes europeus a que «não se atrevam» a proceder a cortes no orçamento da União Europeia para a cultura e reiterado que a cultura é o «coração e a alma do nosso projeto europeu comum».

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

- Quais os principais riscos inerentes a este corte?
- Crê ser possível aplicar os fundos disponíveis de modo mais produtivo e reprodutivo?
- Quais devem ser, em seu entender, as prioridades da União Europeia no tocante à cultura?

Resposta dada por Androulla Vassiliou em nome da Comissão

(5 de março de 2013)

O Conselho Europeu chegou a acordo sobre o Quadro Financeiro Plurianual para o período de 2014-2020, em 8 de fevereiro de 2013. O acordo estabeleceu o nível máximo das autorizações e dos pagamentos por rubricas sem as desagregar ainda mais. Como é do conhecimento do Senhor Deputado, o Parlamento Europeu ainda tem de examinar o acordo.

Neste contexto, é prematuro, de momento, a Comissão avaliar quais serão as implicações de financiamento precisas para o futuro programa «Europa Criativa», que abrange o período de 2014-2020.

Em resposta à pergunta do Senhor Deputado sobre as prioridades da UE no domínio da cultura, é de salientar que essas prioridades continuarão a refletir o teor do artigo 167.º do Tratado sobre o Funcionamento da União Europeia, nomeadamente: contribuir «para o desenvolvimento das culturas dos Estados-Membros, respeitando a sua diversidade nacional e regional», «incentivar a cooperação entre Estados-Membros» no domínio da cultura «e, se necessário, apoiar e completar a sua ação».

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000805/13
to the Commission**

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(28 January 2013)

Subject: Possible cuts in the EU budget for culture

Recent reports reveal that Commissioner Androulla Vassiliou has urged EU leaders not to cut the Union's budget for culture and has reiterated that 'culture is the heart and soul of our shared European project'.

- What are the main risks associated with this cut?
- Does the Commission believe that the available funds could be used in a more productive and creative way?
- What should the EU's priorities be as far as culture is concerned?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission

(5 March 2013)

The European Council reached an agreement on the multiannual financial framework for the period 2014-2020 on 8 February 2013. The agreement has set the maximum level of commitments and payments by headings without breaking them down any further. As the Honourable Member knows, the European Parliament still has to examine the agreement.

Against this backdrop, it is premature for the time being for the Commission to assess what the precise funding implications will be for the future Creative Europe programme covering the period 2014-2020.

In response to the Honourable Member's question regarding the EU's priorities for culture, these will continue to reflect the contents of Article 167 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, namely to 'contribute to the flowering of the cultures of the Member States, while respecting their national and regional diversity', encourage 'cooperation between Member States' in the field of culture and 'if necessary, support and supplement their action'.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000806/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(28 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Segurança em Bengazi

A imprensa internacional reportou que diversos governos europeus têm instado os seus nacionais a deixar a cidade líbia de Bengazi, uma vez que aí existiria uma ameaça iminente contra os cidadãos ocidentais.

1. Confirma a Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante estes receios?
2. De que informações dispõe a Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante quanto à situação na região de Cirenaica?
3. Como avalia a Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante o processo de transição líbio para a democracia?
4. Que recomendações fez ou fará a Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante ao governo líbio quanto à necessidade de proteger os cidadãos estrangeiros no seu território? Que respostas obteve a Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(2 de abril de 2013)

A Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente (AR/VP) tem estado atenta às recomendações efetuadas por vários Estados-Membros da UE aos seus nacionais relativamente às questões de segurança em Bengazi.

A situação em termos de segurança em Benghazi permanece precária com o assassinio regular de agentes de segurança muitas vezes acusados de lealdade para com o antigo regime. As instituições ocidentais e indivíduos têm sido repetidamente perseguidos, sendo a morte do embaixador norte-americano o caso mais proeminente.

Todavia, embora estes desenvolvimentos em Bengazi sejam preocupantes, existem também evoluções positivas importantes. No segundo aniversário da revolução, a AR/VP e o Comissário Štefan Füle emitiram uma declaração onde se mencionava que nos últimos dois anos a Líbia fez progressos significativos no caminho para a transição democrática tal como comprovam as primeiras eleições livres em julho de 2012. A transferência de poder sem sobressaltos do Conselho Nacional de Transição para o Congresso Geral Nacional e a organização bem-sucedida de eleições locais em todo o país (sendo Trípoli uma notável exceção) constituem outras realizações da transição em curso que merecem reconhecimento.

A UE encontra-se em constante diálogo com as autoridades líbias sobre as questões de segurança e enveredou pela implementação de vários projetos importantes no setor da segurança. A questão específica da proteção de cidadãos estrangeiros é da direta responsabilidade das respetivas embaixadas.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000806/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Diogo Feio (PPE)
(28 January 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Security in Benghazi

The international media has reported that several European governments have advised their nationals to leave the Libyan city of Benghazi due to an imminent threat against Western citizens.

1. Can the Vice-President/High Representative confirm these concerns?
2. What information does the Vice-President/High Representative have on the situation in the Cyrenaica region?
3. What is the view of the Vice-President/High Representative regarding the Libyan transition to democracy?
4. What recommendations has the Vice-President/High Representative made, or does she intend to make, to the Libyan Government regarding the need to protect foreign citizens in its territory? What responses has the Vice-President/High Representative received?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2013)

The HR/VP has taken note of the advice of several EU Member States to their nationals with regard to the security situation in Benghazi.

The security situation in Benghazi remains precarious with regular killings of security officials often accused of loyalty to the former regime. Western institutions and individuals have repeatedly been targeted, with the death of the American ambassador as the most prominent case.

While these developments in Benghazi are a cause of concern, there are also important positive developments. For the second anniversary of the revolution, the HRVP and Commissioner Füle issued a statement, which mentioned that in the last two years Libya has made significant progress on the path of democratic transition as witnessed by the first ever free elections in July 2012. The orderly transfer of power from the National Transitional Council to the General National Congress and the successful organisation of local elections across the country (with Tripoli as a notable exception) constitute other achievements of the ongoing transition to be commended.

The EU is in constant dialogue with the Libyan authorities on the security situation and has embarked on the implementation of a number of important projects in the security sector. The specific issue of the protection of foreign citizens is the direct responsibility of the embassies concerned.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000807/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(28 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Primavera Árabe — ponto da situação

O espoletar das revoltas no mundo muçulmano, ante a incredulidade e a paralisia inicial do Ocidente — enredado no dilema teórico entre ditaduras aliadas e democracias islâmicas —, acarretou consigo dúvidas como esta e a constatação de que «a rua islâmica» era bastante mais heterogênea e complexa do que se poderia pensar. Subitamente, o Ocidente deu-se conta dessa diversidade, das inquietações e frustrações e da profunda vontade de mudança que perpassavam sociedades julgadas impermeáveis a elas até há bem pouco tempo. Não obstante a expectativa inicial, a denominada «Primavera Árabe» parece ainda não ter correspondido à esperança nela depositada, multiplicando-se os conflitos e a instabilidade política.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

- Como avalia a situação dos países árabes que recentemente conheceram revoltas e revoluções no âmbito da «Primavera Árabe»?
- Que papel deve assumir a União Europeia no auxílio a estes Estados e suas populações? Quais são as prioridades europeias neste tocante?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão

(2 de abril de 2013)

A situação no mundo árabe continua a ser altamente fluida, verificando-se diferenças importantes entre os países e as regiões.

Em geral, foram feitos progressos significativos na promoção das reformas democráticas. No entanto, os processos de transformação democrática iniciados nos países vizinhos do Sul têm de ser considerados numa perspetiva de longo prazo. Haverá inevitavelmente obstáculos a ultrapassar antes de se poder consolidar com êxito os processos de transição.

Também continuam a existir desafios de relevo em matéria de segurança. A coesão social de alguns países árabes em transição corre o risco de ser destabilizada pelas novas formas de polarização política interna, bem como por uma deterioração da situação económica. É crucial assegurarmos um apoio constante às reformas económicas inclusivas.

Apesar destas dificuldades, é importante o facto de as transformações suscitadas pela Primavera Árabe terem conduzido globalmente a importantes conquistas democráticas.

A UE assumiu compromissos políticos desde os primeiros dias da Primavera Árabe, tendo também reorientado e intensificado a sua assistência financeira para apoiar os países na sua transição democrática e económica. Foram criados grupos de trabalho de alto nível entre a UE e a Tunísia, a Jordânia e o Egipto. O apoio às eleições foi um elemento essencial. As organizações da sociedade civil têm sido apoiadas na sensibilização da opinião pública e na formação de observadores das eleições internas. A UE continua a apoiar a sociedade civil, sendo a sua contribuição de importância fundamental para o debate democrático e a garantia de uma melhor responsabilização pública. O desenvolvimento dos contactos entre as populações permitirá ainda prestar assistência aos países da Primavera Árabe e às suas populações. Por último, a interação com os intervenientes na região constitui também um elemento essencial da resposta da UE, que renovou o seu compromisso com a Liga dos Estados Árabes.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000807/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(28 January 2013)**

Subject: Arab Spring: state of play

The wave of uprisings that swept the Muslim World — leaving the West frozen in disbelief, albeit initially, as it struggled with the theoretical dilemma between allied dictatorships and Islamist democracies — brought about such uncertainties as well as the realisation that ‘the Islamic path’ was much more diverse and complex than one might have thought. The West suddenly became conscious of this diversity, and of the concerns, frustrations and deep desire for change felt by societies who, until very recently, were thought to be impervious to such feelings. Despite initial expectations, however, the ‘Arab Spring’ does not yet seem to have lived up to the hope placed in it, with conflicts and political instability spreading.

— How does the Commission view the situation of the Arab countries that recently experienced uprisings and revolutions during the ‘Arab Spring’?

— What role should the EU play in assisting these countries and their people? What are the EU’s priorities in this regard?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2013)**

The situation in the Arab world remains highly fluid with important differences between the countries and the regions.

Overall significant progress has been made in promoting democratic reforms. However, the democratic transformation processes initiated in Southern Neighbourhood countries are long-term. There will inevitably be stumbling blocks to overcome before transitions can be successfully consolidated.

Outstanding security challenges also remain. The social cohesion of some Arab countries undergoing transition risks being undermined by new forms of internal political polarisation, as well as by a deteriorating economic situation. It is crucial that we ensure a steady support to inclusive economic reforms.

Despite these difficulties, it is important that the transformations prompted by the Arab Spring have led overall to important democratic gains.

The EU from the very first days of the Arab Spring has expressed political commitments and has also reoriented and stepped up its financial assistance to support countries in their democratic and economic transitions. High-level EU Task Forces with Tunisia, Jordan and Egypt have been put in place. Support for elections has been a key focus. Civil society organisations have been supported in raising public awareness and training domestic election observers. The EU continues to support civil society, its role being of key importance in contributing to the democratic debate and to ensuring better public accountability. Developing people-to-people contacts will further assist the Arab Spring countries and their people. Finally, engaging with actors in the region is also an essential element of the response of the EU, which has renewed its engagement with the League of Arab States.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000808/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(28 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Igualdade — Dinamarca

Foi recentemente noticiado que o *Board of Equal Treatment* da Dinamarca considerou que preços diferentes para cortes de cabelo de homem e de mulher violavam o princípio da igualdade. Por esse motivo, levou um cabeleireiro, que praticava preços diferentes para homens e mulheres, a pagar uma indemnização de 2 500 coroas a uma cliente, ao mesmo tempo que declarou tais diferenças de preços ilegais.

1. Tem a Comissão conhecimento desta decisão do *Board of Equal Treatment*? Revê-se a Comissão na mesma?
2. Considera a Comissão que, de facto, preços diferentes para cortes de cabelo de homens e mulheres são uma forma de discriminação de género?
3. Pondera a Comissão tomar medidas no sentido da decisão do *Board of Equal Treatment*?

Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão

(27 de março de 2013)

A discriminação em razão do sexo no acesso a bens e serviços e seu fornecimento ⁽¹⁾ é proibida pela Diretiva 2004/113/CE do Conselho. Os serviços de cabeleireiro estão abrangidos pelo âmbito de aplicação desta diretiva. Geralmente, as diferenças de tratamento só são permitidas mediante condições específicas. A diferença de tratamento no que respeita a determinados serviços, como serviços de cabeleireiro, pode ser aceite se a medida for justificada por um objetivo legítimo e os meios para a atingir forem apropriados e justificados. Cabe às autoridades nacionais determinarem se as diferenças de tratamento aquando da prestação de um serviço, por exemplo, serviços de cabeleireiro, preenchem estas condições. Um importante elemento a considerar pode ser a disponibilização, ou não, de opções neutras em termos de género. Para efeitos de fixação de preços, também podem ser disponibilizadas opções neutras em termos de género, como, por exemplo, preços fixados de acordo com o comprimento do cabelo ou o tipo de corte solicitado.

A Dinamarca transpôs a Diretiva 2004/113/CE para o seu direito nacional. Após a transposição, cabe aos tribunais nacionais e a autoridades como o conselho dinamarquês para a igualdade de tratamento (*Board of Equal Treatment*) aplicar a legislação nacional e podendo as vias nacionais de recurso ser utilizadas para recorrer contra decisões internas.

A Comissão não tem conhecimento da decisão individual do conselho dinamarquês para a igualdade de tratamento referida na questão. A Comissão não previsto qualquer plano de ação específico neste domínio, mas tenciona apresentar um relatório sobre a aplicação da Diretiva 2004/113/CE ao Parlamento Europeu e ao Conselho em 2014. No referido relatório, a Comissão apreciará assuntos relevantes para a presente diretiva.

(1) Diretiva 2004/113/CE do Conselho que aplica o princípio de igualdade de tratamento entre homens e mulheres no acesso a bens e serviços e seu fornecimento, JO L 373/37, p. 37.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000808/13
to the Commission**

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(28 January 2013)

Subject: Equality — Denmark

It was reported recently that the Danish Board of Equal Treatment has ruled that charging different prices for men's and women's haircuts violates the principle of equal treatment. Accordingly, it declared such price differences to be illegal, and ordered a hairdresser who charged men and women different prices to pay compensation of DKK 2 500 to a customer.

1. Is the Commission aware of this decision by the Board of Equal Treatment? Will the Commission be reviewing it?
2. Does the Commission believe that charging different prices for men's and women's haircuts really is a form of gender discrimination?
3. Is the Commission thinking of taking action in line with the decision of the Board of Equal Treatment?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission

(27 March 2013)

Discrimination on grounds of sex in access to and supply of goods and services ⁽¹⁾ is prohibited by Directive 2004/113/EC. Haircut services are covered by the scope of application of this directive. In general, differences of treatment are allowed only under specific conditions. The difference of treatment as regards certain services, such as haircut services, may be accepted if the measure is justified by a legitimate aim and the means of achieving that aim are appropriate and necessary. It is up to the national authorities to assess whether differences of treatment when providing a specific service, such as a haircut service, would comply with these conditions. One important element of consideration could be whether gender-neutral options would be available. For the purposes of pricing haircut services, there may be also gender-neutral options available like pricing on the basis of the length of hair and type of haircut requested.

Denmark has transposed Directive 2004/113/EC into its national law. Following that, it is for the national courts and authorities like the Danish Board of Equal Treatment to apply national law and national means of recourse can be used for the purposes of appealing against national decisions.

The Commission is not aware of the individual decision of the Danish Board of Equal Treatment referred to in the question. The Commission is not planning any specific action in this matter but intends to present a report on the application of Directive 2004/113/EC to the European Parliament and the Council in 2014. In that report, the Commission will assess issues relevant to this directive.

⁽¹⁾ Council Directive 2004/113/EC implementing the principle of equal treatment between men and women in the access to and supply of goods and services, OJ L 373/37.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000809/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(28 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Igualdade — brinquedos na Suécia

Este Natal os catálogos de brinquedos na Suécia trouxeram uma novidade: meninas a apontar pistolas e meninos a brincar com bonecas. Tal medida pretendia, segundo os responsáveis pela sua implementação, retirar as conotações de género dos catálogos de brinquedos e promover a igualdade entre géneros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Tem conhecimento desta medida relativa à representação dos géneros nos catálogos de brinquedos? Revê-se na mesma?
2. Considera vantajoso que as crianças cresçam num ambiente em que não têm contacto com os papéis tradicionais associados ao género masculino e feminino?
3. Considera esta medida benéfica para o desenvolvimento das crianças?

Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão

(25 de março de 2013)

A Comissão segue atentamente as iniciativas e políticas dos Estados-Membros no domínio da igualdade dos géneros, nomeadamente no plano educativo. Todavia, desconhecia os catálogos de brinquedos sem conotações de género distribuídos no Natal passado na Suécia e não os examinou. O exame dessa iniciativa privada não se insere no acompanhamento regular, por parte da Comissão, das políticas seguidas.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000809/13
to the Commission**

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(28 January 2013)

Subject: Equality — toys in Sweden

This Christmas, toy catalogues in Sweden featured something different: girls brandishing guns and boys playing with dolls. According to those responsible for the move, this was intended to make the toy catalogues gender neutral and to promote gender equality.

1. Is the Commission aware of these 'gender-neutral' toy catalogues? Has it reviewed them?
2. Does it believe that children benefit from growing up in an environment where they are detached from the traditional gender roles associated with men and women?
3. Does it believe that this move is good for child development?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission

(25 March 2013)

The Commission closely monitors the gender equality policies and initiatives in Member States, including in the field of education. However it was not aware of the 'gender-neutral' toys catalogues that were disseminated this Christmas in Sweden, and has not reviewed it. The review of this private initiative is beyond the scope of the regular policy monitoring of the Commission.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000810/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(28 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: RyanAir

Nas últimas semanas, têm voltado a ser notícia inúmeros incidentes com aviões da RyanAir.

Em resposta anterior, a Comissão mencionou que «tendo em conta a importância de que se reveste para a segurança, a troca do maior número possível de informações sobre esta matéria entre as entidades reguladoras competentes, nomeadamente entre os Estados-Membros, a Comissão está a preparar uma alteração às regras existentes sobre comunicação de ocorrências no setor da aviação civil».

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. A Comissão já procedeu à alteração das regras existentes sobre a comunicação de ocorrências no setor da aviação?
2. Embora não tendo competências na investigação de acidentes ou incidentes, a Comissão tem competências em matéria de segurança da aviação, publicando, nomeadamente, uma lista negra das companhias impedidas de voar na Europa. Assim sendo, e nestes termos, que avaliação faz do cumprimento, por parte da RyanAir, das regras de segurança que lhe são aplicáveis, nomeadamente as suas «guidelines» e políticas de utilização de combustível?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão

(18 de março de 2013)

No que respeita à primeira pergunta do Senhor Deputado, a Comissão adotou em 18 de dezembro de 2012 a *Proposta de Regulamento do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativo à comunicação de ocorrências na aviação civil, que altera o Regulamento (UE) n.º 996/2010⁽¹⁾ e revoga a Diretiva 2003/42/CE⁽²⁾, o Regulamento (CE) n.º 1321/2007⁽³⁾ da Comissão e o Regulamento (CE) n.º 1330/2007⁽⁴⁾ (COM/2012/776)*. Esta proposta está atualmente a ser debatida pelo Conselho e pelo Parlamento Europeu de acordo com o procedimento legislativo normal.

A Ryanair é objeto de inspeções regulares nos aeroportos europeus com base num programa de inspeções na plataforma de estacionamento das aeronaves (SAFA). Este programa é uma das principais fontes com base nas quais a Comissão estabelece a lista de segurança assistida por um comité de representantes dos Estados-Membros. Os dados disponíveis no âmbito do Programa SAFA não levantam preocupações quanto à segurança da Ryanair. Cabe à autoridade da aviação civil irlandesa a responsabilidade primária pela supervisão das operações da Ryanair.

⁽¹⁾ JO L 295 de 12.11.2010.

⁽²⁾ JO L 167 de 4.7.2003.

⁽³⁾ JO L 294 de 13.11.2007.

⁽⁴⁾ JO L 295 de 14.11.2007.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000810/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(28 January 2013)

Subject: Ryanair

Over the last few weeks, countless incidents involving Ryanair aircraft have been reported.

In its answer to a previous written question, the Commission said that 'in view of the importance for safety of a maximum level of exchange of safety related information amongst appropriate safety regulators including notably Member States, the Commission is preparing a modification of the existing rules on occurrence reporting in civil aviation'.

1. Has the Commission already taken action to modify the existing rules on occurrence reporting in the aviation sector?
2. Although the Commission has no powers to investigate accidents or incidents, it does have powers in the field of air safety, and publishes a blacklist of companies which are banned from flying in European airspace. In light of this, how does the Commission assess Ryanair's compliance with the safety rules by which it is bound, particularly in relation to its 'guidelines' and policy on fuel use?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(18 March 2013)

With regards to the first question of the Honourable Member, the Commission has adopted on 18 December 2012 the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on occurrence reporting in civil aviation amending Regulation (EU) No 996/2010 ⁽¹⁾ and repealing Directive No 2003/42/EC ⁽²⁾, Commission Regulation (EC) No 1321/2007 ⁽³⁾ and Commission Regulation (EC) No 1330/2007 ⁽⁴⁾ (COM/2012/776). This proposal is currently discussed by the Council and by the European Parliament according to the normal legislative procedure.

Ryanair is regularly inspected at European airports pursuant to a programme for ramp checks of aircraft (SAFA). This programme is one of the main sources on the basis of which the Commission draws up the safety list assisted by a Committee of Member States' representatives. Data available under the SAFA programme do not give rise to concerns about the safety of Ryanair. The primary responsibility for oversight of Ryanair's operations rests with the Irish Civil Aviation Authority.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 295, 12.11.2010.
⁽²⁾ OJ L 167, 4.7.2003.
⁽³⁾ OJ L 294, 13.11.2007.
⁽⁴⁾ OJ L 295, 14.11.2007.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000811/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(28 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Declaração de Lisboa — Cimeira UE-África de 2007

No Declaração conjunta aprovada por ocasião da Cimeira União Europeia-África realizada em Lisboa em dezembro de 2007 as partes afirmam que: «Como testemunho das nossas ambições, e de tudo o que hoje partilhamos e partilhámos no passado, estamos decididos a construir uma nova parceria política estratégica para o futuro, ultrapassando a tradicional relação doador-recetor e partindo de valores e objetivos comuns, na via da paz, da estabilidade e do Estado de direito, do progresso e do desenvolvimento.»

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

- Como avalia a evolução da parceria estratégica para o futuro então anunciada?
- Por que formas e através de que meios concretos tenciona construí-la?
- Como qualifica o atual estado das relações UE-África tendo presente as ambições e as expectativas motivadas pela Cimeira de Lisboa?

Resposta dada por Andris Piebalgs em nome da Comissão

(7 de março de 2013)

A Estratégia Conjunta UE-África, adotada em Lisboa em 2007, constitui o enquadramento político global das relações UE-África. Ambas as Partes aprovaram uma nova abordagem para ultrapassar a relação tradicional, centrada no desenvolvimento. Foram instituídas oito parcerias temáticas, aplicadas conjuntamente através de dois planos de ação (2007-2010 e 2011-2013).

Os resultados alcançados são numerosos. A título de exemplo, a Arquitetura Africana de Paz e Segurança foi substancialmente reforçada. Um outro exemplo é o Programa de Apoio à União Africana que concede um apoio significativo às instituições da União Africana (UA) no sentido de acelerar o processo de reforma institucional.

Contudo, a tradução na prática de uma tal estratégia ambiciosa revelou-se um desafio e as modalidades de execução existentes não se revelaram tão eficazes como se tinha inicialmente previsto. A UE continua a ser o maior doador de África, o parceiro mais importante no âmbito do comércio e do investimento e um vizinho imediato. Por conseguinte, a estratégia conjunta deve continuar a ser ambiciosa.

Estuda-se atualmente a forma de dar mais ênfase às principais prioridades. É preciso rever os mecanismos de execução e dar um novo impulso à Parceria. Os objetivos e as disposições de aplicação devem ser realistas e realizáveis, centrados em âmbitos de interesse mútuo e em relação aos quais a abordagem pan-africana deu provas do seu valor acrescentado.

Do lado da UE, está em curso uma reflexão a nível interno sobre o futuro da Estratégia Conjunta, que será vastamente discutida com todos os parceiros europeus e africanos, incluindo a UA, as comunidades económicas regionais, os parlamentos e a sociedade civil, na perspetiva da próxima Cimeira em 2014.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000811/13
to the Commission**

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(28 January 2013)

Subject: Lisbon Declaration — EU-Africa Summit 2007

In the Joint Declaration adopted at the EU-Africa Summit in Lisbon in December 2007 the parties stated that: 'In recognition of our ambitions, and of all that we share today and have shared in the past, we are resolved to build a new strategic political partnership for the future, overcoming the traditional donor-recipient relationship and building on common values and goals in our pursuit of peace and stability, democracy and rule of law, progress and development.'

- How does the Commission assess the way in which this strategic partnership for the future, which was announced in 2007, has developed?
- How in practical terms will it build this partnership?
- How does it view the current state of EU-Africa relations bearing in mind the ambitions and expectations arising from the Lisbon Summit?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission

(7 March 2013)

The Joint Africa-EU Strategy adopted in Lisbon in 2007 is the overarching policy framework for EU-Africa relations. Both sides agreed on a new approach to overcome the traditional, development-centred relationship. Eight thematic partnerships were set up and have been jointly implemented through two action plans (2007-2010 and 2011-2013).

Numerous results have been achieved. For instance, the African Peace and Security Architecture has been substantially strengthened. Another example is the African Union Support Programme which provides comprehensive support to the African Union (AU) institutions in speeding up the Institutional Reform Process.

Nonetheless, the translation of such an ambitious strategy into practice has proved challenging and the working arrangements in place have not proved as effective as originally foreseen. The EU remains Africa's biggest donor, most important trade and investment partner, and immediate neighbour. The Joint Strategy should therefore remain ambitious.

Reflections are ongoing on how to focus more on key priorities. There is a need to review the delivery mechanisms and to provide fresh impetus to the Partnership. The objectives and implementation arrangements should be realistic and achievable, targeting areas of mutual interest and where the pan-African approach has proven its added-value.

Internal reflection on the future of the Joint Strategy is ongoing on the EU side and will also be widely discussed with all European and African partners, including the AU, Regional Economic Communities, parliaments and civil society, ahead of the next Summit in 2014.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000812/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(28 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Memória Europeia Ativa contra os totalitarismos

O artigo 3.º da Decisão 1904/2006/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 12 de dezembro de 2006, que instituiu para o período 2007-2013 o programa Europa para os cidadãos, tendo em vista promover a cidadania europeia ativa, previu o apoio à ação «Memória Europeia Ativa», destinada a evitar que se repitam os crimes do nazismo e do estalinismo.

1. Que apreciação global faz a Comissão desta ação?
2. Considera a Comissão que a mesma foi suficientemente divulgada?
3. Prevê a Comissão ações semelhantes para períodos posteriores?

Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão

(8 de março de 2013)

A Comissão está empenhada em sensibilizar as pessoas para o passado da Europa e os crimes perpetrados por regimes totalitários. Para o efeito utiliza o programa «A Europa para os Cidadãos» (2007-2013) ⁽¹⁾ e mais especificamente a ação 4 «Memória europeia ativa» ⁽²⁾. Esta ação tem por objetivo a comemoração das vítimas do nazismo e do estalinismo, como meio de superar o passado, mas transmitir às novas gerações de europeus a memória do que aconteceu.

Cerca de 40 projetos são financiados anualmente através da ação 4 do programa. Segundo o mais recente inquérito sobre o programa, efetuado no final de 2012 ⁽³⁾, a ação 4 contribui significativamente para sensibilizar os europeus para a cultura, identidade e património que partilhamos: 93,2 % dos inquiridos que participaram na ação 4 responderam claramente que as atividades do programa tiveram um impacto positivo neste sentido.

O programa «A Europa para os Cidadãos» e a sua ação «Memória europeia ativa» são promovidos pelos pontos de contacto «Europa para os Cidadãos» que existem na maioria dos Estados-Membros. Ao abrigo da ação 4, foi lançada, em 2010, uma iniciativa para fomentar a criação de redes de organizações na área da memória europeia, financiada pelo programa. O impacto positivo destas atividades reflete-se no aumento constante do número de candidaturas de projetos — de 130 recebidas em 2008 passámos para 311 em 2012.

A Comissão propôs que na próxima geração do programa (2014-2020) se alargasse a vertente «Memória ativa» para incluir «momentos decisivos da história europeia moderna».

Além disso, a Comissão está a preparar a implementação da Marca do Património Europeu ⁽⁴⁾. O objetivo desta iniciativa ⁽⁵⁾ é conferir visibilidade aos sítios que celebram e simbolizam a integração, os ideais e a história da Europa. A primeira seleção de sítios realizar-se-á em finais de 2013.

⁽¹⁾ http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/index_en.php

⁽²⁾ http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/programme/action4_en.php

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/news-events/news/20022013survey_en.htm

⁽⁴⁾ Criada pela Decisão n.º 1194/2011/UE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho.

⁽⁵⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/label/what-is-the-heritage-label_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000812/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(28 January 2013)

Subject: Active European Remembrance against totalitarianism

Article 3 of Decision No 1904/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006 establishing for the period 2007 to 2013 the programme Europe for Citizens to promote active European citizenship, expected support for the 'Active European Remembrance' action, with the aim of preventing the crimes of Nazism and Stalinism from being repeated.

1. What is the Commission's overall assessment of this action?
2. Does the Commission believe that it has been publicised sufficiently?
3. Does the Commission expect similar action for more recent periods?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(8 March 2013)

The Commission is committed to raising people's awareness of Europe's past and the crimes perpetrated by totalitarian regimes. It does so through the Europe for Citizens Programme (2007-2013) ⁽¹⁾ and more specifically through Action 4 'Active European Remembrance' ⁽²⁾. This Action is concerned with commemorating the victims of Nazism and Stalinism, as a means of moving beyond the past and passing the memory of what happened on to the young generation of Europeans.

Around 40 projects are financed through Action 4 of the Programme every year. According to the latest survey on the programme, carried out at the end of 2012 ⁽³⁾, Action 4 contributes strongly to raising the awareness of our shared European culture, identity and heritage. 93.2% of respondents who participated in Action 4 stated clearly that the programme activities had a positive impact in this respect.

The Europe for Citizens programme and its Remembrance Action is promoted by the Europe for Citizens Contact Points, which exist in a majority of Member States. Under Action 4, a scheme to encourage networking of remembrance organisations funded by the programme was initiated in 2010. The positive impact of these activities is reflected in the steadily increasing number of project applications — from 130 received in 2008 to 311 in 2012.

The Commission has proposed for the next generation of the programme (2014-2020) broadening the focus of the Remembrance strand to include 'defining moments in modern European history'.

In addition, the Commission is preparing the implementation of the European Heritage Label ⁽⁴⁾. The aim of this scheme ⁽⁵⁾ is to highlight heritage sites that symbolise European integration, ideals and history. The first selection of sites will take place later in 2013.

⁽¹⁾ http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/index_en.php.

⁽²⁾ http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/programme/action4_en.php.

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/news-events/news/20022013survey_en.htm

⁽⁴⁾ Established by Decision 1194/2011/EC of the European Parliament and the Council.

⁽⁵⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/label/what-is-the-heritage-label_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000813/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(28 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Dia Europeu da Memória das Vítimas do Estalinismo e do Nazismo

Não creio que, tendo em conta a Resolução 1481(2006) da Assembleia Parlamentar do Conselho da Europa, a União Europeia deveria condenar expressamente não apenas o estalinismo mas todos os crimes cometidos pelos regimes comunistas totalitários?

Estaria disposta a promover esta alteração junto das demais instituições europeias?

Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão

(18 de abril de 2013)

A Comissão tem sublinhado repetidamente o seu empenho em manter viva a memória dos crimes cometidos por todos os regimes totalitários, desde o regime nazi até ao regime estalinista, e está empenhada em utilizar os instrumentos de que dispõe para o efeito, em particular os seus programas financeiros, como a ação «Memória europeia ativa» do programa «Europa para os cidadãos».

No que se refere aos crimes cometidos pelos nazis, a Comissão mantém o compromisso de participar nas comemorações do Dia Internacional da Recordação do Holocausto, em 27 de janeiro. No seu relatório sobre a memória dos crimes dos regimes totalitários ⁽¹⁾, a Comissão propôs também aos Estados-Membros que analisassem a possibilidade de reconhecerem o dia 23 de agosto ⁽²⁾ como Dia Europeu da Memória dos crimes cometidos pelos regimes totalitários, tendo em conta a história e as especificidades de cada um.

⁽¹⁾ «A memória dos crimes cometidos pelos regimes totalitários na Europa», COM(2010) 783 final.

⁽²⁾ Resolução do Parlamento Europeu de 2 de abril de 2009 sobre a consciência europeia e os regimes totalitários.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000813/13
to the Commission**

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(28 January 2013)

Subject: European day of Remembrance for Victims of Stalinism and Nazism

Does the Commission not consider that, in light of Resolution 1481(2006) of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, the EU should specifically condemn not just Stalinism but all crimes committed by the totalitarian communist regimes?

Is it prepared to propose this amendment to the other European institutions?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission

(18 April 2013)

The Commission has consistently underlined its commitment to support the memory of the crimes committed by all totalitarian regimes, whether committed by Nazi or Stalinist regimes. The Commission is committed to use the instruments at its disposal in order to do so, in particular its financial programmes such as the Action 'Active European Remembrance' of the Europe for Citizens programme.

As regards the crimes committed by Nazis, the Commission remains committed to participate in the commemoration of the International Holocaust Remembrance Day on 27 January. In its report on the memory of totalitarian crimes ⁽¹⁾, the Commission also encouraged the Member States to examine the possibility to recognise the 23 August ⁽²⁾ as a Europe-wide Day of Remembrance of the crimes committed by totalitarian regimes, in the light of their own history and specificities.

⁽¹⁾ 'The memory of the crimes committed by totalitarian regimes in Europe', COM(2010) 783 final.

⁽²⁾ European Parliament resolution of 2 April 2009 on European conscience and totalitarianism.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000814/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(28 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Discurso de David Cameron

No passado dia 23 de janeiro de 2013, o Primeiro-Ministro britânico David Cameron proferiu um discurso acerca da União Europeia que tem motivado o debate acerca da estrutura, competências e modo de atuação da União.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

- Que apreciação global faz do discurso de David Cameron?
- De que modo crê que os cinco princípios enunciados por Cameron — competitividade, flexibilidade, devolução de poder aos Estados, responsabilização democrática, justiça — podem ser mais efetivamente postos em prática pela União?
- Que lhe parece o desejo manifestado por Cameron de vir a ter uma União mais flexível, mais adaptável, mais aberta e preparada para os desafios atuais?

Resposta dada por José Manuel Mr Barroso em nome da Comissão

(14 de março de 2013)

A Comissão remete o Senhor Deputado para a resposta dada à pergunta escrita E-000232/2013 ⁽¹⁾.

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

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000814/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(28 January 2013)**

Subject: Speech by David Cameron

On 23 January 2013, British Prime Minister David Cameron gave a speech about the EU which has given rise to debate about the Union's structure, powers and way of functioning.

- What is the Commission's overall assessment of David Cameron's speech?
- How does the Commission feel that the five principles listed by Cameron — competitiveness, flexibility, devolvement of power to Member States, democratic accountability and fairness — can be best put into practice by the Union?
- How does it view Cameron's expressed wish to see a Union which is more flexible, adaptable, open and fit for the challenges of the modern age?

**Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(14 March 2013)**

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-000232/2013 ⁽¹⁾.

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

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000815/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)**

Diogo Feio (PPE)
(28 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Segurança dos investimentos europeus no mundo

Diversas notícias dão conta que empresas europeias, em particular dos setores bancário e energético, vêm sendo nacionalizadas por Estados da América Latina com óbvio prejuízo para os seus acionistas e trabalhadores.

Assim, pergunto à Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante:

- Tem acompanhado a nacionalização de empresas europeias por parte de Estados latino-americanos?
- Que apreciação faz das mesmas?
- Tem procurado intervir para reverter estas situações e impedir a sua repetição?
- De que modo pretende contribuir para a segurança das empresas e dos investimentos europeus no mundo?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(4 de abril de 2013)

A Comissão tem vindo a acompanhar os processos de nacionalizações que afetam as empresas europeias na Bolívia e na Argentina. No âmbito de contactos bilaterais, a UE tem insistido na necessidade de respeitar o quadro jurídico internacional que regula a nacionalização dos investimentos estrangeiros e as compensações.

As nacionalizações ou expropriações de empresas da UE enviam um sinal muito negativo para a comunidade empresarial internacional, que pretende ver garantidas a estabilidade e a previsibilidade dos investimentos. A continuação das nacionalizações de empresas estrangeiras poderia prejudicar gravemente a reputação dos países em causa enquanto destino para os investimentos.

A Comissão instou as autoridades argentinas e bolivianas a respeitarem plenamente os seus acordos de investimento com os Estados-Membros e a proporcionarem o mais rapidamente possível uma compensação efetiva e adequada.

Os governos têm o direito de proceder a nacionalizações se assim o entenderem e a UE reconhece esse direito. No entanto, as nacionalizações só podem ser realizadas com objetivos legítimos de política pública, nos devidos termos da lei, de uma forma não discriminatória e contra o pagamento de uma compensação rápida, adequada e efetiva, em conformidade com os tratados bilaterais de investimento existentes.

A UE recordou igualmente à Argentina e à Bolívia a necessidade de respeitarem as suas declarações em favor de um enquadramento jurídico e económico estável, incluídas na Declaração da Cimeira UE-CELAC de Santiago, de 27 de janeiro de 2013.

A União Europeia continuará a acompanhar de perto estas situações e a incentivar a Argentina e a Bolívia a respeitarem os seus compromissos internacionais, bem como a chegarem a um acordo com as partes interessadas no que diz respeito à compensação.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000815/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Diogo Feio (PPE)
(28 January 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Security of European overseas investments

It has been widely reported that European companies, particularly in the banking and energy sectors, have been undergoing nationalisation by Latin American states, which is clearly damaging for their shareholders and employees.

- Has the Vice-President/High Representative been monitoring the nationalisation of European companies by Latin American states?
- What is her view of this?
- Has she sought to take action to reverse these nationalisations and to stop them happening again?
- How will she help ensure the security of European companies and investments overseas?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(4 April 2013)

The Commission has been monitoring nationalisations affecting European companies in Bolivia and Argentina. In bilateral contacts, the EU insists on the need to respect the international legal framework regulating nationalisation of foreign investments and compensations.

Nationalisations or expropriations of EU companies send a very negative signal to the international business community, which seeks stability and predictability for investments. Repeated nationalisations of foreign companies could seriously harm the respective countries' reputations as investment destinations.

The Commission has urged the Argentinean and Bolivian authorities to fully uphold their investment agreements with Member States and proceed to providing prompt, effective and adequate compensation as soon as possible.

Governments have the right to proceed to nationalisations if they so choose and the EU recognises this right. However, this can only be made for legitimate public policy objectives, under due process of law, in a non-discriminatory manner and against payment of prompt, adequate, and effective compensation, in accordance with the existing bilateral investment treaties.

The EU has also reminded Argentina and Bolivia to abide by their statements in favour of a stable legal and economic policy framework included in the EU-CELAC Santiago Summit Declaration of 27 January 2013.

The EU will continue to monitor these cases closely and to encourage Argentina and Bolivia to respect their international commitments and to reach an agreement with the interested parties as regards compensation.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000816/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(28 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Obesidade

Foi notícia que, no Reino Unido, estavam a ser pensadas penalizações financeiras para quem é gordo e não esteja disposto a emagrecer. Esta é uma medida proposta pelas autoridades do distrito de Westminster, que irá, assim, vigiar os residentes obesos e castigá-los na eventualidade de estes não mostrarem iniciativa para alterarem os seus comportamentos de risco.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Tem conhecimento desta medida? Revê-se na mesma?
2. Sabendo que o combate à obesidade se inscreve dentro das competências da UE em matéria de saúde, pondera aconselhar os Estados a implementar penalizações ou perda de benefícios para cidadãos obesos?
3. Não será que esta medida, tal como proposta, viola os mais elementares direitos dos cidadãos, nomeadamente o princípio da não-discriminação, no caso vertente com base no peso?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão

(18 de março de 2013)

A Comissão Europeia tem conhecimento de que a autarquia de Westminster, no Reino Unido, introduziu sanções pecuniárias como instrumento de saúde pública. Os Estados-Membros podem, regra geral, instituir e manter disposições nacionais em domínios não harmonizados a nível da UE, desde que as mesmas sejam compatíveis com as disposições pertinentes do direito da UE.

Há pouca experiência com este tipo de iniciativas e um conhecimento limitado do seu impacto sobre as tendências do excesso de peso e da obesidade. A Comissão não tenciona, de forma alguma, aplicar medidas punitivas às pessoas obesas que não tencionem perder peso.

Ao invés, a Comissão está a facilitar o intercâmbio de experiências entre Estados-Membros sobre as suas iniciativas nacionais destinadas a combater a obesidade, no contexto do Grupo de Alto Nível dedicado aos problemas de saúde relacionados com a nutrição e a atividade física, um dos instrumentos fundamentais da estratégia para a Europa em matéria de problemas de saúde ligados à nutrição, ao excesso de peso e à obesidade ⁽¹⁾. Esta estratégia dá prioridade a seis áreas de ação: informar melhor os consumidores; tornar disponível a opção saudável; encorajar a atividade física; desenvolver a base de conhecimentos para apoiar as decisões políticas; desenvolver sistemas de monitorização e dar prioridade às crianças e aos grupos socioeconómicos mais desfavorecidos. A Comissão lançou uma avaliação desta estratégia, e o relatório correspondente está previsto para a primavera de 2013.

(1) COM(2007) 279 final.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000816/13
to the Commission**

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(28 January 2013)

Subject: Obesity

According to news reports, financial penalties have been under consideration in the United Kingdom for people who are overweight and not prepared to lose weight. The measure has been proposed by Westminster Council, which will thus monitor overweight residents and penalise them if they do not show any initiative to change their reckless behaviour.

1. Is the Commission aware of this measure? Is it reviewing it?
2. Given that tackling obesity comes under the EU's competences in respect of health, is the Commission planning to advise the Member States to penalise obese citizens or take away their benefits?
3. Does this measure, as it has been proposed, not violate citizens' most fundamental rights, namely the principle of non-discrimination, in this case based on weight?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission

(18 March 2013)

The European Commission is aware that Westminster Council in the United Kingdom has introduced financial penalties as a public health instrument. Member States may, as a general rule, introduce and maintain national regulations on areas not harmonised at EU level provided that these are compatible with the relevant provisions of EC law.

There is limited experience with these types of initiatives and limited knowledge of the impact of such initiatives on overweight and obesity trends. The Commission is not in any way considering to implement punitive measures for overweight people who do not intend to lose weight.

Instead, the Commission is facilitating the exchange of experiences between the EU Member States on their national initiatives to fight obesity in the context of the High Level Group on Nutrition and Physical Activity, one of the core instruments of the strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity-related Health issues ⁽¹⁾. This strategy prioritises six areas for action: better informed consumers; making the healthy option available; encouraging physical activity; developing the evidence base to support policy making; developing monitoring systems, and putting children and low socioeconomic groups as a priority. The Commission has launched an evaluation of this Strategy and the report is expected in spring 2013.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2007)279 final.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000817/13
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(28 January 2013)**

Subject: Novel tobacco products

Can the Commission outline how the consumer rights and health of EU citizens will be adequately safeguarded when, under the proposed Tobacco Products Directive, novel tobacco products can be launched onto the market through a simple notification system? How can consumers make an informed decision when a full investigation of the health effects of novel products has yet to be conducted?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(7 March 2013)**

At this stage, the Commission has only limited knowledge about the addictiveness, health effects and attractiveness of novel tobacco products, a prohibition of which is therefore considered premature. The authorities of the Member State where the product will be placed on the market can take appropriate measures if it is necessary in order to protect public health.

In addition, as novel products are tobacco products, they will have to comply with the provisions of the directive, such as in terms of labelling and ingredients. The applicable rules will depend on whether the product involves a combustion process or not.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000818/13
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(28 January 2013)**

Subject: Tourism as a means of economic growth

In the United States, tourism has created jobs 26 % faster than the rest of the economy. In Europe, however, the tourism sector is not being utilised to its full potential. In fact, Europe's share of international arrivals is decreasing. Tourism could provide an economic motor for hastening the economic recovery in EU Member States hit by the crisis. Some of the Member States hit hardest by the crisis are in fact among those with the greatest potential to use tourism as a means of job creation and economic growth.

To what extent does the Commission view tourism as a catalyst to provide economic growth and recovery?

Does the Commission recognise the potential of tourism to stimulate economic growth and lower unemployment rates?

What is the Commission doing to encourage the creation of jobs in the tourism and hospitality sectors, in particular in Ireland, Italy, Spain, Portugal and Greece?

Can the Commission outline what it is doing to give financial incentives to the development of the tourism sector?

Does the Commission believe that the tourism sector should receive more funding than it already does, that is, a more proportional share relative to other areas which fall under EU competencies, given the potential within the sector for job creation and economic gain? If so, what is the Commission doing to make this a reality?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2013)**

The Commission recognises the economic importance of tourism as an export service and growth sector in contributing to the economic recovery ⁽¹⁾ and strongly believes that the tourism sector has a major potential to stimulate economic growth and job creation in the EU ⁽²⁾.

This is also true in the case of the countries mentioned by the Honourable Member. Therefore, the Commission encourages the Member States to steer their national strategic tourism plans towards enhancing the competitiveness of the sector and pleads for a better, more efficient, strategic and integrated use of EU Structural Funds for tourism investments under different thematic objectives ⁽³⁾.

In 2010, the Commission adopted a renewed action framework for consolidated EU tourism policy which includes a wide range of initiatives and actions meant to stimulate the competitiveness and development of the European tourism sector, including possibilities for co-financing of transnational and European-added value tourism projects. The tourism earmarked financial resources are complemented by additional possibilities for financial support for tourism activities and projects offered under different EU financial instruments, depending on their focus and provided that the objectives of the projects match the different objectives and requirements specific to those financial programmes ⁽⁴⁾.

⁽¹⁾ This is confirmed by data which shows that the European travel performance exceeded expectations in 2012 (+4% increase), after a year of even stronger growth (+7% in 2011) and despite the persistent negative economic climate in the Eurozone. *Source:* European Travel Commission (ETC) Market Intelligence Report, February 2013.

⁽²⁾ This has been already underlined in the 2010 Commission communication on tourism: COM(2010) 352 final of 30.6.2010.

⁽³⁾ Such as research and innovation, SME competitiveness, ICT/Digital Agenda, low-carbon economy, environment, employment and labour mobility, education, skills and lifelong learning, etc.

⁽⁴⁾ An overview of EU financial instruments for possible use by the tourism sector's public and private stakeholders can be found at: http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/newsroom/cf/_getdocument.cfm?doc_id=7652

In order to fully tap into the potential of tourism as a contributor to economic growth and jobs, appropriate financial resources are essential. In light of this, the Commission proposed the inclusion of an adequate budget allocation for tourism-related initiatives in the indicative split of operational appropriations and budget distribution for the future COSME programme ⁽⁹⁾.

⁽⁹⁾ COM(2011) 834 final of 30.11.2011. The Programme for the Competitiveness of Enterprises and Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (COSME) has as objectives to improve access to finance and to markets for SMEs, to encourage an entrepreneurial culture in Europe, and to improve framework conditions for the competitiveness and sustainability of enterprises including in the tourism sector.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000819/13
to the Commission**

Jim Higgins (PPE)

(28 January 2013)

Subject: The survival, promotion and future of the arts in Europe

The arts have come under threat since the onset of the global economic crisis. With the reduction in the government funding made available to the arts in many states, it has become much more difficult for organisations to have a full programme of artistic events. The arts are important to promote the culture and heritage of each state and, in the case of Ireland, the arts are intrinsic to the concept of an Irish identity. Not only this, but they also provide a means of entertainment, they attract visitors and they provide people with a means to express themselves. Therefore, it is vital to recognise the importance of the arts and their contribution to society.

Does the Commission recognise that the promotion of the arts and arts programmes can have a social, economic and cultural benefit?

With the reduction in the funding available to many arts organisations, what is the Commission doing to protect the survival of projects and programmes in the arts sector?

What does the Commission intend to do to promote the arts in the future?

What does the Commission intend to do to further promote cross-border arts projects across Member State borders?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission

(28 February 2013)

The Commission fully recognises that the promotion of the arts has a social, economic and cultural benefit. In this respect, the Commission proposed a future Creative Europe programme to support the cultural and creative sectors for the period 2014-2020 which aims to stimulate smart, sustainable and inclusive growth.

Furthermore, the proposal made by the Commission to increase the overall budget available for this programme by 37% compared to the total funding available for the current programmes in these fields is the best illustration of its concrete commitment to promote culture and arts in the near future. The final budget for the future programme is being negotiated in the framework of the overall EU budget for 2014-2020.

The new programme will have a strong focus on reinforcing the sectors' capacity to safeguard and promote European cultural and linguistic diversity and to strengthen their contribution to competitiveness in the context of the Europe 2020 strategy. In parallel with the mobility and circulation of art works and cultural professionals, which will be core elements of the new programme, a strong emphasis will be put on building the capacity of cultural operators to work across borders, to adjust to the digital shift, and to develop new business models and new audience-building strategies.

However, it should be stressed that the Commission must stay within the remit of its mandate as defined by Article 167 of the Treaty on the functioning of the European Union. Thus, the Commission's programme support cannot substitute the role of Member States in supporting the arts.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000820/13
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(28 January 2013)**

Subject: Cystic fibrosis research

With over 1 100 cases of cystic fibrosis in Ireland and approximately 1 in every 19 Irish people carrying a gene which causes this condition, what does the Commission intend to do to support more research into this condition?

**Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(12 March 2013)**

The Commission is aware of the impact of cystic fibrosis (CF) and the importance of funding research in this field, including support of basic research and translation into clinical practice.

In the Health 2010 call of the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013), EUR 5.3 million were allocated to the currently ongoing project 'Immunoglobulin IgY pseudomonas A clinical trial for cystic fibrosis treatment (IMPACTT)' ⁽¹⁾ that is aiming to improve the quality of life of CF patients and their families. A clinical phase III trial will demonstrate the preventive and therapeutic effects of a pioneering therapy with the hope to eradicate bacterial infection in CF patient lungs.

European Networks for rare diseases have been identified by the EU as important key initiatives to optimise the healthcare for European citizens. One of these network supported with EUR 0.9 million is 'European Centres of Reference Network for Cystic Fibrosis' (ECORN-CF) ⁽²⁾. This project brings together participants from six EU countries, Ireland among them, to set up patient registries, biobanks and clinical trial networks, thus facilitating easy access to expert knowledge and advice for the CF patients, doctors and other care team members.

The researchers and organisations investing in rare diseases research are teamed up by the International Rare Diseases Research Consortium (IRDIRC) ⁽³⁾ launched two years ago. IRDiRC will hold its first Conference in Ireland on 16-17 April 2013. Further opportunities for investigating cystic fibrosis may arise in future calls for proposals within Horizon2020.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.impactt.eu>

⁽²⁾ <http://www.ence-plan.eu>

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/research/health/medical-research/rare-diseases/irdirc_en.html

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000821/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(28 ianuarie 2013)

Subiect: Interdicții la importuri în Rusia

Rusia a anunțat că va interzice începând cu 4 februarie importurile de carne refrigerată de pui, vită și porc din Germania, invocând nerespectarea de către această țară a cerințelor sanitar-veterinare. Autoritățile sanitar-veterinare ruse au arătat că „nu pot accepta garanțiile serviciului veterinar din Germania”.

De asemenea, începând cu 1 aprilie, Rusia va interzice temporar importul de cartofi de sămânță din țările UE, invocând refuzul Comisiei Europene de a oferi garanții privind securitatea producției.

Comisia este rugată să comenteze impunerea în continuare de către Rusia a unor interdicții la importurile de produse agricole și alimentare, în contextul recentei aderări a acestui stat la Organizația Mondială a Comerțului.

Răspuns dat de dl Borg în numele Comisiei
(18 martie 2013)

Comisia consideră că măsurile restrictive impuse la importurile de carne refrigerată din Germania, precum și de produse lactate și produse din carne din trei landuri nu sunt în conformitate cu obligațiile care îi revin Rusiei în cadrul OMC, deoarece suspendă fluxul de schimburi comerciale în curs, fără a se fi demonstrat existența unui risc grav pentru sănătate. Comisia acordă încrederea sa deplină eficacității și fiabilității sistemului german oficial de control al siguranței alimentare și susține eforturile depuse de autoritățile germane pentru a își demonstra capacitatea de a îndeplini cerințele sanitar-veterinare de import ale Rusiei. Comisia a solicitat autorităților ruse să elimine, cu efect imediat, măsurile restrictive. Comisia consideră că măsurile impuse de Rusia sunt disproporționate și nejustificate din punct de vedere tehnic și juridic.

Comisia consideră, de asemenea, că interdicția anunțată cu privire la cartofii de sămânță nu este în conformitate cu principiile OMC, deoarece schimburile comerciale cu aceste produse s-au desfășurat până în prezent fără a genera riscuri fitosanitare specifice. Niciunul dintre cazurile în care Rusia a depistat organisme dăunătoare în cadrul importurilor din UE în 2012 nu a vizat cartofii de sămânță. Cu toate acestea, trebuie remarcat faptul că, în general, UE interzice, de asemenea, importul de cartofi de sămânță, cu excepția cazurilor în care se acordă derogări. Rusia, în pofida faptului că nu a cerut o astfel de derogare, a contestat, la rândul său, conformitatea cu principiile OMC a măsurii impuse de UE și își prezintă măsura drept o aliniere la standardele UE. În prezent se pregătește desfășurarea unor discuții la nivel tehnic pe această temă între UE și Federația Rusă, în urma cărora autoritățile ruse ar putea să își revizuiască restricțiile.

Având în vedere cele de mai sus, Comisia consideră măsurile Rusiei drept măsuri potențial protecționiste deghizate și monitorizează îndeaproape evoluția acestora.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000821/13
to the Commission**

Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)

(28 January 2013)

Subject: Bans on imports into Russia

Russia has announced that it will ban imports of refrigerated poultry, beef and pork from Germany as from 4 February 2013, citing Germany's failure to meet veterinary and sanitary requirements. According to Russia's veterinary health authorities, the guarantees provided by the German veterinary health services are insufficient.

Russia is also to impose a temporary ban on imports of seed potatoes from EU countries as from 1 April 2013, citing the Commission's refusal to provide guarantees on the safety of those products.

How does the Commission view the fact that Russia is continuing to impose bans on imports of agricultural and food products at a time when it has recently acceded to the World Trade Organisation?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission

(18 March 2013)

The Commission views the restrictive measures imposed on imports of chilled meat from Germany and of dairy and meat products from three *Länder* as not being in line with Russia's WTO obligations, since they suspend ongoing trade flows without a demonstrated serious risk for health. The Commission has full confidence in the effectiveness and reliability of the German official system of food safety control. The Commission supports the German authorities' efforts to demonstrate ability to meet the Russian sanitary import requirements. The Commission requested Russian authorities to lift the measures with immediate effect. The Commission considers the Russian measures to be disproportionate and are not justified on technical nor legal grounds.

The Commission considers the announced ban on seed potatoes also as not being in line with WTO principles since trade of these products has been ongoing without causing specific phytosanitary risks. None of the Russian detection of harmful organisms in imports from the EU in 2012 concerned seed potatoes. However it has to be noted that EU also generally prohibits import of seed potatoes unless derogation is granted. Russia, despite the fact that it has never requested such derogation, also questioned the WTO compliance of the EU measure, and presents its measure as an alignment with the EU standards. EU-Russian Federation technical discussions on this issue are being organised and the Russian authorities might reconsider their restrictions after these discussions.

In view of the above, the Commission considers the Russian measures as potential disguised protectionist measures and closely monitors their evolution.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000822/13
adresată Comisiei
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(28 ianuarie 2013)

Subiect: Centre de vacanță

Criza economică cu care se confruntă Europa influențează negativ și funcționarea centrelor de vacanță pentru copiii și adolescenți din diferite regiuni ale Uniunii Europene.

Aceste centre au misiunea de a le permite copiilor și adolescenților să petreacă un sejur în afara familiei, să participe la diferite activități educative și extrașcolare, dar și să facă cunoștință cu alți copii și tineri de vârstă apropiată, din țara de origine sau din alte țări.

În unele state membre, aceste centre riscă să dispară sau să le fie schimbată destinația.

Cum intenționează Comisia să sprijine eforturile autorităților locale și regionale de menținere a acestor centre, dar și de dezvoltare a unor noi locații, inclusiv prin programele de cooperare transfrontaliere?

Răspuns dat de dl Hahn în numele Comisiei
(26 martie 2013)

Comisia nu oferă ajutor direct pentru centrele de vacanță.

În anumite circumstanțe, proiecte precum centrele de vacanță pot beneficia de sprijin prin intermediul programelor transfrontaliere din cadrul politicii de coeziune, dar acest lucru depinde de prioritățile individuale și de criteriile de selecție stabilite în cadrul fiecărui program. În temeiul principiului gestiunii partajate, responsabilitatea pentru implementarea programelor din cadrul politicii de coeziune, inclusiv pentru selecționarea proiectelor, le revine țărilor participante.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000822/13
to the Commission
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(28 January 2013)**

Subject: Holiday camps

The economic crisis facing Europe has also had a negative impact on holiday camps for children and adolescents in various regions in the European Union.

These holiday camps are designed to enable children and adolescents to spend time outside their families and take part in various educational and extracurricular activities, as well as meeting other children and young people of similar ages from their own country or from other countries.

In some Member States, there is a risk that these holiday camps may disappear or see a change in use.

What will the Commission do to support the efforts being made by local and regional authorities to preserve these holiday camps and develop new sites, including through cross-border cooperation programmes?

**Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(26 March 2013)**

The Commission does not provide direct support for holiday camps.

In certain circumstances, projects such as holiday camps may be able to receive support via cohesion policy cross-border programmes, but this will depend on the individual priorities and selection criteria established in each programme. Under the shared management principle, the implementation of cohesion policy programmes, including project selection, is the responsibility of the participating countries.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000823/13
an die Kommission
Bernd Lange (S&D)
(28. Januar 2013)

Betrifft: Europäische Normung von Tourismusdienstleistungen durch die Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1025/2012

Mit der neuen Gesetzgebung zur Normung (Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1025/2012) werden Verfahren zur Findung von Normen auch im Dienstleistungsbereich festgelegt.

Zweifelsohne ist der Bereich der Tourismusdienstleistungen ein großer Wirtschaftssektor in der Europäischen Union. Allerdings gibt es hier nur vereinzelt Normen und Standards, insbesondere Sicherheitsnormen, wie zum Beispiel beim Tauchen. Eine klare Definition von Leistungen und verlässlichen Standards ist aber im Interesse der Verbraucher.

Dies vorausgeschickt frage ich die Kommission:

1. Wie sieht die Kommission die Notwendigkeit zur Normung touristischer Dienstleistungen?
2. Welche Maßnahmen wird die Kommission unternehmen, um Normen im Bereich des Tourismus zur Verbesserung der Dienstleistungen und zur Sicherheit der Verbraucher zu etablieren?

Antwort von Herrn Tajani im Namen der Kommission
(21. März 2013)

In der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1025/2012 wird betont, dass die Entwicklung europäischer Normen und Normungsprodukte im Dienstleistungsbereich von größter Wichtigkeit ist. Dabei wird anerkannt, dass viele Produktnormen auch für den Dienstleistungsbereich und umgekehrt Dienstleistungsnormen teilweise auch für Produkte relevant sein können.

Die Kommission berücksichtigt die zur Umsetzung ihrer in KOM(2012)352⁽¹⁾ festgelegten Tourismusstrategie am besten geeigneten Instrumente, einschließlich der Verwendung von Normen, um innovative, wettbewerbsfähige und hochwertige Tourismusdienstleistungen erbringen zu können.

Freilich sollte die Normung im Tourismus, wie in jeder anderen Branche, freiwillig, marktorientiert und einvernehmlich erfolgen. Ferner sind dabei Transparenz und die uneingeschränkte Beteiligung der von den Normen betroffenen Wirtschaftsteilnehmer und Interessenträger zu gewährleisten.

Im Januar 2013 hat die Kommission den europäischen Normungsgremien den Auftrag M/517 für den Dienstleistungsbereich übermittelt. Diese sollen ein Normungsprogramm entwickeln, um die Vergleichbarkeit von erbrachten Dienstleistungen von Dienstleistungserbringern aus verschiedenen Mitgliedstaaten, die Information der Dienstleistungsempfänger und die Qualität der Dienstleistungen, wie in Artikel 26 Absatz 5 der Richtlinie 2006/123/EG vorgesehen, zu verbessern. Das Ergebnis dieser Arbeit wird auch für die Tourismusbranche von Nutzen sein.

⁽¹⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0352:FIN:DE:PDF>

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000823/13
to the Commission
Bernd Lange (S&D)
(28 January 2013)

Subject: European standardisation of tourism services through Regulation (EU) No 1025/2012

The new standardisation legislation (Regulation (EU) No 1025/2012) establishes procedures for setting standards, including in the services sector.

Tourism services are undoubtedly a major economic sector in the European Union. However, only few norms and standards exist in this sector; this is particularly true of safety standards, for instance as regards diving. Nevertheless, it is in the interest of consumers to have a clear definition of services and reliable standards.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. How does it view the need for the standardisation of tourism services?
2. What action will it take to establish standards in the tourism sector in order to improve services and protect consumers?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(21 March 2013)

Regulation (EU) No 1025/2012 highlights the importance of the development of European standards and standardisation deliverables on services, recognising that many standards for products incorporate also a service element, and conversely standards for services relate partly to products.

The Commission takes into consideration the most appropriate tools to implement its Tourism Strategy laid down in COM(2010) 352 (¹), including the use of standardisation, to deliver innovative, competitive, and high-quality tourism services.

However, as for any other sector, the use of standardisation for services, including tourism, shall be a voluntary, market-driven, consensus-based process, which also ensures transparency and full participation of the economic operators and stakeholders affected by such standards.

In the area of services, the Commission submitted in January 2013 Mandate M/517 to the European standardisation organisations to develop a standardisation programme to facilitate compatibility between services supplied by providers in different Member States, information to the recipient and the quality of service provision in accordance with Article 26(5) of Directive 2006/123/EC. The result of this work will also be useful for the tourism sector.

(¹) <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0352:FIN:EN:PDF>

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000824/13

al Consejo

Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)

(28 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: Efectos de las políticas de austeridad en la salud

Vista la Carta Abierta a los líderes políticos europeos y autoridades sanitarias enviada por altas autoridades del colectivo médico de España, Irlanda, Grecia y Portugal ⁽¹⁾ al Presidente de la Comisión Europea, al Presidente del Parlamento Europeo, Martin Schulz, y al Presidente del Consejo Europeo, Van Rompuy.

Considerando que en la misma se exponen los serios efectos sobre la salud de las personas que están teniendo las decisiones económicas y financieras adoptadas en los últimos años; entre los cuales se indican: «pérdida de autoestima y depresión; aumento de conductas de riesgo tanto en términos de adicciones como de factores de riesgo de enfermedades crónicas; mayores obstáculos para el uso de los servicios sanitarios; empeoramiento de las condiciones laborales para los profesionales sanitarios». Asimismo, la carta denuncia que se está produciendo «un sufrimiento humano mayor y más profundo, un incremento del número de situaciones que desafían nuestra ética y los principios básicos de dignidad humana. El deterioro de los sistemas de salud, así como la emigración de los más cualificados entre los jóvenes, el desempleo de larga duración y unas menores tasas de fertilidad probablemente tendrán consecuencias a largo plazo, lo que afectará a las generaciones futuras». Los ajustes presupuestarios en sanidad y la introducción de medidas de copago sanitario y farmacéutico en los cuatro países son alarmantes. La Comisión Europea se encuentra, junto con el FMI y el BCE, recomendando muchos de estos ajustes (principalmente en Irlanda, Grecia y Portugal). Asimismo, las recomendaciones del semestre europeo hacen hincapié en las reducciones de los ratios de deuda y déficit público sin considerar los efectos negativos en la salud.

¿Qué opinión tiene el Consejo al respecto?

¿Tiene el Consejo datos que corroboren el sufrimiento humano al cual hacen referencia los profesionales en esta carta abierta?

¿Piensa utilizar el Consejo estos datos para revertir la política de austeridad y de recortes en las recomendaciones del semestre europeo?

Respuesta

(22 de abril de 2013)

Según el artículo 168, apartado 7, del TFUE, la definición de la política de salud y la organización y prestación de servicios sanitarios y atención médica, incluida su gestión y la asignación de los recursos que se destinan a dichos servicios, son responsabilidad de los Estados miembros.

El 28 de febrero de 2013, el Consejo refrendó las conclusiones y los mensajes políticos clave que figuran en el informe anual sobre 2012 del Comité de Protección Social ⁽²⁾, donde se hace un seguimiento de la situación social en la EU. El informe indica que la sostenibilidad a largo plazo de los sistemas de asistencia sanitaria y su capacidad de mejorar los resultados en el ámbito de la salud pueden requerir llevar a cabo reformas estructurales que tomen en consideración tanto la financiación y el acceso a los servicios como una intensificación de la promoción sanitaria y de la prevención de las enfermedades. A tal fin, las políticas sanitarias han de buscar la eficacia y el control de los gastos de manera integrada. Asimismo, el informe destaca que para garantizar la accesibilidad, la calidad y la eficacia, las reformas estructurales deben ir acompañadas de medidas globales que tengan en cuenta la gradación social en lo que respecta a la salud ⁽³⁾.

⁽¹⁾ https://www.cgcom.es/sites/default/files/carta_abierta_0.pdf

⁽²⁾ 6138/13 ADD 1.

⁽³⁾ 6138/13.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000824/13
to the Council**

Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)

(28 January 2013)

Subject: Effects of austerity policies on health

Leading members of the medical world in Spain, Ireland, Greece and Portugal have sent the President of the European Commission, the President of the European Parliament Martin Schulz, and the President of the European Council Herman Van Rompuy an 'Open letter to European political leaders and health authorities' ⁽¹⁾.

In this letter they set out the serious effects that the economic and financial decisions taken in recent years are having on people's health. These include: loss of self-esteem and depression; enhancement of risk-taking behaviour both in terms of addictions and in relation to risk factors for chronic illnesses; increased obstacles to proper health service utilisation; depressed working conditions for health professionals. The letter also speaks out against the 'extensive and deep human suffering' this is producing, with an 'increased number of situations that defy our ethics and basic notions of human dignity. Deteriorating health systems, along with the emigration of the most qualified among the young, long-term unemployment and depressed fertility rates will very likely have long-term consequences, affecting future generations'. The budgetary adjustments in health and the introduction of measures whereby patients pay a share of their medical and prescription costs in the four countries are alarming. It is the Commission, together with the FMI and the ECB, which is recommending many of these adjustments (primarily in Ireland, Greece and Portugal). Likewise, the European Semester emphasises in its recommendations reducing debt ratios and public deficit but does not consider the negative effects of this on health.

What is the Council's opinion?

Does the Council have figures that corroborate the human suffering referred to by these medical professionals in their open letter?

Is the Council thinking of using these figures in order to reverse the policy of austerity and cuts in the European Semester recommendations?

Reply

(22 April 2013)

Pursuant to Article 168(7) TFEU, the definition of health policy and the organisation and delivery of health services and medical care, including their management and the allocation of resources to them, is the responsibility of the Member States.

On 28 February 2013, the Council endorsed the key conclusions and policy messages of the Social Protection Committee's 2012 Annual Report ⁽²⁾ monitoring the social situation in the EU. The report indicated that the long-term sustainability of healthcare systems and their capacity to ameliorate health outcomes may require structural reforms reviewing both financing and access to services as well as strengthening health promotion and disease prevention. To this end, health policies should pursue effectiveness and expenditure control in an integrated fashion. Moreover, the report highlights that comprehensive measures tackling the social gradient in health need to accompany structural reforms in order to ensure accessibility, quality and effectiveness ⁽³⁾.

⁽¹⁾ https://www.cgcom.es/sites/default/files/carta_abierta_0.pdf

⁽²⁾ 6138/13 ADD 1.

⁽³⁾ 6138/13.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000825/13
a la Comisión**

Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(28 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: Efectos de las políticas de austeridad en la salud

Vista la Carta Abierta a los líderes políticos europeos y autoridades sanitarias enviada por altas autoridades del colectivo médico de España, Irlanda, Grecia y Portugal ⁽¹⁾ al Presidente de la Comisión Europea, al Presidente del Parlamento Europeo, Martin Schulz, y al Presidente del Consejo Europeo, Van Rompuy.

Considerando que en la misma se exponen los serios efectos sobre la salud de las personas que están teniendo las decisiones económicas y financieras adoptadas en los últimos años, entre los cuales se indican: «pérdida de autoestima y depresión; aumento de conductas de riesgo tanto en términos de adicciones como de factores de riesgo de enfermedades crónicas; mayores obstáculos para el uso de los servicios sanitarios; empeoramiento de las condiciones laborales para los profesionales sanitarios». Asimismo, la carta denuncia que se está produciendo «un sufrimiento humano mayor y más profundo, un incremento del número de situaciones que desafían nuestra ética y los principios básicos de dignidad humana. El deterioro de los sistemas de salud, así como la emigración de los más cualificados entre los jóvenes, el desempleo de larga duración y unas menores tasas de fertilidad probablemente tendrán consecuencias a largo plazo, lo que afectará a las generaciones futuras». Los ajustes presupuestarios en sanidad y la introducción de medidas de copago sanitario y farmacéutico en los cuatro países son alarmantes. La Comisión Europea se encuentra, junto con el FMI y el BCE, recomendando muchos de estos ajustes (principalmente en Irlanda, Grecia y Portugal). Asimismo, las recomendaciones del semestre europeo hacen hincapié en las reducciones de los ratios de deuda y déficit público sin considerar los efectos negativos en la salud.

¿Qué opinión tiene la Comisión al respecto?

¿Tiene la Comisión datos que corroboren el sufrimiento humano al cual hacen referencia los profesionales en esta carta abierta?

¿Piensa utilizar la Comisión estos datos para revertir la política de austeridad y de recortes con la que predica en estos países junto con la Troika?

La carta hace referencia a la «clausura social» del Tratado de Lisboa, ¿considera la Comisión que actualmente se está violando dicha carta en estos cuatro Estados miembros?

¿Qué medidas piensa adoptar la Comisión al respecto?

Respuesta del Sr. Borg en nombre de la Comisión

(18 de marzo de 2013)

Eurostat recoge información sobre el acceso a los servicios de asistencia sanitaria de forma rutinaria a través de la encuesta de la UE sobre la renta y las condiciones de vida, así como datos sobre la situación sanitaria de un país como, por ejemplo, la tasa de mortalidad por causa. No obstante, la información a escala de la UE que se ha recopilado (hasta el año de referencia 2011 para la información recogida a través de dicha encuesta) no permite sacar conclusiones claras sobre cuáles son las consecuencias de una política de austeridad en el ámbito sanitario.

La Comisión, consciente de que la información relevante puede tardar en estar disponible, ha encargado examinar los informes sobre los temas de ámbito sanitario financiados mediante el Programa de Salud de la UE durante las crisis financieras actual y pasada. Se espera que el examen de dichos informes esté disponible en 2014.

La Comisión quiere enfatizar que los paquetes de condicionantes ligados a los programas de ayuda financiera se basan en compromisos voluntarios por parte de los Estados miembros afectados. Cuando se incluye una reforma del sistema de salud en dichos paquetes, se intenta ante todo aumentar la eficiencia fin de garantizar la sostenibilidad a largo plazo de los presupuestos de salud pública. La Comisión apoya el esfuerzo de los Estados miembros, ya que considera que los presupuestos sostenibles son la mejor garantía a largo plazo de un acceso equitativo a una asistencia sanitaria de alta calidad para todos los ciudadanos.

⁽¹⁾ https://www.cgcom.es/sites/default/files/carta_abierta_0.pdf

La Comisión considera asimismo que estas medidas respetan plenamente el Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea.

La Comisión seguirá supervisando la situación y apoyando el esfuerzo de los Estados miembros por salvaguardar la sostenibilidad a largo plazo de sus respectivos sistemas de salud.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000825/13
to the Commission**

Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(28 January 2013)

Subject: Effects of austerity policies on health

Leading members of the medical world in Spain, Ireland, Greece and Portugal have sent the President of the European Commission, the President of the European Parliament Martin Schulz, and the President of the European Council Herman Van Rompuy an 'Open letter to European political leaders and health authorities' ⁽¹⁾.

In this letter they set out the serious effects that the economic and financial decisions taken in recent years are having on people's health. These include: loss of self-esteem and depression; enhancement of risk-taking behaviour both in terms of addictions and in relation to risk factors for chronic illnesses; increased obstacles to proper health service utilisation; depressed working conditions for health professionals. The letter also speaks out against the 'extensive and deep human suffering' this is producing, with an 'increased number of situations that defy our ethics and basic notions of human dignity. Deteriorating health systems, along with the emigration of the most qualified among the young, long-term unemployment and depressed fertility rates will very likely have long-term consequences, affecting future generations'. The budgetary adjustments in health and the introduction of measures whereby patients pay a share of their medical and prescription costs in the four countries are alarming. It is the Commission, together with the FMI and the ECB, which is recommending many of these adjustments (primarily in Ireland, Greece and Portugal). Likewise, the European Semester emphasises in its recommendations reducing debt ratios and public deficit but does not consider the negative effects of this on health.

What is the Commission's opinion?

Does the Commission have figures that corroborate the human suffering referred to by these medical professionals in their open letter?

Is the Commission thinking of using these figures in order to reverse the policy of austerity and cuts which it and the Troika are advocating in these countries?

The letter makes reference to the 'social clause' in the Lisbon Treaty. Does the Commission consider that this Charter is being breached in these four Member States at present?

What measures does the Commission plan to adopt?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission

(18 March 2013)

Eurostat routinely collects data on access to healthcare services via the Survey on Income and Living Conditions as well as related health outcomes such as mortality by cause. However, at present, available data compiled at EU level (up to 2011 reference year for data under this survey) do not allow for clear conclusions to be drawn on the effects of austerity policies on health.

The Commission is aware of the applicable time lags in the availability of relevant data and commissioned a review of reports on health aspects of the current and previous financial crises (financed by the EU Health Programme). The review is expected to be available in 2014.

The Commission stresses that the conditionality packages linked to financial assistance programmes are based on voluntary commitments by the Member States affected. When healthcare system reform is included in such packages, focus is put on finding efficiency gains to ensure the long-term sustainability of public healthcare budgets. The Commission supports Member States in their efforts as it considers that sustainable budgets are the best long-term guarantee of equitable access to high quality healthcare for all citizens...

The Commission considers that its actions are in full respect of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

The Commission will continue to monitor the situation and support Member States in their efforts to safeguard the long-term sustainability of their health systems.

⁽¹⁾ https://www.cgcom.es/sites/default/files/carta_abierta_0.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000826/13
to the Commission
Marian Harkin (ALDE)
(28 January 2013)

Subject: Income tax on employed and self-employed persons in Ireland

Can the Commission examine the following situation and give its view as to whether it contravenes any European legislation?

An Irish citizen, who is a full-time resident of the Republic of Ireland, is self-employed exclusively in Northern Ireland and has no income from earnings in the Republic of Ireland. He pays tax on his earnings in Northern Ireland and is subject to further tax in the Republic of Ireland (albeit that an allowance is made for the tax he pays in Northern Ireland). However, a person who is a full-time resident of the Republic of Ireland and employed (rather than self-employed) solely in Northern Ireland is not subject to any further income tax in the Republic of Ireland.

Section 13 of the 1998 Irish Finance Act allows for a reduction in income tax for certain income earned outside the State. It appears that this reduction in income tax applies to employed persons working outside the State, who do not pay further tax in the Republic of Ireland, but not to self-employed persons who are working in identical circumstances. This disparity appears discriminatory and places an onerous burden on self-employed persons while restricting the freedom of establishment and free movement of services.

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(13 March 2013)

In international tax law, the home state usually taxes its resident taxpayers on their worldwide income, while the source state only taxes income arising in that state. The home state often eliminates the double taxation by not taxing the foreign source income (exemption method) or by deducting the tax levied abroad from its own tax (credit method).

There is no EU legislation determining a single State of taxation when a taxpayer has fiscal links to several Member States. Thus, Member States remain competent to determine both the criteria for the division of their respective taxing rights and the method of double taxation relief.

Concerning self-employed persons, the double tax treaty between Ireland and the UK provides for the credit method.

As regards employment income, Section 825A of the Taxes Consolidation Act 1997 provides for relief for individuals who are resident in Ireland but who commute to their place of work outside Ireland (the cross-border workers relief) by exempting qualified employment income when certain conditions are met. The cross-border workers relief applies to all Irish tax residents, irrespective of their nationality.

The fact that Ireland decided to unilaterally provide for the exemption method for the qualified employment income and for the credit method for self-employed individuals, as provided for in double tax treaty, does not lead to any discrimination contrary to EC law.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000827/13

an den Rat

Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE)

(28. Januar 2013)

Betrifft: Standpunkt der EU zur Verlängerung der Übergangsfristen für das WTO-TRIPS-Übereinkommen für am wenigsten entwickelte Länder

Am 5. November 2012 stellte Haiti im Namen der Gruppe der am wenigsten entwickelten Länder (LDC-Gruppe) der Welthandelsorganisation (WTO) einen Antrag (IP/C/W/583) an den WTO-TRIPS-Rat auf Verlängerung der Übergangsfristen nach Artikel 66 Absatz 1 des WTO-TRIPS-Übereinkommens. In dem Antrag wird folgender Beschluss vorgeschlagen:

in Anerkennung des Artikels 66 Absatz 1 des TRIPS-Übereinkommens, der vorsieht, dass der „Rat für TRIPS [...] auf ordnungsgemäß begründeten Antrag eines der am wenigsten entwickelten Länder, das Mitglied ist, Verlängerungen dieser Frist“ gewährt,

beschließt:

Am wenigsten entwickelte Länder, die Mitglieder sind, müssen die Bestimmungen des Übereinkommens, außer Artikel 3, 4 und 5, nicht einhalten, bis sie nicht mehr zu den am wenigsten entwickelten Länder gehören.

1. Ist der Rat für oder gegen den Antrag der LDC-Gruppe auf Verlängerung der Übergangsfristen nach Artikel 66 Absatz 1 des TRIPS-Übereinkommens, wie im Dokument IP/C/W/583 gefordert?
2. Ist der Rat insbesondere damit einverstanden, dass am wenigsten entwickelte Länder, die Mitglied der WTO sind, die Bestimmungen des TRIPS-Übereinkommens außer Artikel 3, 4 und 5 nicht einhalten müssen, bis sie nicht mehr zu den am wenigsten entwickelten Länder gehören?
3. Der Rat wird gebeten, seinen Standpunkt zu dem Antrag (IP/C/W/583) ausführlich zu begründen.

Antwort

(15. April 2013)

Der Rat stellt fest, dass der EU als größter Handelsmacht der Welt, führendem Mittelgeber für ausländische Direktinvestitionen und weltweit größtem Entwicklungshilfegeber eine entscheidende Rolle bei der Unterstützung der Entwicklungsbemühungen der Partnerländer zukommt. Daher befürwortet der Rat es, auf konkrete Ergebnisse im Rahmen der WTO hinzuwirken, die insbesondere den am wenigsten entwickelten Ländern (LDC) und anderen in besonderem Maße bedürftigen Entwicklungsländern zugutekommen können ⁽¹⁾.

Im Anschluss an den Beschluss vom 17. Dezember 2011, in dem die Achte WTO-Ministerkonferenz den Rat für handelsbezogene Aspekte der Rechte des geistigen Eigentums (TRIPS) ersucht hatte, begründete Anträge von LDC-Mitgliedern auf Verlängerung ihrer Übergangsfrist gemäß Artikel 66.1. des TRIPS-Übereinkommens umfassend zu prüfen, hat der Rat — in seinen Schlussfolgerungen vom 16. März 2012 ⁽¹⁾ — die Kommission aufgefordert, solche Ersuchen um eine weitere Verlängerung der Frist zur Umsetzung des TRIPS für die LDC wohlwollend zu prüfen.

Wie von der Frau Abgeordneten angeführt, wurde der Antrag auf Verlängerung der Übergangsfrist — solange das besagte Mitglied den LDC-Status behält —, auf der Tagung des TRIPS-Rates im November 2012 eingereicht. Der Rat hat sich bisher nicht mit diesem konkreten Antrag befasst.

⁽¹⁾ Dok. 7412/12 WTO 86 DEVGEN 59 ACP 32 SPG 14 FDI 11 OC 120.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000827/13
to the Council
Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE)
(28 January 2013)

Subject: EU's position on extension of WTO TRIPS Agreement transition period for Least Developed Countries

On 5 November 2012, on behalf of the Least Developed Countries group (LDC group) of the World Trade Organisation (WTO), Haiti submitted a request (IP/C/W/583) to the WTO TRIPS Council for an extension of the transitional period under Article 66.1 of the WTO TRIPS Agreement. The request proposes the following decision:

'Recognising that Article 66.1 of the TRIPS Agreement provides that the Council for TRIPS "shall, upon duly motivated request by a least developed country Member, accord extensions of this period";

Decides as follows:

Least developed country Members shall not be required to apply the provisions of the Agreement, other than Articles 3, 4 and 5, until they cease to be a least developed country Member.'

1. Does the Council support or oppose the LDC group's request for an extension to the transition period under Article 66.1 of the TRIPS Agreement, as articulated in document IP/C/W/583?
2. In particular, does the Council agree that least developed country Members of the WTO should not be required to apply the provisions of the TRIPS Agreement, other than Articles 3, 4 and 5, until they cease to be least developed country Members?
3. Could the Council please detail its reasons for its position on the request (IP/C/W/583)?

Reply
(15 April 2013)

The Council recognises the EU's critical role as the world's largest trading power, a leading foreign direct investor, and the world's biggest provider of development assistance, in supporting development efforts of partner countries. Consequently, the Council supports working towards obtaining tangible results in the WTO context that can particularly benefit Least-Developed Countries (LDCs) and other developing countries most in need ⁽¹⁾.

Following the decision of 17 December 2011 in which the Eighth WTO Ministerial Conference invited the TRIPS Council to give full consideration to a duly motivated request from LDC Members for an extension of their transition period under Article 66.1 of the TRIPS Agreement, the Council — in its conclusions of 16 March 2012 ⁽¹⁾ — invited the Commission to give favourable consideration to such requests for further extension of the TRIPS implementation deadline for LDCs.

As the Honourable Member points out, the request for an extension of the transition period for as long as the member in question retains the LDC status was introduced at the TRIPS Council meeting in November 2012. The Council has not discussed this specific request thus far.

⁽¹⁾ Doc. 7412/12 WTO 86 DEVGEN 59 ACP 32 SPG 14 FDI 11 OC 120.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000828/13

an die Kommission

Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE)

(28. Januar 2013)

Betrifft: Standpunkt der EU zur Verlängerung der Übergangsfristen für das WTO-TRIPS-Übereinkommen für am wenigsten entwickelte Länder

Am 5. November 2012 stellte Haiti im Namen der Gruppe der am wenigsten entwickelten Länder (LDC-Gruppe) der Welthandelsorganisation (WTO) einen Antrag (IP/C/W/583) an den WTO-TRIPS-Rat auf Verlängerung der Übergangsfristen nach Artikel 66 Absatz 1 des WTO-TRIPS-Übereinkommens. In dem Antrag wird folgender Beschluss vorgeschlagen:

in Anerkennung des Artikels 66 Absatz 1 des TRIPS-Übereinkommens, der vorsieht, dass der „Rat für TRIPS [...] auf ordnungsgemäß begründeten Antrag eines der am wenigsten entwickelten Länder, das Mitglied ist, Verlängerungen dieser Frist“ gewährt,

beschließt:

Am wenigsten entwickelte Länder, die Mitglieder sind, müssen die Bestimmungen des Übereinkommens, außer Artikel 3, 4 und 5, nicht einhalten, bis sie nicht mehr zu den am wenigsten entwickelten Länder gehören.

1. Ist die Kommission für oder gegen den Antrag der LDC-Gruppe auf Verlängerung der Übergangsfristen nach Artikel 66 Absatz 1 des TRIPS-Übereinkommens, wie im Dokument IP/C/W/583 gefordert?
2. Ist die Kommission insbesondere damit einverstanden, dass am wenigsten entwickelte Länder, die Mitglied der WTO sind, die Bestimmungen des TRIPS-Übereinkommens außer Artikel 3, 4 und 5 nicht einhalten müssen, bis sie nicht mehr den am wenigsten entwickelten Länder gehören?
3. Die Kommission wird gebeten, ihren Standpunkt zum Antrag (IP/C/W/583) ausführlich zu begründen.

Antwort von Herrn De Gucht im Namen der Kommission

(12. März 2013)

Im TRIPS-Übereinkommen war ursprünglich vorgesehen, dass die am wenigsten entwickelten Länder erst von 1995 an gerechnet in zehn Jahren den Großteil der Bestimmungen anzuwenden brauchten. Auf einen entsprechenden Antrag hin war es möglich, die Übergangsfrist zu verlängern. Im Jahr 2005 einigte man sich auf eine Verlängerung von siebeneinhalb Jahren bis Juni 2013. Unterdessen war im Rahmen der Erklärung von Doha zum TRIPS-Übereinkommen und zur öffentlichen Gesundheit von 2001 bereits die Fristverlängerung für die Einhaltung der Bestimmungen bezüglich des Patent- und Datenschutzes von Arzneimitteln durch die LDC-Gruppe beschlossen worden.

Die Kommission prüft derzeit den Antrag der LDC-Gruppe nach Artikel 66 Absatz 1 des TRIPS-Übereinkommens, wie er dem Dokument IP/C/W/583 zu entnehmen ist, und die damit verbundenen Folgen. Der Antrag der LDC-Gruppe wird außerdem mit anderen Mitgliedern der Welthandelsorganisation in Genf diskutiert.

Die Kommission begrüßt eine Erörterung dieses Antrags basierend auf einer genauen Analyse des aktuellen Stands der Umsetzung. Obwohl sich durch den Schutz des geistigen Eigentums das Wirtschaftswachstum und die Entwicklung fördern, Auslandsinvestitionen ins Land holen und der Technologietransfer unterstützen lassen, wird in der Präambel des TRIPS-Übereinkommens anerkannt, dass die am wenigsten entwickelten Länder die größtmögliche Flexibilität beim Erlass von innerstaatlichen Gesetzen und Vorschriften brauchen. Die Kommission ist sich dessen voll und ganz bewusst und berücksichtigt dies auch in ihren Entscheidungsprozessen.

Folglich steht die Kommission einer Prüfung des Antrags, über den derzeit noch in Genf beraten wird, offen gegenüber. Die Kommission behält sich allerdings solange eine endgültige Stellungnahme vor, bis sie einen besseren Überblick über den aktuellen Stand der Umsetzung gewonnen hat. Dabei wird sie sich auf laufende Untersuchungen diesbezüglich stützen.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000828/13
to the Commission**

Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE)

(28 January 2013)

Subject: EU's position on extension of WTO TRIPS Agreement transition period for Least Developed Countries

On 5 November 2012, on behalf of the Least Developed Countries group (LDC group) of the World Trade Organisation (WTO), Haiti submitted a request (IP/C/W/583) to the WTO TRIPS Council for an extension of the transitional period under Article 66.1 of the WTO TRIPS Agreement. The request proposes the following decision:

'Recognising that Article 66.1 of the TRIPS Agreement provides that the Council for TRIPS "shall, upon duly motivated request by a least developed country Member, accord extensions of this period";

Decides as follows:

Least developed country Members shall not be required to apply the provisions of the Agreement, other than Articles 3, 4 and 5, until they cease to be a least developed country Member.'

1. Does the Commission support or oppose the LDC group's request for an extension to the transition period under Article 66.1 of the TRIPS Agreement, as articulated in document IP/C/W/583?
2. In particular, does the Commission agree that least developed country Members of the WTO should not be required to apply the provisions of the TRIPS Agreement, other than Articles 3, 4 and 5, until they cease to be least developed country Members?
3. Could the Commission please detail its reasons for its position on the request (IP/C/W/583)?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission

(12 March 2013)

The TRIPS Agreement originally allowed Least Developed Countries (LDCs) 10 years from 1995 to apply the bulk of its provisions. It was possible to extend the transition period was in response to a specific request, and in 2005, an extension was agreed for another 7 ½ years until June 2013. Meanwhile, the 2001 Doha Declaration on TRIPS and Public Health had already extended the period for LDCs to comply with provisions on patent and data protection for pharmaceuticals to 2016.

In regard to the LDC group's request under Article 66.1 of the TRIPS Agreement, as articulated in document IP/C/W/583, the Commission is assessing the request and its implications. The LDC group's request is also being discussed with other WTO members in Geneva.

The Commission welcomes a discussion on this request, based on proper analysis of the current state of play of implementation. While intellectual property is a means to foster economic growth and development, attract foreign investment and technology transfer, the TRIPS Agreement's preamble acknowledges LDCs' particular needs for maximum flexibility in implementing laws and regulations domestically, which the Commission fully appreciates and considers in its decision making.

The Commission is thus open to examining the request, which is still under discussion in Geneva. It has not yet adopted a final position on the matter and will only do so once it has obtained a better understanding of the actual state of implementation, of which there are ongoing studies which will help in this regard.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000829/13
to the Commission**

Catherine Stihler (S&D)

(28 January 2013)

Subject: Insolvency and consumer protection

In January 2013, various companies in the UK went into administration. In particular, the music chain HMV, which offers gift cards that are particularly popular with consumers at Christmas, had to call in the administrators. Therefore, HMV gift cards already received by consumers effectively became worthless the second the company collapsed. Once a company is in administration, the administrators are under no obligation to honour its vouchers. Gift vouchers are in effect a debt owed by the company, and if it goes bust, anyone with a voucher it has issued becomes an unsecured creditor, with a long and uncertain wait to get any money back. However, administrators have discretion to carry on accepting vouchers after a company has failed. Furthermore, if the business is sold to someone else, there is no guarantee that the buyer will continue to accept the vouchers. Even if a business is sold and continues trading under the same name, the new owner is a separate legal entity and is under no obligation to honour the obligations — including vouchers — issued by the original concern.

In the case of HMV, the administrators have changed their original plans and offered refunds to consumers. However, while there are provisions from the EU on cross-border insolvency, is the Commission doing any work on protecting consumers in cases where a company ends up in administration?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission

(2 April 2013)

The recovery rate of consumer claims in insolvency proceedings will traditionally depend on economic factors -such as the assets' value, the proportion of secured and priority claims, the viability of the business which can lead to its liquidation or to its restructuring and possibly the transfer of undertakings. Regulatory factors are also key — as the possibility of reorganisation or debt settlement, the ranking of claims and the powers of the administrator under domestic insolvency law.

The Commission, on 12 December 2012, proposed to modernise the current EU rules on cross-border insolvency ⁽¹⁾. The new rules will shift focus away from liquidation and develop a new approach to helping businesses overcome financial difficulties, all the while protecting creditors' right to get their money back. The revision of the Insolvency Regulation is a key first step. However there are a number of areas where differences between domestic insolvency laws — such as the time period for debt discharge, the conditions for opening proceedings, the filing of claims and restructuring plans — have the greatest potential to hamper the establishment of an efficient insolvency legal framework in the internal market. This may diminish the prospects of successful restructuring and reduce the value of the insolvent company, to the detriment of all creditors including consumer claim holders. In this context the Commission Communication launches a reflection process on a new European approach to business failure and insolvency. The Commission has presented these measures at a Parliament workshop organised by the Committee on Legal Affairs on 23 January 2013.

⁽¹⁾ Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Council Regulation (EC) No 1346/2000 on insolvency proceedings, COM(2012) 744;
Communication to the European Parliament, the Council and the European Economic and Social Committee: 'A new European approach to business failure and insolvency', COM(2012) 742;
Report to the European Parliament, the Council and the European Economic and Social Committee on the application of Regulation (EC) No 1346/2000, COM(2012) 743.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000830/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(28 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Medicamentos para a febre e lesões hepáticas

Foi noticiado que medicamentos usados frequentemente para reduzir a febre e a dor em crianças, tais como o ibuprofeno e o naproxeno, podem provocar lesões renais graves, especialmente quando associados a algum grau de desidratação devido à gripe ou a outras doenças. A conclusão é de um estudo científico liderado por uma equipa de cientistas das universidades de Indiana e de Butler, nos EUA. Este concluiu que quase 3 % dos casos de lesão renal aguda pediátrica registados ao longo de 11 anos no hospital pediátrico local podem ser diretamente associados à toma de anti-inflamatórios não esteróides comuns (NSAID).

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Tem conhecimento deste estudo?
2. Que medidas pretende tomar relativamente às conclusões agora conhecidas e que relacionam o uso de NSAID com lesões renais?
3. Pondera fazer incluir esta informação nos resumos das características destes medicamentos e nos respetivos folhetos informativos?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(11 de março de 2013)

1. Resposta conjunta aos pontos 1 e 2. Em conformidade com a legislação aplicável no domínio farmacêutico ⁽¹⁾, a segurança de um medicamento autorizado é continuamente monitorizada, a fim de garantir a adoção de medidas adequadas caso seja identificada uma evolução do risco ou o aparecimento de um risco novo. A fiscalização da literatura médica com vista à deteção de reações adversas suspeitas constitui parte integrante das obrigações de farmacovigilância dos titulares das autorizações de introdução no mercado e da Agência Europeia de Medicamentos. A avaliação de questões de segurança relativamente aos medicamentos para uso humano a nível da UE é realizada pela Agência, seguida de uma decisão da Comissão sobre a adoção de medidas regulamentares, se for caso disso.

As autorizações de comercialização de anti-inflamatórios não esteróides comuns (NSAID) que contêm naproxeno e ibuprofeno foram concedidas pelos Estados-Membros, que são, por conseguinte, as autoridades competentes no que respeita a esses produtos.

Até ao momento, não foi remetido à UE, para análise e discussão, qualquer sinal de alerta relativo ao ibuprofeno e ao naproxeno e ao potencial risco de lesões renais. Todavia, anteriores dúvidas motivaram, a nível da UE, a análise de vários aspetos de segurança dos NSAID, designadamente no que respeita a efeitos cardio-renais, gastrointestinais e de hipersensibilidade ou a reações cutâneas e hepatotoxicidade ⁽²⁾.

A Comissão não foi informada sobre o estudo mencionado, mas procederá à sua cuidadosa análise caso o Senhor Deputado fizer o favor de no-lo enviar.

3. Os resumos das características e os folhetos informativos fazem parte da autorização de introdução no mercado dos medicamentos. Por conseguinte, no que respeita a produtos que contenham ibuprofeno e naproxeno, é da competência dos Estados-Membros garantir que as informações que os acompanham refletem os conhecimentos mais atualizados sobre os respetivos benefícios e riscos.

⁽¹⁾ Regulamento (CE) n.º 726/2004 que estabelece procedimentos comunitários de autorização e de fiscalização de medicamentos para uso humano e veterinário e que institui uma Agência Europeia de Medicamentos, JO L 136 de 30.4.2004, alterado; Diretiva 2001/83/CE que estabelece um código comunitário relativo aos medicamentos para uso humano, JO L 311 de 28.11.2001, alterada.

⁽²⁾ http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/news_and_events/news/2012/10/news_detail_001637.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058004d5c1

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000830/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(28 January 2013)

Subject: Fever-reducing drugs and liver damage

There have been reports that certain medications commonly used to reduce fever and pain in children, such as ibuprofen and naproxen, can lead to serious kidney damage, particularly when associated with some degree of dehydration from flu or other illnesses. These are the findings of a scientific study led by a group of scientists from Indiana University and Butler University in the US. Their research shows that over 11 years, nearly 3 % of cases of acute kidney lesions in children at a local paediatric hospital could be linked directly to the children having taken common nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs).

I ask the Commission:

1. Is it aware of this research?
2. What action does it intend to take regarding these findings that associate the use of NSAIDs with kidney damage?
3. Does it plan to include this information in the summaries of product characteristics and the respective leaflets for these drugs?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(11 March 2013)

1 and 2. In accordance with the pharmaceutical legislation ⁽¹⁾, the safety of an authorised medicinal product is continuously monitored to ensure, that appropriate action is taken if a signal of a new or changed risk is identified. Monitoring of the medical literature for suspected adverse reactions is part of the pharmacovigilance obligations of marketing authorisation holders and the European Medicines Agency. Assessment of safety issues for human medicines at EU-level is performed by the Agency, followed by a Commission Decision on regulatory actions, if appropriate.

Marketing authorisations for non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) containing naproxen and ibuprofen have been granted by the Member States, which are therefore competent authorities for the products.

A safety signal on ibuprofen and naproxen and potential risk of kidney damage has so far not been referred to EU-level analysis and discussion. However, previous EU referrals have considered several safety aspects of NSAIDs including cardio-renal, gastrointestinal, hypersensitivity or skin reactions and hepatotoxicity ⁽²⁾.

The Commission has not been made aware of the particular research mentioned, but will thoroughly look at it if the Honourable Member forwards it.

3. Summaries of product characteristics and package leaflets are part of the marketing authorisation of medicinal products. Therefore for naproxen- and ibuprofen-containing products it is the competence of Member States to ensure that their product information reflects current knowledge on benefits and risks of respective medicinal products.

⁽¹⁾ Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 laying down Community procedures for the authorisation and supervision of medicinal products for human and veterinary use and establishing a European Medicines Agency (OJ L 136, 30.4.2004) as amended and Directive 2001/83/EC on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use (OJ L 311, 28.11.2001) as amended.

⁽²⁾ http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/news_and_events/news/2012/10/news_detail_001637.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058004d5c1

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000831/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(28 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Declarações do Comissário Laszlo Andor sobre o emprego

Segundo a Agência noticiosa EFE, o Comissário europeu para o Emprego, Assuntos Sociais e Inclusão, Laszlo Andor, alertou para a possibilidade de a Europa perder uma geração se não adotar medidas para a criação de emprego.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

- Que medidas concretas pretende tomar a este respeito?
- Em que é que estas medidas diferem dos planos anteriormente apresentados com o mesmo propósito?
- Que balanço faz da aplicação das medidas anteriores?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(18 de março de 2013)

Em 5 de dezembro de 2012, a Comissão adotou o Pacote de Emprego dos Jovens ⁽¹⁾, o qual inclui uma proposta de Recomendação do Conselho relativa ao estabelecimento de uma Garantia para a Juventude, que exorta os Estados-Membros a garantir que todos os jovens com menos de 25 anos recebam uma boa oferta de emprego, ensino, estágio ou aprendizagem, nos quatro meses subsequentes ao abandono da educação formal ou à perda do emprego. Em 28 de fevereiro de 2013, chegou-se a um acordo político no Conselho.

No âmbito deste pacote de medidas, foi igualmente lançada uma consulta dos parceiros sociais sobre um quadro de qualidade para os estágios destinado a garantir que os estágios servem realmente de trampolim para o emprego. Uma vez que os parceiros sociais decidiram não negociar um acordo ao abrigo do artigo 155.º do TFUE, a Comissão irá apresentar a sua proposta até finais de 2013.

Foi ainda anunciada a criação da Aliança Europeia para a Aprendizagem e proposto um conjunto de medidas para reforçar a mobilidade dos trabalhadores jovens.

Em contraste com anteriores iniciativas, o pacote de medidas em prol do emprego juvenil terá o apoio da Iniciativa para o Emprego dos Jovens (IEJ), anunciada pelo Conselho Europeu em 7 e 8 de fevereiro. Esta iniciativa vai disponibilizar pelo menos 6 mil milhões de euros no período 2014-2020 a todas as regiões com níveis de desemprego juvenil superiores a 25 %.

Para mais detalhes relativamente à concretização de ações anteriores, em especial a Iniciativa Oportunidades para a Juventude ⁽²⁾, remete-se para a comunicação «Ajudar à transição dos jovens para o emprego» ⁽³⁾.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2012) 727-728-729 final de 5 de dezembro de 2012.

⁽²⁾ COM(2011) 933 final de 20 de dezembro de 2011.

⁽³⁾ COM(2012) 727 final de 5 de dezembro de 2012.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000831/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(28 January 2013)**

Subject: Statements by Commissioner László Andor on employment

According to the EFE news agency, the European Commissioner for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion, László Andor, has warned that the EU runs the risk of creating a lost generation if action is not taken to create jobs.

- What specific action will the Commission take in this regard?
- How does that action differ from plans presented in the past with the same goal?
- What view does it take of how previous action has been implemented?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(18 March 2013)**

On 5 December 2012, the Commission adopted a Youth Employment Package ⁽¹⁾ (YEP), which includes a proposal for a Council Recommendation on establishing a Youth Guarantee, recommending Member States to ensure that all young people under 25 receive a good quality offer of a job, further education, a traineeship or an apprenticeship within four months of leaving formal education or becoming unemployed. A political agreement was reached on 28 February 2013 in the Council.

The YEP also launched a social partner consultation on a Quality Framework for Traineeships to ensure that traineeships really serve as a stepping stone to a job. Since social partners decided not to negotiate towards an agreement under Art 155 TFEU, the Commission will present its proposal by the end of 2013.

The YEP also announced the launch of a European Alliance for Apprenticeships, and proposed several measures to enhance young workers' mobility.

As a major difference to earlier initiatives, the implementation of the YEP, will be supported by the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI), announced by the European Council of 7-8 February. The YEI makes available at least EUR 6 billion for 2014-2020 to all regions with levels of youth unemployment above 25%.

As for the implementation of previous action, and in particular the Youth Opportunities Initiative ⁽²⁾, the YEP communication 'Moving youth into employment' ⁽³⁾ contains a detailed overview.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2012) 727-728-729 final of 5 December 2012.

⁽²⁾ COM(2011) 933 final of 20 December 2011.

⁽³⁾ COM(2012) 727 final of 5 December 2012.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000872/13
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(28 gennaio 2013)**

Oggetto: Caso di doppio incarico e stipendio UE/Presidenza del Consiglio italiano

Risulta all'interrogante che l'alto funzionario europeo Elisabetta Olivi continui a percepire integralmente l'intero stipendio comunitario, pur avendo assunto da tempo — come chiaramente risulta dal sito della Presidenza del Consiglio italiano — il ruolo di portavoce del Presidente del Consiglio, Prof. Mario Monti.

Intende la Commissione esaminare l'eventuale incompatibilità sia fra i due incarichi sia sul contemporaneo mantenimento dei due relativi stipendi?

**Risposta congiunta di Maros Šefčovič a nome della Commissione
(21 marzo 2013)**

Così come le amministrazioni degli Stati membri distaccano a loro carico gli esperti nazionali presso la Commissione, la Commissione può distaccare funzionari presso gli Stati membri in virtù dell'articolo 37 dello statuto dei funzionari. In realtà questi distaccamenti reciproci rappresentano un mezzo di collaborazione amministrativa consolidato e sono fortemente apprezzati sia dalla Commissione che dagli Stati membri.

La Commissione concede un distaccamento previa un'apposita valutazione individuale dell'interesse del servizio; inoltre vengono svolte revisioni periodiche durante il distaccamento per valutare se l'interesse del servizio lo giustifichi ancora.

Per motivi di protezione dei dati, la Commissione non può rivelare informazioni specifiche sul tipo di personale distaccato e sulla sua retribuzione. Gli stipendi base dei funzionari della Commissione sono pubblicamente disponibili nello statuto dei funzionari:
(<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:1962R0031:20110101:EN:PDF>; pagina 221).

Ai funzionari distaccati al di fuori della loro istituzione continua ad applicarsi lo statuto dei funzionari.

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000832/13
aan de Commissie
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(28 januari 2013)**

Betref: Nationale „experts” op loonlijst Europese Commissie

Vrijdag 25 januari bevestigde een woordvoerder van de Commissie dat Elisabetta Olivi, woordvoerder van de Italiaanse premier Mario Monti, op de loonlijst staat van de Commissie. Tevens werd bevestigd dat een tweede adviseur van Monti eveneens op de loonlijst staat ⁽¹⁾. In dat kader de volgende vragen:

1. Kan de Commissie aangeven in welke andere Europese lidstaten nog meer „experts”, „adviseurs” of anderssoortige medewerk(st)ers van nationale overheden c.q. regeringsleden op de loonlijst van de Commissie staan?
2. Kan de Commissie aangeven wat de taakomschrijving van deze bovenstaande personen is en met welk doel zij de Italiaanse premier „bijstaan”?
3. Op grond van welke Europese regelgeving kan een nationale regering van een lidstaat dit soort „experts” op kosten van de Commissie inhuren?
4. Bent u het met de PVV eens dat dit soort „congsi's” indruisen tegen iedere ethisch-morele gedragscode van overheden in het algemeen en die van de Commissie in het bijzonder?
5. Kunt u exact aangeven om welke loonbedragen het hier gaat en uit welke begrotingslijn zij worden gefinancierd?
6. Onder wiens eindverantwoordelijkheid vallen zij? Onder die van premier Monti of die van de Commissie?
7. Bent u met de PVV van mening dat hier sprake lijkt van ernstige belangenverstremming en politieke beïnvloeding in het democratische rechtsstaatsproces van lidstaat Italië en dat dit zeer ongewenst is?
8. Zou een Italiaanse regering onder leiding van de heer Berlusconi ook aanspraak kunnen maken op een door de Commissie betaalde „expert”, „woordvoerder”, „adviseur” of anderszins?

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000915/13
aan de Commissie
Daniël van der Stoep (NI)
(29 januari 2013)**

Betref: Wordvoerster van de heer Monti

Op EUobserver.com ⁽²⁾ stond een artikel waarin melding werd gemaakt van het feit dat de woordvoerster van de heer Monti, mevrouw Olivi, op de loonlijst staat bij de Europese Commissie.

Volgens het artikel verzekeren de partijen de EU-regels te respecteren. Sterker, volgens DailyMail Online ⁽³⁾ is het werk van mevrouw Olivi in het belang van de Commissie. Ten aanzien hiervan zou ik graag het volgende willen weten:

1. Waarom wordt mevrouw Olivi betaald door de Commissie, terwijl zij de woordvoerster van de heer Monti is?
2. Welke regels voorzien in de mogelijkheid van een dergelijke situatie?
3. Waarom wordt mevrouw Olivi niet betaald door de Italiaanse staat?
4. Waaruit bestaat het in de tweede alinea genoemde belang van de Commissie om mevrouw Olivi te betalen?

⁽¹⁾ <http://euobserver.com/tickers/118855>

⁽²⁾ <http://euobserver.com/tickers/118855>

⁽³⁾ <http://synonblog.dailymail.co.uk/2013/01/eu-commission-staff-member-now-acting-as-the-italian-prime-ministers-offical-spokesman.html>

5. Zijn er meer gevallen waarbij personeel van regeringsleiders en/of ministers van lidstaten op de loonlijst staan van de Commissie? Zo ja, welke gevallen betreft dit?
6. Indien sprake is van andere gevallen, waarbij personen die de facto werk verrichten voor regeringsleiders en/of ministers van lidstaten op de loonlijst staan van Commissie, wil ik ook graag weten waarom dit gebeurt en welke regels voorzien in de mogelijkheid van een dergelijke situatie.
7. Zijn er andere gevallen bekend, waarbij personen een dienstverband hebben met de Commissie, maar de facto werken voor een openbaar orgaan van een lidstaat?
8. Van alle gevraagde gevallen ontvang ik graag een compleet en helder overzicht.

Antwoord van de heer Šefčovič namens de Commissie

(21 maart 2013)

Net zoals lidstaten nationale deskundigen op hun loonlijst kunnen detacheren bij de Commissie, kan de Commissie op grond van artikel 37 van het personeelsstatuut ambtenaren detacheren bij de lidstaten. Deze wederzijdse detacheringen vormen een gevestigd instrument voor administratieve samenwerking en worden zowel door de Commissie als door de lidstaten bijzonder op prijs gesteld.

De Commissie staat een detachering pas toe na een individuele ad-hocbeoordeling van het belang van de dienst. De detachering wordt regelmatig geëvalueerd om na te gaan of ze nog steeds gerechtvaardigd is in het belang van de dienst.

Omwille van gegevensbescherming kan de Commissie geen specifieke informatie vrijgeven over de graad van de gedetacheerde personeelsleden en hun salarissen. De basissalarissen van personeelsleden van de Commissie zijn beschikbaar voor het publiek in het personeelsstatuut (<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:1962R0031:201110101:EN:PDF>; pagina 221).

Ambtenaren van de Commissie die buiten hun instelling gedetacheerd worden, blijven gebonden door het personeelsstatuut.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000832/13
to the Commission
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(28 January 2013)**

Subject: National 'experts' on the Commission's payroll

On Friday, 25 January, a Commission spokesman confirmed that Elisabetta Olivi, a spokeswoman for the Prime Minister of Italy, Mario Monti, was on the Commission's payroll. At the same time it was also confirmed that a second adviser to Monti was also on the payroll ⁽¹⁾.

1. Can the Commission indicate in what other EU Member States 'experts', 'advisers' or other kinds of staff of national authorities or members of the government are on the Commission's payroll?
2. Can the Commission indicate what the above persons' job description is and for what purpose they are 'assisting' the Italian Prime Minister?
3. On the basis of what European legislation can a national government of a Member State hire such 'experts' at the Commission's expense?
4. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that such 'coteries' contravene any conceivable ethical and moral code of conduct for authorities in general, and that of the Commission in particular?
5. Can the Commission indicate exactly how much pay these people are receiving, and under what budget heading they are financed?
6. To whom are they ultimately answerable — to Prime Minister Monti or to the Commission?
7. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that there seems to be a serious conflict of interests here and that political influence is being brought to bear in the democratic process, affecting the rule of law in the Member State Italy, and that this is highly undesirable?
8. Could an Italian Government headed by Mr Berlusconi likewise expect assistance from an 'expert', 'spokesperson' or 'adviser' paid by the Commission or in some other form?

**Question for written answer E-000872/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(28 January 2013)**

Subject: Two posts and two salaries — one from the EU and the other from the Italian Prime Minister's Office

It would appear that a senior EU official, Elisabetta Olivi, is continuing to receive her full EU salary even though — as is apparent from the website of the Italian Prime Minister's Office — she long ago took on the role of spokesperson for Italian Prime Minister Mario Monti.

Will the Commission look into the possible incompatibility between these two positions and whether she should be receiving two salaries at the same time?

**Question for written answer E-000915/13
to the Commission
Daniël van der Stoep (NI)
(29 January 2013)**

Subject: Mr Monti's spokeswoman

EUobserver.com has published an article reporting that Mr Monti's spokeswoman, Ms Olivi, is on the European Commission's payroll ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://euobserver.com/tickers/118855>

⁽²⁾ <http://euobserver.com/tickers/118855>

According to the article, the parties gave assurances to respect EU rules. What is more, according to Daily Mail Online ⁽³⁾, Ms Olivi's work is in the interest of the Commission. In this regard I would like to know the following:

1. Why is Ms Olivi being paid by the Commission while she is Mr Monti's spokeswoman?
2. What rules allow such a situation?
3. Why is Ms Olivi not being paid by the Italian state?
4. What exactly is the Commission's interest in paying Ms Olivi, as mentioned in the second paragraph?
5. Are there more cases where the staff of Member States' heads of government and/or ministers are on the Commission's payroll? If so, what are those cases?
6. If there are other cases where persons de facto working for Member States' heads of government and/or ministers are paid by the Commission, I would also like to know why this happens and what rules allow such a situation.
7. Are there other known cases where persons are in the Commission's employment while de facto working for a Member State's public body?
8. I would like to receive a complete and clear overview of all such cases.

Joint answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(21 March 2013)

Just like Member States' administrations second national experts on their payroll to the Commission, the Commission can second officials to the Member States on the basis of Article 37 of the Staff Regulations. In fact, these two-way secondments represent an established means of administrative collaboration and are very much appreciated both by the Commission and the Member States.

A secondment is granted by the Commission after an ad hoc individual assessment of the interest of the service and regular reviews take place during the secondment to assess if the interest of the service still justifies it.

For reasons of data protection, the Commission cannot disclose specific information on the grade of the seconded staff and their salaries. The scale of basic salaries of Commission Officials is publicly available in the Staff Regulations (<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:1962R0031:20110101:EN:PDF>; page 221).

The Commission officials seconded outside their institution continue to be bound by the Staff Regulations.

⁽³⁾ <http://synonblog.dailymail.co.uk/2013/01/eu-commission-staff-member-now-acting-as-the-italian-prime-ministers-offical-spokesman.html>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000833/13
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(28 January 2013)**

Subject: Environmental impact of tourism

Tourism can have a harsh impact on the environment in popular tourist regions. This, coupled with climate change, will undoubtedly cause much damage to many of Europe's popular tourist areas.

What is the Commission doing to reduce the impact of tourism on the environment of tourist destinations throughout the EU?

Does the Commission believe that measures need to be introduced to minimise the impact of tourism on the environment?

If so, what measures does the Commission believe are necessary?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(21 March 2013)**

The Commission acknowledges that the EU tourism industry needs to be responsibly and sustainably managed to avoid negative impacts on the environment in popular tourist destinations, many of which are vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change. The industry thereby needs to make the utmost of the role it can play in the preservation of the diverse natural landscapes.

The Commission has already proposed several EU level initiatives to encourage sustainable, including environmentally friendly, tourism management. These include the development of a European system of indicators for the sustainable management of tourist destinations ⁽¹⁾, as well as an award for non-traditional 'European destinations of excellence' (EDEN) ⁽²⁾. It has also co-financed projects related to cycle or hiking tourism, encouraging the reduction of CO₂ emissions in the tourism industry.

Moreover, the Commission offers and supports tools such as the European Eco-Management and Audit Scheme (EMAS) ⁽³⁾ to facilitate sound environmental management for businesses. It furthermore promotes tourism accommodations and campsites with high environmental performances through the use of the EU Ecolabel ⁽⁴⁾.

Measures to minimise the negative impact of tourism on environment should be an integral part of tourism sustainability strategies at all levels. If left unconsidered, climate change could further increase the vulnerability of natural resources and landscapes in tourist regions.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/sustainable-tourism/indicators/index_en.htm
⁽²⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/eden/index_en.htm
⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/environment/emas/index_en.htm
⁽⁴⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/ecolabel/>

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000836/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(28 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Κίνδυνος παύσης της λειτουργίας των Κέντρων Εκπαίδευσης και Αποκατάστασης Τυφλών σε Αθήνα και Θεσσαλονίκη

Τα Κέντρα Εκπαίδευσης και Αποκατάστασης Τυφλών (ΚΕΑΤ) σε Θεσσαλονίκη και Αθήνα κινδυνεύουν να κλείσουν λόγω της καθυστέρησης του διορισμού διοικητή, ενώ πρόσφατα έγινε γνωστό σχέδιο συγχώνευσής τους από σχετικό έγγραφο της Διεύθυνσης Οργανωτικής Ανάπτυξης του Υπουργείου Διοικητικής Μεταρρύθμισης & Ηλεκτρονικής Διακυβέρνησης ⁽¹⁾. Η Ένωση Τυφλών Β. Ελλάδος θεωρεί ότι αυτό είναι ένα βήμα για επιπλέον συρρίκνωση των υπηρεσιών του Ιδρύματος καθώς δεν υφίστανται οι στρατηγικές και τακτικές επίτευξης του ουσιαστικού σκοπού, που είναι η κοινωνική ανέλιξη του τυφλού ατόμου. Προσθέτει δε ότι «Αυτό που οφείλει η Πολιτεία να πράξει για την ανάπτυξη του Ιδρύματος και που αποτελεί παράλληλα πάγια θέση του συλλόγου μας είναι η ενίσχυση των ήδη υπαρχόντων τμημάτων αλλά και η σύσταση νέων, με γνώμονα τις σύγχρονες απαιτήσεις και τις ανάγκες για εκπαίδευση και προστασία των ατόμων με προβλήματα όρασης». Το ΚΕΑΤ προσφέρει σε άτομα με προβλήματα όρασης σημαντικές ευκαιρίες και δυνατότητες στην απασχόληση και την κοινωνική ζωή. Το έργο του είναι αξιόλογο και μοναδικό και η προσφορά του στην κοινωνία είναι αναμφισβήτητη. Επιπρόσθετα, προβλήματα έχουν αναφερθεί και για τη λειτουργία της Σχολής Τυφλών Θεσσαλονίκης, λόγω ελλείψεως προσωπικού ⁽²⁾.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Έχει ενημέρωση από το κράτος-μέλος για τις δυσλειτουργίες του ΚΕΑΤ σε Αθήνα και Θεσσαλονίκη, και στη Σχολή Τυφλών Θεσσαλονίκης;
2. Έχουν ζητήσει η τρώικα και ο εκπρόσωπος της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής σε αυτήν περικοπές δαπανών στις πολιτικές για τα άτομα με προβλήματα όρασης, και, αν ναι, πού;
3. Τι πόρους του ΕΣΠΑ έχει αξιοποιήσει το κράτος-μέλος μέχρι τώρα για την ουσιαστική ένταξη αυτών των συμπολιτών μας στην οικονομική και κοινωνική ζωή;
4. Είναι σε γνώση της κάποιο εθνικό σχέδιο δράσης με στόχους, χρονοδιαγράμματα και εργαλεία εφαρμογής;
5. Τι μέτρα προτίθεται να αναλάβει ώστε να υποστηριχθεί και να ενισχυθεί η λειτουργία υποδομών υποστήριξης των τυφλών πολιτών της Ελλάδας;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(27 Μαρτίου 2013)

Οι ελληνικές αρχές διεξάγουν αξιολόγηση των δομών των υπουργείων με στόχο να καταστεί αποτελεσματική η δημόσια διοίκηση. Η εν λόγω αξιολόγηση από τις ελληνικές αρχές αφορά τις λειτουργίες τόσο των υπουργείων όσο και ορισμένων φορέων που τελούν υπό την εποπτεία τους. Η Επιτροπή δεν είναι ενήμερη για τυχόν πρόταση συγχώνευσης των Κέντρων Αποκατάστασης Αθήνας και Θεσσαλονίκης και δεν διαθέτει καμιά πληροφορία σχετικά με τα συγκεκριμένα θέματα στα οποία αναφέρεται το Αξιότιμο Μέλος, το οποίο θα μπορούσε ενδεχομένως να συλλέξει τις απαιτούμενες πληροφορίες από τις ελληνικές αρχές.

Η Επιτροπή δεν έχει προτείνει περικοπές στις δαπάνες για τις πολιτικές που αφορούν άτομα με προβλήματα όρασης.

⁽¹⁾ http://www.etbe.gr/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=178:2013-01-17-11-55-47&catid=25:news&Itemid=53. Σχετικά με το ΚΕΑΤ Θεσσαλονίκης, πρόσφατα έγινε γνωστό ότι δεν θα δέχεται πλέον νεοσυμφωθέντες ηλικίας άνω των 18 ετών.

⁽²⁾ http://www.etbe.gr/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=175:2012-12-14-11-01-59&catid=34:2009-05-29-16-26-25&Itemid=54

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000836/13
to the Commission
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(28 January 2013)

Subject: Risk of closure of Athens and Thessaloniki Centres for Education and Rehabilitation for the Blind

The Athens and Thessaloniki Centres for Education and Rehabilitation for the Blind are at risk of closure, due to the delay in appointing an administrator and, according to a recent letter from the Directorate of Organisational Development of the Ministry of Administrative Reform and e-Governance, there are plans to merge them. The Association of Blind People ⁽¹⁾ of Northern Greece considers that this is a step towards further cutbacks in the Thessaloniki Centre's services, as there are no strategies or tactics for achieving its basic objective, i.e. the social deployment of blind people. It adds: 'What the State needs to do in order to develop the Centre, and this is also the Association's standard approach, is to support departments which already exist and establish new departments based on contemporary requirements and needs in terms of educating and protecting people with impaired vision'. The Centre offers people with impaired vision important opportunities and potential in employment and social life. It does important and unique work and its contribution to society is uncontested. Furthermore, problems have also been reported at the Thessaloniki School for the Blind, due to staff shortages ⁽²⁾.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Has Greece advised it of the problems at the Athens and Thessaloniki Centres for Education and Rehabilitation for the Blind and at the Thessaloniki School for the Blind?
2. Have the Troika and the European Commission representative in the Troika demanded cutbacks in spending on policies for people with impaired vision and, if so, where?
3. What NSRF funds has Greece used to date for the purposes of the proper integration of these fellow citizens into economic and social life?
4. Is it aware of any national action plan with targets, timetables and application instruments?
5. What measures does it intend to take to support and strengthen infrastructures to support blind citizens in Greece?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2013)

The Greek authorities conduct an assessment of structures of the ministries to allow for an efficient public administration. This assessment by the Greek authorities concerns the functions of both the ministries and a number of entities they supervise. The Commission is not aware of any proposal to merge the Athens and Thessaloniki Centres for Rehabilitation and does not have any information on the specific issues the Honourable Member refers to. The Honourable Member may be able to obtain the requested information from the Greek authorities.

The Commission has not suggested cutbacks in spending on policies for people with impaired vision.

⁽¹⁾ http://www.etbe.gr/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=178:2013-01-17-11-55-47&catid=25:news&Itemid=53. It was recently announced that the Thessaloniki Centre for Education and Rehabilitation for the Blind will not accept persons over the age of 18 who recently lost their sight.

⁽²⁾ http://www.etbe.gr/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=175:2012-12-14-11-01-59&catid=34:2009-05-29-16-26-25&Itemid=54.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-000839/13

til Kommissionen

Anna Rosbach (ECR)

(28. januar 2013)

Om: Antibiotika uden recept

En meget vigtig ting i forbindelse med bekæmpelsen af den voksende trussel fra antimikrobiel resistens er at sikre, at antibiotika anvendes med forsigtighed. Imidlertid kommer der stadig meldinger om, at folk kan købe antibiotika uden recept i medlemsstaterne

1. I hvilke medlemsstater er det stadig muligt at købe antibiotika uden recept på lovlig vis (enten til mennesker eller til veterinær brug)?
2. I hvilke medlemsstater rapporteres der om, at det stadig er muligt at købe antibiotika uden recept (til enten mennesker eller dyr), selv om det måske ikke er lovligt?
3. Hvilke planer har Kommissionen for at gøre noget ved dette spørgsmål?
4. Hvor meget antibiotikum (til mennesker og dyr) er der blevet solgt uden recept i EU i de sidste ti år?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Tonio Borg

(22. marts 2013)

På baggrund af oplysninger fra medlemsstaterne vises det i Kommissionens rapport om gennemførelsen af Rådets henstilling (2002/77/EF) om hensigtsmæssig brug af antimikrobielle stoffer i humanmedicin ⁽¹⁾, at der ikke blev solgt antibiotika til human brug uden recept i 11 lande (Danmark, Tyskland, Irland, Frankrig, Luxembourg, Ungarn, Slovenien, Slovakiet, Finland, Sverige og Norge). Syv lande (Belgien, Tjekkiet, Estland, Italien, Nederlandene, Østrig og Det Forenede Kongerige) indberettede, at et sådant salg muligvis udgjorde op til 1 % af det samlede salg af antibiotika til human brug inden for deres territorier. Kommissionen agter fortsat at overvåge situationen og at præsentere en tredje gennemførelsesrapport i 2014.

Kommissionen har udsendt en indkaldelse af forslag om antimikrobiel resistens og forskning i årsagerne til ikke-hensigtsmæssig brug af antibiotika i humanmedicin ⁽²⁾. Denne forberedende foranstaltning vil dokumentere forekomst af salg og forbrug af antimikrobielle stoffer uden recept og vil identificere nationale tiltag og national lovgivning, der er blevet udviklet og gennemført for at håndhæve receptreglerne.

Al veterinær antibiotika til behandling af dyr, der anvendes til produktion af fødevarer, skal være dyrlægeordineret. Kommissionen har ingen data om salg af veterinær antibiotika uden recept.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/health/antimicrobial_resistance/docs/amr_report2_en.pdf

⁽²⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/health_consumer/funding/call_amr_en.htm

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000839/13
to the Commission
Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(28 January 2013)**

Subject: Prescription-free antibiotics

One of the important issues in combating the growing threat of antimicrobial resistance is making sure that antibiotics are being used carefully. Yet there are still reports of people being able to buy prescription-free antibiotics in the Member States.

1. In which Member States is it still possible to legally buy prescription-free antibiotics (for either human or veterinary use)?
2. In which Member States are there reports that, even though this might not be legal, it is still possible to buy prescription-free antibiotics (for either human or veterinary use)?
3. What plans does the Commission have to act on this issue?
4. How many prescription-free antibiotics (for human and veterinary use) have been sold in the EU in the past 10 years?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(22 March 2013)**

On the basis of information provided by the Member States, the Commission's report on the implementation of Council Recommendation (2002/77/EC) on the prudent use of antimicrobial agents in human medicine ⁽¹⁾ shows that in 11 countries (Finland, France, Germany, Denmark, Hungary, Ireland, Luxembourg, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden and Norway) no human antibiotics were sold without prescription. Seven countries (Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Estonia, Italy, the Netherlands and the UK) reported that such sales might contribute to less than 1% of total sales of human antibiotics within their territories. The Commission plans to continue monitoring the situation and present a third implementation report in 2014.

The Commission has launched a call on antimicrobial resistance and research on the causes of non-prudent use of antibiotics in human medicine ⁽²⁾. This preparatory action will document the prevalence of the sale and consumption of antimicrobials without a prescription and identify national measures and national legislation that has been developed and implemented to enforce the rules on prescription.

All veterinary antibiotics for food-producing animal species require a veterinary prescription. The Commission has no data on the sale of veterinary antibiotics without prescription.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/health/antimicrobial_resistance/docs/amr_report2_en.pdf

⁽²⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/health_consumer/funding/call_amr_en.htm

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-000840/13
til Kommissionen
Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(28. januar 2013)

Om: Parallelimport af lægemidler

Selv om parallelimport af lægemidler er lovlig i henhold til EU-retten, er der forlydender om, at der — navnlig i visse lande — stilles hindringer i vejen herfor, hvorved proceduren begrænses eller forsinkes.

1. I hvor mange medlemsstater er der blevet klaget over, at myndighederne forsinker og lægger hindringer i vejen for parallelimport af lægemidler? Antallet af tilfælde pr. land med nærmere enkeltheder bedes angivet, hvis det er muligt.
2. I hvor mange tilfælde er klagerne blevet fundet berettigede?
3. Er der efter Kommissionens opfattelse stadig nogen medlemsstater, der lægger uforholdsmæssigt store retlige og/eller administrative hindringer i vejen for parallelimport af lægemidler? Hvilke medlemsstater er der i bekræftende fald tale om?
4. Hvor mange konkurrencesager om parallelimport har Kommissionen behandlet, og med hvilket resultat?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Antonio Tajani
(15. marts 2013)

Pr. dags dato er der otte igangværende sager om fri bevægelighed (artikel 34-36 TEUF) af parallelimporterede/eksporterede humanmedicinske lægemidler og veterinærlægemidler. Sagerne vedrører Grækenland (4), Danmark (1), Estland (1) og Frankrig (2). De berørte emner vedrører prisfastsættelse, eksportrestriktioner, refusion, sprogkrav og byrdefulde godkendelses- og registreringsprocedurer.

Kommissionen gennemgår hver enkelt klage fra sag til sag og ser på, om den nationale lovgivning eller administrativ praksis skaber handelshindringer, og om der foreligger andre mulige begrundelser. Ovennævnte sager befinder sig på forskellige stadier af en proces, der eventuelt fører til et sagsanlæg ved Domstolen. Der er en række domme afsagt af Domstolen på dette område (se f.eks. sagen C-267/95 og C-268/95, Merck mod Primecrown, sag 247/81, Kommissionen mod Tyskland (1984), sag C-427/93, Bristol-Myers Squibb mod Paranova A/S) ⁽¹⁾.

Hvad angår konkurrencesager er kun én relevant konkurrencesag blevet behandlet af Kommissionen. I AstraZeneca-sagen (beslutning i 2005, stadfæstet af Domstolen i 2012) blev AstraZeneca idømt en bøde (52,7 mio. EUR) for at hindre indførelsen af generiske produkter og parallelimport ved at afregistrere markedsføringstilladelsen for et lægemiddel uden en objektiv begrundelse.

Det bør bemærkes, at konkurrencesager har været mere relevante med hensyn til restriktioner for paralleleksport (Johnson & Johnson-beslutningen i 1980, Sandoz-beslutningen i 1987, Adalat-beslutningen i 1996 og GSK-beslutningen i 2001).

⁽¹⁾ Flere tilfælde kan hentes fra Domstolens hjemmeside.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000840/13
to the Commission
Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(28 January 2013)**

Subject: Parallel imports of pharmaceuticals

Although parallel imports of pharmaceuticals are legal under European law, there are reports that — in some countries in particular — barriers are being put in place, thereby limiting or delaying the procedure.

1. In how many Member States have complaints been made that the authorities are delaying or putting obstructions in the way of parallel imports of pharmaceuticals? Please state the number of cases per country with details, if possible.
2. In how many cases have the complaints been deemed to have been justified?
3. In the opinion of the Commission, do some Member States still put disproportionate legal and/or administrative barriers in the way of parallel imports of pharmaceuticals? If so, which Member States are they?
4. How many competition cases regarding parallel imports has the Commission dealt with, and with what outcomes?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(15 March 2013)**

To date, there are eight ongoing cases on the free circulation (Articles 34-36 TFEU) of parallel imported/exported medicinal products for human use and veterinary medicinal products. These cases concern Greece (4), Denmark (1), Estonia (1) and France (2). The issues arising concern price fixing, export restrictions, reimbursement, language requirements and burdensome authorisation and registration procedures.

The Commission examines each complaint on a case-by-case basis looking at whether the national laws or administrative practices erect any barriers to trade and whether there are any possible justifications. The abovementioned cases are at different stages in the process leading up to a possible referral to the Court of Justice. There are a number of rulings of the Court in this area (see e.g. C-267/95 and C-268/95, *Merck v Primecrown*; Case 247/81 *Commission v Germany* (1984); Case C-427/93, *Bristol-Myers Squibb v Paranova A/S*)⁽¹⁾.

In relation to competition cases, only one relevant competition case has been dealt with by the Commission. In the *AstraZeneca* case (Decision in 2005, upheld by the ECJ in 2012), *AstraZeneca* was fined (EUR 52.5m) for hindering the introduction of generic products and parallel imports by deregistering the marketing authorisation of a pharmaceutical without an objective justification.

It should be noted that competition cases have been more relevant as regards restrictions to parallel exports (*Johnson & Johnson* Decision in 1980, *Sandoz* Decision in 1987, *Adalat* Decision in 1996 and *GSK* Decision in 2001).

⁽¹⁾ More cases can be retrieved from the Court of Justice's website.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000841/13
a la Comisión**

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)

(28 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: Gran reducción de la financiación de la ciencia en el Estado español

Los equipos científicos, para obtener financiación pública, proponen sus proyectos de investigación y, tras la evaluación minuciosa de los mismos, reciben la respuesta de aprobación o denegación. Este sistema es el eje fundamental de la actividad científica en España. En la última convocatoria, ahora resuelta, el Gobierno ha reducido a 309 millones la cuantía total adjudicada a los proyectos (incluyendo unos 40 de fondos europeos), frente a 384 millones en la convocatoria anterior (19,5 % menos). Además, según el BOE, los investigadores recibirán el dinero en cuatro años en vez de tres, a pesar de que se exige a los científicos cumplir con la investigación en 3 años solamente. Desde el año 2009, la caída es del 50 %.⁽¹⁾ Por otro lado, el esquema de financiación perjudicará gravemente los recursos para arrancar la investigación y por lo tanto el cumplimiento de los objetivos a alcanzar en sólo 3 años.

Mientras tanto, el Gobierno español sólo ha reducido el gasto de la Casa Real en un 4 %, el de Interior un 5 % y el de Defensa un 6 %. En este último caso cabe señalar la aprobación de un informe sobre Finanzas Públicas ⁽²⁾ por parte del Parlamento Europeo en el que se pedía priorizar la consolidación fiscal aplicando recortes en defensa.

A la luz de todo lo anterior,

1. ¿Cree la Comisión que recortar los fondos para la investigación en un 50 % en 4 años acerca el Estado español a cumplir con los objetivos del horizonte 2020 ⁽³⁾ y al desarrollo de un crecimiento sostenible?
2. ¿Qué opina la Comisión sobre el hecho que los investigadores cobren en 4 años a pesar que ello perjudica el objetivo de sus investigaciones?
3. ¿Cree adecuadas la Comisión las recomendaciones hechas por el Parlamento Europeo en su informe sobre las Finanzas Públicas en el ámbito de la defensa?

Respuesta del Sr. Hahn en nombre de la Comisión

(2 de abril de 2013)

1. La Comisión es consciente de que, a raíz de la crisis financiera, las inversiones pública y privada en I+D han disminuido. Con ello se corre el riesgo de minar la capacidad de innovación del país a largo plazo ⁽⁴⁾. Dado que la situación fiscal en España no es favorable, la Comisión ha alentado a las autoridades españolas a sacarle el máximo partido a los Fondos Estructurales disponibles. En el período actual, las inversiones en energía, innovación e IDT, el espíritu emprendedor y las empresas son bastante reducidas y se alejan mucho de la media de la UE, poniendo así en peligro la capacidad de España para alcanzar sus ambiciosos objetivos de Europa 2020 y transformar con ello su economía. A este respecto, España recibió una recomendación específica para el país en julio de 2012 animando a revisar las prioridades de gasto y a redistribuir los fondos a fin de facilitar la posibilidad de ofrecer financiación a las PYME, la investigación, la innovación y los jóvenes. La Comisión supervisa periódicamente los avances de España en cuanto a esta recomendación.
2. No es competencia de la Comisión precisar la duración de la financiación de los programas nacionales de investigación.
3. A la Comisión no le cabe la menor duda de que, a fin de reducir el impacto negativo en el crecimiento y el empleo a corto plazo, el saneamiento presupuestario ha de llevarse a cabo de modo que favorezca el crecimiento, es decir, priorizando la financiación de áreas como el I+D, la educación y proyectos de inversión específicos y cuidadosamente seleccionados.

⁽¹⁾ http://sociedad.elpais.com/sociedad/2013/01/24/actualidad/1359061061_171675.html

⁽²⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//NONSGML+REPORT+A7-2012-0425+0+DOC+PDF+V0//ES>

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/research/innovation-union/index_en.cfm?pg=action-points&view=all

⁽⁴⁾ Documento de trabajo de los servicios de la Comisión «Evaluación del programa nacional de reforma y del programa de estabilidad de España de 2012» [SWD(2012) 310].

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000841/13
to the Commission**

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)

(28 January 2013)

Subject: Major reduction in the funding of science in Spain

To obtain public funding, teams of scientists submit research projects which, after thorough appraisal, are either approved or rejected. This system is fundamental to scientific activity in Spain. In the last call for proposals, which has now been decided, the Government reduced the total amount awarded to the projects to EUR 309 million (including some EUR 40 million from European funds), compared to EUR 384 million for the previous call for proposals (a reduction of 19.5 %). Furthermore, according to the Official State Bulletin, the researchers will receive the money over four years instead of three, despite the fact that the scientists are required to complete their research in only three years. There has been a reduction of 50 % since 2009 ⁽¹⁾. Moreover, the funding scheme will have a highly detrimental effect on the resources available to start up research and consequently on the ability to meet the objectives set in only three years.

Meanwhile, the Spanish Government has reduced expenditure on the Royal Family by only 4 %, Home Affairs by 5 % and Defence by 6 %. In the latter case, it should be noted that a report on Public Finances ⁽²⁾ has been approved by the European Parliament, calling for the prioritisation of fiscal consolidation by way of defence cuts.

In light of the above:

1. Does the Commission believe that by cutting research funding by 50 % over four years the Spanish State will get any closer to achieving the 2020 objectives ⁽³⁾ and the development of sustainable growth?
2. What does the Commission think about the fact that researchers receive funding over four years despite the fact that this harms their research objectives?
3. Does the Commission believe that the recommendations made by the European Parliament regarding defence in its report on Public Finances are appropriate?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission

(2 April 2013)

1. The Commission is aware that in the wake of the financial crisis, both public and private investment in R&D declined. This risks undermining the long-term capacity for innovation ⁽⁴⁾. Given the tight fiscal situation in Spain, the Commission has encouraged the Spanish authorities to make the most of the available Structural Funds. Within the current period, investments on energy, innovation and RTD, entrepreneurship and enterprises are quite low and far from the EU average thus jeopardising Spain's ability to reach its ambitious Europe 2020 targets and transform its economy. In this context, Spain received a country-specific recommendation in July 2012 to review spending priorities and reallocate funds to support access to finance for SMEs, research, innovation and young people. The Commission is regularly monitoring progress on this recommendation.

2. It is not within the competence of the Commission to specify the length of funding of national research policy schemes.

3. The Commission is fully convinced that in order to mitigate their negative effects on employment and growth in the short term, fiscal consolidations should be conducted in a growth-friendly manner by prioritising expenditure areas such as R&D, education and specific, well-targeted investment projects.

⁽¹⁾ http://sociedad.elpais.com/sociedad/2013/01/24/actualidad/1359061061_171675.html

⁽²⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//NONSGML+REPORT+A7-2012-0425+0+DOC+PDF+V0//ES>

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/research/innovation-union/index_en.cfm?pg=action-points&view=all

⁽⁴⁾ Commission Staff Working Document Assessment of the 2012 national reform programme and stability programme for Spain (SWD(2012) 310.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000845/13
to the Commission**

Alyn Smith (Verts/ALE)

(28 January 2013)

Subject: 'Enough Food For Everyone If' campaign

The 'Enough Food For Everyone If' campaign was launched by more than a hundred UK aid organisations on 23 January 2013 with the aim of tackling world hunger.

The UN Millennium Development Goals are already promoting the good work that is currently being done to tackle world hunger, and which the Commission has been a vocal supporter of.

Can I therefore ask whether the Commission supports the 'Enough Food For Everyone If' campaign, and what support, if any, it will be providing to the campaign?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission

(27 March 2013)

The Commission is aware of the 'Enough Food For Everyone If' campaign and supports its objective of ensuring food and nutrition security for all, particularly for the most vulnerable. The 'ifs' advocated are in line with the policies and programmes the EU is supporting through its development cooperation with partner countries. The eradication of hunger and under-nutrition has been placed at the top of the EU development agenda.

For example, the EU believes that land governance and secure access to land are prerequisites for food and nutrition security and higher productivity in the agricultural sector. This is why the EU is a staunch supporter of the 'Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests' and supports countries in their implementation as well as the principles for responsible agricultural investment.

The EU also recognises that fighting under-nutrition is vital to equip the world's poorest children with the chances to pull themselves out of poverty and is committed to helping countries reduce the number of stunted children by at least 7 million by 2025. The Commission has recently adopted a communication on 'Enhancing maternal and child nutrition in external assistance' ⁽¹⁾.

At this year's G8, the EU will continue to play a key role and ensure commitments are upheld. The EU played an active part in the G8 in 2012 when leaders launched a partnership between governments in Africa, G8 countries and the private sector to lift 50 million people out of poverty in the next 10 years.

The Commission does not provide direct support to the campaign itself but works together with many of the organisations involved in the campaign in implementing EU programmes in the field and in dialogue on political and policy issues.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2013) 141.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000846/13
to the Commission
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(28 January 2013)

Subject: Potential for a serious negative impact on medical and scientific research of the Data Protection Regulation

A number of experienced senior medical and social science researchers in my London constituency have expressed serious concerns about the potential impact of the proposed EU Data Protection Regulation (DPR) in that it may restrict the availability of useful information to inform policy and conduct vital medical and scientific research. It is believed that if the DPR is adopted by Parliament with the proposed changes as summarised by the rapporteur for the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE), it will mean that no identifiable individual data could be used without the individual's prior consent for that use, unless this is considered of exceptionally high priority — e.g. bioterrorism. While it is reasonable to restrict access and regulate information stored on EU citizens as individuals, and to prevent the possibility that this may be misused, there are legitimate medical and scientific research uses whose loss would have adverse effects on the welfare of individuals and society at large, particularly as EU health providers are now expected to base treatments on evidence of proven efficacy.

This evidence often requires use of mortality and cancer data; for instance, in Scandinavian countries, the population registers are often used. It would become logistically impossible to undertake much of this research if researchers had to re-contact individuals every time they wanted to use the data. Generally, when carrying out surveys, researchers ask permission to link acquired data to other legitimate uses, but they cannot specify every possible use.

Researchers are acutely aware of the importance of protecting individuals and of having prior authorisation procedures for access to individually-identifiable data. In addition, many clinical trials for therapeutic treatment require that one can find and contact people with the conditions to be treated, which means accessing registers or documents with their details. The DPR, if adopted as proposed in the current draft, will impact negatively on clinical trial recruitment and also on pharmacovigilance research.

1. Can the Commission confirm that these very serious academic research concerns have been fully assessed prior to proposing this legislation, and that these concerns have been transmitted clearly to the competent committee (LIBE) of Parliament, and if existing arrangements in Member States such as the UK and Sweden will be allowed to continue if and when the DPR comes into force?
2. Furthermore, if the Commission considers these concerns as outlined above as valid, will it withdraw its entire draft DPR proposal in order to safeguard clinical and scientific research in the EU?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(12 April 2013)

In Directive 95/46/EC⁽¹⁾ data concerning health is considered to be a special category of personal data which is subject to specific safeguards. The Commission's proposal for a General Data Protection, submitted in January 2012 and currently under the scrutiny of the co-legislators does not change this situation. The processing of health data remains possible, subject to the safeguards established by the regulation as regards the processing of sensitive data.

To process such data there is no obligation to obtain consent; consent is just one of several possible ground for the processing of health data. This principle is fleshed out in Article 81 on health data which allows EU and National law to tackle matters such as preventive medicine, research and cross-border threats to health. Processing of personal data concerning health which is necessary for scientific research purposes, such as patient registries set up for improving diagnoses and differentiating between similar types of diseases and preparing studies for therapies, is subject to the conditions and safeguards referred to in Article 83.

The Commission has no intention of withdrawing its proposal for the reform of EU data protection rules but will engage in a discussion with the co-legislators to come to a balanced and ambitious solution.

⁽¹⁾ Article 8 Directive 95/46/EC on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000847/13
ao Conselho
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL) e João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(28 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Fim da «Posição Comum» sobre Cuba

Nos próximos dias 26 e 27 de janeiro, irá realizar-se em Santiago do Chile a 1.ª Cimeira CELAC-UE. A partir do final da Cimeira, Cuba assumirá a Presidência Pro Tempore da CELAC. No entanto, como é sabido, o Conselho adotou, em 1996, no que se refere às relações com Cuba, uma «Posição Comum» que se mantém e que é singular do ponto de vista das suas relações externas, assumindo um comportamento discriminatório inaceitável em relação a este país. Esta «Posição Comum» declara como objetivo a promoção de transformações políticas neste país, numa atitude de ostensiva ingerência neste país soberano.

Tendo em conta a realização da 1.ª Cimeira UE-CELAC, tendo em conta que Cuba presidirá proximamente à CELAC e tomando em consideração as intenções expressas de aprofundar as relações entre as duas partes, pergunto ao Conselho:

1. Não considera que a manutenção da «Posição Comum» trata discriminatoriamente um país, desrespeitando-o e desrespeitando toda a região da América Latina e Caraíbas que atribuiu a este país a responsabilidade de presidir à mais ampla organização de integração da região?
2. Quais as suas expectativas em relação ao diálogo que manterá com a nova Presidência da CELAC, uma vez que mantém uma posição discriminatória em relação ao país que a preside?
3. Não considera necessário terminar urgentemente com esta inaceitável «Posição Comum» contra Cuba e acabar com uma postura discriminatória e ingerencista que visa negar o direito soberano do povo cubano à sua autodeterminação e à escolha do modelo económico, político, social e cultural que entenda mais consentâneo com os seus interesses e aspirações?
4. Não considera urgente que, estreitando relações com a CELAC, a UE devia assumir uma posição de defesa do fim do bloqueio económico dos EUA a Cuba que condiciona de forma muito significativa as possibilidades de desenvolvimento económico de Cuba, como tem sido sucessivamente reconhecido pela Assembleia Geral da ONU?

Resposta
(4 de abril de 2013)

Em 27 de janeiro de 2013 Cuba sucedeu ao Chile na Presidência do CELAC. Cuba assumirá esta posição até ao final de 2013. A UE começou já a trabalhar com a Presidência Cubana a fim de assegurar o seguimento da Cimeira UE-CELAC, que teve lugar em Santiago em 26-27 de janeiro de 2013, e a implementação do respetivo Plano de Ação.

A revogação da Posição Comum exige uma decisão unânime do Conselho.

A política comercial dos EUA em relação a Cuba é uma questão bilateral.

Numa perspetiva mais ampla, a União Europeia e os seus Estados-Membros manifestaram claramente a sua oposição, nomeadamente na ONU, à aplicação extraterritorial do embargo dos Estados Unidos, consignado na Lei da Democracia Cubana de 1992 e na Lei Helms-Burton de 1996.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000847/13
to the Council
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL) and João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(28 January 2013)

Subject: End to the 'Common Position' on Cuba

The 1st EU-CELAC Summit will be held in Santiago, Chile, on 26-27 January. After the Summit, Cuba will assume the *Pro-Tempore* Presidency of CELAC. However, as is known, in 1996 the Council adopted a 'Common Position' governing relations with Cuba. This remains in place and, uniquely for its external relations, it maintains an unacceptable discriminatory policy regarding this country. This 'Common Position' has the declared objective of promoting political reform in Cuba, in an act of ostensible intervention in this sovereign nation.

Considering, the upcoming 1st EU-CELAC Summit; Cuba's upcoming presidency of CELAC; and the declared intention to improve relations between the two parties, I ask the Council.

1. Does it not consider that maintaining the 'Common Position' is discriminatory and disrespectful to Cuba and to the entire Latin American and Caribbean region, which has entrusted to this country the responsibility of presiding over the most extensive organisation for integration in the region.
2. What are its expectations for discussion with the new Presidency of CELAC whilst maintaining a discriminatory position on its presiding country?
3. Does it not consider it necessary to put an end to this unacceptable 'Common Position' against Cuba and to discontinue this discriminatory and interventionist policy, which seeks to deny the Cuban people their sovereign right to self-determination and to choose the economic, political, social and cultural model best suited to their own interests and aspirations?
4. Does it not consider that, in the interest of furthering closer relations with CELAC, the EU should urgently advocate for a lift of the US economic embargo against Cuba, which significantly limits the country's prospects of economic development, as has been repeatedly recognised by the UN General Assembly?

Reply
(4 April 2013)

On 27 January 2013 Cuba succeeded Chile as CELAC President. Cuba will hold this position until the end of 2013. The EU has already started working with the Cuban Presidency in order to ensure follow-up to the EU-CELAC Summit, which took place in Santiago on 26-27 January 2013, and the implementation of its Action Plan.

Repealing the Common Position requires a unanimous Decision of the Council.

United States trade policy towards Cuba is a bilateral issue.

From a wider perspective, the European Union and its Member States have clearly expressed their opposition, notably at the UN, to the extraterritorial application of the United States embargo, as is contained in the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992 and the Helms-Burton Act of 1996.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000848/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(28 janvier 2013)

Objet: Graph Search et l'intrusion dans la vie privée

À première vue, pour le Facebookien lambda, Graph Search est un outil rigolo, rien de plus. L'outil permet de souligner les points communs entre un internaute et ses amis.

Pour les entreprises qui tiennent une page officielle sur Facebook, Graph Search permettra d'obtenir une radiographie ultra-précise de leurs fans, avec tous les enjeux marketing que cela implique. Cette recherche sera probablement payante, histoire de monétiser le service.

Graph Search va donner une immense visibilité à toutes les informations personnelles que l'on aurait oublié de faire passer en mode privé. Déjà passablement intrusif jusqu'ici, Facebook permettait à l'internaute distrait de se fondre dans la masse. Mais le nouveau moteur de recherche, le moindre «J'aime», le moindre commentaire, la moindre photo apparaîtra en quelques clics, là où il était relativement caché et quasi-inaccessible par le passé.

1. La Commission compte-t-elle ordonner une enquête sur cet outil?
2. La Commission partage-t-elle l'avis selon lequel cet outil est intrusif et une campagne d'information appuyée devrait être commanditée?
3. La Commission planifie-t-elle des actions pour lutter contre les dérives liées à l'intrusion potentielle ou à l'utilisation des données personnelles?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Reding au nom de la Commission
(8 avril 2013)

Les fonctionnalités Graph Search de Facebook ont été lancées en janvier 2013, sous la forme d'un projet accessible jusqu'ici uniquement en langue anglaise, à certains utilisateurs aux États-Unis. Si Facebook déployait Graph Search dans l'Union européenne, le traitement des données à caractère personnel devrait être conforme à la directive 95/46/CE sur la protection des données et aux mesures législatives nationales de transposition.

Sans préjudice des compétences de la Commission en tant que gardienne du traité, ce sont les autorités de contrôle nationales chargées de la protection des données qui sont compétentes pour le suivi de l'application des mesures nationales de transposition de la directive 95/46/CE. En 2012, l'autorité de contrôle irlandaise a procédé à une analyse approfondie des activités de Facebook en matière de traitement des données à caractère personnel.

Le règlement général sur la protection des données proposé par la Commission clarifie et renforce les droits des personnes concernées dans le cadre d'activités en ligne telles que la participation à des réseaux sociaux: les prestataires doivent tenir compte du principe de «protection des données par défaut», ce qui signifie que le paramétrage par défaut doit être celui qui garantit le plus grand respect de la vie privée. Les prestataires seront tenus de donner aux personnes des informations aussi claires, compréhensibles et transparentes que possible sur les modalités d'utilisation de leurs données à caractère personnel, de façon à ce qu'elles puissent déterminer en toute connaissance de cause quelles données elles partageront.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000848/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(28 January 2013)**

Subject: Graph Search and intrusions into private life

At first glance, the average Facebook user could think that Graph Search is nothing more than an amusing tool which allows them to find out what they have in common with their friends.

Businesses with official Facebook pages will be able to use Graph Search to obtain a highly detailed profile of their fans, along with all the associated marketing opportunities. Users will probably have to pay for searches, since the aim is to monetise the service.

Graph Search will make any personal information that users may have forgotten to make private extremely visible. Although Facebook has always been intrusive to some degree, absent-minded Internet users have been able to blend into the crowd. This new search engine, however, means that every 'Like', every comment and every photo will be accessible in just a few clicks, after being relatively hidden and practically inaccessible in the past.

1. Is the Commission planning to order an enquiry into this tool?
2. Does the Commission also believe that this tool is intrusive and that an EU-funded information campaign should be commissioned?
3. Is the Commission planning any measures to combat abuses linked to this potential intrusion or to the use of personal data?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(8 April 2013)**

The Facebook Graph Search Features was launched in January 2013 as a limited preview for some English-speaking users in the United States. In case Facebook would deploy Graph Search in the European Union, the processing of personal data would have to be in line with the Data Protection Directive 95/46/EC and the national laws implementing it.

Without prejudice to the powers of the Commission as guardian of the Treaty, it is the national data protection supervisory authorities which are competent to monitor the application of the national measures implementing Directive 95/46/EC. In 2012, the Irish supervisory authority conducted an in-depth analysis of Facebook's personal data processing activities.

The Commission's proposal for a General Data Protection Regulation clarifies and strengthens the rights of data subjects in the context of online activities, such as social networking: providers must take account of the principle of 'data protection by default', which means that the default settings should be those that provide the most privacy. Companies will be obliged to inform individuals as clearly, understandably and transparently as possible about how their personal data will be used, so that they are in the best position to decide what data they share.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000849/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(28 janvier 2013)

Objet: Protection des données: Sony doit faire l'objet d'une enquête

Presque deux ans après le piratage du PlayStation Network, qui avait vu des millions de comptes piratés et des millions de données personnelles — mais a priori pas financières — dérobées, Sony vient d'être condamné à une amende «symbolique» outre-Manche.

L'*Information Commissioner's Office* (ICO), équivalent de notre Commission nationale de l'informatique et des libertés (CNIL), a condamné le groupe japonais à une amende de 250 000 livres — près de 300 000 euros. Si la Commission reconnaît que les données étaient protégées, elle pointe surtout le fait que Sony «*aurait pu faire plus*». Sony a donc été condamné pour n'avoir pas suffisamment protégé les données personnelles des utilisateurs du système PlayStation Network reliant ses consoles de jeu à l'internet.

Le portail interactif avait été pris pour cible en avril 2011 par des pirates qui se sont emparés de données appartenant aux utilisateurs, notamment leur date de naissance et leur mot de passe. Les mesures de sécurité mises en place n'étaient tout simplement pas suffisantes.

Vu l'expertise technique de l'entreprise et les ressources qu'elle a à sa disposition, il ne fait aucun doute à mes yeux que Sony a abusé ses clients.

1. La Commission a-t-elle rempli son rôle de «hub» de l'information en avertissant toutes les autorités européennes?
2. La Commission compte-t-elle ordonner une enquête afin de s'assurer que le cas anglais ne se reproduise pas ailleurs en Europe?
3. Même si on ne peut que féliciter les autorités anglaises, on peut s'interroger sur l'amende ridiculement basse qui finalement donne l'impression que la violation de la protection des données est un délit secondaire. Quel est l'éventail de sanctions potentielles que la Commission pourrait mettre en œuvre?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Reding au nom de la Commission
(8 avril 2013)

Sans préjudice des compétences dévolues à la Commission en tant que gardienne du traité, ce sont les autorités nationales, en particulier les autorités nationales de contrôle de la protection des données, qui sont compétentes pour surveiller l'application des mesures nationales de mise en œuvre de la directive 95/46/CE. Il est vrai, cependant, qu'actuellement le montant maximal des sanctions applicables en cas d'infraction aux dispositions nationales de protection des données n'est pas harmonisé et reste relativement faible dans la plupart des États membres.

Les autorités de protection des données coordonnent leurs activités au sein du groupe de travail «article 29», établi par la directive 95/46/CE. Toutes les autorités européennes de protection des données ainsi que la Commission en sont membres. L'affaire «Sony Playstation» a été examinée au cours de la réunion du mois de mai 2011 ⁽¹⁾.

La Commission a élaboré une proposition de règlement général sur la protection des données qui précise et renforce les règles régissant les atteintes aux données à caractère personnel. Elle ferait notamment obligation aux prestataires de notifier les violations de données à caractère personnel aux autorités de protection des données. De plus, en cas de violation susceptible de porter atteinte à la protection des données à caractère personnel ou à la vie privée de la personne concernée, le responsable du traitement devrait communiquer la violation à cette dernière. Enfin, en ce qui concerne les sanctions, la proposition prévoit des sanctions harmonisées qui, dans le cas d'une entreprise, sont plafonnées à 2 % de son chiffre d'affaires mondial.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/justice/data-protection/article-29/press-material/agenda/index_en.htm (en anglais).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000849/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(28 January 2013)

Subject: Data protection: Sony must be the subject of an investigation

Almost two years after the PlayStation Network was breached, with millions of accounts hacked and millions of items of personal — but seemingly not financial — data stolen, Sony has just been ordered to pay a ‘symbolic’ fine in the United Kingdom.

The Information Commissioner’s Office (ICO), the equivalent of France’s *Commission nationale de l’informatique et des libertés* (CNIL), has ordered the Japanese group to pay a fine of GBP 250 000, or almost EUR 300 000. Although the ICO recognises that the data were protected, it highlights the fact that Sony ‘could have done more’. Sony has therefore been fined for its failure to adequately protect PlayStation Network users’ personal data when connecting its games consoles to the Internet.

The interactive portal had been targeted in April 2011 by hackers who seized data belonging to its users, including in particular their dates of birth and passwords. The security measures put in place were simply not good enough.

Given the company’s technical expertise and the resources at its disposal, there is no doubt in my mind that Sony deceived its customers.

1. Has the Commission fulfilled its role as an information hub by informing all the European authorities?
2. Does it intend to order an investigation so as to ensure that the UK case is not repeated elsewhere in Europe?
3. Although the UK authorities should be commended, one has to question the ridiculously low fine, which ultimately gives the impression that data protection violations are a minor offence. What kinds of potential penalties could the Commission apply?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(8 April 2013)

Without prejudice to the powers of the Commission as guardian of the Treaty, it is the national authorities, in particular the national data protection supervisory authorities, which are competent to monitor the application of the national measures implementing Directive 95/46/EC. However, the maximum amount of the possible sanctions in case of infringements of the national data protection measures are currently not harmonised and relatively low in most Member States.

The data protection authorities coordinate their activities in the so called Article 29 Working Party, established by Directive 95/46/CE. All European Data Protection Authorities and the Commission are members of this Working Party. The Sony Playstation case was discussed in the meeting of May 2011 ⁽¹⁾.

The Commission’s proposal for a General Data Protection Regulation clarifies and strengthens the rules related to personal data breaches. According to the proposal, providers must in particular notify personal data breaches to data protection authorities. In addition, when the breach is likely to adversely affect the protection of personal data or privacy of the data subject, the controller shall communicate the breach to the data subject. Finally, regarding sanctions, the proposal foresees harmonised sanctions, with a maximum amount of 2% of the worldwide turnover of an enterprise.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/justice/data-protection/article-29/press-material/agenda/index_en.htm

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000850/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(28 janvier 2013)

Objet: Facebook fouille dans les mails personnels

Un récent rapport de l'autorité irlandaise considère que les internautes ne peuvent pas s'attendre à ce que les mots-clés soient extraits du contenu des messages ou des *chats*. Facebook a précisé ne pas faire de publicité ciblée sur cette base. Cependant il apparaît que l'entreprise a pu analyser le contenu des messages dans une optique de prévention des crimes et plus particulièrement la pédophilie.

D'autre part, on se rappelle que Facebook, suite à un bug qu'elle a considéré comme mineur, a publié sur le mur public de millions d'internautes des échanges de mails privés.

1. La Commission peut-elle garantir que Facebook n'outrepasse pas ses droits sur l'utilisation des données de consommateurs?
2. Concernant la publicité ciblée, la Commission peut-elle faire la lumière sur le fait que Facebook dit ne pas rechercher des données, via mots-clés par exemple, dans les e-mails personnels et non publics, mais le ferait quand même?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Reding au nom de la Commission

(8 avril 2013)

Facebook est un responsable du traitement de données à caractère personnel établi dans l'Union européenne et, à ce titre, est soumis aux dispositions des législations nationales qui mettent en œuvre la directive 95/46/CE.

Sans préjudice des compétences de la Commission en tant que gardienne du traité, ce sont les autorités nationales, en particulier les autorités de contrôle nationales chargées de la protection des données, qui sont compétentes pour le suivi de l'application des mesures nationales de transposition de la directive 95/46/CE. Par exemple, le «bug» supposé de Facebook a fait l'objet d'analyses par l'autorité française responsable de la protection des données (la CNIL — Commission nationale de l'informatique et des libertés), qui a conclu qu'à la suite du déploiement d'une nouvelle version du service, certains messages publics avaient été davantage mis en évidence que d'autres, mais qu'il n'y avait pas eu de «bug» en tant que tel ⁽¹⁾. Comme l'indique l'Honorable Parlementaire, l'autorité irlandaise a, pour sa part, procédé en 2012 à une analyse approfondie des activités de traitement de données à caractère personnel de Facebook.

Le règlement général sur la protection des données proposé par la Commission précise et renforce les droits des personnes concernées dans le cadre des activités en ligne telles que l'usage d'un réseau social: les prestataires devraient tenir compte du principe de «protection des données par défaut», ce qui signifie que les paramètres par défaut seraient ceux qui protègent le plus la vie privée. Les sociétés seraient tenues d'informer les particuliers de façon aussi claire, compréhensible et transparente que possible quant aux modalités d'utilisation de leurs données à caractère personnel, pour leur permettre de décider, en toute connaissance de cause, quelles données ils souhaitent communiquer.

Cette proposition de règlement est actuellement examinée par les colégislateurs.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.cnil.fr/la-cnil/actualite/article/article/les-conclusions-de-la-cnil-sur-le-bug-facebook/>

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000850/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(28 January 2013)

Subject: Facebook searches through personal messages

According to a recent report by the Irish authorities, Internet users should not expect keywords to be extracted from the content of their messages or chat conversations. Facebook has made it clear that its advertising is not targeted on that basis. However, the company appears to have been able to analyse the content of messages with a view to preventing crime and — more specifically — paedophilia.

It should also be remembered that, following what it called a 'minor' bug, Facebook posted private messages on the public wall of millions of Internet users.

1. Can the Commission guarantee that Facebook is not going beyond its rights regarding the use of consumer data?
2. In connection with targeted advertising, can it explain why Facebook says it does not search for data, via keywords for example, in private and not public emails, but appears to be doing so anyway?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(8 April 2013)

Facebook is a controller of personal data established in the European Union, and therefore it is subject to the obligations of national laws implementing Directive 95/46/CE.

Without prejudice to the powers of the Commission as guardian of the Treaty, national authorities, in particular the national data protection supervisory authorities are competent to monitor the application of the national measures implementing Directive 95/46/EC. For instance, the alleged Facebook 'bug' has been investigated by the French Data Protection Authority (CNIL), who concluded following the deployment of a new version of the service, some public messages were more prominently displayed than others, but that there was no bug as such ⁽¹⁾. As the Honourable Member points out, the Irish authority conducted an in depth analysis of Facebook personal data processing activities in the course of 2012.

The Commission's proposal for a General Data Protection Regulation clarifies and strengthens the rights of data subjects in the context of online activities, such as social networking: providers must take account of the principle of 'data protection by default', which means that the default settings should be those that provide the most privacy. Companies will be obliged to inform individuals as clearly, understandably and transparently as possible about how their personal data will be used, so that they are in the best position to decide what data they share.

This proposal is under examination of the co-legislators.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.cnil.fr/la-cnil/actualite/article/article/les-conclusions-de-la-cnil-sur-le-bug-facebook/>.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000851/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(28 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Το πρόβλημα της αιθαλομίχλης στην Ελλάδα

Το αυξημένο κόστος θέρμανσης στα ελληνικά νοικοκυριά, ως συνέπεια της μεγάλης αύξησης της τιμής του πετρελαίου, λόγω του ειδικού φόρου που προβλέπεται στο μηνόμιο συνεργασίας που υπέγραψε η Ελλάδα με τους διεθνείς δανειστές της, έχει οδηγήσει σε σημαντική αύξηση της χρήσης εναλλακτικών πηγών ενέργειας (τζάκι, σόμπες, κ.λπ.). Καθώς ωστόσο, η αλλαγή χρήσης πραγματοποιήθηκε σχετικά απότομα, σε ορισμένες περιπτώσεις δεν υπάρχουν οι κατάλληλες υποδομές στα νοικοκυριά που να προστατεύουν το περιβάλλον και την υγεία, με αποτέλεσμα την εμφάνιση του φαινομένου της αιθαλομίχλης στα αστικά κέντρα. Υπενθυμίζεται ότι το φαινόμενο αυτό, που είναι ιδιαίτερος επικίνδυνος για την δημόσια υγεία και το περιβάλλον, ευθύνεται για χιλιάδες θανάτους στην Ευρώπη στις αρχές του προηγούμενου αιώνα.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

- Είναι σε θέση να κινητοποιήσει περισσότερους κοινοτικούς πόρους ώστε να στηρίξει μέσω προγραμμάτων του ΕΣΠΑ τα ελληνικά νοικοκυριά που δεν έχουν πόρους, να μετατρέψουν σε ενεργειακές και φιλικές προς το περιβάλλον και την υγεία τις εστίες θέρμανσής τους;
- Σκοπεύει να αναλάβει πρωτοβουλίες για την αντιμετώπιση της επανεμφάνισης της αιθαλομίχλης στα κράτη μέλη και κυρίως σε εκείνα που πλήττονται από την οικονομική κρίση; Ποιες είναι αυτές;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(8 Απριλίου 2013)

Τα διαρθρωτικά ταμεία στοχεύουν στην ενίσχυση της οικονομικής, κοινωνικής και εδαφικής συνοχής μέσω της μείωσης των ανισοτήτων μεταξύ περιφερειών και κρατών μελών ως προς το επίπεδο ανάπτυξης. Σε αυτό το πλαίσιο, μπορούν να συγχρηματοδοτηθούν πολιτικές στον τομέα της εξοικονόμησης ενέργειας και των ανανεώσιμων πηγών ενέργειας, οι οποίες θα συμβάλουν σε ένα ενεργειακά βιώσιμο μέλλον. Τα διαρθρωτικά ταμεία δεν μπορούν να επιδοτήσουν τους λογαριασμούς θέρμανσης.

Στην Ελλάδα, το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης συγχρηματοδοτεί πρόγραμμα εξοικονόμησης ενέργειας, το οποίο δημιουργήθηκε ειδικά για τη βελτίωση της ενεργειακής απόδοσης των κατοικιών και καλείται «Εξοικονόμηση κατ' Οίκον». Το εν λόγω πρόγραμμα διαθέτει προϋπολογισμό ύψους 396 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ και παρέχει συνδυασμό επιχορηγήσεων και δανείων σε νοικοκυριά, αφού ολοκληρώσουν τα μέτρα ενεργειακής απόδοσης, τα οποία έχουν προσαρμοστεί στις ανάγκες τους. Σύμφωνα με την αρχή της επιμερισμένης διαχείρισης που εφαρμόζεται στο πλαίσιο της πολιτικής για τη συνοχή, την ευθύνη για την επιλογή και την υλοποίηση του έργου φέρουν οι ελληνικές αρχές.

Η Επιτροπή συνεργάζεται με τα κράτη μέλη, ώστε να διασφαλίζεται η συμμόρφωση με τη νομοθεσία της ΕΕ για την ποιότητα του αέρα, όμως η θέσπιση των σχετικών μέτρων άπτεται της αρμοδιότητας των κρατών μελών. Τα κράτη μέλη (και οι τοπικές αρχές τους) είναι τα πλέον κατάλληλα για να προσδιορίσουν τα πιο αποδοτικά μέτρα για την αντιμετώπιση των υψηλών επιπέδων συγκέντρωσης αιθαλομίχλης στην περιοχή τους.

Κατά την εφαρμογή των μέτρων που προβλέπει η οδηγία 2009/125/EK σχετικά με τον οικολογικό σχεδιασμό των συνδεδεμένων με την ενέργεια προϊόντων και η οδηγία 2010/30/ΕΕ σχετικά με την ενεργειακή επισήμανση, η Επιτροπή θα λάβει υπόψη τον παράγοντα της εξοικονόμησης ενέργειας και του περιβάλλοντος, ιδίως τις εκπομπές, διαφόρων τύπων νέων θερμαντήρων. Τα εν λόγω μέτρα θα αφορούν λέβητες κεντρικής θέρμανσης στερεών καυσίμων και θερμαντήρες δωματίου στερεών καυσίμων, οι οποίοι συμβάλλουν στη συγκέντρωση της αιθαλομίχλης αλλά και εναλλακτικές λύσεις για τη μακροπρόθεσμη εξοικονόμηση κόστους από τη χρήση της συσκευής. Αναμένεται να εγκριθούν το 2013 ή στις αρχές του 2014.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000851/13
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(28 January 2013)**

Subject: The smog problem in Greece

The increase in domestic heating costs in Greece, as a result of the massive increase in oil prices caused by the excise provided for in the memorandum of understanding signed by Greece and its international lenders, has led to a significant increase in the use of alternative energy sources (open fires, stoves etc.). However, as this change has come about somewhat suddenly, some households do not have appropriate infrastructures for protecting the environment and public health and, as a result, smog is a problem in towns. This problem, which is extremely dangerous to public health and the environment, was responsible for thousands of deaths in Europe at the beginning of the last century.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

- Is it in a position to mobilise more Union resources to provide support via NSRF programmes to Greek households which cannot afford to convert to energy-efficient, environmentally-friendly heating?
- Does it intend to take initiatives to combat the return of smog in the Member States, especially those suffering under the economic crisis and, if so, what initiatives does it intend to take?

**Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(8 April 2013)**

The Structural Funds aim to strengthen economic, social and territorial cohesion by reducing disparities in the level of development among regions and Member States. In this context, policies in the area of energy efficiency and renewable energy sources, which will contribute to a sustainable energy future, can be supported. The Structural Funds cannot subsidise heating bills.

In Greece, the European Regional Development Fund support a dedicated energy efficiency fund for energy performance improvements in housing, named 'Saving at Home' ('EXOIKONOMO KAT' OIKON'). This Fund has an allocation of EUR 396 million and it provides a combination of grants and loans to households upon completion of tailored made energy efficiency measures. In line with the shared management principle used for the administration of cohesion policy, project selection and implementation is the responsibility of the Greek authorities.

The Commission works with Member States to ensure compliance with EU legislation on air quality, but the competence to decide on measures to achieve this lies with the Member States. Member States (and their local authorities) are best placed to identify the most efficient measures to address high concentration levels on their territory.

The Commission will address energy-efficiency and environmental aspects, notably emissions, of various types of new heaters in implementing measures under Directive 2009/125/EC on ecodesign of energy-related products and Directive 2010/30/EU on energy labelling. These measures will address solid fuel central heating boilers, solid fuel local room heaters that contribute to smog and alternatives which provide cost savings over the lifetime of the appliance. They are expected to be adopted in 2013/early 2014.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000852/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(28 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Αθλητική υγεία — Προώθηση της ενημέρωσης, της πρόληψης και της εξέτασης σε χώρους άθλησης και εκπαίδευσης

Η άσκηση χωρίς φυσικά προσόντα και χωρίς γνώση είναι ατελής. Δεν είναι λίγα τα φαινόμενα όπου πολλοί αθλητές, ακόμα και οι νεότεροι, παρά τα εξαιρετικά φυσικά τους προσόντα, αντιμετωπίζουν προβλήματα υγείας χωρίς να γνωρίζουν ότι πάσχουν από κάποια δυσμορφία ή πάθηση με αποτέλεσμα να κινδυνεύει η ζωή τους εν αγνοία αυτών και των κηδεμόνων τους. Σε πολλές παθολογικές περιπτώσεις, ιδιαίτερα νεαρών ερασιτεχνών αθλητών η μη τακτική παρακολούθηση της υγείας, η άγνοια και η μη πρόληψη μπορούν να θέσουν σε κίνδυνο την ζωή τους, ενώ ο κίνδυνος λόγω άγνοιας αποτελεί δημόσια απειλή.

Σύμφωνα με την έκθεση Watson για την Υγεία και Διαθρονωτικά Ταμεία 2007-2013, προβλέπονται δράσεις για την ανάπτυξη των υποδομών υγείας που σχετίζονται και με την αθλητική υγεία. Ειδικότερα, στο Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης αναφέρεται μεταξύ άλλων η έμφαση που δίνεται στην προώθηση της υγείας και την πρόληψη, μέσω διαφόρων μέτρων ευαισθητοποίησης.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Έχει γίνει επαρκής αξιοποίηση των σχετικών πόρων που προβλέπονται από τα διαθρονωτικά ταμεία; Έχει η Επιτροπή προβεί σε συγκεκριμένες ενέργειες ή συστάσεις προς τα κράτη μέλη γι' αυτή την κατεύθυνση; Είναι ικανοποιημένη από την πρόοδο των κρατών μελών στον συγκεκριμένο τομέα; Ποια η περίπτωση της Ελλάδας;

Απάντηση του κ. Haehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(2 Απριλίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή δεν γνωρίζει τυχόν ανησυχίες ως προς τη χρήση των πόρων που προβλέπονται από τα διαθρονωτικά ταμεία για ζητήματα υγείας. Δεν έχει προβεί σε επίσημες ενέργειες ούτε σε συγκεκριμένες συστάσεις στα κράτη μέλη για τα θέματα αυτά.

Τα κράτη μέλη καταθέτουν συγκεντρωτικά δεδομένα στην Επιτροπή για συγκεκριμένες κατηγορίες δαπανών, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των υγειονομικών υποδομών και της πρόσβασης σε υπηρεσίες, όπως η «ηλεκτρονική υγεία» (e-health). Σε αμφότερες τις εν λόγω κατηγορίες, τα κράτη μέλη σημειώνουν ικανοποιητική πρόοδο. Η Ελλάδα έχει ήδη υπερβεί τα προβλεπόμενα για αυτή κονδύλια για αμφότερες τις κατηγορίες.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000852/13
to the Commission**

Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)

(28 January 2013)

Subject: Health in sport/promoting information, prevention and examination in training and education establishments

Exercise without the necessary physical condition and knowledge is pointless. On more than a few occasions we have seen numerous athletes, even young athletes, face health problems, despite their excellent physical condition, without knowing that they are suffering from some sort of malformation or illness which, unbeknown to them and their guardians, is putting their life at risk. In numerous medical cases, especially involving young amateur athletes, a lack of regular health monitoring, ignorance and lack of prevention may be putting their lives at risk and the risk caused by ignorance is a public threat.

According to the Watson report on Health and the Structural Funds in 2007-2013, action is planned to develop sport-related health infrastructures. It refers in particular to the emphasis placed in the European Regional Development Fund on health promotion and prevention through various health awareness measures.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

Has adequate use been made of the resources provided under the Structural Funds? Has the Commission taken specific action or made recommendations to the Member States along these lines? Is it satisfied with the progress made by the Member States in this particular sector? How does Greece rate?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission

(2 April 2013)

The Commission is not aware of any concerns with regard to the use of funding on health matters under the Structural Funds. It has not taken any formal action or made any specific recommendations to Member States on these issues.

Member States report aggregated data to the Commission on certain categories of expenditure, including health infrastructure and access to services, such as e-health. On both these categories, Member States are making good progress. Greece has already exceeded its planned financial allocations for both categories.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000853/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(28 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Έκταση οπλοκατοχής στην ΕΕ

Η έντονη συζήτηση και αντιπαράθεση που προκαλείται σχετικά με την έκταση της οπλοκατοχής στις ΗΠΑ και τα αμερικανικά νοικοκυριά προκαλεί και ανησυχία σχετικά με το εύρος του φαινομένου στην Ευρώπη. Παρά το γεγονός ότι η νομοθεσία των κρατών μελών κατά κανόνα απαγορεύει ή δεν είναι ευνοϊκή ως προς την οπλοκατοχή από πολίτες, εντούτοις υπάρχουν ενδείξεις ότι η παράνομη ή η μη δηλωμένη οπλοκατοχή σε αρκετά νοικοκυριά της ΕΕ είναι υπαρκτή.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Διαθέτει στοιχεία και συγκριτικά στοιχεία για την εκτιμώμενη έκταση του φαινομένου στην ΕΕ;
2. Διαπιστώνεται ότι τα τελευταία έτη υπάρχει έξαρση του φαινομένου;
3. Προτίθεται να αναλάβει περισσότερες πρωτοβουλίες για τον περιορισμό της;

Απάντηση του κ. Tajani εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(27 Μαρτίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει ότι ο έλεγχος της οπλοκατοχής είναι ζωτικής σημασίας για την καταπολέμηση της ανασφάλειας και της εγκληματικότητας. Δείκτες του μεγέθους του προβλήματος περιλαμβάνονται στην έκθεση⁽¹⁾ της Επιτροπής για την κατάταξη των πυροβόλων όπλων.

Η σχετική νομοθεσία σε επίπεδο ΕΕ είναι η οδηγία 91/477/ΕΟΚ του Συμβουλίου για τον έλεγχο της απόκτησης και κατοχής όπλων, όπως τροποποιήθηκε με την οδηγία 2008/51/ΕΚ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου και ο κανονισμός (ΕΕ) αριθ. 258/2012 για την καταπολέμηση της παράνομης διακίνησης όπλων μέσω της βελτίωσης της ανίχνευσης και του ελέγχου των εξαγωγών μη στρατιωτικών όπλων από και προς την ΕΕ, περιλαμβανομένων μέτρων όσον αφορά τις εισαγωγές και τη διαμετακόμιση.

Σε συνέχεια των εν λόγω πράξεων της ΕΕ, η Επιτροπή τώρα οριστικοποιεί πρόταση απόφασης του Συμβουλίου επί της σύναψης του πρωτοκόλλου του ΟΗΕ για τα πυροβόλα όπλα.

Η Επιτροπή θα υποβάλει έκθεση στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο και στο Συμβούλιο το 2015 σχετικά με την κατάσταση που συνεπάγεται η εφαρμογή της οδηγίας, συνοδευόμενη, αν ενδείκνυται, από προτάσεις.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2012)415 — Τελική έκθεση της Επιτροπής προς το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο και το Συμβούλιο — Πιθανά πλεονεκτήματα και μειονεκτήματα από τη μείωση των κατηγοριών πυροβόλων όπλων σε δύο (απαγορευμένων ή επιτρεπόμενων), με σκοπό την καλύτερη λειτουργία της εσωτερικής αγοράς όσον αφορά τα εν λόγω προϊόντα, μέσω ενδεχόμενης απλούστευσης.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000853/13
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(28 January 2013)

Subject: Extent of firearm possession in the EU

The intense debate and controversy about the extent of firearm possession in the US and US households are also causing concern about the extent of the problem in Europe. Despite the fact that Member States' legislation generally prohibits or is unfavourable towards the possession of firearms by civilians, there are indications that many households in the EU have firearms illegally or without registering them.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Does it have any information and comparative data on the estimated scale of the problem in the EU?
2. Has it noted an aggravation of the problem in recent years?
3. Will it take further initiatives to curb gun possession?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2013)

The Commission is aware that the control of firearms is crucial in the fight against insecurity and criminality. Some indicators on the magnitude of the problem can be found in the Commission report ⁽¹⁾ on the classification of firearms.

The relevant legislation at EU level is the Council Directive 91/477/EEC on the control of the acquisition and possession of weapons as amended by Directive 2008/51/EC of the European Parliament and the Council and Regulation (EU) No 258/2012 to combat illicit arms trafficking through improved tracing and control of exports of civilian firearms from the European Union, including measure for imports and transit.

Following these EU legal acts the Commission is now finalising a proposal for a Council decision on the conclusion of the UN Protocol on Firearms.

The Commission will submit a report to the European Parliament and the Council in 2015 on the situation resulting from the application of the directive, accompanied if appropriate, by proposals.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2012) 415 final Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council — Possible advantages and disadvantages of reducing the classification to two categories of firearms (prohibited or authorised) with a view to improving the functioning of the internal market for the products in question through simplification.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000854/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(28 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ανθρωπιστική κρίση στο Μάλι: κύμα προσφύγων

Η ανθρωπιστική κρίση στο Μάλι επιβαρύνθηκε ακόμη περισσότερο λόγω της εμφύλιας σύγκρουσης, με αποτέλεσμα να εντείνεται το προσφυγικό κύμα πολιτών της χώρας, καταρχήν σε γειτονικές χώρες.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει αν σύμφωνα με τις πληροφορίες που διαθέτει παρατηρείται αύξηση αιτήσεων ασύλου προσφύγων από το Μάλι σε κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ;
2. Ποια μέσα και ποιους πόρους έχει μέχρι στιγμής κινητοποιήσει η Επιτροπή για την αντιμετώπιση της εξελισσόμενης ανθρωπιστικής κρίσης στην περιοχή;
3. Υποστηρίζει τεχνικά γειτονικές χώρες προκειμένου να μπορούν να υποδέχονται και να φιλοξενούν πρόσφυγες από το Μάλι; Εκτιμά ότι μεσοπρόθεσμα ο αριθμός αιτημάτων ασύλου από πρόσφυγες της περιοχής θα αυξηθεί στην ΕΕ;

Απάντηση της Υπατης Εκπροσώπου/Αντιπροέδρου Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(5 Απριλίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή θεωρεί ότι η παροχή ανθρωπιστικής βοήθειας παραμένει η αμεσότερη και σημαντικότερη προτεραιότητα για το Μάλι και τις γειτονικές χώρες που φιλοξενούν πρόσφυγες από το Μάλι. Η ΕΕ αποτελεί μείζονος σημασίας ανθρωπιστικό φορέα. Μέχρι στιγμής, η Επιτροπή έχει διαθέσει 15 εκατ. ευρώ για την αντιμετώπιση της κρίσης στο Μάλι. Ως προς την ανάληψη δράσης, η Επιτροπή συνεργάζεται με τους εταίρους της στην περιοχή για την παροχή βοήθειας σε πρόσφυγες στη Μπουρκίνα Φάσο, τη Νιγηρία και τη Μαυριτανία. Η ανταπόκριση συντονίζεται κυρίως από την Υπατη Αρμοστεία των Ηνωμένων Εθνών για τους Πρόσφυγες (UNHCR) και λοιπούς διεθνείς οργανισμούς, όπως το Παγκόσμιο Επισιτιστικό Πρόγραμμα (ΠΕΠ) και ΜΚΟ. Συμμετέχουν επίσης και τοπικές κυβερνήσεις. Η Επιτροπή εργάζεται στενά με τους επιτόπιους εταίρους της, συμπεριλαμβανομένων εκείνων με την εντονότερη παρουσία στο βόρειο Μάλι (Διεθνής Επιτροπή του Ερυθρού Σταυρού, Médecins Sans Frontières (Γιατροί Χωρίς Σύνορα) και λοιποί ανθρωπιστικοί φορείς) (Γραφείο Συντονισμού Ανθρωπιστικών Υποθέσεων, Unicef, ΠΕΠ, UNHCR). Οι ανθρωπιστικές ανάγκες στον βορά παραμένουν σημαντικές. Η επιτόπιου κατάσταση παρακολουθείται εκ του σύνεγγυς από ομάδα εμπειρογνομόνων της ΕΕ για θέματα ανθρωπιστικής βοήθειας με στόχο να προσδιοριστεί κατά πόσον συντρέχουν λόγοι ανάληψης περαιτέρω δράσης. Η αδυναμία πρόσβασης των εργαζομένων στον ανθρωπιστικό τομέα και τα (υψηλά) επίπεδα ανασφάλειας παραμένουν ανησυχητικά.

Σύμφωνα με διαθέσιμα στοιχεία, ο αριθμός των αιτούντων ασύλου στην ΕΕ που δηλώνουν υπήκοοι του Μάλι μειώθηκε το 2012 σε σχέση με το 2011, από 3 625 σε 2 150 [πηγή: Eurostat]. Η Επιτροπή θα συνεχίσει να παρακολουθεί την κατάσταση. Είναι αδύνατη η πρόβλεψη μεσοπρόθεσμων εξελίξεων.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000854/13
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(28 January 2013)**

Subject: Humanitarian crisis in Mali: wave of refugees

The humanitarian crisis in Mali has been further aggravated by the civil war, which has increased the flow of refugees leaving the country, initially to neighbouring countries.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Can it say whether, according to the information available to it, there has been an increase in the number of asylum applications by refugees from Mali in EU Member States?
2. What tools and what resources has it so far mobilised to address the ongoing humanitarian crisis in the region?
3. Is it providing technical support for neighbouring countries to enable them to receive and host refugees from Mali? Does it believe that, in the medium term, the number of asylum applications in the EU by refugees from the region will increase?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(5 April 2013)**

The Commission considers that provision of humanitarian assistance remains the most immediate and important priority for Mali and the neighbouring countries hosting Malinese refugees. The EU is a major humanitarian actor. So far, the Commission has allocated EUR 115 M to respond to the crisis in Mali. In terms of action, the Commission is working with its partners in the region to provide assistance to refugees in Burkina Faso, Niger and Mauritania. The response is mainly coordinated by The UN Refugee Agency (UNHCR) and other international organisations, such as World Food Programme (WFP) or NGOs. Local governments are also involved. The Commission works closely with its partners on the ground, including those with the strongest presence in the North of Mali (The International Committee of the Red Cross, Médecins Sans Frontières and other humanitarian actors (Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, Unicef, WFP, UNHCR). Humanitarian needs remain great in the North. The situation on the ground is closely monitored with a team of experienced EU humanitarian experts deployed in order to determine the need for further action. Lack of access for humanitarian workers and (high) levels of insecurity remain a concern.

According to the information available, the number of asylum-seekers in the EU stating to be Malinese nationals decreased in 2012 comparing with 2011, from 3.625 to 2.150 [source: Eurostat]. The Commission will continue to monitor the situation. It is not possible to predict medium term developments.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000855/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(28 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Επιπρόσθετες πληροφορίες σχετικά με τις δαπάνες λειτουργίας της ομάδας εργασίας στην Ελλάδα

Σε πρόσφατη απάντηση σε ερώτησή μου (E-009413/2012), ο αξιότιμος Επίτροπος κ. Šefčovič σημείωσε ότι το 2012 (πρώτο έτος πλήρους εφαρμογής) το ποσό για τις λειτουργικές δαπάνες της ομάδας εργασίας στην Ελλάδα ανήλθε στις 747 368 ευρώ· ωστόσο για το 2013 έχει διατεθεί εκ των προτέρων ποσό ύψους 840 138 ευρώ.

- Είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει για ποιες δράσεις και δαπάνες προβλέπεται ότι θα χρειαστεί αύξηση των δαπανών κατά 100 000 περίπου ευρώ το 2013;
- Είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει για το αν κάποιες από αυτές τις δαπάνες καλύπτονται από το ελληνικό δημόσιο και, αν ναι, ποιες;

Απάντηση του κ. Šefčovič εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(12 Μαρτίου 2013)

Ύστερα από αίτημα του Συμβουλίου και της Επιτροπής, από τον Μάιο του 2012 ενισχύθηκε η στελέχωση της Ομάδας Δράσης για την Ελλάδα, ιδίως στην Αθήνα. Η πρόσληψη πρόσθετου προσωπικού ξεκίνησε το καλοκαίρι του 2012 και θα επιφέρει πρόσθετες δαπάνες το 2013, όπως προκύπτει από την απάντηση στην ερώτηση E-009413/2012.

Οι εν λόγω λειτουργικές δαπάνες καλύπτονται από τον διοικητικό προϋπολογισμό της Επιτροπής.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000855/13
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(28 January 2013)**

Subject: Additional information on Task Force for Greece expenses

In his recent response to my Question E-009413/2012, Commissioner Šefčovič noted that the expenses of the Task Force for Greece totalled EUR 747 368 in 2012 (first full year of application); however, the sum of EUR 840 138 has been earmarked in advance for 2013.

- Is he able to tell me what action and outlay are planned that will require additional expenses of approximately EUR 100 000 in 2013?
- Is he able to tell me if any of these expenses are paid by the Greek State and, if so, which?

**Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(12 March 2013)**

Further to a request from the Council and the Commission, the staffing of the Task Force for Greece (TFGR) was increased as of May 2012, with an emphasis on the presence in Athens. The phasing in of the additional staff took place as of summer 2012 and will lead to additional costs in 2013, as set out in the reply given to Question E-009413/2012.

All these operating expenses are financed from the administrative budget of the Commission.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000856/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(28 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Κρυφές χρεώσεις σε εφαρμογές κινητών

Η εξάπλωση χρήσης των λεγόμενων «smart phones» έχει οδηγήσει σε εκτεταμένη χρήση εφαρμογών από τους πολίτες. Ωστόσο, παρατηρείται ραγδαία αύξηση των καταγγελιών σχετικά με εφαρμογές που, ενώ αναφέρουν πως η χρήση τους είναι δωρεάν εντούτοις εμπεριέχουν κρυφές χρεώσεις που επιβαρύνουν τους λογαριασμούς των καταναλωτών. Ενδεικτικό είναι το γεγονός ότι μόνο στην Βρετανία, οι σχετικές καταγγελίες αυξήθηκαν κατά 300%.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Διαθέτει στοιχεία σχετικά με την έκταση του φαινομένου στην ΕΕ και το ύψος των οικονομικών απωλειών για τα νοικοκυριά που επιφέρουν οι κρυφές χρεώσεις στις εφαρμογές των κινητών;
2. Αναμένεται να αναλάβει η Επιτροπή νέες πρωτοβουλίες σχετικά με την ενίσχυση του κοινοτικού νομοθετικού πλαισίου για την προστασία των καταναλωτών;

Απάντηση της κ. Reding εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(4 Απριλίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει τους κινδύνους που ενέχουν για τους καταναλωτές οι κρυφές χρεώσεις στις διαδικτυακές προσφορές υποτιθέμενων δωρεάν ψηφιακών προϊόντων. Οι εν λόγω κρυφές χρεώσεις ήταν ένα από τα σημαντικότερα ζητήματα που ανέκυψαν όταν οι εθνικές αρχές που είναι αρμόδιες για την επιβολή της νομοθεσίας και την προστασία των καταναλωτών στην ΕΕ, την Ισπανία και τη Νορβηγία, διενήργησαν ταυτόχρονα έλεγχο των ιστοτόπων που προσφέρουν τα εν λόγω προϊόντα («έλεγχος συμμόρφωσης») ⁽¹⁾ υπό τον συντονισμό της Επιτροπής, κατά το παρελθόν έτος.

Οι κανόνες της ΕΕ που διέπουν τον τομέα αυτόν θα ενισχυθούν με την επικείμενη εφαρμογή της οδηγίας για τα δικαιώματα των καταναλωτών ⁽²⁾. Το άρθρο 8 της εν λόγω οδηγίας επιβάλλει ρητώς στον έμπορο να παρέχει στον καταναλωτή με σαφή και ευκρινή τρόπο, και αμέσως προτού ο καταναλωτής υποβάλει την παραγγελία, του τις απαραίτητες πληροφορίες, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της τιμής, σχετικά με το εάν η σύμβαση εξ αποστάσεως συνεπάγεται επιβάρυνση στον καταναλωτή την υποχρέωση να πληρώσει. Ο έμπορος οφείλει να μεριμνήσει ώστε ο καταναλωτής, κατά την υποβολή της παραγγελίας, να αναγνωρίσει ρητώς ότι η παραγγελία συνεπάγεται υποχρέωση πληρωμής. Εάν η υποβολή παραγγελίας απαιτεί την ενεργοποίηση ενός διακόπτη ή ανάλογη λειτουργία, ο διακόπτης ή η ανάλογη λειτουργία πρέπει να φέρουν ευανάγνωστη σήμανση που να αναγράφει τις λέξεις «παραγγελία με υποχρέωση πληρωμής» ή μια ανάλογη σαφή διατύπωση που να δείχνει ότι η υποβολή παραγγελίας συνεπάγεται υποχρέωση πληρωμής στον έμπορο. Εάν ο έμπορος δεν συμμορφωθεί με τις υποχρεώσεις αυτές, ο καταναλωτής δεν δεσμεύεται από τη σύμβαση ή την παραγγελία.

Οι εν λόγω κανόνες ισχύουν για όλες τις συμβάσεις εξ αποστάσεως, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των εφαρμογών έξυπνων τηλεφώνων (smart phones). Η οδηγία για τα δικαιώματα των καταναλωτών πρέπει να μεταφερθεί στην εθνική νομοθεσία των κρατών μελών έως τις 13 Δεκεμβρίου 2013 και θα καταστεί εφαρμοστέα από τις 13 Ιουνίου 2014. Επί του παρόντος, η Επιτροπή συνδράμει τα κράτη μέλη στην προσπάθειά τους να διασφαλίσουν την ορθή μεταφορά της οδηγίας.

⁽¹⁾ Βλ. IP/12/1320 της 06/12/2012: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-12-1320_en.htm

⁽²⁾ Οδηγία 2011/83/ΕΕ, της 25ης Οκτωβρίου 2011, σχετικά με τα δικαιώματα των καταναλωτών, την τροποποίηση της οδηγίας 93/13/ΕΟΚ του Συμβουλίου και της οδηγίας 1999/44/ΕΕ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου και την κατάργηση της οδηγίας 85/577/ΕΟΚ του Συμβουλίου και της οδηγίας 97/7/ΕΕ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000856/13
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(28 January 2013)**

Subject: Hidden charges for mobile applications

The widespread use of smart phones has led to extensive use of applications by the public. However, there has been a rapid increase in complaints concerning applications which are supposedly free, but which contain hidden charges which inflate consumers' bills. In Great Britain alone, such complaints have risen by 300 %.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Does it have information on the extent of this problem in the EU and the financial losses caused to households by hidden charges for mobile applications?
2. Does the Commission expect to take new initiatives to strengthen the Community legislative framework in order to protect consumers?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(4 April 2013)**

The Commission is aware of the risks for consumers arising from hidden charges in the online offers of supposedly free digital products. Such hidden charges were one of the major issues identified when national consumer enforcement authorities across the EU, Iceland and Norway, under the coordination of the Commission, in the last year were simultaneously screening websites offering such products ⁽¹⁾.

EU rules in this area will be reinforced by the upcoming implementation of the Consumer Rights Directive ⁽²⁾. Its Article 8 expressly requires the trader to make the consumer aware in a clear and prominent manner, and directly before the consumer places his order, of certain essential information, including the price, if the distance contract places the consumer under an obligation to pay. The trader must ensure that the consumer, when placing his order, explicitly acknowledges that the order implies an obligation to pay. If placing an order entails activating a button or a similar function, the button or similar function must be labelled in an easily legible manner only with the words 'order with obligation to pay' or a corresponding unambiguous formulation indicating that placing the order entails an obligation to pay the trader. If the trader has not complied with these requirements, the consumer is not bound by the contract or order.

These rules apply to all distance contracts, including for smartphone applications. The Consumer Rights Directive is to be transposed into national laws by 13 December 2013 and it will become applicable by 13 June 2014. The Commission is currently assisting the Member States to ensure correct transposition of the directive.

⁽¹⁾ See IP/12/1320 of 06/12/2012: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-12-1320_en.htm

⁽²⁾ Directive 2011/83/EU of 25 October 2011 on consumer rights, amending Council Directive 93/13/EEC and Directive 1999/44/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council and repealing Council Directive 85/577/EEC and Directive 97/7/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000857/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(28 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Διαφυγόντα κεφάλαια στο εξωτερικό

Από το ελληνικό Υπουργείο Οικονομικών εκτιμάται ότι, την τριετία 2009-2011, περίπου 7 δις ευρώ διέφυγαν στο εξωτερικό από την Ελλάδα χωρίς να μπορούν να δικαιολογηθούν και να καταβληθούν οι ανάλογοι φόροι. Για τον λόγο αυτό το αρμόδιο Υπουργείο λαμβάνει μια σειρά από μέτρα για τον έλεγχο και την φορολόγηση τους.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Συγκεντρώνει στοιχεία που αφορούν τον όγκο των διαφυγόντων κεφαλαίων από τα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ; Είναι σε θέση να μου παραθέσει την συγκριτική κατάσταση μεταξύ των κρατών μελών;
2. Αναμένεται να αναλάβει νέες πρωτοβουλίες προς την κατεύθυνση της υποστήριξης των κρατών μελών στη προσπάθεια καταπολέμησης της φοροδιαφυγής των κεφαλαίων;

Απάντηση του κ. Šemeta εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(7 Μαρτίου 2013)

Δεδομένα για το συνολικό ποσό των καταθέσεων των ελλήνων μη τραπεζικών επενδυτών οι οποίες βρίσκονται στο εξωτερικό είναι διαθέσιμα στο κοινό στον δικτυακό τόπο της ΤΔΔ ⁽¹⁾. Το συνολικό ποσό των καταθέσεων των ελλήνων μη τραπεζικών επενδυτών στο εξωτερικό αυξήθηκε από 12,3 δις. USD τον Δεκέμβριο 2008 σε 31,9 δις. USD τον Σεπτέμβριο του 2012, που αντιπροσωπεύει αύξηση κατά 19,6 δις. USD ή 2,6 φορές την αρχική τιμή του 2008. Για την ίδια περίοδο ο ίδιος δείκτης παρέμεινε σχετικά σταθερός για τις άλλες μεγάλες οικονομίες της ΕΕ — 2,3 τρισ. USD τον Δεκέμβριο του 2008 έναντι 2,6 τρισ. τον Σεπτέμβριο του 2012. Τα διαθέσιμα στοιχεία δεν δείχνουν κατά πόσον οι καταθέσεις που υφίστανται στο εξωτερικό είχαν φορολογηθεί στο κράτος διαμονής του επενδυτή.

Στις 6 Δεκεμβρίου 2012, η Επιτροπή ενέκρινε σχέδιο δράσης για την ενίσχυση της καταπολέμησης της φορολογικής απάτης και της φοροδιαφυγής (COM (2012)722 τελικό). Το σχέδιο δράσης προσδιορίζει μια σειρά ειδικών μέτρων που μπορούν να αναπτυχθούν τώρα και στο μέλλον. Η Επιτροπή πιστεύει ότι ο συνδυασμός αυτών των δράσεων μπορεί να εξασφαλίσει ολοκληρωμένη και αποτελεσματική ανταπόκριση στις διάφορες προκλήσεις που τίθενται από τη φορολογική απάτη και τη φοροδιαφυγή, συμβάλλοντας έτσι στο να καταστούν πιο δίκαια τα φορολογικά συστήματα των κρατών μελών, στην εξασφάλιση εξαιρετικά αναγκαίων φορολογικών εσόδων και, τελικά, στη βελτίωση της λειτουργίας της εσωτερικής αγοράς.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.bis.org/statistics/bankstats.htm>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000857/13
to the Commission**

Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)

(28 January 2013)

Subject: Capital flight

The Greek Ministry of Finance estimates that capital flight out of Greece which could not be justified and on which no tax was paid totalled approximately EUR 7 billion over the three years between 2009 and 2011. The Ministry is therefore taking a series of measures to audit and tax that capital.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Is it collecting information on the level of capital flight from EU Member States? Is it in a position to provide a comparison between the Member States?
2. Does it expect to take new initiatives in order to support the Member States in efforts to combat tax evasion?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission

(7 March 2013)

Data on the total amount of deposits of Greek non-bank investors held abroad are publicly available on the BIS website ⁽¹⁾. The total amount of deposits of Greek non-bank investors abroad has increased from USD 12.3 billion in December 2008 to USD 31.9 billion in September 2012, an increase of USD 19.6 billion or 2.6 times the initial 2008 value. For that same period the same indicator has remained relatively stable for the other major EU economies — USD 2.3 trillion in December 2008 compared to 2.6 trillion in September 2012. The available data do not indicate whether deposits held abroad have been subject to tax in the investor's state of residence.

On 6th December 2012 the Commission adopted an Action Plan to strengthen the fight against tax fraud and tax evasion (COM(2012)722 final). It identifies a series of specific measures which can be developed now and in years to come. The Commission believes that the combination of these actions can provide a comprehensive and effective response to the various challenges posed by tax fraud and evasion and can thus contribute to increasing the fairness of Member States' tax systems, to securing much needed tax revenues and ultimately to improving the functioning of the internal market.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.bis.org/statistics/bankstats.htm>

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000858/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(28 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Aquicultura

A Comissão Europeia publicou, em 2009, a estratégia de desenvolvimento sustentável da aquicultura europeia. Mais de três anos volvidos, pergunto à Comissão:

- Qual a avaliação que faz sobre a implantação da aquicultura nos Estados-Membros?
- De que forma a aquicultura conseguiu, ou está em vias de conseguir, implantar-se como alternativa à pesca marítima e, dessa forma, contribuir para a sustentabilidade dos recursos marítimos?

Resposta dada por Maria Damanaki em nome da Comissão
(12 de abril de 2013)

A Comunicação «Construir um futuro sustentável para a aquicultura» ⁽¹⁾ destinava-se a proporcionar orientações às administrações e às partes interessadas, para assegurar o desenvolvimento sustentável da aquicultura europeia. A Comissão contribuiu para a execução da estratégia para a aquicultura através de diversas ações, designadamente a preparação do documento «Guidance on Aquaculture and Natura 2000 — Sustainable aquaculture activities in the context of the Natura 2000 Network» ⁽²⁾.

A produção aquícola nos Estados-Membros está, no entanto, a estagnar. Os dados relativos a 2010 revelam uma produção no valor de 3,1 mil milhões de euros e um volume de 1,26 milhões de toneladas. Atualmente, 10 % do consumo de produtos do mar na UE provém da aquicultura, 25 % da pesca e 65 % de importações de países terceiros (incluindo pesca e aquicultura). O fosso existente entre o nosso consumo e a produção do nosso setor das pescarias tem vindo a aumentar de forma constante nos últimos anos.

A reforma da política comum das pescas ⁽³⁾ visa alcançar níveis sustentáveis de pesca e aquicultura mediante a abolição da sobrepesca e a promoção da produção aquícola. A aquicultura não deve ser considerada uma alternativa à pesca, mas o aumento da sua contribuição pode concorrer para o objetivo de melhorar a parte da oferta de produtos da pesca da UE aos consumidores europeus.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2009) 162 final.

⁽²⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/Aqua-N2000%20guide.pdf>

⁽³⁾ COM(2011) 425 final – Proposta de Regulamento do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativo à política comum das pescas.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000858/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(28 January 2013)**

Subject: Aquaculture

In 2009, the European Commission published the strategy for the sustainable development of European aquaculture. Now that over three years have passed, I ask the Commission:

- What is its assessment of the implementation of aquaculture in the Member States?
- To what extent has aquaculture succeeded in becoming an alternative to sea fishing, or has made progress in this direction, thereby contributing to the sustainability of maritime resources?

**Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(12 April 2013)**

The communication 'Building a sustainable future for aquaculture' ⁽¹⁾ was aimed at providing guidance to both administrations and stakeholders to ensure the sustainable development of European aquaculture. The Commission has contributed to the implementation of the Aquaculture Strategy through different actions such as the preparation of the document: 'Guidance on Aquaculture and Natura 2000 — Sustainable aquaculture activities in the context of the Natura 2000 network' ⁽²⁾.

In spite of this aquaculture production in Member States is stagnating. Data referring to 2010 show a production value of EUR 3.1 billion and a volume of 1.26 million tonnes. Today, 10% of the EU seafood consumption comes from aquaculture, 25% from fisheries and 65% from imports from third countries (including both fisheries and aquaculture). The gap between our consumption and the production of our capture fisheries sector has been steadily growing in the last years.

The reform of the common fisheries policy ⁽³⁾ aims to achieve sustainable fishery and aquaculture, through the ending of overfishing and promotion of aquaculture production. Aquaculture should not be considered as an alternative to fishing, an increased contribution from aquaculture can however be complementary in the aim to improve the share of supply from EU fish products to European consumers.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2009) 162 final.

⁽²⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/Aqua-N2000%20guide.pdf>

⁽³⁾ COM(2011)425 final — Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the common fisheries policy.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse P-000859/13

til Kommissionen
Britta Thomsen (S&D)

(28. januar 2013)

Om: Aldring og kvinders helbred

Aldring er en af de største sociale og økonomiske udfordringer i det 21. århundrede i Europa. I 2025 vil over 20 pct. af alle europæere være 65 år eller derover.

Europa-Parlamentets beslutning 2012/2129 (INI) om forebyggelse af aldersbetingede sygdomme hos kvinder viser, at ældre kvinder i Europa har en højere forventet levealder (82,4 år) end mænd (76,4 år). Samtidig er afstanden mellem raske leveår mindre, nemlig 62,6 år for kvinder og 61,7 år for mænd.

I november 2011 lancerede Kommissionen en rapport om mænds helbred i Europa.

— Planlægger Kommissionen at gennemføre en lignende undersøgelse for at finde årsagertil, at kvinder lever længere med alvorlige sygdomme i slutningen af deres liv, end mænd gør?

— Hvilke tiltag planlægger Kommissionen at tage for at sikre Europas kvinder flere raske leveår?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Tonio Borg

(1. marts 2013)

Kommissionen bestilte og offentliggjorde rapporten »The State of Men's Health in Europe« (status over mænds sundhed i Europa) i 2011. I 2009 blev en rapport om »Data and Information on Women's Health in the EU« (kvinders sundhed i EU) offentliggjort. Grundene til, at Kommissionen har udarbejdet disse rapporter, var forskellene mellem mænd og kvinders forventede levetid og andre indikatorer, og formålet var at udfylde en informationskløft, bidrage til drøftelser og inspirere til skabelsen af yderligere oplysninger. Kommissionen planlægger ikke at udarbejde andre lignende rapporter.

Kommissionen udvikler i øjeblikket ikke specifikke aktiviteter vedrørende kun mænds sundhed eller kun kvinders sundhed. Kønspolitiske spørgsmål i almindelighed er integreret i de sundhedspolitiske initiativer. Kommissionen vil fortsat udvikle politikker, der søger at forbedre europæernes sundhed og trivsel, f.eks. ved at sætte fokus på sundhedsfremme og forebyggelse af sygdomme (initiativer såsom tobakslovgivningen eller antitygekampagnen »Eksrygere er ikke til at stoppe«, aktiviteter inden for ernæring og fysisk aktivitet eller det europæiske partnerskab om en indsats mod kræft i samarbejde med medlemsstaterne og den nyligt lancerede fælles aktion for at løse problemerne med og håndteringen af kroniske sygdomme i hele livscyklens). Kommissionen er også i færd med at gennemføre det europæiske innovationspartnerskab inden for aktiv og sund aldring, der sigter mod at øge den forventede raske levetid i EU.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-000859/13
to the Commission
Britta Thomsen (S&D)
(28 January 2013)**

Subject: Ageing and women's health

Ageing is one of the greatest social and economic challenges of the 21st century in Europe. In 2025 more than 20% of all Europeans will be 65 or over.

The European Parliament resolution on prevention of age-related diseases of women (2012/2129(INI)) shows that older women in Europe have a longer life expectancy (82.4 years) than men (76.4 years). At the same time the gap in healthy life expectancy is more narrow, being 61.7 years for men and 62.6 years for women.

In November 2011 the Commission published a report on the State of Men's Health in Europe.

- Does the Commission plan to carry out a similar study to discover the reason why women live longer with serious illnesses at the end of their lives than men do?
- What measures does the Commission plan to take to increase women's healthy life expectancy?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(1 March 2013)**

The Commission commissioned and published the report 'The State of Men's Health in Europe' in 2011. In 2009, a previous report on 'Data and Information on Women's Health in the EU' was published. The reasons for the Commission issuing these reports were the differences between men and women in life expectancy and other indicators and the aim was to fill an information gap, to contribute to the discussion and to inspire generation of further information. The Commission does not plan to prepare other similar reports.

Currently, the Commission is not developing any specific activities targeted only on men's health or on women's health; the gender issues in general are integrated in the health policy initiatives. The Commission will continue developing policies that seek to improve Europeans' health and well-being, for example by focusing on health promotion and prevention of diseases (initiatives such as the tobacco legislation or the anti-smoking campaign 'Ex-Smokers are Unstoppable'; activities in the area of nutrition and physical activity; or the European Partnership for Action Against Cancer in cooperation with the Member States and the recently launched Joint Action on tackling and managing chronic diseases across the life cycle). The Commission is also implementing the European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing, which aims to increase healthy life expectancy in the EU.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000860/13

à Comissão

Nuno Teixeira (PPE)

(28 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Obstáculos à concessão de vistos de permanência a cidadãos europeus no Brasil

Tendo em conta que:

- As relações históricas, culturais, económicas e políticas do Brasil com a União Europeia se estabeleceram ainda na década de 60 e que, após vários acordos de cooperação, foi firmada uma Parceria Estratégica em 2007, que engloba a cooperação em áreas como os Direitos Humanos, as alterações climáticas, as energias sustentáveis, a luta em prol da erradicação da pobreza e a integração regional;
- A extraordinária evolução económica e política do Brasil nos últimos anos, que o tornou numa potência económica emergente como parte do grupo BRIC, com um PIB que representa metade do da América do Sul e mais de 70 % do Mercosul, levou a um aumento exponencial da procura deste país por parte de migrantes;
- A 6.ª Cimeira conjunta Brasil-União Europeia teve lugar este mês, no dia 24, e que, na declaração conjunta, não há uma referência quanto aos problemas atinentes aos vistos de permanência de cidadãos europeus no Brasil;
- O Plano de Ação Conjunta para o período de 2012-2014 faz referência à necessidade de flexibilização e simplificação dos vistos e que, desde 1 de outubro de 2012, está em vigor o acordo recíproco que permite aos cidadãos de todos os Estados-Membros a isenção de vistos de curta duração;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Se, no decorrer da 6.ª Cimeira Brasil-União Europeia, não se fez referência, nos diálogos bilaterais, à simplificação de vistos de trabalho e permanência de cidadãos europeus no Brasil;
2. Se tem conhecimento dos inúmeros casos que têm vindo a público sobre as restrições e a burocracia que enfrentam, em particular, os cidadãos portugueses e espanhóis para a obtenção de um visto de permanência no Brasil;
3. Se não tenciona encetar diálogos com as autoridades brasileiras quanto a este tema, uma vez que se multiplica o número de migrantes europeus ilegais a viver e a trabalhar no Brasil.

Resposta dada por Cecilia Malmström em nome da Comissão

(27 de março de 2013)

A simplificação de vistos de trabalho e de permanência não foi formalmente discutida no contexto da 6.ª Cimeira Brasil-UE, uma vez que não fazia parte da agenda acordada, nem qualquer um dos Estados-Membros fez o pedido específico para que fosse incluída.

No entanto, a Comissão está ciente das oportunidades de trabalho emergentes para os cidadãos da UE nos países da Comunidade de Estados da América Latina e das Caraíbas (CELAC) e está determinada a continuar a trabalhar em conjunto com aquela região, incluindo o Brasil, para melhor organizar a migração legal e a promover uma mobilidade bem gerida, em sintonia com a Abordagem Global para a Migração e a Mobilidade. Este é também um dos objetivos da Parceria Estratégica UE-Brasil: o Plano de Ação Conjunto UE-Brasil 2012-2014 procura melhorar o intercâmbio, organizando melhor os fluxos migratórios regulares e abordando eficazmente todas as dimensões do fenómeno migratório. Esta cooperação surge no âmbito do Diálogo Estruturado e Abrangente UE-CELAC sobre Migrações criado em junho de 2009.

Um passo importante nesse sentido foi a entrada em vigor, em 1 de outubro de 2012, do Acordo UE-Brasil sobre a isenção de visto para as estadas de curta duração para titulares de passaportes comuns, o que garante a reciprocidade e contribui para promover a mobilidade entre as duas partes.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000860/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(28 January 2013)

Subject: Obstacles to obtaining residence visas for European citizens in Brazil

Whereas:

- Historical, cultural, economic and political relations between Brazil and the European Union were established in the 1960s and, following several cooperation agreements, a Strategic Partnership was signed in 2007, which covers cooperation in areas such as Human Rights, climate change, sustainable energy, the fight against poverty and regional integration.
- Brazil's extraordinary economic and political evolution over recent years has made it an emerging economic power as part of the BRIC group. Its GDP represents half of that of South America and more than 70 % of that of Mercosul, and this has led to an exponential increase in the number of migrants seeking to enter the country.
- The VI Brazil-EU Summit took place on the 24th of this month, and the Joint Statement makes no mention at all of the problems relating to residence visas for European Citizens in Brazil;
- The Joint Action Plan 2012-2014 refers to the need for flexibility and simplification of visas and the reciprocal agreement that exempts citizens of all Member States from short-term visas has been in force since 1 October 2012.

I ask the Commission:

1. Was the subject of simplifying work and residence visas for European citizens in Brazil was discussed at the VI Brazil-EU Summit?
2. Is it aware of the countless reports of the restrictions and bureaucracy that Portuguese and Spanish citizens in particular, face when trying to obtain a residence visa in Brazil?
3. If it intends to discuss this issue with the Brazilian authorities, as the number of European immigrants living and working illegally in Brazil continues to rise?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2013)

Simplification of work and residence visas was not formally discussed in the context of the VI Brazil-EU Summit as it was not part of the agreed agenda, nor was there a specific request to have it included from any of our Member States.

The Commission is aware of the employment opportunities emerging in the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States (CELAC) countries, including Brazil, for EU citizens and is determined to continue to work with the region in better organising legal migration and fostering well managed mobility in line with the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility. This is also one of the objectives of the EU-Brazil Strategic Partnership: the EU-Brazil Joint Action Plan 2012-2014 calls for further exchanges on better organising regular migration flows and effectively addressing all the dimensions of the migration phenomenon. Cooperation in this field takes place as part of the EU-CELAC Comprehensive and Structured Dialogue on Migration established in June 2009.

An important step in that direction was the entering into force on 1 October 2012 of the EU-Brazil agreement on short stay visa-waiver for ordinary passports holders which guarantees reciprocity and contributes to foster mobility between the two parties.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000861/13
a la Comisión
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(28 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: Proyecto de conexión ferroviaria del puerto exterior de Ferrol (A Coruña)

El Gobierno del Estado español ha licitado el proyecto de conexión ferroviaria con el puerto exterior de Ferrol (A Coruña). Esta actuación ha provocado un amplio rechazo social por su impacto en determinadas zonas, especialmente en la zona de la ensenada de A Malata (Ferrol). La licitación ha sido llevada a cabo de manera irregular, sin haber respondido a las alegaciones presentadas por los afectados durante el periodo de exposición pública. La Directiva 2011/92/UE relativa a la evaluación de las repercusiones de determinados proyectos públicos y privados sobre el medio ambiente establece en su considerando número 7 que dicha evaluación se debe realizar tomando como base «la información [...] proporcionada por el promotor» y «por el público al que pueda interesar el proyecto». De igual manera, en su artículo 6, apartado 4, afirma que «el público interesado tendrá la posibilidad real de participar desde una fase temprana en los procedimientos de toma de decisiones [...], tendrá derecho a expresar observaciones y opiniones».

Además, este proyecto ha sido publicado sin la declaración de impacto ambiental correspondiente, de manera que contraviene lo dispuesto por la Directiva 2011/92/UE en su artículo número 3, donde se recogen los requisitos y factores que han de ser evaluados en la declaración de impacto ambiental de un proyecto de estas características. El Gobierno del Estado español ha anunciado que este proyecto va a ser cofinanciado con fondos europeos.

- ¿Conoce la Comisión la existencia de este proyecto? ¿Con qué tipo de fondos europeos será cofinanciado? ¿Puede informar la Comisión Europea a esta diputada, miembro de la Comisión de Desarrollo Regional del Parlamento Europeo, de esta posible cofinanciación?
- ¿Considera la Comisión que el procedimiento seguido para la licitación del proyecto es irregular, habiendo ignorado las alegaciones presentadas, contrariamente a lo dispuesto por la Directiva 2011/92/UE?
- ¿Es consciente la Comisión del impacto ambiental y estructural que tendrá el trazado escogido por el Ministerio de Fomento del Gobierno español sobre la ría de Ferrol, frente a los trazados alternativos existentes?
- ¿Tomará la Comisión las medidas necesarias para que se haga pública la declaración de impacto ambiental del proyecto de conexión ferroviaria del puerto exterior de Ferrol?

Respuesta del Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión
(20 de marzo de 2013)

La Comisión apoya la conexión de los puertos con su zona de influencia mediante modos de transporte más respetuosos con el medio ambiente como el ferrocarril. En ese proceso, debe respetarse toda la legislación de la UE y del Estado, como la referida a los procedimientos de adjudicación de contratos y a la realización de una evaluación del impacto ambiental, cuando proceda. Según la información disponible, el procedimiento de evaluación del impacto ambiental de ese proyecto de ferrocarril está en marcha y se encuentra en una fase muy avanzada. Las consultas con el público y las autoridades ya se han celebrado.

Se espera que el Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente expida pronto la declaración de impacto ambiental, antes de que las autoridades competentes autoricen el proyecto.

El puerto de Ferrol, incluidas sus conexiones por carretera y ferrocarril, forma parte de la red general RTE-T ⁽¹⁾. Para su cofinanciación futura no podrá recurrirse al mecanismo «Conectar Europa» ⁽²⁾ propuesto ya que este instrumento está concebido para cofinanciar la red básica de RTE-T. Sí podrá recurrirse en cambio a los Fondos Estructurales.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2011)650.

⁽²⁾ COM(2011)665.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000861/13
to the Commission**

Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)

(28 January 2013)

Subject: Planned rail link to the outer harbour of Ferrol (Coruña)

The Spanish Government has opened a call for tenders for the planned rail link to the outer harbour of Ferrol (Coruña). This project has met with widespread public opposition on account of its impact on a number of areas, particularly A Malata cove (Ferrol). The tender procedure is flawed, as no response has been given to the representations made by those affected during the period of public consultation. Under Recital 7 of Directive 2011/92/EU on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment, this assessment should be carried out on the basis of the 'information supplied by the developer' and 'by the public likely to be concerned by the project in question'. Similarly, Article 6(4) stipulates that 'the public concerned shall be given early and effective opportunities to participate in the environmental decision-making procedures (...) and shall (...) be entitled to express comments and opinions'.

This project was published without the corresponding environmental impact statement, which means that it also contravenes Article 3 of Directive 2011/92/EU, which lists the relevant requirements and the factors that are to be considered in the environmental impact statement for a project of this type. The Spanish Government has announced that this project will be co-financed with European funds.

— Is the Commission aware of the existence of this project? What type of European funds will be used to co-finance it? Can the Commission provide me, as a member of the European Parliament's Committee on Regional Development, with information on this possible co-financing?

— Does the Commission consider that the tender procedure for the project is flawed, since it has disregarded the representations made, contrary to the provisions of Directive 2011/92/EU?

— Is the Commission aware of the environmental and structural impact that the route chosen by the Spanish Government's Ministry of Public Works will have on the Ferrol estuary, compared with the alternative routes?

— Will the Commission take the necessary steps to ensure that the environmental impact statement for the planned rail link to the outer harbour of Ferrol is published?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission

(20 March 2013)

The Commission supports connecting ports to their hinterland through more environmentally friendly transport modes such as rail. All relevant EU and national legislation has to be respected, such as legislation regarding procurement procedures and carrying out an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) where this is so required. According to the available information, the EIA procedure for this railway project is ongoing and at a very advanced stage. All the consultations with the public and other authorities have already taken place.

It appears that the Ministry for Agriculture, Food and Environment will issue the EIA Statement soon and before the development consent for this project will be granted by the competent authority.

The port of Ferrol, including its road and rail links, is part of the TEN-T comprehensive network ⁽¹⁾. Future co-financing through the proposed Connecting Europe Facility ⁽²⁾ will not be possible as this instrument is foreseen to co-fund the TEN-T core network. Co-financing through the structural funds may however be available.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2011) 650.

⁽²⁾ COM(2011) 665.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-000862/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Diane Dodds (NI)

(28 January 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Persecution of Christians in Iran

Saeed Abedini, an American Christian pastor, is currently being held in an Iranian prison and risks the death penalty for 'compromising Iranian national security'. Those demanding Mr Abedini's release say that if he now faces such a harsh sentence it is because of his religious beliefs.

There has been an increasing intolerance towards Christianity in the past decade following the implementation of a much stricter form of Islamic Sharia law in Iran.

Whilst the specific charges against Abedini have not been made public, his situation is most certainly related to his conversion from Islam to Christianity back in 2000 and his subsequent efforts to spread the gospel.

As a matter of urgency, could Vice-President/High Representative Ashton state how many similar cases there are of European citizens being held in Iranian custody because of their religious beliefs?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(20 March 2013)

The High Representative is aware of the imprisonment of the American Pastor Saeed Abedini, and the eight-year sentence given to him. The High Representative and the EEAS have, on several occasions, expressed concern over charges such as those levelled at Abedini, and more generally the persecution of Christians and other religious minorities in Iran. Imprisoning or otherwise restricting individuals on the basis of their religious beliefs contravenes the International Convention of Civil and Political Rights, which Iran is signatory to.

The High Representative is not aware of any current cases of European citizens imprisoned in Iran on the basis of their religious beliefs or activities.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-000863/13
do Komisji**

Bogdan Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz (PPE)

(28 stycznia 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Prawna strona użytkowania bezpilotowych statków powietrznych (UAV) w świetle unijnego prawa

W związku z prowadzonymi przez Komisję Europejską pracami nad regulacjami dotyczącymi operacji lotniczych, zdolności do lotu i klasyfikacji bezpilotowych statków powietrznych (UAV) a także licencjonowania personelu powietrznego, chciałbym dopytać, w jaki sposób osoby fizyczne, ośrodki naukowe, firmy i instytucje państwowe mogą zapewnić bezpieczeństwo lotów bezpilotowych statków powietrznych, skoro brakuje odpowiednich regulacji prawnych na szczeblu zarówno krajowym, jak i unijnym.

W zaistniałej sytuacji pada pytanie, czy brak regulacji oznacza, że użytkowanie bezpilotowych statków powietrznych jest wykroczeniem lub przestępstwem?

Do momentu prawnego uregulowania kwestii Komisja powinna określić zalecenia (standardy) mające na celu poprawę bezpieczeństwa lotów. Dodatkowo nasuwa się pytanie w kontekście wzrostu ilości lotów w europejskiej przestrzeni powietrznej: czy w ramach opracowywanych przepisów przewidywany jest obowiązek montażu w bezpilotowych statkach powietrznych systemu czujników antykolidyjnych?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Siima Kallasa w imieniu Komisji

(27 lutego 2013 r.)

Jak wyjaśniono w odpowiedzi na pytanie P-010657/2012, ramy prawne dotyczące regulacji kwestii cywilnych systemów zdalnie sterowanych statków powietrznych (RPAS) zostały określone w rozporządzeniu (WE) nr 216/2008 ⁽¹⁾.

Aby określić strategię rozwoju aplikacji RPAS w Europie, Komisja przeprowadziła szeroko zakrojone konsultacje od czerwca 2011 r. do lutego 2012 r. na temat przyszłości RPAS w Europie. Biorąc pod uwagę rosnące znaczenie RPAS w ruchu lotniczym, ich potencjał pod względem wzrostu i tworzenia miejsc pracy oraz korzyści, jakie ich zastosowanie przyniesie społeczeństwu, Komisja postanowiła wesprzeć włączenie RPAS do europejskiego systemu lotniczego oraz opracować plan działania na rzecz bezpiecznej integracji RPAS w ramach systemu europejskiej przestrzeni powietrznej.

Ogłoszenie tego planu działania przewidziano w późniejszym okresie bieżącego roku. Plan ten dotyczyć będzie zdalnie sterowanych statków powietrznych, o masie powyżej oraz poniżej 150 kg, i uwzględnić będzie zagadnienia regulacyjne oraz badawczo-rozwojowe, jak również obszary pokrewne, w tym – między innymi – kwestie odpowiedzialności cywilnej i ubezpieczenia, bezpieczeństwa i ochrony prywatności. Integracja operacji wykonywanych przez RPAS w ramach europejskiej przestrzeni powietrznej będzie przebiegała stopniowo i w sposób zróżnicowany – zależnie od rodzaju tych operacji.

Rozwój systemów antykolidyjnych („Detect and avoid”) i związanych z nimi procedur ma rzeczywiście duże znaczenie; element ten zostanie wyraźnie uwzględniony w wyżej wymienionym planie.

⁽¹⁾ Dz.U. L 79 z 19.3.2008.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-000863/13
to the Commission**

Bogdan Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz (PPE)

(28 January 2013)

Subject: Legality of using unmanned aerial vehicles under EC law

With reference to the Commission's ongoing work on regulations concerning air operations, airworthiness, the classification of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) and the licensing of air crews, how can natural persons, research centres, companies and state institutions guarantee the safety of UAV flights in the absence of appropriate legal frameworks at both EU and national levels?

This situation begs the question: does the absence of regulation mean that the use of unmanned aerial vehicles is illegal?

The Commission should issue guidelines (standards) aimed at improving flight safety until a suitable legal framework is established. In the context of the increasing numbers of flights in European airspace, will the rules currently being developed include provision for the compulsory fitting of anti-collision sensors to UAVs?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission

(27 February 2013)

As explained in the answer to Question P-010657/2012, the legal framework for the regulation of civil remotely piloted aircraft systems (RPAS) is defined in Regulation (EC) No 216/2008⁽¹⁾.

In order to define a strategy for the development of RPAS applications in Europe, the Commission conducted an extensive consultation from June 2011 to February 2012 on the future of RPAS in Europe. Considering the increasing impact of RPAS on air traffic, the potential they represent for growth and jobs and the benefit of their applications for society, the Commission decided to support the integration of RPAS in the European air system, and to develop a roadmap for safe RPAS integration into the European Airspace system.

The publication of this roadmap is foreseen for later this year. This roadmap will cover remotely piloted aircraft, both above as well as below 150 kg, and will address the regulatory and research and development domains, as well as complementary areas including (but not limited to) third party liability and insurance, security and privacy. The integration of RPAS operations in the European airspace will be gradual and differentiated, based on the type of operations.

The development of 'detect and avoid' systems and associated operational procedures is indeed an important element which will be clearly identified in the aforementioned roadmap.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 79, 19.3.2008.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000864/13
a la Comisión**

Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)

(28 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: Asegurar la reapertura del ferrocarril internacional Canfranc-Pau en 2020

Se han cumplido diez años desde la apertura del túnel carretero internacional de Somport que comunica Aragón y Aquitania. La estadística de tránsito muestra que el número de vehículos ligeros ha aumentado en ese tiempo en alrededor de un 11 % mientras que el de camiones lo ha hecho en un 86 %. En este momento los Gobiernos de Aragón, Aquitania, España y Francia (a través de un convenio marco cuatripartito) colaboran para reabrir en 2020 la conexión ferroviaria Canfranc-Pau. Ello puede suponer una alternativa al transporte de mercancías por carretera en ese corredor, contribuyendo a los objetivos de emisiones de CO₂ de la Unión Europea (20/20/20) y a los de la Estrategia Europa 2020. El cierre del paso carretero numerosos días a causa de la nieve en el invierno, el sinuoso trazado de la carretera en el lado francés y el impacto ambiental de la carretera hacen del ferrocarril la alternativa idónea al creciente paso de vehículos pesados. Sin embargo, tras su creación en noviembre de 2011, a lo largo de 2012 el cuatripartito no se ha reunido ni una sola vez, y aunque los trabajos en el tramo Oloron-Bedous están en marcha, la inactividad es total en cuanto a las mejoras que necesita el tramo aragonés de la línea.

1. ¿Considera la Comisión que asegurar la puesta en servicio de esta conexión ferroviaria para el transporte de mercancías en 2020 contribuye efectivamente a alcanzar los objetivos de la Estrategia Europa 2020 y de reducción de emisiones de carbono?
2. ¿Estaría la Comisión dispuesta a hacer un llamamiento a los Gobiernos de Francia, España, Aquitania y Aragón para que aseguren la consecución dicho objetivo para el año 2020?

Respuesta del Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión

(13 de marzo de 2013)

La Comisión es consciente del papel potencial de la línea Pau-Canfranc en la consecución de los objetivos de la política común de transportes en la región. Por este motivo, la infraestructura ha sido incluida en la red transeuropea de transporte.

La Comisión ha cofinanciado recientemente estudios sobre esta conexión dentro del objetivo de cooperación territorial de la política de cohesión.

Además, la Comisión ha lanzado recientemente una convocatoria abierta por la cual el proyecto podría ser subvencionable en el marco del programa plurianual de la RTE-T.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000864/13
to the Commission**

Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)

(28 January 2013)

Subject: Ensure the reopening of the Canfranc-Pau international railway line in 2020

Ten years have passed since the opening of the Somport international road tunnel between Aragon and Aquitaine. Transit statistics show that over this period the number of light-duty vehicles has increased by approximately 11 % while that of lorries has increased by 86 %. At the present time, the Governments of Aragon, Aquitaine, Spain and France (through a quadripartite framework agreement) are cooperating to reopen the Canfranc-Pau rail link in 2020. This may provide an alternative to freight road transport in this corridor, and help attain the European Union's (20/20/20) carbon emission targets and those of the Europe 2020 strategy. The frequent closure of the road pass in winter due to snow, the winding route of the road on the French side and the environmental impact of the road make the railway a suitable alternative for the growing volume of heavy vehicles. The quadripartite was set up in November 2011 but has not met on a single occasion since then or throughout 2012, and although work is in progress on the Oloron-Bedous section, there is total inactivity as regards the improvements required along the Aragonese section of the line.

1. Does the Commission consider that ensuring this freight transport rail link is put into service in 2020 makes an effective contribution to achieving the targets of the Europe 2020 strategy and the reduction of carbon emissions?
2. Would the Commission be prepared to call on the Governments of France, Spain, Aquitaine and Aragon to ensure that these objectives are achieved by 2020?

Proposed Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission

(13 March 2013)

The Commission is aware of the potential role of the Pau-Canfranc line in the achievement of the Common Transport Policy objectives in the Region. It is for this reason that the infrastructure has been included in the Trans-European Transport Network.

The Commission has recently co-financed studies concerning this connection within the Territorial Cooperation objective of the Cohesion Policy.

Further, it has recently launched an open call for which the project would be eligible in the framework of the TEN-T Multiannual Programme.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000865/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(28 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ποινικές ρήτρες για τον αυτοκινητόδρομο E65

Στην ερώτησή μου E-009552/12, σχετικά με τον αυτοκινητόδρομο E65, μεταξύ άλλων, μου απαντήθηκε ότι, «Η Επιτροπή δεν αποτελεί συμβαλλόμενο μέρος της συμφωνίας παραχώρησης και δεν είναι ενήμερη αναφορικά με τη συμφωνία μεταξύ των ελληνικών αρχών και των κατόχων της παραχώρησης σχετικά με τον E65».

Δεδομένου ότι, η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή έχει συγχρηματοδοτήσει το εν λόγω έργο και ότι ο άξονας E65 ανήκει στο Διερωπαϊκό Δίκτυο TEN, θεωρώ ότι οφείλει η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή να είναι ενήμερη για κάθε εξέλιξη που αφορά στον άξονα E65, περιλαμβανομένης της συμφωνίας των ελληνικών αρχών με τους κατόχους της παραχώρησης.

Λαμβάνοντας υπ' όψιν τα ανωτέρω και τη ρητή δήλωση του παραχωρησιούχου του ανωτέρω έργου ότι «το υπουργείο σκέφτεται να αποζημιώσει τον ανάδοχο με 1 δις ευρώ», θα μου επιτρέψετε να επαναδιατυπώσω τα ερωτήματα, προκειμένου να έχω τις δέουσες απαντήσεις:

1. Τι γνωρίζει η Επιτροπή για τις αποφάσεις της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης σχετικά με μερική ή ολική εγκατάλειψη του έργου;
2. Με δεδομένο ότι στην ίδια απάντηση είχε τονισθεί ότι, «η έλλειψη ρευστότητας από πλευράς τραπεζών δημιουργεί τα προβλήματα για τη συνέχιση του δανεισμού», μπορεί να βεβαιώσει η Επιτροπή ότι όχι μόνο δεν θα επιτρέψει να κινηθούν ποινικές ρήτρες εναντίον του ελληνικού δημοσίου, αλλά αντίθετα ότι θα ενεργοποιηθούν οι ποινικές ρήτρες εναντίον των ανάδοχων και των τραπεζών, καθώς αυτοί είχαν συμβατικά δεσμευθεί για την ανεύρεση κεφαλαίων;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(2 Απριλίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή επαναλαμβάνει ότι, επειδή δεν είναι συμβαλλόμενο μέρος στις συμφωνίες παραχώρησης και δεν συμμετέχει στις διαπραγματεύσεις, δεν έχει ενημερωθεί για στοιχεία που συνδέονται με τις διαπραγματεύσεις, στα οποία περιλαμβάνεται και η πιθανή καταβολή αποζημιώσεων. Στις 12 Δεκεμβρίου 2012, το ελληνικό Υπουργείο Υποδομών ανακοίνωσε ότι οι διαπραγματεύσεις μεταξύ του ελληνικού Δημοσίου και των παραχωρησιούχων είχαν ολοκληρωθεί και ότι είχε πλέον ξεκινήσει ο δεύτερος κύκλος με τις τράπεζες-δανειστές. Έως σήμερα δεν υπάρχει καμία τελική συμφωνία και η Επιτροπή δεν γνωρίζει εάν η ελληνική κυβέρνηση έχει λάβει κάποια τελική απόφαση σχετικά με την ακύρωση του συνόλου ή μέρους του έργου E65.

Δεδομένου ότι η Επιτροπή δεν είναι συμβαλλόμενο μέρος στις συμβάσεις παραχώρησης, δεν έχει νομική συμμετοχή όσον αφορά την ενεργοποίηση οποιωνδήποτε ποινικών ρητρών.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000865/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(28 January 2013)**

Subject: Penalty clauses for E65 motorway

In response to my question E-009552/2012 on the E65 motorway, I was informed, among other things, that the Commission was not party to the concession contract and was not conversant with the contract between the Greek authorities and the holders of the E65 concession.

Given that the European Commission co-financed the project in question and that the E65 motorway belongs to the Trans-European Network, I consider that the European Commission should be conversant with every development relating to the E65 motorway, including the contract between the Greek authorities and the holders of the concession.

In view of the above and the express statement by the concession holder of the above project that 'the Ministry is thinking of paying the contractor compensation of EUR 1 billion', please allow me to reformulate the questions in the hope of receiving more precise replies:

1. What does the Commission know about the decisions by the Greek Government to cancel part or all of the project?
2. Given that, in its reply, the Commission emphasised that the lack of bank liquidity was causing continued lending problems, can the Commission confirm that not only will it not allow penalty clauses to be invoked against the Greek State, but that, on the contract, it will activate the penalty clauses against the contractors and the banks, as they are contract bound to raise capital?

**Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2013)**

The Commission reiterates that, being neither a signatory to the concession agreements nor a participant in the negotiations, it is not privy to information that is linked to the negotiations, including the possible payment of any penalties. On 12 December 2012, the Greek Minister of Infrastructure announced that the negotiations between the Greek state and the concession holders have concluded and that they have now entered into their second round with the lending banks. No final agreement exists up to this date and the Commission is not aware of any final decision of the Greek Government to cancel all or part of the E65 project.

As the Commission is not party to the concession contracts, it has no legal involvement with regard to the activation of any penalty clauses.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000866/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(28 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Συγχρηματοδοτούμενα μεγάλα έργα και έργα-γέφυρες στην Ελλάδα

Σε έκθεσή του, που παρουσίασε το Δεκέμβριο του 2012 το Ελληνικό Ελεγκτικό Συνέδριο, επισημαίνεται ότι, «Μέχρι 31.12.2011 υποβλήθηκαν αιτήσεις επιβεβαίωσης χρηματοδοτικής συνδρομής για 16 μεγάλα έργα. Το 36,9% των έργων αυτών αποτελούν έργα-γέφυρες, τα οποία σύμφωνα με τον κανονισμό της ΕΕ θα πρέπει να έχουν ολοκληρωθεί εντός της προγραμματικής περιόδου ΕΣΠΑ 2007-2013. Σε αντίθετη περίπτωση, ενδέχεται να μην υπάρξει δυνατότητα υλοποίησής τους με χρηματοδότηση επόμενης περιόδου και να απαιτηθεί από την ΕΕ η επιστροφή του συνόλου της χρηματοδότησης».

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Ποια είναι τα 16 μεγάλα έργα και ποια τα έργα-γέφυρες που αναφέρονται στην ανωτέρω έκθεση;
2. Τι ποσοστό απορρόφησης έχουμε για την καθεμία από τις 2 ομάδες έργων; Πώς σχολιάζει το ποσοστό απορρόφησης για την κάθε μία από τις ομάδες έργων;
3. Προκειμένου για τα έργα-γέφυρες, υπάρχει κίνδυνος απώλειας ή επιστροφής κονδυλίων, σε περίπτωση μη ολοκλήρωσης της τρέχουσας περιόδου προγραμματισμού; Τι προβλέπουν οι κανονισμοί;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(12 Απριλίου 2013)

Έως τις 31 Δεκεμβρίου 2011, η Επιτροπή είχε λάβει 23 παραδεκτές αιτήσεις για μεγάλα έργα, 14 εκ των άρχισαν να υλοποιούνται κατά την περίοδο προγραμματισμού 2000-2006. Ο κατάλογος των έργων θα αποσταλεί απευθείας στο αξιότιμο μέλος και στη Γραμματεία του Κοινοβουλίου.

Βάσει των πληροφοριών που ελήφθησαν από τις ελληνικές αρχές, η επί τόπου υλοποίηση των προαναφερθέντων μεγάλων έργων προχωράει, παρά το γεγονός ότι ορισμένα έργα καθυστερούν, κυρίως λόγω προβλημάτων στο πλαίσιο των δημόσιων συμβάσεων, των δικαστικών διαδικασιών και των προβλημάτων ρευστότητας των κατασκευαστών.

Κατευθυντήριες γραμμές για την περάτωση των προγραμμάτων 2007-2013 δεν εξετάζουν το ενδεχόμενο περαιτέρω κλιμάκωσης των έργων-γεφυρών, ώστε να αποφεύγεται το ενδεχόμενο παράτασης των μεγάλων έργων πάνω από τρεις περιόδους. Κατ' αρχήν, κάθε ποσό που καταβλήθηκε στο πλαίσιο της περιόδου προγραμματισμού 2000-2006 για τα έργα-γέφυρες θα πρέπει να επιστραφεί στην Επιτροπή, σε περίπτωση που ολόκληρο το έργο δεν ολοκληρωθεί εντός της περιόδου προγραμματισμού 2007-2013. Η Επιτροπή αναγνωρίζει την ιδιαίτερη κατάσταση της Ελλάδας, όμως της συνιστά αποδοτική και έγκαιρη υλοποίηση των έργων, ώστε να αποκομίσει το μέγιστο όφελος από τα κονδύλια της ΕΕ.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000866/13
to the Commission**

Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)

(28 January 2013)

Subject: Co-financed major works and bridge works in Greece

In a report published in December 2012, the Hellenic Court of Audit noted that 'Applications for confirmation of financial contributions were filed for 16 major works up to 31 December 2011. Of these works, 36.9% are bridge works which, according to the EU Regulation, must be completed within the NSRF 2007-2013 programming period. Otherwise, it will most likely be impossible to implement them with financing from the next period and the EU may demand a refund of all financing'.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. What are the 16 major works and what are the bridge works referred to in the above report?
2. What is the take-up rate for each of the two categories of works? What comments does it have to make on the take-up rate for each category of works?
3. In the case of the bridge works, is there a risk of losing or having to refund financing if they are not completed in the current programming period? What do the regulations provide for?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission

(12 April 2013)

Up to 31 December 2011, the Commission had received 23 admissible applications for major projects out of which 14 are projects whose implementation started during the 2000-2006 programming period. The list of projects will be sent directly to the Honourable Member and to the secretariat of the Parliament.

On the basis of information received from the Greek authorities, the implementation on the ground of the aforementioned major projects is advancing, even though some projects are delayed mainly due to public procurement issues, judicial procedures and liquidity problems of the constructors.

The closure guidelines 2007-2013 do not envisage further phasing of bridge projects to avoid having major projects spanning over three periods. In principle, any amount paid under the 2000-2006 programming period for bridge projects will have to be reimbursed to the Commission in case the entire project is not completed within the 2007-2013 programming period. The Commission recognises the specific situation in Greece but recommends efficient and timely implementation of the projects which will ensure the maximum benefit of EU funds.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000867/13

adresată Comisiei

Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)

(28 ianuarie 2013)

Subiect: Dezvoltare rurală — implicarea comunităților locale

România se distinge în Uniunea Europeană prin fertilitatea solului și potențialul agricol deosebit. Lipsa unor tehnologii adecvate, dar și modalitățile, nu întotdeauna potrivite, de implicare a comunităților rurale în procesul de dezvoltare au dus la o productivitate redusă.

În cadrul strategiei de dezvoltare rurală din țările UE, comunitățile locale determină care sunt nevoile zonei în care trăiesc, care sunt modalitățile de satisfacere a acestora, acțiuni în urma cărora spațiul rural va evolua în folosul comunităților locale.

Dezvoltarea comunitară este un factor de dezvoltare durabilă, fiind o investiție pe termen lung ce urmărește creșterea capacității colectivităților umane de participare, implicare și decizie.

În acest context, cum intenționează Comisia să sprijine autoritățile locale în vederea implicării acestora pentru îndeplinirea concretă a obiectivelor strategiei de dezvoltare rurală stabilite la nivel european și, implicit, pentru stimularea productivității agricole?

Răspuns dat de dl Cioloș în numele Comisiei

(12 martie 2013)

Propunerea legislativă privind politica UE de dezvoltare rurală în contextul Fondului european agricol pentru dezvoltare rurală (FEADR) după 2013 ⁽¹⁾ solicită implicarea, prin diverse mijloace, a nivelului local pentru atingerea obiectivelor prioritare ale Uniunii în ceea ce privește dezvoltarea rurală.

Abordarea LEADER va continua să fie foarte importantă pentru furnizarea de soluții comunităților rurale, ajutându-le să devină mai autonome și să participe activ la îndeplinirea obiectivelor de dezvoltare locală prin elaborarea și punerea în practică a unor strategii de dezvoltare locală.

Punerea sa în aplicare poate cuprinde o contribuție la organizarea și structurarea agriculturii locale, la dezvoltarea de produse locale și la conceperea de noi acțiuni care să implice mai mult agricultura alături de alte activități sociale și economice.

În cazul României, de exemplu, una dintre acțiunile încurajate de Comisie pentru următoarea perioadă de programare (2014-2020) este îmbunătățirea calității vieții și a atractivității așezărilor rurale prin promovarea dezvoltării locale ghidate de comunitate (profitând de experiența dobândită de România în privința LEADER în perioada 2007-2013) și prin investiții în îmbunătățirea atât a infrastructurii la scară mică, cât și a accesului la servicii locale de bază în zonele rurale, acolo unde aceste lucruri sunt necesare pentru dezvoltarea lor economică.

Pe lângă LEADER, măsura planificată de „cooperare” pentru viitor va oferi sprijin explicit dezvoltării de piețe locale și de lanțuri de aprovizionare scurte. Aceeași măsură va fi și unul dintre canalele de finanțare prin Parteneriatul european pentru inovare în domeniul productivității și durabilității agriculturii, prin care o serie de părți interesate — inclusiv comunitățile locale — pot primi sprijin pentru elaborarea și testarea ideilor de îmbunătățire a productivității și de eficientizare a utilizării resurselor în agricultură.

(1) Dispozițiile relevante pot fi găsite în documentul COM(2011) 627 final/2, 19 octombrie 2011.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000867/13
to the Commission**

Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)

(28 January 2013)

Subject: Rural development — involvement of local communities

Romania has some of the most fertile land in the European Union and significant potential for agricultural development. However, its output remains low owing to the lack of suitable technologies and consistently appropriate channels for the involvement of rural communities in the development process.

For the purposes of rural development policy in the EU Member States, it is the local communities which decide on their own particular needs and how they should be met, thereby ensuring that rural development will be of benefit to them.

This is a means of ensuring sustainable growth and is also a long-term investment designed to increase the scope for participation and involvement of members of the local community and decision making by them.

In view of this:

What action is being envisaged by the Commission to encourage the involvement of local authorities in the achievement of specific European rural development strategy objectives, including measures to stimulate agricultural output?

Answer given by Mr Cioleş on behalf of the Commission

(12 March 2013)

The legal proposal for the EU rural development policy under the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) after 2013 ⁽¹⁾ calls by different means the involvement of the local level in achieving the Union priorities for rural development.

The Leader approach will continue to be of major importance for delivering solutions to rural communities, empowering them to participate actively in the achievement of local development goals by means of design and implementation of local development strategies.

Its application can comprise a contribution to the organisation and structuring of local agriculture, the development of local products and the development of new actions which involve agriculture more in cooperation with other social and economic activities.

In the case of Romania, for example, one of the actions encouraged by the Commission for the future programming period (2014-2020) is to improve quality of life in and attractiveness of rural settlements by promoting community-led local development (building on Romania's first Leader experience in the 2007-2013 period) and through investments in improving both small scale infrastructure and access to local basic services for the rural areas where necessary for their economic development.

Besides Leader, the planned future 'cooperation' measure will explicitly offer support for the development of short supply chains and local markets. The same measure will be one of the vehicles of funding for the European Innovation Partnership for Agricultural Productivity and Sustainability, within which a range of interested parties — including local communities — may receive help to develop and test ideas for making farming more productive and resource-efficient.

⁽¹⁾ The relevant provisions can be found in COM(2011) 627 final/2; 19 October 2011.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000868/13
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(28 January 2013)**

Subject: Cross-border energy trade

Ireland has recently agreed to sell wind energy generated in the state to Britain. This will have the potential to create up to 30 000 jobs in the Irish economy by 2020.

1. Could the Commission provide information, in percentage terms, on the amount of renewable energy used by Member States as of 2013?
2. Could the Commission give an update on its projects to increase the amount of renewable energy used by Member States while reducing their dependence on fossil fuels?
3. Could the Commission provide information on the capabilities of Member States to export and trade in renewable energy and on whether there is a Europe-wide plan to increase cross-border trade in the energy sector?

**Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(7 March 2013)**

1. The latest Eurostat figures on the share of renewable energy in final energy consumption are for 2010. At that time, the share of renewable energy in the EU stood at 12.5% and in Ireland at 5.5%. Eurostat figures for 2011 are already available for the electricity sector, where a share of 20.4% renewable energy in gross electricity consumption was reached in the EU and 19.4% in Ireland. Further information can be found on Eurostat's website: <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/energy/introduction>.
2. The Commission is continuously monitoring the progress of Member States towards their 2020 targets for renewable energy and will release its first progress report on the implementation of the Renewable Energy Directive (RED) ⁽¹⁾ shortly. In its communication 'Renewable Energy: A major player on the European Energy Market' ⁽²⁾ of June 2012 the Commission announced that it intended to provide Member States with guidance on renewable energy support scheme design as well as guidance on the implementation of cooperation mechanisms contained in the RED.
3. The latter also aims at facilitating increased trade of energy from renewable sources and related services across borders. The RED has established the legal framework for such trade at a European level, which can be implemented by all Member States.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 2009/28/EC, OJ.

⁽²⁾ COM/2012/271; <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2012:0271:FIN:EN:PDF>.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000869/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(28 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Καταστροφή φυσικής περιοχής στην κοινότητα Λιβερών-Κορμακίτης Κύπρου

Μηχανήματα εκσκαφής με ανοχή ή/και στήριξη των τουρκοκυπριακών αρχών έχουν προβεί σε εκχερσώσεις, για οικιστικούς λόγους, στον Κορμακίτη (Κερύνεια). Παρόμοιες καταστροφές είχαν γίνει και παλιότερα (2008, 2010) στην περιοχή, που έχει αξιόλογα χαμαίφυτα και σημαντικό αριθμό σπάνιων κι απειλούμενων φυτών: κυπριακή τουλίπα (*Tulipa cypria*), κυπριακός κρόκος (*Crocus cyprius*), νάρκισσος (*Narcissus tazetta*), κυκλάμινο (*Cyclamen cyprium*), πλούσια ποικιλία ενδημικής κυπριακής ορχιδέας (*Ophrys kotschyi*, *Ophrys lapetheca*, *Ophrys elegans*, *Ophrys syriana*, *Eriopactis veratrifolia*, *Serapias aphroditae*). Γι' αυτό έχει προταθεί προς ένταξη στο Δίκτυο Natura.

Το 2008, σε απάντησή της σε καταγγελία για παρόμοια καταστροφή στην περιοχή, η Επιτροπή δηλώνει ⁽¹⁾: «Με βάση το πρόγραμμα που χρηματοδοτείται από το μέσο χρηματοδοτικής στήριξης για την προαγωγή της οικονομικής ανάπτυξης της τουρκοκυπριακής κοινότητας ⁽²⁾, η Επιτροπή στηρίζει ένα σχέδιο για την προστασία των μελλοντικών ζωνών "Natura 2000", στο βόρειο τμήμα της Κύπρου. Ο γενικότερος σκοπός του εν λόγω σχεδίου, του οποίου ο προϋπολογισμός ανέρχεται στα 5 000 000 ευρώ, είναι η εφαρμογή αποτελεσματικών συστημάτων προστασίας του περιβάλλοντος, σύμφωνα με τις διατάξεις της κοινοτικής νομοθεσίας και πολιτικής. Το πεδίο δράσης του σχεδίου αυτού αφορά την κατάρτιση λεπτομερών επιμέρους σχεδίων για τη διαχείριση και την προστασία έξι περιοχών στο βόρειο τμήμα της Κύπρου. Οι περιοχές έχουν χαρακτηριστεί ως περιοχές που χρήζουν άμεσης προστασίας, λόγω της οικολογικής τους σημασίας, της αστάθειάς τους και των πιέσεων που υφίστανται. Μια από αυτές είναι και η περιοχή της Αγίας Ειρήνης-Κορμακίτη. Οι τοποθεσίες αυτές είναι πιθανόν να χαρακτηρισθούν ως ζώνες "Natura 2000" μετά από πλήρη επίλυση του κυπριακού ζητήματος και επανένωση της Κύπρου. Μέσω του σχεδίου αυτού, θα υποστηριχθεί η προσπάθεια για εντατικοποίηση της ενημέρωσης κι επαγγελματικής ικανότητας των τουρκοκυπρίων εμπλεκόμενων, που είναι αρμόδιοι για την προστασία του περιβάλλοντος».

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

- Είναι ενήμερη για την καταστροφή που συντελείται στον Κορμακίτη; Αν ναι, τι μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει για να σταματήσει την καταστροφή και να διασφαλίσει ότι οι τουρκοκύπριοι εμπλεκόμενοι, αρμόδιοι για την προστασία του περιβάλλοντος, θα αναλάβουν τις ευθύνες τους;
- Ποια είναι τα αποτελέσματα της διάθεσης πόρων για στήριξη του σχεδίου προστασίας των μελλοντικών ζωνών Natura 2000 στο βόρειο τμήμα της Κύπρου;

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000878/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Sophocles Sophocleous (S&D)
(29 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Οικολογική καταστροφή στην κοινότητα Λιβερών

Στην κατεχόμενη περιοχή της Κοινότητας Λιβερών, στην επαρχία Κερύνειας, εκσκαφείς εισέβαλαν σε περιοχή, η οποία έχει επιλεγεί και ενταχθεί από την Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία στο Σχέδιο «Φύση 2000» της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, ως «Τόπος Κοινοτικής Σημασίας», την οποίαν και εκχέρσωσαν, εκρίζονοντας είδη σπάνιας και άγριας πανίδας και μοναδικής χλωρίδας, με καταστροφικές και μη αναστρέψιμες συνέπειες για την φυσική πολιτιστική κληρονομιά του τόπου.

Όπως έχω ενημερωθεί από την κοινότητα Λιβερών, η εγκληματική οικολογική καταστροφή, που έχει επιφέρει η παράνομη δράση του ψευδοκράτους στην περιοχή αυτή, ξεκίνησε από τις αρχές Νοεμβρίου 2012 και συνεχίζεται.

Με τις ενέργειές του το ψευδοκράτος απειλεί να καταστρέψει την πλούσια βιοποικιλότητα του τόπου. Θα πρέπει εδώ να τονιστεί ότι η υπό αναφορά περιοχή διαμορφώνει μια έντονη μωσαϊκότητα τοπίου, με αξιόλογα χαμαίφυτα και σημαντικό αριθμό σπάνιων και απειλούμενων φυτών όπως, η κυπριακή τουλίπα (*tulipa cypria*), ο κυπριακός κρόκος (*crocus cyprius*), ο νάρκισσος (*narcissus tazetta*), το κυκλάμινο (*cyclamen cyprium*) και μια πλούσια ποικιλία ενδημικής κυπριακής ορχιδέας (*ophrys kotschyi*, *ophrys lapetheca*, *ophrys syriana*, *eripactis veratrifolia*, *ophrys elegans*, *serapias aphroditae*, κ.ά.).

⁽¹⁾ Απάντηση στις 18.12.2008 του Επιτρόπου Όλι Ρεν εκ μέρους της Επιτροπής σε σχετική ερώτηση <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2008-5974&language=EL>
⁽²⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:065:0005:0008:EL:PDF>

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Προτίθεται να ερευνήσει το θέμα το οποίο σας εγείρω και να προβεί στα απαραίτητα μέτρα για την προστασία της περιοχής;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(20 Μαρτίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει τα Αξιότιμα Μέλη του Κοινοβουλίου στην απάντησή της στις γραπτές ερωτήσεις P-84/2013 και E-161/2013 ^(¹).

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

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000869/13
to the Commission**

Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)

(28 January 2013)

Subject: Destruction of nature area in Commune of Livera-Kormakiti in Cyprus

Bulldozers have started excavations for a residential development in Kormakiti (Kyrenia) with the acceptance and/or support of the Turkish Cypriot authorities. Similar havoc has been wreaked in the past (2008 and 2010) in the area, which has valuable chamaephytes and a large number of rare and endangered plants: Cypriot tulip (*Tulipa cypria*), Cypriot crocus (*Crocus cyprius*), narcissus (*Narcissus tazetta*), cyclamen (*Cyclamen cyprium*) and a rich variety of endemic Cypriot orchid (*Ophrys kotschyi*, *Ophrys lapetheca*, *Ophrys elegans*, *Ophrys syriana*, *Epipactis veratrifolia*, *Serapias aphroditae*). For that reason, it has been proposed that it be included in the Natura network.

In 2008, in reply to a complaint of similar destruction in the area, the Commission stated that ⁽¹⁾, based on the programme financed by the instrument of financial support for encouraging the economic development of the Turkish Cypriot community ⁽²⁾, the Commission supported a plan to protect future Natura 2000 zones in Northern Cyprus. The general objective of that plan, which has a budget of EUR 5 000 000, was to apply effective systems to protect the environment, in accordance with the provisions of EU legislation and policy. The purpose of that plan was to prepare detailed individual plans for managing and protecting six areas in Northern Cyprus. These areas have been classed as areas in need of immediate protection, due to their ecological importance and instability and the pressures on them. One of these is the area of Agia Irini/Kormakiti. These places may be classified as Natura 2000 zones once the Cyprus question has been fully resolved and Cyprus has been reunified. This plan will be used to support efforts to step up information for and the professional skills of the Turkish Cypriots involved who are responsible for environmental protection.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

- Is it aware of the destruction being wreaked in Kormakiti? If so, what measures does it intend to take to stop the destruction and ensure that the Turkish Cypriots involved who are responsible for environmental protection assume their responsibilities?
- What results have been obtained from making funds available to support the plan to protect future Natura 2000 zones in Northern Cyprus?

**Question for written answer E-000878/13
to the Commission**

Sophocles Sophocleous (S&D)

(29 January 2013)

Subject: Environmental destruction in the community of Livera

In the community of Livera in the province of Kyrenia in the occupied territories of Cyprus, bulldozers have moved into and cleared an area selected by the Republic of Cyprus for inclusion in the European Union's 'Natura 2000' programme as a 'site of Community importance', driving out rare species of wildlife and uprooting unique flora, with disastrous and irreversible consequences for the region's natural heritage.

As I have been informed by the community of Livera, this criminal act of environmental destruction, brought about by the illegal actions of the puppet state in this region, began in early November 2012 and is continuing today.

By its actions, the puppet state is putting at risk the rich biodiversity of the area. It should be noted that the area in question forms an intricate patchwork of different landscapes with remarkable chamaephytes and a significant number of rare and endangered plants such as the *tulipa cypria*, the *crocus cyprius*, the *narcissus tazetta*, the *cyclamen cyprium* and a rich variety of endemic Cypriot orchids (*ophrys kotschyi*, *ophrys lapetheca*, *ophrys syriana*, *epipactis veratrifolia*, *ophrys elegans*, *serapias aphroditae*, etc.).

⁽¹⁾ Reply on 18 December 2008 by Commissioner Olli Rehn, on behalf of the Commission, to a question on the subject.

⁽²⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:065:0005:0008:EN:PDF>

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

Will it investigate this matter and take the necessary steps to protect the area?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission

(20 March 2013)

The Commission refers the Honourable Members to its answer to Written Questions P-84/2013 and E-161/2013 ⁽¹⁾.

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

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-000870/13
до Комисията
Othmar Karas (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE) и Patrizia Toia (S&D)
(28 януари 2013 г.)

Относно: Социално справедливо развитие на политиката в областта на възобновяемата енергия в рамките на вътрешния енергиен пазар

В своето Съобщение от 15 ноември 2012 г., озаглавено „За постигане на реално функциониращ вътрешноевропейски енергиен пазар“ (COM(2012)0663), раздел 3.2.2. „Целенасочена помощ за подобряване на защитата на уязвимите потребители“ Комисията счита за необходимо социалната политика да защитава социално слабите потребители, тъй като крайните цени на енергията за потребителите могат да продължат да се покачват през следващите години. Оценката на въздействието SWD (2012)0149 изчислява конкретното въздействие върху заетостта, като се позовава също и на социалния аспект на достъпността за уязвимите потребители. Тъй като въздействието на разходите за инициативите за ВЕИ (възобновяеми енергийни източници) се превръща във все по-голямо предизвикателство за потребителите с ниски доходи дори в богати държави членки, достъпността е въпрос на обществено приемане на политика, насочена към постигане на устойчива енергийна система. Като се вземат предвид огромните разлики в доходите в рамките на ЕС, въпросът за чувствителността по отношение на развитието на цените изглежда подценен. Тъй като финансовите предизвикателства за много граждани на ЕС са се увеличили през последните години, ние сме загрижени за обществената подкрепа за енергийните цели.

1. Има ли налична информация за социалното въздействие върху икономически уязвимите групи потребители, което биха оказали вероятни съществени увеличения на цените в някои държави членки, произтичащи от създаването на вътрешния пазар, разходите за ВЕИ и подобряването на енергийната ефективност? Колко големи са тези групи?
2. Каква е частта от потребителските бюджети, налична за енергия, и по-специално за електроенергия?
3. Какви критерии могат да се приложат, за да се определят уязвимите потребители и енергийната бедност?
4. Във всички държави членки ли има подходящи социални инструменти за защита, които да гарантират достъпност за хората с ниски доходи?
5. Осъществени ли са анализ на добрите практики и дългосрочна стратегия за действие за социална сигурност по отношение на енергоспестяването и разходите за енергия?
6. Извършена ли е оценка на приложимостта на корекциите на цените за всяка държава членка с цел постигане на подходящо равнище на цените на енергийния пазар и покриване на разходите на други цели на енергийната стратегия?
7. Разполага ли Комисията с някакви сведения относно степента, в която изпълнението на целите на вътрешния пазар и на другите енергийни цели е затруднено от политически опасения за социална несъвместимост? За кои региони на Европейския съюз се отнася това?

Отговор, даден от г-н Oettinger от името на Комисията
(21 март 2013 г.)

1. Посредством завършването на вътрешния енергиен пазар и прилагането на политиките за насърчване на възобновяемите енергийни източници и енергийната ефективност Комисията има за цел да засили конкуренцията на енергийните пазари на ЕС, да разшири избора за потребителите и да повиши надеждността и устойчивостта на енергийните доставки в ЕС. Социалните и други видове въздействия биваха оценявани преди всяка законодателна инициатива ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Бяха извършени оценки на въздействието по отношение на
(i) „третия пакет“, т.е. директиви 2009/72/ЕО и 2009/73/ЕО съответно за електроенергия и газ:
http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/ia_carried_out/docs/ia_2007/sec_2007_0635_en.pdf
http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/ia_carried_out/docs/ia_2007/sec_2007_1180_en.pdf
(ii) Директива 2009/28/ЕО относно енергията от възобновяеми източници:
http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/ia_carried_out/docs/ia_2008/sec_2008_0085_en.pdf
(iii) Директива 2012/27/ЕС относно енергийната ефективност:
http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/ia_carried_out/docs/ia_2011/sec_2011_0779_en.pdf

2. Домакинствата в ЕС изразходват средно 4,4 % от общите си разходи за електроенергия, газ и други горива ⁽²⁾.
3. Докато някои насърчават използването на дела на енергийните разходи в рамките на общите разходи на домакинствата, критериите — както и практиката на държавите членки при определянето на уязвимите потребители и енергийната бедност — се различават съществено и хармонизиран подход не съществува нито в законодателството на ЕС, нито в академичните анализи на този въпрос.
- 4—5. Законодателството на ЕС ⁽³⁾ поставя пред държавите членки ясно изискване за защита на уязвимите потребители и за справяне с енергийната бедност, при констатиране на наличието ѝ. Срокът за транспониране на въпросното законодателство от държавите членки беше март 2011 г. Понастоящем Комисията провежда проверки за съответствие, за да се провери пълнотата и качеството на транспонирането на законодателството. В изготвения от Съвета на европейските енергийни регулатори (CEER) „Преглед на прилагането на разпоредбите относно клиентите и пазара на дребно 2012 г.“ ⁽⁴⁾ подробно са описани инструментите за социална закрила по отношение на ценовата достъпност на енергията във всяка държава членка.
6. Комисията не е извършила посочената във въпроса оценка, нито е запозната с наличието на подобен анализ от други източници.
7. Посочената във въпроса обстойна количествена и/или географска информация не е на разположение на Комисията.

⁽²⁾ Разходите на отделните държави членки варират от 2,7 % в Малта и 2,9 % в Люксембург до 9,1 % в Полша и 10,9 % в Словакия. Eurostat data: http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=nama_co3_c&lang=en

⁽³⁾ Директива 2009/72/ЕО; Директива 2009/73/ЕО.

⁽⁴⁾ http://www.energy-regulators.eu/portal/page/portal/EER_HOME/EER_PUBLICATIONS/CEER_PAPERS/Customers/Tab3/C12-CEM-55-04_SR-3rd-Pack-customers_7-Nov-2012.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000870/13
an die Kommission
Othmar Karas (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE) und Patrizia Toia (S&D)
 (28. Januar 2013)

Betrifft: Sozial gerechte Entwicklung der Politik für erneuerbare Energieträger im Energiebinnenmarkt

Die Kommission erachtet es in Punkt 3.2.2. „Gezielter Schutz für schutzbedürftige Verbraucher“ ihrer Mitteilung vom 15. November 2012 mit dem Titel „Ein funktionierender Energiebinnenmarkt“ (KOM(2012)0663) für notwendig, dass Verbraucher in einer wirtschaftlich schwachen Lage durch die Sozialpolitik abgeschirmt werden, weil die von den Verbrauchern zu zahlenden Endpreise für Energie in den kommenden Jahren weiter steigen können. In der Folgenabschätzung SWD(2012)0149 werden die Auswirkungen speziell auf die Beschäftigung berechnet und es wird der soziale Aspekt der Erschwinglichkeit für weniger zahlungsstarke Kunden angesprochen. Da die finanziellen Auswirkungen von Initiativen für erneuerbare Energiequellen immer mehr zu einer Herausforderung für Kunden mit geringem Einkommen, selbst in wohlhabenden Mitgliedstaaten, wird, geht es bei der Erschwinglichkeit um die öffentliche Akzeptanz einer Politik, mit der ein nachhaltiges Energieversorgungssystem erreicht werden soll. In Anbetracht der ungeheuren Einkommensunterschiede innerhalb der EU wird offenbar unterschätzt, wie sehr die Preisentwicklung durchschlägt. Da die finanziellen Herausforderungen vieler EU-Bürger in den letzten Jahren gestiegen sind, sorgen wir uns um die öffentliche Unterstützung der energiepolitischen Ziele.

1. Liegen Informationen vor über die sozialen Auswirkungen von wahrscheinlich deutlichen Preissteigerungen in einigen Mitgliedstaaten aufgrund der Schaffung des Binnenmarkts, der Kosten für erneuerbare Energiequellen und der Verbesserungen der Energieeffizienz auf wirtschaftlich schwächere Verbrauchergruppen? Wie groß sind diese Gruppen?
2. Wie hoch ist der Anteil des Haushalts der Verbraucher, der für Energie, insbesondere Strom, zur Verfügung steht?
3. Mit welchen Kriterien können schutzbedürftige Kunden und Brennstoffarmut ermittelt werden?
4. Gibt es in allen Mitgliedstaaten einen angemessenen Sozialschutz, um die Erschwinglichkeit für Menschen mit geringem Einkommen sicherzustellen?
5. Wurde eine Analyse bewährter Verfahren und einer langfristigen Maßnahmenstrategie für soziale Sicherheit im Bereich Energieeinsparungen und Energiekosten vorgenommen?
6. Wurde eine Abschätzung der Durchführbarkeit von Preisanpassungen für jeden Mitgliedstaat vorgenommen, um ein angemessenes Preisniveau auf dem Energiemarkt zu erreichen und die Kosten anderer energiepolitischer Ziele zu decken?
7. Liegen der Kommission Informationen darüber vor, in welchem Umfang die Verwirklichung des Binnenmarkts und anderer energiepolitischer Ziele durch politische Bedenken wegen schlechter Sozialverträglichkeit behindert wird? Auf welche Regionen der Europäischen Union trifft dies zu?

Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission
 (21. März 2013)

1. Mit der Vollendung des Energiebinnenmarktes und der Umsetzung von politischen Maßnahmen zur Förderung der erneuerbaren Energien und der Energieeffizienz verfolgt die Kommission das Ziel, den Wettbewerb auf den Energiemärkten der EU zu steigern, die Wahlmöglichkeiten der Verbraucher zu verbessern und die Energieversorgung in der EU zuverlässiger und nachhaltiger zu gestalten. Die sozialen und sonstigen Auswirkungen wurden vor jeder Rechtssetzungsinitiative evaluiert ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Folgenabschätzungen wurden zu folgenden Initiativen durchgeführt:

(i) zu dem dritten Energiepaket, d. h. zu den Richtlinien 2009/72/EG und 2009/73/EG für Strom und für Gas:
http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/ia_carried_out/docs/ia_2007/sec_2007_0635_en.pdf
http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/ia_carried_out/docs/ia_2007/sec_2007_1180_en.pdf
 (ii) zur Erneuerbare-Energien-Richtlinie 2009/28/EG:
http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/ia_carried_out/docs/ia_2008/sec_2008_0085_en.pdf
 (iii) zur Energieeffizienz-Richtlinie 2012/27/EU:
http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/ia_carried_out/docs/ia_2011/sec_2011_0779_en.pdf

2. Die EU-Haushalte wenden im Durchschnitt 4,4 % ihrer Gesamtausgaben für Strom, Gas und sonstige Brennstoffe auf ⁽²⁾.
3. Zuweilen wird zwar dafür eingetreten, den Anteil der Energiekosten an den Gesamtausgaben der Privathaushalte als Kriterium heranzuziehen, gibt es große Unterschiede bei den angewandten Kriterien — ebenso wie bei der Ermittlung der schutzbedürftigen Verbraucher und der Energiearmut durch die Mitgliedstaaten. Zudem existiert im EU-Recht bzw. in akademischen Analysen zu dem Thema kein harmonisierter Ansatz.
- 4.-5. Die Rechtsvorschriften ⁽³⁾ der EU sehen für die Mitgliedstaaten eine eindeutige Verpflichtung vor, schutzbedürftige Verbraucher zu schützen und Lösungen für die Energiearmut, soweit sie festgestellt wurde, zu finden. Die Mitgliedstaaten mussten diese Rechtsvorschriften bis März 2011 umsetzen. Die Kommission überprüft derzeit die Vollständigkeit und die Qualität der Umsetzung der Rechtsvorschriften. In dem vom Rat der Europäischen Energieregulierungsbehörden (CEER) erstellten Papier „Status Review of Customer and Retail Market Provisions 2012“ ⁽⁴⁾ wird eingehender auf die in den einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten im Zusammenhang mit der Erschwinglichkeit von Energie vorhandenen Instrumente des Sozialschutzes eingegangen.
6. Die Kommission hat weder die in der Anfrage genannte Abschätzung vorgenommen noch ist ihr bekannt, dass solche Analysen aus anderen Quellen zur Verfügung stehen.
7. Umfassende quantitative und/oder geografische Informationen, auf die in der Anfrage Bezug genommen wird, liegen der Kommission nicht vor.

⁽²⁾ Die Ausgaben in den einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten reichen von 2,7 % in Malta und 2,9 % in Luxemburg bis 9,1 % in Polen und 10,9 % in der Slowakei; Eurostat-Daten: http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=nama_co3_c&lang=en

⁽³⁾ Richtlinie 2009/72/EG, Richtlinie 2009/73/EG.

⁽⁴⁾ http://www.energy-regulators.eu/portal/page/portal/EER_HOME/EER_PUBLICATIONS/CEER_PAPERS/Customers/Tab3/C12-CEM-55-04_SR-3rd-Pack-customers_7-Nov-2012.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000870/13
alla Commissione
Othmar Karas (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE) e Patrizia Toia (S&D)
(28 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Sviluppo socialmente equo della politica in materia di energie rinnovabili nel mercato interno dell'energia

Nella sua comunicazione del 15 novembre 2012 intitolata «Rendere efficace il mercato interno dell'energia» (COM(2012)0663), sezione 3.2.2. «Assistenza mirata a una maggiore tutela del consumatore vulnerabile», la Commissione ritiene necessario che la politica sociale tuteli i consumatori che versano in condizioni di debolezza economica, poiché è possibile che nei prossimi anni le tariffe finali al consumo dell'energia continuino ad aumentare. La valutazione di impatto SWD(2012)0149 calcola l'impatto specifico sull'occupazione e allude inoltre all'aspetto sociale dell'accessibilità per i consumatori vulnerabili. Poiché l'impatto in termini di costi delle iniziative RES (fonti di energia rinnovabile) assume sempre più il carattere di una sfida per la clientela a basso reddito anche negli Stati membri ricchi, l'accessibilità rappresenta una questione di accettazione pubblica di una politica concepita per realizzare un sistema energetico sostenibile. Tenendo conto delle notevoli differenze reddituali esistenti nell'Unione, la questione della sensibilità dell'evoluzione dei prezzi sembra essere sottovalutata. Considerato il fatto che per molti cittadini dell'UE le sfide finanziarie sono aumentate negli ultimi anni, il sostegno pubblico agli obiettivi energetici è per noi motivo di preoccupazione.

Può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Sono disponibili informazioni relative all'impatto sociale che la probabile significativa impennata dei prezzi, derivante dall'instaurazione del mercato interno, dai costi delle RES e dal miglioramento dell'efficienza energetica, potrebbe avere in alcuni Stati membri sui gruppi di consumatori economicamente vulnerabili? Quanto sono grandi questi gruppi?
2. Qual è la quota dei bilanci dei consumatori disponibile per l'energia e in particolare per l'elettricità?
3. Quali criteri possono essere applicati per identificare la clientela vulnerabile e la povertà energetica?
4. Gli Stati membri sono tutti dotati di adeguati strumenti di tutela sociale che garantiscano l'accessibilità per i cittadini a basso reddito?
5. In termini di risparmio energetico e costi dell'energia, è stata condotta un'analisi delle buone prassi e di una strategia d'azione a lungo termine per la sicurezza sociale?
6. È stata effettuata per ogni Stato membro una valutazione dell'applicabilità degli adeguamenti dei prezzi al fine di raggiungere un adeguato livello dei prezzi del mercato energetico e coprire i costi di altri obiettivi di strategia energetica?
7. È la Commissione in possesso di informazioni relative alla misura in cui l'attuazione del mercato interno e degli altri obiettivi energetici è ostacolata dalle preoccupazioni politiche sull'incompatibilità sociale? A quali regioni dell'Unione europea si fa riferimento?

Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(21 marzo 2013)

1. Con il completamento del mercato interno dell'energia e l'attuazione di politiche volte a promuovere fonti rinnovabili di energia ed efficienza energetica, la Commissione mira ad aumentare la concorrenza sui mercati dell'energia nell'UE, ad ampliare la scelta per i consumatori e ad accrescere l'affidabilità e la sostenibilità dell'approvvigionamento energetico nell'UE. Ciascuna iniziativa legislativa è stata preceduta da una valutazione dell'impatto sociale e delle altre ricadute ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Le valutazioni d'impatto sono state condotte in relazione a:

i) Terzo pacchetto, direttive 2009/72/CE e 2009/73/CE, rispettivamente per l'energia elettrica e per il gas:

http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/ia_carried_out/docs/ia_2007/sec_2007_0635_en.pdf

http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/ia_carried_out/docs/ia_2007/sec_2007_1180_en.pdf

ii) direttiva 2009/28/CE sulle energie rinnovabili: http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/ia_carried_out/docs/ia_2008/sec_2008_0085_en.pdf

iii) direttiva 2012/27/UE sull'efficienza energetica: http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/ia_carried_out/docs/ia_2011/sec_2011_0779_en.pdf

2. In media, le famiglie UE spendono 4,4 % del totale delle loro spese per energia elettrica, gas e altri combustibili ⁽²⁾.
3. Mentre alcuni promuovono l'impiego della quota destinata alla spesa energetica della spesa totale delle famiglie, i criteri — nonché le prassi degli Stati membri nell'identificare i consumatori vulnerabili e la povertà energetica — differiscono tra loro notevolmente e non esiste un approccio armonizzato nell'ambito della legislazione dell'UE o negli studi scientifici del settore.
- 4.-5. La legislazione dell'UE ⁽³⁾ fa obbligo esplicito agli Stati membri di proteggere i consumatori vulnerabili e di affrontare la povertà energetica ove riscontrata. Entro marzo 2011 gli Stati membri avrebbero dovuto recepire tale legislazione. La Commissione sta attualmente effettuando i controlli di conformità per verificare la completezza e la qualità del recepimento della normativa. Il rapporto sullo stato della normativa per il mercato al dettaglio e i consumatori 2012 ⁽⁴⁾, elaborato dal Consiglio dei regolatori europei dell'energia (CEER), illustra nel dettaglio gli strumenti di protezione sociale in ciascuno Stato membro rispetto all'accessibilità in termini di prezzo dell'energia.
6. La Commissione non ha intrapreso la valutazione cui si fa riferimento nell'interrogazione né è a conoscenza della disponibilità di un'analisi di questo tipo presso altre fonti.
7. La Commissione non dispone di informazioni complete del tipo quantitativo e/o geografico cui si fa riferimento nell'interrogazione.

⁽²⁾ La spesa nei singoli Stati membri va dal 2,7 % a Malta e 2,9 % in Lussemburgo, al 9,1 % in Polonia e 10,9 % in Slovacchia. Dati Eurostat: http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=nama_co3_c&lang=en

⁽³⁾ Direttiva 2009/72/CE, Direttiva 2009/73/CE.

⁽⁴⁾ http://www.energy-regulators.eu/portal/page/portal/EER_HOME/EER_PUBLICATIONS/CEER_PAPERS/Customers/Tab3/C12-CEM-55-04_SR-3rd-Pack-customers_7-Nov-2012.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000870/13
to the Commission
Othmar Karas (PPE), Andrey Kovatchev (PPE) and Patrizia Toia (S&D)
 (28 January 2013)

Subject: Socially fair development of Renewable Energy Policy in the internal energy market

In its communication of 15 November 2012 entitled 'Making the internal energy market work' (COM(2012)0663), Section 3.2.2. 'Targeted assistance to give vulnerable consumers better protection', the Commission considers it necessary for social policy to protect consumers in an economically weak situation, because final energy prices for consumers may continue to rise in the coming years. Impact assessment SWD(2012)0149 calculates the specific impact on employment and also alludes to the social aspect of affordability for vulnerable customers. As the cost impact of RES (renewable energy sources) initiatives becomes more and more a challenge for customers with low incomes, even in wealthy Member States, affordability is a matter of public acceptance of a policy designed to achieve a sustainable energy system. Taking into account the huge differences in income within the EU, the question of sensitivity in price development seems to be underestimated. Since the financial challenges for many EU citizens have increased in recent years, we are concerned about public support for the energy objectives.

1. Is there any information available about the social impact on economically vulnerable consumer groups of likely significant price hikes in some Member States resulting from the establishment of the internal market, the costs of RES and energy efficiency improvement? How big are these groups?
2. What is the proportion of consumers' budgets available for energy, and especially electricity?
3. What criteria may be applied to identify vulnerable customers and fuel poverty?
4. Are there adequate social protection instruments in all Member States to ensure affordability for people with low incomes?
5. Has an analysis of good practices and a long-term action strategy for social security been conducted in terms of energy savings and energy costs?
6. Has an assessment of the applicability of price adjustments been carried out for each Member State in order to achieve a suitable energy market price level and cover the cost of other energy strategy targets?
7. Has the Commission any information on the extent to which the implementation of the internal market and the other energy targets is hampered by political concerns about social incompatibility? In which regions of the European Union does this apply?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
 (21 March 2013)

1. By completing the internal energy market and implementing policies promoting renewable energy sources and energy efficiency, the Commission aims to increase competition in EU energy markets, enhance consumer choice, and increase the reliability and sustainability of energy supplies in the EU. The social and other impacts were assessed prior to each legislative initiative ⁽¹⁾.
2. On average, EU households spend 4.4% of their total expenditure on electricity, gas and other fuels ⁽²⁾.
3. While some promote the use of the proportion of energy expenditure within overall household expenditure, the criteria — as well as Member States' practice in identifying vulnerable consumers and energy poverty — differ widely and there is no harmonised approach under EC law or in academic analyses of the subject.

⁽¹⁾ Impact assessments were conducted relating to:

(i) The Third Package, i.e. Directives 2009/72/EC and 2009/73/EC for electricity and gas respectively:

http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/ia_carried_out/docs/ia_2007/sec_2007_0635_en.pdf

http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/ia_carried_out/docs/ia_2007/sec_2007_1180_en.pdf

(ii) the Renewable Energy Directive 2009/28/EC: http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/ia_carried_out/docs/ia_2008/sec_2008_0085_en.pdf

(iii) the Energy Efficiency Directive 2012/27/EU: http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/ia_carried_out/docs/ia_2011/sec_2011_0779_en.pdf

⁽²⁾ Spending for individual Member States ranges from 2.7% in Malta and 2.9% in Luxembourg to 9.1% in Poland and 10.9% in Slovakia Eurostat data: http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=nama_co3_c&lang=en

4–5. EU legislation ⁽³⁾ puts a clear requirement on Member States to protect vulnerable consumers and to address energy poverty where identified. The deadline for the transposition of this legislation by Member States was March 2011. The Commission is currently conducting compliance checks to verify the completeness and quality of the transposition of the legislation. The Status Review of Customer and Retail Market Provisions 2012 ⁽⁴⁾ prepared by the Council of European Energy Regulators (CEER) details social protection instruments in each Member State with respect to energy affordability.

6. The Commission has not undertaken the assessment referred to in the question nor is it aware of the availability of such analysis from other sources.

7. Comprehensive quantitative and/or geographical information referred to in the question is not available to the Commission.

⁽³⁾ Directive 2009/72/EC, Directive 2009/73/EC.

⁽⁴⁾ http://www.energy-regulators.eu/portal/page/portal/EER_HOME/EER_PUBLICATIONS/CEER_PAPERS/Customers/Tab3/C12-CEM-55-04_SR-3rd-Pack-customers_7-Nov-2012.pdf

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-000871/13
aan de Commissie
Corien Wortmann-Kool (PPE)
(28 januari 2013)**

Betref: Europese begrotingsregels en het vastleggen van nationale begrotingsmechanismen in de lidstaten

De vorig jaar versterkte wetgeving voor het economisch bestuur van Europa vraagt om „passende coördinatiemechanismen” in de lidstaten om begrotingsdiscipline op nationaal en subnationaal niveau te waarborgen ⁽¹⁾. Daarnaast zijn er in het begrotingspact aanvullende afspraken gemaakt om in nationale wetgeving een fiscaal correctiemechanisme vast te leggen bij overschrijding van de begrotingsnormen ⁽²⁾.

In Nederland wijkt de boekhoudmethode van decentrale overheden (baten- en lastenstelsel) af van die van de rijksoverheid (kasstelsel). Decentrale overheden sparen voor investeringen in de vorm van reserves of schrijven deze in een aantal jaren af. Bij berekening van het EMU-saldo worden investeringsuitgaven echter volledig toegerekend aan het jaar waarin deze worden gedaan.

1. Is de Commissie met mij van mening dat het baten en lasten stelsel van decentrale overheden in combinatie met de bestaande interventiemechanismen ⁽³⁾ de afgelopen jaren goed heeft gefunctioneerd en als passend coördinatiemechanisme kan worden aangemerkt? Zo nee, waarom niet?
2. Is de Commissie met mij van mening dat lidstaten niet verplicht worden een macro-norm op te leggen voor het EMU-saldo van decentrale overheden bij het vastleggen van passende nationale coördinatiemechanismen? Zo nee, waarom niet?
3. Is de Commissie van mening dat de Europese verplichting tot het vastleggen van nationale correctiemechanismen ruimte laat voor verschillen in boekhoudmethodes tussen de rijksoverheid en decentrale overheden? Valt het baten- en lastenstelsel van Nederlandse decentrale overheden volgens de Commissie onder de „landspecifieke kenmerken” zoals opgenomen in de principes van de Commissie voor de uitwerking van de nationale fiscale correctiemechanismen ⁽⁴⁾? Zo nee, waarom niet?
4. Onderschrijft de Commissie dat in een baten en lasten stelsel een bepaalde tekortruimte nodig is voor vervangings- en uitbreidingsinvesteringen? Onderschrijft de Commissie dat het opleggen van een EMU-tekortnorm aan decentrale overheden die een baten- en lastenstelsel hanteren leidt tot minder investeringsruimte, hoe degelijk het financieel beleid ook is? Zo nee, waarom niet?
5. Kan de Commissie aangeven of er naast Nederland ook andere lidstaten zijn die te maken hebben met verschillen in boekhoudmethodes tussen de rijksoverheid en decentrale overheden? Zo ja, kan de Commissie hier een overzicht van publiceren?

**Antwoord van de heer Šemeta namens de Commissie
(5 maart 2013)**

Artikel 3 van Richtlijn 2011/85/EU schrijft geen op baten en lasten gebaseerd boekhoudstelsel voor de organen van de centrale overheid voor. Het artikel bepaalt dat de lidstaten moeten beschikken over stelsels voor overheidsboekhouding die volledig en coherent alle subsectoren van de overheid bestrijken en de informatie bevatten die nodig is voor het genereren van transactiegegevens ter voorbereiding van op de ESR 95-norm gebaseerde gegevens.

Volgens de ESR/EDP-voorschriften moet de balans van de overheid gebaseerd zijn op een baten- en lastenstelsel, waarbij investeringen doorgaans worden geboekt in het jaar waarin zij zijn voltooid of geleverd. Er behoort geen onduidelijkheid te zijn over het moment van boeking van investeringen binnen de overheid.

1. De algemene doeltreffendheid van de coördinatiemechanismen moet worden beoordeeld in de context van het versterkte Europese kader voor het begrotingsbeheer.

⁽¹⁾ Richtlijn 2011/85/EU van de Raad van 8 november 2011 tot vaststelling van voorschriften voor de begrotingskaders van de lidstaten.

⁽²⁾ Verdrag inzake Stabiliteit, Coördinatie en Bestuur in de Economische en Monetaire Unie.

⁽³⁾ Bijvoorbeeld in Artikel 7 en 12 van de Wet Financiering decentrale overheden en de Financiële-verhoudingswet.

⁽⁴⁾ Mededeling van de Commissie COM(2012)0342 van 20 juni 2012 over de Gemeenschappelijke beginselen inzake nationale begrotingsmechanismen.

2. Het is de verantwoordelijkheid van elke lidstaat om te zorgen voor een goed begrotingsbeheer en naleving van de begrotingsregels.
 3. Consistente boekhoudkundige regels binnen de overheid zijn doorslaggevend om aan de verplichtingen van het begrotingspact te voldoen en naleving van de begrotingsregels te garanderen, terwijl landenspecifieke kenmerken hoofdzakelijk andere belangrijke aspecten van correctiemechanismen betreffen.
 4. Begrotingstekorten kunnen leiden tot een ontoereikende dekking van de afschrijving/vermindering van het kapitaal. Een boekhouding op basis van een baten- en lastenstelsel dat aan de ESR/EDP voldoet, vermindert echter de investeringsruimte niet, maar geeft die ruimte duidelijker weer. De door het herziene stabiliteits- en groeipact ingevoerde uitgavenbenchmark maakt het mogelijk de investeringsuitgaven beter over de jaren te verdelen.
 5. Recentelijk is bij een raadpleging namens Eurostat informatie over de overheidsboekhouding in de lidstaten verzameld. Hierbij bleek dat Oostenrijk, Cyprus, Denemarken, Duitsland, Hongarije, Ierland, Italië, Luxemburg, Portugal, Nederland en Slovenië gemengde stelsels hebben. Dit houdt in dat zij ofwel verschillende boekhoudkundige praktijken voor verschillende niveaus of subsectoren van de overheid gebruiken, ofwel jaarrekeningen op basis van verschillende boekhoudkundige beginselen opstellen.
-

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000871/13
to the Commission
Corien Wortmann-Kool (PPE)
(28 January 2013)

Subject: European budgetary rules and the establishment of national budgetary mechanisms in the Member States

The more stringent legislation adopted last year concerning the economic governance of Europe calls for 'appropriate mechanisms of coordination' in the Member States to maintain budgetary discipline at national and subnational level ⁽¹⁾. In addition, further agreements were reached in the Fiscal Compact regarding making provision in domestic legislation for a fiscal correction mechanism to be triggered by any breach of the budgetary rules ⁽²⁾.

In the Netherlands, the method of accounting used by local authorities (accrual system) deviates from that used by central government (cash accounting). Local authorities save for investment in the form of reserves or write it off over a number of years. For the purpose of calculating the EMU balance, however, investment expenditure is attributed entirely to the year in which the expenditure is incurred.

1. Does the Commission agree that the accrual accounting system used by local authorities in combination with the existing intervention mechanisms ⁽³⁾ has worked well in recent years and can be regarded as an appropriate mechanism of coordination? If not, why not?
2. Does the Commission agree that Member States are not required to impose a macro-norm for the EMU balances of local authorities when adopting appropriate national mechanisms of coordination? If not, why not?
3. Does the Commission consider that the European requirement to lay down national correction mechanisms leaves scope for differences in accounting methods between central and local government? Does the Commission believe that the accrual accounting system used by local authorities in the Netherlands falls under the heading of 'country-specific features' as referred to in the Commission's principles underlying national fiscal correction mechanisms? ⁽⁴⁾ If not, why not?
4. Does the Commission accept that in an accrual system a certain margin for deficits is needed for replacement investment and expansion investment? Does the Commission accept that imposing an EMU deficit norm on local authorities which use an accrual accounting system will result in less scope for investment, no matter how sound the financial policy pursued may be? If not, why not?
5. Can the Commission indicate whether there are also other Member States besides the Netherlands where differences in accounting methods exist between central and local government? If so, can the Commission publish a list of them?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(5 March 2013)

Council Directive 2011/85/EU, Art. 3, does not require accruals based accounting within general government (GG) entities. It states that Member States (MSs) shall have in place public accounting systems that consistently cover all GG sub-sectors and contain the information needed to generate accrual data that are in line with ESA 95.

According to ESA/EDP rules, the GG balance is accruals based, with investment generally recorded in the year in which it is finished or delivered. There should be no contradiction on the time of recording investment within GG.

1. Overall effectiveness of coordination mechanisms will have to be assessed in the context of the strengthened European fiscal governance framework.
2. It is up to each MS to ensure proper fiscal coordination and compliance with fiscal rules.
3. While consistent accounting rules across GG are key to meeting Fiscal Compact obligations and ensuring compliance with fiscal rules, country-specific features refer primarily to other core aspects of correction mechanisms.

⁽¹⁾ Council Directive 2011/85/EU of 8 November 2011 on requirements for budgetary frameworks of the Member States.

⁽²⁾ Treaty on Stability, Coordination and Governance in the Economic and Monetary Union.

⁽³⁾ For example in Articles 7 and 12 of the Local Government Financing Act and the Grants to Municipal Authorities Act.

⁽⁴⁾ Commission Communication COM(2012)0342 of 20 June 2012 concerning common principles on national fiscal correction mechanisms.

4. Budget constraints may lead to insufficient cover of capital stock depreciation. However, accrual accounting in line with ESA/EDP rules does not reduce the scope for investment; it better outlines that scope. The expenditure benchmark introduced by the revised SGP allows for smoothing investment spending over years.

5. A consultancy on behalf of Eurostat recently collected information on public accounting in MSs. Austria, Cyprus, Denmark, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Portugal, the Netherlands and Slovenia were reported having mixed systems. They either use differing accounting practices for differing levels or sub-sectors of GG, or, prepare financial statements on different accounting bases.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000875/13
à la Commission
Anne Delvaux (PPE)
(29 janvier 2013)

Objet: Impact des néonicotinoïdes sur la santé des abeilles

Suite à la demande de la Commission européenne d'évaluer les risques associés à l'utilisation de pesticides ayant comme substance active soit de la clothianidine, soit de l'imidaclopride, soit du thiaméthoxame sur les populations d'abeilles, l'Autorité européenne de sécurité alimentaire (EFSA) a publié, le 16 janvier 2013, les résultats de ses réponses aux questions «EFSA-Q-2012-00553», «EFSA-Q-2012-00792» et «EFSA-Q-2012-00793». Dans ces conclusions, il apparaît que l'EFSA a identifié un certain nombre de risques associés à ces trois types d'insecticides néonicotinoïdes pour les abeilles et que le lien de cause à effet est avéré.

Je me réjouis de ces premières conclusions. En effet, à de nombreuses reprises, j'ai demandé l'inclusion, dans le schéma d'évaluation des pesticides, de l'exposition chronique des abeilles et des larves à ces pesticides mais aussi l'établissement d'un moratoire conduisant, à terme, au retrait des pesticides neurotoxiques et des produits à usage agricole contenant ces substances. Il en va de la santé et de la survie des abeilles.

Dès lors, et sur base du principe de précaution, la Commission compte-elle prendre des mesures à l'encontre des trois pesticides précités?

Par ailleurs, la Commission compte-elle revoir ses procédures d'autorisation de vente des pesticides en intégrant comme critère de commercialisation une analyse préalable de leur impact sur la faune et la flore?

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000934/13
à la Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(29 janvier 2013)

Objet: Pesticides et abeilles en Europe

Afin d'enrayer le déclin des populations d'abeilles en Europe, l'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments a lancé une enquête en novembre dernier pour déterminer et évaluer les possibles conséquences d'une utilisation généralisée des pesticides dans l'agriculture sur cette population.

Le mercredi 16 janvier 2013, l'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments a rendu publiques ses conclusions dans un rapport dans lequel elle mettait en garde contre l'utilisation de trois pesticides couramment utilisés et fabriqués par des entreprises européennes.

Selon ses conclusions, ces pesticides pourraient constituer une menace grave pour les abeilles mellifères.

Cependant, l'Agence n'a pu établir de corrélation avec le déclin des colonies d'abeilles (les données scientifiques n'étant pas assez précises pour tirer des conclusions définitives sur le long terme).

1. Face à ces résultats, la Commission prévoit-elle d'interdire la vente de certains pesticides?
2. Quel est l'avis de la Commission sur la pertinence de telles études qui soulignent la dangerosité d'un produit, tout en affirmant que les données scientifiques ne sont pas assez précises pour tirer des conclusions valables sur le long terme?
3. Face au déclin avéré des colonies d'abeilles en Europe, la Commission travaille-t-elle sur une stratégie de repeuplement, sachant que les abeilles participent à la sauvegarde de notre écosystème?

Réponse commune donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission*(20 mars 2013)*

La Commission prie les auteurs des questions de se référer à ses réponses aux questions écrites E-000450/2013, E-011166/2011 et E-00077/2013 ⁽¹⁾.

Les États membres procéderont à des contrôles officiels pour veiller au respect du règlement (CE) n° 1107/2009 ⁽²⁾. Ces contrôles porteront sur la production, l'emballage, le stockage, le transport, la commercialisation, la formulation, le commerce parallèle et l'utilisation des produits phytopharmaceutiques. L'Office alimentaire et vétérinaire de la Commission effectue des audits pour vérifier les systèmes de contrôle des États membres et des pays tiers ⁽³⁾.

E-00934/2013: Le règlement «OCM unique» ⁽⁴⁾ prévoit un soutien financier au repeuplement des ruches dans le cadre des programmes apicoles mis en place par les États membres. Les mesures environnementales relevant des programmes de développement rural contribuent à la protection des populations d'abeilles. Par ailleurs, la directive «Habitats» ⁽⁵⁾ établit un cadre juridique pour la protection d'habitats d'une importance majeure pour les abeilles, de manière que celles-ci profitent de la conservation et de la gestion des habitats naturels *via* le réseau «Natura 2000». La cartographie et l'évaluation des écosystèmes et de leurs services, tels que la pollinisation, fourniront la base de connaissance nécessaire à l'intégration de la valeur économique de ces services dans les systèmes de comptabilité et de notification au niveau de l'Union européenne et des États membres d'ici à 2020.

E-001281/2013: La Commission finance plusieurs projets de recherche visant à évaluer l'état de santé des abeilles en Europe et ailleurs dans le monde. L'action COLOSS ⁽⁶⁾ COST s'ajoute aux efforts de recherche nationaux consacrés à l'examen de l'état de santé des abeilles et à la prévention de la mort des colonies. Le projet Bee Doc ⁽⁷⁾ étudie les conséquences des interactions entre divers pathogènes et pesticides sur la santé des abeilles. Le budget de l'Union pour la recherche sur la santé des abeilles dans le cadre du septième programme-cadre s'élève à environ 15 millions d'euros.

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

⁽²⁾ JO L 309 du 24.11.2009.

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/ir_search_en.cfm

⁽⁴⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:299:0001:0149:EN:PDF>

⁽⁵⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:1992:206:0007:0050:EN:PDF>

⁽⁶⁾ <http://www.coloss.org/>

⁽⁷⁾ <http://www.bee-doc.eu/>

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001281/13
do Komisji**

Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE)

(7 lutego 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wpływ pestycydów na populacje pszczół

Coraz częściej w debatach na temat zdrowia i ochrony środowiska pojawia się temat wpływu wybranych pestycydów z grupy neonicotynoidów na populacje pszczół.

Tą sprawą również zajmuje się Komisja Europejska, argumentując, że rozwiązania przyjęte w Unii Europejskiej muszą być oparte na naukowych dowodach i raportach ekspertów. Nie ulega wątpliwości, że masowe wymieranie pszczół z różnych przyczyn może doprowadzić do kryzysu żywnościowego.

W dniu 16 stycznia 2013 r. Europejska Agencja ds. Bezpieczeństwa Żywności (EFSA) zaprezentowała zamówiony przez Komisję Europejską raport, w którym zwrócono uwagę na ryzyko dla populacji pszczół wynikające ze stosowania aktywnych pestycydów.

W związku z powyższym zwracam się do Komisji z następującymi zapytaniami:

1. Jakie środki ostrożności zamierza zastosować Komisja w związku z raportem EFSA?
2. Czy Komisja zamierza przedstawić końcowy raport na temat wpływu ww. pestycydów na żywotność pszczół?
3. Czy Komisja monitoruje badania na temat stanu populacji rodzin pszczelich w Europie i na świecie?
4. Jak często i w jaki sposób Komisja przeprowadza kontrole, monitoring producentów pestycydów w Unii Europejskiej?

Wspólna odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Tonio Borga w imieniu Komisji

(20 marca 2013 r.)

Komisja zwraca uwagę na swoje odpowiedzi E-000450/2013, E-011166/2011 i E-00077/2013 ⁽¹⁾.

Państwa członkowskie przeprowadzają urzędowe kontrole w celu zapewnienia zgodności z rozporządzeniem (WE) nr 1107/2009 ⁽²⁾. Obejmuje to produkcję, pakowanie, etykietowanie, składowanie, transport, marketing, formę użytkową, handel równoległy i stosowanie środków ochrony roślin. Biuro ds. Żywności i Weterynarii Komisji przeprowadza audyty mające na celu zweryfikowanie systemów kontroli państw członkowskich i państw trzecich ⁽³⁾.

E-00934/2013: Rozporządzenie o jednolitej wspólnej organizacji rynku ⁽⁴⁾ przewiduje wsparcie finansowe na ponowne zasiedlanie uli pszczelich w ramach programów pszczelarskich wprowadzonych przez państwa członkowskie. Środki ochrony środowiska w ramach programów rozwoju obszarów wiejskich przyczyniają się do zachowania populacji pszczół. Ponadto dyrektywa siedliskowa ⁽⁵⁾ ustanawia ramy prawne zapewniające ochronę najważniejszych siedlisk pszczół, tak aby mogły one korzystać z ochrony siedlisk przyrodniczych i zarządzania nimi w ramach sieci Natura 2000. Sporządzenie planu i ocena ekosystemów i ich usług, takich jak zapylenie, zapewni podstawy wiedzy dla celów uwzględnienia ekonomicznej wartości tych usług w systemach rachunkowości i sprawozdawczości na poziomie unijnym i krajowym do roku 2020.

E-001281/2013: Komisja finansuje kilka projektów badawczych w celu oceny zdrowia pszczół w Europie i w innych częściach świata. Działanie COLOSS COST ⁽⁶⁾ koordynuje krajowe badania naukowe w celu lepszego zrozumienia zdrowia pszczół miodnych oraz zapobiegania wymieraniu kolonii. W ramach projektu Bee Doc ⁽⁷⁾ badane są skutki wzajemnego oddziaływania między różnymi czynnikami chorobotwórczymi i pestycydami na zdrowie pszczół. Budżet UE na badania w zakresie zdrowia pszczół w ramach 7. programu ramowego wynosi około 15 mln EUR.

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

⁽²⁾ Dz.U. L 309 z 24.11.2009.

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/ir_search_en.cfm

⁽⁴⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:299:0001:0149:PL:PDF>

⁽⁵⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:1992:206:0007:0050:PL:PDF>

⁽⁶⁾ <http://www.coloss.org/>

⁽⁷⁾ <http://www.bee-doc.eu/>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000875/13
to the Commission
Anne Delvaux (PPE)
(29 January 2013)**

Subject: Impact of neonicotinoids on bee health

In response to the European Commission's request for an evaluation of the risks to bee populations associated with the use of pesticides containing clothianidin, imidacloprid or thiamethoxam as an active substance, on 16 January 2013 the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) published the results of its answers to the questions EFSA-Q-2012-00553, EFSA-Q-2012-00792 and EFSA-Q-2012-00793. These conclusions indicate that the EFSA has identified a certain number of risks to bees associated with these three types of neonicotinoid insecticides, and that a cause and effect relationship has been established.

I welcome these initial conclusions, since I have called repeatedly for chronic exposure of bees and larvae to these pesticides to be included in the pesticide evaluation scheme, as well as for the introduction of a moratorium eventually leading to the withdrawal of neurotoxic pesticides and products for agricultural use containing these substances. The health and survival of bees are what is at stake.

Is the Commission therefore intending to take action in respect of the abovementioned three pesticides, in line with the precautionary principle?

Moreover, is the Commission planning to revise its procedures for authorising the sale of pesticides, by including a preliminary assessment of their impact on fauna and flora as a marketing criterion?

**Question for written answer E-000934/13
to the Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(29 January 2013)**

Subject: Pesticides and bees in Europe

In order to stem the decline in European bee populations, last November the European Food Safety Authority launched an enquiry aimed at identifying and evaluating the possible consequences for these populations of the widespread use of pesticides in agriculture.

On Wednesday 16 January 2013, the European Food Safety Authority published its conclusions in a report warning against the use of three pesticides which are widely used and manufactured by European companies.

The Authority states in its conclusions that these pesticides could pose a serious threat to honey bees.

However, the Authority was unable to identify any correlation with the decline of bee colonies, since the scientific data were not accurate enough to draw any definitive long-term conclusions.

1. In light of these results, is the Commission planning to ban the sale of certain pesticides?
2. What view does the Commission take of the relevance of studies of this kind, which highlight the hazardous nature of a product while maintaining that the scientific data are not accurate enough to draw valid long-term conclusions?
3. Given the proven decline in bee colonies in Europe, and the fact that bees help to safeguard our ecosystem, is the Commission working on a repopulation strategy?

**Question for written answer E-001281/13
to the Commission**

Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE)

(7 February 2013)

Subject: The effects of pesticide use on the bee population

The issue of the effects of neonicotinoid pesticide use on the bee population is cropping up increasingly frequently in discussions on health and environmental protection.

The Commission is also addressing the issue, arguing that arrangements agreed on in the EU must be based on scientific evidence and expert reports. There is no doubt that a mass die-off of bees for various reasons could lead to a food crisis.

On 16 January 2013, the European Food Safety Agency (EFSA) introduced a report, requested by the Commission, that drew attention to the risk to the bee population posed by the use of active pesticides.

In this connection:

1. What precautions is the Commission intending to take with regard to EFSA's report?
2. Is the Commission intending to come forward with a final report on the effects of the aforementioned pesticides on the life-span of bees?
3. Is the Commission monitoring research on the state of bee colonies in Europe and the rest of the world?
4. How often and in what manner does the Commission monitor and check pesticide manufacturers in the EU?

Joint answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission

(20 March 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Members to its answers to E-000450/2013, E-011166/2011 and E-00077/2013 ⁽¹⁾.

Member States shall carry out official controls in order to enforce compliance with Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 ⁽²⁾. This includes the production, packaging, labelling, storage, transport, marketing, formulation, parallel trade and use of plant protection products. The Food and Veterinary Office of the Commission carries out audits to verify the control systems of Member States and third countries ⁽³⁾.

E-00934/2013: The Single CMO Regulation ⁽⁴⁾ provides for financial support for restocking of bee hives in the frame of the apiculture programmes put in place by the Member States. Environmental measures under Rural development programmes contribute to safeguarding bee populations. Also, the Habitats Directive ⁽⁵⁾ provides a legal framework for the protection of key habitats for bees so that bees benefit from the conservation and management of natural habitats in the Natura 2000 network. The mapping and assessment of ecosystems and their services, such as pollination, will provide the knowledge base for the integration of economic value of these services into accounting and reporting systems at EU and national level by 2020.

E-001281/2013: The Commission is funding several research projects to evaluate the bee health status in Europe and in other parts of the world. The COLOSS ⁽⁶⁾ COST action joins national research efforts to better understand honey bee health and to prevent colony deaths. The Bee Doc project ⁽⁷⁾ is studying the consequences of interactions between various pathogens and pesticides on bee health. The EU budget for bee health research under FP7 amounts to approximately EUR 15 million.

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

⁽²⁾ OJ L 309, 24.11.2009.

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/ir_search_en.cfm

⁽⁴⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:299:0001:0149:EN:PDF>

⁽⁵⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:1992:206:0007:0050:EN:PDF>

⁽⁶⁾ <http://www.coloss.org/>

⁽⁷⁾ <http://www.bee-doc.eu/>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000877/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(29 January 2013)**

Subject: Rwandan aid programmes

While the insurrection by the armed militia known as M23 is in progress in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the EU continues to fund Rwandan aid programmes. Despite the increase in violence by M23, EUR 47 million in aid was given to Rwanda, which the international community suspects of arming the rebels, in September 2011.

1. How is the EU aid programme ensuring that there is no misappropriation of funds by Rwanda in order to fund the rebels?
2. Should the EU not follow a similar policy to that of the UK Government, which is withholding GBP 34 million in aid payments to Rwanda over allegations that it is behind the current violence in the Democratic Republic of the Congo?

**Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(22 March 2013)**

1. EU Budget Support (BS) programmes include a set of indicators and targets that the Government must achieve for the funds to be released. The EU, together with other donors, establishes strict mechanisms to evaluate such indicators and assesses the achievement of each target before releasing every tranche of BS.

Indicators show our BS aid has a positive impact on improving living conditions and eradicating poverty in Rwanda. There was a 12% reduction in the poverty rate in the last five years and an 11% reduction in extreme poverty. Rwanda has already achieved the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) target concerning underweight children.

Rwanda has an excellent track record regarding its commitment to improving Public Finance Management (PFM). The last Public Expenditure and Financial Assessment exercise shows major progress in all PFM dimensions.

2. The EU remains concerned about the security and humanitarian situation in eastern DRC and is firmly committed to contributing to sustainable solutions to the crisis and its regional implications.

The Foreign Affairs Council has repeatedly condemned the M23 sedition and any external support to the rebellion.

The EU backs efforts by the UN, the African Union and the International Conference of the Great Lakes Region to promote a sustainable peace and welcomes the efforts of the UN Secretary General to conclude a 'framework agreement', defining global objectives to be met at national and regional level.

The EU has postponed all new decisions on additional BS to Rwanda, while we seek reassurances about its role and its constructive engagement in the search for solutions in the eastern DRC.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000879/13

alla Commissione
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(29 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Concessione di mutui a privati

Nell'anno passato, grazie alla Long Term Refinancing Operation, la BCE ha previsto un prestito a favore delle banche europee, pronti contro termine a tre anni al tasso straordinariamente agevolato dell'1 %. Benché le banche italiane abbiano ricevuto un lauto finanziamento che ammonta in totale a 530 miliardi di euro stanziati dalla BCE, queste non si adoperano per utilizzare detto denaro per concedere mutui ai privati ed alle imprese. Infatti, secondo il rapporto della BCE, il 70 % delle banche boccia ogni richiesta di finanziamento. Le giustificazioni addotte sono sostanzialmente due: necessità di ulteriori indagini istruttorie (che poi si concludono sempre negativamente) e l'inidoneità della richiesta.

Peraltro il mutuo è concesso solo a soggetti che godano di uno stipendio mensile di almeno duemila euro al mese, condizione improponibile a parere della BCE, posto che ultimamente gli stipendi dei dipendenti italiani sono stati drasticamente ridotti. Bankitalia conferma che alle famiglie sono toccate solamente le briciole dei finanziamenti stanziati dalla BCE, che hanno segnatamente registrato un aumento dello 0,1 % rispetto alle erogazioni a favore delle stesse.

Va notato che detto prestito della BCE è stato previsto per far fronte a diversi problemi, quali la necessità di far provvista di fondi, il rimborso delle obbligazioni in scadenza, l'acquisto dei titoli di Stato dei propri paesi ovvero la concessione di mutui a famiglie e a imprese al fine di rimettere in moto l'economia.

Tutto ciò premesso, può la Commissione far sapere se:

- reputa di poter agire al fine di ridimensionare le ristrette condizioni che le banche italiane hanno previsto in modo consuetudinariamente preclusivo alla concessione di mutui richiesti dai privati;
- reputa di potersi attivare al fine di prevedere che una quota del finanziamento della BCE sia obbligatoriamente riservata dalle banche alle richieste di privati, fermo restando il punto precedente?

Risposta di Olli Rehn a nome della Commissione

(28 febbraio 2013)

La politica monetaria nella zona euro è di competenza esclusiva della BCE, la cui indipendenza è sancita dal trattato. La Commissione non interferisce negli obblighi che il trattato o lo statuto impongono alla BCE.

Le operazioni di liquidità e le misure non convenzionali della BCE, alle quali è stato fatto ricorso durante la crisi, hanno contribuito a creare le condizioni per un graduale miglioramento dei mercati interbancari e obbligazionari, il che agevolerà il flusso di credito verso l'economia reale della zona euro. Tuttavia, le misure della BCE in materia di liquidità devono essere completate da sforzi significativi di ristrutturazione da parte delle banche con problemi di bilancio, sforzi che dovrebbero consentire al settore bancario di aumentare la dotazione di capitale e di accrescere la resilienza e che dovrebbero migliorare ulteriormente le condizioni per favorire il flusso di credito alle imprese private e alle famiglie.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000879/13
to the Commission
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(29 January 2013)

Subject: Lending to private individuals

In the past year the European Central Bank (ECB), under its Long Term Refinancing Operation, has granted loans to Europe's banks, to be repaid within three years at the extraordinarily favourable rate of 1 %. Although Italian banks have received the substantial sum of EUR 530 billion from the ECB, they are not using the money to lend to private individuals and businesses. In fact, according to the ECB report, 70 % of them are rejecting all loan applications. There are basically two reasons given: the need for additional background checks (which always end in rejection) and the ineligibility of the application.

Moreover, only those individuals who earn at least EUR 2 000 a month are being granted loans, a condition which the ECB believes cannot be imposed, given the recent drastic reduction in Italian employees' salaries. Bankitalia confirms that families have received only a fraction of the loans granted by the ECB, which have, *inter alia*, risen by 0.1 % when compared to those granted to families.

It should be noted that the ECB loan was intended to be used to tackle a variety of problems, such as the need to build up reserves, the repayment of maturing bonds, the acquisition of own-country government bonds, and the granting of loans to families and businesses in order to kick-start the economy.

Can the Commission state whether:

- it believes it can take steps to ease the restrictive conditions on lending to private individuals that Italian banks have laid down in a frequently preclusive manner;
- it believes it can act to ensure that the banks reserve a share of the ECB funds for requests from private individuals, notwithstanding the previous point?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(28 February 2013)

Monetary policy in the euro area is the exclusive competence of the ECB, whose independence is enshrined in the Treaty. The Commission does not interfere with the ECB's Treaty or statutory obligations.

The ECB's liquidity operations and non-standard measures carried out during the crisis helped to set conditions for a gradual improvement of interbank and bond markets, which will facilitate the flow of credit to the euro-area real economy. However, the ECB's liquidity measures need to be complemented by significant restructuring efforts by banks with weak balance sheets, which should result in a better capitalised and more resilient banking sector and should further improve the conditions for credit to flow into private companies and households.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000880/13
alla Commissione
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(29 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Microcredito

Conformemente a quanto prefigurato nell'agenda di Lisbona, il microcredito è uno strumento fondamentale per il risanamento dell'economia atto a promuovere la crescita e l'occupazione nell'Unione europea. Detto strumento, infatti, permetterebbe alle tante PMI, costrette nella morsa di un latente fallimento, di finanziare i propri progetti.

Grazie al CIP l'Unione ha scelto di attivarsi per agevolare l'accesso al credito per le PMI, segnatamente ideando un meccanismo teso a garantire le piccole imprese, affinché le banche siano incoraggiate alla concessione di finanziamenti. Il programma è lungimirante, ma nella sua realizzazione sono individuati taluni problemi dovuti a una pachidermica burocratizzazione dell'iter. Talvolta questa situazione diviene sconcertante e conduce gli imprenditori a ricorrere a forme di finanziamento con tassi non esattamente agevolati che trascendono la legalità: l'usura trova terreno fertile in una situazione in cui gli imprenditori non riescono a vedere una concreta alternativa all'ottenimento di finanziamenti.

L'Unione dovrebbe attivarsi in maniera ancor più puntuale per mettere gli istituti bancari in una posizione di maggiore apertura a favore della concessione di microcrediti alle PMI rivedendone le condizioni.

Tutto ciò premesso, può la Commissione far sapere se reputa auspicabile una revisione delle condizioni finanziarie necessarie alla concessione del microcredito alle PMI al fine di renderla maggiormente semplificata e meno burocratizzata?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(27 marzo 2013)

La Commissione è impegnata a migliorare l'offerta di microcrediti per incoraggiare le nuove imprese e stimolare la crescita economica e la creazione di posti di lavoro. La Commissione opera con intermediari negli Stati membri per accrescere la loro offerta di microcrediti e rafforzare così lo sviluppo del microcredito in Europa.

In linea generale, l'obiettivo degli strumenti di garanzia del CIP è stimolare i prestiti alle imprese. Si noti tuttavia che il processo di domanda dei prestiti stessi è determinato dal singolo erogatore di microcredito.

Per affrontare la questione della semplificazione la Commissione ha discusso i requisiti procedurali del Gruppo BEI ⁽¹⁾ nel quadro del Forum sul finanziamento delle PMI ⁽²⁾ per risolvere gli eventuali oneri amministrativi eccessivi che gravano sulle PMI. Tuttavia, agli intermediari finanziari sono imposti certi requisiti per assicurare una rendicontazione trasparente e una sana gestione finanziaria. In proposito, la Commissione ha presentato nel 2011 il Codice europeo di buona condotta per l'erogazione di microcrediti ⁽³⁾, sviluppato in stretta consultazione con diversi attori e stakeholder del settore della microfinanza (comprese le casse di risparmio). Questo codice stabilisce buone pratiche e standard comuni nel campo del microcredito e incoraggia la trasparenza nel settore nonché l'uso di un linguaggio comune nel settore e nei rapporti con le banche ⁽⁴⁾.

Inoltre, nel contesto dei negoziati in corso sul Quadro finanziario pluriennale 2014-2020, la Commissione ha adottato il proprio primo Quadro della semplificazione ⁽⁵⁾ il quale spiega come i beneficiari dei finanziamenti UE possono attendersi una semplificazione delle regole e a una riduzione degli oneri amministrativi nella prossima generazione di programmi di spesa che verrà implementata a decorrere dal 1° gennaio 2014 ⁽⁶⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Banca europea per gli investimenti. Il Gruppo BEI è costituito dalla Banca europea per gli investimenti (BEI) e dal Fondo europeo per gli investimenti (FEI).

⁽²⁾ Il Forum sul finanziamento delle PMI è stato istituito dalla Commissione europea per monitorare la situazione del mercato e incoraggiare nuovi approcci onde migliorare l'accesso ai finanziamenti per le PMI.

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/the_funds/instruments/jasmine_cg_en.cfm.

⁽⁴⁾ Con questo codice la Commissione intende aiutare il settore ad affrontare le sfide legate all'accesso a finanziamenti a lungo termine e al mantenimento e miglioramento della qualità dei servizi. È in via di elaborazione una metodologia per il monitoraggio della sua corretta implementazione. L'osservanza del codice è raccomandata nella «Proposta di regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio relativo a un programma dell'Unione europea per il cambiamento e l'innovazione sociale» (PSCI) (articolo 23, paragrafo 3) varata dalla Commissione e può diventare una condizione da rispettare per gli erogatori di microcrediti al fine di ottenere finanziamenti nell'ambito di tale strumento.

⁽⁵⁾ Comunicazione Primo quadro di valutazione della semplificazione per il QFP 2014-2020, COM(2012)531 final del 20.9.2012.

⁽⁶⁾ Nell'ambito del prossimo quadro finanziario pluriennale la Commissione continuerà a sostenere i prestiti alle microimprese nell'ambito del dispositivo per la concessione di crediti (debt facility) di COSME. Tuttavia, il principale strumento finanziario di microcredito dell'UE sarà il programma per il cambiamento e l'innovazione sociale (PSCI), che è il successore dell'attuale strumento europeo Progress di microfinanza.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000880/13
to the Commission
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(29 January 2013)**

Subject: Microcredit

Under the terms of the Lisbon strategy, microcredit is a fundamental instrument for economic recovery that promotes growth and employment throughout the European Union. Indeed, that instrument arguably helps many SMEs facing potential bankruptcy to finance their projects.

The Union has chosen to take steps, via the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme (CIP), to facilitate access to credit for SMEs, in particular by devising a mechanism for guaranteeing small businesses, so that banks are encouraged to lend to them. The programme is far-sighted, but there have been some problems with its implementation as a result of the inflexible and bureaucratic nature of the process. At times the situation becomes disheartening and causes entrepreneurs to resort to forms of finance with illegally high rates: usury flourishes when entrepreneurs cannot see any other concrete means of obtaining finance.

The Union should take an even more targeted approach in order to make banks more open to granting microcredit to SMEs, and the conditions should be reviewed.

Can the Commission therefore say whether it considers it worthwhile to review the financial conditions that must be met in order to grant microcredit to SMEs so that the process can be made simpler and less bureaucratic?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2013)**

The Commission is committed to improving the supply of microcredit in order to encourage new businesses and stimulate economic growth and job creation. The Commission is working with intermediaries in Member States to increase their provision of microcredit and thus reinforce the development of microcredit in Europe.

As a general rule, the purpose of the CIP guarantee instruments is to stimulate more lending to businesses. However, it should be noted that the application process for the loans themselves is determined by the particular microcredit provider.

To address the issue of simplification, the Commission has discussed the procedural requirements of the EIB ⁽¹⁾ Group in the framework of the SME Finance Forum ⁽²⁾ in order to address possible excessive administrative burden for SMEs. However, certain requirements are imposed on financial intermediaries in order to ensure transparent reporting and sound financial management. In this regard, the Commission presented in 2011 the European Code of Good Conduct for Microcredit Provision ⁽³⁾, developed in close consultation with many actors and stakeholders from the microfinance sector (including savings banks). This code sets out good practice guidelines and common standards in the field of microcredit and encourages transparency in the sector, as well as a common language in the sector including with banks ⁽⁴⁾.

Furthermore, in the context of the ongoing negotiations on the 2014-2020 Multiannual Financial Framework, the Commission adopted its first Simplification Scoreboard ⁽⁵⁾ which explains how beneficiaries of EU funding can expect simpler rules and less administrative burden in the next generation of spending programmes that will be implemented as of 1 January 2014 ⁽⁶⁾.

⁽¹⁾ European Investment Bank. The EIB Group consists of the European Investment Bank (EIB) and the European Investment Fund (EIF).

⁽²⁾ The SME Finance Forum has been set up by the European Commission to monitor the market situation and to encourage new approaches to improve access to finance for SMEs.

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/the_funds/instruments/jasmine_cg_en.cfm

⁽⁴⁾ With this Code the Commission seeks to support the sector in facing the challenges of accessing long-term finance and maintaining and raising the quality of services. A methodology aimed at monitoring its proper implementation is currently under development. Observance of the Code is being recommended in the 'Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on a European Union Programme for Social Change and Innovation' (PSCI) (Article 23, §3) launched by the Commission and may become a condition for microcredit providers to obtain funds under this instrument.

⁽⁵⁾ Communication First Simplification Scoreboard for the MFF 2014-2020, COM(2012) 531 final 20.9.2012.

⁽⁶⁾ Within the next multiannual financial framework the Commission will continue supporting loans to micro enterprises under the debt facility of COSME. However, the main EU micro-credit financial instrument will be Programme for Social Change and Innovation (PSCI), the successor of current European Progress Microfinance Facility.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000882/13

à Comissão

Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)

(29 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Situação na Empresa Barbosa e Almeida Vidro

Tomei conhecimento da luta desenvolvida pelos trabalhadores das empresas do Grupo BA Vidro, em Portugal — que integra as empresas BA Marinha Grande, BA Avintes e Sotancro, na Amadora — na sequência de uma informação entregue pela administração da empresa. Esse documento propunha a alteração do pagamento dos feriados, alteração do pagamento do subsídio de turno, alteração do pagamento das horas extraordinárias, a implementação do banco de horas e a perda de dias de compensação. A administração da empresa recusou sempre dialogar com as estruturas sindicais e convocou um referendo para que o citado documento passasse a ser lei na empresa, derogando, assim, ao Contrato Coletivo de Trabalho do Setor. Embora os trabalhadores tivessem recusado, por grande maioria, em referendo, o documento proposto, a administração impôs unilateralmente a redução do valor a pagar nos dias feriados (utilizando o pretexto da entrada em vigor do novo Código do Trabalho, a partir do último dia 15 de agosto). Como forma de protesto, os trabalhadores marcaram greves nos dias feriados (5 de outubro e 1 de novembro de 2012), as quais obtiveram uma participação massiva, sendo que, na sequência destas jornadas de luta, os dirigentes e delegados sindicais passaram a sofrer retaliações e perseguições por parte da administração.

Neste contexto, um administrador informou também os trabalhadores de que não se «importaria» de deslocalizar a empresa, numa clara atitude de chantagem e criação de «clima de terror» entre os trabalhadores, de forma a condicioná-los na prossecução da sua luta pelos direitos laborais adquiridos.

Assim, solicita-se à Comissão que informe do seguinte:

1. A referida empresa recebeu quaisquer apoios comunitários? Com que fins foram concedidos e que compromissos assumiu aquando da concessão dos apoios? Considera que, a existirem compromissos, estes estão a ser postos em causa pela administração da empresa?
2. Tem conhecimento da situação de perseguição dos trabalhadores, delegados e dirigentes sindicais? Como avalia esta situação?
3. Conhece a Comissão qualquer intenção de deslocalização da empresa Barbosa e Almeida Vidro? A existir essa intenção, considera que os compromissos assumidos pela empresa estão a ser postos em causa?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão

(26 de março de 2013)

Na resposta à sua pergunta E-11884/2011 ⁽¹⁾, a Comissão informa que a BA Vidro SA (Marinha Grande) e a Sotranco SA receberam financiamento do FSE no montante de 589 358,80 euros nos períodos de programação de 1989-1993 e 1994-1999 e a Sotranco SA recebeu 52 970,95 euros no período de programação entre 2000-2006. A BA Vidro SA (Avintes) recebeu financiamento do FSE no montante de 81 862,09 euros nos períodos de programação 2000-2006 e 2007-2013. Estas empresas cumpriram os requisitos obrigatórios para financiamento do FSE.

A empresa BA Vidro SA recebeu financiamento do FEDER no montante de 5 881 183 euros no período de programação de 2007-2013.

A Comissão não tem conhecimento de qualquer perseguição do tipo referida pelo Senhor Deputado. Embora a legislação da UE não regule esta situação, algumas diretivas da UE preveem disposições para a proteção dos representantes dos trabalhadores em certos casos ⁽²⁾; essas diretivas foram transpostas para a legislação nacional. É da competência das autoridades nacionais assegurar que a legislação nacional está a ser correta e efetivamente aplicada pela entidade patronal em causa, tendo em conta as circunstâncias específicas de cada caso.

Embora a Comissão não tenha conhecimento de qualquer plano de deslocalização, salienta que o objetivo do FSE não seria comprometido por essa deslocalização, visto que o financiamento se referiu a atividades de formação ligadas à qualificação profissional, que visam melhorar o potencial dos trabalhadores.

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

⁽²⁾ Em particular o artigo 10.º da Diretiva 94/45/CE (relativa aos conselhos de empresa europeus); artigo 6.º n.º 2 da Diretiva 2001/23/CE (relativa à transferência de empresas) e o artigo 7.º da Diretiva 2002/14/CE (que estabelece um quadro geral relativo à informação e à consulta dos trabalhadores) A expressão «representantes dos trabalhadores» é definida segundo a legislação e as práticas nacionais. As diretivas estão disponíveis em: http://europa.eu.int/comm/employment_social/labour_law/directives_en.htm

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000882/13
to the Commission
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(29 January 2013)**

Subject: Concerns regarding the Barbosa e Almeida Vidro Company

I have become aware that employees of the BA Vidro Group in Portugal, which includes the companies BA Marinha Grande and BA Avintes and Sotancro in Amadora, are engaged in a struggle after the company management presented them with a document that proposes changes to holiday pay, shift allowance and overtime pay, the introduction of bank hours and the loss of days in lieu. The company management has consistently refused to talk to the trade unions and called a vote to bring the aforementioned document into force as a company regulation, thereby undermining the Collective Work Agreement for the sector. Although the great majority of employees rejected the proposed document in the vote, the management has unilaterally imposed the reduction in holiday pay (using the pretext of the new Labour Code that came into force on 15 August 2012). In protest, the employees held strikes on public holidays (5 October and 1 November 2012), which were strongly supported, following which trade union leaders and delegates suffered retaliation and persecution by the management.

A manager informed employees that he 'would not mind' if the company were relocated, in a clear attempt at blackmail aimed at creating a 'climate of fear' amongst employees to undermine their struggle for their employment rights.

I ask the Commission:

1. Has this company received any kind of EU aid? For what purpose was this aid allocated and what undertakings were made when it was received? If undertakings were given, does the Commission believe these have been compromised by the company management?
2. Is it aware of employees and trade union delegates and leaders being persecuted? What is its view of this situation?
3. Is the Commission aware of any plans to relocate the Barbosa and Almeida Vidro company? If there are any such plans, does it believe that any undertakings given by the company would be compromised?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(26 March 2013)**

In its answer to Question E-11884/2011 ⁽¹⁾, the Commission reported that BA Vidro SA (Marinha Grande) and Sotancro SA received ESF funding amounting to EUR 589 358.80 in respect of the 1989-93 and 1994-99 programming periods, and Sotanco SA received EUR 52 970.95 in respect of the 2000-06 programming period. BA Vidro SA (Avintes) received ESF funding amounting to EUR 81 862.09 in the 2000-06 and 2007-13 programming periods. These companies all complied with the mandatory requirements for ESF funding.

BA Vidro SA has received ERDF funding of EUR 5.881.183 in the 2007-2013 programming period.

The Commission is not aware of any persecution of the sort referred to by the Honourable Member. While EC law does not regulate this issue, certain EU directives lay down provisions for the protection of workers' representatives in certain cases ⁽²⁾ that have been transposed into national legislation. It is for the competent national authorities to ensure that the national legislation is correctly and effectively applied by the employer concerned, having regard to the specific circumstances of each case.

Although the Commission is not aware of any relocation plans, it would point out that the aim of the ESF would not be jeopardised by relocation since the funding referred to concerned training activities linked to vocational training which aim to improve the employees' potential.

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

⁽²⁾ In particular, Article 10 of Directive 94/45/EC (on European Works Council), Article 6(2) of Directive 2001/23/EC (on transfer of undertakings) and Article 7 of Directive 2002/14/EC (on a general framework for informing and consulting employees). The term 'workers' representatives' is defined in accordance with national law and practice. The text of the directives are available at: http://europa.eu.int/comm/employment_social/labour_law/directives_en.htm

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-000883/13
до Комисията
Slavi Binev (EFD)
(29 януари 2013 г.)

Относно: Опасни сметища в България, нарушаващи европейското законодателство

До мен достигнаха подписки на жители на населени места в България, където правителството възнамерява да строи или рекултивира депа за отпадъци. Едното е в Югозападна — с. Джерман, другото в Югоизточна България — гр. Ямбол. И двете са на по-малко от 1 км от населени места.

За депото до гр. Ямбол липсва ОВОС, има реална опасност от по-силно замърсяване на подземните води, не се предвижда изграждане на пречиствателна станция, ще се унищожат ценни паметници на културата, предвиденият капацитет на депото ще се запълни за 2 години, а инвестицията е 15 млн. евро. За другото депо, след като има вече отредена площадка с предназначение депо за отпадъци и свободни дерета до нея, защо е необходимо да се търси ново място? Не са взети предвид изискванията на европейското законодателство за отстояние на съоръжения за третиране на отпадъци от населени места, реки и др. Посоченият терен е в земетръсна и свлачищна зона. Депото ще е на около 20—30 м от газопровода за Гърция и при авария щетите биха били непредвидими. Теренът навлиза в сервитутната зона на трансграничния газопровод България—Гърция. Определеното трасе на новостроящата се автомагистрала „Струма“ ЛОТ-2 Дупница—Благоевград отстои на около 250 м от терена. Не е спазена обичайната българска и европейска практика в такива случаи — представяне на минимум пет терена за одобрение. С оглед на тези и други нарушения на Директиви 1999/31/ЕО, 2000/60/ЕС, 2008/1/ЕО и 2011/92/ЕС искам да попитам:

1. Наясно ли е ЕК с практиката за незаконни депа в България?
2. Какво смята да предприеме ЕК по тези случаи?

Отговор, даден от г-н Поточник от името на Комисията
(8 април 2013 г.)

В момента тече разследване във връзка с няколко депа (съществуващи или в процес на изграждане) в България. Едно от тях е регионалното депо в Ямбол, което е и предмет на петиция № 1353/2011. Резултатите от разследването ще бъдат съобщени на Европейския парламент в рамките на горепосочената петиция.

Що се отнася до другия проект, посочен в писмения въпрос, Комисията беше информирана, че на 4 декември 2012 г. компетентният орган е издал решение, съгласно което за планираното регионално депо в близост до с. Джерман (община Дупница) следва да се извърши оценка на въздействието върху околната среда. Решението е публично и достъпно онлайн ⁽¹⁾. Сега строителят е отговорен за изготвяне на доклад за оценка на въздействието върху околната среда и той трябва да предприеме всички необходими процедурни стъпки за осигуряване на съответствие с правото на ЕС (включително обсъждане със съответните заинтересовани страни и обществеността).

(1) http://www.pk.riovs-pernik.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=583:re55&catid=36:preценка&Itemid=29.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000883/13
to the Commission
Slavi Binev (EFD)
(29 January 2013)**

Subject: Dangerous waste dumps in Bulgaria in breach of EC law

I have received a number of written submissions from people living in communities in Bulgaria where the Government is planning to build or to recultivate landfills. One of the sites is close to the village of Djerman in the southwest, the other to the town of Yambol in the southeast. Both sites are less than a kilometre away from a built-up area.

In the case of the Yambol landfill, no environmental impact assessment has been carried out, there is a real danger of increased pollution of groundwater, there are no plans to build a water treatment plant, a number of sites of cultural importance will be destroyed, it is expected that the site will be filled to capacity in two years' time, and EUR 15 million is being invested in it.

In the other case, given that there is already a site designated for waste disposal with empty gullies beside it, why is it necessary to seek a new landfill site? No account has been taken of the stipulations under EC law about siting waste treatment sites at a distance from built-up areas, rivers, etc. The site selected is in an area subject to earth tremors and landslides. The landfill will be approximately 20-30 metres away from the gas pipeline that runs from Bulgaria to Greece, and the damage potentially resulting from any accident would be incalculable. The site is within the area appurtenant to the cross-border gas pipeline, and the intended route of the Dupnitsa-Blagoevgrad (Lot 2) section of the Struma motorway, currently under construction, is approximately 250 m away. The normal Bulgarian and European practice in such cases — of submitting at least five proposed sites for approval — has not been followed.

In the light of these and other breaches of the provisions of Directives 1999/31/EC, 2000/60/EU, 2008/1/EC and 2011/92/EU:

1. Is the Commission fully aware of practice in Bulgaria in relation to unlawful landfills?
2. What does the Commission intend to do about the cases in question?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission
(8 April 2013)**

There is an investigation under way on several landfills (existing or in construction) in Bulgaria. One of them is the regional landfill in Yambol, which is also subject to petition ref. No 1353/2011. The results of the investigation will be communicated to the European Parliament in the context of the abovementioned petition.

As regards the other project mentioned in the written question, the Commission was informed that on 4 December 2012 the competent authority issued a decision that a planned regional landfill close to the village of Djerman (Municipality Dupnitsa) should be subject to an environmental impact assessment. This decision is public and can be accessed online ⁽¹⁾. Now the developer has the responsibility to prepare an environmental impact assessment report and to undertake all the necessary procedural steps to ensure compliance with EC law (including consultations with relevant stakeholders and the public).

⁽¹⁾ http://www.pk.riovs-pernik.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=583:re55&catid=36:precenka&Itemid=29.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000884/13
a la Comisión**

Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(29 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: «Error» del FMI sobre los efectos de la austeridad en Europa

El pasado 3 de enero el Economista Jefe del Fondo Monetario Internacional (FMI), Olivier Blanchard, reconoció el «error» cometido por la institución a la hora de recomendar políticas de austeridad a los gobiernos europeos al no entender que los efectos de las políticas de los recortes supondrían el fin del crecimiento económico en la región.

«Errores en el Pronóstico de Crecimiento y Multiplicadores Fiscales» es el título del informe presentado por Blanchard en el que se reconoce haber subestimado el incremento del desempleo y la caída de la demanda interna. El informe no está firmado por la dirección del organismo pero en él, el economista jefe reconoce la equivocación en el caso de Grecia, donde el aumento de la deuda pública pese al importante recorte del gasto fue mucho mayor de lo esperado. Haber tenido en cuenta los errores cometidos habría supuesto la elaboración de recomendaciones políticas mucho menos agresivas para países como Portugal y España que no hubiesen destruido sus expectativas de crecimiento.

La Comisión Europea, en la elaboración de las recomendaciones específicas a países, ha calcado las conclusiones de esta institución reforzando la presión sobre los gobiernos de los Estados miembros para imponer una austeridad que no ha generado ninguna estabilización fiscal. La Dirección General de ECFIN de la Comisión debe asumir responsabilidad al haber realizado recomendaciones basándose en estudios «erróneos» del FMI habiéndolos asumido sin crítica alguna. Esta rápida asunción de lo recomendado por el FMI ha supuesto la caída del crecimiento económico en los países del sur de Europa y en toda la Unión. Los errores que la Comisión asumió como verdades absolutas están provocando la parálisis económica y procesos de degradación social que pueden ser contabilizados en vidas humanas.

1. ¿Está la Comisión desarrollando una investigación para esclarecer responsabilidades y sancionar a los culpables de la DG ECFIN por haber desarrollado recomendaciones basadas en informes erróneos del FMI sin haberlos contrastado con otras fuentes de información?
2. ¿Continuará la Comisión basándose en los informes del FMI para la elaboración de las próximas recomendaciones específicas a los Estados miembros?

Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión
(13 de marzo de 2013)

La Comisión basa sus orientaciones estratégicas en sus propios análisis detallados, teniendo en cuenta una amplia gama de datos y otra información, según proceda. Este planteamiento se refleja, entre otras cosas, en los documentos de análisis de la Comisión en los que se basan las orientaciones políticas dirigidas a los Estados miembros, tales como el documento de trabajo de los servicios de la Comisión relativo a cada Estado miembro, que fundamenta las recomendaciones específicas por país en el marco del «Semestre Europeo», los análisis exhaustivos que se realizan dentro del procedimiento de desequilibrio macroeconómico y los exámenes de los programas de los Estados miembros sujetos a un programa de ajuste macroeconómico.

Una evaluación reciente del historial de previsiones de la Comisión no indica que haya sesgos en las previsiones para la UE o la zona del euro, esto es, no ha habido una sobrestimación ni subestimación sistemáticas. La evaluación puede consultarse en la página web de la Comisión:

http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/economic_paper/2012/ecp476_en.htm

Si bien los multiplicadores presupuestarios son probablemente mayores de lo normal en la coyuntura actual, hay que ser muy cautos a la hora de usar los errores anteriores de las previsiones como indicios indirectos de la verdadera dimensión de los multiplicadores del saneamiento presupuestario. Puede encontrarse más información al respecto en las páginas 41-44 de las previsiones económicas de la Comisión Europea de otoño de 2012:

http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2012/pdf/ee-2012-7_en.pdf

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000884/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(29 January 2013)**

Subject: IMF error regarding the effects of austerity in Europe

On 3 January, the chief economist of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), Olivier Blanchard, acknowledged the 'mistake' made by the institution in recommending austerity policies to European governments without understanding that the effects of those cuts would mean the end of economic growth in the region.

'Growth Forecast Errors and Fiscal Multipliers' is the title of the report presented by Blanchard in which it is acknowledged that the increase in unemployment and decline in domestic demand were underestimated. The report is not signed by the organisation's management, but in it the chief economist acknowledges the mistake made in the case of Greece, where the increase in public debt, despite significant spending cuts, was much higher than expected. Had the errors been taken into account, it would have led to far less aggressive policy recommendations for countries such as Portugal and Spain, and would not have destroyed their growth expectations.

The European Commission, when drawing up specific recommendations to countries, copied the organisation's conclusions by increasing pressure on the governments of the Member States to impose austerity measures that have not generated any fiscal stabilisation. The Commission's Directorate-General for Economic and Financial Affairs (DG ECFIN) should take responsibility for having made recommendations based on 'erroneous' IMF studies after accepting them without criticism. This swift acceptance of the IMF's recommendations has brought about the decline in economic growth in the countries of southern Europe and throughout the Union. The errors that the Commission accepted as absolute truths are causing economic stagnation and processes of social degradation that can be counted in human lives.

1. Is the Commission carrying out an investigation to clarify responsibilities and penalise those within DG ECFIN who are guilty of developing recommendations based on erroneous IMF reports without comparing them with other sources of information?
2. Will the Commission continue to use IMF reports as a basis for drawing up its upcoming specific recommendations to the Member States?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(13 March 2013)**

The Commission bases its policy guidance on its own thorough analyses, taking into account a wide range of data and other information, as appropriate. This approach reflected *inter alia* in the Commission's analytical documents that support policy guidance to Member States such as the Staff Working Document prepared for each Member State underpinning the Country-specific Recommendations in the context of the European Semester, the In-depth Reviews carried out in the context of the Macroeconomic Imbalances Procedure and the Programme Reviews for Member States subject to a macroeconomic adjustment programme.

A recent assessment of the Commission's forecast track record, shows no evidence of a bias in the forecast for the EU or the euro area, i.e. no systematic over- or underestimation. The assessment can be found on the Commission's website: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/economic_paper/2012/ecp476_en.htm

While fiscal multipliers are probably larger than usual at the current juncture, much caution is warranted when using past forecast errors as indirect evidence for the true size of the fiscal consolidation multiplier. Further detail on this issue can be found on pp. 41-44 of the European Economic Forecast, autumn 2012: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2012/pdf/ee-2012-7_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000885/13
to the Commission
Michael Cashman (S&D)
(29 January 2013)

Subject: Investigation of the UK School Standards and Framework Act (SSFA) legislation

In April 2010, the British Humanist Association complained to the Commission that the UK is in breach of Council Directive 2000/78/EC in allowing state-funded religious schools to select up to 100 % of their teaching staff on the basis of their faith alone, without regard, among other concerns, to whether there is a genuine occupational requirement ⁽¹⁾. In June 2012, the Commission wrote to the British Humanist Association, stating that 'Our initial assessment is that the SSFA [the relevant legislation] raises questions about conformity of some of its provisions concerning employment in teaching posts with Article 4 of Directive 2000/78/EC. We will, therefore, contact the UK authorities to ask for clarifications in the matter. These contacts are the necessary next step in assessing whether any breach of EC law is at stake' ⁽²⁾.

1. Could the Commission provide an update on any subsequent progress made in this investigation?
2. Has the Commission now contacted the UK Government, and, if not, when does it expect to do so?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(3 April 2013)

The complaint in question raised concerns about the compliance of United Kingdom School Standards and Framework Act 1998 (SSFA) with Directive 2000/78/EC as regards discrimination of teachers in employment in state-funded religious schools. The Commission has received also other complaints concerning various UK acts, which are claimed to be in breach of this directive. Since all these complaints are related to Article 4 of Directive 2000/78/EC, the Commission has deemed it appropriate to investigate all points in the context of the same investigation. The point on the SSFA has been relevant for the completion of investigation on other complaints, in particular since one of the more recent complaints concerns the same issue.

⁽¹⁾ <http://humanism.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/bha-complaint-to-the-european-commission-on-employment-in-faith-schools.pdf>

⁽²⁾ <http://humanism.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/european-commission-response-to-bha-complaint-on-employment-in-faith-schools.pdf>

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-000886/13
til Kommissionen
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(29. januar 2013)

Om: Bestemmelser vedrørende vandløbs kvalitative tilstand i vandrammedirektivet

I henhold til den danske Miljømålslov § 12 skal alt overfladevand og grundvand have opnået en god tilstand senest den 22. december 2015, jf. dog §§ 15-20. § 12, stk. 2, i loven slår fast, at der ved god tilstand for overfladevand forstås den tilstand, et overfladevandområde har nået, når det både har god økologisk tilstand og god kemisk tilstand (<https://www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/R0710.aspx?id=127102&exp=1>).

På den baggrund bedes Kommissionen oplyse, om det i henhold til vandrammedirektivet er tilstrækkeligt, at et vandløbs tilstand dokumenteres alene ved faunaanalyser eller om tilstanden også skal dokumenteres gennem kemiske analyser?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Janez Potočnik
(5. marts 2013)

I artikel 2, nr. 18) i vandrammedirektivet⁽¹⁾ defineres god overfladevandstilstand som den tilstand et overfladevandområde har nået, når både dets økologiske tilstand og dets kemiske tilstand i det mindste er »god«. Faunaanalyser alene er hverken tilstrækkelige til at fastslå den økologiske eller den samlede tilstand.

God kemisk tilstand for overfladevand betyder, at prioriterede stoffer og visse andre forurenende stoffer har nået standarderne som fastsat i direktivet om miljøkvalitetskrav⁽²⁾. På nuværende tidspunkt er det kun muligt at bestemme koncentrationen af disse stoffer gennem kemisk analyse.

Det skal nævnes, at den økologiske tilstand for overfladevand er defineret af flere parametre, ikke bare biologiske, men også kemiske, fysiske og hydromorfologiske. De kemiske parametre omfatter koncentrationer af forurenende stoffer, der har national interesse, men som ikke er dækket af direktivet om miljøkvalitetskrav.

⁽¹⁾ EFT L 343 af 22.12.2000.

⁽²⁾ EUT L 348 af 24.12.2008.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000886/13
to the Commission
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(29 January 2013)**

Subject: Provisions concerning the qualitative status of water courses in the Water Framework Directive

In accordance with Section 12 of the Danish Act on Environmental Objectives, all surface water and groundwater shall have achieved good status by 22 December 2015, cf. Sections 15-20, however. Section 12(2) of the Act states that good surface water status means the status achieved by a surface water body when both its ecological status and its chemical status are good (<https://www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/R0710.aspx?id=127102&exp=1>).

In view of this, could the Commission indicate whether, in accordance with the Water Framework Directive, it is sufficient for the status of a water course to be documented by faunal analyses alone, or if the status is also required to be documented by means of chemical analyses?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission
(5 March 2013)**

The Water Framework Directive ⁽¹⁾ Article 1 (18) defines good surface water status as the status achieved by a surface water body when both its ecological status and its chemical status are at least 'good'. Faunal analyses alone are not sufficient to determine either the ecological or the overall status.

Good surface water chemical status means that the standards set for the priority substances and certain other pollutants in the Environmental Quality Standards Directive ⁽²⁾ are met. At present, the concentrations of those substances can only be determined by chemical analysis.

It should be noted that the ecological status of surface waters is defined by several parameters, not only biological but also chemical, physical and hydromorphological. The chemical parameters include the levels of pollutants of national concern that are not covered by the Environmental Quality Standards Directive.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L327, 22.12.2000.
⁽²⁾ OJ L 348, 24.12.2008.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000887/13
to the Commission**

Jim Higgins (PPE)

(29 January 2013)

Subject: Implementation of the EU Transparency Directive and Accounting Directive

Given the ongoing humanitarian crisis in the Democratic Republic of Congo and the pressing need for improved infrastructure, it would seem that the natural resource wealth of the region is not being fairly allocated.

In this context, can the Commission outline how it intends to ensure the full implementation of the Transparency Directive and the Accounting Directive?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission

(21 March 2013)

The Commission fully shares the objective of promoting greater transparency and more accountability, in particular as regards the extractive industry. This is one of the reasons why, in the framework of the revision of the Accounting and Transparency Directives, the Commission adopted a legislative proposal on 25 October 2011 requiring the disclosure of payments to governments on a country and project basis by listed and large unlisted companies with activities in the extractive and forestry sectors.

The Commission's proposal is now following its normal course of procedure and the final adopted legal text will be the result of tripartite negotiations between the Commission, the Council and the European Parliament. The Commission will start closely monitoring the implementation by Member States upon the entry into force of the legislation, in accordance and within the boundaries of the Treaty.

The HR-VP and the Commission are fully aware of the problems resulting from poor governance of natural resources sector in resource-rich country, as the Democratic Republic of Congo. The EU is actively developing efforts to improve corporate governance and financial transparency as well as the Regional Initiative on Illegal exploitation of Natural Resources of the International Conference of the Great Lakes Region, which intends to set-up a mechanism aiming at certifying conflict-free minerals sourced in the region on the basis of the OECD guidelines.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000888/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(29 janvier 2013)

Objet: Stratégie européenne pour la Corne de l'Afrique

La Corne de l'Afrique est l'une des régions du monde où l'insécurité alimentaire est la plus forte. Des millions d'habitants y souffrent de sous-nutrition et sont menacés de famine. Cette région géographique comprend des pays parmi ceux possédant les normes sanitaires les plus faibles et c'est également l'une des parties du monde où la pauvreté et l'absence de gouvernance sont les plus prononcées.

L'insécurité des populations et l'insécurité alimentaire en particulier y provoquent de graves crises humanitaires. Force est de constater que la communauté internationale n'a pas réussi à prendre des mesures préventives pour traiter, sur place, les questions relatives à la sécurité des populations, à la sécheresse et à la famine.

1. La Commission envisage-t-elle d'apporter une aide et un soutien à tous les pays africains qui sont engagés militairement au maintien de la paix dans les pays de la Corne de l'Afrique et notamment en Somalie?
2. La Commission va-t-elle effectuer une analyse approfondie de l'ampleur et des retombées économiques, environnementales et sociales des pratiques de location de terres à des pays tiers dans la Corne de l'Afrique, et proposer des stratégies et des mécanismes de sauvegarde envisageables?

Réponse donnée par M. Piebalgs au nom de la Commission

(18 mars 2013)

En 2011, l'UE a adopté un cadre stratégique pour la Corne de l'Afrique ⁽¹⁾, soulignant la nécessité de s'attaquer au lien entre l'insécurité, la pauvreté et la gouvernance. Dans ce cadre, l'UE se penche sur des questions liées à la sécurité (la lutte contre le terrorisme par exemple), ainsi qu'à la sécheresse et à la famine. Lorsque la Corne de l'Afrique a été confrontée à la sécheresse de 2011, l'UE a fourni une aide humanitaire de grande ampleur (321 millions d'euros pour la période 2011-2012) et intensifié son soutien pour renforcer la résilience de la région (250 millions d'euros).

1. L'UE soutient financièrement la mission militaire de maintien de la paix de l'Union africaine (UA) en Somalie (Amisom) depuis son lancement en mars 2007, principalement à travers la Facilité de soutien à la paix pour l'Afrique. L'appui financier, d'un montant total de 411 millions d'euros, que la Facilité de soutien à la paix pour l'Afrique s'est engagée à apporter à l'Amisom, est affecté aux prestations versées aux forces de maintien de la paix et aux frais de fonctionnement du siège de la mission à Nairobi. L'Amisom a contribué de manière très efficace à la sécurité en Somalie et sa présence reste indispensable jusqu'à ce que les forces de sécurité somaliennes soient en mesure de prendre le relais. Tous les pays africains engagés dans l'Amisom (actuellement l'Ouganda, le Burundi, le Kenya et Djibouti) bénéficient de l'appui de l'UE à l'opération de maintien de la paix.
2. Des investisseurs locaux et internationaux acquièrent des terrains dans de nombreux pays en développement. La Commission s'attaque au problème en soutenant les initiatives mondiales visant à surveiller les transactions foncières à grande échelle et à réduire leurs effets négatifs potentiels, telles que l'Observatoire sur les acquisitions foncières et le projet Land Matrix, lancés par la Coalition internationale pour l'accès à la terre, et les Directives volontaires pour une gouvernance responsable des régimes fonciers applicables aux terres, aux pêches et aux forêts. En outre, l'UE soutient en Afrique l'initiative sur les politiques foncières ⁽²⁾, qui aide les États membres de l'UA à développer, modifier, mettre en œuvre et évaluer leurs politiques foncières.

(1) adopté lors de la 3124^e session du Conseil «Affaires étrangères», le 14 novembre 2011, voir: (<http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/fr/11/st16/st16858.fr11.pdf>).

(2) L'initiative africaine sur les politiques foncières est un programme conjoint de l'Union africaine, la Commission économique pour l'Afrique et la Banque africaine de développement, voir: (<http://new.uneca.org/fr/ipf/>).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000888/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(29 January 2013)

Subject: The EU's strategy for the Horn of Africa

Food insecurity is worse in the Horn of Africa than almost anywhere else in the world. Millions of people living there are malnourished and on the brink of starvation. This geographical region includes countries with the lowest standards of sanitation in the world, and it is also one of the worst areas in the world for poverty and lack of governance.

The insecurity faced by the people living there, in particular food insecurity, is the cause of major humanitarian crises. There is no getting away from the fact that the international community has failed to take preventive action on the ground to deal with issues relating to drought, famine and the security of local populations.

1. Is the Commission planning to provide aid and support to all the African countries involved in military peacekeeping operations in the countries of the Horn of Africa, and particularly in Somalia?
2. Will the Commission carry out an in-depth analysis of the scale and impact in economic, environmental and social terms of practices of land-renting to third countries in the Horn of Africa, and propose possible safeguard strategies and mechanisms?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(18 March 2013)

In 2011, the EU adopted a Strategic Framework for the Horn of Africa ⁽¹⁾, underlining the need to address the link between insecurity, poverty and governance. In this framework the EU addresses issues related to security (e.g. counterterrorism), as well as drought and famine. Faced with the 2011 drought, the EU provided massive humanitarian assistance (EUR 321 million for the period 2011-2012) and stepped up support to strengthen resilience (EUR 250 million).

1. The EU has supported the African Union (AU) military peacekeeping mission in Somalia (Amisom) financially since its launch in March 2007, mainly through the African Peace Facility (APF). The total contracted APF contribution to Amisom amounts to EUR 411 million, for peacekeepers' allowances and running costs of the mission office in Nairobi. Amisom's contribution to Somalia's security has been very successful and remains vital until the Somali Security Forces are able to take over Amisom's tasks. All African countries involved in Amisom (currently Uganda, Burundi, Kenya, Djibouti) are benefiting from EU support to the peacekeeping operation.
2. Land acquisitions by local and international investors occur in many developing countries. The Commission therefore addresses the issue through support to global initiatives to monitor large scale land transactions and mitigate their potential negative effects, such as the land observatory and land matrix developed by the International Land Coalition and the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests. Moreover, in Africa, the EU supports the Land Policy Initiative ⁽²⁾ which assists AU member states in developing, reviewing, implementing and evaluating their land policies.

⁽¹⁾ Adopted at the 3124th FAC meeting, 14 November 2011, see:
http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/126052.pdf

⁽²⁾ The African Land Policy Initiative is a joint programme of the Africa Union, Economic Commission for Africa and the African development Bank, see: <http://new.uneca.org/lpi/>

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000889/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(29 janvier 2013)

Objet: Introduction d'obligations de stabilité

La zone euro se trouve dans une situation singulière, dans laquelle les États membres participants partagent une monnaie unique sans politique budgétaire commune et sans marché obligataire unique. On ne peut que se féliciter, par conséquent, des projets de propositions contenus dans le rapport intitulé «Vers une véritable Union économique et monétaire» présenté par le président du Conseil européen, qui constituent un bon point de départ vers une Union économique et monétaire solide et véritable.

Le Parlement a demandé que la Commission présente un rapport sur la possibilité d'introduire des euro-obligations, qui fait partie intégrante de l'accord entre le Parlement et le Conseil sur le paquet législatif relatif à la gouvernance économique («six-pack»).

1. La Commission pourrait-elle préciser les critères d'entrée et de sortie reposant sur de strictes conditions d'assainissement et de discipline budgétaires, tout en tenant compte de la crise en cours et des ajustements budgétaires conduits dans plusieurs pays de la zone euro?
2. La Commission pourrait-elle préciser davantage les critères d'attribution des prêts aux États membres, étant donné que le livre vert indique uniquement que cela se ferait «en fonction de leurs besoins», et insister sur le fait que la capacité de service de la dette devrait être l'un des principaux critères d'attribution?
3. La Commission compte-t-elle, comme le lui demande le Parlement, présenter un rapport au Parlement et au Conseil examinant les différentes options et formulant des propositions en vue d'une feuille de route vers l'émission conjointe d'instruments de dette publique, en tenant compte des conditions financières, budgétaires et juridiques?
4. La Commission nourrit-elle quelques craintes en ce qui concerne les aspects comptables du traitement des obligations de stabilité au regard des législations nationales. Dans ce cadre, la Commission pourrait-elle évaluer de manière exhaustive l'incidence des différentes structures de garantie des obligations de stabilité sur les ratios dettes/PIB nationaux?

Réponse donnée par M. Rehn au nom de la Commission

(8 mars 2013)

Dans son projet détaillé pour une union économique et monétaire (UEM) véritable et approfondie, la Commission a considéré que, sur le moyen terme et dans des conditions strictes, un fonds d'amortissement et des bons du Trésor européens pourraient être de possibles éléments de cette nouvelle UEM. Comme principe directeur, toute mesure visant à renforcer la mutualisation des risques devra aller de pair avec un approfondissement de la discipline et de l'intégration budgétaires. La Commission créera un groupe d'experts afin d'approfondir cette analyse, dont les résultats sont attendus pour mars 2014 au plus tard.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000889/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(29 January 2013)**

Subject: Introduction of stability bonds

The euro area is in a unique situation, with its Member States sharing a common currency but not a common fiscal policy or a single bond market. The draft proposals in the report 'Towards a genuine economic and monetary union' presented by the President of the European Council are therefore very welcome, since they are a good starting point on the path towards a sound and genuine economic and monetary union.

Parliament has asked the Commission to present a report on the possible introduction of euro bonds, since this issue forms an integral part of the agreement between Parliament and the Council on the economic governance legislative package (the 'six-pack').

1. Can the Commission provide details of entry and exit criteria based on strong fiscal consolidation and budgetary discipline, in view of the ongoing crisis and the fiscal adjustments carried out in several euro area countries?
2. Can the Commission also elaborate further on the criteria for allocation of loans to the Member States, given that the Green Paper only states that this will be done 'according to their needs', although capacity to service the debt should be one of the central allocation criteria?
3. Is the Commission planning to comply with Parliament's request to present a report to Parliament and the Council examining the options for, and making proposals for, a roadmap towards common issuance of public debt instruments, taking into account financial, budgetary and legal aspects?
4. The Commission has expressed certain concerns with regard to accounting issues relating to the treatment of stability bonds under national law. In this context, can the Commission provide a comprehensive assessment of the impact of different guarantee structures for stability bonds on national debt-to-GDP ratios?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(8 March 2013)**

In its Blueprint for a Deep and Genuine EMU, the Commission considered that, in the medium-term, a redemption fund and eurobills could be possible elements of deep and genuine EMU under certain rigorous conditions. The guiding principle would be that any steps to further mutualisation of risk must go hand-in-hand with greater fiscal discipline and integration. The Commission will establish an Expert Group to deepen the analysis, the results of which are expected not later than March 2014.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000890/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(29 janvier 2013)

Objet: Propriété intellectuelle des ressources génétiques et biopiraterie

La protection et la conservation de la diversité génétique est un élément clé de la réalisation des objectifs du Millénaire pour le développement. Les ressources génétiques sont particulièrement cruciales pour une agriculture durable et pour la sécurité alimentaire. En outre, la diversité génétique est l'un des aspects les plus importants pour la survie des espèces et la résilience de l'écosystème. En conséquence, l'appauvrissement de la diversité génétique, qui fait partie intégrante du processus d'érosion de la diversité biologique, représente un enjeu fondamental pour l'humanité.

En dépit de son importance cruciale pour la survie de l'humanité, la diversité génétique s'appauvrit à une vitesse très préoccupante. Une telle érosion de la diversité pose de nouveaux défis tant aux détenteurs qu'aux utilisateurs de ressources génétiques, les premiers étant le plus souvent des pays en développement riches en diversité biologique, et les seconds des pays développés.

Dans ce contexte, la biopiraterie est devenue une préoccupation majeure des pays en développement. Bien qu'il n'existe aucune définition générale de la «biopiraterie», ce terme renvoie généralement à une situation dans laquelle les ressources biologiques sont enlevées aux communautés locales ou aux populations autochtones et brevetées, sans que les bénéfices qui en résultent ne profitent aux communautés d'origine qui en ont révélé les propriétés et les ont utilisées.

Compte tenu du fait que l'éradication de l'extrême pauvreté et de la faim et le soutien à la diversité biologique et à des écosystèmes sains pour l'agriculture, la sylviculture et la pêche dans une perspective de développement durable sont des thèmes extrêmement importants:

1. La Commission pourrait-elle arrêter une définition précise de la biopiraterie?
2. La Commission compte-t-elle se munir de statistiques sur la biopiraterie et l'appropriation abusive?
3. Comment la Commission compte-t-elle mettre en œuvre le protocole de Nagoya?

Réponse donnée par M. Potočnik au nom de la Commission

(15 mars 2013)

1. La Commission n'envisage pas d'arrêter une définition de la «biopiraterie», mais en octobre 2012, dans le cadre du protocole de Nagoya, elle a proposé un règlement relatif à l'accès aux ressources génétiques et au partage juste et équitable des avantages découlant de leur utilisation dans l'Union ⁽¹⁾.
2. Le protocole de Nagoya et le règlement proposé susmentionné prévoient des obligations en matière de surveillance et de notification, y compris dans les cas de non-conformité. Le règlement vise à imposer des obligations aux utilisateurs de ressources génétiques au sein de l'Union. Il ne couvre pas les questions relatives aux règles et dispositions régissant l'accès aux ressources génétiques. Il ne comporte donc pas de dispositions concernant la collecte de statistiques sur la «biopiraterie» et l'appropriation abusive.
3. Le règlement proposé introduit des mesures destinées à garantir le respect des règles par les utilisateurs. À cet effet, tous les utilisateurs de l'Union sont tenus de faire preuve de la diligence nécessaire afin de s'assurer que l'accès aux ressources génétiques et aux connaissances traditionnelles associées à ces ressources est conforme à la législation ou aux dispositions réglementaires applicables en matière d'accès et de répartition équitable des avantages, et que les avantages sont répartis de manière juste et équitable selon des conditions convenues de commun accord. La proposition prévoit aussi l'obligation d'arrêter l'utilisation des ressources génétiques si la légalité de leur origine ne peut être certifiée. En ce qui concerne l'accès aux ressources génétiques relevant de leur souveraineté, les États membres de l'Union sont libres d'exiger ou non un consentement préalable donné en connaissance de cause et le partage équitable des avantages découlant de leur utilisation.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2012)576 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000890/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(29 January 2013)

Subject: Intellectual property rights to genetic resources and biopiracy

The protection and conservation of genetic diversity is a key aspect in achieving the Millennium Development Goals. Genetic resources are of particularly crucial importance to sustainable agriculture and food security. Genetic diversity is also one of the most important contributors to species survival and ecosystem resilience. The depletion of genetic diversity, which plays an integral role in the process of biodiversity erosion, is therefore one of the major challenges facing humanity.

Despite its crucial importance for the survival of humanity, the depletion of genetic diversity is advancing at a very worrying rate. This erosion of diversity presents fresh challenges for both custodians and users of genetic resources, whereby it is generally the case that the first are developing countries with a rich biodiversity and the second are developed countries.

Against this background, biopiracy has become a major concern for developing countries. Although there is no general definition of 'biopiracy', the term usually refers to a situation in which biological resources are removed from local communities or native populations and patented, without the original communities which used them and reported their properties sharing in any of the resulting profits.

In view of the huge importance of eradicating extreme poverty and famine, and supporting biodiversity and healthy ecosystems for agriculture, forestry and fisheries within the framework of sustainable development:

1. Can the Commission establish a precise definition of biopiracy?
2. Is the Commission intending to gather statistics on biopiracy and misappropriation?
3. How is the Commission planning to implement the Nagoya Protocol?

Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission
(15 March 2013)

1. The Commission does not envisage establishing a definition of 'biopiracy', but in the context of the Nagoya Protocol, it has proposed a regulation on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization in the Union in October 2012 ⁽¹⁾.
2. The Nagoya Protocol and the abovementioned proposed regulation provide for monitoring and reporting obligations, including with regard to situations of non-compliance. The regulation focuses on establishing obligations for users of genetic resources within the EU. It does not cover matters relating to rules and regulations governing access to genetic resources. It therefore does not include provisions with regard to gathering statistics on 'biopiracy' and misappropriation.
3. The proposed regulation introduces measures for user-compliance in the form of a due diligence obligation for all EU users to ensure that genetic resources and traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources were accessed in accordance with applicable access and benefit sharing legislation or regulatory requirements and that benefits are fairly and equitably shared on mutually agreed terms. The proposal also foresees an obligation to discontinue the utilisation of genetic resources if the legality of origin cannot be ascertained. With regard to access to genetic resources under their sovereignty EU Member States will have discretion whether or not to require prior informed consent and the sharing of benefits arising from their utilisation.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2012)576 final.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000891/13

à la Commission

Marc Tarabella (S&D)

(29 janvier 2013)

Objet: Information et consultation des travailleurs en cas de restructuration

La restructuration n'est pas un phénomène nouveau, mais une pratique qui a lieu plus fréquemment aujourd'hui en raison des difficultés économiques et qui est devenue, ces dernières années, plus répandue en revêtant diverses formes, en s'intensifiant dans certains secteurs et en gagnant de nouveaux, porteuse de conséquences imprévisibles pour le tissu économique et social des États membres. La crise économique mondiale déclenchée en 2008 oblige les entreprises et les salariés à accomplir les changements difficiles, douloureux mais hélas souvent nécessaires pour préserver la viabilité et les emplois. Cette crise a été fortement aggravée par la spéculation financière, en accélérant fortement le rythme des mutations et en accentuant ainsi de manière alarmante les pressions à l'adaptation aux changements structurels sur les travailleurs, les territoires et tous les niveaux de l'exercice des responsabilités publiques.

Par conséquent, en raison des changements radicaux effectués dans les stratégies économiques, une réorientation massive s'est opérée, au cours des trente dernières années, de l'économie réelle vers l'économie financière. Il convient d'améliorer la situation de ceux qui créent tous les biens et fournissent tous les services, mais sont le plus durement touchés par la crise économique.

1. La Commission compte-t-elle, comme le lui demande le Parlement, présenter dans les plus brefs délais, sur la base de l'article 225 du traité et après consultation des partenaires sociaux, une proposition d'acte législatif sur l'information et la consultation des travailleurs, l'anticipation et la gestion des restructurations, selon les recommandations précises énoncées dans l'annexe du présent rapport?
2. La Commission peut-elle garantir et faire garantir que le licenciement sera considéré comme un dernier recours et ne sera envisagé qu'après l'épuisement de toutes les autres possibilités, sans qu'il soit pour autant porté atteinte à la compétitivité des entreprises?

Réponse donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission

(21 mars 2013)

Dans le prolongement du livre vert ⁽¹⁾ sur les restructurations et de l'adoption du rapport Cercas, la Commission étudie la meilleure façon d'encourager les bonnes pratiques en matière de restructuration et d'anticipation du changement et de garantir que celles-ci soient largement respectées. Conformément à son engagement pris dans l'accord-cadre sur les relations avec le Parlement, elle informera ce dernier de la réponse qu'elle compte apporter à sa demande.

La Commission n'a aucun pouvoir d'intervention dans les décisions spécifiques d'entreprises entraînant la fermeture d'installations en Europe. Elle encourage cependant vivement les sociétés et tous les autres acteurs à anticiper leurs besoins en capital humain et à effectuer des restructurations de manière socialement responsable. À ce sujet, la Commission attire l'attention sur les principes et lignes directrices présentés dans les Orientations de référence pour gérer le changement et ses conséquences sociales ⁽²⁾, négociées par les partenaires ⁽³⁾ sociaux européens, et sur sa Checklist sur les processus de restructuration. Ces deux documents soulignent que les licenciements devraient être une solution de dernier recours, lorsque toutes les autres possibilités ont été épuisées.

En outre, la nouvelle communication sur la politique industrielle ⁽⁴⁾ propose des mesures d'accompagnement visant à créer des emplois et à encourager les investissements dans le capital humain et les compétences, en donnant à la main-d'œuvre les moyens d'affronter les transformations de l'industrie, notamment grâce à une meilleure anticipation des besoins et des inadéquations en matière de compétences.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2012)7 final du 17.01.2012.

⁽²⁾ CES, CEEP et UNICE/UEAPME (novembre 2003), disponible à: <http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=2750&langId=fr>

⁽³⁾ Commission européenne (2009), disponible à: <http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=2741&langId=fr>

⁽⁴⁾ COM(2012)582 final du 10.10.2012.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000891/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(29 January 2013)**

Subject: Information and consultation for workers in the event of restructuring

Restructuring is not a new phenomenon, but a practice which happens more frequently nowadays due to economic challenges. It has become more prevalent in recent years as well as taking many different forms, intensifying in some sectors and spreading to others, with unforeseeable consequences for the economic and social fabric of the Member States. The global economic crisis triggered in 2008 requires companies and their employees to make difficult and painful changes which are unfortunately often necessary to safeguard competitiveness and jobs. The crisis has been significantly worsened by financial speculation, since the latter has speeded up the rate of change sharply, thereby increasing to an alarming extent the pressure on workers, territories and all levels of government for structural adjustments.

As a result of radical changes in economic strategies, the last 30 years have seen a massive shift from the real economy to the financial economy. The situation of those who create all the goods and supply all the services, but who bear the full brunt of the economic crisis, needs to be improved.

1. Is the Commission planning to comply with Parliament's request to submit as soon as possible, on the basis of Article 225 of the Treaty and after consulting social partners, a proposal for a legal act on information and consultation of workers, anticipation and management of restructuring, following the detailed recommendations set out in the annex to Parliament's report?
2. Can the Commission guarantee and ensure that guarantees are provided that redundancies will be regarded as a last resort and will only be envisaged after all other possible alternative options have been exhausted, without damaging the competitiveness of businesses?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(21 March 2013)**

Following the Green Paper ⁽¹⁾ on restructuring and the adoption of the Cercas Report, the Commission is considering how best to encourage and ensure wide observance of best practice in the field of restructuring and anticipation of change. In accordance with its commitment under the framework Agreement on relations with Parliament, the Commission will inform the Parliament of the response it intends giving to the Parliament's request.

The Commission has no powers to interfere in specific company decisions leading to the closure of plants in Europe. However, it urges companies and all other stakeholders to anticipate human capital needs and carry out restructuring in a socially responsible way. In this regard, it draws attention to the principles and guidelines presented in the Orientations for reference in managing change and its social consequences ⁽²⁾ negotiated by the European social partners and the Commission's Checklist on Restructuring Processes ⁽³⁾. Both texts underline the fact that redundancies should be a last resort after all other options are exhausted.

Moreover, the new Communication on Industrial Policy ⁽⁴⁾ proposes accompanying measures to create jobs and increase investment in human capital and skills by equipping the labour force for industrial transformation, notably through better anticipating skills needs and mismatches.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2012) 7 final of 17 January 2012.

⁽²⁾ ETUC, CEEP and UNICE/UEAPME (November 2003), at: <http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=2750&langId=en>.

⁽³⁾ European Commission (2009), at: <http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=2741&langId=en>.

⁽⁴⁾ COM(2012) 585 final of 10 October 2012.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000892/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(29 janvier 2013)

Objet: Diane 35: détournement de notice

L'Agence française du médicament (ANSM) a décrit «Diane 35», traitement contre l'acné, comme hautement dangereux compte tenu de son profil de risque (thromboses pouvant déboucher sur des embolies pulmonaires).

Cette agence a travaillé un an sur ce dossier, notamment pour évaluer le rapport bénéfice/risque du Diane 35. Elle fait état, sur ces 25 dernières années, de quatre décès «imputables à une thrombose veineuse liée à Diane 35», un traitement contre l'acné mais à l'usage détourné comme contraceptif oral et utilisé par 315 000 femmes en France.

Ce produit est utilisé dans de nombreux pays européens et souvent à des fins très éloignées de ce qui est prévu dans la notice. Il faut trancher pour arrêter cet usage ambigu. Pour ce faire:

1. La Commission a-t-elle communiqué le rapport français aux autorités des 27 États membres?
2. Que prévoit la Commission afin de faire respecter les indications du médicament, car, pour rappel, le laboratoire Bayer n'avait pas demandé à enregistrer le Diane 35 comme contraceptif?
3. La Commission a-t-elle en sa possession des estimations sur le pourcentage de médicaments utilisés à des fins autres que celles prévues? A-t-elle mené une étude? Une liste de ces médicaments existe-t-elle?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(12 mars 2013)

1. L'Agence européenne des médicaments a entamé une analyse des données de sûreté de Diane 35 et de ses génériques lors de sa réunion de février 2013 ⁽¹⁾, dans le cadre d'une procédure d'urgence ⁽²⁾ lancée à la suite de la décision de la France de suspendre les autorisations de mise sur le marché de ces produits dans un délai de trois mois. Conformément aux règles existantes, l'agence française doit mettre son rapport d'évaluation à la disposition de l'Agence afin que tous les États membres puissent y avoir accès. L'Agence évaluera tous les éléments de preuve disponibles concernant les bénéfices et les risques de ces médicaments et formulera une recommandation maintenant, modifiant, suspendant ou retirant les autorisations de mise sur le marché de ceux-ci.
2. Le contrôle de la bonne utilisation du médicament relève de la responsabilité des États membres. À cet égard, la Commission renvoie l'auteur de la question à sa précédente réponse à la question E-005440/2011 ⁽³⁾.
3. La Commission dispose de données fiables sur le pourcentage de médicaments utilisés hors notice. Afin d'analyser en détail les pratiques en vigueur dans les différents États membres, elle a entamé en octobre 2012 une réflexion sur la question.

⁽¹⁾ http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/medicines/human/referrals/Cyproterone_and_ethinylestradiol_containing_medicinal_products/human_referral_prac_000017.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac05805c516f

⁽²⁾ Article 107 decies de la directive 2001/83/CE instituant un code communautaire relatif aux médicaments à usage humain (JO L 311 du 28.11.2001), telle que modifiée.

⁽³⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000892/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(29 January 2013)**

Subject: Diane 35: off-label use

The French National Agency for the Safety of Medicines and Health Products (ANSM) has described the acne drug 'Diane 35' as extremely dangerous in view of its risk profile (thrombosis which may result in pulmonary embolism).

The Agency has spent one year preparing a dossier aimed in particular at evaluating the benefit-risk ratio of Diane 35. It reports that over the past 25 years there have been four deaths 'due to deep-vein thrombosis linked to Diane 35', an acne drug which is used off-label as an oral contraceptive by 315 000 women in France.

This product is used in many European countries, often for purposes very far removed from the label indications, and a decision must be taken to put a stop to this ambiguous use. With this in mind:

1. Has the Commission forwarded the French report to the authorities of the 27 Member States?
2. How does it plan to ensure compliance with the drug's indications, given that Bayer has not asked for Diane 35 to be registered as a contraceptive?
3. Does it have access to any estimates of the percentage of medicines used for purposes other than those intended? Has it carried out any studies, or does a list of such medicines exist?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(12 March 2013)**

1. The European Medicines Agency started a safety review of Diane 35 and its generics at its meeting in February 2013 ⁽¹⁾ in the framework of an urgency procedure ⁽²⁾ launched after France announced the plan to suspend the marketing authorisations for these products over the next three months. In accordance with the rules in place, the French agency shall make its assessment report available to the Agency so that all Member States will have access to the report. The Agency will evaluate all available evidence on the benefits and risks of these medicines to give a recommendation on whether their marketing authorisations should remain as they are, be varied, suspended or revoked.
2. The monitoring of the correct use of medicinal product is the responsibility of Member States. In that respect, the Commission is referring the Honourable Member to its previous answer to Question E-005440/2011 ⁽³⁾.
3. The Commission does have reliable figures on the off-label use of medicinal products. In order to thoroughly analyse the different practice in Member States, the Commission has started in October 2012 a reflection process with Member States regarding the off-label use of medicinal products.

⁽¹⁾ http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/medicines/human/referrals/Cyproterone_and_ethinylestradiol_containing_medicinal_products/human_referral_prac_000017.jsp&mid=W0b01ac05805c516f.

⁽²⁾ Article 107i of Directive 2001/83/EC on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use, OJ L 311, 28.11.2001, as amended.

⁽³⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000893/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Diane Dodds (NI)

(29 January 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Plight of Christians in Nigeria

With an attack by a Boko Haram suicide bomber on a church in Kaduna State, northern Nigeria, killing at least 11 worshippers, it is apparent that there is a clear escalation of attacks against and persecution of Christians in Nigeria by the Islamist jihadist movement.

With these attacks becoming more regular and deadly, could the Vice-President/High Representative explain what is being done by the EU, in its relations with Nigeria, to bring peace and stability to the region?

Additionally, what has the EEAS done to date in partnership with the Nigerian Government to protect the people and places of worship of the wider Christian community living in the Muslim-dominated north of the country?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(12 March 2013)

The escalating violence in parts of northern Nigeria is a growing cause of concern for those inside and outside the country as it targets innocent civilians, both Christians and Muslims, and the institutions of the state. The EU is working with Nigeria to help it tackle the challenges of creating durable security and dealing with the factors conducive to radicalisation and violence, through both continuous political dialogue on appropriate approaches to these problems, as well as targeted aid interventions. An EU mission was recently in Nigeria to examine specific forms of support in the fight against terrorism. The EU's objective is in particular to assist the Nigerian authorities in ensuring respect for the rule of law and human rights.

The EU already undertakes a number of programmes providing social assistance, e.g. through immunisation, maternal care, and water resources in the North. The EU is considering, however, focusing more attention on integrated programmes that tackle the full range of economic and social challenges that give impetus to the violence.

In addition, in July 2012 the EU provided capacity building for mediation in the Plateau State using funds from a special initiative by the European Parliament (EEAS BL 2238). The EU is also preparing another project focusing on conflict prevention and youth employment for this area.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000894/13
do Komisji**

Ryszard Antoni Legutko (ECR)

(29 stycznia 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Promocja transportu publicznego w Polsce

Jak wskazują wyniki badań Eurostatu Polacy obok Litwinów najrzadziej korzystają z transportu publicznego. W ocenie ekspertów jednym z głównych powodów takiego stanu rzeczy jest wzrastająca cena biletów, która powoduje, że transport publiczny staje się coraz mniej konkurencyjny w stosunku do prywatnego transportu samochodowego.

Unia Europejska od wielu lat podejmuje działania, które mają promować transport publiczny, niestety opisany stan rzeczy może zniweczyć jej dotychczasowe działania. W związku z powyższym proszę o odpowiedź na następujące pytanie:

Czy w nowym okresie programowania funduszy europejskich, Komisja rozważy mechanizm dotyczący inwestycji związanych z transportem publicznym, który polegałby na obniżeniu wkładu własnego do zera, w zamian za gwarancję ze strony beneficjenta, o wstrzymaniu w określonym czasie podwyżek cen biletów?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Siima Kallasa w imieniu Komisji

(26 marca 2013 r.)

Komisja nie przewiduje w nowym okresie programowania dla funduszy europejskich szczególnego mechanizmu dla inwestycji w dziedzinie transportu publicznego, który pozwoliłby zmniejszyć wkład własny do zera w zamian za gwarancję wstrzymania na określony czas podwyżek cen biletów ze strony beneficjenta.

Jeśli chodzi o inwestycje, Komisja przewiduje jednak szereg działań mających na celu wspieranie zrównoważonego transportu publicznego oraz zwiększenie liczby korzystających z niego osób. Środki te obejmują modernizację taboru i floty autobusowej, budowę centrów multimodalnych, zwiększenie dostępności dla osób o ograniczonej sprawności ruchowej, ujednoczenie systemów sprzedaży biletów, większe wykorzystanie zarządzania ruchem i flotą, uwzględnienie technologii informatycznych w transporcie publicznym itp.

W tym kontekście Komisja pragnie podkreślić, że w dniu 30 stycznia 2013 r. przedłożyła wniosek w sprawie zmiany rozporządzenia (WE) nr 1370/2007⁽¹⁾ dotyczącego usług publicznych w zakresie kolejowego i drogowego transportu pasażerskiego. Poprawka ta wprowadza obowiązek stosowania procedury przetargowej na potrzeby zawierania umów o świadczenie usług publicznych w zakresie transportu kolejowego i określone środki towarzyszące, ułatwiając otwarcie rynku przy jednoczesnym zachowaniu korzyści związanych z siecią transportu kolejowego. Zgodnie z dokonaną przez Komisję oceną skutków, wdrożenie procedur zamówień publicznych umożliwi właściwym organom uzyskanie znacznych oszczędności środków publicznych wydawanych na zapewnienie transportu kolejowego (rzędu 20 %-30 %). Oszczędności te mogą zostać przeznaczone na poszerzenie oferty transportowej albo na ustalanie opłat kolejowych na poziomie bardziej atrakcyjnym dla pasażerów.

⁽¹⁾ (COM(2013) 28).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000894/13
to the Commission**

Ryszard Antoni Legutko (ECR)

(29 January 2013)

Subject: Promotion of public transport in Poland

As indicated by the results of Eurostat research, Poles, alongside Lithuanians, are least likely to use public transport. According to experts, one of the main reasons for this is the increasing price of tickets, which means that public transport is becoming less competitive compared to private car transport.

The European Union has for many years taken action to promote public transport; unfortunately, the described state of affairs may nullify this previous action. In view of the above, please answer the following question:

In the new programming period for European funds, will the Commission consider a mechanism for investments in public transport that would reduce own contributions to zero, in return for a guarantee on the part of the beneficiary to withhold for a specified period of time increases in ticket prices?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission

(26 March 2013)

In the new programming period for European funds the Commission does not specifically foresee a mechanism for investments in public transport that would reduce own contributions to zero, in return for a guarantee on the part of the beneficiary to withhold for a specified period of time increases in ticket prices.

As far as the investments are concerned, the Commission foresees however series of actions aiming at encouraging sustainable public transport and increasing the number of people who use it. Such measures include modernising rolling stock and bus fleets, building multimodal centres, increasing accessibility to people with reduced mobility, applying uniform ticketing, increasing the use of traffic and fleet management, incorporating IT in public transport, etc.

In this context, the Commission would like to point out that on 30 January 2013 it proposed an amendment to Regulation (EC) No 1370/2007 ⁽¹⁾ concerning the opening of the market for domestic passenger transport services by rail. This amendment introduces mandatory tendering of public service contracts for rail transport and some accompanying measures facilitating market opening while preserving network benefits of rail transport. When implemented, according to the Commission's impact assessment, public tendering will enable competent authorities to make significant savings of public funds used for the provision of rail transport (about 20%-30%). These savings can be used to either increase the offer of transport or to set rail fares at a more attractive level for passengers.

⁽¹⁾ (COM(2013) 28).

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000895/13
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(29 stycznia 2013 r.)**

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Prześladowania chrześcijan w Egipcie

Według Międzynarodowego Towarzystwa Praw Człowieka (IGFM), w Egipcie, w mieście Biba, doszło do skazania na 15 letni wyrok więzienia rodziny Nadi Mohamed Ali za powrót z islamu na chrześcijaństwo.

Organizacja Open Doors w swoim dorocznym indeksie prześladowań chrześcijan za 2013 rok umieściła Egipt na 25 miejscu pod względem wolności religijnej dla wyznawców Chrystusa. Podkreśliła przy tym niebezpieczeństwo wyłączenia chrześcijan ze społeczeństwa oraz próby wprowadzenia specjalnego podatku (dżizja) dla osób niebędących wyznawcami islamu.

1. Czy Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel zna sprawę Nadi Mohamed Ali? Czy ma zamiar podjąć działania zmierzające do jej uwolnienia?
2. Jak Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel ocenia sytuację chrześcijan zamieszkujących Egipt i jej zmianę w kontekście ostatnich lat?
3. Jakie działania podjęła, aby wspomóc chrześcijan oraz upomnieć się o ich prawa? Czy rozważa się uzależnienie ewentualnych porozumień handlowych od pozytywnych zmian egipskiej władzy wobec chrześcijan zamieszkujących Egipt?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu
Komisji
(6 maja 2013 r.)**

Delegatura UE w Kairze bardzo uważnie śledzi sytuację w zakresie wolności religii lub przekonań, a dyplomaci UE regularnie podnoszą tę kwestię podczas rozmów z odpowiednimi partnerami. Unia Europejska wzywa w szczególności do zmiany art. 98 Kodeksu karnego przewidującego karę za lekceważenie religii. Ogólne brzmienie tego przepisu prowadzi do bardzo szerokiej interpretacji przestępstwa „znieważania islamu” przez sędziów. Tym samym sprawą najwyższej wagi jest niezwłoczne przyjęcie jednolitego prawa regulującego wnoszenie domów modlitwy.

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca wielokrotnie potępiała akty przemocy skierowane przeciwko osobom należącym do mniejszości religijnych i ich miejscom kultu w Egipcie, wzywając władze Egiptu do zapewnienia w kraju poszanowania wolności lub przekonań. Związane z tą kwestią obawy są także regularnie wyrażane w nieformalnych kontaktach UE z władzami Egiptu w Brukseli oraz Kairze.

UE wykorzystuje pełen zakres dostępnych jej instrumentów, by angażować partnerów międzynarodowych na szczeblu dwustronnym i wielostronnym, poprzez dialogi dotyczące praw człowieka, działania dyplomatyczne, rezolucje Organizacji Narodów Zjednoczonych (ONZ) lub pomoc finansową, między innymi celem rozwiązania problemów związanych z wolnością religii lub przekonań.

W celu wzmocnienia działań UE Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca zaproponowała opracowanie nowych publicznych wytycznych w sprawie wolności religii lub przekonań, które będą zawierać jasno określone priorytety i narzędzia służące propagowaniu wolności religii lub przekonań na całym świecie. Stanowi to część planu działania UE w sprawie praw człowieka i demokracji przyjętego przez Radę do Spraw Zagranicznych dnia 25 czerwca 2012 r. UE wierzy, że takie wytyczne pomogą zintensyfikować działania UE w tym zakresie w możliwie najbardziej konkretny sposób.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000895/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(29 January 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Persecution of Christians in Egypt

According to the International Society for Human Rights (ISHR), in Beba, Egypt, the family of Nadia Mohamed Ali has been sentenced to 15 years in prison for converting from Islam to Christianity.

The Open Doors organisation in its annual index of persecution of Christians for 2013 placed Egypt in 25th place in terms of religious freedom for Christians. It emphasised the danger of Christians being excluded from society and attempts to introduce a special tax (jizyah) for non-Muslims.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative familiar with the case of Nadia Mohamed Ali? Do you intend to take steps for her release?
2. How does the Vice-President/High Representative assess the situation of Christians living in Egypt and the change in recent years?
3. What actions have been taken to help Christians and stand up for their rights? Are you considering making any future trade agreements dependent on positive changes from the Egyptian authorities in their treatment of Christians living in Egypt?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(6 May 2013)

The EU Delegation in Cairo monitors the situation of Freedom of Religion and Belief (FoRB) with the closest attention and EU diplomats raise this matter regularly with relevant interlocutors. In particular, the EU is calling for the amendment of Article 98 of the Penal Code foreseeing punishment for contempt of religion, its general wording leading to a very extensive interpretation by judges of the offense of 'insulting Islam'. Thus, the adoption at the earliest of a unified law on the building of places of worship is of the utmost importance.

The HR/VP has condemned repeatedly the acts of violence committed against persons belonging to the religious minorities and their places of worship in Egypt, calling on the Egyptian authorities to ensure the respect for FoRB in the country. These concerns are also regularly raised in the EU's informal contacts with the Egyptian authorities in Brussels and in Cairo.

The EU is using the full range of its instruments to engage international partners at the bilateral and multilateral levels, through human rights dialogues, demarches, United Nations (UN) resolutions or financial assistance, to address, among other things, concerns of FoRB.

To strengthen the EU's action, the HR/VP proposed to develop new public Guidelines on FoRB, which will contain clearly defined priorities and tools for the promotion of FoRB worldwide. It is part of the EU action plan on Human Rights and Democracy that the Foreign Affairs Council adopted on 25 June 2012. The EU believes such Guidelines will help towards enhancing EU activity in this field in the most concrete way possible.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000896/13
do Komisji
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD) oraz Jacek Olgierd Kurski (EFD)
(29 stycznia 2013 r.)**

Przedmiot: Sytuacja TV Bielsat

Bielsat jest jedyną niezależną telewizją nadawaną w języku białoruskim zapewniającą dostęp do mediów dla białoruskiej opozycji. Niestety ma on problemy z finansowaniem, w związku z czym istnieje niebezpieczeństwo, że zostanie zamknięta.

1. Czy Komisja zna sytuację TV Bielsat?
2. Czy w nowej perspektywie finansowej Komisja planuje przeznaczyć środki finansowe na wsparcie dla białoruskiej opozycji, w tym TV Bielsat?
3. W jaki sposób Komisja zamierza pomóc w rozwoju społeczeństwa demokratycznego na Białorusi?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu
Komisji
(19 marca 2013 r.)**

1. Komisja Europejska doskonale zdaje sobie sprawę z sytuacji telewizji Bielsat i z pełnionej przez nią roli. Komisja rozważa obecnie udzielenie pomocy w szkoleniu dziennikarzy TV Bielsat. Toczą się również rozmowy na temat dalszych projektów.

TV Bielsat może również składać wnioski w ramach ogólnych ogłaszanych przez służby Komisji zaproszeń do składania wniosków dotyczących udziału w programach związanych z prawami człowieka.

2. Planuje się, że wspieranie społeczeństwa obywatelskiego będzie kontynuowane w latach 2014-2020.

Europejski Fundusz na rzecz Demokracji znajdzie być może również alternatywne sposoby udzielenia telewizji Bielsat dodatkowego wsparcia.

3. Od początku 2011 r. wsparcie UE dla społeczeństwa obywatelskiego wzrosło sześć razy, osiągając w latach 2011 i 2012 odpowiednio poziom 13,6 i 12,7 mln EUR. Kwoty te obejmują dotacje dla organizacji społeczeństwa obywatelskiego, stypendia, kursy językowe i pomoc dla Europejskiego Uniwersytetu Humanistycznego. UE nieustannie umacnia swój znaczący dialog ze społeczeństwem obywatelskim. W marcu 2012 r., na uroczystości w Brukseli, komisarz Štefan Füle ogłosił rozpoczęcie europejskiego dialogu na rzecz modernizacji ze społeczeństwem białoruskim. Dialog na rzecz modernizacji polega na wymianie idei i opinii pomiędzy przedstawicielami białoruskiego społeczeństwa obywatelskiego oraz UE i jej państwami członkowskimi. Dyskusja dotyczy możliwych reform mających na celu modernizację Białorusi.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000896/13
to the Commission
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD) and Jacek Olgierd Kurski (EFD)
(29 January 2013)**

Subject: The TV Belsat situation

Belsat is the only independent television station that is broadcast in the Belarusian language, providing access to the media for the Belarusian opposition. Unfortunately, it has problems with financing, so there is a danger that it will be closed.

1. Is the Commission aware of the Belsat TV situation?
2. In the new financial perspective, is the Commission planning to allocate funds for the support of the Belarusian opposition, including TV Belsat?
3. How does the Commission intend to assist in the development of a democratic society in Belarus?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(19 March 2013)**

1. The European Commission is well aware of the role and situation of Belsat TV. At present, the Commission is envisaging to assist in the training of Belsat journalists and discussions are ongoing on further projects.

Belsat can also submit proposals under the global calls for proposals launched by the EC services in the context of the Human Rights programmes.

2. It is planned that support to civil society will continue in 2014-2020.

The European Endowment for Democracy may also identify alternative ways to provide additional and complementary support to Belsat.

3. EU support to Civil Society has increased six-fold since the start of 2011, reaching EUR 13.6 and EUR 12.7 million respectively in 2011 and 2012. These figures include grants for civil society organisations, scholarships, languages courses and support to the European Humanities University. The EU has continuously strengthened its substantial dialogue with civil society. Commissioner File in March 2012 at an event in Brussels launched a European Dialogue on Modernisation with Belarusian society. The Dialogue on Modernisation consists of an exchange of views and ideas between representatives of the Belarusian civil society, as well as the EU and its Member States. Discussions revolve around possible reforms for the modernisation of Belarus.
-

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000897/13
to the Commission**

Phil Prendergast (S&D)

(29 January 2013)

Subject: Data protection and Facebook's 'graph search'

In the context of the proposed introduction of Facebook's new 'Graph Search' facility in the European Union, does the Commission consider the 'Graph Search' facility to constitute a breach of citizens' right to protection of personal data and/or to privacy?

Will the Commission be issuing proposals to prevent potentially dangerous, embarrassing or misleading interests from being discoverable using the new 'Graph Search' facility, particularly when those interests were established, and attributed to users, by data-mining means other than explicit choices on the part of the users, such as the Facebook 'like' tool?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission

(8 April 2013)

The Facebook Graph Search Features was launched in January 2013 as a limited preview for some users in the United States. In case Facebook would deploy Graph Search in the European Union, the processing of personal data would have to be in line with the Data Protection Directive 95/46/EC and the national laws implementing it.

Without prejudice to the powers of the Commission as guardian of the Treaty, it is for the national authorities and in particular the national data protection supervisory authorities which are competent to monitor the application of the national measures implementing Directive 95/46/EC. In 2012, the Irish supervisory authority conducted an in-depth analysis of Facebook's personal data processing activities.

The Commission's proposal for a General Data Protection Regulation clarifies and strengthens the rights of data subjects in the context of online activities, such as social networking: providers must take account of the principle of 'data protection by default', which means that the default settings should be those that provide the most privacy. Companies will be obliged to inform individuals as clearly, understandably and transparently as possible about how their personal data will be used, so that they are in the best position to decide what data they share.

This proposal is under examination of the co-legislators.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000899/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(29 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Imigração Reino Unido

Em 28 de janeiro de 2013, os meios de comunicação davam conta de um plano do Governo britânico para lançar uma iniciativa destinada a desincentivar a imigração de cidadãos búlgaros e romenos para o Reino Unido.

Assim, pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Tem conhecimento desta iniciativa do Governo britânico?
2. Que medidas tenciona tomar para garantir que o artigo 3.º do Tratado da União Europeia e os artigos 18.º e 45.º do Tratado sobre o Funcionamento da União Europeia sejam respeitados?

Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão

(11 de março de 2013)

A Comissão não foi notificada desta iniciativa pelo Governo do Reino Unido e não pretende comentar artigos publicados na imprensa ou declarações públicas de políticos dos Estados-Membros.

O direito fundamental à livre circulação é garantido pela legislação comunitária aos cidadãos da UE e constitui o direito mais prezado na União Europeia.

A Comissão está plenamente empenhada em salvaguardar este direito e em garantir que os cidadãos da UE usufruem do mesmo em toda a União.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000899/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(29 January 2013)**

Subject: United Kingdom immigration

On 28 January 2013, the media reported that the British Government is planning to launch an initiative to discourage Bulgarian and Romanian citizens from emigrating to the United Kingdom.

I ask the Commission:

1. Is it aware of this initiative by the United Kingdom Government?
2. What action will it take to ensure that Article 3 of the Treaty on European Union and Articles 18 and 45 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union will be respected?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(11 March 2013)**

The Commission has not been notified of this initiative by the United Kingdom Government. It does not wish to comment on articles appearing in the press or on public statements by politicians in the Member States.

The fundamental right of free movement guaranteed by EC law to EU citizens is the most cherished right in the European Union.

The Commission is fully committed to safeguarding this right and ensuring that EU citizens can effectively enjoy it across the EU.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000900/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(29 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Impostos Rússia

O Procurador-Geral estónio, Piret Paukstys, afirmou que os 10 milhões de rublos de impostos roubados na Rússia e associados ao assassinato do ativista anticorrupção Sergei Magnitsky terão sido extraviados da Rússia através de 10 empresas sediadas na Estónia, na Lituânia, em Chipre e na Suíça.

Assim, pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Tem conhecimento desta situação, que pode envolver lavagem de dinheiro utilizando empresas de três Estados-Membros?
2. Quais os próximos passos da União Europeia relativamente a acordos com paísesterceiros na luta contra a lavagem de dinheiro, fraude e evasão fiscal?

Resposta dada por Michel Barnier em nome da Comissão

(8 de abril de 2013)

1. A Comissão tem conhecimento das alegações feitas em torno do assassinato do Sr. Magnitsky. A responsabilidade final pela investigação dos casos de branqueamento de capitais incumbe às autoridades competentes do Estado-Membro envolvido. A Comissão considera que, dada a amplitude da alegada fraude, mais de 200 milhões de euros, e tendo em conta as ações já empreendidas pelos outros Estados-Membros e pela Suíça, que conduziram ao congelamento de ativos pelas autoridades suíças, um esforço coordenado dos Estados-Membros da UE poderia ter algum valor acrescentado. Esta questão foi levantada pela Comissão no contexto da plataforma das Unidades de Investigação Financeira da UE. O Membro da Comissão responsável pelos Assuntos Internos também discutiu o caso Magnitski com os Ministros do Interior da UE, bem como com as autoridades russas.

A UE continua a acompanhar muito de perto este caso e aborda-o regularmente com as autoridades russas. A UE insta a Rússia a assegurar o devido processo judicial. Deve ser concluída rapidamente uma investigação exaustiva sobre a morte de Sergey Magnitsky, que entregue à justiça todos os responsáveis.

2. No que respeita à luta contra a fraude e a evasão fiscais, a Comissão adotou, em 6 de dezembro de 2012, um plano de ação pormenorizado ⁽¹⁾, bem como duas recomendações com ele associadas ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2012) 722 final.

⁽²⁾ C(2012)8805 e C(2012)8806.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000900/13
to the Commission**

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(29 January 2013)

Subject: Russian taxes

The Estonian Attorney General, Piret Paukstys, has stated that the RUB 10 million of taxes stolen in Russia and linked to the murder of the anti-corruption campaigner Sergei Magnitsky may have been misappropriated from Russia through 10 companies registered in Estonia, Lithuania, Cyprus and Switzerland.

I ask the Commission:

1. Is it aware of this situation, which could involve money laundering using companies from three Member States?
2. What are the next steps the European Union will be taking with regard to agreements with third countries in the fight against money laundering, fraud and tax evasion?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission

(8 April 2013)

1. The Commission is aware of the allegations surrounding the murder of Mr Magnitsky. The ultimate responsibility for investigating money laundering rests with the competent authorities in the Member State concerned. The Commission holds the view that given the scale of the alleged fraud, over EUR 200 million, and actions already undertaken by other Member States and Switzerland that led to the freezing of assets by the Swiss authorities, a coordinated effort of EU Member States could offer added value. This issue has been put forward by the Commission in the context of the EU Financial Investigation Units Platform. The Member of the Commission responsible for Home Affairs also discussed the Magnitski case with EU Interior Ministers and has raised it with the Russian authorities.

The EU continues to follow this case very closely and regularly raises the case with the Russian authorities. The EU urges Russia to ensure a due judicial process. A comprehensive investigation into the death of Sergey Magnitsky should be brought to a conclusion quickly, bringing all those responsible to justice.

2. With regard to the fight against tax fraud and tax evasion, the Commission adopted on 6 December 2012 a detailed Action Plan ⁽¹⁾ as well as two related recommendations ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2012)722 final.

⁽²⁾ C(2012)8805 & C(2012)8806.

(Svensk version)

**Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-000901/13
till kommissionen**

Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)

(29 januari 2013)

Angående: De ackrediterade assistenternas rättsliga ställning vid Europaparlamentet

Enligt rådets förordning (EG) nr 160/2009, som rådet antog den 23 februari 2009, gavs ackrediterade assistenter till Europaparlamentets ledamöter en särskild ställning som tjänstemän i Europeiska gemenskapen. De är bundna av tjänsteföreskrifterna för tjänstemän i Europeiska gemenskapen i rådets förordning (EG) nr 259/68.

Med beaktande av att man i dessa dokument med "ackrediterad parlamentsassistent" avser en person "som valts av en eller flera ledamöter och som genom ett direkt anställningsavtal med Europaparlamentet har till uppgift att i Europaparlamentets lokaler på någon av dess tre arbetsorter direkt bistå ledamoten eller ledamöterna i utövandet av deras uppgifter som ledamöter av Europaparlamentet; under ledamöternas ledning och överinseende i ett ömsesidigt förtroende" (artikel 5a i förordning (EG) nr 160/2009) och med beaktande av citatet "med strikt hänsyn tagen till framför allt den särskilda arten av de ackrediterade parlamentsassistenternas uppgifter och ansvar och det ömsesidiga förtroende som måste känneteckna arbetsrelationen mellan dem och den eller de ledamöter av Europaparlamentet som de bistår (artikel 127) undrar jag: är ackrediterade assistenter, som ledamöterna enligt bestämmelserna ska arbeta tillsammans med i ett förhållande av ömsesidigt förtroende, personer som kommissionen inte anser omfattas av högsta sekretesskrav gentemot sin institution?"

Svar från Maroš Šefčovič på kommissionens vägnar

(12 mars 2013)

Enligt artikel 127 första meningen i rådets förordning (EG) nr 160/2009 av den 23 februari 2009 omfattas ackrediterade parlamentsassistenter av skyldigheterna i artiklarna 11–26a i tjänsteföreskrifterna (tjänstemännens rättigheter och skyldigheter). Bland dessa bestämmelser återfinns artikel 17, enligt vilken en tjänsteman inte utan tillstånd får lämna ut information som han fått tillgång till i tjänsten, om inte denna information redan har offentliggjorts eller är tillgänglig för allmänheten.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000901/13
to the Commission**

Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)

(29 January 2013)

Subject: Status of accredited assistants at the European Parliament

Under Council Regulation (EC) No 160/2009, which was adopted by the Council on 23 February 2009, accredited assistants to Members of Parliament are granted special status as civil servants in the European Community, and they are bound by the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Communities as laid down by Council Regulation (EC) No 259/68.

Given that, in these texts, an 'accredited parliamentary assistant' means a person 'chosen by one or more Members and engaged by way of direct contract by the European Parliament to provide direct assistance, in the premises of the European Parliament at one of its three places of work, to the Member or Members in the exercise of their functions as Members of the European Parliament, under their direction and authority and in a relationship of mutual trust' (Article 5a of Regulation (EC) No 160/2009) and 'having strict regard, in particular, to the specific nature of the functions and duties of accredited parliamentary assistants and the mutual trust which has to characterise the working relationship between them and the Member or Members of the European Parliament whom they assist' (Article 127), would the Commission say that accredited assistants, with whom Members are, by statute, in a relationship of mutual trust, are persons whom it does not regard as bound by the highest standards of confidentiality vis-à-vis their institution?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Šefčovič au nom de la Commission

(12 mars 2013)

En vertu de l'article 127, 1^{re} phrase du Règlement (EC) n° 160/2009 adopté par le Conseil le 23 février 2009, les assistants parlementaires accrédités (APA) sont soumis aux obligations des articles 11 à 26 bis du Statut (droits et obligations du fonctionnaire). Parmi ces dispositions figurent notamment l'article 17 interdisant la divulgation non autorisée d'informations portées à la connaissance d'un fonctionnaire, dans l'exercice de ses fonctions, à moins que ces informations n'aient déjà été rendues publiques ou ne soient accessibles au public.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000902/13

à Comissão

Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)

(29 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Dia Europeu da Proteção de Dados

Comemora-se hoje o Dia Europeu da Proteção de Dados, instituído pelo Conselho da Europa para assinalar a data de assinatura, em 28 de janeiro de 1981, da Convenção 108 sobre Proteção de Dados, que expressa como finalidade, no seu artigo 1.º, garantir «no território de cada Parte, a todas as pessoas singulares, seja qual for a sua nacionalidade ou residência, o respeito pelos seus direitos e liberdades fundamentais, e especialmente pelo seu direito à vida privada, face ao tratamento automatizado dos dados de caráter pessoal que lhes digam respeito (“proteção dos dados”)).

Ora, o Acordo SWIFT entre a UE e os EUA, em vigor, permite a troca e o acesso às bases de dados SWIFT, quer pelas autoridades dos EUA, quer pelas agências da UE, acarretando perigos não controláveis. O «novo» Acordo PNR entre a União Europeia e os EUA obriga as agências de viagens a disponibilizarem todas as informações que têm sobre um passageiro que viaja de, para ou faz escala nos EUA, ao Departamento de Segurança Interna dos EUA. Essa informação inclui os dados de viagem, mas também todos os dados estão armazenados na base de dados das agências de viagens, nomeadamente o nome das pessoas que acompanham o viajante, as rotas anteriores efetuadas, todas as informações relativas a aluguer de viaturas e quartos de hotel, as preferências alimentares especificadas, entre outros.

Assim, solicito à Comissão que me informe do seguinte:

1. Não considera que os Acordos SWIFT e PNR violam grosseiramente os princípios expressos na Convenção 108 sobre Proteção de Dados, que se celebra no dia de hoje?
2. Tem dados sobre o número de pessoas que já recorreram judicialmente na UE ou nos EUA, invocando que a proteção dos seus dados pessoais estaria a ser posta em causa pela aplicação dos dois acordos mencionados?
3. Pretende revogar ou rever os acordos referidos?

Resposta dada por Cecilia Malmström em nome da Comissão

(26 de março de 2013)

O Acordo PNR de 2012 entre a UE e os EUA e o Acordo relativo ao TFTP entre a UE e os EUA remetem explicitamente para os compromissos da UE relativos à Convenção n.º 108 do Conselho da Europa para a proteção das pessoas, para os princípios da proporcionalidade e da necessidade, no que se refere ao respeito pela vida privada e a proteção dos dados pessoais em conformidade com o artigo 8.º da Convenção Europeia para a Proteção dos Direitos do Homem e das Liberdades Fundamentais. Consequentemente, está incluída uma série de salvaguardas em matéria de proteção de dados que visa limitar o âmbito dos pedidos de dados e assegurar que os dados obtidos são tratados em conformidade com os acordos e as correspondentes exigências em matéria de proteção de dados da UE.

A Comissão não tem conhecimento de quaisquer ações judiciais intentadas a este respeito.

A Comissão não tenciona revogar estes acordos. Em conformidade com o artigo 13.º do Acordo relativo ao TFTP são efetuadas revisões conjuntas periódicas. Uma revisão conjunta está também prevista no artigo 23.º do Acordo PNR de 2012. Estas revisões verificarão a observância dos acordos, incluindo as salvaguardas em matéria de proteção de dados.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000902/13
to the Commission**

Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)

(29 January 2013)

Subject: European Data Protection Day

Today is European Data Protection day, which was launched by the Council of Europe to mark the signing on 28 January 1981 of Convention 108 for the Protection of Individuals with regard to Automatic Processing of Personal Data. The Convention states in Article 1 that its purpose is to secure ‘in the territory of each Party for every individual, whatever his nationality or residence, respect for his rights and fundamental freedoms, and in particular his right to privacy, with regard to automatic processing of personal data relating to him (“data protection”).’

However, the SWIFT agreement in force between the EU and the US allows exchange of and access to SWIFT databases by both US authorities and EU agencies, which presents uncontrollable risks. The ‘new’ Passenger Name Records (PNR) agreement between the EU and the US requires travel agencies to make all the information they have about a passenger travelling from, to or via the US available to the US Department for Homeland Security. This information includes not only the travel data, but also all data stored in the travel agency database, including the names of people travelling with the passenger, previous journeys, all information relating to vehicle rental and hotel bookings, specified food preferences and more.

I ask the Commission:

1. Does it not agree that the SWIFT and PNR agreements are a gross violation of the principles expressed in Convention 108 for the Protection of Individuals with regard to Automatic Processing of Personal Data, which is commemorated today?
2. Does it have data on the number of people who have taken legal action in the EU or the US citing that the security of their personal data is being put at risk through the application of these two agreements?
3. Does it intend to revoke or review these agreements?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission

(26 March 2013)

The 2012 EU-US PNR Agreement and the EU-US TFTP Agreement explicitly refer to the EU's commitments pursuant to the Council of Europe Convention 108 for the Protection of Individuals, the principles of proportionality and necessity with regard to respect for privacy and protection of personal data under Article 8 of the European Convention on the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. As a result, a number of data protection safeguards are included, which aim to limit the scope of the requests for data and to ensure that the obtained data is handled in conformity with the Agreements and the relevant EU data protection requirements.

The Commission is not aware of any legal actions initiated in this respect.

The Commission does not intend to revoke these Agreements. Regular joint reviews are performed in line with Article 13 of the TFTP Agreement. A joint review is also provided for in Article 23 of the 2012 PNR agreement. These reviews will monitor compliance with the Agreements, including the data protection safeguards..

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000903/13
to the Commission
Ashley Fox (ECR)
(29 January 2013)

Subject: Welsh Government's proposal to purchase Cardiff Airport

The Welsh Labour Government announced in December 2012 its intention to purchase Cardiff Airport from its private owners, TBL.

Not only would such a move create a significant burden on the taxpayer, it would also appear to provide Cardiff Airport with an unfair competitive advantage over other, nearby, airports not in receipt of government funds, such as Bristol Airport.

EU rules on state aid limit the use of public resources where this would distort competition in the internal market. Arguably, the purchase of Cardiff Airport would place it in a favourable position with respect to its competitors and, as such, it would not be operating on an equal basis.

If the Welsh Government were to proceed with the purchase of Cardiff airport, would this constitute a breach of EU state aid rules?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(15 March 2013)

According to Article 345 TFEU 'The Treaties shall in no way prejudice the rules in Member States governing the system of property ownership'. It is not a violation of the TFEU for a Member State to acquire or found an undertaking or to invest in one.

Nevertheless, Member States have to respect state aid rules also in this respect. As long as the state behaves as a profit-oriented market economy investor would do, there is no state aid involved. That means that the price for which the state acquires the undertaking has to be a market price.

At the moment the Commission has no indication that the UK intends to grant state aid by acquiring the airport or by subsequently financing its operation.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000904/13
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(29 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: Planta incineradora de Son Reus en Mallorca (España)

El importante problema de la gestión de residuos lleva tiempo siendo un foco de atención para las autoridades de muchos países europeos. Existen territorios que desarrollan un negocio de la importación de residuos de otros países para su incineración, con el objetivo de producir energía, pero el coste energético del transporte supera ampliamente las posibilidades de generación energética que pueden ofrecer este tipo de combustibles.

Este es el caso de la planta incineradora Son Reus, en Mallorca (España); esta planta dispone de una gran capacidad que supera con creces la propia generación de residuos de la Isla. Esto ha convertido a dicha incineradora en un complejo de funcionamiento internacional planificado para la importación de residuos de otros países. Dicha importación contraviene la Directiva Europea de residuos (2008/98/CE) en cuanto al criterio de proximidad en el tratamiento de residuos, así como en la priorización de la reutilización y el reciclaje de los residuos. El proyecto de ampliación de la planta, desde antes de haber sido realizado, debería haber tenido en cuenta estos principios y no contemplar una planta con semejante capacidad que solo puede ser útil en el caso de la importación de residuos.

Las autoridades locales encargadas de la gestión de residuos, el Consell de Mallorca, sostiene que la importación de residuos es necesaria para financiar la construcción de la planta, cuando esta ha sido construida con unas dimensiones mucho mayores de las necesarias. También se acude a un argumento como la «valorización energética» para sostener que dicha incineradora es una actividad sostenible, pero si tomamos en cuenta el coste energético del transporte esta «valorización energética» de los residuos carece totalmente de sentido económico así como ambiental.

1. ¿Considera la Comisión que la planta incineradora de Son Reus cumple con los criterios de proximidad del tratamiento y priorización del reuso y del reciclaje de la Directiva de Residuos?
2. ¿Está la Comisión actuando para impedir la importación masiva de residuos para su incineración en esta planta de Son Reus y de esta manera impedir su nocivo impacto ambiental?
3. ¿Está la Comisión desarrollando alguna normativa para impedir la construcción de este tipo de grandes incineradoras que exceden la capacidad local de generación de residuos?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(8 de abril de 2013)

La Comisión remite a Su Señoría a la respuesta que dio a la pregunta escrita E-007917/2012 ⁽¹⁾.

Según el Reglamento relativo al traslado de residuos ⁽²⁾ (títulos II y III), los Estados miembros están autorizados a realizar en el interior de la UE traslados destinados a operaciones de valorización, por ejemplo, valorización energética, si se observa el marco de procedimiento aplicable. La Comisión, por tanto, no se opone a ese tipo de traslados si se respetan las mencionadas disposiciones jurídicas.

Las últimas estadísticas disponibles ⁽³⁾ sobre el tratamiento de residuos urbanos (2011) indican que no hay un exceso de capacidad de incineración en España, ya que el índice de incineración se situó ese año en el 9 %, mientras que se destinó a vertederos el 58 % de los residuos urbanos.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+WQ+E-2012-007917+0+DOC+XML+V0//ES>

⁽²⁾ Reglamento (CE) n.º 1013/2006, relativo al traslado de residuos (DO L 190 de 12.7.2006).

⁽³⁾ http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_PUBLIC/8-04032013-BP/EN/8-04032013-BP-EN.PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000904/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(29 January 2013)

Subject: Son Reus incineration plant on the island of Majorca (Spain)

The major problem of waste management has long been a focus of attention for the authorities in many European countries. Some territories are making a business out of importing waste from other countries and incinerating it to produce energy; however, transport energy costs far exceed the opportunities for power generation offered by this type of fuel.

This is the case at the Son Reus incineration plant in Majorca (Spain). This plant has a large capacity that far exceeds the island's own waste generation. This has turned the incineration plant into an international complex, which is used to receive waste from other countries. This importation contravenes Directive 2008/98/EC on waste in terms of the principles of proximity of waste treatment and of prioritising the reuse and recycling of waste. The plans to expand the plant, before they were implemented, should have taken these principles into account and not provided for a plant with this level of capacity, which is only useful when waste is imported.

The local authorities responsible for waste management, the Consell de Mallorca, maintain that it is necessary to import waste to finance the construction of the plant, which far exceeds local requirements. They also use the 'energy recovery' argument to maintain that the incineration plant is sustainable. However, if we take account of transport energy costs, this 'energy recovery' from waste makes absolutely no economic or environmental sense.

1. Does the Commission believe that the Son Reus incineration plant complies with the principles of proximity of treatment and of prioritising the reuse and recycling of waste established in the directive on waste?
2. Is it taking action to prevent the large-scale importation of waste for incineration at the Son Reus plant to prevent its harmful environmental impact?
3. Is it developing any regulations to prevent the construction of such large incineration plants, which exceed the local capacity for waste generation?

Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission
(8 April 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-007917/2012 ⁽¹⁾.

According to the Waste Shipment Regulation ⁽²⁾ (Titles II and III) Member States are allowed to carry out shipments destined for recovery operations e.g. energy recovery, within the EU if the relevant procedural framework is observed. The Commission would, therefore, not object to such shipments if the aforementioned legal provisions are observed.

The latest statistics available ⁽³⁾ on municipal waste treatment in 2011 indicate that there is no incineration overcapacity in Spain. The incineration rate was 9%, while 58% of municipal waste was landfilled.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=WQ&reference=E-2012-007917&language=EN>

⁽²⁾ Regulation 1013/2006 on shipment of waste. OJ L 190, 12.7.2006.

⁽³⁾ http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_PUBLIC/8-04032013-BP/EN/8-04032013-BP-EN.PDF

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000905/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(29 janvier 2013)

Objet: Rôle du développement territorial dans la politique de cohésion

La complémentarité entre les programmes de financement permettra d'améliorer l'efficacité du financement de l'Union aux niveaux local et régional. Les propositions de la Commission relatives aux stratégies de développement local menées par les acteurs locaux, dispositions importantes du règlement portant sur les dispositions communes (RPDC) qui sera centré sur la création de synergies entre tous les Fonds couverts par le RPDC, sont très intéressantes.

Cet instrument est une excellente manière d'encourager une participation, au niveau du citoyen, d'une grande variété d'acteurs de la communauté locale travaillant à des objectifs territoriaux durables. Le renforcement accru des capacités administratives aux niveaux régional et local dans le cadre des actions de renforcement des capacités vise à améliorer la participation des pouvoirs locaux et régionaux, mais aussi des partenaires sociaux.

Dans ce cadre:

1. La Commission pourrait-elle préciser, lors de la phase de mise en œuvre, ses propositions sur le développement local mené par les acteurs locaux, afin de permettre aux participants potentiels de déterminer pleinement les objectifs, la portée et les effets probables du développement?
2. La Commission envisage-t-elle, dans un avenir proche, de publier un guide sur les stratégies de développement local menées par les acteurs locaux à destination des autorités de gestion?

Réponse donnée par M. Hahn au nom de la Commission
(18 mars 2013)

1. Le développement local mené par les acteurs locaux est un instrument permettant aux citoyens de participer, au niveau local, à l'élaboration de solutions aux problèmes sociaux, environnementaux et économiques. Cet instrument peut influencer profondément sur la vie des populations et générer de nouvelles idées dont la mise en pratique nécessitera un engagement commun des acteurs. Afin de faciliter l'utilisation de ces nouvelles possibilités, la Commission prépare des orientations détaillées sur les objectifs et les modalités de mise en œuvre du développement local mené par les acteurs locaux. Début février, un premier projet avait fait l'objet de discussions avec des experts des États membres. Il est actuellement en cours de révision ⁽¹⁾ afin d'intégrer les commentaires reçus lors de cette réunion, mais également de prendre en considération l'avancement du dialogue avec le Conseil et le Parlement sur les dispositions législatives correspondantes.

2. Les orientations précitées s'adressent avant tout aux autorités de gestion, mais elles peuvent également constituer une source d'information utile pour les parties intéressées au niveau local. Pour ce qui est de ces dernières, la Commission envisage de fournir dans les mois à venir des orientations complémentaires à leur intention.

⁽¹⁾ Version actuelle disponible sur: http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/what/future/pdf/preparation/clld_guidance_2013_01_31.pdf

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000905/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(29 January 2013)**

Subject: Role of territorial development in cohesion policy

Complementarity between funding programmes will allow more efficient use of EU funding at local and regional levels. I was very interested to read the Commission's proposals on community-led local development strategies, which are key provisions of the Common Provisions Regulation (CPR) that will focus on creating synergies between all the funds covered by the CPR.

This instrument is a very good way of encouraging citizen-level participation among a wide range of members of local communities working towards sustainable local development objectives. The further strengthening of administrative capacities at regional and local level, which forms part of capacity-building measures, is aimed at increasing participation by local and regional authorities and by social partners.

In this context:

1. Can the Commission provide more details regarding the implementation of its proposals on community-led local development, in order to enable potential participants to be fully informed about the objectives, scope and likely impacts of such development?
2. Is the Commission planning to publish a guide on community-led local development strategies in the near future aimed at the managing authorities?

**Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(18 March 2013)**

1. Community-led local development (CLLD) is a tool for involving citizens at the local level in developing responses to the social, environmental and economic challenges. It can have a profound impact on people's lives, generate new ideas and establish shared commitments for putting these ideas into practice. In order to help the uptake of these new possibilities, the Commission is preparing comprehensive guidance on the objectives and implementation arrangements of community-led local development. A first draft was discussed with experts from Member States at the beginning of February. It is currently being revised ⁽¹⁾ in light of comments received at that meeting, but also to reflect the progress in the dialogue with the Council and Parliament on the corresponding legislative provisions.

2. The guidance referred to above is mainly aimed at managing authorities, but it is also a useful source of information for interested parties at the local level. For this group, the Commission intends to provide complementary guidance in the coming months.

⁽¹⁾ Current version available at: http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/what/future/pdf/preparation/clld_guidance_2013_01_31.pdf

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-000906/13
to the Commission**

William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)

(29 January 2013)

Subject: Bulgarian and Romanian citizens entering the UK

Has the Commission made an estimate of the number of people from Bulgaria and Romania that have entered the UK?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission

(5 March 2013)

The Commission has only an estimate of the number of people from Romania that have entered the UK (7 505 persons in 2010 and 8 422 persons in 2011 as provided by the UK to Eurostat).

With respect to residence, official migration statistics transmitted by the UK record 94 825 Romanian persons in the UK on 1 January 2012 (75 572 on 1 January 2011).

The UK has not provided to Eurostat estimates as regards Bulgarian nationals.

Nevertheless, the EU-Labour Force Survey indicates that, in the third quarter of 2012, around 52 000 Bulgarian (and around 97 000 Romanian) citizens were residing in the UK.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000907/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(29 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ωφελήματα των Τουρκοκυπρίων

Από το 1974 που έγινε η τουρκική εισβολή στην Κύπρο, η παροχή ηλεκτρισμού από την Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία στα κατεχόμενα κόστισε στην Αρχή Ηλεκτρισμού Κύπρου (ΑΗΚ) 283 εκατομμύρια ευρώ. Αυτά τα εκατομμύρια κατανέμονται στους Ελληνοκύπριους μέσω των λογαριασμών της ΑΗΚ και τα πληρώνουν αγγύστα, ενώ οι Τουρκοκύπριοι που διαμένουν στα κατεχόμενα δεν πληρώνουν τίποτα. Επιπρόσθετα οι Τουρκοκύπριοι απολαμβάνουν συντάξεις, επιδόματα, στήριξη διδάκτρων ως βοήθεια της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας προς αυτούς χωρίς να έχουν υποχρεώσεις έναντι της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας. Είναι αυτό δίκαιο;

1. Για ποια «απομόνωση» των Τουρκοκυπρίων μιλάμε;
2. Υπάρχει άλλη χώρα στην ΕΕ οι πολίτες της οποίας να έχουν ωφελήματα χωρίς όμως να κατανέμονται και ισότιμα οι υποχρεώσεις τους έναντι του κράτους;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(15 Μαρτίου 2013)

Οι ειδικοί κανόνες, βάσει των οποίων οι Τουρκοκύπριοι μπορούν να εξασφαλίζουν την απόκτηση όλων των κοινωνικών δικαιωμάτων ως πολίτες της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας, δεν εμπίπτουν στην αρμοδιότητα της Επιτροπής.

Το θέμα που έθεσε το Αξιότιμο Μέλος καταδεικνύει για μια ακόμη φορά την ανάγκη ταχείας και συνολικής διευθέτησης του κυπριακού προβλήματος. Τον Οκτώβριο του 2012, στην ανακοίνωσή της ⁽¹⁾ σχετικά με τη στρατηγική διεύρυνσης και τις κυριότερες προκλήσεις κατά το διάστημα 2012-2013, η Επιτροπή υπογράμμισε την ανάγκη επανέναρξης των διαπραγματεύσεων με στόχο την ταχεία ολοκλήρωση των συνομιλιών.

(1) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000907/13
to the Commission**

Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)

(29 January 2013)

Subject: Benefits enjoyed by Turkish Cypriots

Since the Turkish invasion of Cyprus in 1974, the provision of electricity by the Republic of Cyprus to the occupied territories has cost the Cyprus Electricity Board EUR 283 million. The cost of this electricity is divided among Greek Cypriots through Cyprus Electricity Board bills which they pay without demur, while Turkish Cypriots living in the occupied territories pay nothing. Moreover, Turkish Cypriots receive pensions, benefits and tuition grants as assistance from the Republic of Cyprus without them having any obligations towards the Republic of Cyprus. Is this fair?

1. What 'isolation' are Turkish Cypriots supposed to be suffering from?
2. Is there any other EU Member State whose citizens enjoy benefits without their obligations towards the state being shared equally?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission

(15 March 2013)

The special rules whereby Turkish Cypriots can secure entitlements to all social rights as citizens of the Republic of Cyprus fall outside the Commission's competence.

The issue raised by the Honourable Member once again underlines the need for a rapid comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem. In its October 2012 Communication ⁽¹⁾ on the Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2012-2013, the Commission underlined the necessity to re-launch the negotiations with the aim of reaching a swift conclusion of the talks.

(1) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000908/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(29 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Κυπριακές τράπεζες και συστημικοί κίνδυνοι στην Ευρωζώνη

Απαντώντας αρνητικά και επικριτικά δημοσιεύματα στον γερμανικό τύπο δέχεται η Κύπρος για κατ' ισχυρισμό βρώμικο ρωσικό χρήμα στα πλαίσια της προεκλογικής εκστρατείας στη Γερμανία. Η Γερμανία μάλιστα αρνείται οικονομική στήριξη στην Κύπρο υποστηρίζοντας πως είμαστε «ασήμαντοι» και δεν αποτελούμε συστημικό κίνδυνο για την Ευρώπη όπως άλλες οικονομίες.

Ερωτάται λοιπόν η Επιτροπή και συγκεκριμένα ο αρμόδιος Επίτροπος για τις Οικονομικές και Νομισματικές Υποθέσεις της ΕΕ Όλι Ρεν αν συμφωνεί με τη γερμανική στάση έναντι της Κύπρου. Με δεδομένο πως ο ίδιος φέρεται να δήλωσε πως «θα ήταν εξαιρετικά χαζό και ανόητο να ληφθεί τυχόν ρίσκο για αποχώρηση της Κύπρου από το ευρώ», ερωτάται τι προτίθεται να πράξει προκειμένου να αντιμετωπιστούν τα προβλήματα των κυπριακών τραπεζών ώστε να πάψουν να αποτελούν κίνδυνο συστημικής φύσης για την Ευρωζώνη.

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(27 Μαρτίου 2013)

Παρά το μικρό μέγεθος της κυπριακής οικονομίας σε σχέση με το μέγεθος της ζώνης του ευρώ, η οικονομική της σταθερότητα είναι σημαντική για τη λειτουργία της ζώνης του ευρώ. Οποιοσδήποτε αρνητικές εξελίξεις θα μπορούσαν να έχουν άμεσες επιπτώσεις στην Ελλάδα και έμμεσες συνέπειες για την ευρύτερη ζώνη του ευρώ, μεταξύ άλλων μέσω της κάμψης της εμπιστοσύνης. Αυτό θα δημιουργούσε τον κίνδυνο να παρουσιαστεί νέα χρηματοπιστωτική αστάθεια που θα απαιτούσε περαιτέρω πολιτικές για τον περιορισμό των επιπτώσεων και περαιτέρω απουσία ανάπτυξης στη ζώνη του ευρώ.

Βασικός στόχος του μελλοντικού προγράμματος οικονομικής προσαρμογής της Κύπρου αποτελεί η αποκατάσταση της ευρωστίας του κυπριακού τραπεζικού τομέα. Το πρόγραμμα θα αντιμετωπίσει τα προβλήματα του κυπριακού τραπεζικού συστήματος και θα μετριάσει τον συστημικό κίνδυνο για την ζώνη του ευρώ. Για τον σκοπό αυτό, η Επιτροπή εργάζεται στενά με τις κυπριακές αρχές και την Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα, με το Διεθνές Νομισματικό Ταμείο και τον Ευρωπαϊκό Μηχανισμό Σταθερότητας για την οριστικοποίηση του προγράμματος οικονομικής προσαρμογής το συντομότερο δυνατόν.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000908/13
to the Commission**

Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)

(29 January 2013)

Subject: Cypriot banks and systemic risks in the eurozone

In the context of the election campaign in Germany, Cyprus has been the subject of negative and critical reports in the German press about allegedly dirty Russian money. Germany is refusing financial support in Cyprus, claiming that we are 'insignificant' and do not represent a systemic risk to the EU like the economies of other countries.

In view of the above, will the Commission and particularly the Commissioner for Economic and Monetary Affairs, Olli Rehn, say whether they agree with the German attitude towards Cyprus? Given that Commissioner Rehn has been quoted as saying that it would be very silly and foolish to take any risk of Cyprus withdrawal from the eurozone, will the Commission say what it intends to do to address the problems facing Cypriot banks so that they cease to constitute a systemic risk for the eurozone?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission

(27 March 2013)

Despite the small size of the Cypriote economy relative to the size of the Euro area, its financial stability is important for the functioning of the euro area. Any adverse developments could have direct implications for Greece and indirect consequences for the wider euro area, *inter alia* via confidence effects. This could pose a risk to renewed financial instability requiring further mitigating policies and to a further loss of growth in the Eurozone.

A key objective of the future economic adjustment programme for Cyprus is the restoration of the Cypriot banking sector's soundness. It will address the problems that the Cypriot banking system faces and mitigate the systemic risk for the Eurozone. To this end, the Commission is working closely with the Cypriot authorities and the European Central Bank, the International Monetary Fund and the European Stability Mechanism to finalise the economic adjustment programme as soon as possible.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000909/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(29 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Συρρίκνωση του κοινωνικού κράτους

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Είναι λογικό να σώζονται τράπεζες και να κλείνουν νοσοκομεία στην Ισπανία και στις χώρες του Ευρωπαϊκού Νότου;
2. Είναι λογικό να καταργούνται επιδόματα και να συρρικνώνεται η αγοραστική δύναμη των πολιτών;
3. Γνωρίζει η ΕΕ πως αυξήθηκαν οι αριθμοί των αυτοκτονιών λόγω των εξώσεων φτωχών οικογενειών από τα σπίτια τους λόγω αδυναμίας αποπληρωμής των υποθηκών των σπιτιών τους;
4. Τι προτίθεται να πράξει η ΕΕ για να τερματίσει την συρρίκνωση του κοινωνικού κράτους στον Ευρωπαϊκό Νότο;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(27 Μαρτίου 2013)

Στις χώρες που έχουν πληγεί από την κρίση χρέους, χρειάζονται μεταρρυθμίσεις που θα αποκαταστήσουν την φορολογική φερεγγυότητα και θα προωθήσουν την οικονομική ανάπτυξη. Η μη λήψη των απαραίτητων μέτρων θα μπορούσε να οδηγήσει σε οξύτερη δημοσιονομική κρίση με σοβαρές κοινωνικές, πολιτικές και οικονομικές επιπτώσεις. Πράγματι, κατά τη πραγματοποίηση μεταρρυθμίσεων, ο παράγοντας της δίκαιης μεταχείρισης λαμβάνεται πάντα υπόψη προκειμένου να μη πληγούν τα περισσότερα ευάλωτα άτομα και να διασφαλιστεί η όσο το δυνατόν δικαιότερη κατανομή του κόστους προσαρμογής.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000909/13
to the Commission**

Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)

(29 January 2013)

Subject: Erosion of welfare state

1. Does the Commission consider it reasonable to bail out banks while at the same time closing down hospitals in Spain and other southern European countries?
2. Does it consider it reasonable for benefits to be cut and individual purchasing power reduced?
3. Is it aware of the increase in suicides caused by the eviction of poor families unable to make mortgage repayments on their homes?
4. What action will the EU take to halt the erosion of the welfare state in southern Europe?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission

(27 March 2013)

In the countries hit by the debt crisis, reforms are needed to re-establish fiscal solvency and foster economic growth. Failing to undertake necessary measures would lead to a more acute fiscal crisis with severe social, political and economic repercussions. Indeed, when pursuing reforms, equity considerations are always taken into account with a view to sparing the more vulnerable and to ensuring a fair distribution of the adjustment cost as much as possible.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000910/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(29 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Πρόγραμμα προσάρτησης

Το νέο όραμα της Άγκυρας για την Κύπρο τροχοδρομεί βήματα ενσωμάτωσης των κατεχομένων στην Τουρκία, τόσο πολιτικά όσο και οικονομικά. Με βάση αυτήν την ενσωμάτωση θα μπορούν εφεξής οι παράνομοι έποικοι να ασκούν «εκτελεστική εξουσία», ενώ θα «ιδιωτικοποιηθούν» «δημόσιες υπηρεσίες» του ψευδοκράτους, οι οποίες θα περάσουν στον έλεγχο τουρκικών κεφαλαίων. Το πρόγραμμα προσάρτησης των κατεχομένων (2013-2015) προβλέπει τόσο διαρθρωτικές αλλαγές στο ψευδοκράτος όσο και μέτρα περιορισμού της δράσης των «Τουρκοκυπριακών συντεχνιών». Προνοεί μεταφορά νερού από την Τουρκία στα κατεχόμενα με τοποθέτηση υποθαλάσσιων αγωγών που θα συνδέουν το Λμούρι της Τουρκίας με την κατεχόμενη Κύπρο. Το έργο θα ολοκληρωθεί τον Μάρτιο 2014. Παράλληλα μελετάται και η εισαγωγή ηλεκτρικού ρεύματος από την Τουρκία στο ψευδοκράτος.

Με τέτοια δεδομένα, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή αν:

1. Η Τουρκία, ως χώρα υπό ένταξη, δικαιούται να προσαρτήσει την κατεχόμενη περιοχή της Κύπρου και να τη θεωρεί ως τουρκική επαρχία;
2. Με τέτοιες επιθετικές ενέργειες, πως προάγει η Τουρκία σχέσεις «καλής γειτονίας» στη γεωστρατηγική της περιοχή;
3. Πώς η ΕΕ μπορεί να δράσει ώστε να τερματίσει νέα τετελεσμένα και να αποφύγει «μη αναστρέψιμες εξελίξεις» που εδραιώνουν τον πάγιο επεκτατικό στόχο της Τουρκίας για δημιουργία δύο κρατών στην Κύπρο;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(15 Μαρτίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος στην ανακοίνωση που εξέδωσε τον Οκτώβριο του 2012 με θέμα «Στρατηγική για τη διεύρυνση και κυριότερες προκλήσεις για την περίοδο 2012-2013», στην οποία παροτρύνει την Τουρκία να ενισχύσει με απτές ενέργειες τη δέσμευση και τη συμβολή της στις συνομιλίες που διεξάγονται υπό την αιγίδα του Γενικού Γραμματέα των Ηνωμένων Εθνών για την εξεύρεση ολοκληρωμένης λύσης στο κυπριακό ζήτημα. Η Επιτροπή υπογραμμίζει επίσης ότι είναι αναγκαίο τα μέρη να επαναλάβουν τις διαπραγματεύσεις με σκοπό να επιτευχθεί η ταχεία ολοκλήρωση των συνομιλιών. Επίσης, η Επιτροπή ζητεί την αποφυγή κάθε είδους απειλών, προστριβών ή ενεργειών οι οποίες θα μπορούσαν να αποβούν επιζήμιες για τις σχέσεις καλής γειτονίας και την ειρηνική διευθέτηση των διαφορών.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000910/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(29 January 2013)

Subject: Annexation plan

Turkey's new vision for Cyprus increasingly involves the integration of the occupied territories with Turkey, both politically and economically. If this integration goes ahead, the illegal settlers will be able henceforth to exercise 'executive powers' and the 'public services' of the puppet state will be 'privatised' and then fall under the control of Turkish capital. The programme for the annexation of the occupied territories (2013-2015) provides both for structural changes in the puppet state and measures to curb the activities of 'Turkish Cypriot trade unions.' It provides also for the transport of water from Turkey to the occupied areas through underwater pipelines linking Anamur in Turkey and the occupied part of Cyprus. The project is due to be completed in March 2014. At the same time, a plan to import electricity from Turkey to the puppet state is being studied.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Is Turkey, a candidate country, entitled to annex the occupied area of Cyprus and treat it as a Turkish province?
2. With aggressive acts of this kind, how is Turkey promoting 'good neighbourly' relations in its geostrategic area?
3. What action can the EU take to prevent a new *fait accompli* and avoid 'irreversible developments' that would further Turkey's unwavering expansionist aim of creating two states in Cyprus?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(15 March 2013)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its October 2012 Communication Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2012-2013, in which it encourages Turkey to increase in concrete terms its commitment and contribution to the talks under the good offices of the UN Secretary General to find a comprehensive settlement to the Cyprus issue. The Commission further underlines the necessity for the parties to re-launch these negotiations with the aim of reaching a swift conclusion of the talks. Moreover, the Commission also urges to avoid any kind of threat, source of friction or action that could damage good neighbourly relations and the peaceful settlement of disputes.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000911/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(29 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ανησυχητική έξαρση του ευρωσκεπτικισμού

Ο ευρωσκεπτικισμός ενισχύεται θεαματικά για πολλούς λόγους σε ευρωπαϊκές χώρες, συμπεριλαμβανομένης και της έντονης αντιευρωπαϊκής τοποθέτησης των περισσότερων ΜΜΕ. Τι προτίθεται να πράξει η ΕΕ ώστε να βελτιώσει την εικόνα της στα εθνικά ΜΜΕ των χωρών μελών της ΕΕ και όχι μόνο;

Απάντηση της κ. Reding εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(2 Απριλίου 2013)

Το Ευρωπαϊκό Έτος των Πολιτών αποτελεί μοναδική ευκαιρία για να εστιάσουν οι πολίτες στην προστιθέμενη αξία των πολιτικών της ΕΕ για την ενίσχυση των δικαιωμάτων τους, για να κατανοήσουν τα δικαιώματά τους ως πολίτες της ΕΕ και για να συμμετάσχουν όλοι οι Ευρωπαίοι σε μία ευρεία συζήτηση.

Ως εισηγήτρια του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου για το Ευρωπαϊκό Έτος των Πολιτών 2013, η κυρία βουλευτής ίσως γνωρίζει ότι στο πλαίσιο του Ευρωπαϊκού Έτους η Επιτροπή έχει συντάξει αναλυτικό σχέδιο δράσεων, στις οποίες περιλαμβάνονται «Διάλογοι με τους Πολίτες» σε όλα τα κράτη μέλη, όπου οι πολίτες μπορούν να συζητήσουν τους προβληματισμούς και τις προσδοκίες τους για το μέλλον της ΕΕ με ευρωπαίους και εθνικούς πολιτικούς, παρουσία εθνικών και περιφερειακών μέσων ενημέρωσης. Η κυρία βουλευτής μπορεί να βρει περισσότερες πληροφορίες στην ιστοσελίδα ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://europa.eu/citizens-2013/el/>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000911/13
to the Commission**

Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)

(29 January 2013)

Subject: Alarming rise in Euroscepticism

Euroscepticism has, for many reasons, been gaining ground dramatically in a number of European countries, one reason for this being the markedly anti-European stance adopted by most of the media. What action is being envisaged by the EU to improve its image in the national media of the EU Member States and elsewhere?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission

(2 April 2013)

The European Year of Citizens is a special occasion to focus on the added value of EU policies to enhance the rights of citizens, to help them understand their EU rights and engage all Europeans in a broad debate.

As the European Parliament's Rapporteur for the European Year of Citizens 2013, the Honourable Member may be aware that the Commission has set out a detailed plan of actions in the context of the European Year, including 'Citizens' Dialogues' in all Member States, where citizens can discuss and debate their concerns and hopes for the future of the EU with European and national politicians in the presence of national and regional media. The Honourable Member can find more information on the website ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://europa.eu/citizens-2013/>.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000912/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(29 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Προγράμματα παροχής εγγυήσεων για τη νεολαία

Το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο πρόσφατα ψήφισε υπέρ ενός ψηφίσματος που καλεί τους υπουργούς απασχόλησης της ΕΕ να συμφωνήσουν σε μια σύσταση του Συμβουλίου το Φεβρουάριο του 2013, για την εφαρμογή προγραμμάτων παροχής εγγυήσεων για τη νεολαία σε όλα τα κράτη μέλη, που θα εξασφαλίζουν ότι όλοι οι νέοι πολίτες της ΕΕ, θα έχουν τη δυνατότητα απασχόλησης, εκπαίδευσης ή κατάρτισης εντός τεσσάρων μηνών από τη στιγμή που αποχωρούν από την επίσημη εκπαίδευση ή που μένουν άνεργοι.

1. Ποια μέτρα προτίθεται η Επιτροπή να λάβει για να βοηθήσει τα κράτη μέλη που βρίσκονται σε δεινή οικονομική κατάσταση, να εισάγουν παρόμοια συστήματα;
2. Πώς τα συστήματα αυτά θα είναι επιλέξιμα για χρηματοδότηση από την ΕΕ;
3. Προτίθεται η Επιτροπή να αποδεχθεί την πρόταση του Κοινοβουλίου να διαθέσει τουλάχιστον το 25% των διαρθρωτικών ταμείων της ΕΕ σε αυτά τα συστήματα; Πώς αυτή η χρηματοδότηση θα διατεθεί στα κράτη μέλη;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(4 Απριλίου 2013)

Στις 28 Φεβρουαρίου, τα κράτη μέλη όντως συμφώνησαν με την πρόταση της Επιτροπής⁽¹⁾ για σύσταση του Συμβουλίου σχετικά με την καθιέρωση μιας «Εγγύησης για τη Νεολαία».

1. Η εφαρμογή των προγραμμάτων εγγυήσεων για τη νεολαία μπορεί να υποστηριχθεί από το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο τόσο κατά την τρέχουσα όσο και κατά τη μελλοντική περίοδο χρηματοδότησης. Οι χώρες που αντιμετωπίζουν ιδιαίτερες δυσκολίες (οι λεγόμενες χώρες του προγράμματος), μπορούν να επωφεληθούν από ένα συμπλήρωμα κατά 10% επιπλέον του ποσοστού συγχρηματοδότησης από την ΕΕ. Επιπλέον, η «Πρωτοβουλία για την Απασχόληση των Νέων» που αποφασίστηκε από το Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο στις 7-8 Φεβρουαρίου 2013 θα παράσχει πρόσθετα μέσα για την ειδική υποστήριξη της ταχύτερης εφαρμογής τέτοιων προγραμμάτων στα επιλέξιμα κράτη μέλη.
2. Κατά τη διάρκεια των συζητήσεων σχετικά με τα επιχειρησιακά προγράμματα της περιόδου 2014-2020, η Επιτροπή θα ενθαρρύνει τα κράτη μέλη να υποστηρίξουν την εφαρμογή των νέων προγραμμάτων εγγυήσεων για την αντιμετώπιση της ανεργίας των νέων και τη μείωση του αριθμού των ατόμων που δεν έχουν απασχόληση ούτε παρακολουθούν εκπαίδευση ή κατάρτιση (γνωστών με το αγγλικό ακρωνύμιο NEET). Το θέμα αυτό έχει ήδη αναφερθεί στα έγγραφα θέσης της Επιτροπής τα οποία εστάλησαν στα ενδιαφερόμενα κράτη μέλη, υπογραμμίζοντας τις κύριες προκλήσεις της συγκεκριμένης χώρας και τα θέματα προτεραιότητας που πρέπει να υποστηριχθούν από τα ευρωπαϊκά διαρθρωτικά και επενδυτικά ταμεία από το 2014 έως το 2020.
3. Η Επιτροπή θα ενθαρρύνει τα κράτη μέλη να διαθέσουν επαρκείς πόρους από τα ευρωπαϊκά διαρθρωτικά και επενδυτικά ταμεία, και ιδίως το ΕΚΤ, για την υποστήριξη των προγραμμάτων εγγυήσεων για τη νεολαία. Η παραπάνω σύσταση προβλέπει απευθείας σύνδεση των εν λόγω προγραμμάτων και της υποστήριξης εκ μέρους των ταμείων της ΕΕ.

Η Επιτροπή έχει προτείνει την καθιέρωση ελάχιστου μεριδίου του ΕΚΤ με σκοπό τη διασφάλιση ότι το μερίδιο του ΕΚΤ στην πολιτική συνοχής της ΕΕ ανέρχεται τουλάχιστον στο 25%. Από την απόφαση του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου προκύπτει ένα πρόσθετο επιχείρημα υπέρ της διατήρησης του μεριδίου αυτού και η υποστήριξη εκ μέρους του Κοινοβουλίου αποτελεί ουσιαστικό στοιχείο για την επίτευξη αυτού του στόχου.

(¹) COM(2012) 729 final της 5ης Δεκεμβρίου 2012.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000912/13
to the Commission**

Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)

(29 January 2013)

Subject: Youth guarantee schemes

The European Parliament recently voted in favour of a resolution calling on EU employment ministers to agree to a Council recommendation in February 2013 that all Member States introduce youth guarantee schemes to ensure that no young person in the EU goes without a job, education or training for more than four months after becoming unemployed or leaving formal education.

1. What action does the Commission intend to take in order to help those Member States that are in dire financial straits to introduce such schemes?
2. How will these schemes be eligible for EU funding?
3. Will the Commission accept Parliament's proposal to allocate at least 25 % of EU structural funds to these schemes? How will this funding be allocated to Member States?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission

(4 April 2013)

On 28 February, Member States indeed agreed on the Commission's proposal ⁽¹⁾ for a Council recommendation on establishing a Youth Guarantee.

1. Implementation of youth guarantee schemes can be supported by the European Social Fund in both the current and future financing period. Countries facing particular difficulties ('so called' programme countries) can benefit from a 10% top up to the EU co-financing rate. In addition, the 'Youth Employment Initiative' decided by the European Council on 7-8 February 2013 will provide additional means to specifically support a speedier implementation of such schemes in eligible Member States.
2. During the discussions on the 2014-2020 operational programmes, the Commission will encourage Member States to support the implementation of Youth Guarantee schemes to address youth unemployment and reduce the number of NEETs. This is already mentioned in the Commission Position Papers sent to the concerned Member States, underlining the main country challenges and priority themes to be supported through the European Structural and Investment Funds from 2014 to 2020.
3. The Commission will encourage Member States to make adequate allocations of the European Structural and Investment Funds and in particular the ESF to support Youth Guarantee schemes. The abovementioned recommendation makes a direct link between these schemes and EU funds' support.

The Commission has proposed establishing ESF minimum share with the aim to ensure that the ESF part in the EU cohesion policy reaches at least 25%. The European Council decision gives an additional argument in favour of preserving this share and the Parliament's support is essential in this regard.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2012) 729 final of 5 December 2012.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000913/13
aan de Commissie
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE) en Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE)
(29 januari 2013)

Betreft: Intrekking of herziening van de voorschriften met betrekking tot vloeistoffen en lichaamsscanners

In zijn verslag over de situatie van de grondrechten in de Europese Unie, dat werd aangenomen op 12 december 2012, riep het Europees Parlement de Commissie en de lidstaten op de voorschriften met betrekking tot vloeistoffen en lichaamsscanners in te trekken of te herzien. Daarnaast spoorde het de Commissie aan een inbreukprocedure in te leiden tegen lidstaten die zich niet aan EU-regelgeving houden, om de grondrechten van burgers op dit terrein te beschermen. Enkele weken later berichtte de media over het besluit van de Amerikaanse Transportation Security Administration (Dienst voor vervoersveiligheid) om zijn contract van vijf miljoen dollar met Rapiscan Systems te verbreken, omdat deze producent van lichaamsscanners, die gebruikmaakt van technologie op basis van retrodiffusie van röntgenstralen, had nagelaten software te leveren om de privacy van passagiers te beschermen. Kan de Commissie toelichten:

- of er technologie is ontwikkeld om vloeistoffen op luchthavens te screenen, zoals het Parlement had verzocht, en of de lidstaten zich aan de EU-regelgeving hebben gehouden, met inbegrip van de termijn van 29 april 2011 voor de screening van vloeistoffen, spuitbussen en gels die op een luchthaven van een derde land of aan boord van een luchtvaartuig van een niet-communautaire luchtvaartmaatschappij zijn gekocht, zoals vastgesteld in de bijlage bij Verordening (EU) nr. 297/2010 tot wijziging van Verordening (EG) nr. 272/2009; en van 29 april 2013 voor de screening van alle vloeistoffen, spuitbussen en gels;
- waarom zij heeft besloten de termijn van 29 april 2011 voor een geleidelijke invoering van de screening van vloeistoffen, spuitbussen en gels op EU-luchthavens te schrappen via Verordening (EU) nr. 720/2011 van 22 juli 2011 tot wijziging van Verordening (EG) nr. 272/2009;
- waarom zij heeft besloten de termijn van 29 april 2013 te herroepen en te vervangen door een geleidelijke opheffing van de beperkingen;
- waarom zij haar evaluatie van de situatie met betrekking tot de screening van vloeistoffen, spuitbussen en gels op EU-luchthavens (COM(2012)0404 van 18 juli 2012) niet openbaar heeft gemaakt;
- of de lichaamsscanners die in de EU worden gebruikt beantwoorden aan privacy- en gegevensbeschermingsregels, zowel wat hun hardware als softwareprogramma's betreft;
- of er in de EU lichaamsscanners zijn — of nog steeds worden — gebruikt die vergelijkbaar zijn met de in de VS verwijderde scanners, en zo ja: hoeveel, in welke lidstaten en op welke luchthavens;
- of alle lidstaten de EU-regelgeving toepassen op grond waarvan iemand een lichaamsscan mag weigeren en in plaats daarvan mag kiezen voor foullering, en zo niet, welke lidstaten dit wel en niet doen;
- of de Commissie bereid is te onderzoeken of de desbetreffende verordening op alle luchthavens volledig wordt nageleefd, aangezien er aanwijzingen zijn dat niet alle luchthavens foullering als alternatief bieden voor een lichaamsscan;
- of zij voornemens is gehoor te geven aan het verzoek van het EP om de voorschriften voor vloeistoffen en lichaamsscanners in te trekken of te herzien en om een inbreukprocedure in te leiden tegen de lidstaten die de EU-regelgeving en de grondrechten op dit gebied schenden?

Antwoord van de heer Kallas namens de Commissie
(26 maart 2013)

De Commissie heeft op 18 juli 2012 aan het Parlement en de Raad verslag uitgebracht over de uitvoering van de EU-wetgeving inzake de screening van vloeistoffen, spuitbussen en gels (*liquids, aerosols and gels* — LAG's) op luchthavens in de Europese Unie. Daartoe is een vertrouwelijk rapport ⁽¹⁾ opgesteld waarin wordt uitgelegd waarom de overgang van de beperkingen op het meenemen van LAG's in handbagage naar het screenen op LAG's bijna niet haalbaar was tegen de beoogde datum van 29 april 2013 wegens operationele en economische redenen en zonder ongemak te creëren voor de passagiers.

⁽¹⁾ Dit verslag is geen openbaar document vanwege de gevoelige aard van de informatie die het bevat.

Om die reden is een gefaseerde aanpak voorgesteld waarbij de beperkingen in de komende jaren geleidelijk worden vervangen door screening. In een eerste fase die uiterlijk op 31 januari 2014 ingaat, worden belastingvrij verkochte vloeistoffen gescreend op voorwaarde dat deze vloeistoffen verzegeld zijn in manipulatieaantonende tassen. Volgende fasen om de beperkingen op andere categorieën LAG's op te heffen, worden vastgesteld na een beoordeling van de uitvoering van de eerste fase.

Alle beveiligingsscaners die worden gebruikt in EU-luchthavens voldoen aan de eisen van de EU-wetgeving ⁽²⁾ en zijn volledig in overeenstemming met de regels inzake privacy en gegevensbescherming. De beveiligingsscaners die in de VS zullen worden verwijderd, zijn gebaseerd op röntgentechnologie. Dergelijke beveiligingsscaners mogen niet worden gebruikt in EU-luchthavens.

De Commissie gaat op dit moment na of de maatregelen van het Verenigd Koninkrijk op grond waarvan de passagiers wordt ontzegd om een beveiligingsscan te weigeren, in strijd zijn met de EU-wetgeving. Zodra de Commissie hierover een officieel standpunt heeft ingenomen, zal zij het Parlement daarvan in kennis stellen. In andere lidstaten die beveiligingsscaners gebruiken, hebben passagiers het recht om de scan te weigeren en om een andere screeningsmethode te vragen.

De Commissie beschikt niet over aanwijzingen dat de regels met betrekking tot beveiligingsscaners onwettig zijn en is derhalve niet van plan deze regels te herzien.

(2) PBL 97 van 9.4.2008.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000913/13
à Comissão
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE) e Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE)
(29 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Revogação ou revisão das restrições relativas aos líquidos e aos scanners corporais

No seu relatório sobre a situação dos direitos fundamentais na União Europeia, aprovado em 12 dezembro de 2012, o Parlamento Europeu exorta «a Comissão e os Estados-Membros a revogarem ou reverem as normas relacionadas com os líquidos e os scanners corporais» e insta «a Comissão a intentar procedimentos por infração contra os Estados-Membros que violem as disposições da UE que protegem os direitos fundamentais dos cidadãos nesta matéria». Algumas semanas mais tarde, de acordo com notícias vindas a lume na comunicação social, o departamento norte-americano responsável pela segurança dos transportes (TSA) rescindiu um contrato de 5 milhões de dólares com a empresa fabricante de scanners corporais, a Rapiscan Systems (que utiliza uma tecnologia baseada na retrodifusão de raios X), devido ao facto desta empresa não ter fornecido programas informáticos destinados a salvaguardar a privacidade dos passageiros. Poderá a Comissão esclarecer:

- se foram desenvolvidas tecnologias para rastrear líquidos nos aeroportos, como solicitado pelo Parlamento, e se os Estados-Membros respeitaram, quer as normas, quer o prazo de 29 de abril de 2011 previsto no anexo do Regulamento (UE) n.º 297/2010 que altera o Regulamento (CE) n.º 272/2009 para o rastreio de líquidos, aerossóis e géis adquiridos num aeroporto de um país terceiro ou a bordo de uma aeronave de uma transportadora aérea não comunitária, e de 29 de abril de 2013 para o rastreio de todos os líquidos, aerossóis e géis;
- por que motivo, através do Regulamento (UE) n.º 720/2011 de 22 de Julho de 2011 que altera o Regulamento (CE) n.º 272/2009 no respeitante à introdução progressiva do rastreio de líquidos, aerossóis e géis nos aeroportos da UE, suprimiu o prazo de 29 de abril de 2011;
- por que motivo suprimiu o prazo de 29 de abril de 2013, substituindo-o por um levantamento gradual das restrições;
- por que motivo não publicou uma avaliação da situação relativa ao rastreio de líquidos, aerossóis e géis nos aeroportos da UE — COM(2012)0404, de 18 de julho de 2012;
- se o equipamento e os programas informáticos dos *scanners* corporais utilizados na UE respeitam as normas de privacidade e a proteção de dados;
- se os *scanners* semelhantes aos retirados nos EUA foram, ou ainda são, utilizados na UE e, em caso afirmativo, quantos, em que Estados-Membros e em que aeroportos;
- se todos os Estados-Membros aplicam a norma que permite recusar o rastreio corporal e, em vez disso, sujeitar-se a uma inspeção manual, quais o fazem e quais não;
- se a Comissão está disposta a investigar se o regulamento pertinente está a ser inteiramente aplicado em todos os aeroportos, tendo em conta os indícios de que nem todos os aeroportos possibilitam a inspeção manual em vez da passagem pelo *scanner*;
- se pretende dar seguimento ao pedido do PE no sentido de revogar ou de rever as normas relacionadas com líquidos e *scanners* corporais e intentar procedimentos por infração contra os Estados-Membros que violem as disposições da UE e os direitos fundamentais nesta matéria.

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(26 de março de 2013)

A Comissão apresentou a 18 de julho de 2012 um relatório ao Parlamento Europeu e ao Conselho sobre a aplicação da legislação da UE relativa ao rastreio de líquidos, aerossóis e geles (LAG) nos aeroportos da UE. Para esse efeito, foi elaborado um relatório restrito da UE ⁽¹⁾, explicando por que razão a substituição das restrições ao transporte dos LAG na bagagem de mão pelo rastreio de LAG não era facilmente exequível até ao prazo de 29 de abril de 2013 devido a considerações operacionais, económicas e relacionadas com a comodidade para os passageiros.

⁽¹⁾ O relatório não é um documento público devido ao carácter sensível da informação que contém.

Como tal foi proposta uma abordagem para a substituição gradual das restrições pelo rastreio nos próximos anos. O primeiro passo consiste em rastrear, o mais tardar até 31 de janeiro de 2014, os líquidos vendidos isentos de impostos («duty-free»), desde que esses líquidos sejam selados em sacos invioláveis. As etapas seguintes — para eliminar as restrições nas outras categorias de LAG — seriam definidas na sequência de uma avaliação da aplicação da primeira fase.

Todos os *scanners* de segurança instalados nos aeroportos da União Europeia cumprem os requisitos da legislação da UE ⁽²⁾ e que estão plenamente conformes com as regras de proteção da privacidade e dos dados. Os *scanners* de segurança a ser retirados nos EUA são baseados na tecnologia de raios X. Este tipo de *scanner* não está autorizado para a utilização nos aeroportos da UE.

A Comissão está atualmente a realizar uma avaliação jurídica para avaliar se as medidas do Reino Unido para negar aos passageiros a opção de recusa do rastreio corporal constituem uma violação da legislação da UE. A Comissão informará o Parlamento no mais breve prazo, assim que adotar uma posição oficial sobre este assunto. Os outros Estados-Membros que instalaram *scanners* de segurança permitem aos passageiros não se submeterem ao controlo e solicitar métodos de controlo alternativos.

A Comissão não tem indicações de que as atuais regras sobre os *scanners* de segurança não são adequadas e, por conseguinte, não as tenciona rever.

(2) JO L 97 de 9.4.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000913/13
to the Commission
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE) and Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE)
(29 January 2013)

Subject: Abrogation or review of 'liquids and body scanners' rules

The European Parliament, in its report on the situation of fundamental rights in the European Union adopted on 12 December 2012, called on 'the Commission and the Member States to abrogate or review the rules on liquids and body scanners' and urged the Commission 'to bring infringement proceedings against those Member States violating EU regulations protecting citizens' fundamental rights on the matter'. A few weeks later, the media reported the decision by the US Transportation Security Administration to cancel its USD 5 million contract with full-body scanner maker Rapiscan Systems, which employs backscatter x-ray technology, owing to its failure to deliver software to protect the privacy of passengers. Can the Commission clarify:

- if technology has been developed to screen liquids at airports, as requested by Parliament, and whether the EU regulations have been respected by the Member States, including the deadlines set — in the annex to Regulation (EU) 297/2010 amending Regulation (EC) No 272/2009 — of 29 April 2011 for the screening of liquids, aerosols and gels (LAGs) obtained at a third country airport or on board an aircraft of a non-Community air carrier; and of 29 April 2013 for the screening of all liquids, aerosols and gels;
- why, via regulation (EU) No 720/2011 of 22 July 2011 amending Regulation (EC) No 272/2009 as regards the phasing-in of the screening of liquids, aerosols and gels at EU airports, it deleted the deadline of 29 April 2011;
- why it decided to delete the deadline of 29 April 2013 and replace it with a gradual lifting of restrictions;
- why it has not published its assessment of the situation in respect of the screening of liquids, aerosols and gels at EU airports — COM(2012)0404 of 18 July 2012;
- if the body scanners used in the EU conform to privacy and data protection rules, in terms both of their hardware and of their software programmes;
- if body scanners similar to those withdrawn in the US have been — or still are — used in the EU, and if so how many, in which Member States and at which airports;
- if all Member States apply the EU rule of allowing one to opt out from a body scan and opt for a pat-down body search, and if not, which do and which do not;
- if the Commission is willing to investigate whether the relevant Regulation is being applied in full at all airports, for there are signs that not all airports offer the option of a pat-down search instead of passing through a scanner;
- if it intends to follow up the EP's request to abrogate or review the rules on liquids and body scanners and to bring infringement proceedings against those Member States which violate EU rules and fundamental rights in this field?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(26 March 2013)

On 18 July 2012, the Commission reported to the Parliament and the Council concerning the implementation of EU legislation on the screening of liquids, aerosol and gels (LAGs) at EU airports. An 'EU Restricted' report ⁽¹⁾ was prepared for that purpose setting out the factors to explain why replacing the restrictions on the carriage of LAGs in cabin baggage by the screening of LAGs was not easily feasible within the timeframe of 29 April 2013 due to operational, economic, and passenger facilitation considerations.

As such a phased approach was proposed to gradually replace the restrictions by screening over the coming years. The first step is to screen liquids sold as duty-free provided those liquids are sealed in Security Tamper-Evident Bags by 31 January 2014 at the latest. Subsequent steps — to remove the restrictions on other categories of LAGs — would be defined following an assessment of the implementation of this first step.

⁽¹⁾ The report is not a public document due to the sensitive nature of the information it contains.

All security scanners deployed at EU airports meet the requirements of the EU legislation ^(¹) and are fully in line with privacy and data protection rules. Security scanners that will be removed in the US are based on X-ray technology. Such security scanners are not authorised for use at EU airports.

The Commission is currently carrying out a legal assessment whether UK measures to deny passengers an opt-out from security scanner screening constitute a breach of EU legislation. The Commission will inform the Parliament as soon as it takes an official position on this subject. The other MS that deploy security scanners allow passengers to opt out and request alternative screening methods.

The Commission has no indication that the rules on security scanners are not appropriate and therefore does not intend to review these rules.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 97, 9.4.2008.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000914/13
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(29 January 2013)**

Subject: Roma and benefits in the UK

Can the Commission state whether it has employed people to explain to Roma all the benefits they can demand on arrival in the UK?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(11 March 2013)**

The European Union and Member States have a joint responsibility to improve the social and economic inclusion of Roma by using all the instruments and policies within their respective competences. As you are aware, the responsibility for Roma integration lies primarily with the Member States.

It is not the role of the Commission to employ staff to explain to Roma about the benefits they may be entitled to upon their arrival on the territory of any Member State.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande P-000916/13
till kommissionen
Nils Torvalds (ALDE)
(29 januari 2013)

Angående: Produktionsstöd för el från förnybara energikällor på Åland

Ålands landskapsregering har länge haft ett system med produktionsstöd till förnybara energikällor, huvudsakligen vindkraft, på den självstyrande ögruppen.

Många medlemsstater har liknande system för statsstöd till produktion av förnybar energi, eftersom produktionen i sig inte är ekonomiskt lönsam utan dessa bidrag.

För att kunna garantera produktionsstödet behöver landskapsregeringen ett godkännande från kommissionen och GD Konkurrens. Landskapsregeringen lämnade in en anmälan om produktionsstöd till GD Konkurrens den 5 september 2011. Godkännandet har dock ännu inte kommit.

Ärendet har nummer SA.33567 (2011/PN) i Sani-databasen (systemet för interaktiv anmälan av statligt stöd).

Efter att flera tidningar skrivit om saken har jag blivit kontaktad av många människor som undrar hur det kan ta så lång tid för EU att fatta beslut i en – som de uppfattar det – så enkel fråga. De tycker att ett och ett halvt år är en orimligt lång väntetid, vilket jag kan hålla med om. Om vi framgångsrikt ska kunna vinna kampen mot EU-skepticismen måste vi kunna leverera resultat från Bryssel fortare än så. Så mycket mer som grön energi också är en del av Europa 2020-strategin och utsedd till ett flaggskeppsinitiativ av kommissionen.

Därför undrar jag när landskapsregeringen på Åland kommer att få besked av kommissionen och GD Konkurrens angående den anmälan som lämnades in till kommissionen den 5 september 2011?

Svar från Joaquín Almunia på kommissionens vägnar
(26 mars 2013)

Kommissionen är i kontakt med de behöriga myndigheterna i Finland (Ålands landskapsregering) i detta ärende.

De finländska myndigheterna förhandsanmälde den 5 september 2011 Ålands landskapsregerings avsikt att bevilja stöd till produktion av el från förnybara energikällor, för att kompensera för de högre produktionskostnaderna vid anläggningar som producerar el från dessa energikällor på Åland i förhållande till marknadspriset på el. I samband med förhandsanmälan uppmanades de nationella myndigheterna att lämna de ytterligare upplysningar som behövdes för att kommissionen skulle kunna bedöma stödåtgärden. Myndigheterna lade fram dessa upplysningar den 29 januari 2013.

Den 11 februari 2013 lade kommissionen fram en formell anmälan om stödordningen. Kommissionen kan inte fatta beslut innan det föreligger en formell anmälan. Efter den formella anmälan av åtgärden är kommissionen skyldig att fatta beslut inom två månader.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000916/13
to the Commission
Nils Torvalds (ALDE)
(29 January 2013)

Subject: Production aid for electricity from renewable energy sources on the Åland Islands, Finland

The government of the Åland Islands, an autonomous region of Finland, has for a long time had in place a system with production aid to support renewable energy sources, mainly wind power, on the islands.

Many Member States have similar types of public aid systems to support the production of renewable energy, reflecting the fact that it is not economically sustainable without subsidies.

In order to grant such production aid, granting authorities need the approval of the Commission and DG COMP. On 5 September 2011, the government of the Åland Islands submitted to DG COMP notification of its plans to grant production aid. It is still waiting for the approval.

The number of the case in DG COMP's State Aid Notification Interactive (SANI) database is SA.33567 (2011/PN).

Following the publication of several newspaper articles on this issue, many people have contacted our office to ask why it has taken the European Union so long time to decide on what, in their eyes, is a simple matter. They think that a year and a half is an unreasonably long time to wait, and I tend to agree. If we are to overcome euroscepticism, we must deliver results from Brussels faster than this. This is especially true when it comes to green energy, which is also part of the Europe 2020 strategy and the focus of one of the Commission's flagship initiatives.

I would therefore like to know when the government of the Åland Islands will receive a reply, with a decision by the Commission and DG COMP, regarding the notification it submitted to the Commission on 5 September 2011.

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(26 March 2013)

The Commission is in contact with the competent authorities of Finland (Åland Government) regarding this case.

The Finnish authorities pre-notified on 5 September 2011 the intention of the Åland Government to grant operating aid for electricity produced from renewable sources in order to compensate the higher production costs of the plants producing electricity from renewable sources on Åland compared to the market price of electricity. In the context of the pre-notification the national authorities were asked to provide further information in order to allow the Commission to assess the measure, which they provided on 29 January 2013.

The Commission has launched on 11 February 2013 the formal notification of the scheme. The Commission cannot take a decision before the formal notification of the aid measure. After the formal notification of the measure the Commission is obliged to adopt a decision within the period of two months.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita P-000917/13

à Comissão

Nuno Teixeira (PPE)

(29 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Novas linhas de crédito do Banco Europeu de Investimento

O Banco Europeu de Investimento (BEI) é constituído por acionistas que são os 27 países da União Europeia. O BEI levanta dinheiro nos mercados de capitais e empresta-o a taxas de juro reduzidas para financiar projetos relacionados com o melhoramento das infraestruturas, o aprovisionamento energético ou as normas ambientais, tanto na Europa como nos países vizinhos ou nos países em desenvolvimento.

Portugal tem vindo a recorrer a sucessivos empréstimos do BEI, tendo como principal objetivo dinamizar a implementação do Quadro de Referência Estratégica Nacional (QREN). Recentemente, o Governo português apresentou a criação de uma nova linha de crédito, no valor de 2 mil milhões de euros, para apoiar as pequenas e médias empresas (PME), intitulada PME Crescimento 2013. Cerca de 1,6 mil milhões de euros serão destinados a apoiar as empresas exportadoras e o remanescente será orientado para financiar as micro e pequenas empresas, juntando-se a verba hoje anunciada aos seis mil milhões de euros que o Ministério da Economia já desbloqueou nos últimos dois anos.

O líder do principal partido da oposição em Portugal, António José Seguro, apresentou recentemente um roteiro para o crescimento económico, em que defende a concessão de uma linha de crédito do BEI no valor de cinco mil milhões de euros.

Portugal celebrou com o Banco Central Europeu, Comissão Europeia e Fundo Monetário Internacional um acordo de assistência financeira que estipula a celebração de medidas de austeridade que levarão à correção financeira das contas públicas.

Tendo em conta o acima exposto, solicito à Comissão que responda ao seguinte:

1. Qual o valor remanescente das linhas de crédito disponibilizadas pelo BEI a Portugal e que ainda não se encontra totalmente alocado a novos projetos de investimento?
2. No atual momento de acordo de equilíbrio financeiro, é possível Portugal solicitar novas linhas de crédito ao BEI, ou será preferível que as empresas portuguesas se candidatem ao novo aumento de capital de 10 mil milhões de euros, que poderá apoiar projetos no valor de 60 mil milhões de euros?
3. Qual a melhor forma de o Governo português criar linhas de crédito para apoiar os investimentos das empresas nacionais?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão

(26 de fevereiro de 2013)

Ao longo dos anos, o BEI tem concedido aos bancos portugueses e à República Portuguesa linhas de crédito para fins de financiamento de projetos elegíveis realizados por entidades dos setores público e privado. Tendo em consideração os empréstimos assinados até dezembro de 2012, e a necessidade do cumprimento prévio de determinadas condições, o montante total atualmente disponível para pagamento e alocação é de cerca de 1,3 mil milhões de euros.

No contexto da capacidade de empréstimo adicional permitida pelo recente aumento de capital, o BEI continuará a contribuir para a consecução dos objetivos da UE, incluindo o crescimento e o emprego em Portugal. Não existe qualquer valor específico para a capacidade de empréstimo adicional, dado que esta se inserirá nos critérios normais de elegibilidade e outros requisitos de crédito para os empréstimos do BEI.

O BEI manteve um bom diálogo com os promotores dos projetos em Portugal, bem como com as autoridades portuguesas, para conceber e implantar regimes que permitam a prossecução da colaboração de longa data entre o BEI e Portugal em termos de financiamento de projetos válidos que respeitem quer os objetivos da UE quer os nacionais.

De facto, em dezembro de 2012, o BEI e a República Portuguesa assinaram uma garantia estatal relativamente a uma carteira a 20 anos até um valor de 2,8 mil milhões de euros, o que assegurará o cumprimento dos requisitos normais de crédito do BEI. A carteira coberta por tal garantia, incluindo a atual e a prevista nova exposição, poderá atingir um máximo de 6 mil milhões de euros numa base rotativa. Isto poderá criar uma margem de manobra significativa para futuras transações.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000917/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(29 January 2013)

Subject: New credit lines from the European Investment Bank

The European Investment Bank (EIB) is formed by its shareholders, which are the 27 EU countries. The EIB raises money in the capital markets and lends it at low interest rates to finance projects linked to the improvement of infrastructure, energy supply or environmental standards in Europe and in neighbouring countries and developing countries.

Portugal has received successive EIB loans, the main aim of which has been to stimulate implementation of its National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF). The Portuguese Government recently announced the creation of a new EUR 2 billion credit line to support small and medium-size enterprises (SMEs), called SME Growth 2013. Approximately EUR 1.6 billion will go to support export enterprises and the remainder will be used to finance micro and small-scale enterprises. The amount announced today is in addition to the EUR 6 billion already released by the Ministry of Economy over the last two years.

The leader of Portugal's main opposition party, Antonio José Seguro, recently presented a roadmap for economic growth, in which he backed the granting of a EUR 5 billion credit line from the EIB.

Portugal signed a financial aid agreement with the European Central Bank, the Commission and the International Monetary Fund, one of the terms of which is the application of austerity measures to achieve the financial correction of its public accounts.

In light of the above, can the Commission answer the following:

1. What is the outstanding amount available under the credit lines provided to Portugal by the EIB, which has not yet been fully allocated to new investment projects?
2. At this time of agreement on the balance of finance, is Portugal entitled to ask the EIB for new credit lines, or would it be preferable for Portuguese enterprises to apply for funding under the new EUR 10 billion capital increase, which can be used to support projects up to a value of EUR 60 million?
3. How can the Portuguese Government best set up credit lines to support investment by national enterprises?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(26 February 2013)

Over the years the EIB has provided Portuguese banks and the Portuguese Republic with loan facilities for the purpose of funding eligible projects undertaken by entities of the private and public sector. Taking into consideration loans signed until December 2012, and the need of prior fulfilment of certain conditions, the total amount currently available for disbursement and allocation is about EUR 1.3 billion.

In the context of the additional lending capacity enabled by the recent capital increase, the EIB will continue contributing to the achievement of EU objectives, including growth and employment in Portugal. There is no specific window for the additional lending capacity, as this will fall under the standard eligibility criteria and other credit requirements for EIB lending.

The EIB has maintained a good dialogue with project promoters in Portugal as well as with the Portuguese authorities to design and deploy schemes that enable the continuation of the long-standing collaboration between the EIB and Portugal in terms of financing valuable projects that meet both EU and national objectives.

As a matter of fact, in December 2012, the EIB and the Portuguese Republic signed a 20-year Portfolio State Guarantee for up to EUR 2.8 billion, which would ensure compliance with EIB standard credit requirements. The portfolio covered by such a guarantee, including existing and expected new exposure, could reach a maximum of EUR 6 billion on a revolving basis. This could create a significant leeway for future transactions.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000918/13

**προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)**

(29 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Περιφρόνηση δικαστικών αποφάσεων στην Ελλάδα

Περιήλθε σε γνώση μου ότι εκτελεστέα απόφαση του Διοικητικού Εφετείου Αθηνών, που αφορά ανάπηρο πρόσωπο που επέτυχε σε διαγωνισμό πρόσληψης στο Δημόσιο το 2008 και διατάσσει την πρόσληψή του, δεν εφαρμόζεται. Η δικαιολογία των αρχών φαίνεται να είναι ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή και η τρόικα περιορίζουν τις προσλήψεις στο Ελληνικό Δημόσιο. Το παράδοξο είναι ότι βάσει της δικαστικής απόφασης απολύθηκε άλλο πρόσωπο που είχε προσληφτεί παράνομα και η θέση είναι πλέον κενή, οι αρχές όμως δεν προσλαμβάνουν το πρόσωπο που δικαιώθηκε. Η αντίληψη αυτή προφανώς για την εξοικονόμηση δαπανών κινδυνεύει να έχει το αντίθετο αποτέλεσμα δεδομένου ότι η παρούσα υπόθεση ίσως καταλήξει στο Ευρωπαϊκό Δικαστήριο και πολύ πιθανό η Ελλάδα να κληθεί να καταβάλει αποζημίωση (με έτος αναφοράς το 2008), πράγμα το οποίο θα αποτελούσε μη συμφέρουσα προοπτική σε σύγκριση με την πρόσληψη του δικαιωθέντος ατόμου και την εργασία που θα προσφέρει.

Δεδομένου ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή και η τρόικα, λόγω του μνημονίου έχουν την ευθύνη του ελέγχου των δημοσίων δαπανών στην Ελλάδα,

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Τι προτίθεται να πράξει εν προκειμένω, αφού, νομικά, η εν λόγω δικαστική απόφαση πρέπει να εφαρμοσθεί άμεσα, χωρίς αυτό να θεωρηθεί ότι αντιβαίνει στους κανόνες που έχει επιβάλλει στη Ελλάδα για τον περιορισμό προσλήψεων στον δημόσιο τομέα η τρόικα, που άλλωστε διατείνεται ότι αξιώνει βελτίωση της λειτουργίας της Δικαιοσύνης;
2. Θεωρεί η Επιτροπή ότι η τρόικα πρέπει να επιβάλλει και να αξιώνει μέτρα που επεκτείνονται και κατά προσώπου ΑμεΑ;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής

(12 Μαρτίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή δεν μπορεί να λάβει θέση για συγκεκριμένη υπόθεση η οποία αφορά τη λειτουργία του ελληνικού συστήματος δικαιοδοσίας και του ελληνικού διοικητικού συστήματος. Η Επιτροπή αναγνωρίζει ότι η Ελλάδα έχει περιορίσει τις προσλήψεις στο δημόσιο τομέα, με βάση τους κανόνες που συμφωνήθηκαν στο πλαίσιο του Μνημονίου Συμφωνίας (ΜΣ), ωστόσο είναι ακόμη δυνατόν να προσλαμβάνεται προσωπικό υπό τον όρο ότι τηρείται η αναλογία 1/5 (μία πρόσληψη ανά πέντε αποχωρήσεις).

Η Επιτροπή σημειώνει επίσης ότι, κατά την εφαρμογή της νομοθεσίας της ΕΕ, η Ελλάδα θα πρέπει να τηρεί τις διατάξεις του Χάρτη των Θεμελιωδών Δικαιωμάτων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, που περιλαμβάνει την αποφυγή διακρίσεων (άρθρο 21) και την ένταξη των ατόμων με ειδικές ανάγκες (άρθρο 26). Επιπλέον, η οδηγία 2000/78/ΕΚ απαγορεύει τις άμεσες και έμμεσες διακρίσεις με το αιτιολογικό της αναπηρίας στον τομέα της απασχόλησης.

Η Επιτροπή στηρίζει τη μεταρρύθμιση των κοινωνικών προγραμμάτων που αποσκοπούν στην καλύτερη στοχοθέτηση και την αποτελεσματικότερη προστασία των ευάλωτων ομάδων. Η Επιτροπή προωθεί την κοινωνική και εργασιακή ένταξη των ατόμων με ειδικές ανάγκες στο πλαίσιο του συγχρηματοδοτούμενου από το ΕΚΤ επιχειρησιακού προγράμματος «Ανάπτυξη των ανθρώπινων πόρων» (ΕΠ ΑΑΔ).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000918/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(29 January 2013)

Subject: Contempt for court judgments in Greece

It has come to my attention that an enforceable judgment by the Athens Administrative Court of Appeal concerning a disabled person who succeeded in a competition for public sector employment in 2008 ordering him to be appointed is not being carried out. The excuse given by the authorities seems to be that the Commission and the Troika are restricting recruitment to the Greek public sector. The paradox is that under the judgment in question another person who had been illegally recruited has been dismissed so that the post is now vacant, but the authorities have not hired the person whose claim had been vindicated. This attitude — obviously motivated by a desire to make savings — is likely to be counter-productive, since the present case may come before the Court of Justice of the European Union; if so, Greece will very likely be ordered to pay compensation (backdated to 2008) — an unattractive prospect compared to the recruitment of the person with a rightful claim to the post and the work that person will perform.

Since, under the Memorandum, the Commission and the Troika are responsible for controlling public expenditure in Greece, will the Commission say:

1. What does it intend to do in this case, since, legally, the judgment in question must be applied immediately, without this being regarded as contrary to the rules imposed on Greece to limit public sector recruitment by the Troika, which also claims to be demanding an improvement the administration of justice?
2. Does it consider that the Troika should impose and demand measures that also adversely affect persons with disabilities?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(12 March 2013)

The Commission cannot take a position on a specific case which concerns the functioning of the Greek jurisdictional and administration systems. The Commission acknowledges that Greece has restricted the recruitment in the public sector according to the rules agreed in the context of the memorandum of understanding (MoU), however it is still possible to hire personnel provided that the attrition rule of 1:5 (one recruitment for five exits) is respected.

The Commission notes as well that, when implementing EC law, Greece should respect the provisions of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, which include non-discrimination (Article 21) and the integration of persons with disabilities (Article 26). Furthermore, Directive 2000/78/EC prohibits direct and indirect discrimination on the grounds of disability in the field of employment.

The Commission supports reform of social programmes aimed at better targeting and more effectively protecting the vulnerable. The Commission promotes social and employment integration of persons with disabilities under the ESF co-financed operational programme 'Human Resources Development' (OP HRD).

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000919/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(29 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Αποκρατικοποίηση του ΟΠΑΠ και επέκταση του Οργανισμού στα βιντεολότο (VLTs)

Σύμφωνα με δημοσίευμα στον ελληνικό Τύπο, «εν όψει της ιδιωτικοποίησης του ΟΠΑΠ έχουν παγώσει όλες οι συμβάσεις συνεργασίας, μεταξύ αυτών και η επέκταση του Οργανισμού στα βιντεολότο (VLTs). Ο ΟΠΑΠ, για να αποκτήσει την άδεια των VLTs έδωσε στο δημόσιο το ποσό των 560 εκ. ευρώ. Από τα 35 000 βιντεολότο ο ΟΠΑΠ θα εκμεταλλεύεται για λογαριασμό του τα 16 500 και τα υπόλοιπα 18 500 πρέπει να δοθούν σε ιδιώτες. Η προθεσμία που προβλέπει ο νόμος για να αναλάβουν οι ιδιώτες την εγκατάσταση και εκμετάλλευση των VLTs λήγει τον Νοέμβριο. Ο νόμος εκτός από τον χρονικό περιορισμό προβλέπει ότι, αν η χρονική προθεσμία παρέλθει άπρακτη, τότε τα 18 500 βιντεολότο που προορίζονταν για ιδιώτες, θα επιστραφούν στην κυριότητα του ΟΠΑΠ εκτός και εάν η κυβέρνηση αποφασίσει να παρέμβει νομοθετικά και να παρατείνει τη σχετική προθεσμία».

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη ότι:

- Εάν μέχρι την ολοκλήρωση των διαδικασιών της ιδιωτικοποίησης του ΟΠΑΠ δεν υπάρχει χρόνος για να ολοκληρωθούν οι διαδικασίες που είναι αναγκαίες για να δοθούν σε ιδιώτες τα βιντεολότο, θα επηρεαστεί σημαντικά η τιμή πώλησης του Οργανισμού.
- Η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί την πρόοδο στην εφαρμογή της πολιτικής των αποκρατικοποιήσεων κατά την τακτική εξέταση που διενεργείται στο πλαίσιο του Προγράμματος Οικονομικής Προσαρμογής της Ελλάδας.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Θεωρεί ότι για λόγους διαφάνειας (να αποκλειστεί η περίπτωση προνομιακής πληροφόρησης σε σχέση με τις μελλοντικές νομοθετικές ρυθμίσεις για την παράταση ή όχι της προθεσμίας για τα βιντεολότο) και μεγιστοποίησης της τιμής του διαγωνισμού (με την άρση της σχετικής αβεβαιότητας), θα πρέπει να έχει ρητά διευκρινιστεί αν θα παραταθεί η σχετική προθεσμία, πριν πραγματοποιηθεί ο διαγωνισμός ιδιωτικοποίησης του ΟΠΑΠ, ώστε να διασφαλίζεται ότι θα πραγματοποιηθεί υπό συνθήκες σύμφωνες με τις γενικές αρχές διαφάνειας που διέπουν το ευρωπαϊκό δίκαιο και ότι θα μεγιστοποιηθούν τα έσοδα που έχουν προβλεφθεί στο πρόγραμμα αποκρατικοποιήσεων που έχει εγκρίνει η Επιτροπή;

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000939/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(29 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Απόφαση του Δικαστηρίου και ιδιωτικοποίηση του ΟΠΑΠ

Σύμφωνα με την απόφαση του Δικαστηρίου της 24ης Ιανουαρίου 2013 στις συνεκδικαζόμενες υποθέσεις C-186/11 και C-209/11 με αντικείμενο αιτήσεις προδικαστικής αποφάσεως που υπέβαλε το Συμβούλιο της Επικρατείας, το Δικαστήριο αποφαινεται μεταξύ άλλων ότι είναι αρμοδιότητα του εθνικού δικαστηρίου να διασφαλίσει ότι η εθνική νομοθεσία πράγματι ανταποκρίνεται στην μέριμνα για μείωση των δυνατοτήτων συμμετοχής σε παίγνια και καταπολέμηση της συναφούς εγκληματικότητας και να εξακριβώσει την αποτελεσματικότητα των κρατικών ελέγχων. Το Δικαστήριο επίσης απαντά ότι το ευρωπαϊκό δίκαιο δεν συνάδει με εθνική νομοθεσία η οποία δίνει το αποκλειστικό δικαίωμα των τυχερών παιγνίων σε έναν μόνο οργανισμό, χωρίς πραγματικά να μειώνει τις δυνατότητες συμμετοχής σε παίγνια όταν δεν μειώνει τις δραστηριότητες σε αυτόν τον τομέα με συνεπή και συστηματικό τρόπο ή δεν διασφαλίζει αυστηρό έλεγχο της επέκτασης του τομέα των παιγνίων, στο σημείο που αυτό είναι αναγκαίο για την καταπολέμηση της εγκληματικότητας. Επισημαίνει ακόμη ότι η Ελληνική Πολιτεία έχει να επιλέξει μεταξύ συγκεκριμένων εναλλακτικών λύσεων, είτε στην περίπτωση που διατηρήσει το μονοπώλιο, είτε όχι.

Με δεδομένο ότι:

- τα στοιχεία που επισημαίνει το Συμβούλιο της Επικρατείας (επεκτατική διαφημιστική πολιτική και ανωνυμία των παικτών) δεν διασφαλίζονται από την παρούσα νομοθεσία και πιθανότατα θα χρειαστούν νέα νομοθετική παρέμβαση,

- αν μέχρι την ολοκλήρωση των διαδικασιών της ιδιωτικοποίησης του ΟΠΑΠ δεν έχει διευκρινιστεί το νομικό πλαίσιο σε σχέση με τα ανωτέρω σημεία, η προκύπτουσα αβεβαιότητα θα επηρεάσει σημαντικά προς τα κάτω την τιμή πώλησης του Οργανισμού,
- για λόγους διαφάνειας (να αποκλειστεί η περίπτωση προνομαϊκής πληροφόρησης σε σχέση με μελλοντικές νομοθετικές ρυθμίσεις που μπορεί να αλλάξουν την πραγματική αξία του σχετικού μονοπωλίου για τους ενδιαφερόμενους ιδιώτες), είναι σκόπιμο να έχουν διευκρινιστεί τα θέματα αυτά πριν την κατάθεση των δεσμευτικών προσφορών τους,
- η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί την πρόοδο στην εφαρμογή της πολιτικής των αποκρατικοποιήσεων, κατά την τακτική εξέταση που διενεργείται στο πλαίσιο του Προγράμματος Οικονομικής Προσαρμογής της Ελλάδας.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Θεωρεί ότι για λόγους διαφάνειας, θα πρέπει να διευκρινιστούν οι δύο αυτές εκκρεμότητες (έκταση της διαφήμισης και ανωνυμία των παικτών), πριν πραγματοποιηθεί ο διαγωνισμός ιδιωτικοποίησης του ΟΠΑΠ, ώστε να διασφαλίζεται ότι θα πραγματοποιηθεί υπό συνθήκες σύμφωνες με τις γενικές αρχές διαφάνειας που διέπουν το ευρωπαϊκό δίκαιο και ότι θα μεγιστοποιηθούν τα έσοδα που έχουν προβλεφθεί στο πρόγραμμα αποκρατικοποιήσεων που έχει εγκρίνει η Επιτροπή;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(11 Απριλίου 2013)

Η ελληνική κυβέρνηση πρέπει να λάβει όλα τα απαραίτητα προπαρασκευαστικά μέτρα ώστε να δρομολογήσει επιτυχώς την πώληση των εταιρικών και ακίνητων περιουσιακών στοιχείων. Το ίδιο ισχύει επίσης και για τον ΟΠΑΠ και συνεπάγεται τη λήψη σειράς σύνθετων και ποικίλων μέτρων που είναι αναγκαία για τη δημιουργία κατάλληλου πλαισίου ώστε να προχωρήσει η διαδικασία ιδιωτικοποίησης με επιτυχία.

Το ταμείο ιδιωτικοποιήσεων (ΤΑΙΠΕΔ) συστάθηκε με μοναδικό σκοπό την εκτέλεση του προγράμματος ιδιωτικοποιήσεων της κυβέρνησης ακολουθώντας μία ενδεδειγμένη διαδικασία στην οποία ελήφθησαν υπόψη οι διεθνείς βέλτιστες πρακτικές, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της καθοριστικής συμβολής τεχνικών, νομικών και οικονομικών συμβούλων.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000919/13
to the Commission
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(29 January 2013)

Subject: Privatisation of OPAP (Greek Organisation of Football Prognostics) and its expansion into video lottery terminals (VLTs)

According to Greek press reports, in view of the privatisation of OPAP, all cooperation agreements, including its expansion into VLTs, have been suspended. In order to obtain the licence to operate VLTs, OPAP paid the state EUR 560 million. Of the 35 000 VLTs, OPAP will operate 16 500 on own account and the other 18 500 will have to be ceded to private individuals. The period provided for by law for individuals to install and operate VLTs expires in November. Apart from providing a time limit, the law provides that, if the time limit expires without any action being taken, the 18 500 VLTs intended for individuals, will revert to the ownership of OPAP unless the government decides to intervene with legislation to extend the deadline.

Bearing in mind that:

- If there is not enough time to complete the procedures necessary to cede the VLTs to individuals before the OPAP privatisation procedure is completed, this will significantly affect OPAP's selling price;
- The Commission monitors progress in the implementation of the privatisation policy during the regular examination conducted under the economic adjustment programme in Greece;

Will the Commission say:

Does it consider that, for reasons of transparency (to ensure that no inside information is available in connection with future legislation on whether or not the deadline for VLTs will be extended) and in order to maximise the value of the tender (by removing the associated uncertainty), steps must be taken clearly to specify whether the deadline will be extended, before the OPAP privatisation tender is launched, so as to ensure that it is held under conditions consistent with the general principles of transparency informing European law and that the revenue provided for in the privatisation programme approved by the Commission is maximised?

Question for written answer E-000939/13
to the Commission
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(29 January 2013)

Subject: Court of Justice judgment and privatisation of OPAP (Greek Organisation of Football Prognostics Ltd.)

According to the Court of Justice's judgment of 24 January 2013 in linked Cases C-186/11 and C-209/11 concerning applications for a preliminary ruling submitted by the Greek Council of State, the Court has ruled, *inter alia*, that it is for the national court to ensure that national legislation genuinely meets the concern to reduce opportunities for gambling, combats criminality linked to gambling and ascertains the effectiveness of government controls. The Court has also ruled that national legislation which gives exclusive gambling rights to a single organisation, without genuinely reducing the opportunities for gambling is incompatible with EC law if it fails to reduce activities in this area in a consistent and systematic manner or to ensure strict controls on the expansion of the sector of games of chance, in so far as is necessary to combat criminality linked to those games. Furthermore, it notes that the Greek state has to choose between specific alternatives, whether it maintains the monopoly or not.

Given that:

- the factors put forward by the Council of State (extensive advertising policy and player anonymity) are not safeguarded by the present law and fresh legislation will probably be needed;
- if, by the completion of the OPAP privatisation procedures, the legal framework in relation to the above points has not clarified, the resulting uncertainty will significantly push OPAP's selling price down;

- for reasons of transparency (to ensure that no privileged information relating to future legislation that may change the actual value of the monopoly for the parties concerned) these issues should be clarified prior to the submission of binding bids;
- the Commission monitors progress in the implementation of the privatisation policy in the regular examination conducted under the economic adjustment programme in Greece;

Will the Commission say:

Does it consider that, for reasons of transparency, these two outstanding issues (the scope of advertising and player anonymity) must be clarified, before the OPAP privatisation tender is launched, so as to ensure that it is held under conditions consistent with the general principles of transparency informing European law and that the revenue provided for in the privatisation programme approved by the Commission is maximised?

Joint answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission

(11 April 2013)

The Greek Government has to take all the preparatory measures needed to launch successfully the sale of corporate and real estate assets. This is also the case for OPAP and is involving a complex and diverse set of measures needed to create the right framework for the privatisation process to move forward in a successful way.

The privatisation fund (HRADF) was created with the sole objective to implement the government privatisation program by following a thorough process taking into account international best practices including key input given by technical, legal and financial advisors

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000920/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**

Mario Borghezio (EFD)

(29 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Distruzione della biblioteca di Timbuctù: intervento UE

Nel ritirarsi da Timbuctù, i terroristi islamici di Al Qaeda e del «Mujao» hanno dato alle fiamme un'antica biblioteca che custodiva preziosi manoscritti relativi anche alla spiritualità islamica e un centro di ricerca contenente 18mila volumi con vari testi redatti sia in arabo sia in lingue africane di medicina, astronomia, diritto, storia, geografia, letteratura, come denunciato dal sindaco della città.

1. Come valuta il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante il rischio che i jihadisti islamici continuino a perseguire la distruzione di simili patrimoni culturali appartenenti alla cultura universale?
2. Quali iniziative specifiche intende prevedere a tutela anche delle altre «biblioteche del deserto» disseminate in varie regioni a rischio del Nord Africa?

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

(5 aprile 2013)

In linea con il gruppo internazionale di sostegno e di monitoraggio sulla situazione in Mali ospitato il 5 febbraio a Bruxelles, l'Unione europea partecipa alla mobilitazione internazionale a favore della stabilità e della sicurezza in Mali.

In questo ambito, il Consiglio «Affari esteri» del 18 febbraio 2013 ha assicurato il proprio sostegno politico all'operazione francese Serval e alla missione internazionale di sostegno al Mali sotto guida africana (AFISMA). Ha altresì ribadito il suo impegno nella lotta contro la minaccia del terrorismo.

In questa fase, l'azione operativa congiunta dell'esercito del Mali, dell'operazione Serval e dell'AFISMA ha permesso la liberazione della città di Timbuctù dal controllo dei gruppi armati e terroristi al comando. Pertanto è ormai molto ridotto il rischio che questi gruppi continuino ad attaccare il patrimonio culturale mondiale (attentati o azioni isolate).

L'azione di cooperazione civile dell'Unione europea tiene conto della necessità di preservare, valorizzare e restaurare il patrimonio del Mali, ma anche, in prospettiva più ampia, quello dell'Africa sahelo-sahariana. È invece di competenza delle autorità nazionali la tutela della sicurezza di questo patrimonio, unitamente ai partner impegnati sul piano operativo.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000920/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Mario Borghezio (EFD)

(29 January 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Destruction of Timbuktu library: EU intervention

On their withdrawal from Timbuktu, the city's mayor reports, Islamic terrorists belonging to Al-Qaida and the Movement for Unity and Jihad in West Africa (MUJAO) set fire to an ancient library housing precious manuscripts on, among other subjects, Islamic spirituality, and to a research centre holding 18 000 books comprising various Arabic and African-language texts on medicine, astronomy, law, history, geography and literature.

1. What is the risk, according to the Vice-President/High Representative, that Islamic jihadists will continue to destroy similar items of cultural heritage belonging to global civilisation?
2. What specific steps does she intend to take in order to protect the other 'desert libraries' spread across various regions under threat in North Africa, too?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante Ashton au nom de la Commission

(5 avril 2013)

En ligne avec le Groupe international de Soutien et de Suivi sur la situation au Mali qu'elle a accueilli le 5 février à Bruxelles, l'UE participe à la mobilisation internationale en faveur de la stabilité et de la sécurité au Mali.

Dans ce cadre, le Conseil Affaires étrangères du 18 février 2013 a apporté son soutien politique à l'opération française Serval ainsi qu'à la Mission Internationale de Soutien au Mali sous conduite africaine (MISMA). Il a également réaffirme son engagement dans la lutte contre la menace terroriste.

À ce stade, l'action opérationnelle conjointe de l'armée malienne, de l'opération Serval ainsi que de la MISMA ont permis de libérer la ville de Tombouctou du contrôle des groupes armés et terroristes qui y régnaient. Le risque de poursuite par ces groupes des atteintes au patrimoine mondial culturel est donc désormais très limité (attentats ou action isolée).

L'action de coopération civile de l'UE prend en compte le besoin de préserver, valoriser et de restaurer le patrimoine malien mais également, au-delà, de celui d'Afrique saharo-sahélienne. L'action de protection sécuritaire de ce patrimoine est en revanche du ressort des autorités nationales en lien, dans le cas malien, avec leurs partenaires impliqués au plan opérationnel.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001232/13
aan de Commissie
Esther de Lange (PPE)
(6 februari 2013)

Betref: Gebruik Diane-35-pil in Europa

Op 31 januari 2013 heeft de Franse toezichthouder op geneesmiddelen (ANSM) de Diane-35-pil uit de schappen gehaald. De autoriteiten kwamen tot deze maatregel omdat er de afgelopen 25 jaar vier vrouwen zijn overleden aan trombose als gevolg van het slikken van deze pil.

De Diane-35-pil wordt in heel Europa verkocht en gebruikt. In Nederland is de Diane-35-pil sinds 1987 toegestaan en ondertussen slikken circa 370 000 vrouwen deze pil of een pil met dezelfde werkzame stof. Volgens het College ter Beoordeling van Geneesmiddelen (CBG) is er vooralsnog geen reden om de pil in Nederland uit de schappen te halen.

Volgens de Europese regelgeving is het aan de lidstaten zelf om te bepalen of zij de pil toestaan, tijdelijk uit de schappen halen of geheel verbieden. Via het Europees Geneesmiddelenbureau (EMA) kan een onderzoek naar de werking en bijwerking van deze pil worden ingesteld op verzoek van een of meerdere Europese lidstaten. Naar aanleiding van het onderzoek, uitgevoerd door het Risicobeoordelingscomité voor geneesmiddelenbewaking (PRAC), kan de Diane-35-pil in alle EU-lidstaten verboden worden, als deze schadelijk wordt bevonden voor de gezondheid van Europese patiënten.

Is de Commissie op de hoogte van de maatregel van de Franse toezichthouder ANSM om de Diane-35-pil uit de schappen te halen? Is de Commissie het eens met deze maatregel? Zo nee, waarom niet?

Vindt de Commissie het wenselijk dat vrouwen in verschillende lidstaten verschillend en zelfs tegengesteld advies ontvangen van hun autoriteiten over de veiligheid van de Diane-35-pil?

Is er een verzoek voor onderzoek naar de Diane-35-pil ingediend door een of meerdere lidstaten bij het Europees Geneesmiddelenbureau? Zo niet, is de Commissie bereid om zelf via PRAC een Europees onderzoek te starten naar de werking en de bijwerkingen van de Diane-35-pil?

Is de Commissie het eens met de urgentie van dit onderzoek om te achterhalen of de Diane-35-pil al dan niet schadelijk is?

Antwoord van de heer Borg namens de Commissie
(12 maart 2013)

Diane 35 en de generieke vormen daarvan zijn geneesmiddelen waarvoor de lidstaten een vergunning hebben verleend. Zij worden in de hele EU op grote schaal gebruikt. Het toegestane gebruik verschilt van land tot land en omvat de behandeling van acne en anticonceptie bij vrouwen met hormoongerelateerde aandoeningen zoals acne, hirsutisme (overmatige haargroei in het aangezicht) en alopecia (haaruitval).

Het Europees Geneesmiddelenbureau (EMA) is tijdens zijn bijeenkomst in februari 2013 ⁽¹⁾ begonnen met een veiligheidsevaluatie van Diane 35 en de generieke vormen daarvan in het kader van een spoedprocedure ⁽²⁾ die werd ingeleid nadat Frankrijk had aangekondigd de vergunning voor het in de handel brengen van deze producten voor de komende drie maanden te schorsen.

Het risico op veneuze trombo-embolie bij Diane 35 en de generieke vormen daarvan is laag, maar welbekend. In de productinformatie over deze producten zijn waarschuwingen opgenomen om patiënten en voorschrijvers op de risico's te wijzen. Bovendien is er in Frankrijk een wijdverspreid off-labelgebruik vastgesteld, dit wil zeggen een gebruik voor andere doeleinden dan het toegestane therapeutische gebruik, namelijk als anticonceptivum.

Het EMA zal alle beschikbare informatie over de voordelen en de risico's van deze geneesmiddelen beoordelen en een aanbeveling opstellen of de vergunningen voor het in de handel brengen in het belang van alle patiënten in de Europese Unie ongewijzigd moeten blijven of moeten worden aangepast, geschorst of ingetrokken.

⁽¹⁾ http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/medicines/human/referrals/Cyproterone_and_ethinylestradiol_containing_medicinal_products/human_referral_prac_000017.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac05805c516f

⁽²⁾ Artikel 107decies van Richtlijn 2001/83/EG tot vaststelling van een communautair wetboek betreffende geneesmiddelen voor menselijk gebruik, PBL 311 van 28.11.2001, als gewijzigd.

Aangezien voor al deze geneesmiddelen vergunningen werden verleend op nationaal niveau, zal de aanbeveling van het EMA worden toegestuurd aan een groep van vertegenwoordigers van de lidstaten, die naar verwachting in mei 2013 een definitief standpunt zullen aannemen.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001000/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(31 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Mortes associadas à pílula

No seguimento da investigação da morte de uma jovem vítima de um acidente cardiovascular cerebral, a Agência de Segurança Nacional do Medicamento e Produtos de Saúde (ANSM) francesa relacionou a pílula Diane 35 a quatro mortes por trombose venosa nos últimos 25 anos.

Além disso, esta Agência anunciou uma «análise específica» e um «relatório completo» relativamente à pílula Diane 35 assim como aos seus genéricos.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Tem conhecimento das diligências da ANSM relativamente à pílula Diane 35 e aos seus genéricos?
2. Que medidas pretende tomar relativamente às conclusões que venham a ser extraídas pela ANSM relativamente à possível relação entre a citada pílula e as mortes por trombose venosa?
3. Pondera fazer incluir nova informação sobre a relação entre a citada pílula e a trombose venosa nos resumos das características destes medicamentos e nos respetivos folhetos informativos?
4. Pondera iniciar uma investigação mais abrangente sobre a segurança das várias hormonas contraceptivas disponíveis no mercado e a sua relação com o risco de trombose venosa?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001339/13

à Comissão

Nuno Melo (PPE)

(8 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: França suspende Diane 35

Considerando que:

- Após uma investigação que começou com a denúncia de uma jovem vítima de um acidente vascular cerebral, a Agência de Segurança Nacional do Medicamento e dos Produtos de Saúde (ANSM) francesa relacionou a pílula Diane 35 com a ocorrência de mortes por trombose venosa e suspendeu a comercialização deste fármaco;
- Após um pedido feito pela França, a Agência Europeia de Medicamentos (EMA) anunciou, na segunda-feira, que ia analisar a terceira e quarta geração de contraceptivos orais combinados, para determinar se será necessário restringir a sua utilização;

Pergunto à Comissão:

1. Tem conhecimento desta situação?
2. Possui algum estudo que confirme estas conclusões?

Resposta conjunta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão

(12 de março de 2013)

A Diane 35 e os seus medicamentos genéricos são medicamentos autorizados pelos Estados-Membros e amplamente utilizados em toda a UE. As utilizações autorizadas variam consoante os Estados-Membros e incluem o tratamento do acne ou servem de contraceptivo para as mulheres com sintomas relacionados com problemas hormonais, tais como o acne, a hipertricose (crescimento exagerado de pelos na face) e alopecia (perda de cabelo).

A Agência Europeia de Medicamentos iniciou uma avaliação de segurança do medicamento Diane 35 e dos seus genéricos, na reunião de fevereiro de 2013 ⁽¹⁾, no âmbito de um procedimento de urgência ⁽²⁾ lançado após a França ter anunciado a intenção de suspender as autorizações de comercialização para estes produtos durante os próximos três meses.

O risco de tromboembolia venosa resultante da Diane 35 e dos seus genéricos é reduzido, mas bem conhecido e, na literatura incluída do medicamento, são incluídos avisos para alertar as pacientes e os médicos para esse risco. Além disso, verificou-se que, em França, esses medicamentos são amplamente utilizados de forma não conforme, ou seja, para outros fins além da indicação terapêutica autorizada, como contraceptivos.

A Agência avaliará todas as provas disponíveis sobre os benefícios e riscos destes medicamentos e emitirá uma recomendação sobre se as suas autorizações de comercialização devem manter-se tal como existem, ser alteradas, suspensas ou revogadas, no interesse de todos os pacientes na União Europeia.

Como estes medicamentos são todos autorizados a nível nacional, a recomendação da Agência será enviada a um grupo de representantes dos Estados-Membros, cuja posição final deverá ser adotada em maio de 2013.

⁽¹⁾ http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/medicines/human/referrals/Cyproterone_and_ethinylestradiol_containing_medicinal_products/human_referral_prac_000017.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac05805c516f

⁽²⁾ Artigo 107.º-I da Diretiva 2001/83/CE que estabelece um código comunitário relativo aos medicamentos para uso humano, JO L 311 de 28.11.2001, alterada.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000921/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(29 ianuarie 2013)

Subiect: Efectele secundare ale pilulelor contraceptive

Având în vedere utilizarea extensivă la nivelul Uniunii Europene, precum și la nivel internațional, a pilulei contraceptive „Diane 35”, produsă de laboratoarele Bayer, se ridică problema efectelor secundare majore pe care le prezintă administrarea acestui medicament.

Pilula „Diane 35”, un tratament contra acneei, prescris și ca metodă contraceptivă, a fost lansată în 1987, este aprobată oficial în 135 de state și se comercializează în 116 țări, iar administrarea sa prezintă însemnate riscuri de sănătate, printre care producerea trombozelor vasculare, a inflamațiilor venoase și a emboliei pulmonare. În Franța, unde pilula este utilizată de peste 300.000 de femei anual, Agenția Națională a Medicamentului a anunțat patru decese cauzate de administrarea acestei metode contraceptive, victimele având vârste cuprinse între 18 și 42 de ani.

Deși semnalele de alarmă au fost numeroase, atât în Franța, cât și pe plan internațional, anual se vând între patru și cinci milioane de pastile. Luând în considerare riscurile de sănătate pe care le implică folosirea acestei metode contraceptive, precum și decesele survenite, Comisia este rugată să prezinte un punct de vedere cu privire la această situație.

Răspuns comun dat de dl Borg în numele Comisiei
(12 martie 2013)

Diane 35 și genericele sale sunt medicamente care au fost autorizate de statele membre și care sunt amplu folosite în întreaga UE. Utilizările autorizate diferă de la un stat membru la altul și includ tratamente împotriva acneei și contracepția pentru femei cu probleme medicale de natură hormonală, precum acneea, hirsutismul (creșterea excesivă a părului pe față) și alopecia (pierderea părului).

Agenția Europeană pentru Medicamente a demarat o revizuire a siguranței utilizării Diane 35 și a genericelor sale la reuniunea din februarie 2013 ⁽¹⁾, în cadrul unei proceduri de urgență ⁽²⁾ lansate după ce Franța și-a anunțat intenția de a suspenda autorizațiile de comercializare pentru aceste produse în decursul următoarelor trei luni.

Riscul de tromboze venoase și de embolie asociat cu utilizarea Diane 35 și a genericelor sale este scăzut, dar binecunoscut, iar notițele cu informații despre produs includ avertismente în acest sens, menite să alerteze pacienții și medicii care le prescriu cu privire la riscuri. În plus, trebuie remarcat faptul că, în Franța, ele sunt utilizate adesea fără rețetă, adică în afara unei indicații terapeutice autorizate, pe post de contraceptive.

Agenția va evalua toate dovezile disponibile cu privire la beneficiile și riscurile pe care le prezintă aceste medicamente și va formula o recomandare privind păstrarea, modificarea, suspendarea sau revocarea autorizațiilor de comercializare, în interesul tuturor pacienților din Uniunea Europeană.

Întrucât aceste medicamente sunt autorizate la nivel național, recomandarea Agenției va fi transmisă unui grup de reprezentanți ai statelor membre, a căror poziție finală va fi probabil adoptată în mai 2013.

⁽¹⁾ http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/medicines/human/referrals/Cyproterone_and_ethinylestradiol_containing_medical_products/human_referral_prac_000017.jsp&mid=W00b01ac05805c516f

⁽²⁾ Articolul 107i din Directiva 2001/83/CE de instituire a unui cod comunitar cu privire la medicamentele de uz uman, JO L 311, 28.11.2001, astfel cum a fost modificată.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000921/13
to the Commission
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(29 January 2013)**

Subject: Side effects of contraceptive pills

Given the extensive use at EU and global level of the contraceptive pill 'Diane 35', produced by Bayer Laboratories, it raises the issue of the major side effects caused by the administration of this medication.

The 'Diane 35' pill, an anti-acne treatment which is also prescribed as a contraceptive, was launched in 1987, is officially approved in 135 countries and is marketed in 116 countries. However, its administration causes significant health risks, among which are vascular thrombosis, venous inflammation and pulmonary embolism. In France, where the pill is used by over 300 000 women annually, the National Agency of Medicine and Health Products Safety (ANSM) announced four deaths caused by the administration of this contraceptive method. The victims were between 18 and 42 years old.

Although there have been numerous warning signs, both in France and worldwide, between four and five million pills are sold annually. Considering the health risks involved in using this contraceptive method, as well as the deaths which have taken place, can the Commission present a point of view on this situation?

**Question for written answer E-001000/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(31 January 2013)**

Subject: Deaths linked to contraceptive pill

Following the investigation into the death of a young woman as a result of a cerebral cardiovascular incident, the French National Agency for the Safety of Medicines and Health Products (ANSM) has linked the Diane 35 pill to four deaths from deep vein thrombosis over the last 25 years.

Furthermore, the agency announced that it would be launching a 'specific analysis' and a 'full report' on the Diane 35 pill and its generics.

1. Is the Commission aware of the ANSM's action concerning the Diane 35 pill and its generics?
2. What steps does the Commission intend to take in response to the conclusions drawn by the ANSM concerning the possible link between this pill and deaths from deep vein thrombosis?
3. Is it considering the inclusion of information on the link between this pill and deep vein thrombosis in the summaries of product characteristics and package leaflets of these drugs?
4. Is the Commission considering launching an investigation into the safety of the various hormonal contraceptives currently on the market and their link with the risk of deep vein thrombosis?

**Question for written answer E-001232/13
to the Commission
Esther de Lange (PPE)
(6 February 2013)**

Subject: Use of the Diane-35 pill in Europe

On 31 January 2013, the French drugs regulatory agency (ANSM) removed the Diane-35 pill from the shelves. The French authorities opted for this measure because four women have died of thrombosis in the past 25 years after taking this pill.

The Diane-35 pill is sold and used throughout Europe. In the Netherlands the Diane-35 pill has been allowed on the market since 1987 and since then, some 370 000 women have taken this pill or a pill with the same active ingredient. According to the Dutch Medicines Evaluation Board (CBG), there is no reason to take the pill off the shelves in the Netherlands as yet.

Under European regulations, it is up to the Member States themselves to decide whether to allow the pill to go on the market, temporarily remove it from the shelves or completely ban it. An investigation into the effects and side effects of this pill may be launched through the European Medicines Agency (EMA) at the request of one or more EU Member States. Further to the investigation carried out by the Pharmacovigilance Risk Assessment Committee (PRAC), the Diane-35 pill could be banned in all EU Member States if it is found to be harmful to the health of European patients.

Is the Commission aware of the French regulatory agency ANSM's action in removing the Diane-35 pill from the shelves? Does the Commission agree with this measure? If not, why not?

Does the Commission consider it desirable for women in different Member States to receive different, and even conflicting, advice from their authorities on the safety of the Diane 35 pill?

Has one or more Member States submitted a request for an investigation into the Diane-35 pill by the European Medicines Agency? If not, is the Commission prepared to launch a European investigation itself into the effects and side effects of the Diane-35 pill through PRAC?

Does the Commission agree with the urgent need for such an investigation in order to ascertain whether or not the Diane-35 pill is harmful?

**Question for written answer E-001339/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(8 February 2013)**

Subject: France suspends Diane 35

— After an investigation that began with the complaint of a young stroke victim, the French National Agency for the Safety of Medicines and Health Products (ANSM) has established a link between the Diane 35 pill and deaths caused by deep vein thrombosis, and has thereby suspended sales of the drug.

— Following a request made by France, the European Medicines Agency (EMA) announced on Monday that it would examine third- and fourth-generation combined oral contraceptive pills, to determine whether or not their use should be restricted.

1. Is the Commission aware of this situation?
2. Does it have any research at its disposal to confirm these findings?

**Joint answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(12 March 2013)**

Diane 35 and its generics are medicinal products which have been authorised by Member States and are widely used across the EU. The authorised uses differ between Member States and include treatment of acne or contraception in women with hormone-related conditions such as acne, hirsutism (excessive growth of hair on the face) and alopecia (loss of hair).

The European Medicines Agency started a safety review of Diane 35 and its generics at its meeting in February 2013 ⁽¹⁾ in the framework of an urgency procedure ⁽²⁾ launched after France announced the plan to suspend the marketing authorisations for these products over the next three months.

The risk of venous thromboembolism with Diane 35 and its generics is low but well known, and warnings are included in their product information to alert patients and prescribers to the risks. In addition, it has been noted that in France they are widely used off label, meaning outside the authorised therapeutic indication, as a contraceptive.

⁽¹⁾ http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/medicines/human/referrals/Cyproterone_and_ethinylestradiol_containing_medicinal_products/human_referral_prac_000017.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac05805c516f.

⁽²⁾ Article 107i of Directive 2001/83/EC on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use, OJ L 311, 28.11.2001, as amended.

The Agency will evaluate all available evidence on the benefits and risks of these medicines and give a recommendation on whether their marketing authorisations should remain as they are, be varied, suspended or revoked, in the interest of all patients in the European Union.

As these medicines are all authorised nationally, the Agency's recommendation will be forwarded to a group of Member States representatives whose final position is expected to be adopted in May 2013.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000922/13
an die Kommission**

Jorgo Chatzimarkakis (ALDE)

(29. Januar 2013)

Betrifft: Fehlkalkulation bei den Sparmaßnahmen („Konsolidierung der öffentlichen Finanzen“) in Griechenland

In dem Arbeitspapier WP/13/1 des Internationalen Währungsfonds (IWF) zu Irrtümern bei Wachstumsprognosen und Multiplikatoren der öffentlichen Finanzen („Growth Forecast Errors and Fiscal Multipliers“), das im Januar 2013 veröffentlicht wurde, stellen die Autoren Olivier Blanchard und Daniel Leigh die Behauptung auf, dass der Zuwachs der Arbeitslosenrate und der Rückgang des Konsums der privaten Haushalte und der Investitionen, die mit der Konsolidierung der öffentlichen Finanzen einhergehen, deutlich unterschätzt worden seien.

Die Kommission wird vor dem Hintergrund der Schlussfolgerungen, die in dem Arbeitspapier des IWF gezogen wurden, um die Beantwortung der folgenden Fragen ersucht:

1. Hat die Kommission Kenntnis davon, wie sich die eingestandene Fehlkalkulation bei den Sparmaßnahmen, die Griechenland auferlegt wurden, auswirkt? Inwieweit verlässt sich die Kommission bei ihrer Politikgestaltung zur Konsolidierung der öffentlichen Finanzen Griechenlands auf die Angaben des IWF?
2. Welche konkreten Maßnahmen würde die Kommission als Teil der „Troika“ in Erwägung ziehen, um ihre Politik der Konsolidierung der öffentlichen Finanzen im Hinblick auf Griechenland anzupassen, damit die Fehlkalkulation ausgeglichen wird, die möglicherweise zu einer erheblichen Verschlechterung der wirtschaftlichen Lage des Landes geführt hat?

Antwort von Herrn Rehn im Namen der Kommission

(18. März 2013)

Die jüngsten Studien zum Fiskalmultiplikator sind wegen der Kürze ihres Zeithorizonts und anderer Faktoren, die das Wachstum in unerwartete Richtung beeinflusst haben könnten, nur begrenzt belastbar. Darin eingerechnet sind die Vertrauenseffekte, die nun zum Tragen kommen und von denen die anfälligen Länder profitieren. Berücksichtigt man hingegen das an den steigenden Staatsanleiherenditen ablesbare nachlassende Anlegervertrauen, so wird klar ⁽¹⁾, dass die vorliegenden Daten durchaus mit dem in den gängigen makroökonomischen Modellen verwendeten durchschnittlichen Multiplikator von unter eins zu vereinbaren sind.

Im Falle Griechenlands sind die jüngsten Studien von besonders eingeschränktem Nutzen, was auch in einer in der griechischen Presse veröffentlichten Stellungnahme des IWF-Chefökonom ⁽²⁾ bestätigt wird.

2009 hatte das Haushaltsdefizit 15,6 % des BIP erreicht und waren die Märkte nicht mehr zur Finanzierung des hohen griechischen Schuldenstandes bereit, weswegen im Frühjahr 2010 das Finanzhilfeprogramm eingeleitet wurde. In den ersten Programmjahren herrschte jedoch anhaltende Ungewissheit und gestaltete sich die Umsetzung problematisch. Seit letztem Sommer verläuft das griechische Programm nun aber wieder plangemäß. Die Einigung in der Eurogruppe vom vergangenen Dezember hat der allzu langen Ungewissheit über die Zukunft Griechenlands ein Ende gesetzt und den Weg für eine Rückkehr des Vertrauens geebnet. Unter diesen Umständen haben sich die Partner im Euroraum bereiterklärt, die Frist für die Haushaltskorrektur um zwei Jahre zu verlängern.

Nun ist es an den griechischen Behörden, durch entschlossene Umsetzung des Reformprogramms sicherzustellen, dass dieses Vertrauen weiter wächst.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2012/pdf/ee-2012-7_en.pdf, S. 41, Kasten 1.5.

⁽²⁾ Dieser stellte darin Folgendes fest: „Die schlechten Wirtschaftsdaten Griechenlands mit der Programmgestaltung in Verbindung zu bringen, ist eine grundlegende Fehlinterpretation der bisherigen Ergebnisse und der IWF-Forschungsarbeiten zu Fiskalmultiplikatoren. Hauptursache der aktuellen Probleme Griechenlands sind Ausgabenüberschreitungen in der Vergangenheit. Der Fiskalmultiplikator ist nur einer von vielen potenziellen Faktoren, die die wirtschaftliche Lage beeinflussen, und im Falle Griechenlands wurde dessen Einfluss durch andere unvorhergesehene Faktoren geschmälert.“

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000922/13
to the Commission**

Jorgo Chatzimarkakis (ALDE)

(29 January 2013)

Subject: Miscalculation regarding austerity measures ('fiscal consolidation') for Greece

In the International Monetary Fund (IMF) Working Paper WP/13/1 entitled 'Growth Forecast Errors and Fiscal Multipliers', published in January 2013, authors Olivier Blanchard and Daniel Leigh state that 'forecasters significantly underestimated the increase in unemployment and the decline in private consumption and investment associated with fiscal consolidation'.

In the light of the conclusions drawn in the IMF Working Paper, the Commission is invited to answer the following:

1. Is it aware of any impact of that admitted miscalculation regarding the implications of the austerity measures imposed on Greece? In formulating its policy of fiscal consolidation for Greece, to what degree did it rely on data provided by the IMF?
2. As part of the 'Troika', what concrete action would the Commission consider taking in order to adapt its fiscal consolidation policy for Greece to redress this miscalculation, which may well have harmed the economic situation in the country substantially?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission

(18 March 2013)

The robustness of recent studies on the fiscal multiplier is limited by their short time horizon and other factors that may have impacted on growth compared with what was expected. They include the confidence effects that are materialising now and from which the vulnerable countries are benefiting. If one takes into account the loss of investor confidence expressed by rising government bond yields, it has been shown⁽¹⁾ that the evidence is not inconsistent with an average multiplier smaller than one, as used in common macroeconomic models.

Recent studies are of particularly limited use when it comes to Greece, a view which was echoed in an opinion piece published in the Greek press by the IMF Chief Economist⁽²⁾.

In 2009, the fiscal deficit had reached 15.6% of GDP and markets were no longer willing to finance Greece's high debt levels. It led to the launch of the financial assistance programme in the spring of 2010. However, uncertainty and problems with implementation persisted in the first years of the programme. Since last summer, the Greek programme has been brought decisively back on track. The agreement in the Eurogroup last December has removed the damaging uncertainty that had been hanging over Greece for too long, and paved the way for a return of confidence. In this context, the euro area partners agreed to extend the timeline for fiscal adjustment by two years.

It is now up to the Greek authorities to ensure through determined implementation of the reform programme that this confidence continues to grow.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2012/pdf/ee-2012-7_en.pdf, p41, box 1, 5.

⁽²⁾ The IMF Chief Economist stated that to associate Greece's underperformance with programme design 'represents a fundamental misreading of the historical record and of the IMF's research on fiscal multipliers. The problems Greece is facing come fundamentally from past excesses. Regarding the fiscal multiplier, it is only one of many potential influences on economic outcomes, and in the case of Greece, its impact was dwarfed by other unanticipated factors'.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000923/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(29 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Recente aumento de capital do Banco Europeu de Investimento

Tendo em conta o seguinte:

- O Banco Europeu de Investimento (BEI) é constituído por acionistas que são os 27 Estados-Membros da União Europeia. O BEI levanta dinheiro nos mercados de capitais e empresta-o a taxas de juro reduzidas para financiar projetos relacionados com o melhoramento das infraestruturas, o aprovisionamento energético ou as normas ambientais, tanto na Europa como nos países vizinhos ou nos países em desenvolvimento;
- No ano passado, vários ministros europeus clamaram a necessidade de injetar mais dinheiro no BEI, por forma a aumentar a disponibilidade para financiar a atividade económica;
- O próprio Conselho Europeu de junho de 2012 clamou a necessidade de reforçar o capital do BEI, para minimizar a falta de crédito a projetos de investimento na Europa;
- No início de janeiro de 2013, o BEI anunciou um aumento de capital no valor de 10 mil milhões de euros, aumento este aprovado pelos 27 Estados-Membros da União Europeia, para incrementar o financiamento da economia e, assim, contribuir para a recuperação económica do continente;
- Segundo o Presidente do BEI, Werner Hoyer, «Estamos empenhados em trabalhar com as autoridades nacionais, investidores públicos e empresas para assegurar o uso eficaz dos empréstimos adicionais nos Estados-Membros e desbloquear investimento privado significativo para projetos»;
- Estima-se que esta quantia adicional de 10 mil milhões de euros permitirá à instituição conceder créditos adicionais de 60 mil milhões de euros ao longo de um período de três anos a projetos «economicamente viáveis» em toda a Europa;
- Portugal tem vindo a recorrer a sucessivos empréstimos do BEI, tendo por principal objetivo dinamizar a implementação do Quadro de Referência Estratégica Nacional (QREN);

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Quais as tipologias de projetos e as entidades em causa que deverão ser candidatas a este aumento de capital?
2. Há algum limite máximo que cada projeto possa receber?
3. Portugal ou algum outro Estado-Membro já apresentou algum projeto candidato a este crédito adicional de 60 mil milhões de euros?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(14 de março de 2013)

1. A capacidade adicional de concessão de empréstimos permitida pelo aumento de capital será veiculada através de um mecanismo para o crescimento e o emprego. Os empréstimos concedidos ao abrigo desse mecanismo serão repartidos de forma sensivelmente equitativa pelos seguintes quatro domínios, num total de 60 mil milhões de euros, ao longo de três anos:
 - Inovação e competências
 - Acesso das PME ao financiamento
 - Eficiência dos recursos
 - Infraestruturas estratégicas

2. Não existe um limite, em termos nominais, para o montante que cada projeto pode obter. No entanto, o BEI procederá a uma análise de crédito de cada projeto para avaliar a sua viabilidade financeira. O BEI financia normalmente menos de 50 % do custo de cada projeto, sendo o restante disponibilizado por outras instituições financeiras. Com base nas taxas de cofinanciamento tipicamente observadas, estima-se que a concessão adicional de empréstimos por parte do BEI no âmbito do mecanismo para o crescimento e o emprego venha a apoiar um investimento total da ordem dos 180 mil milhões de euros.

3. A concessão adicional de empréstimos por parte do BEI será disponibilizada a todos os Estados-Membros. O BEI tem avançado na sua reserva de projetos ao longo dos últimos meses, para que o capital novo seja disponibilizado sem demora desde o início do ano. No âmbito do Plano de Atividades do BEI para 2013-2015, aprovado pelo Conselho de Administração do BEI em dezembro de 2012, as assinaturas totais deverão aumentar, passando para 68 mil milhões de euros em 2013, com dados comparáveis em 2014 e 2015.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000923/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(29 January 2013)

Subject: Recent capital increase for the European Investment Bank

The 27 EU Member States are the shareholders of the European Investment Bank (EIB). The EIB raises money on the capital markets and lends it at reduced interest rates to finance projects related to improving infrastructure, energy supplies and environmental standards, both in Europe and in neighbouring and developing countries.

Last year, several European ministers stated the need to inject more money into the EIB in order to increase its ability to finance economic activity.

In June 2012, the European Council itself stated the need to increase EIB capital, to minimise the lack of credit for investment projects in Europe.

At the start of January 2013, the EIB announced a capital increase of EUR 10 billion, which was approved by all 27 EU Member States, to increase lending in the economy and thereby contribute to the EU's economic recovery.

According to the President of the EIB, Werner Hoyer, 'We are committed to working with national authorities, public investors and private business to ensure effective use of the additional lending across all member states and to unlock significant private investment for projects'.

It is estimated that this additional sum of EUR 10 billion will allow the institution to provide up to EUR 60 billion in additional lending over a three-year period for 'economically viable' projects across the European Union.

Portugal has obtained successive loans from the EIB, mainly to stimulate the implementation of the National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF).

1. What kinds of projects and bodies should benefit from this capital increase?
2. Is there an upper limit to what each project can receive?
3. Has Portugal or any other Member State nominated any projects to receive this additional credit of EUR 60 billion?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(14 March 2013)

1. The additional lending enabled by the capital increase will be delivered through a Growth and Employment Facility. Lending under the facility will be more or less evenly split between the following four areas, totalling EUR 60 billion over three years:

- innovation and skills
- SME access to finance
- resource efficiency
- strategic infrastructure

2. There is not a nominal limit to what each project can receive. However, the EIB will conduct a credit analysis of each project to assess its financial viability. The EIB normally finances less than 50% of the cost of any given project, the remainder being provided by other financial institutions. Based on typical co-financing rates, it is estimated that the EIB the additional lending under the Growth and Employment Facility will support total investment in the range of EUR 180 billion.

3. The additional EIB lending will be provided in all Member States. The EIB has been ramping up its project pipeline over the past few months, so that the fresh capital is deployed without delay right from the beginning of the year. Under the EIB's Corporate Operational Plan (COP) for 2013-2015, agreed by the EIB Board of Directors in December 2012, total signatures are set to increase to EUR 68 billion in 2013 with comparable figures in 2014 and 2015.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000924/13

à Comissão

Nuno Teixeira (PPE)

(29 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Regresso de Portugal aos mercados — I

Tendo em conta que:

- Na última reunião do Eurogrupo, nomeadamente a 22 de janeiro de 2013, Portugal solicitou um alargamento do prazo da amortização dos empréstimos concedidos pela *troika*, algo que pode facilitar o processo de regresso aos mercados, já que alivia as necessidades de emissão durante os próximos anos;
- O Comissário Europeu dos Assuntos Económicos, Olli Rehn, salientou que «Do ponto de vista da Comissão posso dizer que somos em princípio favoráveis»;
- No dia seguinte, o Ministério das Finanças de Portugal apresentou os dados da execução orçamental relativos ao passado mês de dezembro e revelam que, em contabilidade pública, o défice provisório das administrações públicas ascendeu a 8 328,8 milhões de euros, ou seja, 5 % do PIB;
- Este valor fica dentro dos limites acordados com as instituições internacionais com quem Portugal celebrou um acordo de assistência financeira para equilibrar as contas públicas;
- Na mesma semana o país regressou aos mercados, tendo recebido ofertas de procura no valor de 12 mil milhões de Euros, um valor seis vezes superior ao inicialmente estipulado e que levou o governo nacional a subir a oferta para 2,5 mil milhões de Euros;
- O sucesso da operação resultou também numa taxa de juro de 4,89 % e salienta-se ainda que a procura de obrigações foi em 93 % realizada por investidores estrangeiros;
- O regresso de Portugal aos mercados permitiu que as empresas portuguesas também se pudessem financiar a médio longo prazo, tendo a REN colocado 300 milhões de Euros, numa emissão a cinco anos, sendo que «dois terços foi para investidores internacionais». A procura mais do que duplicou a oferta, contribuindo para que a taxa tivesse ficado nos 4,2 %;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Qual o impacto financeiro do aumento para o dobro do tempo do prazo de pagamento da assistência financeira a Portugal?
2. Qual a grande mais valia que antevê para a economia portuguesa e europeia deste alargamento dos prazos de pagamento?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão

(18 de abril de 2013)

Os empréstimos concedidos a Portugal pelos dois instrumentos financeiros da União Europeia [Mecanismo Europeu de Estabilidade Financeira (MEEF) e Fundo Europeu de Estabilidade Financeira (FEEF)] têm um prazo de vencimento médio de cerca de 12,5 anos e 15 anos, respetivamente. Tanto o MEEF como o FEEF se financiam nos mercados à taxa de juro em vigor (que é muito baixa devido à boa notação de ambos os instrumentos) e emprestam esse dinheiro ao Estado português à mesma taxa de juro acrescida de uma (pequena) taxa de serviço. Não é possível quantificar o impacto financeiro de uma prorrogação do prazo de vencimento uma vez que este depende da taxa de juro à qual estes dois instrumentos se conseguem refinarciar por si próprios no momento em que um empréstimo pendente é «adiado» (por exemplo, é contraído um novo empréstimo com um prazo de vencimento mais longo para pagar o empréstimo inicial com um prazo de vencimento mais curto e a diferença do custo de refinanciamento de Portugal nos mercados).

O principal valor acrescentado de tal prorrogação para Portugal seria essencialmente o adiamento do reembolso dos empréstimos do MEEF e do FEEF para o período após 2025 ⁽¹⁾. Por conseguinte, o Estado português pode considerar que é mais fácil emitir dívida com um prazo de vencimento de 5 a 10 anos, no período imediatamente a seguir ao fim do programa e facilitando assim o regresso gradual do Estado no acesso aos mercados.

(1) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-307_en.htm?locale=en

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000924/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(29 January 2013)

Subject: Portugal's return to the markets — I

At the latest meeting of the Eurogroup on 22 January 2013, Portugal asked for an extension of the repayment deadline for loans made to it by the Troika. This could ease the country's return to the markets, as it would relieve the pressure on it to issue bonds over the next few years.

The European Commissioner for Economic Affairs, Olli Rehn, emphasised that the Commission supports this idea in principle.

The following day, the Portuguese Minister of Finance presented the budgetary implementation data for December 2012 and announced that, as far as public accounts were concerned, the provisional public administration deficit stood at EUR 8 328.8 million, or 5 % of GDP.

This figure falls within the limits Portugal agreed with the international institutions with which it signed a financial assistance agreement to balance its public accounts.

The country returned to the debt market that same week, where its offer was met with a demand of EUR 12 billion, more than six times the amount initially stipulated, which encouraged the Portuguese Government to increase its offer by EUR 2.5 billion.

The success of the operation also allowed an interest rate of 4.89 % to be set, with 93 % of the demand coming from overseas investors.

Portugal's return to the markets made it possible for Portuguese companies to obtain mid-to-long term finance. The national electricity company REN issued five-year debt bonds worth EUR 300 million, of which two thirds went to international investors. Demand almost doubled supply, which contributed to the interest rate being set at 4.2 %.

Can the Commission say:

1. What is the financial impact of doubling the loan repayment period for the financial aid granted to Portugal?
2. What does the Commission foresee as being the major added value for the Portuguese and European economy of this extension of the debt repayment deadline?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(18 April 2013)

The loans provided to Portugal by the two European financial facilities (European Financial Stability Mechanism (EFSM) and European Financial Stability Facility (EFSF) have an average maturity of close to 12.5 years and 15 years, respectively. Both the EFSM and the EFSF borrow money on the markets at the prevailing interest rate (which due to the good rating of both facilities is very low) and lend it on at the same rate plus a (small) service fee to the Portuguese state. It is not possible to quantify the financial impact of a maturity extension because this depends on the interest rate at which the two facilities can re-finance themselves at the point in time when an outstanding loan is 'rescheduled' (i.e. a new loan is taken up with a longer maturity to pay back the original loan with the shorter maturity and the difference to the refinancing cost of Portugal on the markets).

The major added value of such an extension for Portugal would be that the reimbursement of EFSM/EFSF loans will essentially be postponed to the period after 2025 ⁽¹⁾. As a consequence, the Portuguese state may find it easier to issue debt with a maturity of 5 to 10 years in the years right after the end of the programme, and thus facilitate the sovereign's gradual return to market access.

⁽¹⁾ http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-307_en.htm?locale=en.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000925/13

à Comissão

Nuno Teixeira (PPE)

(29 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Regresso de Portugal aos mercados — II

Tendo em conta que:

- Na última reunião do Eurogrupo, nomeadamente a 22 de janeiro de 2013, Portugal solicitou um alargamento do prazo da amortização dos empréstimos concedidos pela *troika*, algo que pode facilitar o processo de regresso aos mercados, já que alivia as necessidades de emissão durante os próximos anos;
- O Comissário Europeu dos Assuntos Económicos, Olli Rehn, salientou que «Do ponto de vista da Comissão posso dizer que somos em princípio favoráveis»;
- No dia seguinte, o Ministério das Finanças de Portugal apresentou os dados da execução orçamental relativos ao passado mês de dezembro e revelam que, em contabilidade pública, o défice provisório das administrações públicas ascendeu a 8 328,8 milhões de euros, ou seja, 5 % do PIB;
- Este valor fica dentro dos limites acordados com as instituições internacionais com quem Portugal celebrou um acordo de assistência financeira para equilibrar as contas públicas;
- Na mesma semana o país regressou aos mercados, tendo recebido ofertas de procura no valor de 12 mil milhões de Euros, um valor seis vezes superior ao inicialmente estipulado e que levou o governo nacional a subir a oferta para 2,5 mil milhões de Euros;
- O sucesso da operação resultou também numa taxa de juro de 4,89 % e salienta-se ainda que a procura de obrigações foi em 93 % realizada por investidores estrangeiros;
- O regresso de Portugal aos mercados permitiu que as empresas portuguesas também se pudessem financiar a médio longo prazo, tendo a REN colocado 300 milhões de Euros, numa emissão a cinco anos, sendo que «dois terços foi para investidores internacionais». A procura mais do que duplicou a oferta, contribuindo para que a taxa tivesse ficado nos 4,2 %;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Quanto é que Portugal terá de se financiar nos mercados internacionais nos próximos dez anos para fazer face às responsabilidades já assumidas com as instituições internacionais?
2. Como avalia o regresso de Portugal aos mercados e quais os principais motivos que terão contribuído para este sucesso alcançado?
3. Considera que as empresas portuguesas têm assim a possibilidade de recorrer mais facilmente aos mercados e se financiarem para posteriormente procederem a investimentos que alavanquem a economia portuguesa e criem emprego?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão

(11 de abril de 2013)

Embora o recente êxito do Governo na emissão de obrigações de longo prazo se deva, em grande medida, a uma execução global muito boa no contexto do programa de ajustamento económico, foi também facilitada por fatores externos, como as declarações do Banco Central Europeu e a «procura de rendimento» por parte dos investidores internacionais. A mais longo prazo, o regresso de Portugal aos mercados dependerá de vários fatores, sendo os mais importantes a sustentabilidade das finanças públicas e um crescimento económico dinâmico e equilibrado, os quais constituem os principais objetivos do programa.

O alargamento dos prazos para o reembolso dos empréstimos europeus, tal como acordado recentemente pelo Eurogrupo, pode também facilitar o regresso de Portugal aos mercados no período subsequente à vigência do programa, durante o qual a dívida soberana se pode tornar vulnerável às oscilações das perceções dos mercados. Esse alargamento poderá reduzir significativamente as necessidades financeiras do Estado nos próximos 10 anos, que terá de reembolsar 45 mil milhões de euros durante esse período apenas aos credores internacionais, tendo em conta os pagamentos já efetuados e o seu perfil atual de reembolso.

O restabelecimento do acesso aos mercados irá igualmente facilitar as condições de financiamento das empresas, o que permitirá a realização de investimentos tão necessários — uma condição prévia para o crescimento do produto e do emprego.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000925/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(29 January 2013)**

Subject: Portugal's return to the markets II

At the latest meeting of the Eurogroup on 22 January 2013, Portugal asked for an extension of the repayment deadline for loans made to it by the Troika. This could ease the country's return to the markets, as it would relieve the pressure on it to issue bonds over the next few years.

The European Commissioner for Economic Affairs, Olli Rehn, emphasised that the Commission supports this idea in principle.

The following day, the Portuguese Minister of Finance presented the budgetary implementation data for December 2012 and announced that, as far as public accounts were concerned, the provisional public administration deficit stood at EUR 8 328.8 million, or 5% of GDP.

This figure falls within the limits Portugal agreed with the international institutions with which it signed a financial assistance agreement to balance its public accounts.

The country returned to the debt market that same week, where its offer was met with a demand of EUR 12 billion, more than six times the amount initially stipulated, which encouraged the Portuguese Government to increase its offer by EUR 2.5 billion.

The success of the operation also allowed an interest rate of 4.89% to be set, with 93% of the demand coming from overseas investors.

Portugal's return to the markets made it possible for Portuguese companies to obtain mid-to-long term finance. The national electricity company REN issued five-year debt bonds worth EUR 300 million, of which two thirds went to international investors. Demand almost doubled supply, which contributed to the interest rate being set at 4.2%.

Can the Commission say:

1. How much finance will Portugal have to seek in the international markets over the next 10 years in order meet its existing financial commitments to the international institutions?
2. What is its assessment of Portugal's return to the markets and what are the main elements which have contributed to its success so far?
3. Does the Commission consider that this will make it easier for Portuguese enterprises to access the markets and obtain finance for future investments with which to revitalise the Portuguese economy and create employment?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(11 April 2013)**

While the government's recent success in issuing longer-term bonds is, to a significant degree, due to an overall very good implementation record in the context of the Economic Adjustment Programme, it was also favoured by external factors such as the announcements by the European Central Bank and the 'search for yield' of international investors. In the longer-term, Portugal's return to the market will depend on a number of factors, of which the most important ones will be sustainable public finances and dynamic and balanced economic growth, which are the main objectives of the Programme.

Extending the maturities for the redemption of European loans, as agreed recently by the Eurogroup, may also facilitate Portugal's return to markets in the period after the programme when the sovereign will remain vulnerable to swings in market sentiment. Such an extension would significantly reduce the financial needs of the sovereign over the next 10 years, which will have to repay EUR 45 billion over this period only to international lenders, taking into account disbursements already made and their current redemption profile.

Restoring market access will also ease financing conditions for companies which will help unleash badly needed investment, a precondition for output and employment growth.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000926/13

à Comissão

Nuno Teixeira (PPE)

(29 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Relações União Europeia — República da África do Sul

Considerando o seguinte:

- O atual quadro legal que rege as relações entre a União Europeia e a República da África do Sul (RAS) é o Acordo de Comércio, Desenvolvimento e Cooperação (ACDC), cuja assinatura data de 1999 e que entrou em vigor em 2004.
- O calendário de liberalizações do comércio entre a UE e a RAS foi completado no ano transato, incidindo em 90 % do total das relações comerciais entre os dois blocos.
- A adesão da RAS às negociações do Acordo de Parceria Económica, com vista a substituir o Acordo de Cotonou, insere-se nas negociações com o Grupo Comunidade de Desenvolvimento dos Países da África Austral.
- A UE é o mais importante parceiro comercial da África do Sul, tendo em 2010 sido responsável por 31 % do comércio da África do Sul.
- Até ao presente ano, a África do Sul beneficia de uma dotação para a cooperação no valor de 980 milhões de euros. A UE e os Estados-Membros são os principais doadores de ajuda a este país, representando cerca de 70 % da totalidade dos fundos de cooperação. Trata-se de uma ajuda substancial para ajudar a África do Sul a criar postos de trabalho e melhorar os seus sistemas de educação e saúde, contribuindo, assim, para a estabilidade social.
- O Reino do Lesoto, o Reino da Suazilândia e a República do Botswana, membros da CDAA, assinaram um acordo interino de parceria económica e são também membros da União Aduaneira da África Austral.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. De que forma a assinatura dos acordos interinos influencia as negociações do Acordo de Parceria Económica com a RAS? A multiplicidade de estruturas de integração económica regional é um entrave negocial, tendo em conta os objetivos económicos e comerciais entre a UE e a RAS?
2. Qual a estimativa da Comissão sobre o impacto económico que o futuro Acordo de Parceria Económica com a RAS terá na UE?
3. Existe algum relatório da Comissão que faça um balanço da aplicação da ajuda ao desenvolvimento disponibilizada pela UE ao abrigo do ACDC?

Resposta dada por Karel De Gucht em nome da Comissão

(26 de março de 2013)

1. O Reino do Lesoto, o Reino da Suazilândia e a República do Botswana rubricaram e assinaram um Acordo de Parceria Económica (APE) provisório que ainda não foi ratificado. Atualmente, estes mesmos países estão envolvidos conjuntamente com a República da África do Sul em negociações com a UE por forma a concluírem um APE mais amplo e abrangente. As negociações anteriores no quadro do APE provisório ajudaram os nossos parceiros a desenvolver importantes experiências. É por esta razão que o acordo provisório não tem efeito negativo nas atuais negociações.

O APE é uma ótima oportunidade para aproximar os países do APE que são os mesmos da Comunidade para o Desenvolvimento da África Austral (SADC), em termos de comércio e investimento, assim como em termos das medidas sanitárias e de segurança que utilizam.

2. Os países membros do grupo APE SADC com os quais a UE negocia terão um melhor acesso aos mercados da UE, do que aquele que a UE lhes pede para si mesma. Contudo, o nível superior de acesso proporcionado à República da África do Sul será mais limitado do que o dos países da SADC, tendo em conta o desenvolvimento económico da RAS. A República da África do Sul e a UE estão presentemente ligadas pelo Acordo de Comércio, Desenvolvimento e Cooperação (ACDC).

Enquanto se aguardam os resultados das negociações, será prematuro adiantar um impacto económico preciso.

3. Além do Relatório Anual da EuropAid ⁽¹⁾, a Comissão apresenta informação sobre a implementação da sua ajuda ao desenvolvimento para a República da África do Sul também através do Relatório Anual de Atividades e do Relatório de Acompanhamento da Ajuda Externa, que são igualmente transmitidos ao Parlamento Europeu.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/multimedia/publications/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000926/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(29 January 2013)

Subject: European Union–Republic of South Africa relations

The current legal framework that governs relations between the European Union and the Republic of South Africa (RSA) is the Trade Development and Cooperation Agreement (TDCA), which was concluded in 1999 and entered into force in 2004.

The liberalisation schedules between the EU and the RSA were completed last year, and represent 90 % of bilateral trade between the two parties.

The RSA entered negotiations on the Economic Partnership Agreement, which is intended to replace the Cotonou Agreement, as part of the Southern African Development Community (SADC).

The EU is South Africa's main trading partner, and in 2010 it was responsible for 31 % of trade in South Africa.

Up to this year, South Africa has received development cooperation funding amounting to EUR 980 million. The EU and the Member States are the country's main aid donors, providing around 70 % of all cooperation funding. This is a substantial amount to help South Africa create jobs and improve its education and health systems, thereby contributing towards social stability.

The Kingdom of Lesotho, the Kingdom of Swaziland, and the Republic of Botswana, all members of the SADC and also members of the Southern African Customs Union, have concluded a temporary economic partnership agreement.

1. How does the conclusion of these temporary agreements affect negotiations with the RSA on the Economic Partnership Agreement? Are the numerous regional economic integration structures an obstacle to negotiations, bearing in mind the economic and trade objectives between the EU and the RSA?
2. What economic impact does the Commission think that the future Economic Partnership Agreement with the RSA will have on the EU?
3. Has the Commission produced a report on how development aid provided by the EU has been implemented under the TDCA?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(26 March 2013)

1. Lesotho, Swaziland, and Botswana have initialled and signed an interim Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA) but this has not yet been ratified. At present these same countries are engaged together with South Africa in talks with the EU to conclude a wider and comprehensive EPA. Earlier negotiations on the interim EPA have helped develop important experience for our partners. This is why the interim agreement has no negative effect on the current ongoing negotiations.

The EPA is a good opportunity to bring the Southern African Development Community (SADC) EPA group members closer in terms of trade and investment regime as well as in the sanitary and safety standards they employ.

2. The countries in the SADC EPA group with which the EU negotiates will get better access to EU markets, than the access they are asked to grant to the EU. However, the level of improved access granted to South Africa will be more limited than the other SADC countries given the economic development of the country. South Africa and the EU are presently bound by the 2004 Trade, Development and Cooperation Agreement.

Pending the outcome of the negotiations, it will be premature to indicate a precise economic impact.

3. Besides EuropeAid's Annual Report ⁽¹⁾, the Commission reports on the implementation of its development assistance to South Africa also through the Annual Activity Report and the External Assistance Monitoring Report, that are all transmitted to the European Parliament.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/multimedia/publications/index_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000927/13

à Comissão

Nuno Teixeira (PPE)

(29 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Centro Internacional de Negócios da Madeira, vulgo Zona Franca da Madeira

O estudo da Universidade de Strathclyde (2009), apresentado à Comissão pelas entidades portuguesas, mostra que a nova fase do regime de benefícios fiscais a aplicar à Zona Franca da Madeira (ZFM) levou à deslocação (para as Ilhas do Canal, Malta, Chipre, Luxemburgo, Holanda, Suíça, Irlanda e Áustria) de um número significativo de empresas com operações substanciais na ZFM.

De acordo com o referido estudo de 2009, a ZFM reforça a sustentabilidade e diversificação da economia regional como um todo. A contribuição da ZFM, em 2002 e de acordo com os dados do Governo Regional da Madeira, passou a ser de 21 % do PIB regional. De acordo com a mesma fonte, o setor financeiro da ZFM, hoje descontinuado, contribuiu com 70 %, 48 % e 49 % do VAB da ZFM nos anos 2000, 2001 e 2002, respetivamente. A ZFM contribuiu para a atração de quadros técnicos qualificados: 40 % dos trabalhadores diretamente afetos às empresas sediadas na ZFM possuíam um grau académico igual ou superior ao de licenciados.

Os Estados-Membros são responsáveis pelo seu próprio controlo sobre os seus sistemas fiscais com vista a prevenir a evasão fiscal, sem que para tal condicionem negativamente os países e regiões com sistemas fiscais preferenciais legitimamente adotados e em conformidade com todas as regras internacionais referentes à regulamentação do setor financeiro. O setor financeiro é também um gerador de postos de trabalho — veja-se o caso das Ilhas do Canal e das jurisdições caribenhas.

Tendo em conta o acima exposto, solicito à Comissão que responda ao seguinte:

1. Sabendo que os custos de fixação, produção e transporte nas RUP são mais elevados para as atividades industriais e que a geração de empregos qualificados é por vezes menor, por que motivo decidiu a Comissão retirar as atividades financeiras e os serviços intragrupo da abrangência da ZFM? A exclusão do setor financeiro não exclui a oportunidade de geração de outros postos de trabalho para a população da região?
2. O grau de atividade da ZFM não depende diretamente da sua atratividade fiscal?
3. Existe «*path dependence*» da economia regional face à ZFM? De que forma é que a diminuição efetiva da atratividade fiscal afetou e afetará a economia regional? Como pretende a Comissão obviar este efeito?

Resposta dada por Joaquín Almunia em nome da Comissão

(25 de março de 2013)

De acordo com as normas em matéria de auxílios regionais ⁽¹⁾, devido à natureza específica dos serviços financeiros e das atividades intragrupo, os auxílios ao funcionamento concedidos para estas atividades têm apenas uma probabilidade muito reduzida de promover o desenvolvimento regional, mas um risco muito elevado de distorção da concorrência. Por conseguinte, a Comissão não poderia, em princípio, aprovar auxílios ao funcionamento no setor dos serviços financeiros ou destinados a atividades intragrupo. Assim sendo, os serviços financeiros não podem beneficiar de tratamento preferencial na Zona Franca da Madeira (ZFM), razão pela qual foram excluídos do regime da ZFM.

A Comissão pretende apoiar o desenvolvimento das regiões ultraperiféricas, de modo a que estas se tornem mais autossuficientes, mais robustas do ponto de vista económico e mais aptas a criar emprego sustentável. Conforme se reconhece no artigo 349.º do TFUE, subsistirão sempre condicionalismos importantes. O artigo 107.º, n.º 3, alínea a), do TFUE reconhece explicitamente as regiões ultraperiféricas como regiões em que o auxílio estatal pode ser concedido para promover o desenvolvimento económico, tendo em conta a sua situação estrutural, económica e social.

⁽¹⁾ Orientações relativas aos auxílios estatais com finalidade regional para o período 2007-2013, JO C 54 de 4.3.2006, p. 13.

No contexto das normas em matéria de auxílios com finalidade regional, a Comissão continuará a autorizar auxílios para compensar os custos adicionais de transporte e outros custos operacionais resultantes do exercício da maioria das atividades económicas nas regiões ultraperiféricas. Este tipo de auxílios é permitido, desde que as vantagens de que as empresas beneficiam sejam proporcionais às deficiências que a região em causa enfrenta na sua condição de região ultraperiférica e desde que o auxílio contribua para o desenvolvimento regional da Madeira. As normas relativas aos auxílios regionais permitem também a concessão de auxílios para promover novos investimentos, os quais, de facto, contribuem para o desenvolvimento da economia regional.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000927/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(29 January 2013)

Subject: International Business Centre of Madeira: Madeira Free Zone

The 2009 University of Strathclyde study, presented to the Commission by the Portuguese authorities, shows that the new phase of the tax incentive regime to be applied to the Madeira Free Zone (MFZ) has led to a significant number of companies with substantial operations in the MFZ moving to the Channel Islands, Malta, Cyprus, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Ireland and Austria.

According to this 2009 study, the MFZ enhances the sustainability and diversification of the regional economy as a whole. According to data from the Regional Government of Madeira, in 2002 the MFZ generated 21 % of regional GDP. According to the same source, the financial sector of the MFZ, now defunct, accounted for 70 %, 48 % and 49 % of the GAV of the MFZ in the years 2000, 2001 and 2002, respectively. The MFZ helped to attract qualified personnel: 40 % of personnel employed by companies based in the MFZ were educated to graduate level or above.

Member States are responsible for controlling their own tax systems so as to prevent tax evasion, without negatively affecting the countries and regions with preferential systems that have been legitimately adopted and that meet international rules on the regulation of the financial sector. The financial sector also creates jobs — examples of this can be seen in the Channel Islands and the Caribbean jurisdictions.

1. Given that setting up, production and transportation costs in the outermost regions are higher for industrial activities and that it is sometimes harder to create skilled jobs, why did the Commission decide to exclude financial activities and intragroup services from the MFZ? Does the exclusion of the financial sector not also exclude the opportunity to create more jobs for the population of the region?
2. Does the level of activity in the MFZ not depend directly on its fiscal attractiveness?
3. Is there 'path dependence' for the regional economy in the light of the MFZ? How has the effective reduction of fiscal attractiveness affected the regional economy, and how will it affect it in the future? How does the Commission intend to tackle this?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2013)

According to the Regional Aid rules ⁽¹⁾, because of the specific nature of financial and intra-group activities, operating aid granted for these activities has only a very limited likelihood of promoting regional development but a very high risk of distorting competition. Therefore the Commission cannot in principle approve any operating aid to the financial services sector, or for intra-group activities. Accordingly, financial services cannot receive preferential treatment in the Zona Franca da Madeira, which is why they have been excluded from the ZFM scheme.

The Commission aims to support the development of the outermost regions so that they become more self-reliant, economically more robust and better able to create sustainable jobs. As recognised in Article 349 TFEU, important constraints will always remain. Article 107(3)(a) TFEU explicitly recognises the outermost regions as regions where state aid can be granted to promote economic development in view of their structural, economic and social situation.

In the context of regional aid rules, the Commission will continue authorising aid to compensate the additional transport and other operating costs arising in the pursuit of most economic activities in outermost regions. This type of aid is allowed, as long as the corresponding advantages enjoyed by the companies are proportional to the handicaps that this region faces as an outermost region, and as long as the aid contributes to the regional development of Madeira. Regional aid rules also allow for aid for promoting new investments that indeed contribute to the development of the regional economy.

⁽¹⁾ Guidelines on national regional aid for 2007-2013, OJ C 54 of 4.3.2006, p. 13.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000928/13
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(29 January 2013)**

Subject: Mobile phone scam in Ireland

Mobile phone users in Ireland have been receiving calls from a Slovenian premium rate number. This number begins with the prefix +386, which is easily confused with Irish mobile phone numbers using the international code for Ireland and having a number beginning with 086 — e.g. +35386. When people answer a call from this premium rate number, or call it back, it uses all of their call credit or leaves them with an extortionate mobile phone bill.

1. Is the Commission aware of this mobile phone scam?
2. Is the Commission aware of any similar scams being operated in other Member States?
3. What does the Commission intend to do to prevent cross-border scams, such as this one, occurring in the future?

**Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(20 March 2013)**

The specific scheme referred to by the Honourable Member has not been brought to the attention of the Commission. However the Commission is aware of consumer disquiet over this issue in general and is working with the Body of European Regulators for Electronic Communications (BEREC) on the adoption of reinforced procedures for cooperation between the relevant national authorities, and with the involvement of operators, in cases of fraud and misuse in the sector ⁽¹⁾.

The EU regulatory framework provides national authorities with tools to act in relation to problems that exist within their national markets and to impose remedies when appropriate. In particular, Article 28 of Directive 2002/22/EC (Universal Service Directive-USD) ⁽²⁾ contains an obligation that equips national authorities with the possibility to require undertakings providing public communication networks and services to block, on a case-by-case basis, access to numbers and services where it is justified by reasons on fraud or misuse.

⁽¹⁾ Article 28(2) Universal Service Directive: A harmonised BEREC cooperation process — Consultation paper: http://berec.europa.eu/eng/document_register/subject_matter/berec/public_consultations/?doc=979

⁽²⁾ OJ L 108, 24.4.2002, p. 51.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000929/13
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(29 January 2013)**

Subject: Suicide rates among young people

The number of suicides in Ireland rose from 495 in 2010 to 525 in 2011, while 232 people committed suicide there in the first half of 2012. Following on from this, it has been found that the suicide rate among young people in Ireland is very high, especially among young men. 165 teenagers took their own lives in Ireland in 2011, and the suicide rate among young men in Ireland is one of the highest in Europe. We have a moral obligation to address the issue of suicide and to work to reduce suicide rates across all Member States.

1. What is the Commission doing to tackle the issue of suicide and reduce suicide rates?
2. What is it doing to reduce suicide among young people?
3. What does it recommend governments to do in order to reduce the number of suicides?
4. Would it support the development of specialised mental health associations that would have the power to impose whatever measures they felt necessary to tackle the issues of suicide and self-harm, and would address other issues such as the stigma which is often attached to mental health? If so, would the Commission advise the creation of such bodies at national level, or of one such body at European level?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(18 March 2013)**

The Commission is very sensitive to the worrying trend of suicide which remains a significant cause of premature death in the EU, with over 50,000 deaths a year.

In June 2011, the Council adopted conclusions inviting Member States to develop strategies or action plans on mental health including depression and suicide prevention ⁽¹⁾.

In this context, on February 2013 the Commission launched a Joint Action with the Member States on Mental Health and Well-being under the EU Health Programme. One of the objectives of this Joint Action is to develop a framework of action to tackle depression and to help prevent suicide.

The Joint Action will build on the significant number of projects in this area carried out with the financial support of the EU Health Programme and Research Framework Programmes, some of them with a specific focus on young people.

In addition, in December 2009, the Commission co-organised a conference on prevention of depression and suicide under the European Pact for Mental Health and Well-being. This conference highlighted that prevention of suicide needs to involve multiple stakeholders and acknowledge the role of non-professionals and that vulnerable and high-risk groups should be especially targeted.

The Commission has no mandate to make judgments about the bodies which organise suicide prevention activities in Member States, nor does it have the competence to set up a European body to regulate these matters.

⁽¹⁾ Council Conclusions on 'The European Pact for Mental Health and Well-being: results and future action'.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000930/13
do Komisji**

Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)

(29 stycznia 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Procedury dotyczące potencjalnie skażonego mleka w proszku

Trwają procedury związane z wycofywaniem produktów mogących zawierać skażone mleko w proszku w niektórych produktach firmy Magnolia Sp. z o.o. Potencjalne skażenie zostało wykryte przez Główny Inspektorat Sanitarny w Polsce, a informacja o tym incydencie została niezwłocznie wysłana do Komisji Europejskiej, w ramach europejskiego systemu wczesnego ostrzegania RASFF.

Jak wynika z wypowiedzi polskiego ministra rolnictwa istnieją podejrzenia, że w sprawie zatrucia mleka mamy do czynienia z przestępstwem, a przypadek ten jest incydentalny.

Na tym tle doszło do nieporozumień między Polską a Słowacją. Jak wynika z informacji słowackiej agencji TASR ze sprzedaży wycofano również polskie produkty, które nie zawierały mleka w proszku. W sprawie zanieczyszczonego mleka interweniowały w Komisji Europejskiej dodatkowo władze Słowacji.

Zwracam się zapytaniem:

1. Czy system wczesnego ostrzegania RASFF okazał się w tym przypadku wystarczający?
2. Czy rozszerzone procedury wycofywania produktów z rynku wydają się Komisji Europejskiej uzasadnione?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Tonía Borga w imieniu Komisji

(25 marca 2013 r.)

W art. 14 rozporządzenia (WE) nr 178/2002 ⁽¹⁾ przewiduje się, że żywności nie należy wprowadzać do obrotu, jeśli nie jest ona bezpieczna. Właściwy organ może dokonać odrębnej oceny każdego przypadku. W związku z powyższym żywność, co do której uznano, że nie jest bezpieczna, musi zostać wycofana z obrotu niezależnie od tego, czy jej dystrybucja odbywa się na szczeblu krajowym czy unijnym. Komisja w pełni wspiera tę procedurę, jako że stanowi ona główną zasadę prawa żywnościowego UE.

Celem systemu wczesnego ostrzegania o niebezpiecznej żywności i paszach (RASFF) jest umożliwienie państwom członkowskim transgranicznej, pozostającej w obrębie rynku wewnętrznego wymiany informacji o możliwych zagrożeniach związanych z bezpieczeństwem żywności i cel ten został w odpowiedni sposób osiągnięty. Na samych państwach członkowskich spoczywa jednak odpowiedzialność za przekazanie do RASFF prawidłowych informacji oraz za wykonywanie przepisów unijnych.

⁽¹⁾ Dz.U. L 31 z 1.2.2002, s. 1-24.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000930/13
to the Commission
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
(29 January 2013)

Subject: Procedures for potentially contaminated milk powder

Procedures are under way relating to the withdrawal of products of the company Magnolia Sp. z o.o. that may contain contaminated milk powder. The potential contamination was discovered by the Chief Sanitary Inspectorate in Poland, and information about the incident was immediately sent to the European Commission as part of the RASFF early warning system.

As is clear from the statement by the Polish Minister for Agriculture, it is suspected that the milk poisoning is criminal in nature, and that this case is an incidence of it.

In this context, a misunderstanding has arisen between Poland and Slovakia. According to information from the Slovak TASR agency, Polish products that do not contain milk powder have also been withdrawn from sale. In addition, the Slovak authorities have intervened with the European Commission regarding the contaminated milk.

I would like to enquire:

1. Did the RASFF early warning system prove adequate in this case?
2. Does the European Commission believe that the extended procedure for the withdrawal of products from sale is justified?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2013)

Article 14 of Regulation (EC) No 178/2002⁽¹⁾ provides that food shall not be placed on the market if it is unsafe. A case-by-case assessment can be done by the competent authority. Accordingly, food that is considered not to be safe has to be re-called from the market regardless of whether its distribution is national or at EU level. This procedure is fully supported by the Commission as it is a core principle of the EU food law.

The purpose of the Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed (RASFF) is to allow Member States to exchange information on possible food safety hazards across national borders within the internal market and this was fulfilled in an adequate manner. However, Member States themselves are responsible for the correct information submitted to the RASFF and for the implementation of EU legislation.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 31, 1.2.2002, p. 1-24.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000931/13
adresată Comisiei
Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D)
(29 ianuarie 2013)

Subiect: Produsele chimice periculoase din articolele de îmbrăcăminte

În conformitate cu raportul Greenpeace din 2012 intitulat „Toxic Threads: the Big Fashion Stitch-Up”, diverse produse chimice periculoase sunt prezente într-o gamă largă de articole de îmbrăcăminte. Unele dintre aceste substanțe au fost încorporate în mod deliberat în materialele produselor, în timp ce altele sunt doar urme de substanțe chimice folosite în procesul de fabricație. Aceasta înseamnă că, în orice moment din ciclul de viață al unui articol de îmbrăcăminte, se pot elibera în mediu produse chimice periculoase.

Dat fiind faptul că articolele de îmbrăcăminte care conțin produse chimice periculoase emit substanțe periculoase în mediu oriunde ar fi în lume (nu doar în locurile în care sunt fabricate), rugăm Comisia să prezinte ce măsuri sunt luate în următoarele scopuri:

1. creșterea numărului de fabricanți de articole de îmbrăcăminte care se angajează să reducă la zero cantitatea de produse chimice periculoase deversate până în 2020;
2. urmărirea măsurilor luate de fabricanții de articole de îmbrăcăminte pentru a respecta aceste angajamente;
3. creșterea transparenței informațiilor furnizate de fabricanții de articole de îmbrăcăminte cu privire la deversarea de substanțe toxice de către furnizori;
4. sensibilizarea publicului la faptul că industria îmbrăcăminte folosește substanțe periculoase și la impactul negativ al acestor substanțe asupra sănătății oamenilor și asupra mediului?

Răspuns dat de dl Borg în numele Comisiei
(22 martie 2013)

Distinsul membru este invitat să consulte răspunsurile Comisiei la întrebările E-010799/2012 și E-011060/2012 ⁽¹⁾.

Legislația UE, în special Regulamentul REACH, Directiva privind emisiile industriale și Directiva-cadru privind apa, impun restricții în ceea ce privește utilizarea substanțelor periculoase la produsele textile comercializate în UE sau privind deversările și emisiile acestor substanțe în aer, sol și apă.

Implementarea și/sau aplicarea legislației respective intră în atribuțiile autorităților competente ale statelor membre. Autorizațiile de mediu pentru producția textilă prevăd utilizarea „celor mai bune tehnici disponibile” și instalațiile de producție sunt inspectate în mod regulat. Emisiile în apă ale diferitelor substanțe poluante sunt înregistrate în Registrul European al emisiilor și transferului de poluanți. În cazul în care există un risc inacceptabil pentru sănătatea umană sau pentru mediu care trebuie să fie abordat la nivelul UE, procesul de restricționare REACH poate fi inițiat.

Comisia promovează îmbrăcăminte cu un grad ridicat de performanță de mediu prin utilizarea etichetei ecologice UE ⁽²⁾. Criteriile acesteia pentru textile vizează în mod special reducerea poluării apei legată de procesele cheie ale fabricării textilelor, limitând folosirea substanțelor periculoase și crescând transparența în rândul lanțului valoric al produselor.

Consumatorii sunt informați cu privire la anumite produse periculoase disponibile pe piață sau la frontierele UE prin intermediul site-ului sistemului rapid de alertă al UE pentru produse nealimentare (RAPEX) ⁽³⁾.

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

⁽²⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/ecolabel>

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/dyna/rapex/rapex_archives_en.cfm

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000931/13
to the Commission
Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D)
(29 January 2013)**

Subject: Hazardous chemicals in clothing

According to the 2012 Greenpeace report 'Toxic Threads: the Big Fashion Stitch-Up', various hazardous chemicals are present in a broad range of clothing. Some of these substances have been incorporated deliberately in the materials of the products while others are traces of chemical substances used in manufacturing processes. This means that hazardous chemicals could be released into the environment at any point in the life cycle of a clothing article.

Given the fact that clothing products containing hazardous chemicals release dangerous substances into the environment wherever they are in the world (not only where they are produced), can the Commissions state what measures are being taken in order to:

1. increase the numbers of clothing manufacturers committed to reducing the discharge of hazardous chemicals to zero by 2020;
2. follow up on the measures taken by clothing manufacturers to meet those commitments;
3. increase transparency on the part of clothing manufacturers with regard to discharges of toxic substances by suppliers;
4. increase public awareness of the clothing industry's use of dangerous substances and the negative impact of these substances on human health and the environment?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(22 March 2013)**

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to questions E-010799/2012 and E-011060/2012 ⁽¹⁾.

EU legislation, notably the REACH Regulation, the Industrial Emissions Directive and the Water Framework Directive, impose restrictions on the use of dangerous substances in textile products marketed in the EU or on the discharges and emissions of such substances to air, soil and water.

The implementation and/or enforcement of that legislation falls to Member States' competent authorities. Textile manufacturing environmental permits require the use of 'Best Available Techniques', and production facilities are regularly inspected. The emissions to water of various polluting substances are recorded in the European Pollutant Release and Transfer Register. Where there is an unacceptable risk to human health or the environment that needs to be addressed at EU level, the REACH restriction process may be initiated.

The Commission promotes clothing with high environmental performance through the use of the EU Ecolabel ⁽²⁾. Its criteria for textiles specifically aim at reducing water pollution related to key processes of textile manufacture, limiting the use of hazardous substances, and increasing transparency along the products' value chain.

Consumers are informed through the website of the EU Rapid Alert System for non-food products (RAPEX) ⁽³⁾ about specific dangerous products found on the market or at EU borders.

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

⁽²⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/ecolabel/>

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/dyna/rapex/rapex_archives_en.cfm

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000932/13
adresată Comisiei
Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D)
(29 ianuarie 2013)

Subiect: Deșeurile toxice din Ucraina

Dat fiind faptul că, din cauza stării sale precare, depozitul de deșeuri toxice din regiunea Ivano Frankivsk din Ucraina de Vest reprezintă o amenințare reală la adresa mediului, aș dori să întreb Comisia dacă monitorizează situația din regiune și ce măsuri ia pentru a preveni un dezastru care ar determina deversarea a 2 milioane de tone de reziduuri toxice în râul Nistru — un dezastru care ar afecta nu doar Ucraina, ci și Moldova și România.

Răspuns dat de dl Potočník în numele Comisiei
(21 martie 2013)

În martie 2010, Ucraina a solicitat UE și ONU să îi acorde asistență pentru monitorizarea riscurilor asociate sitului în chestiune, aflat în regiunea Ivano-Frankovsk, lângă orașul Kalush, și să facă propuneri cu privire la această situație. Prin intermediul Centrului de monitorizare și de informare gestionat de Direcția Generală Ajutor Umanitar și Protecție Civilă (DG ECHO), Comisia Europeană a trimis experți UE la fața locului și a emis recomandări concrete. Autoritățile ucrainene au raportat că a fost inițiat procesul de îndepărtare a substanțelor chimice depozitate în Kalush. Acestea au fost transportate în Marea Britanie și Polonia, spre a fi retratate. Comisia este pregătită să asiste în continuare Ucraina în această problemă.

Într-un sens mai larg, Comisia încurajează statele suverane să recunoască faptul că este extrem de important ca deșeurile să fie bine gestionate din punctul de vedere al protecției mediului și să existe o bună coordonare între donatori. Pentru a aborda această problemă sub toate aspectele sale, Comisia Europeană a lansat un proiect regional având ca obiect „Îmbunătățirea capacității de eliminare a pesticidelor perimate recurente, ca model de abordare a situației substanțelor chimice periculoase neutilizate din fosta Uniune Sovietică”. Ucraina este invitată să ia parte la proiect.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000932/13
to the Commission**

Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D)

(29 January 2013)

Subject: Toxic waste in Ukraine

Given the fact that, due to its precarious state, the toxic waste dump in the Ivano Frankivsk region of Western Ukraine represents a real threat to the environment, I would like to ask the Commission if it is monitoring the situation in that region and what measures it is taking in order to prevent a disaster that would lead to 2 million tonnes of toxic residues reaching the River Dniester — a disaster that would affect not only Ukraine but also Moldova and Romania.

Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission

(21 March 2013)

In March 2010, Ukraine asked for EU and UN assistance to monitor the risks deriving from this site, located in the Ivano-Frankovsk region near the city of Kalush, and to make proposals. The European Commission sent EU experts to the site, using the Monitoring and Information Centre operated by DG ECHO, and issued specific recommendations. The Ukrainian authorities report that the removal of chemicals stored in Kalush has started. Chemicals have been transported to Great Britain and Poland for retreatment. The Commission stands ready to further assist Ukraine on this issue.

More generally, the Commission encourages sovereign States to recognise that environmentally sound management of waste and proper coordination among donors are of crucial importance. To tackle this problem comprehensively the European Commission launched a regional project on 'Improving capacities to eliminate and prevent recurrence of obsolete pesticides as a model for tackling unused hazardous chemicals in the former Soviet Union'. Ukraine is invited to subscribe to the project.

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000933/13
à la Commission**

Christine De Veyrac (PPE)

(29 janvier 2013)

Objet: Taxe carbone dans l'aviation — profits d'aubaine pour certaines compagnies aériennes

Depuis le 1^{er} janvier 2012, la taxe carbone européenne est en vigueur au sein de l'Union. Dans un premier temps, cette taxe oblige les compagnies aériennes opérant au sein de l'Union, sans distinction de nationalité d'origine, à acheter 15 % de leurs émissions de CO₂ pour lutter contre le réchauffement climatique.

Cette législation européenne autorise les compagnies aériennes à imputer les coûts d'achats de leurs émissions sur les prix des billets, ainsi que le montant fictif de 85 % des droits à polluer restants qui leurs sont octroyés gratuitement pour l'instant.

Cependant, la Commission européenne, dans le but d'obtenir un accord international sur cette taxation, a gelé l'application de cette taxe pour les vols intercontinentaux à destination ou au départ de l'Union européenne jusqu'à la prochaine assemblée générale de l'Organisation de l'aviation civile internationale (OACI) prévue à l'automne 2013.

Le gel de l'application de cette taxe pour les vols intercontinentaux a donc permis à certaines compagnies aériennes de réaliser des profits d'aubaine puisque celles-ci auraient imputé les coûts de cette taxe carbone aux voyageurs sans déboursier le moindre centime en retour. Il est à noter que les majorations de prix varieraient entre 2 et 14 euros par trajet pour l'année 2012.

Une étude publiée en janvier 2013 par l'organisation «Transport et Environnement» évaluerait ce profit d'aubaine à 1,3 milliard d'euros.

1. Afin d'évaluer réellement ce profit d'aubaine, la Commission prévoit-elle de mener une étude indépendante pour déterminer le montant payé en plus par les usagers pour l'année 2012?
2. Si la Commission obtient des informations plus précises dans le futur, cette dernière prévoit-elle de communiquer sur le sujet et d'épingler les compagnies aériennes qui n'ont pas joué le jeu?
3. La Commission a-t-elle un moyen d'action pour inciter les compagnies aériennes, qui ont facturé des coûts additionnels à leurs clients, à reverser l'argent reçu aux voyageurs ou à des organismes qui luttent contre le réchauffement climatique?

Réponse donnée par Mme Hedegaard au nom de la Commission

(6 mars 2013)

Les analyses effectuées par certains instituts de recherche et ONG apportent des contributions intéressantes aux discussions en cours au sujet du mérite et des effets de l'intégration de l'aviation dans le système de quotas d'émission. Néanmoins, il est impossible de vérifier l'importance des éventuels gains exceptionnels en raison de la complexité des politiques tarifaires des compagnies aériennes. De plus, la Commission estime que l'incidence financière de la décision suspensive est plutôt insignifiante parce que son champ d'application est limité à une seule année et que les prix du carbone ont récemment atteint un niveau très bas. Par ailleurs, la concurrence entre les compagnies aériennes devrait limiter les gains exceptionnels.

C'est pourquoi la Commission n'envisage pas de réaliser une étude sur le sujet.

Les choix en matière de tarification et d'utilisation des profits relèvent du pouvoir décisionnel de l'entreprise. L'objectif du système d'échange de quotas d'émission de l'Union européenne est de proposer des choix rentables permettant de réduire les émissions et non d'imposer aux compagnies aériennes ou autres une tarification de leurs services. Cela étant dit, la Commission apprécierait évidemment que les compagnies aériennes qui réaliseraient un quelconque gain exceptionnel en raison de l'amendement suspensif affecteraient volontairement ce gain aux mesures visant à atténuer les effets du changement climatique.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000933/13
to the Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(29 January 2013)**

Subject: Aviation carbon tax — windfall profits for certain airlines

The European carbon tax has been in force within the EU since 1 January 2012. This tax means that airlines operating within the EU, regardless of their country of origin, are initially obliged to purchase 15 % of their CO₂ emissions in order to combat global warming.

The European legislation allows airlines to add the costs of purchasing emissions to ticket prices, as well as the notional cost of the remaining 85 % of their rights to pollute which they are currently allocated free of charge.

In an attempt to reach an international agreement on this tax, however, the European Commission has frozen its application to intercontinental flights to or from the European Union until the next general assembly of the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) planned for autumn 2013.

The fact that this tax has been frozen for intercontinental flights has therefore allowed certain airlines to make windfall profits, since they apparently passed on the costs of the carbon tax to travellers without spending a penny in return. The 2012 price increases varied between EUR 2 and EUR 14 per journey.

A study published in January 2013 by the organisation 'Transport and Environment' estimated the value of this windfall profit at EUR 1.3 billion.

1. In order to obtain an accurate estimate of this windfall profit, is the Commission planning to carry out an independent study in order to find out how much extra was paid by airline users in 2012?
2. If the Commission obtains more accurate information in future, is it planning to pass on this information or to identify those airlines which did not play fair?
3. Is there any way for the Commission to encourage airlines which passed on these additional costs to travellers to return the money, or to donate it to organisations fighting global warming?

**Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(6 March 2013)**

The analyses carried out by some NGOs and research institutes are interesting contributions to the ongoing discussions on the merits and effects on aviation's inclusion in the ETS. However, the magnitude of possible windfall gains is impossible to verify given the complexity of pricing policies of airlines. Moreover, the Commission considers the financial impact of 'stop-the-clock' decision as rather small because its scope is limited to only one year and carbon prices have recently been at a very low level. Furthermore, competition between airlines is likely to limit windfall gains.

The Commission has therefore no plans to carry out a study on the topic.

Any choices relating to pricing and use of profits fall under the remit of corporate decision making. The purpose of the EU ETS is to enable cost-effective abatement choices rather than to tell airlines or others how to price their services. This said, the Commission would of course welcome if airlines that would happen to make any windfall due to the stop-the-clock amendment would voluntarily commit these to climate mitigation actions.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000935/13
to the Commission**

Derek Roland Clark (EFD)

(29 January 2013)

Subject: Road bridge design

Is there a European design standard for the construction of road bridges? If so, is it retrospective and can it thus be invoked in the case of problems caused by a road bridge 60 years after its construction?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission

(2 April 2013)

The European Standardisation Organisation CEN has developed European design codes for several materials used in structural design called the 'Eurocodes' ⁽¹⁾. These standards are also covering the structural design of bridges ⁽²⁾. 'Eurocodes' were published in 2006. National standardisation bodies had to remove all conflicting national standards until 2010.

It should be stressed that technical standards are documents that have to take new methods, research and practical experience into account to remain useful instruments. Therefore, it has to be assumed that, in a period of 60 years state of the art of designing and building, any bridge has changed and references to the currently used 'Eurocodes' would not be possible.

⁽¹⁾ <http://eurocodes.jrc.ec.europa.eu/home.php>

⁽²⁾ http://eurocodes.jrc.ec.europa.eu/doc/1110_WS_EC2/report/Bridge_Design-Eurocodes-Worked_examples-main_only.pdf

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000936/13
a la Comisión
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(29 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: Situación de los profesores de idiomas en las universidades de Italia

Las universidades italianas mantienen a día de hoy diferentes contratos con las personas que enseñan lenguas extranjeras. Esta disparidad afecta a sus retribuciones, a sus derechos pasivos y a la duración de los contratos. Aunque sucesivas sentencias de los tribunales nacionales han obligado a convertir en fijos muchos contratos eventuales, aún se mantienen numerosos contratos temporales y precarios, vinculados a tareas de carácter estructural que deberían ser cubiertas con personal fijo. La controversia fue objeto ya de sentencias de los tribunales europeos en los años 1993, 2001, 2006 y 2008. Todas ellas abogaban por corregir las diferencias de todo orden que afectan a personas que desempeñan iguales funciones y dejar de abusar de la contratación temporal.

Sin embargo, pese a las sentencias que han dado lugar a modificaciones normativas (la última aprobada en 2010) continúa la dispersión de figuras contractuales, lo que supone un imperfecto cumplimiento de las sentencias citadas. La problemática afecta a ciudadanos de toda la Unión Europea pues estos trabajos son desempeñados por personal procedente de otros Estados que aporta a las universidades italianas la cualidad de enseñar su propio idioma en facultades y centros lingüísticos. Además, desde que dejó de sancionarse al Estado italiano con una importante multa diaria a consecuencia de las sentencias citadas, se han dado interpretaciones de la ley y modificaciones de los contratos locales que empeoran notablemente la situación de estos trabajadores. En consecuencia:

1. ¿Conoce la Comisión la problemática de los lectores y los colaboradores expertos lingüísticos que se produce en las universidades italianas?
2. ¿Considera la Comisión que las modificaciones legislativas producidas han servido para cumplir las sentencias de los tribunales de justicia europeos que afectan al caso?
3. ¿Considera la Comisión que esta situación jurídica y las inestabilidades que produce son el mejor marco para facilitar la movilidad de profesores de lenguas entre universidades europeas y promover la enseñanza de las lenguas de los Estados miembros en las universidades italianas?

Respuesta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(26 de marzo de 2013)

La Comisión es consciente de la controversia que existe sobre la contratación de personal para la enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras en universidades italianas y los cambios legislativos que han tenido lugar.

Hay dos investigaciones en curso sobre este asunto. Una de ellas estudia la posible discriminación del personal afectado por causa de su nacionalidad. La otra investigación estudia presuntas infracciones de las normas de la UE en relación con contratos de trabajo de duración determinada. Evaluar los efectos de los cambios legislativos forma parte de dichas investigaciones, que se llevan a cabo dentro del marco de EU Pilot.

A la luz de las últimas informaciones proporcionadas por las autoridades italianas, la Comisión está ultimando su evaluación sobre la situación de los profesores de lenguas extranjeras («lettori») y de los colaboradores y expertos lingüistas («collaboratori e esperti linguistici», CEL) en Italia a fin de determinar si se ha infringido o no el Derecho de la UE.

Simplificar los procedimientos administrativos para el acceso al empleo de los ciudadanos de los distintos Estados miembros de la UE y ofrecerles oportunidades laborales atractivas son factores primordiales del esfuerzo común cuyo fin es mejorar la enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras. No obstante, el modo en que se constituye el marco para promover la enseñanza de idiomas, que debe respetar los principios de no discriminación de la UE, no deja de ser una competencia nacional.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000936/13
to the Commission
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(29 January 2013)

Subject: Situation of language teachers in Italian universities

Italian universities continue to provide different contracts to those who teach foreign languages. This disparity affects their pay, pension rights and contract duration. Although successive rulings by national courts have forced many universities to make temporary contracts permanent, many temporary and precarious contracts still remain, linked to structural tasks that should be covered by permanent staff. The dispute was the subject of European court rulings in 1993, 2001, 2006 and 2008. All of these advocated that universities should correct all forms of discrepancies that affect people who carry out equal roles and should stop taking advantage of temporary contracts.

However, despite the rulings, which have led to regulatory changes (the last was adopted in 2010), the dispersion of contractual arrangements continues, which means that these rulings are not being properly complied with. The problem affects citizens from across the European Union, as these jobs are performed by staff from other Member States who provide Italian universities with teaching services in their native language in universities and language centres. Furthermore, since the considerable daily fine imposed on Italy as a result of those rulings has lapsed, there have been interpretations of the law and changes to local contracts that have significantly worsened the situation of these workers.

1. Is the Commission aware of the problem surrounding language assistants and expert language workers in Italian universities?
2. Does it believe that the legislative changes made have helped to enforce European court rulings on the matter?
3. Does it believe that this legal situation and the resulting instability is the best framework in which to facilitate the movement of language teachers between European universities and to promote the teaching of the official EU languages in Italian universities?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(26 March 2013)

The Commission is aware of the controversy surrounding the employment of foreign-language teaching staff at Italian universities and the regulatory changes that took place in this respect.

Two enquiries are ongoing on this issue, one focusing on possible discrimination on the grounds of the nationality of the staff concerned and the other looking at alleged breaches of the EU rules regarding fixed-term employment contracts. Assessing the effects of the legislative changes is part of these enquiries which are carried out in the framework of EU-Pilot.

In the light of the latest information received from the Italian authorities, the Commission is currently finalising its evaluation of the situation of foreign language lecturers (*lettori*) and *collaboratori e esperti linguistici* (CELs) in Italy to establish whether or not there is a violation of EC law.

Simplifying the administrative procedures for the employment of EU citizens from different Member States and offering them attractive job opportunities is an essential element of the common effort aimed at improving the teaching of foreign languages. However, how to establish a framework — which must respect EU principles of non-discrimination — to promote teaching of foreign languages remains a national competence.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000937/13
an die Kommission
Kerstin Westphal (S&D)
(29. Januar 2013)

Betrifft: Verbesserter LKW-Unterschutz

Jedes Jahr werden allein in Deutschland circa 40 PKW-Insassen bei Auffahrunfällen von Lastwagen tödlich und etwa 1 300 Personen schwer verletzt. Hauptursachen für das hohe Verletzungsrisiko sind die schwachen Verbindungen des Unterschutz-Systems mit dem LKW-Rahmen. Studien belegen (<http://vc-compatibleproject.net>), dass die Kosten für die Verbesserung des Systems bei rund 100 EUR pro Fahrzeug liegen und die Zahl der Getöteten um 57 %, die der Schwerverletzten um 67 % verringern könnte.

1. Zieht die Kommission aus den oben geschilderten Gründen eine Revision der Richtlinie 70/221/EWG, zuletzt geändert durch 2006/20/EG, in Betracht, um insbesondere die Bestimmungen zum Unterschutz im Anhang anzupassen?
2. Welche Änderungen in der UNECE-Verordnung 58 strebt die Kommission an?

Antwort von Herrn Tajani im Namen der Kommission
(14. März 2013)

Mit der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 661/2009 über die Typgenehmigung von Kraftfahrzeugen [...] und selbstständigen technischen Einheiten für diese Fahrzeuge] hinsichtlich ihrer allgemeinen Sicherheit ⁽¹⁾ hob der Gesetzgeber die Vorschriften der Richtlinie 70/221/EWG [...] über die Behälter für flüssigen Kraftstoff und den Unterschutz von Kraftfahrzeugen und Kraftfahrzeuganhängern ⁽²⁾ auf und ersetzte sie durch die entsprechende UN/ECE-Regelung Nr. 58 (Regelung der Wirtschaftskommission der Vereinten Nationen für Europa). Daher werden neue Fahrzeugtypen seit dem 1. November 2012 nur noch nach der UN/ECE-Regelung Nr. 58 genehmigt und nicht mehr nach der Richtlinie 70/221/EWG. Die Kommission beabsichtigt deshalb nicht, Änderungen an der Richtlinie 70/221/EWG vorzuschlagen.

Die UN/ECE-Arbeitsgruppe für allgemeine Sicherheit erörtert derzeit einen Vorschlag Deutschlands zur Änderung der Regelung Nr. 58, um das Sicherheitsniveau von Einrichtungen für den hinteren Unterschutz zu verbessern. Insbesondere wird vorgeschlagen, solche Einrichtungen niedriger zu machen, um zu verhindern, dass Autos im Falle eines Aufpralls unter den Lastwagen/Anhänger geraten. Darüber hinaus wird vorgeschlagen, die Belastung, der derartige Einrichtungen standhalten können, zu erhöhen.

Die Tieferlegung derartiger Einrichtungen führt bei einigen schweren Nutzfahrzeuge allerdings zu praktischen Problemen (z. B. Manövrierfähigkeit an steilen Hängen, Geländefahrzeuge). Darüber hinaus unterscheiden sich die Unfalldaten bezüglich Zusammenstößen zwischen Personenkraftwagen und Nutzfahrzeugen in Deutschland von anderen EU-Mitgliedstaaten (z. B. kommt es in Frankreich seltener zu tödlichen Unfällen wegen solcher Zusammenstöße). Aus diesem Grund sind die Erörterungen auf Expertenebene im Hinblick auf die Einigung über einen endgültigen Entwurf noch nicht abgeschlossen.

Die Kommission und die Mitgliedstaaten nehmen aktiv an dieser Diskussion teil. Wenn es auf UN/ECE-Ebene zu einer Einigung kommt, wird die entsprechende Änderung für die Zwecke der EU-Gesamtfahrzeug-Typgenehmigung übernommen.

⁽¹⁾ ABL L 200 vom 31.7.2009, S. 1.

⁽²⁾ ABL L 76 vom 6.4.1970, S. 23.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000937/13
to the Commission
Kerstin Westphal (S&D)
(29 January 2013)

Subject: Improved under-run protective device for lorries

In Germany alone around 40 car occupants are killed every year in rear-end collisions involving lorries, while about 1 300 persons are seriously injured. The main reasons for the high risk of injury are the weak connections between the under-run protective system and the chassis of the lorry. Studies (<http://vc-compat.rtdproject.net>) show that the costs of improving the system are around EUR 100 per vehicle and that fatalities could be reduced by 57 % and serious injuries by 67 %.

1. In the light of the information outlined above, is the Commission considering revising Directive 70/221/EEC, last amended by 2006/20/EC, in order to modify the provisions in relation to under-run protective devices in the annex in particular?
2. What changes to UNECE Regulation No 58 is the Commission seeking to make?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(14 March 2013)

With Regulation (EC) 661/2009 on the general safety of motor vehicles ⁽¹⁾, the legislator repealed the rear underrun protection requirements of Directive 70/221/EEC relating to fuel tanks and rear underrun protection of motor vehicles ⁽²⁾, and replaced them by the corresponding UNECE Regulation No 58 (Regulation of the Economic Commission for Europe of the United Nations). Therefore, since 1 November 2012, new types of vehicles shall only be approved according to UNECE Regulation No 58 and not according to Directive 70/221/EEC. Consequently, the Commission does not intend to make a proposal for amendment to Directive 70/221/EEC.

The UNECE working group on General Safety is currently discussing a proposal from Germany to amend Regulation No 58 increasing the safety level of rear underrun protection devices. It is in particular proposed to decrease the height of such devices to further avoid that cars go under the truck/trailer in case of crash. Furthermore, it is proposed to increase the force level that can withstand such devices.

However, the height reduction for such devices raises practical problems for some heavy goods vehicles (e.g. manoeuvrability in big slopes, off road vehicles). Furthermore, the accident data regarding crashes between cars and commercial vehicles is different in Germany and in other EU Member States (e.g. less fatality frequency in France due to this crash configuration). Therefore the discussion is still going on at expert level to agree on a final draft.

The Commission and Member States participate actively in this discussion. When an agreement is found at UNECE level, the amendment will be taken on board for the purpose of EU whole-vehicle type-approval.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 200, 31.7.2009, p. 1.

⁽²⁾ OJ L 76, 6.4.1970, p. 23.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000938/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(29 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Σύνδεση λιμανιών Μπουργκάς-Αλεξανδρούπολης και σύνδεση του τελευταίου με το οδικό και σιδηροδρομικό δίκτυο

Στόχος της σύνδεσης των λιμανιών Μπουργκάς - Αλεξανδρούπολης είναι η μεταφορά εμπορευμάτων με εμπορευματοκιβώτια στο πλαίσιο των συνδυασμένων μεταφορών και η λειτουργία των δύο λιμανιών ως διαμετακομιστικών κέντρων για την ταχέως αναπτυσσόμενη εμπορικά ευρύτερη περιοχή της Μαύρης Θάλασσας και η παράκαμψη του κορεσμένου, από πλευράς ναυσιπλοΐας, Βοσπόρου. Το νέο λιμάνι της Αλεξανδρούπολης έχει ολοκληρωθεί και οι δύο λιμενικοί οργανισμοί έχουν συμφωνήσει και έχουν καταθέσει πρόταση για την ηλεκτροκίνηση της γραμμής Sea2Sea η οποία εγκρίθηκε από την Επιτροπή.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Προβλεπόταν η σύνδεση του λιμανιού της Αλεξανδρούπολης με το εθνικό οδικό και σιδηροδρομικό δίκτυο όταν εγκρίθηκε η κατασκευή του, μέσω του Β' και Γ' Κοινοτικού Πλαισίου Στήριξης; Εάν ναι, για πότε προβλεπόταν η ολοκλήρωσή της;

Τον Οκτώβριο 2012 εντάχθηκε το έργο της σιδηροδρομικής σύνδεσης του λιμανιού στο Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης, ο συνολικός προϋπολογισμός για το οποίο είναι 4 εκ. ευρώ. Με αυτά τα δεδομένα, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή, εάν έχει υπάρξει έγκριση έργου για τη σύνδεση του λιμανιού και αν ναι, να καταθέσει την οικονομοτεχνική μελέτη του έργου, δεδομένου ότι η φυσική απόσταση μεταξύ του λιμανιού και της σιδηροδρομικής γραμμής είναι μόλις 300 μέτρα.

Εάν το συγκεκριμένο λιμάνι έχει πρόβλημα καθαρισμού από εναπόθεση άμμου, τι έργα τυχόν προβλέπονται για την αντιμετώπιση του προβλήματος και με βάση ποια οικονομοτεχνική μελέτη προγραμματίζονται; Ελήφθησαν τα θέματα αυτά υπόψη στην αρχική οικονομοτεχνική μελέτη του λιμένος της Αλεξανδρούπολης;

Επίσης, με δεδομένη τη σημασία του έργου της σύνδεσης των δύο λιμανιών, που θα μπορούσε να προσφέρει στην τοπική οικονομία άμεσα εκατοντάδες θέσεις εργασίας, υγιή εξωστρεφή έσοδα για τον ΟΣΕ, φορολογικά και λιμενικά έσοδα, κ.λπ. και, σε συνέχεια δημοσιευμάτων του Τύπου, με βάση τα οποία η Επιτροπή έχει εγκρίνει την μελέτη για την ηλεκτροκίνητη σιδηροδρομική σύνδεση των λιμανιών, στο πλαίσιο του διαδρόμου «Sea2Sea», με βάση ποια προκαταρκτικά οικονομοτεχνικά στοιχεία και δεδομένα εγκρίθηκε η πραγματοποίηση της μελέτης για την προώθηση των διαμετακομιστικών μεταφορών;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(27 Μαρτίου 2013)

Ο λιμένας της Αλεξανδρούπολης συνδέεται ήδη με το σιδηροδρομικό δίκτυο. Τον Ιανουάριο του 2013, στο πλαίσιο του προγράμματος «Μακεδονία και Θράκη» το έργο επέκτασης του σιδηροδρομικού δικτύου από τον λιμένα της Αλεξανδρούπολης στον σταθμό εμπορευματοκιβωτίων επελέγη για στήριξη από το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης. Ο προσωρινός προϋπολογισμός του έργου ανέρχεται σε 4 920 000 ευρώ και αναμένεται να ολοκληρωθεί το 2015.

Βάσει της αρχής της επιμερισμένης διαχείρισης, οι εθνικές και περιφερειακές αρχές είναι υπεύθυνες για την επιλογή, την υλοποίηση και την παρακολούθηση των έργων που χρηματοδοτούνται από την ΕΕ. Με εξαίρεση τα «μεγάλα έργα» (δηλαδή έργα προϋπολογισμού άνω των 50 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ), τα κράτη μέλη δεν υποβάλλουν στην Επιτροπή μελέτη σκοπιμότητας ή άλλου είδους μελέτες. Στην προκειμένη περίπτωση, περισσότερες πληροφορίες μπορούν να ζητηθούν από την ενδιάμεση αρχή διαχείρισης του προγράμματος «Ανατολική Μακεδονία και Θράκη», στην ακόλουθη διεύθυνση:

οδός Ηροδότου 28
69 100 Κομοτηνή
anmathraki@mou.gr

Όσον αφορά την ανάπτυξη ενός πολυτροπικού διαδρόμου μεταφοράς φορτίου που θα συνδέει το Αιγαίο με τη Μαύρη Θάλασσα, βρίσκεται υπό εκπόνηση και χρηματοδοτείται στο πλαίσιο του προγράμματος ΔΕΔ-Μ μια μελέτη σκοπιμότητας⁽¹⁾ που είχε προταθεί από την Ελλάδα και τη Βουλγαρία. Το συνολικό κόστος ανέρχεται σε 1,5 εκατομμύρια ευρώ και η συμμετοχή της ΕΕ σε 750 000 ευρώ. Στη μελέτη διερευνάται η σκοπιμότητα και η βιωσιμότητα της σιδηροδρομικής σύνδεσης μεταξύ των λιμένων της Βορειοανατολικής Ελλάδας (της Καβάλας και της Αλεξανδρούπολης) και του Δούναβη-Μαύρης Θάλασσας μέσω των βουλγαρικών λιμένων Μπουργκάς, Βάρνας και Ruse.

⁽¹⁾ Επονομαζόμενη επίσης μελέτη «Sea2Sea»

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000938/13
to the Commission**

Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)

(29 January 2013)

Subject: Connection between the ports of Burgas and Alexandroupolis and linking the latter to the road and rail network

The aim of linking the ports of Burgas and Alexandroupolis is to transport containerised freight in intermodal transport and to operate the two ports as transit centres for the commercially fast-growing Black Sea area, bypassing the Bosphorus which is saturated with shipping. The new port of Alexandroupolis has been completed and the two port authorities have come to an agreement and submitted a proposal for the electrification of the Sea2Sea line approved by the Commission.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

Was it planned to build a link between the port of Alexandroupolis and the national road and rail network, when construction of the port was approved, under the 2nd and 3rd CSF? If so, when was it expected to be completed?

In October 2012, the project of a rail link to the port was included in the Regional Development Fund, and endowed with a total budget of EUR 4 million. In view of this, can the Commission say whether the project to connect the port has been approved and, if so, can it submit the feasibility study for the project, since the physical distance between the port and the railway line is only 300 metres?

If this port has trouble with sand clearance, what projects may be envisaged to address the problem and on the basis of what feasibility study are they being planned? Were these issues taken into account in the initial feasibility study for the port of Alexandroupolis?

Finally, given the importance of the project of connecting the two ports, which could immediately provide the local economy with hundreds of jobs and generate healthy, outward-looking revenue for the Greek Railways Board and tax and port revenue, etc. and, in the light of media reports that the Commission has approved the study for electric rail link between the ports as part of the 'Sea2Sea' corridor, on the basis of which preliminary feasibility and data was the realisation of the study to promote transit traffic authorised?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission

(27 March 2013)

The Alexandroupolis port is already connected to the railway. In January 2013, under the 'Macedonia & Thrace' programme, the project for the extension of the railway from the port of Alexandroupolis to the container hub was selected for European Regional Development Fund support. The estimated budget is EUR 4 920 000 and the project is expected to be completed by 2015.

Under the shared management principle, national and regional authorities are responsible for the selection, implementation and monitoring of EU funded projects. With the exception of 'major projects', (i.e. projects over EUR 50 million), Member States do not send feasibility or other studies to the Commission. In this case, further information could be provided by the intermediate managing authority of East Macedonia & Thrace, at the following address:

Irodotou Street, 28
69100 Komotini
anmathraki@mou.gr

Concerning the development of a multimodal freight corridor to connect the Aegean and the Black Seas, a feasibility study ⁽¹⁾ proposed by Greece and Bulgaria is currently being carried out, financed under the TEN-T programme. The total cost is EUR 1.5 million with an EU contribution of EUR 750 000. The study explores the feasibility and viability of the rail connection between the North-East Greece ports (Kavala and Alexandroupolis) and the Danube — Black Sea via the Bulgarian ports of Burgas, Varna and Ruse.

⁽¹⁾ Also known as the 'Sea2Sea' study.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000940/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(29 gennaio 2013)**

Oggetto: Norme di sicurezza per le discoteche

La tragedia che ha provocato 250 vittime nella discoteca «nigth club Kiss», nel centro della città universitaria Santa Maria nel sud del Brasile, pone in primo piano ancora una volta, e con urgenza, la questione delle misure di sicurezza nei luoghi chiusi in cui la gente si riunisce per divertirsi. Non dovrebbero essere concesse autorizzazioni alle discoteche che non rispondono a requisiti precisi di sicurezza, con parametri che tengano conto delle dimensioni dei luoghi e del numero massimo delle persone che possono contenere, oltre che dei sistemi di illuminazione e di trasporto dell'energia elettrica.

Di fronte a queste tragedie, che periodicamente seminano lutti in questo o quel continente, la Commissione:

1. non riterrebbe opportuno definire per i luoghi di grande aggregazione severi protocolli di sicurezza, comprendenti anche norme precise per i controlli e la vigilanza da esercitare, al fine di escludere che, anche in presenza di norme corrette, si rischino tragedie dovute a negligenza?
2. In caso negativo, non potrebbe invitare i governi a predisporre regole severe quali indicate al punto 1?

**Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(14 marzo 2013)**

Il problema dei provvedimenti di sicurezza nei locali e negli edifici, ivi compresi i luoghi chiusi destinati all'intrattenimento, è motivo di seria preoccupazione per la Commissione Europea, la quale si impegna a valutare adeguatezza e rispetto delle norme Europee esistenti, provvedendo eventualmente a prendere provvedimenti ulteriori a livello Europeo.

I risultati della suddetta valutazione saranno di riferimento nella definizione dei futuri interventi a livello europeo, miranti a garantire livelli di sicurezza adeguati a chi fruisca dei vari servizi nell'intera Unione Europea.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000940/13
to the Commission**

Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)

(29 January 2013)

Subject: Safety standards for nightclubs

The tragedy that claimed the lives of 250 people inside the Kiss nightclub, in the centre of the university town of Santa Maria in southern Brazil, once again highlights, with some urgency, the issue of safety measures in enclosed spaces in which people gather to enjoy themselves. Licences should not be granted to nightclubs that fail to meet specific safety requirements, with parameters that take into account the size of the premises and the maximum number of people they can hold, as well as the lighting and electricity distribution systems.

In the face of these tragedies, which regularly claim lives on one continent or another, does the Commission not think it advisable to develop strict safety protocols for crowded places, including clear rules on the checks and supervision to be carried out, in order to rule out the risk of tragedies occurring due to negligence, even when appropriate standards are in place?

If not, could it not call on the governments to lay down strict rules of the type indicated above?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission

(14 March 2013)

The safety of premises and buildings, including those dedicated to entertainment services, is an issue of concern which is being examined by the European Commission in order to assess whether existing EU rules and their implementation are adequate and if there is a need to take further action at EU level.

The results of this assessment will be taken into account when considering future EU actions, with a view to ensuring a high level of safety for consumers when using services across the EU.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000941/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(29 gennaio 2013)**

Oggetto: Tassare la carne

La Svezia avrebbe chiesto di tassare il consumo delle carni per scoraggiarne l'uso a fini di tutela ambientale e animale. Se la notizia fosse vera, corrisponderebbe all'ennesimo tentativo di penalizzare un settore produttivo attraverso pretesi fini di ecosostenibilità usati per scardinare gli assetti concorrenziali. È indubbio, infatti, che tassare il consumo delle carni corrisponde a destabilizzare il mercato comunitario di prodotti alimentari di origine animale, attentando da un lato ai trattati europei e dall'altro portando azioni di disturbo allo scacchiere del commercio internazionale.

Può la Commissione far sapere se:

1. conferma la notizia;
2. ritiene che utilizzare il secondo fine dell'ecologia sia una strategia ormai smascherata utile a spostare pesi e oneri sulle spalle dei Paesi competitori, come già è accaduto all'Italia che con il suo export alimentare di grande qualità altre volte è stata slealmente messa in competizione da Paesi senza tradizioni alimentari;
3. è consapevole che alcuni Paesi europei, tra i quali l'Italia, hanno una bilancia commerciale in attivo proprio grazie alle esportazioni delle produzioni alimentari;
4. è disponibile per un'operazione tendente a penalizzare questa positiva realtà esportatrice?

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001558/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(13 febbraio 2013)**

Oggetto: Proposta svedese per una tassa UE sulla carne: pericolo per il settore zootecnico italiano e veneto

Recentemente il Consiglio per l'agricoltura svedese ha proposto che l'Europa imponga una tassa sulla carne. La Svezia ritiene che il settore della produzione della carne sia una fonte di eccessivo inquinamento e corresponsabile del fenomeno del riscaldamento globale. Lo scopo dell'imposta proposta sarebbe proprio quello di disincentivare il consumo di carne e la sua produzione.

Può la Commissione far sapere se è a conoscenza dei fatti sopra descritti?

Considerando che lo scopo di questa tassazione è disincentivare la produzione di un intero settore di mercato, ha la Commissione valutato i danni che essa causerebbe, in termini occupazionali ed economici, al comparto zootecnico della produzione, della distribuzione e della vendita al dettaglio in territori come quello Veneto, che da solo fornisce oltre il 30 % della carne prodotta in Italia?

Non ritiene la Commissione che l'introduzione di tale tassa creerebbe una distorsione nel mercato interno pregiudicando il settore zootecnico?

**Risposta congiunta di Dacian Cioloș a nome della Commissione
(22 marzo 2013)**

La Commissione è a conoscenza della relazione «*Sustainable meat consumption — What is it? What do we get? (Consumo sostenibile di carne — di che si tratta? Che cosa ne ricaviamo?)*» pubblicato dal Consiglio svedese dell'agricoltura nel gennaio 2013 e disponibile per il pubblico sul sito Internet: www.jordbruksverket.se. La relazione in questione raccomanda di limitare il consumo di carne al fine di ridurre le emissioni di gas a effetto serra provenienti dalla produzione alimentare. Sollecita anche norme in materia ambientale e incentivi economici quali, ad esempio, tasse ambientali o sovvenzioni volte a influenzare il comportamento dei consumatori.

Le tasse sui prodotti alimentari non sono oggetto di armonizzazione nell'ambito dell'UE e gli Stati membri possono introdurre imposte nazionali non armonizzate e fissarne liberamente le modalità sempreché tali imposte non comportino una tassazione discriminatoria su prodotti simili di altri Stati membri. Occorre tener conto del fatto che, per alcuni Stati membri, i prodotti alimentari costituiscono una proporzione considerevole del volume degli scambi e che la fiscalità può influenzare i flussi commerciali.

Tuttavia, per il momento non vi sono progetti di legislazione nazionale in materia di tassazione della carne in Svezia.

Inoltre la Commissione sta attualmente elaborando metodologie volte a valutare l'impatto ambientale dei prodotti e delle organizzazioni nell'ambito dell'*European Food Sustainable Consumption and Production Round Table* (Tavola rotonda sul consumo e la produzione sostenibili dei prodotti alimentari europei).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000941/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(29 January 2013)**

Subject: Taxing meat

Sweden has apparently called for a tax on the consumption of meat in order to discourage its use on environmental protection and animal welfare grounds. If the report is true, it will represent yet another attempt to penalise a productive sector for 'environmental sustainability reasons', which are cited in order to destroy competition. There is no doubt, in fact, that a tax on meat consumption will destabilise the EU animal foodstuffs market, undermining the European Treaties, on the one hand, and disrupting international trade, on the other.

Can the Commission say whether:

1. the report is true;
2. it believes that using the environment as an excuse is now a familiar strategy for putting pressure on competitor countries, as has already happened to Italy, which, with its high quality food exports, has on other occasions been unfairly pitted against countries without any food traditions;
3. it is aware that some European countries, such as Italy, have a trade surplus precisely because of their food exports;
4. it supports a move aimed at penalising this positive export situation?

**Question for written answer E-001558/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(13 February 2013)**

Subject: Swedish proposal for an EU tax on meat — a threat to livestock farming in Italy and the Veneto Region

The Swedish Council for Agriculture has recently proposed that the EU impose a tax on meat. Sweden takes the view that the meat production sector is a source of excessive pollution and is partly responsible for global warming. The purpose of the proposed tax is apparently to discourage the consumption and production of meat.

Can the Commission say whether it is aware of these facts?

Given that the purpose of this tax is to discourage production in an entire market sector, has the Commission assessed the damage this would cause, in employment and economic terms, to the production, distribution and retail of livestock in areas such as the Veneto Region, which alone provides more than 30% of the meat produced in Italy?

Does the Commission not agree that the introduction of such a tax would create a distortion in the internal market and jeopardise the livestock farming sector?

**Joint answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission
(22 March 2013)**

The Commission is aware of the report 'Sustainable meat consumption — What is it? What do we get?' published by the Swedish Board of Agriculture in January 2013 and publicly available from their website www.jordbruksverket.se. This report recommends cutting down meat consumption in order to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from food production. It suggests environmental regulations and economic incentives like environmental taxes or subsidies to influence consumer behaviour.

Taxes on food are not subject to harmonisation within the EU and Member States can introduce non-harmonised internal taxes and freely establish their modalities provided that these do not result in discriminatory taxation on similar products of other Member States. It has to be taken into account that for certain Member States food products are a considerable part of their trade volume and that taxation can influence trade flows.

However, at this moment there is no proposal for national legislation on meat tax in Sweden.

Moreover, the Commission is currently developing methodologies for the assessment of the environmental footprint of products and organisations within the European Food Sustainable Consumption and Production Round Table.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000942/13
a la Comisión**

Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(29 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: Estimación de las cantidades afectadas por los presuntos fraudes del Libor y Euribor

En mi anterior pregunta E-009645/2012, expresé mi preocupación sobre los efectos jurídicos que podría implicar el posible fraude en el Euribor. Las personas que han sufrido efectos dolorosos de contratos hipotecarios formulados bajo índices manipulados han sido estafadas por el sistema financiero europeo y tendrían derecho, frente a los respectivos tribunales nacionales, a reclamar la parte correspondiente al fraude que hayan pagado, pero también deberían tener derecho a reclamar daños y perjuicios.

La respuesta dada por el Comisario Almunia sostiene que es posible que a título individual los ciudadanos afectados por la estafa financiera del Libor puedan presentar demandas civiles por daños y perjuicios. Esto supondría una enorme cantidad de reclamaciones al conjunto del sistema financiero europeo en general y español en particular por cantidades millonarias. En la actualidad, la autoridad alemana de supervisión financiera, BaFin, ha abierto una segunda investigación al Deutsche Bank y otros bancos alemanes por la supuesta manipulación del índice del Euribor. Según informaciones publicadas por el periódico financiero The Wall Street Journal, el Deutsche Bank obtuvo un beneficio de unos 500 millones de euros en 2008 tan solo en operaciones ligadas al índice Libor.

Pero más allá de la gravedad que supondrían las cantidades indebidamente cobradas o cobradas bajo contratos nulos de hecho, está el drama de los desahucios. Desde el inicio de la crisis financiera internacional en España se han ejecutado más de 400 000 hipotecas. Miles de ciudadanos han sido expulsados de sus viviendas habituales a causa de sus contratos hipotecarios. Todas estas hipotecas, si queda demostrado el fraude, podrían haber sido nulas y, por tanto, las viviendas asociadas deberían restituirse en algunos casos, así como los daños que estas expulsiones han supuesto. En la respuesta del Comisario se sostenía que la investigación es uno de los puntos prioritarios para la Comisión.

1. ¿Dispone la Comisión de datos sobre el número de ejecuciones hipotecarias realizadas bajo contratos referenciados a estos índices posiblemente fraudulentos?
2. ¿Ha estimado la Comisión las cantidades monetarias que pueden haber sido formuladas con contratos bajo este posible fraude?
3. ¿Qué consecuencias para el sector financiero estima la Comisión que podría tener una sentencia que demostrase este posible fraude?

Respuesta del Sr. Almunia en nombre de la Comisión

(16 de abril de 2013)

La Comisión está investigando varios asuntos de competencia paralelos relacionados con índices de referencia como el LIBOR, el TIBOR y el Euribor. La Comisión está examinando la conducta de determinadas empresas involucradas en la negociación de productos derivados sobre los tipos de interés. A la Comisión le preocupa que determinadas empresas, sobre todo bancos, aunque también intermediarios bursátiles en algunos casos, podrían haber vulnerado las normas de defensa de la competencia de la UE que prohíben los cárteles.

Estas investigaciones constituyen para la Comisión una prioridad absoluta y han alcanzado una fase avanzada. No obstante, la Comisión insiste en que sus investigaciones siguen en curso.

Si las investigaciones revelaran una infracción de la legislación sobre los cárteles, la Comisión aplicaría las normas sobre competencia para sancionar a todas las partes implicadas y poner fin a esas prácticas, lo que propiciaría un cambio de cultura y restablecería una competencia leal en el sector bancario.

Estas investigaciones no se extienden a las disposiciones relativas al crédito a la vivienda, las hipotecas o actividades similares. Se centran exclusivamente en los productos derivados sobre los tipos de interés vinculados a esos índices de referencia. Sobre esta base, la Comisión no dispone de datos relativos al número de ejecuciones hipotecarias en España o al posible valor monetario de las hipotecas en el país. Esta información se puede recabar de la autoridad o autoridades españolas.

En relación con la posible indemnización a las víctimas de hipotecas ligadas a los índices LIBOR, TIBOR o Euribor, la Comisión solo puede abordar, atendiendo a sus competencias, las infracciones del Derecho de competencia. Si se prueba que la supuesta manipulación ha afectado negativamente a las víctimas de hipotecas ligadas a los índices LIBOR, TIBOR o Euribor, estas podrán interponer acciones privadas de reparación por daños y perjuicios ante los tribunales nacionales contra las empresas implicadas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000942/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(29 January 2013)

Subject: Estimation of the sums of money involved in the alleged rigging of Libor and Euribor rates

In my previous question E-009645/2012, I expressed my concern about the potential legal impact of the alleged rigging of Euribor rates. Those who have suffered the painful consequences of mortgage contracts drawn up according to manipulated indices have been defrauded by the European financial system and will be entitled, in the respective national courts, to reclaim the amounts unduly paid. However, they should also have the right to claim damages.

The answer given by Commissioner Almunia maintains that it is possible for individual citizens affected by the Libor financial scam to make private damages claims. This would mean an enormous number of claims for the entire European financial system in general, and the Spanish system in particular, amounting to millions of euros. At present, the German financial supervisory authority, BaFin, has opened a second investigation into Deutsche Bank and other German banks for the alleged rigging of the Euribor rate. According to information published by the financial newspaper *The Wall Street Journal*, Deutsche Bank made a profit of EUR 500 million in 2008 from operations linked to the Libor alone.

However, beyond the seriousness of the amounts unduly paid, or paid under contracts that were null and void, is the tragedy of evictions. Since the start of the financial crisis in Spain more than 400 000 mortgages have been foreclosed on. Thousands of citizens have been forced out of their homes due to their mortgage contracts. All of these mortgages, if fraud is proven, may have been invalid and therefore in some cases people's homes should be returned to them, in addition to the damages that these evictions have entailed. In the Commissioner's response, he argued that the investigation is a priority for the Commission.

1. Does the Commission have data on the number of foreclosures carried out under contracts tied to these potentially fraudulent indices?
2. Has it estimated the monetary sums that may have been made from these potentially fraudulent contracts?
3. What consequences may the financial sector face should a ruling prove that this alleged fraud did in fact take place?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(16 April 2013)

The Commission is investigating several parallel antitrust cases concerning benchmark rates, such as LIBOR, TIBOR and EURIBOR. The Commission is examining the conduct of certain undertakings involved in trading interest rate derivative products. The Commission is concerned that certain companies, in particular banks but also in some instances brokers, may have violated EU antitrust rules that prohibit cartels.

These investigations are a top priority for the Commission and they have reached an advanced stage. However, the Commission stresses that its investigations are still ongoing.

If investigations reveal a cartel infringement, the Commission will apply competition rules to sanction all parties involved and bring these practices to an end. This will prompt a change of culture and restore fair competition to the banking sector.

These investigations do not extend to provisions for housing credit, mortgages or similar activities. They focus only on interest-rate derivative products linked to these benchmark rates. On this basis, the Commission has no data relating to the number of foreclosures in Spain, or to the possible monetary value of mortgages in that country. Such information may instead be obtained from the relevant Spanish authority(ies).

Concerning possible compensation to the victims of LIBOR/TIBOR/EURIBOR-pegged mortgages, as a matter of jurisdiction, the Commission can only act to address infringements of competition law. If the alleged manipulation is proven to have adversely affected victims of LIBOR/TIBOR/EURIBOR-pegged mortgages, they may bring private damages claims in their national courts against the undertakings involved.

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-000943/13

Komisi

Pavel Poc (S&D)

(29. ledna 2013)

Předmět: Omezení finančních ztrát v důsledku průsaků pitné vody na obecních vodovodních řadech

Plytvání pitnou vodou představuje rozsáhlý problém, který je v současnosti v mnoha členských státech Evropské unie ignorován. V důsledku úniků může docházet ke značným ztrátám vody, například v České republice se více než 20 % celkového objemu dodávek vody ztratí v rozvodné síti. Plytvání pitnou vodou se účinně omezuje zveřejňováním údajů o objemových, procentuálních a finančních ztrátách na místních vodovodních potrubích.

Opatření s cílem povinně zveřejňovat tabulky vodních ztrát na stránkách obecních samospráv, a to jak aktuální údaje, tak časový vývoj za posledních 10 let, by vyvolalo autoregulační efekt – veřejnou kontrolu a tlak občanů vedoucí ke snižování finančních ztrát.

Za účelem důsledného omezení ztrát je možné předepsat regulační limity, po jejichž překročení by obec byla povinna neprodleně zajistit opravu vodovodního řadu.

1. Je možné v rámci *Acquis Communautaire* EU upravit povinně zveřejňování údajů o objemových, procentuálních a finančních ztrátách na místních vodovodních potrubích?
2. Zvažovala již Komise tuto možnost jako stimulaci tlaku ze strany veřejnosti směřující k tomu, aby se zabránilo ztrátám pitné vody v EU?

Odpověď pana Potočnicka jménem Komise

(12. března 2013)

Podle stávajícího *acquis communautaire* není zveřejňování údajů o ztrátách vody, ke kterým dochází v rozvodných sítích, povinné. Nicméně problémem úniku vody z vodovodních sítí se zabývá „plán na zachování vodních zdrojů Evropy“, ⁽¹⁾ který Komise přijala v listopadu 2012.

Jelikož se situace v jednotlivých členských státech velmi liší (míra úniku se pohybuje od 7 % do 50 % nebo více), Komise se domnívá, že tento problém lze řešit pouze případ od případu, aby bylo možné posoudit environmentální a hospodářské přínosy snížení objemu úniku.

O opatřeních v oblasti nedostatku vody a hospodárného využívání vody by měly členské státy informovat v plánech povodí, jak to vyžaduje směrnice 2000/60/ES ⁽²⁾, kterou se stanoví rámec pro činnost Společenství v oblasti vodní politiky (rámcová směrnice o vodě).

V roce 2013 bude Komise spolu s členskými státy a vodohospodářským odvětvím EU pracovat na zrychlení vývoje osvědčených postupů v oblasti udržitelné míry úniku vody pro hospodářství a na zvýšení povědomí o těchto postupech. Komise hodlá přezkoumat, jakým způsobem by členské státy mohly tuto otázku nejlépe zohlednit, když informují o plánech povodí v rámci společné prováděcí strategie rámcové směrnice o vodě.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/blueprint/index_en.htm

⁽²⁾ Úř. věst. L 327, 22.12.2000, s. 1-73.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000943/13
to the Commission
Pavel Poc (S&D)
(29 January 2013)**

Subject: Limiting financial losses resulting from leakages of drinking water through public water mains

Wastage of drinking water is an widespread problem that is currently being ignored in many EU Member States. Leakages can cause major water losses. In the Czech Republic, for instance, more than 20% by volume of the water supply will be lost across the network. An effective way of limiting the wastage of drinking water would be to publish data on the losses — expressed as volume, percentage and monetary value — occurring in local water mains.

Requiring tables to be published on local authorities' websites showing water losses — including both current data and data from the previous 10 years — would result in self-regulation, public control and public pressure to limit financial losses.

Regulatory limits could be set in order to ensure that the issue of wastage is thoroughly addressed. Municipalities breaching these limits would be obliged to ensure that the water mains are repaired without delay.

1. Would it be possible under the *Acquis Communautaire* to make the publication of data on losses — expressed as volume, percentage and monetary value — occurring in local water mains compulsory?
2. Has the Commission already considered taking such a step with a view to stimulating public pressure to put a stop to water wastage in the EU?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission
(12 March 2013)**

According to the current *acquis communautaire*, the publication of data on losses occurring in water supply networks is not compulsory. However, the problem of leakage from water distribution networks has been addressed in the 'Blueprint to Safeguard Europe's Water Resources' ⁽¹⁾, adopted by the Commission in November 2012.

The Commission believes that this problem can only be tackled on a case-by-case basis to assess the environmental and economic benefits of reducing the leakage levels, as the situation is very different between and within Member States (leakage rates vary from 7% to 50% or more).

The issues of water scarcity and water efficiency measures should be reported in the river basin management planning as required under Directive 2000/60/EC ⁽²⁾ establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy (Water Framework Directive).

The Commission will work with Member States and the EU water industry to accelerate the development and spread of best practices on Sustainable Economic Leakage Levels (SELL) in 2013. It will consider how this issue can be best reflected in the reporting on River Basin Management Plans in the framework of the Common Implementation Strategy for the Water Framework Directive.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/blueprint/index_en.htm

⁽²⁾ OJ L 327, 22.12.2000, p. 1-73.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000944/13
à la Commission
Anne Delvaux (PPE)
(30 janvier 2013)

Objet: Industrie sidérurgique en Europe

Le Parlement européen a voté, le 13 décembre dernier, une résolution sur «l'industrie sidérurgique de l'Union». Dans cette résolution, le Parlement européen invite la Commission à mener une réflexion sur des initiatives pour soutenir et garder la sidérurgie et les secteurs d'aval, à contrôler les activités de restructuration et de délocalisation par rapport au droit existant et à surveiller les abus de position dominante. Une résolution du 15 janvier dernier invite également la Commission à présenter dans les plus brefs délais un projet d'acte législatif sur l'information et la consultation des travailleurs, l'anticipation et la gestion des restructurations.

En considérant:

- les dernières annonces de fermeture ou restructuration dans le secteur;
- la position du groupe ArcelorMittal au sein du secteur sidérurgique européen;
- le fait que 370 000 personnes en Europe travaillent directement pour le secteur sidérurgique et que des millions d'autres sont employés dans les industries d'aval;

La Commission pourrait-elle préciser:

- l'avancée de ses travaux tant dans les pistes envisagées afin de soutenir l'industrie sidérurgique européenne que dans l'élaboration d'un véritable plan d'action stratégique en faveur de la sidérurgie sur notre continent, en soulignant l'urgence de la situation et la nécessité pour l'Europe de se doter d'un tel plan à très court terme;
- l'état d'avancement de la réévaluation du «modèle d'affaires» européen, parallèlement à son modèle social, comme l'a annoncé le Commissaire Andor lors d'une table-ronde organisée au Parlement le 19 juin 2012;
- les outils actuels à la disposition de la Commission qui lui permettraient d'intervenir en soutien des milliers de personnes dont l'emploi se retrouve aujourd'hui menacé par la stratégie industrielle d'un groupe dominant;
- le timing envisagé afin de proposer un acte législatif définissant un véritable code de conduite pour les entreprises prévoyant des restructurations et/ou des fermetures, en insistant une fois encore sur l'urgence de la situation?

Réponse donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission
(26 mars 2013)

1. À la suite des réunions de la table ronde de haut niveau sur l'avenir de l'industrie sidérurgique européenne lors desquelles a été adopté un ensemble de recommandations, la Commission présentera d'ici à juin 2013 un plan d'action pour l'industrie sidérurgique européenne, afin de l'aider à faire face à la situation actuelle et de promouvoir l'innovation, la croissance et l'emploi dans ce secteur.
2. La Commission a publié un résumé ⁽¹⁾ des réponses au livre vert sur les restructurations ⁽²⁾.
3. La Commission presse les entreprises et toutes les autres parties intéressées d'anticiper leurs besoins en capital humain et de gérer les restructurations d'une manière socialement responsable. Elle est prête à envisager l'utilisation de tous les instruments disponibles, y compris le Fonds social européen et le Fonds européen d'ajustement à la mondialisation, à soutenir la formation et la requalification des travailleurs et à fournir une aide à ceux qui ont été licenciés.

⁽¹⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=8908&langId=en>

⁽²⁾ «Restructurations et anticipation du changement: quelles leçons tirer de l'expérience récente?» [COM(2012)7 final du 17 janvier 2012].

4. Après le Livre vert et l'adoption du rapport Cercas, la Commission examine actuellement quelle est la meilleure manière d'encourager et d'assurer dans une large mesure le respect des meilleures pratiques dans le domaine de la restructuration et de l'anticipation des changements. Elle informera le Parlement de l'action qu'elle a l'intention d'entreprendre en réponse à la demande du Parlement présentée en vertu de l'article 225 du TFUE.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000944/13
to the Commission
Anne Delvaux (PPE)
(30 January 2013)**

Subject: EU steel industry

On 13 December 2012, Parliament adopted a resolution on the EU steel industry in which it called on the Commission to reflect on initiatives that would support and preserve the steel industry and its downstream sectors; to oversee restructuring and relocation activities to ensure they are consistent with EU law; and to monitor potential abuses of dominant market position. In addition, in its resolution of 15 January 2013, Parliament requested the Commission to submit as soon as possible a proposal for a legislative act on information and consultation of workers, anticipation and management of restructuring.

In the light of:

- the latest announcements concerning plant closures and restructuring in the steel industry;
- the dominant position of the ArcelorMittal group in the EU steel industry;
- the fact that 370 000 people in Europe are directly employed by the steel industry, and millions more work in its downstream sectors;
- could the Commission please answer the following questions:
 - What progress has been made in implementing the measures intended to bolster the EU steel industry and drawing up a proper strategic action plan for the EU steel industry? Given the pressing nature of the current problems, the EU needs an action plan as soon as possible.
 - What stage has been reached in the re-evaluation of the EU business and social models, as announced by Commissioner Andor at a Parliament round table held on 19 June 2012?
 - What tools does the Commission currently have at its disposal that would enable it to intervene in support of the thousands of steelworkers in Europe whose jobs are under threat because of the industrial strategy of a dominant steel producer?
 - I would like to emphasise once again just how urgent the current situation is; consequently, when is the Commission planning to submit a proposal for a legislative act setting out a clear code of conduct for companies planning to restructure and/or close plants?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(26 March 2013)**

1. Following the meetings of the High Level Roundtable on the future of the European steel industry where a set of recommendations were adopted, the Commission will present an action plan for the European steel industry by June 2013 to help it cope with the current situation and foster innovation, growth and employment within the sector.
2. The Commission has published a summary ⁽¹⁾ of the replies to the Green Paper on Restructuring ⁽²⁾.
3. The Commission urges companies and all other stakeholders to anticipate their human capital needs and manage restructuring in a socially responsible way. It is willing to consider using all tools available, including the European Social Fund, and the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund and to provide support for the training and reskilling of workers and to provide assistance to those who were made redundant.
4. In the wake of the Green Paper and the adoption of the Cercas Report, the Commission is considering how best to encourage and achieve wide observance of best practice in the field of restructuring and anticipation of change. The Commission will inform Parliament of the action it intends taking in response to the Parliament's request in accordance with Article 225 TFEU.

⁽¹⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=8908&langId=en>

⁽²⁾ 'Restructuring and anticipation of change: what lessons from recent experience?' (COM(2012) 7 final of 17 January 2012).

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000945/13

an den Rat

Werner Langen (PPE)

(30. Januar 2013)

Betrifft: Vizepräsident von Eurojust

Wie die Bild-Zeitung am 6. Januar 2013 berichtete, soll der Vizechef der EU-Justizbehörde SED-Millionen verschoben haben. Als Vizepräsident der EU-Justizbehörde Eurojust koordiniert Carlos Zeyen länderübergreifende Ermittlungen gegen organisierte Kriminalität und Terrorismus. Doch ausgerechnet der Name dieses ranghohen EU-Beamten taucht in bislang geheim gehaltenen Unterlagen zu verschobenem SED-Vermögen auf. Nach einer Klage der Bild-Zeitung gab das Bundesinnenministerium diese Akten jetzt frei. In einem Schreiben an den Bundesnachrichtendienst von 1996 wird Carlos Zeyen als Gesellschafter und Geschäftsführer von drei Unternehmen genannt, die „unmittelbar vom ZK der SED angeleitet und verwaltet“ wurden.

1. Ist dem Rat bekannt, dass der Vizepräsident von Eurojust, Carlos Zeyen, aktiv in mehreren Unternehmen mitgewirkt hat, die dazu dienten, das Vermögen der SED aus der DDR ins Ausland zu transferieren und so dem Zugriff der BvS (Bundesanstalt für vereinigungsbedingte Sonderaufgaben) und der UKPV (Unabhängige Kommission zur Überprüfung des Vermögens der Parteien und Massenorganisationen) zu entziehen?
2. Ist dem Rat bekannt, dass Herr Zeyen als Firmenverantwortlicher der Briefkastenfirmen Ravenburgh Ltd (Gibraltar), Breakwater (Douglas/Isle of Man) und Finatrade Ltd (Dublin/Irland) und als Rechtsanwalt an der Verwaltung von illegalem Auslandsvermögen der SED mitgewirkt hat?

Antwort

(25. März 2013)

Es ist nicht Sache des Rates, zu Presseberichten Stellung zu nehmen.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000945/13
to the Council**

Werner Langen (PPE)

(30 January 2013)

Subject: Vice-President of Eurojust

As the German newspaper 'Bild' reported on 6 January 2013, a Vice-President of the EU judicial authority allegedly transferred millions for the SED (the Socialist Unity Party of Germany). As Vice-President of the EU judicial authority Eurojust, Carlos Zeyen coordinates crossborder investigations into organised crime and terrorism. But this high-ranking EU official's name has now appeared in previously secret documents concerning transfers of SED assets. Following legal action by 'Bild' newspaper, the Interior Ministry has now released these files. In a letter to the Federal Intelligence Service of 1996 Carlos Zeyen is named as a shareholder and director of three companies that were 'directly led and managed by the Central Committee of the SED.'

In view of the above, will the Council say:

1. Is it aware that a Vice-President of the EU judicial authority Eurojust, Carlos Zeyen, was actively involved in a number of companies that were used to transfer SED assets from the GDR abroad and thereby prevent the BvS (Federal Agency for Unification-derived Special Tasks) and the UKPV (Independent Commission for the Review of Assets of Parties and Mass Organisations of the GDR) from accessing them?
2. Is it aware that Mr Zeyen was involved, as a director of the letterbox companies Ravenburgh Ltd (Gibraltar), Breakwater (Douglas / Isle of Man) Ltd and Finatrade. Ltd (Dublin / Ireland) and as a lawyer, in managing illegal foreign assets of the SED?

Reply

(25 March 2013)

It is not for the Council to comment on articles appearing in the press.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000946/13
an die Kommission
Werner Langen (PPE)
(30. Januar 2013)

Betrifft: Vizepräsident von Eurojust

Wie die Bild-Zeitung am 6. Januar 2013 berichtete, soll der Vizechef der EU-Justizbehörde SED-Millionen verschoben haben. Als Vizepräsident der EU-Justizbehörde Eurojust koordiniert Carlos Zeyen grenzübergreifende Ermittlungen gegen organisierte Kriminalität und Terrorismus. Doch ausgerechnet der Name dieses ranghohen EU-Beamten taucht in bislang geheim gehaltenen Unterlagen zu verschobenem SED-Vermögen auf. Nach einer Klage der Bild-Zeitung gab das Bundesinnenministerium diese Akten jetzt frei. In einem Schreiben an den Bundesnachrichtendienst von 1996 wird Carlos Zeyen als Gesellschafter und Geschäftsführer von drei Unternehmen genannt, die „unmittelbar vom ZK der SED angeleitet und verwaltet“ wurden.

1. Ist der Kommission bekannt, dass der Vizepräsident von Eurojust, Herr Carlos Zeyen, aktiv in mehreren Unternehmen mitgewirkt hat, die dazu dienten, das Vermögen der SED aus der DDR ins Ausland zu transferieren und so dem Zugriff der BvS (Bundesanstalt für vereinigungsbedingte Sonderaufgaben) und der UKPV (Unabhängige Kommission zur Überprüfung des Vermögens der Parteien und Massenorganisationen) zu entziehen?
2. Ist der Kommission bekannt, dass Herr Zeyen als Firmenverantwortlicher der Briefkastenfirmen Ravenburgh Ltd (Gibraltar), Breakwater (Douglas, Isle of Man) und Finatrade Ltd (Dublin, Irland) und als Rechtsanwalt an der Verwaltung von illegalem Auslandsvermögen der SED mitgewirkt hat?

Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(2. Mai 2013)

Der Artikel in der deutschen „Bild“-Zeitung bezüglich angeblicher Handlungen von Herrn Zeyen in den 90er Jahren ist der Kommission bekannt.

Herr Zeyen ist kein EU-Beamter. Seit 2006 ist er das luxemburgische Mitglied bei Eurojust. Nach Artikel 2 des Eurojust-Beschlusses ⁽¹⁾ setzt sich Eurojust aus einem nationalen Mitglied pro Mitgliedstaat zusammen, das dieser im Einklang mit seiner Rechtsordnung entsendet.

Die nationalen Mitglieder unterliegen in Bezug auf ihren gesamten Status weiterhin dem nationalen Recht. Den Präsidenten und die Vizepräsidenten von Eurojust wählt das Eurojust-Kollegium aus den Reihen der nationalen Mitglieder. Für die Benennung ihres jeweiligen nationalen Mitglieds bei Eurojust sind ausschließlich die einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten zuständig. Weder die Kommission noch ein anderes EU-Organ sind daran beteiligt.

⁽¹⁾ Beschluss 2002/187/JI, ABl. L 63 vom 6.3.2002, S. 1.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000946/13
to the Commission**

Werner Langen (PPE)

(30 January 2013)

Subject: Vice-President of Eurojust

As the German newspaper 'Bild' reported on 6 January 2013, a Vice-President of the EU judicial authority allegedly transferred millions for the SED (the Socialist Unity Party of Germany). As Vice-President of the EU judicial authority Eurojust, Carlos Zeyen coordinates crossborder investigations into organised crime and terrorism. But this high-ranking EU official's name has now appeared in previously secret documents concerning transfers of SED assets. Following legal action by 'Bild' newspaper, the Interior Ministry has now released these files. In a letter to the Federal Intelligence Service of 1996, Carlos Zeyen is named as a shareholder and director of three companies that were 'directly led and managed by the Central Committee of the SED.'

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Is it aware that a Vice-President of the EU judicial authority Eurojust, Carlos Zeyen, was actively involved in a number of companies that were used to transfer SED assets from the GDR abroad and thereby prevent the BvS (Federal Agency for Unification-derived Special Tasks) and the UKPV (Independent Commission for the Review of Assets of Parties and Mass Organisations of the GDR) from accessing them?
2. Is it aware that Mr Zeyen was involved, as a director of the letterbox companies Ravenburgh Ltd (Gibraltar), Breakwater (Douglas / Isle of Man) Ltd and Finatrade. Ltd (Dublin / Ireland) and as a lawyer, in managing illegal foreign assets of the SED?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission

(2 May 2013)

The Commission is aware of the article in the German newspaper 'Bild' with alleged actions of Mr Zeyen in the nineties.

Mr Zeyen is not an EU official, but the national member of Luxembourg at Eurojust since 2006. According to Article 2 of the Eurojust Decision ⁽¹⁾ Eurojust shall have one national member seconded by each Member State in accordance with its legal system. National Members remain subject to the national law as regards their entire status. Eurojust's President and Vice-Presidents are elected by the Eurojust College from among the national members. Solely the individual Member States are competent to designate their respective National Members at Eurojust. Neither the Commission nor any other EU institution is involved in this process.

⁽¹⁾ Decision 2002/187/JHA (OJ L 63, 6.3.2002, p.1).

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-000947/13
a la Comisión**

Andres Perello Rodriguez (S&D)

(30 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: Aprobación de los planes de reestructuración y capitalización de entidades bancarias españolas e información a los titulares de participaciones preferentes

El pasado 28 de noviembre de 2012, se dictaron cuatro resoluciones por la Dirección General de Competencia en materia de ayudas públicas: SA 35253, SA 34053, SA 33735 y SA 33734, correspondientes respectivamente a la aprobación de los planes de reestructuración y capitalización del grupo BFA, del Banco de Valencia, S.A, de Catalunya Banc, S.A. y de NovaCaixaGalicia, indicándose que, en breve plazo, se publicaría la versión «no confidencial» de las mismas.

Estas resoluciones no solo afectaban al Estado y a las entidades de crédito, sino que —de acuerdo con las noticias de prensa que han sido publicadas desde entonces— parece que incluyen efectos directos respecto a los titulares de valores y deuda emitida por las entidades de crédito en cuestión.

Transcurridos dos meses, no se ha producido la publicación, lo que determina una situación en la que tanto la Comisión como el Gobierno de España y las entidades de crédito interesadas conocen el contenido de los planes aprobados, mientras que los afectados accionistas, titulares de participaciones preferentes y obligaciones subordinadas, carecen de cualquier tipo de información.

Ello genera una situación de asimetría de información relevante y menoscaba las posibilidades de decisión y defensa de muchos pequeños ahorradores españoles, atrapados en la desastrosa situación generada por los comportamientos de algunos altos directivos de entidades de crédito.

Además, el retraso anormal en la publicación de las resoluciones impide el ejercicio del derecho de los ciudadanos europeos a acceder a los documentos de la Comisión, reconocido por el artículo 15 del Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea y regulado por el Reglamento (CE) n° 1049/2001.

¿Cuáles son los motivos del retraso en la publicación de estas resoluciones? ¿Cuándo se procederá a la misma, evitando la continuidad de esta situación, que coloca a los afectados en una posición de verdadera indefensión?

Respuesta del Sr. Almunia en nombre de la Comisión

(18 de marzo de 2013)

No ha habido retrasos en la publicación de las resoluciones sobre ayudas públicas SA 35253, SA 34053, SA 33735 y SA 33734, correspondientes a la aprobación de los planes de reestructuración y capitalización del grupo BFA, del Banco de Valencia, SA, de Catalunya Banc, SA y de NovaCaixaGalicia. De hecho, las resoluciones se han publicado en la página web de la DG Competencia ⁽¹⁾.

La Comisión está obligada a suprimir los secretos comerciales u otra información confidencial en sus decisiones. Para ello, la Comisión remite las decisiones sobre ayuda estatal al Estado miembro en cuestión, el cual indica los aspectos que considera confidenciales con arreglo a la definición de este concepto en la Comunicación de la Comisión C (2003) 4582 ⁽²⁾. La Comisión analiza y tiene en cuenta la petición del Estado miembro y el transmite las decisiones sin los aspectos considerados confidenciales por la Comisión. A continuación, el Estado miembro puede presentar objeciones o solicitar aclaraciones.

Las resoluciones en estos cuatro casos contienen un gran número de secretos comerciales o información sensible, que han hecho que el proceso de diálogo entre la Comisión y las autoridades españolas se prolongue.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/cases/244292/244292_1400504_213_2.pdf
http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/cases/244293/244293_1400377_199_2.pdf
http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/cases/246568/246568_1406507_239_4.pdf
http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/cases/244807/244807_1400359_165_4.pdf

⁽²⁾ Comunicación de la Comisión C(2003) 4582, de 1 de diciembre de 2003, relativa al secreto profesional en las decisiones sobre ayuda estatal, DO C 297 de 9.12.2003, p. 6.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-000947/13
to the Commission**

Andres Perello Rodriguez (S&D)

(30 January 2013)

Subject: Approval of restructuring and capitalisation plans of Spanish banking groups and information for holders of preference shares

On 28 November 2012, DG Competition issued four decisions on state aid: SA 35253, SA 34053, SA 33735 and SA 33734, which approved the restructuring and capitalisation plans of, respectively, the BFA Group, Banco de Valencia S.A., Catalunya Banc S.A. and NovaCaixaGalicia. At the time, DG Competition said that the public versions of the decisions would be published shortly, once they had been 'cleansed of any confidential information'.

These decisions affect not only the Spanish state and the aforementioned banking groups but also — as has since been reported in the press — the holders of securities and debt issued by the banks in question.

Two months on, the public versions of the decisions have still not been published, which means that while the Commission, the Spanish Government and the banking groups in question all know the details of the approved plans, the affected shareholders (holders of preference shares and subordinated bonds) have not been given any information at all.

The resulting 'information asymmetry' is harming the ability of small individual Spanish savers — caught up in the disastrous state of affairs caused by the behaviour of a few top banking bosses — to take well-informed decisions and protect themselves.

Moreover, the abnormally long delay in publishing the decisions is preventing EU citizens from exercising their right to access Commission documents, as enshrined in Article 15 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and governed by Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001.

Why has the publication of the decisions been delayed? When will the decisions be published, thus putting an end to the current situation in which the shareholders are completely defenceless?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission

(18 March 2013)

There is no delay in the publication of the decisions on public aid: SA 35253, SA 34053, SA 33735 and SA 33734, corresponding to the approval of the restructuring plans and capitalization of BFA group, Banco de Valencia, SA, de Catalunya Banc, SA and Novacaixagalicia. In fact, the decisions have been published on the website of DG Competition ⁽¹⁾.

The Commission is required to delete business secrets or other confidential information in its decisions. In order to do so, the Commission provides the state aid decisions to the Member State concerned, which indicates the aspects considered confidential as that concept is defined in Commission Communication C(2003) 4582 ⁽²⁾. The Commission analyses and takes into consideration the request of the Member State and forwards to the Member State the decisions without the aspects that have been deemed confidential by the Commission. After that, the Member State may object or seek clarification.

The decisions in those four cases contain a large number of business secrets or sensitive information, which lengthened the process of dialogue between the Commission and the Spanish authorities.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/cases/244292/244292_1400504_213_2.pdf
http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/cases/244293/244293_1400377_199_2.pdf
http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/cases/246568/246568_1406507_239_4.pdf
http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/cases/244807/244807_1400359_165_4.pdf

⁽²⁾ Commission communication C(2003) 4582 of 1 December 2003 on professional secrecy in state aid decisions, OJ C 297, 9.12.2003, p. 6.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000948/13
to the Commission
Gay Mitchell (PPE)
(30 January 2013)

Subject: Proposal for a regulation on periodic roadworthiness tests for motor vehicles and their trailers and repealing Directive 2009/40/EC

The Commission has brought forward a proposal for a regulation (COM(2012)0380) on periodic roadworthiness tests for motor vehicles and their trailers and repealing Directive 2009/40/EC. The revised requirements under the new proposal cover certain other vehicles for periodic testing which were previously excluded from the original Directive, including motorcycles. The Commission appears to have at the heart of its rationale for the inclusion of motorcycles an estimate that 8 % of motorcycle accidents are the result of mechanical failure. I am informed that this is not borne out by the Motorcycle Accident in Depth Study ('MAIDS') which the Commission itself co-financed. The MAIDS study found that 0.3 % of motorcycle accidents were the result of technical failure as their primary cause. In 1.6 % of cases, technical failure was cited as being a 'contributory cause'. Given that motorcycles constitute a mere fraction of road traffic and the cost involved in providing test centres is exorbitant, with the likelihood that such costs will be passed on to the motorcyclist, the cost-benefit value of such a requirement is very dubious, since there is little evidence that this will improve safety.

1. Will the Commission please provide clarifications as to why it has used the statistic of an 8 % mechanical failure rate in motorcycles to justify the inclusion of motorcycles in the proposal for a regulation?
2. Will the Commission clarify why it has apparently overlooked the findings of the MAIDS study, which it partly commissioned?
3. Will the Commission provide confirmation that it has analysed the probable impact of the regulation on the motorcycle industry, and that it has also analysed the cost-benefit value of this new requirement concerning motorcycles?
4. Will the Commission outline its concerns in the field of safety in relation to this proposal?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(26 March 2013)

As regards questions 1, 2 and 4 the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question P-010344/2012 ⁽¹⁾.

As regards the impact of the proposal on the motorcycle industry, the Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that the impact has been considered as marginal and therefore not been subject to specific considerations in the impact assessment report ⁽²⁾.

The cost benefit of the envisaged requirements has been elaborated in the impact assessment accompanying the Commission proposal.

⁽¹⁾ Available at <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html>
⁽²⁾ SWD(2012)206 final.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000950/13
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(30 gennaio 2013)**

Oggetto: Caso Monte Paschi di Siena: mancata valutazione di operazioni di finanza derivata

Il Monte dei Paschi di Siena, la più antica banca del mondo, è una banca quotata in borsa, attiva sia in Italia sia sul mercato europeo ed internazionale, che si trova al centro di uno scandalo legato ad incerte transazioni sul mercato dei derivati che, oltre a causare forti vendite del suo titolo in borsa, suscita enorme preoccupazione tra i correntisti ed i circa 30.000 dipendenti.

Lo scorso 17 dicembre la Commissione europea ne ha approvato temporaneamente, in base alle norme UE sugli aiuti di Stato, la ricapitalizzazione per 3,9 miliardi di euro al fine di «preservare la stabilità del sistema finanziario italiano» e consentire alla banca di conformarsi alle raccomandazioni dell'Autorità bancaria europea. L'approvazione delle misure è subordinata alla presentazione di un piano di ristrutturazione entro maggio 2013.

Il 12 settembre 2012, nel suo discorso sullo stato dell'Unione, il Presidente della Commissione europea, Barroso, riferendosi alle banche ha detto «quando poi le cose vanno male, il conto lo pagano i contribuenti».

Lo scandalo del Monte dei Paschi di Siena conferma oggi quell'affermazione.

Tutto ciò premesso, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. le ragioni che hanno portato all'approvazione temporanea della ricapitalizzazione senza un'adeguata analisi della stabilità finanziaria e dell'utilizzo della finanza derivata da parte della banca stessa;
2. se ritenga di inserire nell'accordo sulla vigilanza bancaria europea strumenti di controllo per evitare il ripetersi di situazioni simili, in particolare sul mercato dei derivati;
3. quali informative erano state date ai correntisti del Monte dei Paschi di Siena a tutela dei loro risparmi?

**Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(19 marzo 2013)**

1. La ricapitalizzazione del Monte Paschi di Siena (MPS) effettuata dall'Italia è stata approvata temporaneamente ai sensi dell'articolo 107, paragrafo 3, lettera b) del TFUE, in attesa che la Commissione prenda una decisione definitiva in merito al piano di ristrutturazione che dimostri le prospettive di redditività a lungo termine del MPS che l'Italia si è impegnata a presentare entro maggio 2013. La Commissione ha scelto di approvare innanzitutto un aiuto per il salvataggio temporaneo prima di valutare il piano di ristrutturazione di una banca in difficoltà, per poi prendere una decisione definitiva. Tale approccio è stato adottato in più di 60 casi dall'inizio della crisi nel 2008. Nel caso del MPS, come per ogni altro caso, la Commissione valuterà attentamente la prospettiva di redditività a lungo termine del MPS ed in particolare, nella seconda fase della procedura, l'utilizzo della finanza derivata da parte della banca stessa.

2. La Commissione ritiene che la sua proposta per il conferimento alla Banca centrale europea di incarichi specifici in merito alle politiche che riguardano la vigilanza prudenziale degli enti creditizi contribuirà alla sicurezza e alla solidità degli enti creditizi, garantendo loro una vigilanza della massima qualità.

3. In conformità alla direttiva 94/19/CE⁽¹⁾, i depositanti devono essere informati sulle disposizioni del sistema di garanzia dei depositi (DGS) o su eventuali regimi alternativi applicabili, compresi l'importo e la portata della copertura forniti dal DGS stesso. Tutte le informazioni devono essere formulate in modo comprensibile. Per quanto concerne le informazioni specifiche che sono state fornite ai depositanti del Monte Paschi, la Commissione rimanda l'onorevole parlamentare alle informazioni rese disponibili dal DGS italiano (Fondo Interbancario di Tutela dei Depositi)⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ GUL 135 del 31.5.1994, pag. 5-14.

⁽²⁾ www.fitd.it.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000950/13
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(30 January 2013)

Subject: Monte Paschi scandal: failure to calculate the cost of derivatives deals

Monte dei Paschi di Siena, the world's oldest bank, which is quoted on the Stock Exchange and active, as well as in Italy, on European and international markets, is at the centre of a scandal involving dubious trading on the derivatives market, which, in addition to causing mass selling of the bank's shares, is giving rise to immense anxiety among current-account holders and its employees, of whom there are about 30 000.

On 17 December 2012 the Commission, acting under EU State aid rules, temporarily approved a EUR 3.9 billion recapitalisation of Monte Paschi in order to preserve the stability of the Italian financial system and enable the bank to comply with the recommendations of the European Banking Authority. The approval is subject to a requirement to submit a restructuring plan by May 2013.

In his State of the Union Address on 12 September 2012 the Commission President, José Manuel Barroso, had this to say about banks: 'when things went wrong, it was the taxpayers who had to pick up the bill'.

Today the Monte Paschi scandal is proving the truth of that assertion.

In the light of the foregoing:

1. Can the Commission explain why the recapitalisation was temporarily approved when there had been no proper analysis of the bank's financial stability or its use of derivative financing?
2. Does it believe that checks should be built into the agreement on Europe-wide banking supervision in order to avert further cases of this kind, especially where the derivatives market is concerned?
3. What information was given to Monte Paschi current-account holders to help protect their savings?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(19 March 2013)

1. The recapitalisation by Italy of Monte Paschi di Siena (MPS) has been temporarily approved pursuant to Article 107(3)(b) TFEU until the Commission takes a final decision on the restructuring plan proving the long-term viability of MPS, which Italy has committed to submit before June 2013. The Commission has followed that approach of firstly approving temporarily rescue aid before assessing the restructuring plan of a bank in difficulty and then taking a final decision in more than 60 cases since the beginning of the crisis in 2008. In the case of MPS, the Commission will, as in any other case, carefully assess MPS's long-term viability, including in particular its use of derivative financing, in that second stage of the procedure.

2. The Commission believes that its proposal for the conferral of specific tasks upon the European Central Bank concerning policies relating to the prudential supervision of credit institutions will contribute to the safety and soundness of credit institutions by ensuring that they are subject to supervision of the highest quality.

3. According to Directive 94/19/EC⁽¹⁾, depositors shall be informed of the provisions of the Deposit Guarantee Scheme (DGS) or any alternative arrangement applicable, including the amount and scope of the cover offered by the DGS. All information shall be made available in a readily comprehensible manner. As regards what particular information was given to Monte Paschi's depositors, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the information made available by the Italian DGS (Fondo Interbancaria di Tutela dei Depositi)⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 135, 31.5.1994, p. 5-14.

⁽²⁾ www.ftd.it.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000952/13
an die Kommission
Britta Reimers (ALDE)
(30. Januar 2013)**

Betrifft: LIFE+-Projekt LIFE09 NAT/DE/000010 „Aurinia“

In Bezugnahme auf die Antwort der Kommission vom 28.1.2013 auf die Anfrage E-011107/2012 ergeben sich folgende Fragen:

1. Was versteht die Kommission unter „künstlich angepflanzten Wäldern“?
2. Ab welchem Alter rechnet die Kommission einem „künstlich angepflanzten“ Lebensraum eine eigene Wertigkeit zu?
3. Wie legt die Kommission fest, welcher Lebensraum schützenswerter als ein anderer ist und ggf. für diesen weichen muss?
4. Ist für die Kommission ein über 70 Jahre gewachsener Nadelholzwald ökologisch weniger wertvoll als eine Heide?

**Antwort von Herrn Potočnik im Namen der Kommission
(22. März 2013)**

Die vorgeschlagenen Ziele, Maßnahmen und erwarteten Ergebnisse des LIFE+-Projekts „Aurinia“ wurden von mehreren externen Prüfern und Sachverständigen eingehend bewertet. Die Kommissionsdienststellen haben die Qualität dieser Bewertungen überprüft, und anschließend wurde die Liste der LIFE+-Projekte, deren Finanzierung bewilligt wurde, von Vertretern der Mitgliedstaaten im LIFE+-Ausschuss angenommen.

Zu den von der Frau Abgeordneten angesprochenen Fragen nehmen wir wie folgt Stellung:

1. Unter „künstlich angepflanzten Fichtenwäldern“ ist eine gewerbliche Anpflanzung von Fichten außerhalb des Verbreitungsgebiets dieser Art zu verstehen. Mit dem Wort „künstlich“ soll also zum Ausdruck gebracht werden, dass die Art angepflanzt wurde und in dem Gebiet nicht heimisch ist.
2. Das Alter ist nicht der wichtigste Gesichtspunkt bei der Feststellung, ob ein Lebensraum wertvoll ist. Wichtiger ist die Anzahl der Arten, die darin lebt, sowie sein Beitrag zur Erhaltung der biologischen Vielfalt in dem Gebiet und europaweit.
3. Die Vorgehensweise der Kommission bei der Feststellung, ob natürliche Lebensräume von europäischer Bedeutung sind, stützt sich auf die Richtlinie 92/43/EWG ⁽¹⁾.

Insbesondere ist die Prüfung des Werts von Lebensräumen Bestandteil der Bewertung der Projektvorschläge, die der EU vorgelegt wurden, und ist auch im Zusammenhang mit den Zielen dieser Projekte und den speziellen Bedingungen am jeweiligen Standort zu sehen.

4. Im regionalen Umfeld von Schleswig-Holstein können kommerzielle Fichtenplantagen weder an einen natürlichen Lebensraum angeschlossen werden, noch sind sie von besonderem Wert für die Erhaltung gefährdeter Arten. Deshalb haben sie ökologisch gesehen geringere Priorität als die gefährdeten Arten und Lebensräume, auf die das Projekt abzielt.

Die angesprochenen Fragen sind Teil eines umfassenderen Meinungsaustauschs zwischen den Begünstigten des Projekts, Interessenträgern vor Ort und den Bürgern. Weitere Informationen finden sich auf der Website unter dem nachstehenden Link ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ ABl. L 206 vom 22.7.1992 (FFH-Richtlinie).

⁽²⁾ <http://www.stiftung-naturschutz-sh.de/index.php?id=797>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000952/13
to the Commission
Britta Reimers (ALDE)
(30 January 2013)**

Subject: LIFE + project LIFE09 NAT/DE/000010 'Aurinia'

Further to the Commission's answer of 28.1.2013 to Question E-011107/2012, will the Commission answer the following questions:

1. What does it mean by 'artificial spruce plantations'?
2. How old does an 'artificial' habitat have to be before the Commission accords it intrinsic value?
3. How does it determine which habitats are more worthy of protection than others and, where a choice has to be made, whether one habitat has to make way for another?
4. Does it consider that a seventy year-old coniferous forest is ecologically less valuable than a heath?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission
(22 March 2013)**

The proposed objectives, actions and expected results of the LIFE+ project 'Aurinia' have undergone a thorough assessment by several external evaluators and experts. The Commission services have checked the quality of their assessment and the list of projects approved for LIFE+ funding was subsequently endorsed by representatives of the Member States in the LIFE+ Committee.

As far as its specific issues raised by the Honourable Member:

1. An artificial spruce plantation is a commercial plantation of spruce outside of the natural range of the species. *Artificial* refers thus both to the fact the species has been planted and is not native to the territory.
2. Age is not the most relevant factor to determine whether a habitat is valuable or not. More important are the number of species living in a habitat and its contribution to securing biodiversity on regional and European level.
3. The Commission's policy to determine whether natural habitats are of European importance is based on the directive 92/43/EEC ⁽¹⁾.

In particular the assessment of the value of habitats is part of the evaluation of the project proposals submitted to the EC and has to be seen in the context of the project objectives and the specific conditions on the respective site.

4. In the regional context of Schleswig-Holstein commercial spruce plantations can neither be linked to any native habitat, nor are they of any particular value for the conservation of endangered species. Therefore they are of lesser ecological priority compared to the endangered species and habitats tackled by the project.

The questions raised are part of a broader exchange of views between the project beneficiary, local stakeholders and citizens. Further information can be found on the Internet link ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 206, 22.7.1992 (Habitats Directive).

⁽²⁾ <http://www.stiftung-naturschutz-sh.de/index.php?id=797>

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-000953/13
till kommissionen
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(30 januari 2013)

Angående: Fastställande av status för immateriella rättigheter

I sitt svar på frågan E-009093/2012 hänvisar kommissionen till sitt uttalande 2005/295/EG ⁽¹⁾ där det förekommer en uppenbart ofullständig förteckning över immateriella rättigheter som inleds med följande mening: "Kommissionen anser att åtminstone följande immateriella rättigheter omfattas av direktivets tillämpningsområde" (direktivet om säkerställande av skyddet för immateriella rättigheter).

Vilka immateriella rättigheter anser kommissionen faller utanför tillämpningsområdet för direktivet om säkerställande 2004/48/EG?

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-000954/13
till kommissionen
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(30 januari 2013)

Angående: Kriterier för införande av varumärkesrättigheter i förteckningen över immateriella rättigheter

I sitt svar på frågan för skriftligt besvarande E-009093/2012 hänvisar kommissionen till sitt uttalande 2005/295/EG ⁽²⁾ med en uppenbart ofullständig förteckning över immateriella rättigheter som inleds med följande mening: "Kommissionen anser att åtminstone följande immateriella rättigheterna omfattas av direktivets tillämpningsområde" (direktivet om säkerställande av skyddet för immateriella rättigheter).

Vilka kriterier användes för att fastställa att varumärkesrättigheter bör införas i förteckningen över immateriella rättigheter som omfattas av artikel 2 i direktivet?

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-001068/13
till kommissionen
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(1 februari 2013)

Angående: Kriterier för införande av upphovsrätten närstående rättigheter i förteckningen över immateriella rättigheter

I sitt svar på frågan för skriftligt besvarande E-009093/2012 hänvisar kommissionen till sitt uttalande 2005/295/EG ⁽³⁾, i vilket en uppenbart icke uttömmande förteckning över immateriella rättigheter förekommer ("Kommissionen anser att åtminstone följande immateriella rättigheter omfattas av direktivets tillämpningsområde:" [direktivet om säkerställande av skyddet för immateriella rättigheter]).

Vilka kriterier har kommissionen använt för att bestämma att upphovsrätten närstående rättigheter bör införas i förteckningen över de immateriella rättigheter som omfattas av artikel 2 i direktivet?

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-001091/13
till kommissionen
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(1 februari 2013)

Angående: Kriterier för införande av databasframställares sui generis-rättigheter i förteckningen över immateriella rättigheter

I sitt svar på frågan för skriftligt besvarande E-009093/2012 hänvisar kommissionen till sitt uttalande 2005/295/EG ⁽⁴⁾, i vilket en uppenbart icke uttömmande förteckning över immateriella rättigheter förekommer ("Kommissionen anser att åtminstone följande immateriella rättigheter omfattas av direktivets tillämpningsområde:" [direktivet om säkerställande av skyddet för immateriella rättigheter]).

⁽¹⁾ http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/sv/oj/2005/l_094/l_09420050413sv00370037.pdf

⁽²⁾ http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/sv/oj/2005/l_094/l_09420050413sv00370037.pdf

⁽³⁾ http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/sv/oj/2005/l_094/l_09420050413sv00370037.pdf

⁽⁴⁾ http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/sv/oj/2005/l_094/l_09420050413sv00370037.pdf

Vilka kriterier har kommissionen använt för att bestämma att databasframställares *sui generis*-rättigheter bör införas i förteckningen över de immateriella rättigheter som omfattas av artikel 2 i direktivet?

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-001176/13

till kommissionen

Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)

(5 februari 2013)

Angående: Kriterier för införande av rättigheter som tillhör skaparen av kretsmönster i halvledarprodukter i en förteckning över immateriella rättigheter

I sitt svar på skriftlig fråga E-009093/2012 hänvisar kommissionen till sitt uttalande 2005/295/EG ⁽⁵⁾, som innehåller en uppenbart icke-uttömmande förteckning över immateriella rättigheter: "Kommissionen anser att åtminstone följande immateriella rättigheter omfattas av direktivets tillämpningsområde:"

Vilka kriterier användes för att fastställa att rättigheter som tillhör skaparen av kretsmönster i halvledarprodukter bör införas i förteckningen över immateriella rättigheter som omfattas av artikel 2 i direktivet?

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-001199/13

till kommissionen

Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)

(5 februari 2013)

Angående: Kriterier för införande av varumärkesrättigheter i en förteckning över immateriella rättigheter

I sitt svar på skriftlig fråga E-009093/2012 hänvisar kommissionen till sitt uttalande 2005/295/EG ⁽⁶⁾, som innehåller en klart icke-uttömmande förteckning över immateriella rättigheter, där det står: "Kommissionen anser att åtminstone följande immateriella rättigheter omfattas av direktivets tillämpningsområde:"

Vilka kriterier användes för att fastställa att varumärkesrättigheter bör införas i förteckningen över immateriella rättigheter som omfattas av artikel 2 i direktivet?

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-001235/13

till kommissionen

Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)

(6 februari 2013)

Angående: Kriterier för införande av designskydd i en förteckning över immateriella rättigheter

I sitt svar på skriftlig fråga E-009093/2012 hänvisar kommissionen till sitt uttalande 2005/295/EG ⁽⁷⁾, som innehåller en uppenbart icke-uttömmande förteckning över immateriella rättigheter ("Kommissionen anser att åtminstone följande immateriella rättigheter omfattas av direktivets tillämpningsområde:")

Vilka kriterier användes för att fastställa att designskydd bör införas i förteckningen över immateriella rättigheter som omfattas av artikel 2 i direktivet?

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-001321/13

till kommissionen

Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)

(7 februari 2013)

Angående: Kriterier för att inkludera patenträttigheter, inklusive rättigheter som härrör från certifikat om tilläggsskydd, i förteckningen över immateriella rättigheter

I sitt svar på skriftlig fråga E-009093/2012 hänvisar kommissionen till sitt uttalande 2005/295/EG ⁽⁸⁾, som innehåller en uppenbart icke-uttömmande förteckning över immateriella rättigheter ("Kommissionen anser att åtminstone följande immateriella rättigheter omfattas av direktivets tillämpningsområde:")

Vilka kriterier användes för att fastställa att patenträttigheter, inklusive rättigheter som härrör från certifikat om tilläggsskydd, bör införas i förteckningen över immateriella rättigheter som omfattas av artikel 2 i direktivet?

⁽⁵⁾ http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/sv/oj/2005/l_094/l_09420050413sv00370037.pdf

⁽⁶⁾ http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/sv/oj/2005/l_094/l_09420050413sv00370037.pdf

⁽⁷⁾ http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/sv/oj/2005/l_094/l_09420050413sv00370037.pdf

⁽⁸⁾ http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/sv/oj/2005/l_094/l_09420050413sv00370037.pdf

**Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-001378/13
till kommissionen**

Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)

(11 februari 2013)

Angående: Kriterier för införande av geografiska angivelser i förteckningen över immateriella rättigheter

I sitt svar på skriftlig fråga E-009093/2012 hänvisar kommissionen till sitt uttalande 2005/295/EG ⁽⁹⁾, som innehåller en uppenbart icke-uttömmande förteckning över immateriella rättigheter ("Kommissionen anser att åtminstone följande immateriella rättigheter omfattas av direktivets tillämpningsområde:")

Vilka kriterier användes för att fastställa att geografiska angivelser skulle införas i förteckningen över immateriella rättigheter som omfattas av artikel 2 i direktivet?

**Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-001409/13
till kommissionen**

Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)

(11 februari 2013)

Angående: Kriterier för införande av bruksmodellskydd i förteckningen över immateriella rättigheter

I sitt svar på skriftlig fråga E-009093/2012 hänvisar kommissionen till sitt uttalande 2005/295/EG ⁽¹⁰⁾, som innehåller en uppenbart icke-uttömmande förteckning över immateriella rättigheter ("Kommissionen anser att åtminstone följande immateriella rättigheter omfattas av direktivets tillämpningsområde:")

Vilka kriterier användes för att fastställa att bruksmodellskydd skulle införas i förteckningen över immateriella rättigheter som omfattas av artikel 2 i direktivet?

**Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-001544/13
till kommissionen**

Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)

(13 februari 2013)

Angående: Kriterier för att ta upp handelsbeteckningar, i den mån de är skyddade som exklusiva rättigheter i gällande nationell lagstiftning, i förteckningar över immateriella rättigheter

I sitt svar på skriftlig fråga E-009093/2012 hänvisar kommissionen till sitt uttalande 2005/295/EG ⁽¹¹⁾, som innehåller en uppenbart icke-uttömmande förteckning över immateriella rättigheter (kommissionen ansåg att åtminstone de immateriella rättigheter som fanns införda i förteckningen omfattades av direktivet om säkerställande av skyddet för immateriella rättigheter).

Vilka kriterier användes för att fastställa att handelsbeteckningar, i den mån de är skyddade som exklusiva rättigheter i gällande nationell lagstiftning, bör tas upp i förteckningen över de immateriella rättigheter som omfattas av artikel 2 i direktivet?

**Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-001610/13
till kommissionen**

Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)

(14 februari 2013)

Angående: Kriterier för införande av växtförädlarrättigheter i förteckningen över immateriella rättigheter

I sitt svar på skriftlig fråga E-009093/2012 hänvisar kommissionen till sitt uttalande 2005/295/EG ⁽¹²⁾, som innehåller en uppenbart icke-uttömmande förteckning över immateriella rättigheter (kommissionen ansåg att åtminstone de immateriella rättigheter som fanns införda i förteckningen omfattades av direktivet om säkerställande av skyddet för immateriella rättigheter).

Vilka kriterier användes för att fastställa att växtförädlarrättigheter skulle införas i förteckningen över immateriella rättigheter som omfattas av artikel 2 i direktivet?

⁽⁹⁾ http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/sv/oj/2005/l_094/l_09420050413sv00370037.pdf

⁽¹⁰⁾ http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/sv/oj/2005/l_094/l_09420050413sv00370037.pdf

⁽¹¹⁾ http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/sv/oj/2005/l_094/l_09420050413sv00370037.pdf

⁽¹²⁾ http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/sv/oj/2005/l_094/l_09420050413sv00370037.pdf

**Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-001653/13
till kommissionen**

Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)

(18 februari 2013)

Angående: Kriterier för införande av upphovsrätt i förteckningen över immateriella rättigheter

I sitt svar på skriftlig fråga E-009093/2012 hänvisar kommissionen till sitt uttalande 2005/295/EG ⁽¹⁾, som innehåller en uppenbart icke-uttömmande förteckning över immateriella rättigheter (kommissionen ansåg att åtminstone de immateriella rättigheter som fanns införda i förteckningen omfattades av direktivet om säkerställande av skyddet för immateriella rättigheter).

Vilka kriterier användes för att fastställa att upphovsrätt skulle införas i den förteckning över immateriella rättigheter som omfattas av artikel 2 i direktivet?

Samlat svar från Michel Barnier på kommissionens vägnar

(25 mars 2013)

Direktiv 2004/48/EG är i princip tillämpligt på alla intrång i sådana immateriella rättigheter (däribland industriell äganderätt) som följer av gemenskapsrätten och/eller den berörda medlemsstatens nationella rätt (artikel 2). I skäl 13 till direktivet sägs det att direktivet måste ges ett så brett tillämpningsområde som möjligt, så att det inbegriper alla immateriella rättigheter. Därför utesluts inga immateriella rättigheter ur direktivets tillämpningsområde, om de är skyddade antingen via gemenskapsrätten eller i nationell rätt.

Förteckningen i kommissionens uttalande 2005/95/EG är, såsom anges i svaret på skriftlig fråga E-9093/2012, icke uttömmande och har upprättats för att kartlägga harmoniserade immateriella rättigheter i gemenskapens regelverk. Förteckningen tar även upp sådana rättigheter som till exempel designskydd, som betraktas som immateriella rättigheter i medlemsstaterna men som inte har harmoniserats. Förteckningen tar slutligen även upp andra rättigheter som i vissa medlemsstater betraktas som immateriella rättigheter och som i sådana fall kan omfattas av direktivet.

⁽¹⁾ http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/sv/oj/2005/l_094/l_09420050413sv00370037.pdf

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000953/13
to the Commission**

Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)

(30 January 2013)

Subject: Determination of intellectual property right status

In its answer to Written Question E-009093/2012 the Commission refers to its Statement 2005/295/EC ⁽¹⁾, in which a clearly non-exhaustive list of intellectual property rights is introduced with the following sentence: 'The Commission considers that at least the following intellectual property rights are covered by the scope of the [Intellectual Property Rights Enforcement] Directive'.

Which intellectual property rights does the Commission regard as falling outside the scope of the Enforcement Directive 2004/48/EC?

**Question for written answer E-000954/13
to the Commission**

Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)

(30 January 2013)

Subject: Criteria for including trademark rights in list of intellectual property rights

In its answer to Written Question E-009093/2012 the Commission refers to its Statement 2005/295/EC ⁽²⁾, in which a clearly non-exhaustive list of intellectual property rights is introduced with the following sentence: 'The Commission considers that at least the following intellectual property rights are covered by the scope of the [Intellectual Property Rights Enforcement] Directive'.

What criteria were used to determine that trademark rights should be included in the list of intellectual property rights covered by Article 2 of the directive?

**Question for written answer E-001068/13
to the Commission**

Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)

(1 February 2013)

Subject: Criteria for including rights related to copyright in list of IPRs

In its answer to Written Question E-009093/2012 the Commission refers to its Statement 2005/295/EC ⁽³⁾, which includes a clearly non-exhaustive list of intellectual property rights ('The Commission considers that at least the following intellectual property rights are covered by the scope of the [Intellectual Property Rights Enforcement] Directive').

Which criteria were used to determine that rights related to copyright should be included in the list of intellectual property rights covered by Article 2 of the directive?

**Question for written answer E-001091/13
to the Commission**

Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)

(1 February 2013)

Subject: Criteria for including sui generis rights of database makers in list of intellectual property rights

In its answer to Written Question E-009093/2012 the Commission refers to its Statement 2005/295/EC ⁽⁴⁾, in which a clearly non-exhaustive list of intellectual property rights is introduced with the following sentence: 'The Commission considers that at least the following intellectual property rights are covered by the scope of the [Intellectual Property Rights Enforcement] Directive'.

What criteria were used to determine that sui generis rights of database makers should be included in the list of intellectual property rights covered by Article 2 of the directive?

⁽¹⁾ http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2005/l_094/l_09420050413en00370037.pdf

⁽²⁾ http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2005/l_094/l_09420050413en00370037.pdf

⁽³⁾ http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2005/l_094/l_09420050413en00370037.pdf

⁽⁴⁾ http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2005/l_094/l_09420050413en00370037.pdf

**Question for written answer E-001176/13
to the Commission**

Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)

(5 February 2013)

Subject: Criteria for including the rights of the creator of the topographies of a semiconductor product in list of IPRs

In its answer to Written Question E-009093/2012, the Commission refers to its Statement 2005/295/EC ⁽⁵⁾ which contains a clearly non-exhaustive list of intellectual property rights: 'The Commission considers that at least the following intellectual property rights are covered by the scope of the [Intellectual Property Rights Enforcement] Directive'.

Which criteria were used to determine that the rights of the creator of the topographies of a semiconductor product should be included in the list of intellectual property rights covered by Article 2 of the directive?

**Question for written answer E-001199/13
to the Commission**

Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)

(5 February 2013)

Subject: Criteria for including trademark rights in list of IPRs

In its answer to Written Question E-009093/2012, the Commission refers to its Statement 2005/295/EC ⁽⁶⁾, which contains a clearly non-exhaustive list of intellectual property rights, and states: 'The Commission considers that at least the following intellectual property rights are covered by the scope of the [Intellectual Property Rights Enforcement] Directive (...)'.
(...)'.

Which criteria were used to determine that trademark rights should be included in the list of intellectual property rights covered by Article 2 of the directive?

**Question for written answer E-001235/13
to the Commission**

Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)

(6 February 2013)

Subject: Criteria for including design rights in list of IPRs

In its answer to Written Question E-009093/2012 the Commission refers to its Statement 2005/295/EC ⁽⁷⁾, which includes a clearly non-exhaustive list of intellectual property rights ('The Commission considers that at least the following intellectual property rights are covered by the scope of the [Intellectual Property Rights Enforcement] Directive').

Which criteria were used to determine that design rights should be included in the list of intellectual property rights covered by Article 2 of the directive?

**Question for written answer E-001321/13
to the Commission**

Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)

(7 February 2013)

Subject: Criteria for including patent rights, including rights derived from supplementary protection certificates, in list of IPRs

In its answer to Written Question E-009093/2012 the Commission refers to its Statement 2005/295/EC ⁽⁸⁾, which includes a clearly non-exhaustive list of intellectual property rights ('The Commission considers that at least the following intellectual property rights are covered by the scope of the [Intellectual Property Rights Enforcement] Directive').

Which criteria were used to determine that patent rights, including rights derived from supplementary protection certificates, should be included in the list of intellectual property rights covered by Article 2 of the directive?

⁽⁵⁾ http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2005/l_094/l_09420050413en00370037.pdf

⁽⁶⁾ http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2005/l_094/l_09420050413en00370037.pdf

⁽⁷⁾ http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2005/l_094/l_09420050413en00370037.pdf

⁽⁸⁾ http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2005/l_094/l_09420050413en00370037.pdf

**Question for written answer E-001378/13
to the Commission**

Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(11 February 2013)

Subject: Criteria for including geographical indications in list of IPRs

In its answer to Written Question E-009093/2012 the Commission refers to its Statement 2005/295/EC ⁽⁹⁾, which includes a clearly non-exhaustive list of intellectual property rights ('The Commission considers that at least the following intellectual property rights are covered by the scope of the [Intellectual Property Rights Enforcement] Directive').

Which criteria were used to determine that geographical indications should be included in the list of intellectual property rights covered by Article 2 of the directive?

**Question for written answer E-001409/13
to the Commission**

Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(11 February 2013)

Subject: Criteria for including utility model rights in list of intellectual property rights

In its answer to Written Question E-009093/2012 the Commission refers to its Statement 2005/295/EC ⁽¹⁰⁾, which includes a clearly non-exhaustive list of intellectual property rights ('The Commission considers that at least the following intellectual property rights are covered by the scope of the [Intellectual Property Rights Enforcement] Directive').

Which criteria were used to determine that utility model rights should be included in the list of intellectual property rights covered by Article 2 of the directive?

**Question for written answer E-001544/13
to the Commission**

Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(13 February 2013)

Subject: Criteria for including trade names, in so far as these are protected as exclusive property rights in the national law concerned, in lists of intellectual property rights (IPRs)

In its answer to Written Question E-009093/2012, the Commission refers to its Statement 2005/295/EC ⁽¹¹⁾, which contains a clearly non-exhaustive list of intellectual property rights (the Commission stated that it considered that at least those intellectual property rights listed in the statement were covered by the scope of the directive on the enforcement of intellectual property rights).

Which criteria were used to determine that trade names, in so far as these are protected as exclusive rights in the national law concerned, should be included in the list of intellectual property rights covered by Article 2 of the directive?

**Question for written answer E-001610/13
to the Commission**

Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(14 February 2013)

Subject: Criteria for including plant variety rights in lists of intellectual property rights (IPRs)

In its answer to Written Question E-009093/2012 the Commission refers to its Statement 2005/295/EC ⁽¹²⁾, which contains a clearly non-exhaustive list of intellectual property rights (the Commission stated that it considered that at least those intellectual property rights listed in the statement were covered by the scope of the directive on the enforcement of intellectual property rights).

Which criteria were used to determine that plant variety rights should be included in the list of intellectual property rights covered by Article 2 of the directive?

⁽⁹⁾ http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2005/l_094/l_09420050413en00370037.pdf

⁽¹⁰⁾ http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2005/l_094/l_09420050413en00370037.pdf

⁽¹¹⁾ http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2005/l_094/l_09420050413en00370037.pdf

⁽¹²⁾ http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2005/l_094/l_09420050413en00370037.pdf

**Question for written answer E-001653/13
to the Commission**

Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)

(18 February 2013)

Subject: Criteria for including copyright in lists of intellectual property rights (IPRs)

In its answer to Written Question E-009093/2012, the Commission refers to its Statement 2005/295/EC ⁽¹³⁾, which contains a clearly non-exhaustive list of intellectual property rights (the Commission stated that it considered that at least those intellectual property rights listed in the statement were covered by the scope of the directive on the enforcement of intellectual property rights).

Which criteria were used to determine that copyright should be included in the list of intellectual property rights covered by Article 2 of the directive?

Joint answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission

(25 March 2013)

Directive 2004/48/EC applies in principle to any infringement of intellectual property rights (which, for the purposes of the directive, include industrial property rights) as provided for by Community law and/or the national law of the Member State concerned (Article 2). Recital 13 of the directive states that it is necessary to define the scope of the directive as widely as possible in order to encompass all intellectual property rights. The directive therefore does not exclude any intellectual property rights from its scope, as long as protection for them is provided for by Community or national law.

The list provided in Commission Statement 2005/95/EC, which, as reiterated in the answer to Written Question E-9093/2012, is non-exhaustive, was compiled by identifying the harmonised intellectual property rights contained in the *acquis communautaire*. Rights such as utility models, which are considered to be intellectual property rights in the Member States in spite of the fact that they have not been harmonised, were also included in the list. Lastly, rights which are considered to be intellectual property rights in certain Member States, and which can therefore in this case be covered by the directive, were included in the list.

⁽¹³⁾ http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/oj/2005/l_094/l_09420050413en00370037.pdf

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000955/13
à Comissão
Carlos Coelho (PPE) e José Manuel Fernandes (PPE)
(30 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Segurança na circulação rodoviária

É fundamental garantir a livre circulação dos cidadãos na UE, nomeadamente através da criação de incentivos e garantias para que essa mobilidade possa ocorrer da forma mais eficaz e segura.

Para esse efeito, ao longo dos anos, foram criadas normas comuns aplicáveis à circulação rodoviária na UE.

Se é verdade que, no que diz respeito aos domínios relacionados com o tráfego rodoviário, parte deles foram harmonizados, em contrapartida existem outros domínios que não estão regulamentados no âmbito da UE, e outros que foram implementados pelos Estados-Membros com prazos diferentes para os períodos de transição.

Recentemente, um grande acidente rodoviário em que faleceram diversas pessoas tornou evidente a existência de regras diferentes, entre Portugal e Espanha, no que se refere à obrigatoriedade de cinto de segurança para autocarros que já se encontram há alguns anos em circulação.

1. Na opinião da Comissão, o que é que se afigura necessário fazer no plano da segurança rodoviária e da liberdade de circulação dos cidadãos comunitários?
2. Maior nível de informação, bem como uma maior harmonização das exigências legais?
3. Que iniciativas considera a Comissão ser necessário adotar neste âmbito?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(27 de fevereiro de 2013)

As regras sobre o uso do cinto de segurança e dos dispositivos de retenção para crianças estão harmonizadas a nível europeu. A diretiva relativa à utilização obrigatória de cintos de segurança e de dispositivos de retenção para crianças em veículos ⁽¹⁾ estipula que, nos autocarros, todos os ocupantes a partir dos três anos são obrigados a utilizar cintos de segurança sempre que estejam sentados, desde que tais sistemas de segurança estejam instalados. Os Estados-Membros podem, apenas em relação ao transporte no seu território, conceder isenções a esta obrigação para o transporte local em zonas urbanas e zonas edificadas, ou para os transportes em que se pode viajar de pé.

A Comissão continuará a aplicar medidas de segurança rodoviária em consonância com os objetivos das suas orientações para a política de segurança rodoviária de 2011 a 2020 ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Diretiva 91/671/CEE do Conselho (JO L 373 de 31.12.1991), com a redação que lhe foi dada pela Diretiva 2003/20/CE (JO L 115 de 9.5.2003).

⁽²⁾ Comunicação da Comissão ao Parlamento Europeu, ao Conselho, ao Comité Económico e Social Europeu e ao Comité das Regiões: «Rumo a um espaço europeu de segurança rodoviária: orientações para a política de segurança rodoviária de 2011 a 2020»; COM(2010) 389 final.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000955/13
to the Commission
Carlos Coelho (PPE) and José Manuel Fernandes (PPE)
(30 January 2013)**

Subject: Road safety

It is essential to guarantee the free movement of citizens within the EU, by providing incentives and safeguards to ensure that such mobility takes place in the safest and most effective manner.

With this in view, common standards for road transport in the EU have been introduced over the years.

While it is true that a number of road traffic-related areas have been harmonised, there are still several which are not regulated at EU level, while other measures have been implemented by the Member States with different time frames for their transition periods.

Recently, a serious traffic accident in which several people died highlighted the existence of different rules in Portugal and Spain regarding the obligatory use of seat belts in coaches which have already been on the road for a number of years.

1. What does the Commission consider needs to be done at the level of road safety and free movement of EU citizens?
2. Does it see a need for more information, as well as increased harmonisation of legal requirements?
3. In the Commission's view, what measures need to be adopted in this sphere?

**Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(27 February 2013)**

Rules on seat belts and child-restraint systems are harmonised at European level. The relevant directive relating to the compulsory use of safety belts and child-restraint systems in vehicles ⁽¹⁾ stipulates that in buses and coaches all occupants aged three and more are obliged to use safety belts while they are seated, provided that such safety systems are installed. Member States may, only for transport in their territory, grant exemptions from this obligation for local transport in urban and built-up areas, or in which standing is allowed.

The Commission will continue to implement road safety measures in line with the objectives of its Policy Orientations on Road Safety 2011-2020 ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 91/671/EEC (OJ L 373, 31.12.1991), as amended by Directive 2003/20/EC (OJ L 115, 9.5.2003).

⁽²⁾ Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions "Towards a European road safety area : policy orientations on road safety 2011-2020" COM(2010) 389 final.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-001257/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(6 février 2013)

Objet: IP tracking, une pratique qui va à l'encontre de l'intérêt du consommateur

Récemment un blog, SOS consommation, a mis en lumière des pratiques liées à l'IP tracking, méthode qui permet à un site marchand d'adapter ses tarifs en fonction de la navigation de chaque internaute. Le site en question enregistre la recherche d'une personne qui souhaite acheter un billet d'avion, par exemple, et l'associe à une adresse IP (qui correspond au PC utilisé pour cette recherche). Si jamais l'internaute décide de ne pas acheter le billet dans l'immédiat et s'il réessaye un peu plus tard depuis le même terminal, le site proposera alors un prix légèrement supérieur, pour lui faire croire que le nombre de places s'est réduit et susciter l'achat.

En tant qu'eurodéputé en charge de la protection du consommateur européen, je me permets de vous interroger:

1. N'y a-t-il pas, d'après la Commission, violation manifeste des principes de l'Union européenne?
2. La Commission estime-t-elle normal que des entreprises utilisent l'adresse IP à des fins marketing et commerciales?
3. Comment la Commission se positionne-t-elle par rapport au fait que l'IP tracking mènera inévitablement à la discrimination? En effet, qu'est ce qui empêcherait alors une entreprise, en croisant les informations par exemple, de créer des profils en fonction de l'adresse IP des consommateurs et de proposer des prix, non seulement en fonction du moment où ils se connectent, mais aussi en fonction des autres sites qu'ils fréquentent ou du quartier dans lequel ils habitent et donc, in fine, en fonction de leur niveau social?
4. La Commission estime-t-elle que l'adresse IP n'est pas une donnée personnelle, en tout cas pas assez personnelle pour la protéger?
5. La Commission va-t-elle ou a-t-elle mené une enquête sur l'IP tracking?
6. Quelle est la gamme de sanctions prévue par la Commission pour ce type de cas?

Réponse commune donnée par M^{me} Reding au nom de la Commission
(18 avril 2013)

Une adresse IP (Internet Protocol) est un identifiant unique utilisé pour connecter les utilisateurs aux sites web, tels que les sites de vente de services de voyage. Les sites web peuvent aisément établir un profil unique pour chaque internaute puisqu'ils enregistrent l'adresse IP des appareils des utilisateurs. Selon les questions posées à la Commission, les sites web fournissent des prix différents aux utilisateurs sur la base de leurs adresses IP.

Dans la mesure où les adresses IP permettent d'identifier précisément les utilisateurs lorsqu'elles sont associées à d'autres informations reçues par les serveurs, elles constituent des données à caractère personnel au sens de la directive 95/46/CE ⁽¹⁾.

Conformément aux dispositions nationales mettant en œuvre la directive susmentionnée, les données à caractère personnel doivent notamment être traitées pour des motifs légitimes et dans un but spécifique, et le traitement doit être proportionné à l'objectif poursuivi. Les clients des voyageurs devraient être informés de l'existence de ce traitement. Sans préjudice des compétences de la Commission en tant que gardienne du traité, les autorités de contrôle nationales chargées de la protection des données sont les organes compétents pour le suivi de l'application des mesures nationales de transposition de la directive 95/46/CE ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 95/46/CE du Parlement européen et du Conseil, du 24 octobre 1995, relative à la protection des personnes physiques à l'égard du traitement des données à caractère personnel et à la libre circulation de ces données — JO L 281 du 23.11.1995, p. 31.

⁽²⁾ Sans préjudice des compétences de la Commission en tant que gardienne du traité.

La directive 2005/29/CE relative aux pratiques commerciales déloyales et le règlement (CE) n° 1008/2008 ⁽¹⁾ disposent que les informations sur le prix total doivent figurer sur toute invitation à l'achat. Ces dispositions n'empêchent pas les professionnels de changer le prix dans une autre invitation à l'achat tant que le prix total est clairement affiché avant que le consommateur conclue le processus d'achat. La Commission, dans le rapport qu'elle a récemment adopté sur la directive relative aux pratiques commerciales déloyales, a pris acte de l'émergence de nouvelles formes de comportements commerciaux douteux sur les plateformes en ligne. Elle a donc mis en place des ateliers pour évaluer plus précisément dans quelles circonstances l'augmentation soudaine des prix pratiqués par un professionnel peut devenir illégale du point de vue de la protection des consommateurs.

⁽¹⁾ Règlement (CE) n° 1008/2008 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 24 septembre 2008 établissant des règles communes pour l'exploitation de services aériens dans la Communauté (refonte) — JO L 293 du 31.10.2008, p. 3.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000956/13

alla Commissione
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(30 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Problematiche relative all'«IP tracking»

Una recente ricerca francese mostrerebbe come vi siano molti casi in cui gli utenti di siti online di compagnie di trasporto europee si troverebbero vittime di una politica commerciale poco trasparente. Capita infatti sovente di voler prenotare un biglietto online offerto ad un determinato costo, ma se si ritorna per volerlo acquistare poco dopo questo costo è improvvisamente aumentato. Nel contempo, tale aumento non si verificherebbe se la seconda richiesta fosse inoltrata da un altro utente.

Questo «fenomeno» si spiegherebbe col fatto che i gestori di questi siti, e quindi le aziende che rappresentano, utilizzano il sistema del cosiddetto «IP tracking», che permette appunto di individuare l'utente e agire quindi sul prezzo di un prodotto conoscendo l'interesse del consumatore.

1. Può la Commissione verificare se vi siano effettivamente casi in cui questo sistema venga utilizzato, principalmente dalle compagnie di trasporto low cost?
2. Può altresì indicare se l'utilizzo dell'«IP tracking» sia compatibile con la legislazione europea a tutela del consumatore nell'ambito dell'e-commerce?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001574/13

alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(13 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: IP tracking

Il modo utilizzato dalle aziende di e-commerce per riconoscere un utente è l'IP (Internet Protocol) del suo computer. Pare infatti che quando si prenota col computer un viaggio aereo o ferroviario, al secondo clic la tariffa venga sempre maggiorata.

Secondo i consumatori che si sono rivolti al blog di Le Monde per protestare, questa maggiorazione è l'effetto dell'IP tracking. Naturalmente, sia la compagnia ferroviaria SNCF che quella aerea Airfrance hanno negato di utilizzare questa procedura. I consumatori non sono soddisfatti e non accettano di essere spiati di nascosto dalle aziende alle quali si rivolgono per ottenere i biglietti di viaggio via Internet. A riprova di questa convinzione i lettori di Le Monde hanno verificato che l'infelice coincidenza dell'aumento di prezzo succede soltanto quando si prenota dallo stesso computer, ma non succede invece quando si usa un iPad.

Può la Commissione dire:

1. se è al corrente di queste possibili pratiche;
2. se l'uso dell'IP tracking può configurarsi come un reato e, eventualmente, quale;
3. quali iniziative, nel caso in cui venissero confermati i timori dei consumatori francesi, potrebbe intraprendere per la loro tutela e per garantire la massima trasparenza dei rapporti tra aziende e clienti nel settore dell'e-commerce, senza che l'utente possa essere spiato a sua insaputa?

Risposta congiunta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione

(18 aprile 2013)

L'indirizzo di protocollo internet (IP) è un identificatore unico utilizzato per collegare gli utenti e i siti web, compresi quelli delle compagnie che offrono servizi di viaggio. I siti web sono facilmente in grado di costruire un profilo unico degli utenti che li visitano, registrando l'indirizzo IP del dispositivo dell'utente. Stando a quanto affermato nell'interrogazione, vi sarebbero siti web che offrono prezzi diversi agli utenti in base ai loro indirizzi IP.

Nella misura in cui, grazie anche ad altre informazioni ricevute dai server, consentono l'identificazione precisa degli utenti, gli indirizzi IP costituiscono dati personali ai sensi della direttiva sulla tutela dei dati personali (95/46/EC) ⁽¹⁾.

In conformità con la normativa nazionale che recepisce tale direttiva, il trattamento dei dati personali deve avvenire, tra l'altro, per motivi legittimi e per una finalità specifica e deve essere proporzionato allo scopo perseguito. I clienti delle compagnie di trasporto devono essere informati sul trattamento dei loro dati. Fatte salve le competenze della Commissione in quanto custode del trattato, le autorità nazionali di controllo della protezione dei dati sono gli organi preposti a monitorare l'applicazione delle misure nazionali in recepimento della suddetta direttiva ⁽²⁾.

La direttiva sulle pratiche commerciali sleali (2005/29/CE) e il regolamento (CE) n. 1008/2008 ⁽³⁾ stabiliscono che le informazioni relative al prezzo complessivo devono essere fornite in ogni invito all'acquisto; tali norme non impediscono ai professionisti di modificare il prezzo in un secondo invito all'acquisto, a condizione che il prezzo totale sia chiaramente indicato prima del completamento dell'acquisto da parte del consumatore. La Commissione ha recentemente pubblicato una relazione sulla direttiva sulle pratiche commerciali sleali, in cui si riscontra la comparsa, tramite le piattaforme online, di nuove forme di comportamenti commerciali di dubbia natura. La Commissione sta organizzando alcuni incontri per valutare ulteriormente in quali circostanze l'improvviso aumento dei prezzi da parte di un operatore economico possa divenire illegittimo dal punto di vista della tutela dei consumatori.

⁽¹⁾ Direttiva 95/46/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 24 ottobre 1995, relativa alla tutela delle persone fisiche con riguardo al trattamento dei dati personali, nonché alla libera circolazione di tali dati, GU L 281 del 23.11.1995, pag. 31.

⁽²⁾ Fatte salve le competenze della Commissione in quanto custode del trattato.

⁽³⁾ Regolamento (CE) n. 1008/2008 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 24 settembre 2008, recante norme comuni per la prestazione di servizi aerei nella Comunità (rifusione), GU L 293 del 31.10.2008, pag. 3.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000956/13
to the Commission
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(30 January 2013)**

Subject: Problems relating to 'IP tracking'

A recent French survey has apparently shown that there are many cases in which users of European transport company websites are falling victim to a commercial policy that is lacking in transparency. For instance, people often want to book a ticket online that is offered at a given price, but if they go back to buy it a little while later the price has suddenly increased. Meanwhile, there is no such increase where the second request is made by another user.

This 'phenomenon' is explained by the fact that the operators of these sites, and therefore the companies they represent, make use of the so-called 'IP tracking' system, which enables users to be identified and thus the price of a product to be changed in the awareness of the consumer's interest.

1. Can the Commission check whether there are indeed cases in which this system is being used, mainly by low-cost transport companies?
2. Can it also say whether the use of 'IP tracking' is compatible with EU legislation on consumer protection in the field of e-commerce?

**Question for written answer P-001257/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(6 February 2013)**

Subject: IP tracking, a practice which is contrary to consumers' interests

Recently a blog, 'SOS conso', highlighted certain practices involving IP tracking, whereby for example a commercial website can tailor the prices it displays to the browsing history of individual Internet users. For example, a commercial website can record a search made by someone wishing to buy an airline ticket and link it to the IP address of the PC used for the search. If the person searching the site decides not to buy a ticket at that time and conducts another search a little later from the same PC, the website will display a slightly higher price in order to give the impression that fewer tickets are now available and prompt the potential customer to purchase one.

As a Member of the European Parliament with a responsibility to ensure European consumers are protected, I must ask:

1. Does the Commission agree that this practice is in clear breach of European Union rules?
2. Does the Commission regard it as acceptable for businesses to use consumers' IP addresses for commercial purposes?
3. How does the Commission view the fact that IP tracking will inevitably lead to discrimination? For example, what is to stop commercial undertakings from collating data with a view to creating individual user profiles for consumers' IP addresses and displaying prices determined not only by the time when users log on to a website, but also by which other websites they frequent or by their postcode — in effect, by reference to their social classification?
4. Does the Commission take the view that IP addresses are not personal data, or at least not personal enough to warrant protection?
5. Will the Commission launch an investigation into IP tracking, or has it already done so?
6. What penalties does the Commission envisage in cases of this kind?

**Question for written answer E-001574/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(13 February 2013)**

Subject: IP tracking

The method used by e-commerce companies to recognise a user is the IP (Internet Protocol) address of his or her computer. It seems that, when a flight or rail ticket is booked via computer, the fare always increases after the second click.

According to consumers who have turned to the *Le Monde* blog in protest, this increase is the result of IP tracking. Naturally, both the rail company SNCF and the airline Air France have denied using this procedure. The consumers are not satisfied and do not accept being spied upon in secret by the companies they use for purchasing travel tickets via the Internet. In order to prove this, *Le Monde's* readers have verified that the unfortunate coincidence of the price increase only happens when a booking is made from the same computer; it does not happen when an iPad is used.

Can the Commission say:

1. whether it is aware of these possible practices;
2. whether the use of IP tracking may constitute a criminal offence and, if so, which one;
3. what steps, if the French consumers' fears are confirmed, could be taken to protect them and to guarantee maximum transparency in the relationship between companies and clients in the e-commerce sector, without users being spied upon without their knowledge?

**Joint answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(18 April 2013)**

An Internet Protocol (IP) address is a unique identifier used to connect users and websites, including those selling travel services. Websites can easily build a unique profile of Internet users, as they 'log' the IP address of the users' devices. According to the questions, websites provide different prices to users, using their IP addresses.

To the extent that, combined with other information received by the servers they allow those users to be precisely identified, IP addresses are personal data within the meaning of the DPD (95/46/EC) ⁽¹⁾.

In line with the national laws implementing the DPD, personal data must *inter alia* be processed on legitimate grounds, for a specific purpose and the processing must be proportionate to the aim pursued. The clients of the travel companies should be informed about the processing. Without prejudice to the powers of the Commission as guardian of the Treaty, national data protection supervisory authorities are the competent bodies to monitor the application of the national measures implementing the DPD ⁽²⁾.

The Unfair Commercial Practices Directive (UCPD- 2005/29/EC) and Regulation (EC) 1008/2008 ⁽³⁾ provide that information on the total price must be provided in any invitation to purchase; this legislation does not prevent traders from changing the price in a later invitation to purchase, as long as the total price is clearly displayed before the consumer completes the purchasing process. In the recently adopted report on the UCPD, the Commission acknowledged the emergence of new forms of dubious commercial behaviour via online platforms. It is organising workshops to further assess under which circumstances the sudden increase of prices by a trader may become illegitimate from a consumer protection angle.

⁽¹⁾ Data Protection Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24.10.1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, OJ L 281 of 23.11.1995, p. 31.

⁽²⁾ Without prejudice to the powers of the Commission as guardian of the Treaty.

⁽³⁾ 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 (Recast), OJ L 293, 31.10.2008, pp. 3-20.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000957/13
to the Commission**

Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)

(30 January 2013)

Subject: Selective negotiating efforts for qualifying industrial zones in Ukraine

It has been suggested that the EU's current approach to Ukraine discriminates against Ukrainians who are prepared to meet European standards and participate in the common market. Given that a precedent for selective free trade exists in EU dealings with Israel, Egypt and Jordan, does the Commission believe that similar selective negotiating practices could be of benefit for qualifying industrial zones in Ukraine?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission

(22 April 2013)

EU trade policy adheres to the principle of non-discrimination: Ukrainian producers, like others, are able to export to the EU provided they comply with the standards required.

The Commission maintains that the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement (DCFTA) negotiated in the context of the EU-Ukraine Association Agreement offers Ukraine as a whole an effective framework for modernising its trade relations with the EU. With regard to technical barriers to trade, the DCFTA foresees that Ukraine will progressively adapt its technical regulations and standards to those of the EU. Future negotiations of an Agreement on Conformity Assessment and Acceptance of Industrial Products (ACAA) will aim that in specific sectors trade between the Parties will take place as between Member States. Until then, product compliance with EU standards remains a non-discriminatory prerequisite for exporting to the EU.

Note that the Association Agreement including the Deep and Comprehensive FTA is at the moment not yet signed. If political conditions set out in December 2012 are met by Ukraine, the Agreement could be signed in November 2013. If appropriate, provisional application of selected parts of the Agreement, including its trade provisions, could also be envisaged.

The establishment of the qualified industrial zones (QIZ) for the exclusive purpose of export of goods to the USA produced in specifically designated zones of Jordan, Egypt, and Israel is not the approach followed by the EU concerning these countries. Indeed, the EU has chosen a combination of bilateral free trade agreements and possibilities for diagonal cumulation of rules of origin amongst PanEuroMediterranean partners.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000958/13
to the Commission**

Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)

(30 January 2013)

Subject: Review of current arrangements with Iran in light of humanitarian concerns

According to reports, existing trade embargoes imposed by the USA and the European Union on Iran have led to a lack of availability of important medicines used to treat serious illnesses. Whilst humanitarian supplies are not covered by the sanctions, the ban on financial transactions with Iran means in practice that a knock-on effect occurs regarding the supply of drugs.

Does the Commission have any proposals to review the current arrangements with Iran in light of these humanitarian concerns?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(4 April 2013)

The EU's sanctions are targeted at Iran's nuclear programme and at revenues Iran is using to fund this programme. They are not aimed at the Iranian people. In order to minimise any unintended effects on the Iranian population, the EU sanctions regime includes relevant exemptions and specific provisions, for example for transactions regarding foodstuffs, healthcare, medical equipment or for agricultural and humanitarian purposes.

Concerning the transfer of funds to and from Iran, including through Iranian banks, the sanctions include provisions that remove obstacles that would otherwise be applicable to such transactions. In addition, these sectors are exempted from the prohibition on the provision of public financial support for trade with Iran (export credit).

Should operators be confronted with difficulties to carry out transactions or are in doubt about the interpretation of the relevant regulations, the EU institutions and the competent authorities of Member States can provide information and advice. Sanctions are however not accountable for the assessment by private economic operators, in particular banks and financial institutions, of the business risk represented by Iran's political situation given the uncertainties created by the nuclear crisis.

The EU's autonomous sanctions are constantly reviewed in order to assess the efficiency of the measures, including with regard to their exemptions.

It is noted that the deterioration of the Iranian economy is primarily the consequence of the economic policies and choices of the Iranian leadership and the diversion of enormous resources into the nuclear programme.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000959/13
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(30 January 2013)**

Subject: Pan-EU rail market and steps to encourage stakeholders to embrace potential changes

It is claimed that proposed efforts to create a single European model for all national rail systems would lead to increasing costs for stakeholders at a time when Member State budgets would be unable to cope with rising costs deriving from such a reform.

If the Commission is realistic in its stated aim to enable a pan-EU rail market, what steps are being taken to encourage key stakeholders to embrace potential changes?

**Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(12 March 2013)**

The Commission thoroughly evaluated the cost and the benefits of the 4th railway package in the impact assessments accompanying the legislative proposals ⁽¹⁾.

The proposed reform on the governance of infrastructure could entail limited costs related to the enforcement of separation requirements (one off) and to the contractualisation of commercial relations between infrastructure managers and rail operators. These costs are estimated to amount to up to EUR 1.77 billion by 2035. It should however be underlined that enforcement costs would only apply in those Member States maintaining integrated structures and would not affect new entrants. Besides, this amount also depends on the number of actors in the market and are therefore correlated to the level of competition.

On the other hand, the direct benefits from independent infrastructure managers are estimated to reach some EUR 6.5 billion by 2035. Moreover, independence requirements will serve as the catalyst for a successful opening of domestic passenger markets to competition increasing the benefits to up to EUR 43 billion.

Costs will be offset by the benefits from savings in competitive tendering of up to 30% for the public purse (public service obligations cost some EUR 18-20 billion every year), increased supply of services and better use of infrastructures with a direct positive impact on public resources. The impact assessments have been based on an extensive consultation with citizens, rail stakeholders, social partners as well as local and national authorities. The Commission will highlight the expected benefits of the 4th railway package and continue engaging on this subject with industry and public stakeholders throughout the legislative process.

⁽¹⁾ (http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/kallas/headlines/news/2013/01/fourth-railway-package_en.htm).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000960/13
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(30 January 2013)**

Subject: Improving the state of groundwater bodies across Europe

About 25% of all groundwater bodies across Europe are in a poor chemical state. One of the more regularly cited reasons for this trend is high nitrate levels, which it is not estimated will improve within the next 10 to 15 years.

Is the Commission aware of this issue, and has it any strategies to improve the state of groundwater bodies?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission
(13 March 2013)**

The Commission is aware of the chemical status of the groundwater bodies in Europe and has recently issued a report based on the assessment of the Member States' River Basin Management Plans ⁽¹⁾ accompanied by background studies.

These studies show that nitrates pollution causes poor chemical status in a large number of groundwater bodies. Member States are required by the Water Framework Directive ⁽²⁾ to achieve good chemical status of groundwater bodies by 2015 and to include the necessary measures in their River Basin Management Plans in order to achieve this objective. The Commission is currently engaging in bilateral discussions with all Member States to discuss its recommendations to improve the plans to achieve the 2015 objectives.

The Nitrates Directive ⁽³⁾ also aims at reducing nitrates pollution in Europe. Under the directive, Member States are required to establish and implement Action Programmes containing measures related to good agricultural practices and aimed at preventing and reducing pollution caused by nitrates of agricultural origin. These rules are obligatory for farmers located in Nitrates Vulnerable Zones. The last implementation report ⁽⁴⁾ shows, for the period 2004-2007, stable or decreasing nitrate concentrations in 66% of the groundwater monitoring stations and nitrates concentrations above the quality threshold of 50 mg per litre in 15% of the groundwater stations. The next implementation report, referring to the period 2008-2011, will be to be published by mid-2013.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/water-framework/implrep2007/index_en.htm

⁽²⁾ Directive 2000/60/EC, OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.

⁽³⁾ Directive 91/676/EEC, O. J. L 375, 31.12.1991.

⁽⁴⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/water-nitrates/pdf/sec_2011_909.pdf

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000961/13
to the Commission**

Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)

(30 January 2013)

Subject: Promotion and expansion of European Heritage Days

A constituent recently informed me of an enjoyable experience at the 'Doors Open Day', an initiative in Scotland that forms part of the European Heritage Days.

It has since come to my attention that direct EU financial support exists for the programme, and I would like to know whether the EU has any plans to further promote and expand the European Heritage Days experience.

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission

(7 March 2013)

The European Heritage Days is a joint action of the Commission and the Council of Europe, which takes place every year in September in the 50 signatory countries of the European Cultural Convention. On these days, historic buildings which are normally closed to the public open up to visitors, and national, regional and local coordinators from each participating country organise thousands of events on various themes.

The total budget of this action in 2013 is 400 000 EUR, with each institution contributing 50%. The Commission contribution to the budget is financed through a special action of the Culture Programme. The activities supported increase the European dimension of the event by creating a common communication platform for all the countries involved, fostering networking and information exchange between the national coordinators, and encouraging cross-border events. The European Heritage Days are co-funded with national, regional and local budgets in each country.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000962/13
to the Commission**

Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)

(30 January 2013)

Subject: EU funding in Serbia

It is estimated by the Serbian Chamber of Commerce that 70% of EU funds designed to finance financial market projects in the Republic of Serbia go unused.

Is the Commission aware of this issue, and what does it suggest the EU can do to encourage greater interest in funding of this nature in Serbia?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission

(21 March 2013)

The European Commission is providing financial support to Serbia under the instrument for pre-accession assistance (IPA) since 2007. For the period 2007-2011 the European Commission has earmarked EUR 1 billion for IPA projects to be implemented in the country. As of today, more than 90% of these funds have been contracted and more than 50% have been already disbursed. At the end of 2012, additional EUR 171 million have been allocated to Serbia to support the accession process.

The ongoing IPA projects are covering different sectors, including private sector development, but no project is in particular supporting the financial market.

Serbia is also benefiting of loans from international financial organisations such as the EBRD and the EIB.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000976/13

à la Commission

Marielle de Sarnez (ALDE)

(30 janvier 2013)

Objet: Interdiction aux aéroports américains d'appliquer le système européen d'échange de quotas de CO₂

En janvier 2012, la Commission européenne a pris la décision d'étendre le champ d'application du système européen d'échange de quotas de CO₂ (EU ETS) à l'aviation, pour inciter l'industrie aéronautique à réduire ses émissions et à développer des carburants écologiques.

Ainsi, le projet de la Commission européenne prévoit que les 5 000 compagnies aériennes européennes et étrangères opérant sur le marché européen auront à disposition 210,3 tonnes métriques de CO₂ (MtCO₂) par an.

Bien que la Cour de Justice de l'Union européenne ait confirmé la compatibilité du système européen avec le droit international, le gouvernement américain a promulgué, fin novembre, une loi interdisant aux compagnies américaines de se conformer au système ETS européen, estimant que l'Union européenne n'a pas à imposer une taxe aux citoyens américains pour le survol de leur propre espace aérien.

Qu'entend faire la Commission à la suite de la décision américaine, notamment au sein de l'OIAC et de la Conférence des Parties de la Convention-Cadre des Nations unies sur le Changement Climatique (UNFCCC), afin de garantir la viabilité du système?

Réponse commune donnée par M^{me} Hedegaard au nom de la Commission

(21 mars 2013)

La Commission est parfaitement informée de l'actualité aux États-Unis et du fait que le président américain M. Obama a signé le projet de loi Thune le 27 novembre 2012. Cependant, le projet de loi en soi confère uniquement au secrétaire américain aux transports le pouvoir discrétionnaire d'interdire aux compagnies aériennes américaines de respecter la législation de l'Union européenne. C'est au secrétaire qu'il appartient de décider s'il fera ou non usage de ces pouvoirs à l'avenir.

En outre, il est important de souligner que le projet de loi Thune impose également au secrétaire de tenter de parvenir à un accord global sur les émissions produites par le secteur de l'aviation. L'Union européenne partage cet objectif, et la Commission met tout en œuvre, en collaboration avec les États membres, pour accroître les chances d'accomplir des progrès, lors de l'assemblée de l'Organisation de l'aviation civile internationale (OACI), en septembre 2013, sur l'approche globale à adopter pour mettre au point des mesures fondées sur le marché. Afin d'imprimer un élan supplémentaire aux discussions au sein de l'OACI, la Commission a proposé en novembre d'interrompre temporairement la mise en œuvre des points les plus controversés du système d'échange de quotas d'émissions de l'Union appliqués à l'aviation jusqu'à l'assemblée de l'OACI prévue dans le courant de cette année.

Quoi qu'il en soit, les exploitants d'aéronefs américains sont tenus de respecter la législation de l'Union européenne, qui est pleinement compatible avec le droit international, y compris le principe de souveraineté des États. Cela a également été confirmé par la Cour de justice de l'Union européenne dans son arrêt du 21 décembre 2011.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000963/13
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(30 January 2013)**

Subject: EU emissions trading scheme and the USA

US President Barack Obama recently signed into US law a bill barring US airlines from participating in the European Union's emissions trading scheme.

What steps will the Commission now consider to encourage a change in US policy in order to secure mutually beneficial outcomes?

**Question for written answer E-000976/13
to the Commission
Marielle de Sarnez (ALDE)
(30 January 2013)**

Subject: US Government ban on US aircraft operators participating in the EU Emissions Trading System (EU ETS)

In January 2012, the Commission decided to extend the EU ETS to include aviation, in an effort to encourage the aviation industry to reduce carbon emissions and develop eco-friendly fuels.

Under the Commission's plans, the 5 000 EU and non-EU airlines which operate flights into and out of Europe will be allocated an overall annual carbon allowance of 210.3 million metric tonnes of CO₂ (MtCO₂).

Although the Court of Justice of the European Union has confirmed that the EU ETS is consistent with international law, in late November 2012 the US Government enacted a law prohibiting US aircraft operators from participating in the EU ETS, on the basis that the EU does not have the right to impose a tax on US citizens in respect of flights in US airspace.

What steps is the Commission planning to take in response to the US Government's decision, particularly in the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) and the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)?

**Joint answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(21 March 2013)**

The Commission is fully aware of the developments in the United States and the fact that US President Obama signed the 'Thune bill' on the 27 November 2012. However, the bill itself only gives the US Transportation Secretary the discretion to bar US airlines from complying with EC law. It is up to the Secretary himself to decide whether he will use these powers in the future.

Furthermore, it is important to highlight that the 'Thune bill' also directs the Secretary to work for a global agreement on aviation emissions. The EU shares that objective and the Commission works hard with Member States to enhance the chances that progress on a global approach to market-based measures will be achieved at the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) Assembly in September 2013. To add momentum to the ICAO discussions the Commission in November proposed to temporarily 'stop the clock' as regards enforcement of the most contested aspects of the EU ETS's application to aviation until the ICAO Assembly later this year.

In any event US aircraft operators must respect the EU legislation, which is fully compatible with international law including the principle of state sovereignty. This has been also confirmed by the European Court of Justice in its Judgment of 21 December 2011.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000964/13
to the Commission**

Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)

(30 January 2013)

Subject: EU efforts to address global match-fixing

Commissioner Barnier recently identified the need to uphold sporting integrity, suggesting that betting-related match-fixing in particular goes against the nature of fair play. Given that there are cases where match-fixing of sports events held in the EU, such as football matches, is often organised outside the borders of the EU, what steps are the Commission preparing to address the global issue of match fixing?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission

(26 March 2013)

In its communication 'Towards a comprehensive European framework on online gambling' ⁽¹⁾, the Commission announced its intention to promote international cooperation in the fight against match-fixing.

The Commission selected five projects under the 2012 Preparatory Action 'European Partnership on Sports' with the objective of supporting international cooperation, networking and exchange of good practices in the field of prevention of match-fixing through education and awareness-raising actions. The projects are currently under way, with results expected by the first half of 2014.

The Commission is also continuing cooperation with the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and the Council of Europe, both of which have developed measures to address the issue on a global level. In particular, the Commission is participating in the negotiations for a possible Convention of the Council of Europe against the manipulation of sports competitions, which should be open to signature and ratification also by non-European countries.

Furthermore, the Commission intends to explore the possibility of including the fight against match-fixing in discussions with third countries and the competent international organisations in the field of sport.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2012) 596 final.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000965/13
to the Commission**

Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)

(30 January 2013)

Subject: 'eHealth' and accessibility for older generations

The Commission has announced plans for 'eHealth' as part of a more general attempt at individualised patient care. With reference to 2012 having been the European Year for Active Ageing, has the Commission taken into account the accessibility of new technologies for older generations, who may possibly be less open to new methods of technological progress?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission

(18 March 2013)

The eHealth Action Plan — COM(2012)736 final — aims to improve healthcare for the benefit of patients, give patients more control of their care and bring down costs by addressing the barriers to the full use of digital solutions in Europe's healthcare systems. The European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing (EIP AHA) plays an important role in helping to achieve these goals with a specific focus on the older generations. In particular, it is examining how to organise social and healthcare in an integrated way around the older person in his or her own home environment and how to achieve the social and organisational innovation needed for its large scale implementation.

Older generations are also being placed at the centre of a proposed follow-up to the ambient Assisted Living Joint Programme (AAL JP), which plans to integrate older adults into each stage of each project.

Usability and accessibility is an inherent requirement of all relevant Commission-funded research, development and innovation actions. A special emphasis on accessibility is also being undertaken through research and development of 'design for all' methodologies and assistive technologies. Research work on e-accessibility is currently being funded under FP7, through projects such as GUIDE (<http://www.guide-project.eu/>) which develops solutions to allow the user interface of new technologies to be adapted to the impairments and preferences of elderly users.

Moreover, legislative measures which are being taken within the context of the internal market, such as the recent proposal for a directive on the accessibility of public sector bodies' websites and the European Accessibility Act (under preparation), may benefit to elderly users.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000966/13
to the Commission**

Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)

(30 January 2013)

Subject: Cross-border university study programmes

Given the success of the EURES-affiliated scheme linking cross-border university programmes in the Saarland, Kaiserslautern, Trier, Liège, Luxembourg and Lorraine regions, coupled with the precarious situation of the Erasmus programme, has the Commission given any thought to enhancing or encouraging similar study programmes where logical territorial opportunities exist?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission

(27 March 2013)

Regional development plays an important part in the EU's modernisation agenda for higher education. The agenda highlights the importance of a systematic involvement of higher education institutions in preparing integrated local and regional development plans, and calls upon regional authorities to support cooperation between higher education, research centres and businesses to stimulate innovation and entrepreneurship and develop regional hubs of excellence. Highlighting the value of productive relationships between education and the region, the future U-Multirank tool will include an assessment of how well institutions support regional development.

At EU level, the 'Erasmus for All' Programme from 2014 onwards will have the aim of reaching many more students and staff and supporting more cooperation projects than is possible under the current programme.

Under the new programme, support will be available for cooperation between regions, their higher education institutions and other partners across national borders. Such projects may involve intensified student and staff exchanges, including cross-border traineeships at enterprises; or the creation of strategic transnational partnerships among a range of stakeholders to develop and deliver joint programmes including to meet specific territorial needs.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000967/13
to the Commission**

Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)

(30 January 2013)

Subject: Continuation of Erasmus and its potential expansion

What steps is the Commission taking to ensure that the successful Erasmus programme is able to continue functioning at a high level in the midst of difficult financial circumstances, and to potentially expand in the next few years?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission

(6 March 2013)

The Erasmus programme has indeed had a substantial impact on European higher education and is one of the most appreciated EU initiatives — in fact, the demand from students to take part has consistently been higher than the resources available. Therefore, in 2011 the Commission proposed the new streamlined 'Erasmus for All' programme (2014-2020), incorporating all the EU programmes in education, training and youth, and with a much higher budget with the aim of reaching many more students and staff than the current programme allows.

The new programme will not only increase mobility opportunities but it will also improve the quality of the exchanges by introducing more stringent requirements to achieve even better results for all stakeholders. A new loan guarantee scheme should provide support to students wishing to take a full Master's degree abroad to increase their skills and job prospects. In addition to individual mobility, institutions will have more opportunities to work together across borders in line with the EU's modernisation and internationalisation agenda for better quality and more relevant higher education.

The precise implications of the recent European Council agreement on the MFF for the funding of 'Erasmus for All' are not yet clear. However, it does seem clear that the aim of providing a substantial increase in funding for the period 2014-2020 will be achieved.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000968/13
to the Commission**

Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)

(30 January 2013)

Subject: Commission strategies for better management of urban waste water treatment

What strategies are being explored by the Commission to better manage urban waste water treatment, with specific regard to efforts to improve waste water management in an energy-efficient way?

Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission

(19 March 2013)

The European Innovation Partnership on Water (EIP Water), launched by the European Commission in May 2012, aims to facilitate the development of innovative solutions to deal with water challenges. The EIP Water brings together the public sector, industry (including the energy and water industries), NGOs, the financial sector and other relevant stakeholders to develop innovative solutions in a sustainable and holistic manner.

Waste water management and its relation with energy efficiency and the recovery of resources from waste water is an important element in the strategic agenda of the EIP Water. An open call for expression of commitments to form Action Groups is open until 4 April. It is expected that Action Groups will be formed focusing on the abovementioned issues, although it is up to stakeholders to take the initiative. Their experiences and findings will be translated into policy recommendations. Furthermore the Commission is currently developing new Green Public Procurement criteria for waste water infrastructure which includes the energy efficiency dimension. It is planned that the criteria would be made available in the course of 2013.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000969/13
to the Commission**

Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)

(30 January 2013)

Subject: Commission proposals aimed at offering guarantees to young people

The Commission has recently stated its aim of guaranteeing an offer of work, training or further education to young people within four months of their leaving school or becoming unemployed. What specific proposals is the Commission considering with a view to reaching this ambitious target?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission

(22 March 2013)

On 5 December 2012 the Commission adopted a Youth Employment Package, which includes a proposal for a Council recommendation on establishing a Youth Guarantee. It calls on Member States to ensure that all young people under 25 receive a good quality offer of a job, further education, a traineeship or an apprenticeship within four months of leaving formal education or becoming unemployed. The Council reached agreement on this recommendation on 28 February 2013.

The European Council decided on 8 February 2013 to create a Youth Employment Initiative with a budget of EUR 6 billion to support in particular the Youth Guarantee. The Initiative is open to all regions with levels of youth unemployment above 25%.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000970/13
to the Commission**

Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(30 January 2013)

Subject: Commission monitoring of the 'quantitative status' of water across Europe

To what extent is the Commission monitoring the 'quantitative status' of water present in water bodies across Europe, given that in certain areas of Europe, the scarcity of water in river basins is becoming a problem?

Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission

(13 March 2013)

The 2000/60/EC Water Framework Directive ⁽¹⁾ requires Member States to monitor water status. The Commission has recently published an implementation report based on the assessment of the River Basin Management Plans prepared by the Member States including an assessment on water quantity (http://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/water-framework/implrep2007/index_en.htm).

For surface water, Member States are required to monitor water flow. The European Environment Agency has set up an informal annual data flow covering 16 countries. This revealed strong gaps in the geographical coverage and quality of data. The Water Blueprint adopted by the European Commission in 2012 suggests ways to address these problems (http://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/blueprint/index_en.htm).

Regarding groundwater, the Water Framework Directive requires Member States to monitor water levels, to avoid deterioration of groundwater bodies and to achieve good groundwater quantitative status by 2015. According to the abovementioned report, 85% of groundwater bodies were reported to be in good quantitative status in 2009 (based on information from 24 Member States). At the same time, some shortcomings regarding the methodologies for groundwater status assessment were identified in most of the Member States and they should be rectified in the next cycle of RBMPs.

(1) OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000971/13
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(30 January 2013)**

Subject: Commission monitoring methods for goods and services paid in cash

According to Commission data, nearly one fifth of EU Member States' gross domestic product — nearly EUR 2 trillion — involves goods or services that are paid for in cash and never declared to tax authorities. Is the Commission considering methods to better monitor this high total, especially where suspicions of aggressive tax avoidance schemes exist?

**Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(20 March 2013)**

In its communication of 27 June 2012 on concrete ways to reinforce the fight against tax fraud and tax evasion including in relation to third countries, COM(2012) 351 final, the Commission indeed stated that the size of the shadow economy in the EU is estimated at nearly one fifth of GDP ⁽¹⁾. In the Commission's view this added to the urgent need for action at EU level.

Monitoring the exact amount of cash payments and ensuring the proper declaration of taxable income in line with applicable legislative obligations is a task for the individual Member States. As regards tax fraud and evasion more generally, the Commission has outlined its approach in its communication of 6 December 2012 on an Action Plan to strengthen the fight against tax fraud and tax evasion ⁽²⁾ in combination with its Recommendations on aggressive tax planning ⁽³⁾ and regarding measures intended to encourage third countries to apply minimum standards of good governance in tax matters ⁽⁴⁾. The Commission will continue pressing for the rapid implementation of the action plan and Recommendations in line with the proposed time frames.

⁽¹⁾ Source: Schneider, F. (2012), 'Size and development of the Shadow Economy from 2003 to 2012: some new facts'. The figures contained in this study are necessarily based on assumptions and should therefore be considered cautiously as their certainty is not demonstrated.

⁽²⁾ COM(2012) 722 final.

⁽³⁾ COM(2012) 8806 final.

⁽⁴⁾ COM(2012) 8805 final.