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 361 E/01)

Treść **Strona**

E-000768/13 by Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy to the Commission
Subject: Microplastics
Nederlandse versie ... 25
English version ... 26

P-000873/13 by Françoise Castex to the Commission
Subject: Use of IP tracking by European travel companies
Version française ... 27
English version ... 28

E-000874/13 by Jim Higgins to the Commission
Subject: Implementation of the European Working Time Directive in Ireland
English version ... 29

E-000876/13 by Liam Aylward to the Commission
Subject: Support for those affected by the legacy of nuclear weapon testing in Kazakhstan
English version ... 30

E-000972/13 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission
Subject: Commission involvement in relations between Serbia and Kosovo
English version ... 31

P-000973/13 by Jarosław Kalinowski to the Commission
Subject: Funding for consolidation of agricultural land
Wersja polska ... 32
English version ... 33

E-000974/13 by Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska to the Commission
Subject: Threat from African swine fever
Wersja polska ... 34
English version ... 35

E-000977/13 by Marielle de Sarnez to the Commission
Subject: Public health risks associated with the use of diesel fuel
Version française ... 36
English version ... 37

E-000978/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: R & D budget
Versión española ... 38
English version ... 39

E-000979/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Growing numbers of disheartened workers
Versión española ... 40
English version ... 41

E-000980/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission
Subject: Rethinking the European project
Versão portuguesa ... 42
English version ... 43

E-000981/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission
Subject: Rethinking the European project II
Versão portuguesa ... 44
English version ... 45

E-000982/13 by Krišjānis Kariņš to the Commission
Subject: Definition of 'significant power'
Latviešu valodas versija ... 46
English version ... 47

E-000983/13 by Franz Obermayr to the Commission
Subject: EU plans to re-regulate amateur football
Deutsche Fassung ... 48
English version ... 49

P-000985/13 by Justas Vincas Paleckis to the Commission
Subject: Protection of the EU's external border with Belarus
Tekstas lietuvių kalba ... 50
English version ... 51

P-000986/13 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Eurogroup statement of 21 January 2013 concerning simplification of the Greek tax code
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 52
English version ... 53

E-000987/13 by Ashley Fox to the Commission
Subject: GM food labelling
English version ... 54

E-000988/13 by Francisco Sosa Wagner to the Commission
Subject: Gas pipeline in Doñana National Park
Versión española ... 55
English version ... 57

E-001228/13 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission
Subject: Gas extraction in Doñana
Versión española ... 55
English version ... 57

E-000989/13 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: Gambling and gambling addiction
Versione italiana ... 59
English version ... 60

E-000990/13 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Request by Cosco to have concession contract amended
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 61
English version ... 62

E-000991/13 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Waste management in Zakynthos
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 63
English version ... 64

E-000992/13 by Dominique Vlasto to the Commission
Subject: Electric-vehicle charging stations
Version française ... 65
English version ... 66

E-000993/13 by Filiz Hakaeva Hyusmenova to the Commission
Subject: Youth Guarantee
българска версия ... 67
English version ... 68

E-000994/13 by Marina Yannakoudakis to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Assisting international governments, and in particular the Philippine government, in their efforts to develop and enforce legislation prohibiting the trade in, and consumption of, dog meat
English version ... 69

E-000995/13 by Bogusław Sonik and Bogdan Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz to the Commission
Subject: Shale gas — public consultation
Wersja polska ... 70
English version ... 71

E-000996/13 by Elisabeth Köstinger to the Commission
Subject: Properties of waste which render it hazardous, and the European List of Waste
Deutsche Fassung ... 72
English version ... 74

P-000997/13 by Werner Schulz to the Council
Subject: Eurojust
Deutsche Fassung ... 75
English version ... 76

E-000998/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Horsemeat detected in hamburgers
Versão portuguesa ... 77
English version ... 78

E-000999/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: New outbreaks of bird flu (H5N1)
Versão portuguesa ... 79
English version ... 81

E-001103/13 by Rareş-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission
Subject: FAO avian influenza alert
Versiunea în limba română ... 80
English version ... 81

E-001001/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Pandemrix H1N1 and narcolepsy
Versão portuguesa ... 83
English version ... 85

E-001332/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Cases of narcolepsy linked to the flu vaccine
Versão portuguesa ... 83
English version ... 85

E-001002/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: RAN — High-level conference
Versão portuguesa ... 87
English version ... 88

E-001003/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — 1 3th EU-India Ministerial meeting
Versão portuguesa ... 89
English version ... 90

E-001004/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Identification, examination and preservation of European heritage throughout the world
Versão portuguesa ... 91
English version ... 92

E-001005/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Capital flight in France
Versão portuguesa ... 93
English version ... 94

E-001007/13 by Daniël van der Stoep to the Commission
Subject: Salaries and pensions of EU officials
Nederlandse versie ... 95
English version ... 97

E-001008/13 by Lorenzo Fontana to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Organ harvesting from prisoners of conscience in China
Versione italiana ... 99
English version ... 100

E-001009/13 by Michael Cramer to the Commission
Subject: Support for the Iron Gates Museum in Drobeta-Turnu Severin (Romania)
Deutsche Fassung ... 101
English version ... 103

E-001010/13 by Auke Zijlstra to the Commission
Subject: Misleading information from the Commission
Nederlandse versie ... 104
English version ... 105

E-001011/13 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: EU PEACE IV programme
English version ... 106

E-001012/13 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: Construction products
English version ... 107

E-001013/13 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: Human trafficking
English version ... 108

E-001014/13 by Philip Claeys to the Commission
Subject: Censorship in Turkey, list of forbidden books and magazines
Nederlandse versie ... 109
English version ... 110

E-001015/13 by Konstantinos Poupakis to the Commission
Subject: Recent statements by IMF representatives regarding erroneous response to crisis
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 111
English version ... 112

E-001016/13 by Konstantinos Poupakis to the Commission
Subject: EU assistance for children and vulnerable sections of society
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 113
English version ... 114

E-001017/13 by Matteo Salvini to the Commission
Subject: Derogations from and extensions to the application of Article 12 of the Services Directive
Versione italiana ... 115
English version ... 116

E-001018/13 by Georgios Toussas to the Commission
Subject: Outlawing radical movements
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 117
English version ... 118

E-001019/13 by Daniel Hannan to the Commission
Subject: Albinos in Tanzania and elsewhere in Africa
English version ... 119

E-001020/13 by Esther de Lange to the Commission
Subject: European registration of doctors
Nederlandse versie ... 120
English version ... 121

E-001021/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission
Subject: POSEIMA (Programme of Options Specifically Relating to Remoteness and Insularity of Madeira and the Azores) subsidies subject to VAT
Versão portuguesa ... 122
English version ... 123

P-001022/13 by Francesca Barracciu to the Commission
Subject: Recurrence of bluetongue in Sardinia — compensation and vaccinations
Versione italiana ... 124
English version ... 126

E-001023/13 by Fiorello Provera to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — EU proposals to send troops to post-conflict Syria
Versione italiana ... 128
English version ... 129

E-001106/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — State of emergency declared in Egypt due to political protests
Versión española ... 130
English version ... 132

E-001024/13 by Fiorello Provera to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Egyptian state at risk of collapse
Versione italiana ... 131
English version ... 132

E-001025/13 by Fiorello Provera to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Hazards at the Bushehr power plant in Iran
Versione italiana ... 134
English version ... 135

E-001027/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Measures to facilitate access to credit for small and medium-sized enterprises
Versione italiana ... 136
English version ... 138

E-001028/13 by Philip Claeys to the Commission
Subject: Statement by Turkish Minister about journalists in prison
Nederlandse versie ... 140
English version ... 141

E-001029/13 by Philip Claeys and Andreas Mölzer to the Commission
Subject: Statement by the Turkish Prime Minister on joining the 'Shanghai Five'
Deutsche Fassung ... 142
Nederlandse versie ... 145
English version ... 147

E-001041/13 by Laurence J.A.J. Stassen to the Commission
Subject: Turkey wants to join the 'Shanghai Five'
Nederlandse versie ... 145
English version ... 147

E-001272/13 by Franz Obermayr to the Commission
Subject: Ending accession negotiations with Turkey
Deutsche Fassung ... 142
English version ... 149

E-001174/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission
Subject: Turkey and the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 143
English version ... 148

E-001238/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: Does the EU intend to stand up to threats from Turkey?
Versione italiana ... 144
English version ... 148

E-001030/13 by Patrick Le Hyaric to the Commission
Subject: Drastic reduction in export refunds in the poultry sector
Version française ... 150
English version ... 151

E-001031/13 by Giancarlo Scottà to the Commission
Subject: The calculation of birds in small numbers (Article 9(1)(c) of Directive 147/2009/EC)
Versione italiana ... 152
English version ... 153

E-001033/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Information about the use of EU funds for 2007-2013 by the Municipalities of: Arezzo, Grosseto, Florence, Pistoia, Carrara, Pisa, Massa, Livorno
Versione italiana ... 154
English version ... 162

E-001034/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Information about the use of EU funds for 2007-2013 by the Municipalities of: Arezzo, Grosseto, Florence, Pistoia, Carrara, Pisa, Massa, Livorno
Versione italiana ... 154
English version ... 162

E-001035/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Information about the use of EU funds for 2007-2013 by the Municipalities of Arezzo, Grosseto, Florence, Pistoia, Carrara, Pisa, Massa and Livorno (Tuscany)
Versione italiana ... 155
English version ... 163

E-001036/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Information on the use of the Structural Funds by the Tuscany Region in the period 2007-2013
Versione italiana ... 155
English version ... 163

E-001083/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Information on the use of the Structural Funds by the Umbria Region for the period 2007-2013
Versione italiana ... 156
English version ... 164

E-001084/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Information on the use of EU funds for the period 2007-2013 by the municipalities of Perugia, Terni, Città di Castello, Spoleto, Gubbio, Narni, Corciano and Amelia
Versione italiana 156
English version 164

E-001085/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Information on the use of EU funds for the period 2007-2013 by the municipalities of Perugia, Terni, Città di Castello, Spoleto, Gubbio, Narni, Corciano and Amelia
Versione italiana 157
English version 165

E-001086/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Information on the use of EU funds for the period 2007-2013 by the municipalities of Perugia, Terni, Città di Castello, Spoleto, Gubbio, Narni, Corciano and Amelia
Versione italiana 157
English version 165

E-001087/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Information on the use of EU funds for the period 2007-2013 by the municipalities of Urbino, Ancona, Pesaro, Macerata and Chiaravalle
Versione italiana 158
English version 166

E-001088/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Information about the use of EU funds in the period 2007-2013 by the municipalities of Urbino, Ancona, Pesaro, Macerata, Chiaravalle
Versione italiana 158
English version 166

E-001100/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Information on the use of the Structural Funds by the Marche Region for the period 2007-2013
Versione italiana 159
English version 167

E-001101/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Information on the use of EU funds for the period 2007-2013 by the municipalities of Urbino, Ancona, Pesaro, Macerata and Chiaravalle
Versione italiana 159
English version 167

E-001394/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Use of direct and indirect EU funds by the municipality of Pisa (Tuscany)
Versione italiana 160
English version 168

E-001396/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Information on the use of EU funds for the period 2007-2013 by the municipality of Pisa (Region of Tuscany)
Versione italiana 160
English version 168

P-001037/13 by Thijs Berman to the Commission
Subject: Tax evasion by businesses due to lack of European harmonisation of (*inter alia*) corporation tax
Nederlandse versie 170
English version 171

E-001039/13 by Liam Aylward to the Commission
Subject: Match fixing in the EU
Leagan Gaeilge 172
English version 173

E-001040/13 by Ildikó Gáll-Pelcz to the Commission
Subject: Horizon 2020 and female entrepreneurs
Magyar változat ... 174
English version ... 175

P-001042/13 by Philippe Lamberts to the Commission
Subject: ArcelorMittal's compliance with the competition rules laid down in Article 102 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU)
Version française ... 176
English version ... 178

E-001043/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Single identification number for SMEs
Version française ... 180
English version ... 181

E-001044/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: SMEs and transparency
Version française ... 182
English version ... 183

E-001046/13 by Patricia van der Kammen to the Commission
Subject: Commission wants quota for electric car charging stations
Nederlandse versie ... 184
English version ... 186

E-001047/13 by Auke Zijlstra to the Council
Subject: Revote following misleading information from the Commission
Nederlandse versie ... 188
English version ... 189

E-001048/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: SMEs and mezzanine financing
Version française ... 190
English version ... 191

E-001049/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Improving access to finance for SMEs
Version française ... 192
English version ... 193

E-001050/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: Electronic cigarettes: more information for the public about risks and benefits.
Versione italiana ... 194
English version ... 195

E-001051/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: Cultivation of sorghum and creation of biomass for a new agricultural bioenergy supply chain.
Versione italiana ... 196
English version ... 198

E-001052/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: Tick bites and serious diseases: potential treatments for effective diagnosis
Versione italiana ... 199
English version ... 201

E-001054/13 by Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission
Subject: Delay in disbursement of funds for the European Capital of Culture, Guimarães 2012
Versão portuguesa ... 203
English version ... 204

E-001055/13 by Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission
Subject: Payment of teachers under the Operational Programme for Human Potential (POPH)
Versão portuguesa ... 205
English version ... 206

E-001056/13 by João Ferreira and Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission
Subject: Coherency of the EU's sectoral policies: an example
Versão portuguesa ... 207
English version ... 208

E-001057/13 by João Ferreira and Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission
Subject: Access to water and review of VAT reduced rates
Versão portuguesa ... 209
English version ... 210

P-001058/13 by Isabelle Durant to the Commission
Subject: EU aid received by ArcelorMittal
Version française ... 211
English version ... 212

P-001059/13 by Krisztina Morvai to the Commission
Subject: Need for the EU to rescue its citizens held as hostages abroad
Magyar változat ... 213
English version ... 215

P-001067/13 by Tomasz Piotr Poręba to the Commission
Subject: Freezing of funds for road projects in Poland
Wersja polska ... 216
English version ... 218

P-001131/13 by Janusz Wojciechowski to the Commission
Subject: Reports of Poland being deprived of EUR 3.5 billion in investment in roads
Wersja polska ... 216
English version ... 218

P-001158/13 by Ryszard Antoni Legutko to the Commission
Subject: Withholding of funds for road projects in Poland
Wersja polska ... 216
English version ... 218

E-001071/13 by James Nicholson to the Commission
Subject: Products containing nicotine
English version ... 220

E-001072/13 by Bas Eickhout to the Commission
Subject: Long-distance transport of unweaned animals
Nederlandse versie ... 221
English version ... 223

E-001073/13 by Claude Moraes to the Commission
Subject: Modern-day slavery/human trafficking
English version ... 224

E-001074/13 by Auke Zijlstra to the Commission
Subject: Romania floating in corruption
Nederlandse versie ... 225
English version ... 226

E-001077/13 by Georgios Papastamkos to the Commission
Subject: Unlawful trading practices affecting Greek exports
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 227
English version ... 228

E-001078/13 by Ramona Nicole Mănescu to the Commission
Subject: Commission Report on Progress in Romania under the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism
Versiunea în limba română ... 229
English version ... 230

E-001079/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: European Semester
Versión española ... 231
English version ... 232

E-001080/13 by Rainer Wieland to the Commission
Subject: Language arrangements in connection with national ombudsmen
Deutsche Fassung ... 233
English version ... 234

E-001081/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: India: the business of surrogate motherhood — what future for women's rights?
Versione italiana ... 235
English version ... 237

E-001082/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: The *solve et repete* principle of taxation: what conformity with the principles of due process under European law?
Versione italiana ... 239
English version ... 241

E-001090/13 by Georgios Stavrakakis to the Commission
Subject: Level of payments as of 31 January 2013
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 243
English version ... 244

E-001092/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Health hazard posed by water filter jugs
Version française ... 245
English version ... 246

E-001094/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Potential shortages of imported sugar
Version française ... 247
English version ... 248

E-001095/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Cane sugar refineries and inward processing arrangements
Version française ... 249
English version ... 250

E-001234/13 by Elisabeth Köstinger to the Commission
Subject: Sugar regime after 2015
Deutsche Fassung ... 251
English version ... 254

E-001096/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Managing the sugar market and the common market organisation (CMO) for sugar after 2015
Version française ... 252
English version ... 254

E-001301/13 by Agnès Le Brun to the Commission
Subject: Sugar market management and the CMO in sugar after 2015
Version française ... 252
English version ... 255

E-001097/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: Noise level thresholds, including at sea, to protect marine species
Versione italiana ... 256
English version ... 257

E-001098/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: Protection of African lions
Versione italiana ... 258
English version ... 259

E-001099/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: The Commission's investigations into the allocation of research funds disbursed in Italy
Versione italiana ... 260
English version ... 261

E-001102/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Nitrates Directive: Italy at risk of another infringement procedure
Versione italiana ... 262
English version ... 263

E-001104/13 by Sari Essayah to the Commission
Subject: Construction products: mandatory nature or otherwise of environmental product declarations
Suomenkielinen versio ... 264
English version ... 265

E-001105/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission
Subject: Bankruptcy in Iceland
Versión española ... 266
English version ... 267

E-001107/13 by Mariya Gabriel to the Commission
Subject: Counterfeit crop protection products in Europe
българска версия ... 268
English version ... 269

E-001108/13 by Martin Ehrenhauser to the Council
Subject: Directive 2004/82/EC and the communication of Advanced Passenger Information
Deutsche Fassung ... 270
English version ... 271

E-001109/13 by Martin Ehrenhauser to the Commission
Subject: Directive 2004/82/EC and the communication of Advanced Passenger Information
Deutsche Fassung ... 272
English version ... 273

E-001110/13 by Martin Ehrenhauser to the Commission
Subject: Transfer of PNR data to the US
Deutsche Fassung ... 274
English version ... 275

E-001111/13 by Nikos Chrysogelos to the Commission
Subject: Water ski facilities projected on Lake Pamvotida without environmental authorisation
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 276
English version ... 277

E-001112/13 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Utilisation of dormant deposits in Greek banks
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 279
English version ... 280

E-001113/13 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Statement by the Eurogroup on Greece of 21.1.2013 regarding renewable energy sources
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 281
English version ... 282

E-001114/13 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Programme to improve energy efficiency in buildings
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 283
English version ... 284

E-001115/13 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Green Fund in Greece
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 285
English version ... 286

E-001116/13 by Nadja Hirsch, Jorgo Chatzimarkakis, Sonia Alfano and Andrea Zanoni to the Commission
Subject: Export of live animals from the EU to third countries
Deutsche Fassung ... 287
Versione italiana ... 289
English version ... 291

E-001117/13 by Tokia Saïfi to the Commission
Subject: Closer cooperation and regional integration in the Maghreb: Algeria, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco and Tunisia
Version française ... 293
English version ... 295

E-001118/13 by Tokia Saïfi to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Closer cooperation and regional integration in the Maghreb: Algeria, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco and Tunisia
Version française ... 293
English version ... 295

E-001119/13 by Barbara Matera to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Gender equality and women's rights in Tunisia
Versione italiana ... 297
English version ... 298

E-001120/13 by Alajos Mészáros and Zoltán Bagó to the Commission
Subject: Provisions concerning the administration of civil registry documents
Magyar változat ... 299
English version ... 301

P-001121/13 by Jean-Jacob Bicep to the Commission
Subject: Definition of 'competent local authority' — amendment of Regulation (EC) No 1370/2007
Version française ... 303
English version ... 304

P-001122/13 by Adam Bielan to the Commission
Subject: Freezing of funds for the development of roads in Poland
Wersja polska ... 305
English version ... 306

E-001123/13 by Mikael Gustafsson to the Commission
Subject: Forced child labour in Uzbekistan
Svensk version ... 307
English version ... 308

E-001124/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — New Israeli strike on Syrian territory
Versión española ... 309
English version ... 310

E-001125/13 by Konstantinos Poupakis to the Commission
Subject: Suspension of auctions — threat of foreclosure for thousands of over-indebted households
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 311
English version ... 312

E-001126/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Retail problems in Italy and in Europe
Versione italiana ... 313
English version ... 315

E-001127/13 by Adam Bielan to the Commission
Subject: EU action in Burma and support for journalism
Wersja polska ... 316
English version ... 317

E-001128/13 by Adam Bielan to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Protests against expansion of the Latpadaung copper mine in Burma
Wersja polska ... 318
English version ... 319

E-001129/13 by Adam Bielan to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Assistance for countries hit by Cyclone Evan
Wersja polska ... 320
English version ... 321

E-001130/13 by Silvana Koch-Mehrin to the Commission
Subject: Stakeholder involvement in impact assessments
Deutsche Fassung ... 322
English version ... 324

E-001132/13 by Franziska Keller, Amelia Andersdotter and Paul Murphy to the Commission
Subject: Follow-up to Written Question E-011230/2012
Deutsche Fassung ... 326
Svensk version ... 327
English version ... 328

E-001134/13 by Rachida Dati to the Commission
Subject: For a more ambitious Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived
Version française ... 329
English version ... 330

E-001135/13 by Rachida Dati to the Commission
Subject: Concerns remain over issue of planting rights
Version française ... 331
English version ... 332

E-001136/13 by Lorenzo Fontana and Matteo Salvini to the Council
Subject: Violation of the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality in the proposal for a directive COM(2012)0788 on tobacco products
Versione italiana ... 333
English version ... 334

E-001137/13 by João Ferreira to the Commission
Subject: Aftermath of the storm that hit Leiria, Portugal and action to be taken
Versão portuguesa ... 335
English version ... 337

E-001138/13 by João Ferreira to the Commission
Subject: EU Emissions Trading System — state of play
Versão portuguesa ... 338
English version ... 339

E-001139/13 by João Ferreira and Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission
Subject: EFSF and ESM: loan amounts to Portugal
Versão portuguesa ... 340
English version ... 341

E-001140/13 by João Ferreira and Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission
Subject: Nationalising banks to stimulate economic recovery
Versão portuguesa ... 342
English version ... 343

E-001141/13 by João Ferreira and Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission
Subject: Annual ILO report on global employment trends
Versão portuguesa ... 344
English version ... 345

E-001142/13 by João Ferreira and Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission
Subject: Oxfam report on the cost of inequality
Versão portuguesa ... 346
English version ... 348

E-001143/13 by João Ferreira to the Commission
Subject: Situation of the clothing industry in Portugal
Versão portuguesa ... 349
English version ... 351

E-001144/13 by João Ferreira to the Commission
Subject: Policies and programmes for cities under the MFF 2014-2020
Versão portuguesa ... 352
English version ... 353

E-001145/13 by Ádám Kósa to the Commission
Subject: INI report, paragraphs 10 and 59 — Erasmus programme
Magyar változat ... 354
English version ... 355

E-001146/13 by Ádám Kósa to the Commission
Subject: The subject matter of point 74 of the INI Report in relation to the additional costs incurred by people with disabilities
Magyar változat ... 356
English version ... 357

E-001147/13 by Ádám Kósa to the Commission
Subject: The subject matter of point 72 of the INI Report in relation to consumer habits
Magyar változat ... 358
English version ... 359

E-001148/13 by Ádám Kósa to the Commission
Subject: The subject matter of point 68 of the INI Report in relation to increasing the sensitivity of EU institutions and officials
Magyar változat ... 360
English version ... 361

E-001149/13 by Ádám Kósa to the Council
Subject: The subject matter of point 57 of the INI Report in relation to the reduction of prejudice among children
Magyar változat ... 362
English version ... 364

E-001150/13 by Ádám Kósa to the Commission
Subject: The subject matter of points 51, 52 and 62 of the INI Report in relation to transitional employment
Magyar változat ... 366
English version ... 367

E-001151/13 by Ádám Kósa to the Commission
Subject: The subject matter of point 47 of the INI Report in relation to the provision of information to SMEs
Magyar változat ... 368
English version ... 369

E-001152/13 by Ádám Kósa to the Commission
Subject: The subject matter of point 20 of the INI Report in relation to EU consultations
Magyar változat ... 370
English version ... 371

E-001153/13 by Ádám Kósa to the Commission
Subject: The subject matter of point 11 of the INI Report in relation to the administration of justice
Magyar változat ... 372
English version ... 373

E-001154/13 by Ádám Kósa to the Commission
Subject: The subject matter of point 11 of the INI Report in relation to the accessibility of the right to vote and stand for election
Magyar változat ... 374
English version ... 375

E-001155/13 by Ádám Kósa to the Commission
Subject: The subject matter of point 9 of the INI Report in relation to inclusive education
Magyar változat ... 376
English version ... 377

E-001156/13 by Ádám Kósa to the Commission
Subject: The subject matter of point 33 of the INI Report in relation to a more harmonised system of certification
Magyar változat ... 378
English version ... 379

E-001157/13 by Ádám Kósa to the Commission
Subject: The subject matter of point 8 of the INI Report in relation to universal design
Magyar változat ... 380
English version ... 381

E-001159/13 by Konstantinos Poupakis to the Commission
Subject: Cartels and oligopolies on the fuel market in Greece
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 382
English version ... 384

E-001160/13 by Sophia in 't Veld, Joanna Senyszyn, Jean-Marie Cavada, Franziska Katharina Brantner and Michael Cashman to the Commission
Subject: Decision of the European Ombudsman on the implementation of Article 17 TFEU
Deutsche Fassung ... 385
Version française ... 387
Nederlandse versie ... 388
Wersja polska ... 389
English version ... 390

E-001161/13 by Liam Aylward to the Commission
Subject: Breach of the Granada Convention
Leagan Gaeilge ... 391
English version ... 392

E-001162/13 by Paolo De Castro to the Commission
Subject: Wine market: safeguards and protection for geographical designations of origin in the European Union
Versione italiana ... 393
English version ... 394

E-001163/13 by Toine Manders to the Commission
Subject: Better communication concerning the internal market
Nederlandse versie ... 395
English version ... 396

E-001164/13 by Toine Manders to the Commission
Subject: Failure of the manufacturer Apple to cooperate on a standard USB charger for mobile telephones and smartphones
Nederlandse versie ... 397
English version ... 398

E-001165/13 by Christel Schaldemose to the Commission
Subject: Testing strategies for endocrine disrupters in Europe
Dansk udgave ... 399
English version ... 400

E-001166/13 by Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto to the Commission
Subject: State Duma decision breaches human rights
Versión española ... 401
English version ... 402

E-001167/13 by Bendt Bendtsen to the Commission
Subject: European ceramic grinding mills and the Commission's anti-dumping duty
Dansk udgave ... 403
English version ... 404

E-001168/13 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Freedom of the press in Europe-China dialogue
Deutsche Fassung ... 405
English version ... 406

E-001169/13 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Hacking attacks on authorities and institutions
Deutsche Fassung ... 407
English version ... 408

E-001170/13 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Consequences of possible US action against Standard & Poor's
Deutsche Fassung ... 409
English version ... 411

E-001593/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Fraud proceedings: the United States vs. Standard & Poor's
Versão portuguesa ... 410
English version ... 411

E-001171/13 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — EU resources in the Mali conflict
Deutsche Fassung ... 413
English version ... 414

E-001172/13 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission
Subject: Support for EADS drone 'EuroHawk'
Deutsche Fassung ... 415
English version ... 416

E-001217/13 by Franziska Keller to the Commission
Subject: Damage to the Karpasia Special Environmental Protection Area (SEPA), included in the EU's Natura 2000 aid programme for the Turkish Cypriot Community
Deutsche Fassung ... 417
English version ... 419

E-001173/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission
Subject: Destruction of Karpasia
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 418
English version ... 419

E-001177/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission
Subject: Illegal granting of Turkish Cypriot 'citizenship'
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 421
English version ... 422

E-001178/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Crisis in the electrical appliance manufacturing sector in Italy
Versione italiana ... 423
English version ... 425

E-001315/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Crisis in the electrical appliance industry in Italy — Electrolux
Versione italiana ... 423
English version ... 425

E-001179/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Modifying the single municipal tax
Versione italiana ... 427
English version ... 428

E-001180/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: New waste storage and treatment site in the Prè district of Bassano del Grappa (Province of Vicenza)
Versione italiana ... 429
English version ... 430

E-001181/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: Huge expenditure on a questionable opinion-monitoring campaign
Versione italiana ... 431
English version ... 433

E-001295/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: Expensive social communication techniques: influencing political consensus in Europe, ethic rules and safeguarding the freedom of expression and right to vote of European citizens
Versione italiana ... 431
English version ... 433

E-001182/13 by Mark Demesmaeker to the Commission
Subject: Statute of limitations for compensation claims for flight cancellations
Nederlandse versie ... 435
English version ... 436

E-001183/13 by Mark Demesmaeker to the Commission
Subject: Incompatibility of Facebook's Statement of Rights and Responsibilities with Brussels I Regulation
Nederlandse versie ... 437
English version ... 438

E-001184/13 by Artur Zasada to the Commission
Subject: Use of driving simulators to train professional drivers
Wersja polska ... 439
English version ... 440

E-001185/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Credit collapse in the banking sector
Versión española ... 441
English version ... 443

E-001186/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: VAT refunds
Versión española ... 444
English version ... 445

E-001187/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Payment of VAT to suppliers
Versión española ... 446
English version ... 447

E-001189/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Advance payment of VAT by self-employed workers
Versión española ... 446
English version ... 447

E-001191/13 by Konstantinos Poupakis to the Commission
Subject: Compensation for contributions paid by beneficiaries of the defunct Working and Professional Association Representatives' and Employees' Supplementary Insurance Fund due to pension cuts
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 448
English version ... 449

E-001192/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Violations of online democracy and Internet freedom in Vietnam
Versión española ... 450
English version ... 452

E-001193/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — The Islamic Revolutionary Guards and alleged smuggling of anti-aircraft weapons
Versione italiana ... 454
English version ... 455

E-001194/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Political instability in Iraq
Versione italiana ... 456
English version ... 457

E-001195/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Islamist threats in Tunisia
Versione italiana ... 458
English version ... 459

E-001196/13 by Kinga Göncz to the Commission
Subject: A detailed register of translated literature
Magyar változat ... 460
English version ... 461

E-001198/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: The situation of seaside concessions: further details about the applicability of the Spanish model to Italy
Versione italiana ... 462
English version ... 463

E-001200/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Development in Guinea-Bissau
Versão portuguesa ... 464
English version ... 465

E-001201/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Education in Guinea-Bissau
Versão portuguesa ... 466
English version ... 467

P-001202/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Compliance with Spain's support mechanisms for renewable energies
Versión española ... 468
English version ... 469

P-001203/13 by Zbigniew Ziobro to the Commission
Subject: Blocking of EU funds for road building
Wersja polska ... 470
English version ... 472

E-001204/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Credit collapse in the banking sector II
Versión española ... 474
English version ... 475

E-001205/13 by Charles Tannock to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Persecution of Christians in Iran: the case of Farshid Fathi Malayeri and Saeed Abadini
English version ... 476

E-001207/13 by Louis Michel to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Draft law excluding civil service managers belonging to the former RCD party in Tunisia
Version française ... 477
English version ... 478

E-001208/13 by Aldo Patriciello to the Commission
Subject: Air safety
Versione italiana ... 479
English version ... 480

E-001209/13 by Edit Bauer to the Commission
Subject: Consumer protection and discrimination
Magyar változat ... 481
English version ... 482

E-001210/13 by Nicole Sinclaire to the Commission
Subject: Hill Wheeler School, Kenya
English version ... 483

E-001211/13 by Nicole Sinclaire to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — EU-India negotiations concerning the military occupation of Kashmir
English version ... 484

E-001212/13 by Rareş-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission
Subject: Romanian land improvement levy
Versiunea în limba română ... 485
English version ... 486

E-001213/13 by Rareş-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission
Subject: Use of lactic acid to decontaminate bovine carcases
Versiunea în limba română ... 487
English version ... 488

E-001214/13 by Jim Higgins to the Commission
Subject: Road conditions
English version ... 489

E-001216/13 by Horst Schnellhardt to the Commission
Subject: Inspections in slaughterhouses in Poland
Deutsche Fassung ... 490
English version ... 491

E-001218/13 by Zbigniew Ziobro to the Commission
Subject: Smog in Kraków
Wersja polska ... 492
English version ... 494

E-001219/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Religious intolerance and arbitrary detention in Vietnam
Versión española ... 495
English version ... 497

E-001220/13 by Robert Goebbels to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Tragic situation of Syrian and Palestinian refugees in Lebanon
Version française ... 498
English version ... 499

E-001221/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission
Subject: New probation law in Turkey for abusive husbands
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 500
English version ... 501

E-001222/13 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Council
Subject: Financial products speculating on food prices
Versión española ... 502
English version ... 504

E-001223/13 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission
Subject: Financial products speculating on food prices
Versión española ... 505
English version ... 506

E-001224/13 by Dolores García-Hierro Caraballo to the Commission
Subject: Illegal fishing off the islet of Cabrera
Versión española ... 507
English version ... 508

P-001225/13 by Laima Liucija Andrikienė to the Commission
Subject: Elimination of private Lithuanian universities from the EU's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7)
Tekstas lietuvių kalba ... 509
English version ... 510

P-001226/13 by Gaston Franco to the Commission
Subject: Publication of a report on the impact of increased demand for biomass on biomass using sectors
Version française ... 511
English version ... 512

E-001231/13 by Amelia Andersdotter to the Commission
Subject: Why are Norton figures being quoted in connection with the EC3?
Svensk version ... 513
English version ... 514

E-001233/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Traditional descriptions — port wine
Versão portuguesa ... 515
English version ... 516

E-001236/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: The need for the EU to promote the recruitment of local staff
Versione italiana ... 517
English version ... 518

E-001237/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: EU checks on swine from the USA
Versione italiana ... 519
English version ... 520

E-001239/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission
Subject: Reprogramming of cohesion fund allocation to Madeira
Versão portuguesa ... 521
English version ... 522

P-001240/13 by Kriton Arsenis to the Commission
Subject: Danger of islands and islets being appropriated following development projects
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 523
English version ... 524

E-001242/13 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: EU salaries
English version ... 525

E-001243/13 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: EU salaries II
English version ... 526

E-001246/13 by Ulrike Rodust to the Commission
Subject: Live plucking of geese
Deutsche Fassung ... 527
English version ... 528

E-001251/13 by Kay Swinburne to the Commission
Subject: Amber alert early warning system for missing children
English version ... 529

E-001252/13 by Kay Swinburne to the Commission
Subject: The import of 'stun guns' into the UK
English version ... 530

E-001253/13 by Syed Kamall to the Commission
Subject: Sale of escape hoods for use by citizens
English version ... 531

E-001254/13 by Syed Kamall to the Commission
Subject: F-Gas Regulation
English version ... 532

E-001255/13 by Syed Kamall to the Commission
Subject: Alleged anti-competitive practices of hoteliers in Rhodes
English version ... 533

P-001256/13 by Patrizia Toia to the Commission
Subject: Gas pipeline between Sicily and Malta
Versione italiana ... 534
English version ... 535

E-001748/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Need for the EU to protect European citizens' property rights in Egypt
Versione italiana ... 536
English version ... 537

E-001258/13 by Syed Kamall to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Discrimination by the Egyptian Government against property owners deemed not to be 'pure' Egyptian
English version ... 537

E-001259/13 by Gaston Franco to the Commission
Subject: Management of Natura 2000 forest sites: eligibility of forest municipalities under Article 31 of the draft regulation for rural development
Version française ... 539
English version ... 540

E-001260/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Nanoparticles — effects of nanosilver *in vitro* and *in vivo*
Version française ... 541
English version ... 542

E-001261/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Indonesian textile industry and working conditions in Asia
Version française ... 543
English version ... 544

E-001262/13 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Co-financed project fraud investigation
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 545
English version ... 546

E-001263/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Referendum on independence for the people of Veneto
Versione italiana ... 547
English version ... 548

E-001264/13 by Esther Herranz García, Eva Ortiz Vilella, Rosa Estaràs Ferragut and Verónica Lope Fontagné to the Commission
Subject: Labelling to indicate the origin of material used in footwear and the place where the footwear was manufactured
Versión española ... 549
English version ... 550

E-001265/13 by Ria Oomen-Ruijten and Véronique De Keyser to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — EU policy on the Middle East
Version française ... 551
Nederlandse versie ... 553
English version ... 555

E-001266/13 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission
Subject: Impact of the Connecting Europe Facility on cross-sector infrastructure projects
Deutsche Fassung ... 556
English version ... 558

E-001319/13 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission
Subject: Synergies in energy and transport infrastructure projects
Deutsche Fassung ... 556
English version ... 558

E-001267/13 by Kinga Göncz, Danuta Jazłowiecka and Charles Tannock to the Commission
Subject: Free Trade Agreement with the Republic of China, Taiwan
Magyar változat ... 560
Wersja polska ... 561
English version ... 562

E-001268/13 by Lorenzo Fontana to the Commission
Subject: Improper reuse of packaging for fruit and vegetable products in Italy
Versione italiana ... 563
English version ... 564

E-001269/13 by Bart Staes to the Commission
Subject: Sale of new mobile telephony products without a battery charger as standard
Nederlandse versie ... 565
English version ... 566

E-001270/13 by Saïd El Khadraoui to the Commission
Subject: Possible liability of credit rating agencies
Nederlandse versie ... 567
English version ... 569

E-001271/13 by Sophia in 't Veld to the Commission
Subject: Intergovernmental agreements on the US Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act
Nederlandse versie ... 570
English version ... 572

E-001273/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Council
Subject: Designation of Hezbollah as a terrorist organisation
Versione italiana ... 574
English version ... 576

E-001274/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Tunisia's draft criminal code
Versione italiana ... 578
English version ... 579

E-001275/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Vietnamese Government crackdown on dissent
Versione italiana ... 580
English version ... 581

E-001276/13 by Laurence J.A.J. Stassen, Lucas Hartong and Auke Zijlstra to the Council
Subject: Hezbollah responsible for bombing
Nederlandse versie ... 582
English version ... 583

E-001277/13 by Lucas Hartong to the Council
Subject: PCE/PEC — EUR 5 billion subsidy to Egypt
Nederlandse versie ... 584
English version ... 585

E-001278/13 by Francisco Sosa Wagner to the Commission
Subject: Delays in the development of scientific research
Versión española ... 586
English version ... 587

E-001279/13 by Francisco Sosa Wagner to the Commission
Subject: Decision to scrap energy-saving grants
Versión española ... 588
English version ... 589

E-001280/13 by Fiorello Provera, Charles Tannock and Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Arab League boycott of Israeli products
Versión española ... 590
Versione italiana ... 591
English version ... 592

E-001282/13 by Michael Cramer to the Commission
Subject: Approval of capital injection for Berlin-Brandenburg airport
Deutsche Fassung ... 593
English version ... 595

E-001283/13 by Michael Cramer to the Commission
Subject: EU funding for the fixed-link Fehmarn Belt crossing
Deutsche Fassung ... 597
English version ... 598

E-001284/13 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: New developments in Pakistan — implications for the EU
Deutsche Fassung ... 599
English version ... 600

E-001286/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: World Cancer Day: four cancer myths that need to be dispelled
Versione italiana ... 601
English version ... 602

E-001287/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: Cerebrovascular disease — treatment and surgery in Member States
Versione italiana ... 603
English version ... 605

E-001288/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: Female genital mutilation: the UN resolution of December 2012 also offers a chance for concrete measures in the European Union
Versione italiana ... 607
English version ... 608

E-001289/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: Salvaging food wasted by canteens: what future for the European Parliament resolution of 19 January 2012?
Versione italiana ... 609
English version ... 611

E-001290/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Online sale of kits for manufacturing fake wines from powder — request for further clarification
Versione italiana ... 613
English version ... 614

E-001291/13 by Ana Gomes, Edite Estrela, Elisa Ferreira, Luís Paulo Alves, Luis Manuel Capoulas Santos and António Fernando Correia de Campos to the Commission
Subject: Insecurity of teachers employed by the Portuguese Government
Versão portuguesa ... 615
English version ... 616

E-001292/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission
Subject: Suicide of Aaron Swartz
Versión española ... 617
English version ... 619

E-001293/13 by Peter Skinner to the Commission
Subject: Future of the Joint European Torus (JET) facility
English version ... 620

E-001294/13 by Alyn Smith to the Commission
Subject: Food safety regime and country of origin labelling
English version ... 621

E-001296/13 by Marita Ulvskog, Göran Färm, Åsa Westlund, Jens Nilsson, Anna Hedh and Olle Ludvigsson to the Commission
Subject: The 'Farmland' game produced by DG SANCO: a nice way for children to learn about livestock farming
Svensk version ... 622
English version ... 623

E-001298/13 by Julie Girling to the Commission
Subject: Horsemeat burgers
English version ... 624

E-001299/13 by Julie Girling to the Commission
Subject: Eggs
English version ... 625

E-001300/13 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission
Subject: Spain's Coastal Law
Versión española ... 626
English version ... 627

E-001302/13 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission
Subject: Wolves in the province of Avila
Versión española ... 628
English version ... 629

E-001304/13 by María Muñiz De Urquiza to the Commission
Subject: Combating tax havens and EU-Switzerland relations
Versión española ... 630
English version ... 631

E-001305/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Directive 2009/12/EC on airports and the levying of airport charges — exemption adopted by Italy
Versione italiana ... 632
English version ... 633

E-001306/13 by Edit Bauer to the Commission
Subject: Violation of the fundamental principles of the EU
Magyar változat ... 634
English version ... 635

E-001307/13 by Peter van Dalen to the Council
Subject: Hezbollah and the EU list of terrorist organisations
Nederlandse versie ... 636
English version ... 637

P-001308/13 by Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă to the Commission
Subject: Cross-border programmes
Versiunea în limba română ... 638
English version ... 639

E-001309/13 by Liam Aylward to the Commission
Subject: Youth unemployment and the Youth Guarantee Scheme
English version ... 640

E-001310/13 by Nikolaos Salavrakos to the Commission
Subject: One-off property tax charged with Greek electricity bills
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 641
English version ... 642

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000768/13
aan de Commissie
Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE)
(25 januari 2013)

Betreft: Microplastics

In haar antwoord op mijn schriftelijke vraag E-011720/2011 over een verbod op microplastics in consumentengoederen heeft de Commissie erkend op de hoogte te zijn van de mogelijke risico's van microplastics voor de volksgezondheid en het milieu.

De Commissie heeft eveneens opgemerkt dat zij een brede openbare raadpleging over het beheer van plastic afval in de EU aan het voorbereiden was door middel van een groenboek. Hierin zouden de mogelijke risico's van de aanwezigheid van microplastics in afval aan bod komen. Afhankelijk van de uitkomst van deze raadpleging zou de Commissie eventueel verdere maatregelen voorstellen, onder andere op het gebied van microplastics.

Ik zou graag willen weten wat de resultaten van deze raadpleging zijn en of de Commissie overweegt om voorstellen voor verdere maatregelen op het gebied van microplastics toe doen.

Zo ja, behoort een verbod op microplastics in consumentengoederen tot de verdere maatregelen?

Wat wordt er gedaan aan het gebrek aan gegevens op dit gebied?

Heeft de Commissie het groenboek inmiddels gepubliceerd? Zo niet, wanneer denkt zij dit te doen?

Antwoord van de heer Potočnik namens de Commissie
(15 maart 2013)

Het Groenboek van de Commissie over kunststofafval is op 7 maart 2013 gepubliceerd en gaat vergezeld van een publieke online raadpleging die drie maanden zal duren.

Microplastics komen expliciet aan bod in het Groenboek, dat zich specifiek richt op het verzamelen van opvattingen met betrekking tot de impact van deze kleine kunststofdeeltjes. Afhankelijk van de standpunten van belanghebbenden en het grote publiek, zal de Commissie beslissen of verdere maatregelen noodzakelijk zijn, daarbij rekening houdend met het huidige gebrek aan voldoende gegevens over de mogelijke risico's van microplastics.

Tot nu toe is er nog geen specifieke discussie gaande over een algemeen verbod op microplastics in alle consumptiegoederen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000768/13
to the Commission
Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE)
(25 January 2013)

Subject: Microplastics

In its answer to my Written Question E-011720/2011 on a ban on microplastics in consumer goods, the Commission acknowledged it was 'aware of potential problems linked to microplastics for human health and the environment'.

The Commission also stated it was 'preparing a broad public consultation on plastic waste management in the EU through a green paper. Potential risks from the presence of microplastic in waste will be considered in that paper. Depending on the outcome of that consultation, the Commission may propose further appropriate steps, including on microplastics.'

I would like to know the outcome of that consultation, and if the Commission is considering proposing further steps on microplastics.

If so, will those further steps include a ban on microplastics in consumer goods?

How is the lack of sufficient data being addressed?

Has the Commission published the green paper? If not, when does it expect to do so?

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

The Commission Green Paper on plastic waste was published on 7th March 2013 and is accompanied by an online consultation that will last 3 months.

Microplastics are explicitly addressed in the Green Paper with a specific question aimed at collecting views on issues related to their impact. Depending on stakeholders' views and views expressed by the general public, the Commission will then decide on the need for further action, taking into account the current lack of sufficient data.

So far, there has been no specific discussion of any general ban on microplastics in all consumer goods.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-000873/13
à la Commission
Françoise Castex (S&D)
(29 janvier 2013)

Objet: Suivi IP (IP tracking) utilisé par les opérateurs de transport européens

De plus en plus d'internautes européens, usagers de sites d'achat de billets en ligne, se disent victimes du suivi IP (IP tracking) utilisé par les opérateurs de transport européens.

1. La Commission estime-t-elle que ces pratiques sont conformes au droit de l'Union européenne?

2. Le cas échéant, la Commission a-t-elle prévu de diligenter une enquête à ce sujet?

3. Si ces abus sont vérifiés, qu'a prévu de faire la Commission pour y mettre un terme?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Reding au nom de la Commission
(12 mars 2013)

Une adresse IP (Internet Protocol) est un identifiant numérique unique qui est nécessaire à tout dispositif qui se connecte à l'internet. Il est attribué par les fournisseurs d'accès Internet et par les gestionnaires de réseaux locaux. Ceux-ci peuvent, par des moyens raisonnables, identifier les utilisateurs de l'internet, car ils enregistrent systématiquement dans un fichier la date, l'heure, la durée et l'adresse IP dynamique de chaque connexion.

Ces adresses IP peuvent être considérées comme des données à caractère personnel au sens de l'article 2, point a), de la directive 95/46/CE sur la protection des données (la «directive») ([1]), ([2]): elles sont susceptibles de constituer des données à caractère personnel si elles laissent des traces qui, associées à d'autres informations reçues par les serveurs, peuvent être utilisées pour créer des profils et identifier ainsi, directement ou indirectement, les personnes concernées. Ce principe découle de la définition des données à caractère personnel figurant dans la directive. Il est développé plus largement dans le règlement général sur la protection des données proposé par la Commission ([3]).

Tout traitement de données relatives aux clients, telles que les adresses IP, doit respecter les dispositions nationales qui mettent en œuvre les exigences de la directive 95/46/CE; ainsi, les données à caractère personnel doivent être traitées pour des motifs légitimes et dans un but spécifique, et le traitement doit être proportionné à l'objectif poursuivi. Les clients des opérateurs de transport doivent en être informés.

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.

([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]) Cour de justice de l'Union européenne, arrêt du 24 novembre 2011 dans l'affaire C-70/10, Scarlet Extended SA/Société belge des auteurs, compositeurs et éditeurs SCRL (SABAM), (Recueil 2011, p. 00000, point 51).
Texte; voir également l'avis 4 du groupe de travail «article 29» sur le concept de données à caractère personnel, adopté le 20 juin 2007, p. 16.

([3]) Considérant 24 de la proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil relatif à la protection des personnes physiques à l'égard du traitement des données à caractère personnel et à la libre circulation de ces données (règlement général sur la protection des données), COM(2012)11 du 25.1.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000873/13
to the Commission
Françoise Castex (S&D)
(29 January 2013)

Subject: Use of IP tracking by European travel companies

An increasing number of Internet users in Europe who buy travel tickets online are complaining that European travel companies use IP tracking.

1. Is the use of IP tracking by European travel companies consistent with EC law?

2. If not, will the Commission launch an immediate inquiry?

3. If it is confirmed that European travel companies are using IP tracking, what will the Commission do to put a stop to this practice?

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

An Internet Protocol (IP) address is a unique numeric identifier that is needed by every device that connects to the Internet. It is attributed by Internet access providers and managers of local area networks. They can, using reasonable means, identify Internet users, as they systematically 'log' in a file the date, time, duration and dynamic IP address of their connection.

Such IP addresses can be considered personal data in the sense of Article 2 a) of the Data Protection Directive 95/46/EC ('Directive') ([1]) ([2]): Whether they constitute personal data depends on whether they leave traces, which combined with other information received by the servers can be used to create profiles and thereby directly or indirectly identify these individuals. This principle stems from the definition of personal data in the directive and is further developed in the General Data Protection Regulation proposed by the Commission ([3]).

Any processing of client data such as IP addresses must be in line with the national laws implementing the requirements of Directive 95/46/EC; *inter alia* personal data must be processed on legitimate grounds, for a specific purpose and must be proportionate to the aim pursued. The clients of the travel companies must 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 Directive 95/46/EC.

([1]) 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]) Court of Justice of the European Union, Case C-70/10, Judgment of 24 November 2011. Scarlet Extended SA v Société belge des auteurs, compositeurs et éditeurs SCRL (SABAM), ECR [2011] Page 00000, point 51. .
Text; see also Opinion 4 of the article 29 Working Party on the concept of personal data adopted on 20.6.2007, p. 16.

([3]) Recital 24 of the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data (General Data Protection Regulation), COM(2012)11, 25.1.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000874/13
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(29 January 2013)

Subject: Implementation of the European Working Time Directive in Ireland

Can the Commission outline the steps it has taken to ensure the full implementation in Ireland of the Working Time Directive, in particular with regard to junior doctors?

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

The Commission is very aware of the situation regarding working hours of non-consultant hospital doctors in Ireland.

It sent a letter of formal notice on 23 November 2009, and a reasoned opinion on 30 November 2011, about Ireland's failure to comply with the requirements of the Working Time Directive ([1]). The latter sets limits to average weekly working time, and requires minimum daily and weekly rest periods, in the interests of health and safety.

The importance of ensuring concrete and immediate improvements in compliance within the coming months on the basis of specific indicators was discussed recently with the Irish authorities. At that stage, the Commission reserves the right to take all further measures which may be necessary to ensure compliance with the directive.

([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.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000876/13
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(29 January 2013)

Subject: Support for those affected by the legacy of nuclear weapon testing in Kazakhstan

26 April 2011 marked the 25th anniversary of the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant. Since then, the Commission has committed close to EUR 470 million to Chernobyl and to related projects in order to improve nuclear safety, and to deal with the legacy of the disaster. In Kazakhstan, the testing of nuclear weapons has resulted in a similar tragedy for this region.

The Commission's work in nuclear safety has not just had the aim of improving the technical facilities; it has also carried out social projects, in areas such as healthcare and education, to help those who, rebuilding their lives, have had to live with the legacy of Chernobyl. Could the Commission provide information on what funding may be available for the construction and repair of hospices and care centres?

The Chernobyl Shelter Fund has been central to the stabilisation of existing shelters and the construction of facilities in affected areas. The Irish-based charity 'The Greater Chernobyl Cause' is currently overseeing the construction of a hospice for the elderly in the city of Semipalatinsk in Kazakhstan, but has been forced to cease construction owing to lack of funds.

Could the Commission provide further information on the Chernobyl Shelter Fund in the context of the availability of funding for this particular endeavour?

Could the Commission identify any other funding streams which may be available to support organisations of this nature, particularly with regard to the provision of infrastructure and services to assist those affected by the fallout from nuclear testing?

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

The Commission is very much aware of the consequences of the former nuclear test site of Semipalatinsk. On various occasions it has expressed its solidarity with the people of the region and it has expressed concerns about the impact this site has on the quality of the environment. It has been in contact on those issues with the Kazakh authorities and funded a EUR 1 million project for the mapping of the Semipalatinsk test site in Kazakhstan under the Instrument for Nuclear Safety in 2003 (K4.01/03). Unfortunately, this project was unsuccessful and did not come to fruition mainly due to the fact that the authorisation to fly over and access the site was not provided by the Kazakh authorities.

In other frameworks the EU has funded projects through the International Science and Technology Centre (ISTC) to carry out research on remediation techniques and other methods to contain the negative spill over coming from the region.

The Commission stands ready to examine requests for cooperation from the Kazakh authorities on these and other related issues and if possible in close relationship with other partners.

The Chernobyl Shelter Fund does not contemplate any funding regarding the construction and renovation of hospices for the city of Semipalatinsk.

However, NGOs (like the Charity mentioned) may apply for funding through the periodic Calls for Proposals (CfP) that are published on the Europa website. More detailed information concerning the organisation of the CfPs can be obtained by contacting the EU Delegation in Kazakhstan ([1]).

([1]) http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/kazakhstan/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000972/13
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(30 January 2013)

Subject: Commission involvement in relations between Serbia and Kosovo

What measures are being pursued by the Commission to encourage healthy and normalised neighbourly relations between Serbia and Kosovo, with regard to both nations pursuing accession to the EU?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2013)

The conclusions of the Council of December 2012 set out an ambitious agenda for progress in the EU's relations with Serbia and Kosovo ([1]) and the progressive normalisation of relations between them. The Commission is fully engaged in the implementation of this agenda.

In its Opinion on Serbia's membership application, the Commission recommended accession negotiations be opened on condition that Serbia normalises its relations with Kosovo and makes progress towards improvement of relations with Kosovo. This spring the Commission will issue jointly with HR/VP Ashton a report on Serbia's progress in its dialogue with Kosovo. The Commission monitors the implementation of dialogue agreements and helps finance them under the IPA instrument.

The Commission issued its Feasibility Study for a Stabilisation and Association Agreement (SAA) between the EU and Kosovo in October last year. The Commission will propose negotiating directives for an SAA when Kosovo will have met the short-term priorities identified in this study. The Commission is confident that it can do so this spring. The Commission is also finalising its proposal for a framework agreement allowing Kosovo to participate in EU programmes, which it will submit to Council in the spring. The Commission recently held its second Structured Dialogue on the Rule of Law with Kosovo and monitors Kosovo's progress towards visa liberalisation. The Commission works with Kosovo through the Stabilisation and Association Dialogue and provides assistance through the IPA instrument. The Commission will adopt a joint report with HR/VP Ashton on Kosovo's participation in its dialogue with Serbia on the basis of which the Council is to adopt the negotiating directives for an SAA later this spring.

([1]) This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244/1999 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo declaration of independence.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-000973/13
do Komisji
Jarosław Kalinowski (PPE)
(30 stycznia 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Środki na scalanie gruntów rolnych

Wsparcie w ramach programu scalania gruntów rolnych ma niebagatelny wpływ na rozwój obszarów wiejskich. Dlatego pragnę zwrócić uwagę Komisji na problem, z którym borykają się władze województwa podlaskiego w Polsce.

W celu prawidłowej alokacji środków w ramach wsparcia na rzecz scalania gruntów rolnych województwo podlaskie rozpisało konkurs „Poprawianie i rozwijanie infrastruktury związanej z rozwojem i dostosowaniem rolnictwa i leśnictwa przez scalanie gruntów". Jednakże, do przyznania pomocy wszystkim pozytywnie ocenionym wnioskom zabrakło ok. 20 mln PLN. W związku z tym wystąpiono do Ministerstwa Rolnictwa i Rozwoju Wsi o zwiększenie wsparcia dla województwa do kwoty 16 012 926 EUR. Ministerstwo przychyliło się do tej prośby i przygotowało dokument zmieniający rozporządzenie w sprawie podziału środków w ramach Programu Rozwoju Obszarów Wiejskich 2007-2013. Konsultacje społeczne (również ze wszystkimi województwami) i uzgodnienia międzyresortowe uwzględniały zwiększoną kwotę. Jednak dokument opublikowany przez MRiRW jako zwolniony z komisji prawniczej, w załączniku dotyczącym wysokości kwot dla województw, nadal uwzględniał kwotę obecnego rozporządzenia, tj. 11 200 000 EUR.

Z informacji, które uzyskałem wynika, że powyższa zmiana nie może zostać wprowadzona ze względu na brak uzgodnień z Komisją.

Czy Komisja zajęła już stanowisko w tej sprawie?

Zezwolenie na przesunięcie środków umożliwi efektywne wykorzystanie wsparcia unijnego na scalanie gruntów rolnych, natomiast odmowna decyzja obciąży kosztami prac budżet państwa i nie pozwoli użyć całej kwoty przeznaczonej na to działanie dla Polski.

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Daciana Cioloşa w imieniu Komisji
(25 lutego 2013 r.)

Komisja podziela opinię Szanownego Pana Posła, że programy scalania gruntów rolnych znacząco wpływają na rozwój obszarów wiejskich w Polsce. Ze względu na niski poziom absorpcji środków w ramach działania 125. polskiego PROW na lata 2007-2013 dotyczącego scalania gruntów, przedstawiciele Komisji wielokrotnie (na forum komitetów monitorujących, corocznych spotkań) zwracali się do polskich władz apelując o poprawę wdrażania tego środka poprzez działania, takie jak zwiększenie udziału doradztwa, odpowiednie kampanie informacyjne i promocyjne skierowane do potencjalnych beneficjentów, jak również rozpowszechnianie w całej Polsce dobrych praktyk z województwa lubelskiego, skąd pochodzi większość wniosków w sprawie scalania gruntów.

W dniu 31.10.2012 Komisja otrzymała od władz polskich wniosek o zmianę PROW obejmujący, między innymi, zmianę w odniesieniu do działania 125. poprzez zmniejszenie środków budżetowych na scalanie gruntów o 27,5 mln EUR. W przedstawionym uzasadnieniu władze polskie wskazały na ograniczone zainteresowanie scalaniem gruntów i nieprawidłowości w złożonych wnioskach, które doprowadziły do ich odrzucenia przez administrację. Władze utrzymują, że nawet po przyjęciu proponowanej obniżki budżetu, pozostałe środki wystarczą na realizację wszystkich zaplanowanych w ramach programu projektów.

Podział środków budżetowych na ten program wsparcia PROW między poszczególne województwa Polski leży w kompetencjach państwa członkowskiego; Komisja nie bierze w nim udziału.

Wyżej wspomniana procedura zmiany PROW jest nadal w toku.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000973/13
to the Commission
Jarosław Kalinowski (PPE)
(30 January 2013)

Subject: Funding for consolidation of agricultural land

Support provided through agricultural land consolidation programmes has a substantial influence on the development of rural areas. With that in mind, I should like to draw the Commission's attention to a problem faced by the authorities in Poland's Podlaskie province.

With a view to ensuring that resources for the consolidation of agricultural land were allocated correctly, the authorities in Podlaskie province launched a competition entitled 'Improving and developing agricultural and forestry infrastructure through the consolidation of land'. However, in order to grant aid to all of the approved applications, an additional sum of approximately PLN 20 million was needed. Appeals were therefore made to the Polish Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development to increase its assistance to the province to EUR 16 012 926. The Ministry agreed to this request and drew up a document amending the regulation on the division of Rural Development Programme 2007-2013 funds. Public consultations involving all of Poland's provinces and interministerial arrangements resulted in approval being given for the increased amount. However, a document published by the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development and approved by the legal affairs committee still contained the amount of EUR 11 200 000 as set out in the existing regulation.

According to information I have received, the amended amount could not be entered since the Commission had not given its authorisation.

Has the Commission already adopted a position on this matter?

Authorising the transfer of funds would enable EU funds to be used effectively to consolidate agricultural land; however, failure to grant authorisation would burden the national budget with the cost of the work and would prevent the full amount of funds earmarked for this activity in Poland from being used.

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(25 February 2013)

The Commission shares the opinion of the honourable member that agricultural land consolidation programmes substantially influence the development of rural areas in Poland. Due to low uptake of funds under measure 125 of the Polish RDP 2007-2013 related to land reparcelling/land consolidation , on numerous occasions (Monitoring Committees, Annual meetings) the Commission representatives have urged the Polish authorities to boost the implementation of this measure through actions such as better involvement of advisory services, appropriate information and promotion campaigns aimed at potential beneficiaries, as well as dissemination all over Poland of good practices from Lubelskie region where the large majority of land consolidation applications originate.

On 31.10.2012 the Commission received from the Polish authorities a proposal for modification of the RDP including, *inter alia*, changes to the measure 125 budget decreasing the allocation for Land re-parcelling/land consolidation by EUR 27.5 million. The justification provided by the Polish authorities indicates limited interest in the land consolidation scheme and deficiencies in applications submitted, resulting in their rejection by the administration. They maintain that, even after this proposed reduction in the budget, there will be sufficient funds to execute all the projects planned under the scheme.

The allocation of the budget for this RDP support scheme between Polish voivodships is a matter of national competence, in which the Commission is not involved.

The procedure for the abovementioned RDP modification is still ongoing.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000974/13
do Komisji
Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE)
(30 stycznia 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Zagrożenie wirusem afrykańskiego pomoru świń

Od kilku miesięcy dochodzą do Europy informacje o zagrożeniu hodowli świń chorobą *afrykańskiego pomoru świń*, która wywoływana jest przez wirus ASFV (wirus afrykańskiego pomoru świń).

Obecnie nie opracowano szczepionki przeciwko ASF, stąd zwalczanie choroby to tylko likwidacja stad zakażonych. Dotychczas choroba ta występowała głównie w Afryce i sporadycznie w Ameryce Południowej, na obszarze Unii Europejskiej pojawiła się tylko na Sardynii. Państwa UE do tej pory nie należały do strefy najwyższego ryzyka zagrożenia ASF.

Jednak w ostatnich latach choroba pojawiła się blisko granic unijnych, w Rosji i na Ukrainie.

Według danych FAO z 2011 r. z powodu ASF tylko w Rosji zabito 300 tys. świń. Niepokój budzi jednak sytuacja na Ukrainie. Kontrole na granicach z Ukrainą od strony Polski są wzmożone, jednak nie można sprawdzić wszystkich turystów, którzy przewożą zarażoną żywność. W związku ze zbliżaniem się wirusa do polskich granic, a tym samym granic UE, zaplanowano w Polsce na 2013 rok centralne ćwiczenia terenowe. Polska inspekcja weterynaryjna jest w kontakcie z leśnikami oraz ze stroną ukraińską i rosyjską w zakresie przekazywania informacji.

W związku z powyższym zwracam się z zapytaniem do Komisji:

1. W jaki sposób Komisja monitoruje sytuację?

2. Czy Komisja przewiduje pomoc finansową na różne działania związane ze zwalczaniem rozprzestrzenienia się wirusa afrykańskiego pomoru świń w przypadku Ukrainy, najbliższego sąsiada UE?

3. Jakie środki zamierza podjąć Komisja w przypadku wystąpienia wirusa na terenie państw UE?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Tonia Borga w imieniu Komisji
(14 marca 2013 r.)

Komisja bardzo uważnie śledzi sytuację związaną z afrykańskim pomorem świń na wschodnich granicach Unii Europejskiej, zwłaszcza na Ukrainie i w Federacji Rosyjskiej. Na Ukrainie zgłoszono tylko jedno ognisko tej choroby i według wszystkich dostępnych informacji opanowano je i zwalczono.

Za pośrednictwem laboratorium referencyjnego UE ds. afrykańskiego pomoru świń Komisja zapewniła już pomoc techniczną i wsparcie dla Ukrainy głównie w zakresie diagnozowania choroby i gotowości na jej wystąpienie.

Dyrektywą Rady 2002/60/WE ([1]) ustanowiono kompleksowy zbiór zharmonizowanych zasad zwalczania afrykańskiego pomoru świń w UE. Państwa członkowskie posiadają plany awaryjne mające zapewnić szybkie opanowanie i zwalczenie choroby. Biuro ds. Żywności i Weterynarii w Dyrekcji Generalnej Komisji ds. Zdrowia i Konsumentów prowadzi obecnie szereg kontroli w państwach członkowskich, aby upewnić się, że ich awaryjne plany zwalczania chorób zwierząt, w tym afrykańskiego pomoru świń, pozwolą właściwie zareagować na ewentualne wystąpienie choroby.

Szczegółowe środki zapobiegające rozprzestrzenianiu afrykańskiego pomoru świń z Rosji przez pojazdy używane do przewozu świń zostały określone w decyzji Komisji 2011/78/UE ([2]).

([1]) Dz.U. L 192 z 20.7.2002, s. 27.
([2]) Dz.U. L 30 z 4.2.2011, s. 40.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000974/13
to the Commission
Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE)
(30 January 2013)

Subject: Threat from African swine fever

In recent months information has been reaching Europe about the threat to pig farms posed by African swine fever (ASF), which is caused by the African swine fever virus.

No vaccine is currently being produced against ASF so the only means of tackling the disease is to eliminate infected herds. To date, the disease has occurred mainly in Africa and, sporadically, in South America. The only cases in the European Union have been in Sardinia. The highest-risk area for ASF has so far not extended to any EU countries.

However, in recent years the disease has appeared close to the EU's borders, in Russia and Ukraine.

According to FAO data from 2011, in Russia alone some 300 000 pigs were slaughtered as a result of ASF. But it is the situation in Ukraine which is of most concern. Controls on the Polish side of the border with Ukraine have been stepped up, but it is impossible to check all travellers to determine whether they are carrying contaminated food. In response to the virus coming closer to the Polish border (i.e. the EU border), Poland is planning to carry out field exercises in 2013. The Polish Veterinary Inspectorate is in contact with foresters and with the Ukrainian and Russian authorities concerning notification.

In this connection:

1. How is the Commission monitoring this situation?

2. Is the Commission planning to provide financial assistance for action to combat the spread of the African swine fever virus in Ukraine, which directly borders the EU?

3. What measures is the Commission planning to take in the event of an outbreak of the virus in the EU?

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

The Commission is following very closely the African swine fever (ASF) situation in the Eastern borders of the European Union, especially in Ukraine and the Russian Federation. In Ukraine only a single outbreak of this disease has been reported and all information available indicates that it has been successfully controlled and eradicated.

The Commission has already provided technical assistance and support to Ukraine, mainly on disease diagnosis and preparedness, through the EU Reference Laboratory for ASF.

Council Directive 2002/60/EC ([1]) establishes a comprehensive set of harmonised rules on ASF control in the EU. Member States have in place contingency plans to ensure its rapid control and eradication. The Food and Veterinary Office of the Commission's Health and Consumers Directorate is currently engaged in a series of missions in the Member States to ensure that their national contingency plans against animal diseases, including ASF, are appropriate to respond to possible disease outbreaks.

Specific measures to prevent the spread of ASF from Russia via vehicles transporting pigs are laid down in Commission Decision 2011/78/EU ([2]).

([1]) OJ L 192, 20.7.2002, p.27.
([2]) OJ L 30, 4.2.2011, p. 40.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000977/13
à la Commission
Marielle de Sarnez (ALDE)
(30 janvier 2013)

Objet: Risques provoqués par l'utilisation des carburants au diesel sur la santé publique

Le diesel produit moins de gaz à effet de serre dans l'atmosphère que l'essence et bénéficie ainsi d'une fiscalité avantageuse dans les États membres de l'Union européenne, à l'exception du Royaume-Uni.

Mais d'après les résultats d'une étude du Centre International de Recherche sur le Cancer (CICR) de l'OMS, publiée le 13 juin dernier, les gaz d'échappement des moteurs diesel seraient cancérogènes pour l'homme.

La modification de la composition des carburants ainsi que l'installation de filtres à particules ont contribué à réduire les émissions de particules nocives. Cependant, aucune étude scientifique n'a, à ce jour, démontré que ces mesures ont eu un impact positif sur la santé publique.

En avril 2011, la Commission européenne a proposé une révision de la législation européenne sur la taxation des produits énergétiques et de l'électricité (COM(2011)0168).

1. La Commission compte-t-elle conduire une étude sur les aspects sanitaires de l'utilisation des différents carburants sur la santé?

2. Entend-elle revoir sa législation sur la taxation énergétique en prenant en compte les recommandations en matière de santé publique?

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

1. La Commission ne prévoit pas de mener une étude concernant les répercussions sur la santé qui découlent de l'utilisation de différents carburants.

2. À ce stade, la Commission n'envisage pas de présenter une nouvelle proposition de révision de la législation concernant la taxation des produits énergétiques (directive 2003/96/CE du Conseil) afin de prendre en considération les recommandations de santé publique. En 2011, la Commission a présenté une proposition de révision de la directive susmentionnée ([1]) afin qu'elle corresponde mieux aux objectifs de l'Union européenne en matière d'énergie et de changement climatique, et a notamment proposé une taxation des produits énergétiques sur la base de leur teneur en énergie et en CO_2, et qui varierait en fonction de leur utilisation. La Commission n'a pas proposé de règles supplémentaires s'appuyant sur des considérations de santé publique, car elle estime que ces questions peuvent être réglées plus efficacement à l'aide d'autres instruments, tels qu'une législation portant sur la réception des véhicules à moteur au regard des émissions ([2]) ou encore des prescriptions minimales de santé et de sécurité au travail lorsque cela se justifie.

([1]) COM(2011) 169 final.
([2]) Voir par exemple le règlement (CE) n° 715/2007 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 20 juin 2007 relatif à la réception des véhicules à moteur au regard des émissions des véhicules particuliers et utilitaires légers (Euro 5 et Euro 6) et aux informations sur la réparation et l'entretien des véhicules (JO L 171 du 29.06.2007, p. 1-16).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000977/13
to the Commission
Marielle de Sarnez (ALDE)
(30 January 2013)

Subject: Public health risks associated with the use of diesel fuel

Diesel produces less greenhouse gas emissions than petrol and is taxed at a lower rate in the EU Member States, with the exception of the United Kingdom.

However, according to the results of a study by the WHO's International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), which was published on 13 June 2012, exhaust gases from diesel engines are carcinogenic.

Measures such as changing the composition of fuels and fitting filters have helped to reduce emissions of harmful particles. No scientific study has yet shown that these measures have had a positive impact on public health, however.

In April 2011, the Commission proposed a revision of the directive on the taxation of energy products and electricity (COM(2011)0168).

1. Does the Commission intend to conduct a study into the impact that the use of different fuels has on health?

2. Does it plan to revise the legislation on energy taxation to take account of public health recommendations?

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

1. The Commission does not intend to conduct a study on the impact of the use of different fuels on health.

2. At this stage the Commission does not intend to present a new proposal for revision of the legislation on energy taxation (Directive 2003/96/EC) in order to take into account public health recommendations. In 2011 the Commission presented a proposal for a revision of the directive ([1]) aiming at bringing it more closely into line with the EU's energy and climate change objectives and suggesting *inter alia* that energy products are taxed on the basis of their energy and CO_2 content and depending on their use. The Commission did not suggest additional rules based on public health considerations as it believes that these issues can be dealt with more effectively by other instruments such as legislation on approval of motor vehicles with respect to emissions ([2]) or health and safety at work requirements as may be appropriate.

([1]) COM(2011) 169 final.
([2]) See e.g. Regulation 715/2007/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 June 2007 on type approval of motor vehicles with respect to emissions from light passenger and commercial vehicles (Euro 5 and Euro 6) and on access to vehicle repair and maintenance information, OJ L 171, 29.06.2007, pp. 1-16.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000978/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(30 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: Presupuesto en I+D

El Cuadro de Indicadores de Innovación Regional 2012, publicado por la Comisión el pasado mes de noviembre de 2012 ([1]), muestra que existe una diversidad considerable en los resultados en cuanto a la innovación por regiones, no sólo en Europa sino también dentro de los Estados miembros.

Parece ser que hay una relación directa entre inversión en I + D e innovación y competitividad: a más inversión, más competitiva es la región, y más empleo y riqueza genera. Parece ser que las regiones donde se sitúa la capitalidad del estado tienen siempre un nivel de innovación igual o superior al resto de regiones del mismo estado.

En España las regiones mas competitivas, según el estudio de la Comisión y en este orden, son: Madrid (capital de estado), País Vasco y Navarra (que cuentan con concierto económico) y Cataluña (que ha mantenido la inversión de I+D y además es la región española que más fondos europeos recibe para este concepto ([2])).

En los últimos años los gobiernos españoles están reduciendo el presupuesto en I+D; la cifra se aleja de la media de la UE ([3]). ¿No cree la Comisión que en tiempos de crisis invertir en I+D tendría que ser una prioridad para los gobiernos europeos?

¿No cree la Comisión que el Gobierno español debería aumentar la inversión en innovación para aumentar la competitividad de sus regiones y de este modo crear empleo?

Respuesta del Sr. Hahn en nombre de la Comisión
(2 de abril de 2013)

En el Estudio Prospectivo Anual sobre el Crecimiento de 2012 la Comisión defiende la necesidad de una consolidación fiscal inteligente y los ámbitos de fomento del crecimiento que es preciso priorizar y proteger siempre que sea posible. Si en un número limitado de países no se pueden mejorar las inversiones dada la actual situación macroeconómica, al menos los recortes que allí se realicen deberán ser menos drásticos que los que se lleven a cabo en el presupuesto global.

En el caso de España, la Comisión ha reaccionado a propósito de los recortes en I+D introducidos en el presupuesto de 2012 y ha presentado una «recomendación específica para un país», que el Consejo adoptó en julio de 2012, por la que se recomienda a España que «revise las prioridades de gasto y reasigne los fondos con el fin de facilitar el acceso a la financiación a las PYME, la investigación, la innovación y los jóvenes».

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/innovation/files/ris-2012_en.pdf
([2]) http://www.vozbcn.com/2011/07/19/81187/cataluna-receptora-fondos-investigacion/
([3]) http://www.rdipress.com/21/11/2012/el-gasto-de-espana-en-id-cae-un-28/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000978/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(30 January 2013)

Subject: R & D budget

The Regional Innovation Scoreboard 2012 ([1]), published by the Commission in November 2012, shows that there is considerable variation in regional innovation performances, not only on a European scale but also among regions in Member States.

There seems to be a direct correlation between investment in R & D and innovation and competitiveness: the greater the investment, the more competitive the region and the more jobs and wealth that are created. It appears that the level of innovation in regions that are home to a capital city is always equal to or higher than that in the other regions of the same country.

According to the Commission's study, the most competitive regions in Spain are Madrid (the capital), followed by the Basque Country and Navarre (which both have an 'economic agreement' with the central government) and then Catalonia (which has maintained its level of investment in R & D and is also the region in Spain that receives the most European funding for R & D ([2])).

Successive Spanish governments have reduced R & D funding in recent years; the figure is now falling behind the EU average ([3]). Does the Commission not think that in times of crisis, investing in R & D should be a priority for European governments?

Does the Commission not think that the Spanish Government should increase investment in innovation, in order to make the regions more competitive, thereby creating more jobs?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2013)

In the 2012 Annual Growth Survey, the Commission called for smart fiscal consolidation, where growth-enhancing areas are prioritised and protected whenever possible. If increased investments are not possible in a limited number of countries given the current macroeconomic situation, then at least the cuts should be less severe than those in the overall budget.

In the case of Spain, the Commission reacted to the cuts in the R&D budget for 2012 and presented a 'Country-specific recommendation', adopted by the Council in July 2012 which recommends that Spain 'review spending priorities and reallocate funds to support access to finance for SMEs, research, innovation and young people'.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/innovation/files/ris-2012_en.pdf
([2]) http://www.vozbcn.com/2011/07/19/81187/cataluna-receptora-fondos-investigacion/.
([3]) http://www.rdipress.com/21/11/2012/el-gasto-de-espana-en-id-cae-un-28/.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000979/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(30 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: Creciente número de trabajadores desanimados

Desde el inicio de la crisis el número de desempleados ha aumentado hasta llegar a los 5 778 000 según datos de octubre de 2012. Esta cifra, que representa más de un 25 % de la población, no tiene en cuenta el total de desempleados en el Estado español ya que no cuenta las personas que, desanimadas, han dejado de buscar empleo ([1]).

Actualmente en España ya existen 521.000 personas que se encuentran en este estado. En general son parados de larga duración, que ya no tienen esperanza de poder reinsertarse. En muchos casos, 187 000, son personas que tienen más de 55 años con muchas dificultades para encontrar trabajo debido a su edad. En otros, son jóvenes: estos ya suman 87 000 «desanimados» ([2]). Cuando llegue un repunte en la economía, parte de estos desanimados retornarán al mundo laboral y aunque las tasas de paro oficiales no muestren esta grave situación, su exclusión del mercado de trabajo representa una carga económica para el Estado.

A la luz de todo lo anterior,

1. ¿Está preocupada la Comisión por estos datos de desánimo laboral en España?

2. ¿Cree la Comisión que se están tomando las medidas necesarias para evitar que más personas (especialmente jóvenes y mayores de 55 años) salgan del mercado laboral? ¿Cuáles son sus propuestas para paliar esta situación concreta?

3. ¿Cree la Comisión que las estadísticas oficiales de paro deberían incluir también a las personas desanimadas?

Respuesta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(2 de abril de 2013)

1. La tasa de desempleo juvenil en España (55 %) es preocupante, pero no hay datos que indiquen que en ese país la gente joven no tenga ganas de trabajar.

La crisis no ha afectado a los trabajadores de más edad en mayor medida que a otros grupos de edad. Sin embargo, en toda recesión, este grupo de trabajadores afronta problemas particulares que tienen que ver con las transiciones profesionales y laborales, lo que hace que para ellos sea más difícil encontrar un nuevo empleo cuando pierden el que tienen, por lo que el desempleo en esta franja de edad puede llegar a ser estructural.

2. La reforma laboral española de 2012 fue útil para combatir el desempleo juvenil, pero tiene que llevarse a cabo y complementarse con medidas de activación y formación bien diseñadas y enfocadas. El paquete de la Comisión sobre empleo juvenil contempla, entre otras cosas, una «Garantía Juvenil» destinada a garantizar que los jóvenes reciban una oferta de empleo, de formación como aprendices o de período de prácticas en un plazo de cuatro meses tras acabar la educación formal o quedar desempleados.

En el marco del Semestre Europeo de 2012, se recomendó a España que aumentara la edad de jubilación en consonancia con la esperanza de vida y promoviera medidas para los trabajadores de más edad, como el aprendizaje permanente, la mejora de las condiciones de trabajo o la reincorporación de los trabajadores de ese grupo al mercado laboral.

3. Los análisis periódicos de las tendencias del mercado de trabajo en la EU que realiza la Comisión no muestran aumentos significativos de la inactividad o el desánimo. Dado que la tasa de desempleo solo ofrece una imagen parcial de la situación, han empezado a publicarse indicadores de desempleo suplementarios, como el número de parados que buscan trabajo pero que no están disponibles inmediatamente para trabajar o el número de parados que están disponibles pero que no buscan trabajo.

([1]) http://economia.elpais.com/economia/2012/10/26/actualidad/1351234757_130837.html
([2]) http://www.elconfidencial.com/economia/2013/01/25/el-lsquoefecto-desanimorsquo-arrasa-521000-parados-abandonan-la-idea-de-buscar-un-empleo-113557/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000979/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(30 January 2013)

Subject: Growing numbers of disheartened workers

Since the beginning of the crisis, the number of unemployed has increased, with figures for October 2012 showing a total of 5 778 000 jobless. This figure, which represents over 25 % of the population, does not give a full picture of unemployment in Spain, as it fails to take into account those who have lost hope and given up looking for work ([1]).

At present, over 521 000 people in Spain are already in this position. They are usually long-term unemployed who have lost hope of finding another job. Many of them — over 187 000 — are people over 55 who have great difficulty finding work because of their age. Another 87 000 are young people who have become 'disheartened' ([2]). When the economy starts to recover, some of those who have become disheartened will rejoin the labour market. Although the official unemployment figures do not reflect this serious situation, the exclusion of these people from the labour market places an economic burden on the state.

In light of the above:

1. Is the Commission worried by these figures reflecting the lack of will to work?

2. Does the Commission feel that the necessary steps are being taken to prevent more people (particularly young people and over-55s) leaving the labour market? How does it propose to alleviate this specific situation?

3. Does the Commission consider that the official unemployment figures should include those who have stopped looking for work?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2013)

1. The youth unemployment rate (55%) in Spain is worrying, but there is no evidence that young people there lack the will to work.

The crisis has not affected older workers more than other age groups. However, in a recession, older workers face particular career and work transitions- related challenges, which make it more difficult for them to find a new job if they lose theirs, and unemployment among them may become structural.

2. Spain's 2012 labour reform was useful for tackling youth unemployment, but it needs to be carried through and backed up with well designed and targeted activation and training measures. The Commission's Youth Employment Package provides in particular for a Youth Guarantee to ensure young people are offered a job, an apprenticeship or a traineeship within four months of leaving formal education or becoming unemployed.

Under the 2012 European Semester, Spain received a recommendation to raise the retirement age in line with life expectancy and promote measures for older workers, including lifelong learning, better working conditions and reintegrating older workers into the job market.

3. The Commission's regular analyses of labour market trends in the EU show no significant increase in inactivity or discouragement. Since the unemployment rate gives only a partial picture of the situation, it has started publishing supplementary unemployment indicators, including the number of jobless persons seeking a job but not immediately available to work and of jobless persons available for work but not seeking it.

([1]) http://economia.elpais.com/economia/2012/10/26/actualidad/1351234757_130837.html
([2]) http://www.elconfidencial.com/economia/2013/01/25/el-lsquoefecto-desanimorsquo-arrasa-521000-parados-abandonan-la-idea-de-buscar-un-empleo-113557/

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000980/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(30 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Repensar o projeto europeu

Tendo em conta que:

— A atual crise económica e monetária que assola os países da União, desde 2008, obrigou à aplicação de medidas de austeridade e contenção, que resultam em estagnação e recessão económica, principalmente nos países periféricos, embora não deixe de afetar os demais Estados-Membros;

— Os cidadãos europeus, na sua maioria, não entendem o porquê da aplicação destas medidas num tão curto espaço de tempo, que leva implicitamente a mudanças drásticas nas suas condições de vida;

— O discurso pronunciado pelo Primeiro-Ministro britânico, David Cameron, no passado dia 23 de janeiro, aponta vários desafios e problemas reais no processo de integração europeia e vários anseios dos cidadãos, não só britânicos, ao afirmar que não podemos dar como garantido o próprio desenvolvimento do projeto europeu;

— No discurso da União pronunciado em 2012, o Presidente da Comissão Europeia, Durão Barroso, afirmou a necessidade de mudanças no Tratado, para que a União responda com clareza aos desafios da globalização;

— A União tem de progredir à mesma velocidade que as grandes mudanças que ocorrem no mundo e que acontecimentos como a Primavera Árabe e o papel das economias emergentes são exemplos disso;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Se tem a intenção de iniciar um debate profundo sobre a necessidade de um novo tratado europeu, ou se o considera prematuro, visto que estão a ser dados passos fulcrais para uma união económica e financeira;

2. Se esta crise económica e monetária é a altura certa para repensar a crise de valores que afeta a sociedade europeia, a qual, simultaneamente, faz crescer movimentos e partidos antieuropeus;

3. Se não considera importante que, nestes anos de crise que abalaram a moeda única e, consequentemente, todo o projeto europeu, se debata o que pretendemos para o projeto da União;

4. Se, numa situação hipotética, em que Reino Unido consiga fazer valer as suas exigências, não considera perigoso que outros países também o façam, num princípio de igualdade de tratamento.

Resposta dada por José Manuel Barroso em nome da Comissão
(8 de março de 2013)

Na sequência do meu discurso sobre o estado da União de 2012, a Comissão adotou o Plano pormenorizado para uma União Económica e Monetária efetiva e aprofundada (UEM), com vista a lançar um debate europeu sobre o futuro da UE e da UEM. Este plano coloca questões sobre a forma de reforçar a cooperação e a integração económica, orçamental, financeira e política. A Comissão definiu uma visão, as ferramentas e os instrumentos, bem como uma trajetória programada no tempo para atingir este objetivo.

Além disso, a Comissão irá apresentar as linhas gerais para o futuro da UE com vista às eleições para o Parlamento Europeu de 2014. Estas linhas gerais conterão ideias para configurar o futuro da União, algumas das quais exigirão alterações aos Tratados. A Comissão considera o período que antecede as próximas eleições para o Parlamento Europeu como uma ocasião excelente para intensificar um verdadeiro debate a nível europeu.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000980/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(30 January 2013)

Subject: Rethinking the European project

The current economic and monetary crisis which has afflicted the EU countries since 2008 made it necessary to apply austerity and contention measures, which have led to stagnation and economic recession, principally in the peripheral countries, although the other Member States have also been affected.

Most European citizens do not understand why these measures have had to be implemented within such a short space of time, inevitably giving rise to drastic changes in their living conditions.

In his speech on 23 January 2012, UK Prime Minister David Cameron identified a number of challenges and real problems in the European integration process, and the concerns of citizens, not only in the UK, when he stated that we cannot take for granted the development of the European project.

In his 2012 state of the Union speech, Commission President José Manuel Durão Barroso emphasised the need to amend the Treaty so that the Union can adopt a clear-cut response to the challenges of globalisation.

The Union needs to move ahead keeping pace with the major changes taking place in the world, examples of which are events such as the Arab Spring and the role of the emerging economies.

Can the Commission say:

1. Whether it intends to launch a far-reaching debate on the need for a new European treaty, or if it considers this would be premature, given that pivotal steps towards economic and financial union have yet to be taken?

2. Whether this time of economic and monetary crisis is the right moment to reconsider the crisis of values affecting European society, which is at the same time fomenting the rise of anti-European movements and parties?

3. Whether it considers it important, during these years of crisis which have undermined the single currency and, with it, the whole European project, to discuss what we wish the Union to achieve?

4. Whether, in the hypothetical event that the United Kingdom manages to achieve its demands, it sees a danger of other countries doing likewise, based on the principle of equal treatment?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(8 March 2013)

Following my State of the Union Address 2012, the Commission adopted the Blueprint for a Deep and Genuine Economic and Monetary Union (EMU) to launch a European debate on the future of the EU and the EMU. It raises the questions on how to strengthen cooperation and integration in the financial, fiscal, economic and also in the political field. The Commission has set out a vision and the tools and the instruments as well as a sequenced path to achieve this ambition.

In addition, the Commission will present its outline for the future EU ahead of the European Parliament elections in 2014. This outline will present ideas for shaping the future of the Union, some of which will require Treaty change. The Commission considers that the run up to the next elections for the Parliament as an excellent occasion to intensify a genuine European debate.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000981/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(30 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Repensar o projeto europeu — 2

Tendo em conta que:

— A atual crise económica e monetária que assola os países da União, desde 2008, obrigou à aplicação de medidas de austeridade e contenção, que resultam em estagnação e recessão económica, principalmente nos países periféricos, embora não deixe de afetar os demais Estados-Membros;

— Os cidadãos europeus, na sua maioria, não entendem o porquê da aplicação destas medidas num tão curto espaço de tempo, que leva implicitamente a mudanças drásticas nas suas condições de vida;

— O discurso pronunciado pelo Primeiro-Ministro britânico, David Cameron, no passado dia 23 de janeiro, aponta vários desafios e problemas reais no processo de integração europeia e vários anseios dos cidadãos, não só britânicos, ao afirmar que não podemos dar como garantido o próprio desenvolvimento do projeto europeu;

— No discurso da União pronunciado em 2012, o Presidente da Comissão Europeia, Durão Barroso, afirmou a necessidade de mudanças no Tratado, para que a União responda com clareza aos desafios da globalização;

— A União tem de progredir à mesma velocidade que as grandes mudanças que ocorrem no mundo e que acontecimentos como a Primavera Árabe e o papel das economias emergentes são exemplos disso;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Se considera importante reforçar o papel dos parlamentos nacionais nos processos de decisão da União Europeia e que tipo de ações pensa implementar para uma maior implicação dos parlamentos nacionais;

2. O que pretende fazer para reduzir o sentimento de distância entre a União e os cidadãos europeus e que ações concretas pode pôr em prática, em coordenação com os Estados-Membros, para aprofundar o sentimento de pertença ao projeto europeu, nomeadamente através dos programas educativos nacionais.

Resposta dada por José Manuel Barroso em nome da Comissão
(14 de março de 2013)

1. A Comissão remete o Senhor Deputado para a resposta dada à pergunta escrita E-009202/2012.

2. A Comissão remete o Senhor Deputado para a resposta dada à pergunta escrita E-002674/2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000981/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(30 January 2013)

Subject: Rethinking the European project II

The current economic and monetary crisis which has afflicted the EU countries since 2008 made it necessary to apply austerity and contention measures, which have led to stagnation and economic recession, principally in the peripheral countries, although the other Member States have also been affected.

Most European citizens do not understand why these measures have had to be implemented within such a short space of time, inevitably giving rise to drastic changes in their living conditions.

In his speech on 23 January 2012, UK Prime Minister David Cameron identified a number of challenges and real problems in the European integration process, and the concerns of citizens, not only in the UK, when he stated that we cannot take for granted the development of the European project.

In his 2012 state of the Union speech, Commission President José Manuel Durão Barroso emphasised the need to amend the Treaty so that the Union can adopt a clear-cut response to the challenges of globalisation.

The Union needs to move ahead keeping pace with the major changes taking place in the world, examples of which are events such as the Arab Spring and the role of the emerging economies.

Can the Commission say:

1. Whether it considers it important to strengthen the role of national parliaments in the EU's decision-making processes and what type of action it intends to take to bring about greater involvement by national parliaments?

2. What it intends to do to reduce the feeling of distance between the Union and its citizens and what specific actions can be put into practice, in coordination with the Member States, to strengthen the feeling of belonging to the European project, especially through national educational programmes?

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

1. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-009202/2012.

2. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-002674/2012.

(Latviešu valodas versija)

Jautājums, uz kuru jāatbild rakstiski, E-000982/13
Komisijai
Krišjānis Kariņš (PPE)
(2013. gada 30. janvāris)

Temats: Būtiskas ietekmes definīcija

Godīga konkurence ir nepieciešama efektīvai tirgus darbībai. Monopola un oligopola klātesamība atsevišķās nozarēs un ekonomikas sektoros var būt ļoti neizdevīga patērētājiem. Viens no tādiem sektoriem ir tirdzniecības un jo īpaši mazumtirdzniecības sektors. Lai arī šajā sektorā monopols vai pat oligopols neeksistē, tomēr pastāv atsevišķi uzņēmumi, kuri ir dominējoši pār pārējiem, proti, to ietekme uz tirgu ir būtiska. Tas liek nonākt pie secinājuma, ka, iespējams, ir nepieciešama ciešāka to uzraudzība.

1. Vai Komisija ir veikusi izpēti šajā jautājumā?

2. Vai Eiropas Savienības likumdošanā ir definēta tirdzniecības uzņēmumu būtiska ietekme?

3. Vai šo uzņēmumu būtiskas ietekmes definīcijā ir noteikti kvantitatīvi rādītāji?

Atbildi Komisijas vārdā sniedza Hoakins Almunja
(2013. gada 17. aprīlis)

Komisija attiecīgu uzņēmumu ietekmi tirgū novērtē saistībā ar katru konkrēto konkurences lietu. Attiecībā uz vispārīgo jautājumu par mazumtirdzniecības nozares koncentrāciju Komisija pašlaik rīko konkursu par pētījumu, kura mērķis cita starpā ir izpētīt saikni starp koncentrācijas attīstības gaitu pārtikas mazumtirdzniecības nozarē un pārtikas produktu izvēli un jauninājumiem ([1]).

Komisija ir pieņēmusi pamatnostādnes par būtiskas ietekmes tirgū novērtējumu tikai elektronisko sakaru tīklu un pakalpojumu nozarē ([2]), attiecībā uz kuru ES noteikumi paredz, ka "būtiska ietekme tirgū" ir līdzvērtīga dominējošam stāvoklim. Ievērojot attiecīgo judikatūru ([3]), dominējošs stāvoklis saskaņā ar ES Līguma konkurences noteikumiem ir uzņēmuma ekonomisks spēks, kas tam līdz zināmam līmenim ļauj rīkoties neatkarīgi no konkurentiem, klientiem un gala patērētājiem. Komisija mazumtirdzniecības nozarē jēdziena "būtiska ietekme" vietā izmanto dominējoša stāvokļa jēdzienu.

([1]) Papildu informācija ir pieejama http://ec.europa.eu/competition/calls/tenders_open.html

([2]) Komisijas pamatnostādnes par tirgus analīzi un būtiskas ietekmes tirgū novērtējumu saskaņā ar Kopienas reglamentējošiem noteikumiem attiecībā uz elektronisko sakaru tīkliem un pakalpojumiem (Dokuments attiecas uz EEZ). http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2002:165:0006:0031:EN:PDF

([3]) Tiesas 1979. gada spriedums lietā 85/76 *Hoffmann-La Roche* pret Komisiju, *Recueil* 461, 39. punkts.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000982/13
to the Commission
Krišjānis Kariņš (PPE)
(30 January 2013)

Subject: Definition of 'significant power'

Fair competition is essential to ensure efficient functioning of the market. The existence of monopolies and oligopolies in particular branches and sectors of the economy may be highly detrimental to consumers. One such sector is trade, and particularly the retail trade. Although no monopolies or oligopolies exist in this sector, there are still certain businesses which are dominant in respect of the others, their market power being significant. This leads to the conclusion that it may be necessary to supervise them more stringently.

1. Has the Commission investigated this issue?

2. Does European Union legislation define 'significant power' in the case of undertakings engaged in trade?

3. Does the definition of 'significant power' of such undertakings include quantitative indicators?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(17 April 2013)

The Commission assesses the market power of undertakings involved in the context of each particular competition case. Regarding the general issue of the retail sector's concentration, the Commission is currently tendering a study seeking to shed light, *inter alia*, on the relationship between the evolution of food retail's concentration and choice and innovation in food products ([1]).

The Commission has issued guidelines on the assessment of significant market power only in the sector of electronic communication networks and services ([2]) where EU regulations have defined the position of 'significant market power' as equivalent to a dominant position. In line with the relevant jurisprudence ([3]) dominant position under the competition rules of the EU Treaty means a position of economic strength enjoyed by an undertaking that allows it to behave to an appreciable extent independently of its competitors and customers and ultimately of its consumers. The Commission does not employ the concept of 'significant power' for the retail sector but rather that of dominant position.

([1]) More information is available at http://ec.europa.eu/competition/calls/tenders_open.html

([2]) Commission guidelines on market analysis and the assessment of significant market power under the Community regulatory framework for electronic communications networks and services (Text with EEA relevance). http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2002:165:0006:0031:EN:PDF.

([3]) Case 85/76, Hoffmann-La Roche v Commission [1979] ECR461, paragraph 39.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000983/13
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(30. Januar 2013)

Betrifft: Pläne der EU zur Neuregulierung des Amateurfußballs

Zurzeit dürfen im österreichischen Amateurfußballbereich nur zwei Nicht-Österreicher in der Mannschaft spielen. Da diese Regelung Medienberichten zufolge von der EU als diskriminierend angesehen wird, hat der Österreichische Fußballverband sie nun aufgehoben. Ab dem 1.7.2013 soll dementsprechend eine unbegrenzte Zahl an ausländischen Spielern eingesetzt werden dürfen. Daraus ergeben sich folgende Fragen:

1. Stimmen diese Meldungen über Pläne für eine Neuregulierung des Amateurfußballbereichs innerhalb der Europäischen Union?

2. Fußballexperten zeigen sich besorgt über diese kolportierten Pläne der EU, in den Fußball-Amateurligen eine neue Regelung durchzusetzen. Wie weit sind diese Pläne für neue Regulierungen europaweit vorangeschritten?

3. Durch die Aufhebung der Sperrklausel für Ausländer in Österreich würde die Nachwuchswerbung und -ausbildung ggf. massiv gestört, da auf diese Weise viele talentierte Nachwuchsspieler keine Chance mehr hätten, in die Kampfmannschaft aufzurücken. Wie beurteilt die Kommission diese Befürchtungen?

4. Sieht die Kommission generell Handlungsbedarf und Möglichkeiten, rechtliche Anpassungen im Bereich der Arbeitnehmerfreizügigkeit zu verfolgen, um im Bereich des Mannschaftsleistungssports dem Interessenkonflikt zwischen der Verfolgung guter saisonaler Ergebnisse — d. h. damit ggf. auch der starken oder ausschließlichen Bevorzugung von Ausländern in der Mannschaft — und der langfristigen sportlichen Entwicklung der nationalen Potentiale entgegenzutreten?

5. Kann die Gefährdung der Entwicklung ganzer Mannschaftssportarten in einzelnen Ländern, auch im Hinblick auf jugendliches Interesse, in diesem Fall auch als zentrales öffentliches Interesse gesehen werden?

Antwort von Frau Vassiliou im Namen der Kommission
(6. März 2013)

Die Regulierung des Amateurfußballs in der EU fällt nicht in den Zuständigkeitsbereich der Kommission. Die vom Österreichischen Fußball-Bund beschlossenen Änderungen, die in der Frage des Herrn Abgeordneten erwähnt wurden, sind darauf ausgelegt, die geltenden Bestimmungen im Österreichischen Fußball an die EU-Bestimmungen zur Freizügigkeit der Bürgerinnen und Bürger anzugleichen. Wie die Kommission in ihrer Mitteilung „Entwicklung der europäischen Dimension des Sports“ ([1]) und insbesondere in ihrer begleitenden Arbeitsunterlage zur Freizügigkeit von professionellen und Amateursportlern in der EU ([2]) angibt, sind Bestimmungen, die zu direkter Diskriminierung aufgrund der Staatsangehörigkeit führen, nicht mit dem EU-Recht vereinbar.

Die Kommission ist sich der Rolle des Sports in Gesellschaft und Erziehung und der Bedeutung der Förderung und Anwerbung von Nachwuchsspielern bewusst. Die Kommission beteiligt sich an einem konstruktiven Dialog mit den nationalen und internationalen leitenden Sportorganen, um ein Gleichgewicht zwischen den Besonderheiten des Sports und der Einhaltung des EU-Rechts zu finden, insbesondere im Bereich der Freizügigkeit der Bürgerinnen und Bürger. Im Rahmen ihres strukturierten Dialogs mit den Interessenvertretern aus dem Sportsektor und den Mitgliedstaaten bietet die Kommission regelmäßige Beratung an und erläutert die bestehenden Bestimmungen, um ihnen zu helfen, mögliche rechtliche Schwierigkeiten anzusprechen, die auf Handlungen oder Bestimmungen im Bereich Sport zurückzuführen sind.

([1]) KOM(2011)12 endg.
([2]) SEK(2011)66 endg.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000983/13
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(30 January 2013)

Subject: EU plans to re-regulate amateur football

At present, an amateur football team in Austria may field only two non-Austrians. As, according to media reports, this rule is regarded as discriminatory by the EU, the Austrian Football Association has now abolished it. As from 1 July 2013, accordingly, an unlimited number of foreign players may be used.

1. Are the reports about re-regulating amateur football in the EU true?

2. Football experts are concerned about the EU's rumoured plans to impose re-regulation on amateur football leagues. How far advanced are these plans for re-regulation across Europe?

3. Abolishing the exclusion clause for foreigners in Austria might well create a serious obstacle to recruiting and training young up-and-coming players, since many of them would no longer have any chance of moving up to senior teams. How does the Commission view such fears?

4. Does the Commission see a need for action and any scope, in general, for seeking changes to legislation on freedom of movement for workers in order, within competitive team sports, to counter the conflict of interests between looking to achieve good results during a season, meaning that team selection might be heavily or exclusively biased in favour of foreign players, and the long-term development of national sporting potential?

5. Can action which jeopardises the development of entire team sports in individual countries, also with a view to the interests of young people, also be regarded, in this instance, as a key issue of public interest?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(6 March 2013)

The Commission has no competence to regulate amateur football in the EU. The modifications adopted by the Austrian Football Federation, as mentioned in the Honourable Member's question, aim to align the rules in force in Austrian football with EU rules on the free movement of citizens. As stated by the Commission in its communication 'Developing the European Dimension in Sport' ([1]), and notably in its accompanying Staff Working Document on the free movement of professional and amateur sportspeople in the EU ([2]), rules leading to direct discrimination on grounds of nationality are not compatible with EC law.

The Commission is aware of the social and educational role of sport and of the importance of the training and recruitment of young players. The Commission is engaged in a constructive dialogue with the national and international governing bodies for sport with a view to striking the right balance between the specificity of sport and compliance with EC law, notably in the area of free movement of citizens. In the context of its structured dialogue with sports stakeholders and Member States, the Commission regularly provides guidance and explains the existing rules so as to help them address possible legal difficulties stemming from actions or rules in the field of sport.

([1]) COM(2011) 12 final.
([2]) SEC(2011) 66 final.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. P-000985/13
Komisijai
Justas Vincas Paleckis (S&D)
(2013 m. sausio 30 d.)

Tema: ES išorės sienos su Baltarusija apsauga

Baltarusijos Prezidentas A. Lukašenka praėjusių metų pabaigoje mažiausiai du kartus (spalio ir gruodžio mėn.) oficialiai pranešė, kad dėl sankcijų jo šaliai Baltarusija daugiau nebetrukdys migrantams nelegaliai kirsti ES sienų. Be to, Baltarusijos lyderis pareiškė, kad ES turėtų sumokėti už tolesnį sienų saugumo užtikrinimą, „pamiršdamas“ iki šiol skirtą ir planuojamą skirti ES paramą šiam reikalui. Kompetentingos Lietuvos institucijos dar neužfiksavo neįprasto ir didelio nelegalių migrantų skaičiaus išaugimo. Tačiau negalime nekreipti dėmesio į šiuos gąsdinančius pareiškimus, kadangi situacija per labai trumpą laiką gali labai pasikeisti. Ją pablogintų ir tai, kad Baltarusija iki šiol neturi readmisijos sutarties su ES. Silpnas sienos saugumas neišvengiamai padidintų ir kontrabandos mastą. Dėl nepakankamo Baltarusijos pasieniečių skaičiaus ir toliau susidarys didžiulės sunkvežimių ir automobilių spūstys.

1. Ar EK atkreipė dėmesį į šiuos Baltarusijos lyderio pareiškimus?

2. Kokių priemonių ėmėsi ar ketina imtis EK, kad kritiniu atveju sustiprintų ES išorės sieną su Baltarusija?

3. Kokios finansinės, logistinės ar kitokios pagalbos gali tikėtis ES valstybės – Baltarusijos kaimynės?

4. Ar pastaruoju metu buvo imtasi veiksmų, siekiant įtikinti Baltarusiją pradėti derybas dėl readmisijos susitarimo?

Europos Sąjungos vyriausiosios įgaliotinės ir Komisijos pirmininko pavaduotojos Catherine Ashton atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2013 m. kovo 25 d.)

1. ES atidžiai seka Baltarusijos pareiškimus dėl sienų ir migracijos. ES delegacija, valstybių narių ambasados ir nacionalinės institucijos palaiko glaudžius darbo santykius su Baltarusijos sienos apsaugos pareigūnais. Iki šiol tai vyko sklandžiai. Tačiau 2012 m. pastebėta, kad pagausėjo nelegalių migrantų.

2. Užtikrinti veiksmingą išorės sienų apsaugą yra tik atitinkamų valstybių narių, o ne Europos Sąjungos atsakomybė. Operatyvaus bendradarbiavimo prie Europos Sąjungos valstybių narių išorės sienų valdymo įgaliojimai perduoti agentūrai Frontex. Valstybės narės, susidūrusios su skubiais ir išskirtiniais sunkumais, pagal Reglamento (EB) Nr. 863/2007 ([1]) nuostatas gali kreiptis į agentūrą Frontex ir prašyti dislokuoti skubios pasienio intervencijos komandas.

3. Frontex nuolat stebi padėtį ir prireikus gali atitinkamai valstybei narei pasiūlyti tinkamus operatyvaus bendradarbiavimo veiksmus. Jei agentūrai Frontex nepakaks finansinių išteklių, Europos Sąjunga kuo skubiau patikrins, ar galima perskirstyti lėšas.

4. ES ne kartą ragino Baltarusiją pradėti derybas dėl vizų režimo supaprastinimo ir readmisijos. Baltarusijos Užsienio reikalų ministerija pareiškė, jog Baltarusijai kelia nerimą galimybė, kad „įsigaliojus readmisijos susitarimui į Baltarusiją bus grąžinta dešimtys tūkstančių nelegalių migrantų, kurie pasiliks šalyje.“ Padėties negerina ir tai, kad Baltarusija neturi nei sienų, nei readmisijos susitarimo su Rusija. Baltarusijos pareigūnai taip pat nurodė, kad pradėti derybų negalima, kol ES taiko sankcijas. Kol kas valstybės narės ėmėsi veiksmų supaprastinti Baltarusijos piliečių kelionių tvarką pasinaudojant Šengeno vizų kodekse numatytomis lankstumo galimybėmis.

([1]) 2007 m. liepos 11 d. Europos Parlamento ir Tarybos reglamentas (EB) Nr. 863/2007, nustatantis Skubios pasienio pagalbos būrių sudarymo mechanizmą ir iš dalies keičiantis Tarybos reglamentą (EB) Nr. 2007/2004, kiek tai susiję su šiuo mechanizmu, bei reglamentuojantis pakviestųjų pareigūnų užduotis ir įgaliojimus (OL L 199, 2007 7 31, p. 30).

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000985/13
to the Commission
Justas Vincas Paleckis (S&D)
(30 January 2013)

Subject: Protection of the EU's external border with Belarus

At the end of last year Belarusian President Lukashenko officially declared on at least two occasions (in October and December) that because of sanctions against his country Belarus would no longer prevent migrants from illegally crossing the EU's borders. Furthermore, the Belarusian leader stated that the EU should pay for ensuring further border security, 'forgetting' the EU assistance allocated so far and still planned for this purpose. The competent Lithuanian institutions have not yet recorded any unusual and significant increase in the number of migrants. However, we cannot ignore these threatening statements because the situation can change in a very short period of time. It would also get worse because Belarus has not yet concluded a readmission treaty with the EU. Weak border security would also inevitably increase the scale of smuggling. Due to the insufficient number of Belarusian border guards there will continue to be huge queues of lorries and cars at the border.

1. Has the European Commission drawn attention to these statements by the Belarusian leader?

2. What steps has the European Commission taken or does it plan to take to strengthen the EU's external border with Belarus in an emergency?

3. What financial, logistical or other aid can EU Member States neighbouring Belarus expect?

4. Has action been taken recently to convince Belarus to enter into negotiations on a readmission agreement?

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

1. The EU is closely following Belarusian statements on borders and migration. The EU Delegation, Member States Embassies and national authorities maintain a close working relationship with Belarus border guards. So far this has worked satisfactorily. However, an increase in the number of illegal migrants was observed in 2012.

2. Ensuring effective control of the external borders is the sole responsibility of the Member States concerned, not of the Union. The management of the operational coordination at the external borders of the Member States of the Union is in the remit of the Frontex Agency. Member States, facing a situation of urgent and exceptional pressure, may, in line with Regulation (EC) No 863/2007 ([1]), request Frontex to deploy Rapid Border Intervention Teams.

3. Frontex constantly monitors the situation and could suggest, if needed, to the concerned Member States adequate coordinated operational responses. In case of possible insufficient Frontex financial means, the Union will urgently verify whether funds could be redeployed.

4. The EU has repeatedly called on Belarus to engage in visa facilitation and readmission talks. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Belarus stated that Belarus was worried that 'tens of thousands of illegal migrants would be re-admitted and gather in Belarus if a re-admission agreement came into force'. The fact that Belarus has neither a border nor a re-admission agreement with Russia is not helpful either. Belarus officials also indicated that entering into negotiations was not possible as long as the EU applied sanctions. Meanwhile, Member States have taken steps to facilitate the travel of Belarus citizens using the flexibility offered by the Schengen Visa Code.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 863/2007 of Parliament and of the Council of 11 July 2007 establishing a mechanism for the creation of Rapid Border Intervention Teams and amending Council Regulation (EC) No 2007/2004 as regards that mechanism and regulating the tasks and powers of guest officers, OJ L 199, 31.7.2007.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-000986/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(30 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Δήλωση Eurogroup για την Ελλάδα στις 21.1.2013 σχετικά με την απλοποίηση του κώδικα φορολογίας

Στη δήλωση του Eurogroup για την Ελλάδα στις 21.1.2013 αναφέρεται ότι το Eurogroup «χαιρετίζει τη δέσμευση της κυβέρνησης να υιοθετήσει την άνοιξη μια απλοποίηση του φορολογικού κώδικα».

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Ποια ακριβώς σημεία του φορολογικού κώδικα δεσμεύτηκε να απλοποιήσει η ελληνική κυβέρνηση; Μπορεί κατηγορηματικά να βεβαιώσει ότι η πρόθεση της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής, ως μέλος της τρόικας, δεν είναι να επιβληθούν νέοι φόροι ή να αυξηθούν οι υφιστάμενοι, οι οποίοι έχουν ήδη «γονατίσει» τον ελληνικό λαό;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(28 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Η δήλωση του Eurogroup για την Ελλάδα στις 21 Ιανουαρίου 2013 αναφέρει τη δέσμευση της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης να απλουστεύσει τον φορολογικό κώδικα. Ο στόχος είναι να απλουστευθεί ο φορολογικός κώδικας με τη συγκέντρωση των διατάξεων σε ένα ενιαίο κείμενο, καθιστώντας τον φορολογικό κώδικα πιο εύληπτο και την εφαρμογή του λιγότερο επαχθή για τους πολίτες και τις επιχειρήσεις. Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, δεν σχεδιάζονται αλλαγές όσον αφορά τη φορολογική πολιτική ούτε περαιτέρω αυξήσεις όσον αφορά τα έσοδα. Εξάλλου, θα επανεξεταστεί η νομοθεσία για τις φορολογικές διαδικασίες, κατά τρόπον ώστε να καταστεί το σύστημα λιγότερο δαπανηρό και γραφειοκρατικό και να συμβάλει στην καταπολέμηση της φοροδιαφυγής. Στις 23 Ιανουαρίου 2013, ο έλληνας υπουργός οικονομικών Γιάννης Στουρνάρας, δημιούργησε μία επιτροπή εμπειρογνωμόνων επί φορολογικών θεμάτων για να επιβλέπει τις σχετικές εργασίες που διεξάγονται υπό την εποπτεία του υφυπουργού οικονομικών Γιώργου Μαυραγάνη. Η Επιτροπή θα υποβάλει τα πορίσματά της στο Κοινοβούλιο τον Μάιο. Η τρόικα δεν εκπροσωπείται σε αυτήν την επιτροπή, αλλά θα παρακολουθεί με προσοχή την πρόοδο των εργασιών της.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000986/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(30 January 2013)

Subject: Eurogroup statement of 21 January 2013 concerning simplification of the Greek tax code

In its statement of 21 January 2013, Eurogroup welcomed the undertaking by the Greek Government to simplify its tax code by spring.

In view of this:

Which specific provisions of the tax code has the Greek Government undertaken to simplify? Can the Commission, as a member of the Troika, give its unqualified assurance that its objective is not the imposition of new taxes or an increase in existing ones — such measures having already brought the Greek people to its knees?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(28 February 2013)

The Eurogroup statement on Greece on 21 January 2013 mentions a commitment by the Greek Government to simplify the Income Tax Code. The objective is to simplify the income tax code, bringing together the provisions in a single place, making the tax code much easier to understand and less burdensome to administer for citizens and businesses. No major changes in tax policy nor further increases in revenues are planned in this respect. In addition, the legislation on tax procedures will be reviewed, making the system less costly and bureaucratic and helping combat tax evasion. On 23 January 2013, Greek Finance Minister Yannis Stournaras set up a committee of tax experts to oversee this work led by Deputy Finance Minister Giorgos Mavraganis. The committee will produce a bill to reach Parliament in May. The Troika is not represented on this committee, but will follow its progress closely.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000987/13
to the Commission
Ashley Fox (ECR)
(30 January 2013)

Subject: GM food labelling

Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003 on genetically modified food and feed requires that food containing GMOs, or containing ingredients produced from GMOs, must be labelled.

A constituent of mine is concerned that products such as milk, meat and eggs from animals fed on GM feed are not subject to these labelling requirements. This may lead to a situation where a consumer purchases such a product without knowing that the animal was fed on GM feed.

Does the Commission agree that there is a weakness in the GM food labelling rules?

How does the Commission intend to act on the matter?

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

The co-legislators decided that regulation (EC) No 1829/2003 ([1]) only applies to food and feed containing, consisting of or produced from a GMO, but not to food and feed produced 'with' a GMO. Recital 16 of the regulation provides that the determining factor is whether or not material derived from the GM source material is present in the food or in the feed. Consequently, products obtained from animals fed with GMOs, such as eggs, meat or milk, are subject neither to the authorisation requirements nor to the labelling requirements referred to in the regulation.

Following a petition in 2007 asking for the labelling of such products, the Commission asked EFSA to clarify if transgenes or their products may be incorporated into animal tissues or products. EFSA concluded that, to date, a large number of experimental studies with livestock have shown that recombinant DNA fragments or proteins derived from GM plants ingested by farm animals like broilers, cattle, pigs or quails have not been detected in their tissues, fluids or edible products. On this basis, the Commission concluded that it was appropriate to maintain the current legislative approach.

However the EU legislation does not forbid the use of 'GM-free' labels signalling that foodstuffs do not contain GM crops, or were produced not using GMOs, provided that they respect the general rules on food labelling ([2]). Such labels are being developed in several Member States and the Commission has launched a study to gain a better understanding of the scopes and specifications of these labels in the EU, and to assess the need for a possible harmonisation of this field. The results of the study will be published in 2013.

([1]) OJ L 268, 18.10.2003.
([2]) Directive 2000/13/EC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the labelling, presentation and advertising of foodstuffs. OJ L 109, 6.5.2000.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000988/13
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(30 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: Gasoducto en Parque Nacional Doñana

La Secretaría de Estado de Medio Ambiente del Gobierno de España ha aprobado la resolución de declaración de impacto ambiental del proyecto para realizar sondeos e instalar un gasoducto en las marismas orientales del entorno del parque natural de Doñana (resolución de 15 de enero, publicada en el Boletín oficial del Estado de 29 de enero de 2013).

Las actuaciones proyectadas se localizan en espacios incluidos en la Red Natura 2000 (en concreto el lugar de importancia comunitaria y la zona de especial protección para las aves número ES0000024 Doñana y el LIC ES6150009 Doñana Norte y Oeste), dentro de los límites del Espacio Natural Doñana, declarado humedal Ramsar y reserva de la biosfera, coincidiendo, además, con varios hábitats de interés comunitario, al desenvolver su vida allí especies amenazadas o de especial interés.

Por todo ello, pregunto a la Comisión:

1. ¿Tiene conocimiento la Comisión de ese proyecto de sondeos, extracción de gas e instalación de un gasoducto?

2. ¿Pedirá información al Gobierno de España sobre el mismo? ¿Lo considera compatible con la denominada Directiva de hábitats, 92/43/CEE de 21 de mayo?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001228/13
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(6 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: Extracción de gas en el entorno de Doñana

El pasado día 15 de enero, el Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio ambiente aprobó las declaraciones de impacto ambiental (DIA) a favor de tres proyectos de gasoductos y sondeos de extracción de gas, así como el almacenamiento posterior de gas en el subsuelo en esos yacimientos en el Parque Natural de Doñana, lo que permitiría a la compañía Petroleum Oil & Gas España, filial de Gas Natural Fenosa, realizar estudios a fin de determinar la capacidad real y rentabilidad de extraer gas natural de los mismos y su posterior uso para almacenar el hidrocarburo.

Considerando que el Parque Natural de Doñana se encuentra protegido por la Red Natura 2000, debería haberse adjuntado a la DIA una «Declaración de no afección de Red Natura 2000» que tendría que emitir la Junta de Andalucía. Por motivos de consistencia, este permiso debería haberse emitido anteriormente a la DIA; sin embargo, hasta hoy la Junta de Andalucía no se ha pronunciado.

La organización WWF recordó que el Plan de Ordenación de los Recursos Naturales de Doñana prohíbe este tipo de actividades a menos que sean proyectos de «interés nacional». Según WWF, la aprobación de este proyecto vulneraría la Ley de Espacios Protegidos añadiendo 24 km de gasoducto a una red que alcanzaría ya los 70 km.

1. ¿Conocía la Comisión dichos proyectos de extracción de gas natural? ¿Conoce si el Gobierno español está realizando otras DIA para otros proyectos en el Parque Natural de Doñana? ¿Recabará la Comisión información sobre dichos proyectos de la empresa Petroleum Oil & Gas España?

2. ¿Considera que las declaraciones de impacto medioambiental son inválidas dado que no se ha adjuntado previamente la «Declaración de no afección de Red Natura 2000» realizada por la Junta de Andalucía? ¿Exigirá al Gobierno español que retire las DIA presentadas hasta que no reciba la «Declaración de no afección de la Red Natural 2000»?

3. En caso que se prosiga con estos proyectos, ¿considera que el Estado español estaría violando la Directiva 92/43/CEE relativa a la conservación de los hábitats naturales? ¿Qué acciones tomará para frenar, al menos temporalmente, la actividad de la empresa Petroleum Oil & Gas España?

Respuesta conjunta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(25 de marzo de 2013)

La Comisión tiene conocimiento de la evaluación de impacto ambiental realizada por las autoridades españolas para los proyectos «Saladillo» ([1]), «Marismas oriental» ([2]) y «Aznalcázar Marismas C1» ([3]), destinados a la extracción y al almacenamiento de gas natural. Según la evaluación, dos de estos proyectos se desarrollarán en los espacios Natura 2000 ES0000024 Doñana y ES6150009 Doñana Norte y Oeste.

La Comisión va a solicitar a las autoridades españolas información sobre estos proyectos, con el fin de evaluar su pleno cumplimiento de la normativa de la UE y, en particular, de las disposiciones de la Directiva sobre hábitats ([4]) y la Directiva sobre aves ([5]).

([1]) http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2013/01/28/pdfs/BOE-A-2013-820.pdf
([2]) http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2013/01/29/pdfs/BOE-A-2013-868.pdf
([3]) http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2013/01/28/pdfs/BOE-A-2013-819.pdf
([4]) Directiva 92/43/CEE del Consejo, de 21 de mayo de 1992, relativa a la conservación de los hábitats naturales y de la fauna y flora silvestres (DO L 206 de 22.7.1992).
([5]) Directiva 2009/147/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 30 de noviembre de 2009, relativa a la conservación de las aves silvestres (DO L 20 de 26.1.2010, p. 7).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000988/13
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(30 January 2013)

Subject: Gas pipeline in Doñana National Park

The Spanish Government's Secretary of State for the Environment has approved the environmental impact assessment for a project to drill and install a gas pipeline in the eastern marshes of the Doñana Natural Park (resolution of 15 January, published in the Spanish Official Gazette of 29 January 2013).

The proposed activities are to take place in areas which belong to the Natura 2000 network (specifically the site of Community importance (SCI) and special protection area (SPA) for birds ES0000024 Doñana and SCI ES6150009 Doñana Norte y Oeste), within the boundaries of the Doñana natural space, which is a Ramsar wetland and biosphere reserve, and also affect several habitats of Community interest, populated by species which are endangered or of special interest.

1. Is the Commission aware of this project to drill and extract gas and to install a gas pipeline?

2. Will the Commission ask the Spanish Government to provide information about this project? Does it consider it compatible with the Habitats Directive (Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992)?

Question for written answer E-001228/13
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Gas extraction in Doñana

On 15 January 2013, the Spanish Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Environment approved the environmental impact assessment (EIA) in favour of three projects for gas pipelines, gas extraction and subsequent underground gas storage at deposits in Doñana Natural Park, giving the go-ahead for Petroleum Oil & Gas España, a subsidiary of Gas Natural Fenosa, to carry out surveys to determine the viability and profitability of extracting natural gas from these sites and their subsequent use for fuel storage.

In view of the fact that the Doñana Natural Park is protected by the Natura 2000 network, the EIA should have included a declaration that the project will not affect Natura 2000 sites, issued by the Andalusian regional government. In the interests of consistency, this permit should have been issued before the EIA took place; however, the Andalusian government has yet to make a statement in this respect.

The World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) has pointed out that the natural resource management plan for Doñana prohibits this type of activity unless the project involved is of 'national interest'. According to the WWF, approval of this project will contravene the Protected Areas Law by adding 24 km of gas pipeline to what is already a 70 km network.

1. Is the Commission already familiar with this gas extraction project? Does it know whether the Spanish Government is carrying out other EIAs for further projects in Doñana Natural Park? Will the Commission collect information on these projects to be carried out by Petroleum Oil & Gas España?

2. Does the Commission consider that these EIAs lack validity, since a prior declaration of non-affectation of the Natura 2000 network from the Andalusian regional government has not been attached to them? Will it request that the Spanish Government withdraw the EIAs which have been presented, until they have received the abovementioned declaration?

3. If these projects continue to move ahead, will the Commission consider that Spain has infringed Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats? What steps will it take to halt — at least temporarily — the activities of Petroleum Oil & Gas España?

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

The Commission is aware of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) issued by the Spanish authorities for the projects 'Saladillo' ([1]), 'Marimas oriental' ([2]) and 'Aznalcázar Marismas C1' ([3]), aiming at the extraction and storage of natural gas. According to the EIS, two of these projects will take place in the Natura 2000 sites ES0000024 *Doñana* and ES6150009 *Doñana Norte y Oeste*.

The Commission will request information from the Spanish authorities concerning these projects in order to assess full compliance with EU legislation, and in particular with the provisions of the Habitats ([4]) and Birds ([5]) Directives.

([1]) http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2013/01/28/pdfs/BOE-A-2013-820.pdf
([2]) http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2013/01/29/pdfs/BOE-A-2013-868.pdf
([3]) http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2013/01/28/pdfs/BOE-A-2013-819.pdf
([4]) Council Directive 92/43/EEC, of 21 May 1992, on the protection of natural habitats and wild fauna and flora (OJ L 206, 22.7.1992).
([5]) Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council, of 30 November 2009, on the conservation of wild birds (OJ L 20/7, 26.1.2010).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000989/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(30 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Gioco d'azzardo e ludopatia

Il gioco d'azzardo con videopoker e slot machine, così come le scommesse e le sale da gioco sono in continuo aumento. Di conseguenza, sono in crescita anche i ludopatici. Nel mio Paese (Italia) hanno raggiunto la cifra di 800 mila, di cui 300 mila sono gravi, tanto che il ministero della Salute ha incluso questa patologia fra quelle prese in carico dal Servizio Sanitario Nazionale.

La Commissione:

1 Ha svolto, o intende svolgere un'indagine per conoscere l'ampiezza del fenomeno nei vari Stati membri e per sapere in quali altri paesi dell'Unione è prevista la cura da parte dei Servizi sanitari nazionali della ludopatia?

2. Perché non propone una norma che vieti la pubblicità dei giochi d'azzardo in televisione e sulla Rete, così come è accaduto per il tabacco, al fine di evitare proselitismo e di conseguenza contagio sanitario?

3. A seguito della presentazione della comunicazione sul gioco d'azzardo online, approvata dal Parlamento nel novembre del 2011, quando vorrà presentare una direttiva in proposito al fine di impedire il diffondersi indiscriminato di una patologia che colpisce anche i giovanissimi?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(25 marzo 2013)

1. Come comunicato all'onorevole parlamentare in una precedente risposta sul tema della ludopatia ([1]), è necessario svolgere ulteriori ricerche in questo settore al fine di comprendere meglio i termini utilizzati, i comportamenti, i fattori e le cause collegati a questo fenomeno. Il progetto «ALICE RAP», finanziato nell'ambito del settimo programma quadro, si occupa di studiare il fenomeno delle dipendenze in Europa, tra cui la ludopatia ([2]).

2. L'attuale normativa UE che tutela l'interesse dei consumatori vulnerabili disciplina anche il gioco d'azzardo on-line. Per esempio, la direttiva 2005/29/CE ([3]) vieta una vasta gamma di pratiche commerciali ingannevoli o aggressive. Nel corso del 2013 sarà pubblicata una relazione sull'applicazione della presente direttiva.

3. La risoluzione sul gioco d'azzardo on line nel mercato interno ([4]), adottata dal Parlamento europeo nel 2011, ha respinto qualunque ipotesi relativa all'introduzione di un atto normativo europeo che armonizzi la disciplina dell'intero settore del gioco d'azzardo. Come annunciato nella sua comunicazione sul gioco d'azzardo on-line ([5]) adottata nell'ottobre 2012, la Commissione adotterà, tra le altre misure, due raccomandazioni al fine di fornire un elevato livello di protezione comune ai consumatori dei servizi connessi al gioco d'azzardo, inclusa la tutela dei minori, e di garantire una pubblicità del gioco d'azzardo socialmente responsabile.

([1]) E-004100/2012.
([2]) ALICE RAP (Dipendenza e stili di vita nell'Europa contemporanea — Per una ridefinizione dei progetti sulle dipendenze) è un progetto quinquennale transitorio e interdisciplinare iniziato in data 01/04/2011, finanziato nell'ambito delle scienze socio-economiche e umanistiche tramite il settimo programma quadro dell'Unione europea per le attività di ricerca, sviluppo tecnologico e dimostrazioni (2007-2013). Il progetto mira a contribuire al dibattito sulle norme attuali e le future implicazioni delle dipendenze e degli stili di vita in Europa nei prossimi 20 anni.
([3]) Direttiva sulle pratiche commerciali sleali tra imprese e consumatori, GU L 149 dell'11.6.2005, pag. 22.
([4]) 2011/2084(INI).
([5]) COM(2012)596 definitivo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000989/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(30 January 2013)

Subject: Gambling and gambling addiction

Gambling with video poker and slot machines, in addition to betting and gaming halls, are constantly on the increase. As a result, gambling addicts are also on the increase. In my country (Italy) there are now 800 000 such addicts, 300 000 of whom are severe cases, to the extent that the Ministry of Health has now included this disease among those treated by the National Health Service.

1. Has the Commission carried out, or does it intend to carry out, a survey to discover the extent of the phenomenon in the individual Member States and to find out in which other EU countries gambling addiction is treated by the National Health Service?

2. Why does it not propose a rule that prohibits the advertising of gambling on television and on the Internet, as was the case for tobacco, in order to prevent people from being drawn to it, with the resultant adverse effect on their health?

3. Following the submission of the communication on online gambling, adopted by Parliament in November 2011, when will the Commission submit a directive on this issue, in order to prevent the indiscriminate spread of a disease that is even affecting very young people?

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

1. As the Honourable Member was informed in a previous response on the issue of gambling addiction ([1]), research in this area is required for a better understanding of the terms used, the behavioural attitudes and the factors and causes linked to this. The 'ALICE RAP' project, funded through the 7th Framework Programme, is studying addictions in Europe, including gambling ([2]).

2. The current EU legislation protecting the economic interest of vulnerable consumers also covers online gambling. For example, Directive 2005/29/EC ([3]) bans a wide range of misleading or aggressive business practices. A report on the application of the directive will be published during 2013.

3. The Resolution on Online Gambling in the internal market ([4]), adopted by the European Parliament in 2011, rejected a European legislative act uniformly regulating the gambling sector. As announced in its communication on online gambling ([5]) adopted in October 2012, the Commission will — among other measures — adopt two recommendations with the aim of providing a high level of common protection of consumers of gambling services, including the protection of children, and ensuring that gambling advertising remains socially responsible.

([1]) E-004100/2012.
([2]) ALICE RAP (Addiction and Lifestyles in Contemporary Europe, Reframing Addictions Project) is a 5-year transitional and interdisciplinary project started on 01/04/2011, funded under the Socioeconomic Sciences and Humanities theme through the 7th Framework Programme of the European Community for research, technological development and demonstration activities (2007-2013). The project aims at contributing to the debate on current norms and future implications of addiction and lifestyles in Europe over the next 20 years.
([3]) Directive on Unfair Business-to-Consumer Commercial Practices OJ L 149, 11.6.2005, p. 22.
([4]) 2011/2084(INI).
([5]) COM(2012) 596 final.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000990/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(30 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Αίτημα της Cosco για αλλαγή της σύμβασης παραχώρησης

Η εταιρία Cosco, μέσω της θυγατρικής της ΣΕΠ ΑΕ, ζητά την τροποποίηση των όρων σύμβασης παραχώρησης του προβλήτα ΙΙ στο λιμάνι του Πειραιά, την οποία είχε συνάψει με τον Οργανισμό Λιμένος Πειραιώς (ΟΛΠ) το 2008.

Με τη σύμβαση αυτή η Cosco δεσμεύεται κάθε χρόνο, πέραν της επιβολής του ενοικίου να καταβάλλει στον ΟΛΠ και ελάχιστο εγγυημένο τίμημα, το οποίο θα μεταβάλλεται ανάλογα με την δραστηριότητα που θα παρουσιάζει το λιμάνι κάθε χρόνο. Είναι γνωστό μάλιστα πως το 2012 η Cosco διακίνησε περίπου 2 εκατομμύρια κοντέινερ, υπερβαίνοντας τον αρχικό στόχο που ήταν 1,4 εκατομμύρια, ενώ για το 2013 προβλέπεται αύξηση της διακίνησης σε 2,5 εκατομμύρια κοντέινερ.

Σύμφωνα λοιπόν με τις υπάρχουσες πληροφορίες, η εταιρία Cosco, ζήτησε από την διοίκηση του Οργανισμού Λιμένος Πειραιώς (ΟΛΠ), την κατάργηση της καταβολής του ελάχιστου εγγυημένου τιμήματος.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Πώς σχολιάζει το αίτημα της Cosco προς τον ΟΛΠ για τροποποίηση της σύμβασης παραχώρησης στην κατεύθυνση κατάργησης ή, ενδεχομένως, περιορισμού της καταβολής του ελάχιστου εγγυημένου τιμήματος;

Τυχόν υιοθέτησή του θα μπορούσε να συνιστά ασυμβίβαστη κρατική ενίσχυση;

Απάντηση του κ. Almunia εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(15 Μαρτίου 2013)

Οι υπηρεσίες της Επιτροπής δεν γνωρίζουν το εν λόγω αίτημα, δεδομένου ότι οι ελληνικές αρχές δεν έχουν επικοινωνήσει μαζί τους σχετικά με αυτό. Ως εκ τούτου, θα αποσταλεί σύντομα αίτηση παροχής πληροφοριών στις ελληνικές αρχές.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000990/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(30 January 2013)

Subject: Request by Cosco to have concession contract amended

The company Cosco, through its subsidiary PCT Ltd., is requesting an amendment of the terms of the concession contract for Pier II in the port of Piraeus, which it had concluded with the Piraeus Port Authority (PPA) in 2008.

Under this contract, Cosco is committed each year, in addition to the rent, to pay the PPA a guaranteed minimum amount, which will vary depending on the activity at the port in any given year. It is known that in 2012 Cosco handled approximately 2 million containers, exceeding the initial target of 1.4 million, while in 2013 the number of containers handled is set to increase to 2.5 million.

According to the information available, the Cosco has asked the administration of Piraeus Port Authority (PPA) to abolish payment of the guaranteed minimum amount.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

How does it view Cosco's request to the PPA to amend the concession contract, i.e. to abolish the guaranteed minimum amount or limit the amount involved?

If this request were to be accepted, might it constitute inadmissible state aid?

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

The Commission services are not aware of this request, as the Greek authorities have not contacted them about it. Therefore a request for information will shortly be sent to the Greek authorities.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000991/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(30 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Διαχείριση απορριμμάτων στην Ζάκυνθο

Τις τελευταίες μέρες εξαιτίας των εντόνων βροχοπτώσεων που προκάλεσαν κατολίσθηση στον ΧΥΤΑ Ζακύνθου, όγκοι απορριμμάτων ισοπέδωσαν ένα οίκημα που στέγαζε τον ηλεκτρονικό εξοπλισμό για την διαχείριση των αναθυμιάσεων των απορριμμάτων. Παράλληλα, τα υγρά απόβλητα του χώρου ταφής των απορριμμάτων κατέληξαν στον βιότοπο της χελώνας καρέτα-καρέτα στον κόλπο του Λαγανά. Για τον συγκεκριμένο ΧΥΤΑ, η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή ενημέρωσε (IP/12/1023) ότι παραπέμπει την Ελλάδα στο Δικαστήριο καθώς «Η χωματερή στη Ζάκυνθο λειτουργεί κατά παράβαση της ενωσιακής νομοθεσίας περί αποβλήτων και συνιστά σοβαρή απειλή για την ανθρώπινη υγεία, το περιβάλλον, και ιδίως, για τον φωλεασμό των χελωνών».

Ταυτόχρονα, πολίτες και περιβαλλοντικές οργανώσεις στη Ζάκυνθο εξέφραζαν από καιρό την ανησυχία τους για τον υφιστάμενο ΧΥΤΑ και έχουν δικαιολογημένες αντιδράσεις για την επιλογή των αρχών να κατασκευάσουν καινούργιο ΧΥΤΑ, στη θέση Λίβας, εντός περιοχής προστασίας άγριας ζωής, χωρίς και πάλι να γίνεται κανένας σχεδιασμός για πρόληψη δημιουργίας απορριμμάτων και ανακύκλωση στην πηγή όπως προβλέπει η κοινοτική νομοθεσία.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Σε ποιο στάδιο βρίσκεται η υπόθεση στο Δικαστήριο; Τι μέσα διαθέτει η Επιτροπή για να επιβάλλει την κοινοτική νομοθεσία και, ως εκ τούτου, την προώθηση της πρόληψης και την ανακύκλωση στην πηγή των απορριμμάτων, που είναι ιεραρχικά οι βέλτιστες πρακτικές; Τι θα πράξει ώστε, σε κάθε περίπτωση, και πριν τη δημιουργία νέων ΧΥΤΑ να εφαρμόζονται οι αρχές της πρόληψης και της ανακύκλωσης στην πηγή;

Απάντηση του κ. Potočnik εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(8 Απριλίου 2013)

Όσον αφορά τη διαδικασία επί παραβάσει που αφορά τον ΧΥΤΑ Ζακύνθου στον οποίο αναφέρθηκε στην ερώτηση του το Αξιότιμο Μέλος, η Επιτροπή στις 27 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012 παρέπεμψε την υπόθεση στο Ευρωπαϊκό Δικαστήριο και αναμένει τώρα την έκδοση σχετικής απόφασης.

Εκτός από την αγωγή που άσκησε με απώτερο σκοπό τη διασφάλιση της πλήρους εφαρμογής της ενωσιακής νομοθεσίας περί αποβλήτων, η Επιτροπή αναλαμβάνει επίσης διάφορες πρωτοβουλίες για την προώθηση βέλτιστων πρακτικών διαχείρισης των αποβλήτων. Για παράδειγμα, τον Νοέμβριο του περασμένου έτους, οργανώθηκε σε συνεργασία με τις εθνικές και περιφερειακές αρχές, ένα σεμινάριο βέλτιστης πρακτικής για τη διαχείριση των αποβλήτων. Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, αναπτύχθηκε ένας χάρτης πορείας, ο οποίος περιλαμβάνει συγκεκριμένες συστάσεις για την βελτίωση της διαχείρισης αποβλήτων στην Ελλάδα, και στη συνέχεια τέθηκε προς συζήτηση με τις ελληνικές αρχές. Ο εν λόγω χάρτης πορείας θα τεθεί στη διάθεση του κοινού.

Ορισμένα περιφερειακά ταμεία παραμένουν διαθέσιμα για να στηρίξουν τις απαιτούμενες επενδύσεις, να βελτιώσουν τη διαχείριση αποβλήτων στην Ελλάδα και να προωθήσουν τα πρώτα στάδια της ιεράρχησης αποβλήτων — την πρόληψη της δημιουργίας, την επαναχρησιμοποίηση και την ανακύκλωση των αποβλήτων.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000991/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(30 January 2013)

Subject: Waste management in Zakynthos

In the last few days, because of heavy rainfall that has caused landslides at the landfill on the island of Zakynthos, displaced waste has flattened the building housing the electronic equipment for the management of waste fumes. Furthermore, liquid waste from the landfill has reached the habitat of the Caretta caretta turtle in Laganas Bay. In respect of this specific landfill, the Commission has stated (IP/12/1023) that it is referring Greece to the Court as: 'The landfill is operating in breach of EU waste legislation and constitutes a serious threat to human health, the environment, and in particular, to nesting turtles.'

Moreover, citizens and environmental organisations in Zakynthos, who have for a long time been expressing their concern about the existing landfill, now have understandable objections to the choice made by the authorities to construct a new landfill at Livas, within a protected wildlife area, again without making any plans for waste prevention and recycling at source as required by EU legislation.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

What stage have the court proceedings reached? What means does the Commission have to enforce Community law and, thereby promote the prevention and recycling of waste at source, which are best practices? What action will it take so that, in any event, the principles of prevention and recycling at source are implemented before any new landfills are created?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(8 April 2013)

As regards the infringement case related to the landfill mentioned in the question of the Honourable Member, on 27 September 2012 the Commission referred the case to the European Court of Justice and is now awaiting the Court's ruling.

In addition to legal action by the Commission to ensure full implementation of EU waste legislation, the Commission is taking several initiatives to promote best practices for waste management. For instance, in November last year, a best practice seminar was organised in Greece with the national and regional authorities. In this context, a Roadmap including precise recommendations to improve waste management in Greece was developed and discussed with the Greek authorities. This Roadmap will be made publicly available.

Regional funds remain available to support the required investments to improve waste management in Greece and to promote the first steps of the waste hierarchy — waste prevention, re-use and recycling.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000992/13
à la Commission
Dominique Vlasto (PPE)
(30 janvier 2013)

Objet: Bornes de recharge pour les véhicules électriques

La Commission propose de garantir la distribution de carburants alternatifs (gaz naturel liquéfié (GNL), gaz naturel comprimé (GNC, électricité) par le biais d'une directive.

Ce texte législatif établirait, pour chaque État membre, un objectif à atteindre pour le déploiement de stations publiques de ravitaillement, exigeant par exemple de la France qu'elle se dote de 97 000 bornes de recharge pour les véhicules électriques d'ici 2020. Le but est de mettre en place un nombre suffisant de points de recharge pour que les constructeurs automobiles puissent se lancer dans une production de masse, à des prix raisonnables.

En plus de cet objectif à atteindre, la directive exigerait que ces bornes soient dotées d'un seul et même type de prise de connecteurs de type 2, tels que décrits dans la norme EN62196-2:2012, dans l'idée de garantir une interopérabilité des véhicules électriques dans l'UE.

Il existe aujourd'hui pourtant deux types de prises utilisés sur les bornes de recharge électrique. Ainsi, en France et en Grande-Bretagne, le type de prise majoritairement utilisé est la prise dite de type 3. Certaines collectivités locales françaises ont déjà mis en place un système de voiture électrique en libre-service, basé sur le déploiement de milliers de bornes utilisant des prises de type 3.

1. Comment la Commission justifie-t-elle son choix d'imposer un type de technologie au regard du droit de la concurrence et du principe de neutralité technologique?

2. Comment la Commission justifie-elle que cette directive établisse non seulement des objectifs à atteindre par les États membres, mais également des obligations de moyens pour parvenir à ces objectifs, par le biais d'une standardisation? Ce type d'obligation ne relève-t-il pas d'un règlement plutôt que d'une directive?

3. Compte tenu de la modernisation technologique attendue des bornes électriques, est-il nécessaire d'imposer une technologie qui pourrait se révéler obsolète d'ici quelques années?

4. Eu égard aux investissements consentis par les parties prenantes dans les prises de type 2 et de type 3, et à l'objectif d'interopérabilité des véhicules électriques dans l'UE, la meilleure solution pour les automobilistes n'est-elle pas encore le recours à des adaptateurs?

Réponse donnée par M. Kallas au nom de la Commission
(18 mars 2013)

1.-2. La proposition de directive du Parlement européen et du Conseil sur le déploiement d'une infrastructure pour carburants de substitution ([1]) est neutre sur le plan technologique puisqu'elle concerne tous les carburants de substitution. Elle laisse par ailleurs aux États membres une certaine souplesse quant aux modalités de mise en œuvre d'un tel déploiement, d'où le choix de la directive comme instrument juridique.

Le paquet «Énergie propre pour les transports» vise à faciliter le développement d'un marché intérieur pour les véhicules à carburant de substitution, ce qui inclut l'infrastructure nécessaire, en supprimant les obstacles techniques et réglementaires dans toute l'Union européenne. La mise en œuvre de spécifications techniques communes dans l'Union est donc indispensable, sur la base des travaux des organismes de normalisation européens.

3. La proposition de directive prévoit un réexamen tous les deux ans, afin d'adapter les normes aux évolutions technologiques et commerciales.

4. Étant donné que la prise de type 2 est utilisée dans la plupart des États membres et qu'elle est recommandée par les constructeurs automobiles européens et les fournisseurs d'électricité européens, la Commission européenne a proposé d'en faire la norme européenne commune en vue de lever toute incertitude commerciale et de réduire le coût pour les utilisateurs et les pouvoirs publics.

([1]) COM(2013)18 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000992/13
to the Commission
Dominique Vlasto (PPE)
(30 January 2013)

Subject: Electric-vehicle charging stations

The Commission has put forward a proposal for a directive on the deployment of alternative fuels infrastructure (alternative fuels include liquefied natural gas (LNG), compressed natural gas (CNG) and electricity).

Under the proposal, each Member State would have to set up a minimum number of publicly accessible recharging points. For instance, by 2020 France would be required to have 97 000 electric-vehicle charging stations. The aim is to have enough recharging points available so that car manufacturers can start mass-producing affordable 'green' vehicles.

In addition, the Commission proposal calls for all charging stations to be equipped with a single type of plug with Type 2 connectors (as described in standard EN62196-2:2012) so that drivers can charge their vehicles in any Member State, regardless of the make of car.

At present, however, charging stations are equipped with two different types of plug. In France and the United Kingdom, Type 3 plugs are the most widely used. In France, some local authorities have already introduced self-service electric car schemes and built thousands of charging stations equipped with Type 3 plugs.

1. In the light of EU competition law and the principle of technology neutrality, how can the Commission defend its decision to impose a single type of technology?

2. Can the Commission explain why its proposal for a directive not only sets targets for the Member States but also stipulates how they must meet these targets (i.e. through standardisation)? If it wishes to impose such a requirement, should it not be proposing a regulation, rather than a directive?

3. Given that the technology behind electric charging stations is becoming more sophisticated all the time, is it really necessary to force all Member States to use Type 2 plugs when they might become obsolete in a few years anyway?

4. In the light of the money invested by stakeholders in both Type 2 and Type 3 plugs, and the Commission's desire to ensure that all electric vehicle models can be used throughout the EU, would the best solution not be for drivers to simply use adapters instead?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(18 March 2013)

1.-2. The proposal for a directive of the European parliament and of the Council on the deployment of alternative fuels infrastructure ([1]) is technology neutral as it covers all alternative fuels. Furthermore, it gives the Members States the flexibility on how to implement the infrastructure deployment, which explains the choice of a directive as the legal instrument.

The Clean Power for Transport Package aims to facilitate the development of an internal market for alternative fuel vehicles including the necessary infrastructure, by removing technical and regulatory barriers across the EU. The implementation of common technical specifications in the Union is therefore necessary based on the work of the European Standardisation Organisations.

3. The proposed directive foresees a revision clause every two years in order to update the standards in view of any new technology and market developments.

4. As the type 2 is used in most of Member States and is recommended by the European automotive manufacturers and the European electric utilities, the European Commission has proposed type 2 plug as common European standard in order to remove all market uncertainties and reduce the cost for the users and public authorities.

([1]) COM(2013)018 final.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-000993/13
до Комисията
Filiz Hakaeva Hyusmenova (ALDE)
(30 януари 2013 г.)

Относно: Гаранция за младежта

За да се реализира инициативата на Европейската комисия „Гаранция за младежта“, е необходимо да бъдат осигурени финансови средства. Мнението ми е, че към настоящия момент механизмът за микрофинансиране „Прогрес“ все още не е ефективен инструмент за постигане на целите, за които беше създаден. Това се вижда и от доклада за неговото функциониране.

Счита ли Комисията, че за следващия финансов период 2014—2020 г., той би могъл да се насочи в по-висока степен към подпомагане на младежката заетост?

Отговор, даден от г-н Андорон от името на Комисията
(18 март 2013 г.)

С механизма за микрофинансиране „Прогрес“ ([1]) се цели да се увеличат достъпът до микрофинансиране и наличието на такова финансиране за лицата, които желаят да започнат своя дейност или допълнително да развият дейността си и които изпитват затруднения във връзка с достъпа до традиционните банкови заеми.

Крайната цел е да се предоставят 46 000 микрозаема на стойност 500 млн. EUR. Очаква се чрез договореностите, подписани до септември 2012 г. с организациите, предоставящи микрофинансиране, да се генерира обем на микрофинансиране на стойност над 212 млн. EUR. Моделите на прилагане на финансовите инструменти обикновено показват нелинейно нарастване на портфейла с бавен старт, последван от по-сериозно увеличаване на обемите. До септември 2012 г. на микропредприемачи вече са били предоставени 6318 микрозаема на стойност 48,84 млн. EUR. Над 30 % от лицата, създали ново дружество благодарение на микрозаем, преди това са били безработни, неактивни или учащи. Следователно механизмът за микрофинансиране „Прогрес“ определено е на път да постигне целите си.

Целева група на инструмента правоприемник в рамките на Програмата за социална промяна и социални иновации ([2]) ще бъдат младите хора, без обаче да се изключват останалите групи, които са в неравностойно положение или са по-слабо представени.

Колкото до инициативата „Гаранция за младежта“, на проведеното на 7 и 8 февруари заседание Европейският съвет реши да създаде Инициатива за младежка заетост, която да е в подкрепа на набелязаните в пакета за младежката заетост мерки, и по-специално в подкрепа на инициативата „Гаранция за младежта“. За тази нова инициатива в периода 2014—2020 г. се очаква да бъдат предоставени най-малко 6 млрд. EUR.

([1]) Решение № 283/2010/ЕС
([2]) COM(2011) 609 окончателен.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000993/13
to the Commission
Filiz Hakaeva Hyusmenova (ALDE)
(30 January 2013)

Subject: Youth Guarantee

If the Commission's Youth Guarantee initiative is to bear fruit, it is essential that financial resources be secured. In my opinion, the European Progress Microfinance Facility is not yet an effective tool for achieving the goals that it was set up to pursue. That is also the view conveyed in the report on the functioning of the facility.

Does the Commission think that, in the forthcoming 2014-2020 financing period, it could be more heavily focused on supporting youth employment?

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

The aim of Progress Microfinance ([1]) is to increase access to, and the availability of, microfinance for people who would like to start or further develop their business and who have difficulties accessing a traditional bank loan.

The ultimate goal is to generate 46 000 microloans worth EUR 500 million. The transactions signed with microfinance providers until September 2012 are expected to create a microloan volume of more than EUR 212 million. Implementation patterns of financial instruments typically indicate a nonlinear portfolio build-up with a slower start followed by a stronger rise in volumes. By September 2012, 6 318 microloans worth EUR 48.84 million had already been disbursed to micro-entrepreneurs. More than 30% of those who created a new business with a micro-loan were previously unemployed, inactive or studying. Progress Microfinance is thus well on track for achieving its objectives.

The target group of the successor instrument under the Programme for Social Change and Innovation ([2]) will encompass young people, but not exclude other disadvantaged and underrepresented groups.

As regards the Youth Guarantee, the European Council of 7-8 February decided to create a Youth Employment Initiative in support of measures set out in the Youth Employment Package, and in particular to support the Youth Guarantee. The support for this new Initiative would be at least EUR 6 billion for the period 2014-2020.

([1]) Decision No 283/2010/EU.
([2]) COM(2011) 609 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000994/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR)
(30 January 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Assisting international governments, and in particular the Philippine government, in their efforts to develop and enforce legislation prohibiting the trade in, and consumption of, dog meat

Can the European External Action Service (EEAS) indicate what steps are being taken to assist the world's governments, and in particular the Philippine government, in their efforts to develop and enforce legislation prohibiting the trade in, and consumption of, dog meat?

When responding, could the EEAS please take account of the following points:

1. The threat of rabies continues to pose health threats to humans in the Philippines. An estimated 10 000 dogs and 350 humans die of rabies every year. Furthermore, according to the National Meat Inspection Service, additional diseases associated with consuming dog meat include *E.Coli* 107, salmonella, anthrax, hepatitis, internal parasites and brucellosis; a large proportion of these diseases can be fatal.

2. The commercialisation of this practice in the Philippines has led to an industry which slaughters in the region of 500 000 dogs every year. A large proportion of these are strays or are pets that have been stolen by traders.

3. During transportation, dogs endure stressful and painful conditions for a prolonged period of time, in high temperatures and without food or water. It is estimated that up to 90% of such dogs die from heatstroke or asphyxiation. At the slaughterhouses, the surviving dogs are exposed to a number of inhumane killing methods.

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

With regard to the Philippines, the 1998 Animal Welfare Act provides the general framework to protect and promote the welfare of all animals in the country. The 2007 Anti-Rabies Act recognised the role played by the spread of rabies and tightened the supervising and regulating legal framework also by increasing penalties for convicted dog meat traders. However, due to continued reports on animal cruelty the Philippine Congress considers amendments to the 1998 Animal Welfare Act.

Being aware of this issue, the signed but not yet concluded EU — Philippines Partnership Cooperation Agreement includes provisions and creates a framework for dialogue and cooperation also on animal welfare which might be explored in the future based on the interest of both parties.

With reference to the transport of dogs, it is important to recall that the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) has adopted international standards on the transport of animals ([1]).

([1]) http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=169&L=0&htmfile=chapitre_1.7.3.htm

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000995/13
do Komisji
Bogusław Sonik (PPE) oraz Bogdan Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz (PPE)
(30 stycznia 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Gaz łupkowy – konsultacje społeczne

Chcielibyśmy zwrócić się do Komisji Europejskiej i wyrazić nasze zaniepokojenie formą prowadzonych konsultacji społecznych dot. gazu łupkowego. Kwestionariusz nie spełnia podstawowych kryteriów – obiektywizmu i rzetelności, jakimi rządzą się badania opinii publicznej.

Już pierwsze pytanie zawiera w sobie dwa błędy. Pozycjonowanie gazu łupkowego (który jest przecież normalnym gazem, tylko wydobywanym inną metodą) jako paliwa niekonwencjonalnego oraz stwierdzenie „mimo wszystko" od razu nastawia respondenta negatywnie lub co najmniej kreuje postawę podejrzliwości. Lista potencjalnych „wyzwań" zawiera 18 punktów a lista korzyści jedynie 11. Ponadto lista „wyzwań" zawiera sztuczne powtórzenia dot. tych samych aspektów, co sugeruje tendencyjność oraz może wpływać na odpowiedzi i kreować negatywny klimat wokół eksploatowania gazu łupkowego Europie.

Prezentowane w kwestionariuszu sugestie co do braku przejrzystości informacji publicznych dotyczących koncesji, zezwoleń, stosowanych chemikaliów, czy „nowych" problemów związanych z jakością i ilością wody – które przecież nie mają miejsca i nie zostały udowodnione – na terenach, gdzie prowadzone są operacje, jest przejawem przygotowania badania pod wcześniej założoną tezę i chęci wywarcia pośredniego wpływu na postawę respondentów i ich opinie dotyczące wydobycia gazu łupkowego.

W związku z powyższym chcielibyśmy zapytać, dlaczego ankieta została skonstruowana w ten sposób?

Kto personalnie odpowiada za merytoryczną zawartość treści i techniczną formę kwestionariusza?

Co na tym etapie Komisja zamierza uczynić, jakie mechanizmy korygujące zamierza wprowadzić, aby wyniki prowadzonych konsultacji były obiektywne?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Janeza Potočnika w imieniu Komisji
(3 kwietnia 2013 r.)

1. W kwestionariuszu skorzystano z powszechnie stosowanej terminologii. Termin „gaz ze źródeł niekonwencjonalnych" jest stosowany w publikacji MAE z 2012 r. pt. „Golden Rules for a Golden Age of Gas" (Złote zasady dla złotego wieku gazu). Kwestionariusz został skonstruowany tak, aby uzyskać kompleksowe odpowiedzi w celu otrzymania reprezentatywnego przeglądu stanowisk zainteresowanych osób, przedsiębiorstw, organizacji i organów.

2. Za opracowanie kwestionariusza odpowiedzialna jest Komisja.

3. Komisja uważa, że kwestionariusz został skonstruowany w rzetelny sposób i nie planuje wprowadzania do niego żadnych zmian.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000995/13
to the Commission
Bogusław Sonik (PPE) and Bogdan Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz (PPE)
(30 January 2013)

Subject: Shale gas — public consultation

We wish to draw the Commission's attention to our concern about the way in which the public consultations on shale gas are being conducted. The questionnaire does not meet the basic criteria for public opinion surveys of objectivity and accuracy.

The first question already contains two mistakes. Describing shale gas (which is a normal gas, just extracted using a different method) as an 'unconventional fossil fuel' and the use of the word 'anyway' immediately makes the respondent feel negative towards it, or at least creates an air of suspicion. The list of potential 'challenges' has 18 points, whereas the list of benefits has only 11. In addition, the list of 'challenges' repeats the same aspects, which suggests bias and may affect the response and create a negative climate around the exploitation of shale gas in Europe.

The suggestions offered in the questionnaire concerning a lack of transparency and public information on licenses, permits, the use of chemical additives and 'new' problems related to water quality and quantity — which do not apply and have not been proven — in areas where operations are carried out are an indication that the survey was drawn up on the basis of preconceptions and also of a wish to indirectly influence respondents' attitudes and their opinions on the extraction of shale gas.

In this regard we would like to ask why the survey was formulated in this way.

Who personally was responsible for the content and layout of the questionnaire?

What action does the Commission intend to take at this stage and what corrective mechanisms does it intend to apply to ensure that the results of the consultation exercise are objective?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(3 April 2013)

1. The questionnaire uses commonly applied terminology. The term 'unconventional gas' is used throughout the 2012 IEA publication 'Golden Rules for a Golden Age of Gas'. The questionnaire was designed to allow for a comprehensive range of answers in order to obtain a representative overview of the positions of concerned individuals, companies, organisations and authorities.

2. The Commission is responsible for the questionnaire.

3. The Commission considers the questionnaire as balanced and has no plans to introduce any changes.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000996/13
an die Kommission
Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE)
(30. Januar 2013)

Betrifft: Gefahrenrelevante Eigenschaften von Abfällen und Europäisches Abfallverzeichnis

Die Europäische Kommission hat eine Experten-Arbeitsgruppe einberufen, um die gefahrenrelevanten Eigenschaften von Abfällen gemäß Anhang III der Abfallrahmenrichtlinie (Richtlinie 2008/98/EG) und das Europäische Abfallverzeichnis (Entscheidung 2000/532/EG) einer Revision zu unterziehen.

Die Europäische Kommission hat am 26. November 2012 berichtet, dass diese Arbeiten in der Experten-Arbeitsgruppe als abgeschlossen gesehen werden und der Text für die Entwürfe zur Änderung der gefahrenrelevanten Eigenschaften von Abfällen (Anhang III der Abfallrahmenrichtlinie) und zur Änderung des Europäischen Abfallverzeichnisses vorliegt. Mit diesen Entwürfen sollte eine Angleichung an das EU-Chemikalienrecht erfolgen.

Die Entwürfe zeigen nun — für den Abfallbereich auch sinnvolle — Abweichungen vom Chemikalienrecht. Da hier keine 1:1 Anpassung an das Chemikalienrecht erfolgt und auch signifikante Auswirkungen auf das Abfallrecht durch diese Vorschläge zu erwarten sind, wäre entsprechend dem Leitfaden der Europäischen Kommission eine Folgenabschätzung erforderlich.

Kommissionsmitglied Potočnik hat außerdem in der Anfragebeantwortung vom 15. März 2012 mitgeteilt, dass eine Reihe relevanter Abfallströme ermittelt wird und diese Abfallströme auf ihre potenziellen wirtschaftlichen und ökologischen Auswirkungen hin analysiert werden.

Es wird daher um die Vorlage der Folgenabschätzung ersucht.

1. Welche Auswirkungen ergeben sich — insbesondere im Hinblick auf die gefahrenrelevante Eigenschaft HP 14 ökotoxisch — auf die Mengen an gefährlichen Abfällen und deren Behandlungswege?

2. Welche Konsequenzen haben die Änderungen der gefahrenrelevanten Eigenschaften für die Landwirtschaft, insbesondere in Bezug auf Grenzwerte in anderen EU-Rechtsvorschriften z. B. im Hinblick auf die Aufbringung von Klärschlämmen, die als gefährlicher Abfall klassifiziert werden müssten?

3. Welche Auswirkungen ergeben sich im Hinblick auf die Ausbringung von Holz- bzw. Pflanzenaschen, die aufgrund des CaO/Ca(OH)2-Gehalts als gefährlicher Abfall klassifiziert werden müssten, zu Düngezwecken in der Landwirtschaft?

Antwort von Herrn Potočnik im Namen der Kommission
(21. März 2013)

Die Kommission arbeitet gegenwärtig an einer Änderung der in Anhang III der Richtlinie 2008/98/EG ([1]) über Abfälle aufgeführten gefährlichen Eigenschaften und zur Aufhebung bestimmter Richtlinien sowie an einer Änderung der Entscheidung 2000/532/EG ([2]) über ein Abfallverzeichnis. Es werden mehrere Optionen für die Festlegung der Ökotoxizität von Abfällen (gefährliche Eigenschaft HP 14) geprüft und in einer Sachverständigengruppe eingehender diskutiert. Während eine umfassende Folgenabschätzung nicht erforderlich ist, werden dennoch die Auswirkungen der Änderungen erörtert. Eine vorläufige Bewertung ausgewählter Abfallarten ist abrufbar unter: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/framework/pdf/Charact_waste_thermal_processes.pdf.

Im Rahmen der Diskussionen über die Optionen für die Festlegung des Ökotoxizitätskriteriums (HP 14) werden auch die möglichen Auswirkungen auf Klärschlamm und insbesondere die Übereinstimmung mit den bestehenden Vorschriften für die Verwendung von Klärschlamm geprüft.

([1]) ABl. L 312 vom 22.11.2008.
([2]) ABl. L 226 vom 6.9.2000.

Gemäß dem europäischen Abfallverzeichnis werden Stäube aus Holzverbrennungsanlagen dem Abfallcode 10 01 03 „Filterstäube aus Torffeuerung und Feuerung mit unbehandeltem Holz“ zugeordnet. Da es sich hierbei um einen Code für sogenannte „absolut nicht gefährliche“ Abfälle handelt, wird diese Art von Abfällen derzeit als ungefährlich eingestuft und eine Bewertung seiner Eigenschaften ist nicht erforderlich. Es ist nicht vorgesehen, den Abfallcode 10 01 03 zu ändern. Dementsprechend würden Filterstäube aus der Feuerung mit unbehandeltem Holz weiterhin als nicht gefährlicher Abfall eingestuft.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000996/13
to the Commission
Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE)
(30 January 2013)

Subject: Properties of waste which render it hazardous, and the European List of Waste

The Commission has set up an expert working group to revise the properties of waste which render it hazardous, as set out in Annex III to the Waste Directive (Directive 2008/989/EC), and the European List of Waste (Decision 2000/532/EC).

On 26 November 2012 the Commission reported that the expert working group's work was regarded as having been completed and that the drafts amending the properties of waste which render it hazardous and amending the European List of Waste had been produced. The purpose of the drafts was to approximate EU chemicals law.

The drafts depart from chemical law in some respects, which, with regard to waste, is appropriate. As the provisions are not going to be brought fully into line with chemicals law and, in addition, the proposals are likely to impact chemicals law significantly, there should be — according to Commission guidance — an impact assessment.

In his answer of 15 March 2012 (to my Question E-000657/2012) Commissioner Potočnik furthermore stated that a number of waste streams had been identified and that an analysis of their potential economic and economic effects was ongoing.

Submission of the impact assessment is therefore requested.

1. What is the impact — in particular with regard to hazardous property HP 14, Ecotoxic — on the volume of hazardous waste and on the treatment routes for it?

2. What consequences do the changes to hazardous properties have for agriculture, in particular as regards limit values under other EU legislation, e.g. with regard to the spreading of sewage sludge, which ought to be classified as hazardous waste?

3. What is the impact with regard to the spreading of wood and/or plant ash, which ought to be classified as hazardous waste because of the CaO/Ca(OH)2 content, as fertiliser in farming?

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

The Commission is preparing an amendment of the hazardous properties defined in Annex III to Directive 2008/98/EC ([1]) on waste and repealing certain Directives and of Decision 2000/532/EC on the List of Waste ([2]). Several options to define the ecotoxicity of waste (hazardous property HP 14) are being analysed and will be further discussed in an expert working group. While a fully-fledged impact assessment is not required, impacts of the amendments are being discussed. A preliminary assessment of selected waste types can be found under: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/framework/pdf/Charact_waste_thermal_processes.pdf

In the context of the discussions of the options for defining the ecotoxicity criterion (HP 14), possible implications on sewage sludge, and in particular, consistency with existing requirements for the use of sewage sludge, are being analysed.

According to the European List of Waste, the waste code 10 01 03 'Fly ash from peat and untreated wood' is assigned to ashes from wood incineration plants. Given that this waste code is a so-called 'absolute non-hazardous' waste code, this type of waste is currently classified as non-hazardous and no assessment of its properties is needed. It is not foreseen to change the waste code 10 01 03. Accordingly, fly ash from untreated wood would continue to be classified as a non-hazardous waste.

([1]) OJ L 312, 22.11.2008.
([2]) OJ L 226, 6.9.2000.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-000997/13
an den Rat
Werner Schulz (Verts/ALE)
(31. Januar 2013)

Betrifft: Eurojust

Einem Bericht der Bild-Zeitung vom 6.1.2013 ist zu entnehmen, dass der Name des Vizepräsidenten von Eurojust, Carlos Zeyen, in Unterlagen zu verschobenem SED-Vermögen auftaucht. So soll er an verschiedenen Firmen beteiligt gewesen sein, die laut Bundesanstalt für vereinigungsbedingte Sonderaufgaben (BvS) gegründet worden waren, „um Vermögen der SED ins Ausland zu transferieren und so dem Zugriff der BvS zu entziehen".

1. Inwiefern sind dem Rat diese Beschuldigungen bekannt?

2. Ist dem Rat der Vorwurf der Bild-Zeitung bekannt, dass Carlos Zeyen „in seiner früheren Funktion als Rechtsanwalt in die Verschiebung von illegalen SED-Millionen verwickelt war"?

3. Inwieweit hat sich der Rat mit den genannten Vorwürfen beschäftigt?

Antwort
(4. April 2013)

Es ist nicht Sache des Rates, zu Presseberichten Stellung zu nehmen.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000997/13
to the Council
Werner Schulz (Verts/ALE)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Eurojust

According to a report published on 6 January 2013 in the German newspaper *Bild*, the name of Carlos Zeyen, a Eurojust Vice-President, is mentioned in documents relating to smuggled assets held by the now defunct East German Communist (SED) Party. Carlos Zeyen was allegedly involved in various firms set up, according to the BvS (Bundesanstalt für vereinigungsbedingte Sonderaufgaben — Federal Office for Special Tasks Arising out of Unification), in order to transfer SED assets out of Germany and hence out of reach of the BvS.

1. How much does the Council know about the above accusations?

2. Is it aware of *Bild*'s allegation that Carlos Zeyen, when he used to work as a lawyer, helped to smuggle out the SED's illicit fortune?

3. To what extent has the Council sought to respond to these accusations?

Reply
(4 April 2013)

It is not for the Council to comment on articles appearing in the press.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000998/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(31 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Carne de cavalo detectada em hambúgueres

Depois de ter sido detetada carne de cavalo em hambúrgueres vendidos em supermercados britânicos, a OCU, uma associação de consumidores em Espanha, confirmou que, das vinte marcas analisadas nos supermercados espanhóis, duas continham carne de cavalo, não mencionada nos rótulos.

Para além da presença de carne de cavalo, foram detetados antioxidantes, colorantes, potenciadores de sabor, sulfitos e um aditivo que mantém a cor original da carne fresca, com que se pretende *mascarar* a falta de qualidade da carne comercializada.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Está a acompanhar a situação da utilização de carne de cavalo em hambúrgueres comercializados na Europa? Para além dos casos já conhecidos no Reino Unido, na Irlanda e agora em Espanha tem conhecimento se em outros Estados europeus se coloca este mesmo problema?

2. Considera que a adição de antioxidantes, colorantes, potenciadores de sabor e sulfitos à carne podem colocar riscos de segurança alimentar e de saúde pública? Não considera que o uso de tais aditivos deveria ser controlado e regulado?

3. Pretende alterar as regras aplicáveis à rotulagem da carne para que seja identificada a sua composição cabal?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(25 de março de 2013)

1. Na sequência das descobertas de produtos alimentares mal rotulados contendo carne de cavalo mal rotulados, a Comissão tem estado ativamente a coordenar inquéritos nos Estados-Membros. A este respeito, a Comissão aprovou recentemente uma recomendação sobre um plano de fiscalização coordenado, apelando a inspeções à escala da UE aos produtos alimentares comercializados como contendo carne de bovino, por forma a detetar a presença não declarada de carne de cavalo e à carne de cavalo destinada ao consumo humano, por forma a detetar fenilbutazona, medicamento veterinário cuja utilização é permitida apenas em animais não produtores de alimentos. A Europol também está envolvida nas investigações em curso, cujos resultados completos serão publicados em abril do presente ano.

2. O anexo II do Regulamento (CE) n.° 1333/2008 ([1]) estabelece a lista da União dos aditivos alimentares autorizados para utilização nos géneros alimentícios e as respetivas condições de utilização. Só os aditivos alimentares autorizados nessa lista podem ser usados e a segurança destes aditivos alimentares autorizados foi avaliada. Os aditivos que foram comunicados pela UCO estão incluídos na lista acima referida. Os Estados-Membros são responsáveis pelo controlo do uso correto de aditivos alimentares e das obrigações relevantes em matéria de rotulagem.

3. No âmbito da legislação da UE ([2]), os nomes de alimentos que apenas sugerem a presença de carne bovina onde, de facto, estão presentes outras carnes, são enganosos e infringem a legislação da UE. Do mesmo modo, a rotulagem de produtos à base de carne contendo carne de cavalo que a não mencionam na lista de ingredientes infringe as regras da UE. Além disso, se um ingrediente é mencionado no nome do alimento, a sua quantidade em percentagem tem de estar presente na lista de ingredientes.

Estas normas atuais da União em matéria de rotulagem, quando corretamente aplicadas, são suficientes para assegurar que o teor em carne de cavalo possa ser identificado no rótulo dos produtos à base de carne.

([1]) Regulamento (CE) n.° 1333/2008 do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 16 de dezembro de 2008, relativo aos aditivos alimentares, JO L 354 de 31.12.2008.

([2]) Diretiva 2000/13/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 20 de março de 2000, relativa à aproximação das legislações dos Estados-Membros respeitantes à rotulagem, apresentação e publicidade dos géneros alimentícios, JO L 109 de 6.5.2000, p. 29.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000998/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Horsemeat detected in hamburgers

Following the detection of horsemeat in hamburgers sold in British supermarkets, the Spanish consumer association OCU has confirmed that out of 20 brands tested in Spanish supermarkets, two contained horsemeat, without it being listed on the packaging.

In addition to horsemeat, antioxidants, colourings, flavour enhancers, sulphites and an additive to keep the meat looking fresh and disguise its poor quality were also detected.

1. Is the Commission monitoring the situation concerning the use of horsemeat in hamburgers sold in Europe? Apart from the cases already found in the United Kingdom, Ireland and now Spain, does it know whether the same problem exists in other European states?

2. Does the Commission consider the addition of antioxidants, colourings, flavour enhancers and sulphites to meat likely to pose food safety and public health risks? Does it not feel that the use of such additives should be controlled and regulated?

3. Does it intend to change the rules on labelling of meat products, so that horsemeat content can be identified?

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

1. Following the findings of mislabelled food with horsemeat, the Commission has been actively coordinating ongoing investigations in the Member States. To this end, the Commission has recently adopted a recommendation on a coordinated control plan calling for EU-wide controls on foods marketed as containing beef to detect undeclared presence of horse meat and on horse meat destined for human consumption to detect phenylbutazone, a veterinary drug whose use is allowed only in non-food producing animals. Europol is also involved in the ongoing investigations. Full results of this initiative will be published in April 2013.

2. Annex II of Regulation (EC) No 1333/2008 ([1]) contains the Union list of food additives approved for use in foods and conditions of use. Only the listed food additives can be used. The safety of all approved additives has been assessed. The additives that have been reported by OCU are included in the abovementioned list. Member States are responsible for the control of the correct use of food additives and relevant labelling obligations.

3. Under EU legislation ([2]), the name of foods which only suggests the presence of beef meat where, in fact, also other species of meat are present, is misleading and breaches EU legislation. Similarly, labelling of meat products containing horse meat infringes EU rules, if its presence is not mentioned in the list of ingredients. Moreover, if an ingredient is mentioned in the name of the food, its quantity expressed as a percentage has to be provided in the list of ingredients.

These current Union food labelling rules, when correctly enforced, are sufficient to ensure that horsemeat content can be identified on the labelling of meat products.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1333/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2008 on food additives, OJ L 354/16; 31.12.2008.

([2]) Directive 2000/13/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 March 2000 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the labelling, presentation and advertising of foodstuffs, OJ L 109, 6.5.2000, p. 29.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000999/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(31 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Novos focos de gripe aviária do tipo H5N1

A Organização das Nações Unidas para a Alimentação e a Agricultura (FAO) advertiu hoje para a possibilidade de risco de novos focos de gripe aviária caso a vigilância e o controlo da doença não sejam reforçados em todo o mundo. *A continuidade da crise económica mundial implica que há menos dinheiro disponível para a prevenção da gripe aviária do tipo H5N1 ou outras de origem animal*. Além disso, a FAO afirma que, sem controlos adequados, o vírus poderia propagar-se facilmente a nível mundial, como aconteceu em 2006, ano em que foram afetados 63 países.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Está a acompanhar esta situação? Que medidas pretende pôr em marcha no sentido do reforço da vigilância e do controlo da gripe aviária e de outras de origem animal? Pode garantir a segurança das explorações aviárias (e suinícolas) na Europa?

2. Crê que este aviso da FAO pode pôr em causa a saúde pública na medida em que estes novos focos de gripe aviária do tipo H5N1 podem ser transmissíveis a seres humanos? Que medidas de prevenção tomou ou tenciona tomar?

Resposta conjunta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(14 de março de 2013)

A Comissão continua a acompanhar de perto a situação da Gripe Aviária Altamente Patogénica («GAAP H5N1») em todo o mundo, trabalhando em contacto com a Organização das Nações Unidas para a Alimentação e a Agricultura (FAO), a Organização Mundial da Saúde Animal (OIE) e a Organização Mundial de Saúde (OMS) e tendo na devida conta os riscos que este vírus representa para a saúde pública e a saúde animal.

Para reduzir estes riscos, está em vigor, a nível da UE, uma série de medidas:

— A vigilância da gripe aviária nas aves de capoeira e nas aves selvagens é realizada permanentemente na UE, ao abrigo de programas harmonizados cofinanciados. Para 2013, foi afetada uma contribuição financeira total de 2 680 000 euros para o efeito (artigo 9.° da Decisão 2012/761/UE da Comissão ([1])).

— Está em vigor legislação da UE sobre medidas de biossegurança para evitar a transmissão da «GAAP H5N1» a bandos de aves de capoeira na UE (Decisão 2005/734/CE da Comissão ([2])) e, caso esse vírus seja detetado em aves selvagens, para evitar a sua propagação a aves de capoeira (Decisão 2006/563/CE da Comissão ([3])).

— No quadro da Diretiva 2005/94/CE do Conselho ([4]), os Estados-Membros adotam planos de emergência para reagir rapidamente a um eventual surto de gripe aviária em explorações de aves de capoeira.

— Um conjunto abrangente de atos jurídicos da UE está igualmente em vigor para prevenir a gripe aviária através da importação de aves de capoeira vivas, produtos derivados de aves de capoeira e aves em cativeiro provenientes de países fora da UE.

Todas estas medidas demonstraram a sua eficácia na redução dos riscos para a saúde animal suscitados pela «GAAP H5N1», que, até agora, nunca foi detetada em seres humanos na UE.

([1]) JO L 336 de 8.12.2012, p. 83.
([2]) JO L 274 de 20.10.2005, p. 105.
([3]) JO L 222 de 15.8.2006, p. 11.
([4]) JO L 10 de 14.1.2006, p. 16.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001103/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(1 februarie 2013)

Subiect: Avertismentul FAO privind gripa aviară

Conform unui avertisment emis de Organizația Națiunilor Unite pentru Alimentație și Agricultură (FAO), există un risc crescut de reizbucnire a unor noi focare de gripă aviară de tip H5N1.

Având în vedere că în perioada 2003-2011, virusul H5N1 a ucis peste 300 de persoane și a condus la sacrificarea a peste 400 de milioane de păsări domestice, provocând pierderi economice de 20 de miliarde de euro, Comisia este rugată să precizeze care sunt măsurile concrete pe care intenționează să le ia pentru prevenirea răspândirii virusului.

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

Comisia continuă să monitorizeze îndeaproape situația la nivel mondial privind gripa aviară înalt patogenă (HPAI — *highly pathogenic avian influenza*) H5N1 și lucrează în contact cu Organizația pentru Alimentație și Agricultură (FAO), Organizația Mondială pentru Sănătatea Animalelor (OIE) și Organizația Mondială a Sănătății (OMS), luând în considerare în mod corespunzător riscurile pe care acest virus le prezintă pentru sănătatea publică și sănătatea animalelor.

O serie de măsuri sunt în vigoare la nivelul UE pentru a reduce aceste riscuri:

— Supravegherea pentru detectarea gripei aviare la păsările de curte și la păsările sălbatice se desfășoară în UE în mod permanent în cadrul programelor cofinanțate armonizate. Pentru 2013, a fost alocată în acest scop o contribuție financiară de 2 680 000 EUR (articolul 9 din Decizia Comisiei 2012/761/CE ([1])).

— Există o legislație a UE privind măsurile de biosecuritate de împiedicare a introducerii în efectivele de păsări de curte din UE a HPAI H5N1 (Decizia Comisiei 2005/734/CE ([2]) a Comisiei) și, în cazul în care acest virus este detectat la păsările sălbatice, de evitare a răspândirii sale la păsări de curte (Decizia 2006/563/CE ([3]) a Comisiei).

— În conformitate cu Directiva 2005/94/CE ([4]) a Consiliului, statele membre pun în aplicare planuri de urgență pentru a reacționa rapid la o posibilă apariție a gripei aviare în ferme de creștere a păsărilor de curte.

— Există, de asemenea, un set cuprinzător de documente legislative ale UE care are ca scop împiedicarea introducerii gripei aviare prin importurile de păsări de curte vii, de produse obținute din păsări de curte și de păsări captive din afara UE.

Toate aceste măsuri s-au dovedit a fi eficiente în reducerea riscurilor pentru sănătatea animală prezentate de HPAI H5N1, care, până în prezent, nu a fost raportat la oameni pe teritoriul UE.

([1]) JO L 336, 8.12.2012, p. 83.
([2]) JO L 274, 20.10.2005, p. 105.
([3]) JO L 222, 15.8.2006, p. 11.
([4]) JO L 10, 14.1.2006, p. 16.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000999/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: New outbreaks of bird flu (H5N1)

The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) today warned of the risk of new bird flu outbreaks unless surveillance and disease control is strengthened globally. 'The continuing international economic downturn means less money is available for prevention of H5N1 bird flu and other threats of animal origin.' Furthermore, the FAO says that unless adequate controls are put in place the virus could easily spread worldwide, as it did in 2006 when 63 countries were affected.

1. Is the Commission monitoring this situation? What steps will it take to strengthen the surveillance and control of bird flu and other animal diseases? Can it guarantee the safety of poultry (and pig) farms in Europe?

2. Does it believe that this FAO warning may constitute a threat to public health since these new outbreaks of bird flu (H5N1) may be transmissible to humans? What preventive measures has it taken or does it intend it take?

Question for written answer E-001103/13
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: FAO avian influenza alert

The UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) has issued a warning of a heightened risk of further H5N1 avian influenza outbreaks.

In view of the fact that, between 2003 and 2011, the H5N1 virus claimed over 300 human lives and necessitated the destruction of over 400 million domestic fowl, engendering losses of EUR 20 billion, what specific measures does the Commission it intend to take to prevent any spread of the virus?

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

The Commission continues to closely monitor the highly pathogenic avian influenza (HPAI) H5N1 situation all over the world, working in contact with the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) and the World Health Organisation (WHO), taking into due account the risks that this virus poses to animal and public health.

A series of measures are in place at EU level to reduce these risks:

— Surveillance for avian influenza in poultry and wild birds is carried out in the EU on a permanent basis under harmonised co-financed programmes. For 2013, a total financial contribution of EUR 2 680 000 has been allocated for this purpose (Article 9, Commission Decision 2012/761/EC ([1])).

— EU legislation is in place on biosecurity measures to prevent HPAI H5N1 introduction into EU poultry flocks (Commission Decision 2005/734/EC ([2])) and, in case this virus is detected in wild birds, to avoid its spread to poultry (Commission Decision 2006/563/EC ([3])).

— In the framework of Council Directive 2005/94/EC ([4]), Member States have in place contingency plans to swiftly react to a possible occurrence of avian influenza in poultry farms.

— A comprehensive set of EU legislation is also in place to prevent avian influenza introduction via imports of live poultry, poultry products and captive birds from outside the EU.

([1]) OJ L 336, 8.12.2012, p. 83.
([2]) OJ L 274, 20.10.2005, p. 105.
([3]) OJ L 222, 15.8.2006, p. 11.
([4]) OJ L 10, 14.1.2006, p. 16.

All these measures have shown to be effective in reducing the animal health risks posed by HPAI H5N1, which has up to now never been reported in humans in the EU.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001001/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(31 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Pandemrix H1N1 e narcolepsia

Cerca de 800 crianças e adolescentes europeus foram diagnosticados com narcolepsia após imunização com a vacina Pandemrix H1N1 da GlaxoSmithKline. Na sequência destes casos, a Agência Europeia de Medicamentos decidiu que a Pandemrix não deve ser utilizada em pessoas com menos de 20 anos.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Em que provas científicas se baseou a EMEA para decidir que a relação entre a vacina Pandemrix e a narcolepsia apenas se verifica em crianças e jovens até aos 20 anos?

2. Considera segura a utilização da Pandemrix em pessoas com mais de 20 anos?

3. Na medida em que podem ocorrer novos casos de gripe aviária ou suína e que serão produzidas novas vacinas, que medidas tomou ou pretende tomar para garantir que essas novas vacinas não comportarão um risco de associação a casos de narcolepsia, tal como a Pandemrix?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001332/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(8 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Casos de narcolepsia associados à vacina contra a gripe A

Considerando o seguinte:

— O Infarmed (Autoridade Nacional do Medicamento) revelou ter recebido 4 notificações de narcolepsia, um distúrbio do sono incurável, associadas à vacina Pardermix contra a gripe A;

— Noutros países europeus registaram-se cerca de 800 casos de narcolepsia em crianças também depois de terem sido imunizadas com a vacina Pandermix produzida pela farmacêutica GlaxoSmithKline;

Pergunto à Comissão:

Em que países da UE há conhecimento de casos de narcolepsia associados esta vacina?

Resposta conjunta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(22 de março de 2013)

1. Na sua reapreciação de 2011 ([1]), a Agência Europeia de Medicamentos considerou todos os dados disponíveis sobre a possível associação entre a Pandemrix e a narcolepsia, bem como o impacto global sobre a relação risco-benefício da Pandemrix. Os dados incluíram resultados de estudos epidemiológicos na Finlândia e na Suécia, análises de dados em matéria de segurança realizadas em vários Estados-Membros, relatórios de casos da EU ([2]) e resultados preliminares de um estudo sobre a narcolepsia e as vacinas pandémicas em oito Estados-Membros, coordenado pelo Centro Europeu de Prevenção e Controlo das Doenças ([3]).

([1]) A revisão sobre a associação entre a Pandemrix e a narcolepsia teve início a pedido da Comissão Europeia ao abrigo do artigo 20.° do Regulamento (CE) n.° 726/2004, de 27 de agosto de 2010.
([2]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/news_and_events/news/2011/07/news_detail_001312.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058004d5c1
([3]) http://vaesco.net/vaesco.html

2. Os resultados dos estudos na Finlândia e na Suécia indicaram que existe entre seis a treze vezes mais probabilidade de risco de narcolepsia nas crianças e nos adolescentes vacinados. Este risco acrescido não foi detetado em adultos com mais de 20 anos. Em conformidade com as conclusões científicas da Agência, a Comissão adotou uma decisão ([4]) segundo a qual a Pandemrix só deve ser utilizada em pessoas com menos de 20 anos de idade se a vacina trivalente da gripe sazonal recomendada anualmente, não se encontrar disponível e se a imunização contra o H1N1 for considerada necessária. Além disso, na reapreciação de 2012 ([5]), não foram assinaladas novas preocupações relativamente à Pandemrix ou outras vacinas. Visto não haver atualmente uma pandemia de gripe, a Pandemrix não é atualmente comercializada na UE.

3. As vacinas antigripe estão sujeitas ao rigoroso quadro normativo da UE relativo aos medicamentos ([6]). A autorização de introdução no mercado é concedida a um medicamento apenas após a avaliação da sua qualidade, segurança e eficácia e após ter sido concluída uma análise positiva da relação risco-benefício associada à sua utilização. Após a sua referida autorização, um medicamento é sujeito a um sistema de fiscalização rigoroso de pós-comercialização.

([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/html/alfregister.htm

([5]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/news_and_events/news/2012/10/news_detail_001636.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058004d5c1

([6]) Regulamento (CE) n.° 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 e Diretiva 2001/83/CE que estabelece um código comunitário relativo aos medicamentos para uso humano, JO L 311 de 28.11.2001, alterada.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001001/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Pandemrix H1N1 and narcolepsy

Around 800 European children and adolescents have been diagnosed with narcolepsy after receiving the Pandemrix H1N1 vaccine manufactured by GlaxoSmithKline. Following these cases, the European Medicines Agency concluded that Pandemrix should not be administered to persons under 20 years of age.

1. On what scientific evidence has the European Medicines Agency based its conclusion that the Pandemrix vaccine may cause narcolepsy only in children and adolescents under 20 years of age?

2. Does the Commission believe that it is safe to administer Pandemrix to persons over 20 years of age?

3. Given that new vaccines will be manufactured should new cases of bird flu and swine flu arise, what measures has it taken or will it take to ensure that these new vaccines will not pose the risk of narcolepsy associated with Pandemrix?

Question for written answer E-001332/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(8 February 2013)

Subject: Cases of narcolepsy linked to the flu vaccine

INFARMED (Portuguese National Authority of Medicines) has received four reports of cases of narcolepsy, an incurable sleep disorder, linked to the Pardermix flu vaccine.

Other European countries have recorded around 800 cases of narcolepsy in children who have received the Pandermix vaccine manufactured by GlaxoSmithKline.

Which EU countries have recorded cases of narcolepsy linked to this vaccine?

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

1. In the 2011 review ([1]) the European Medicines Agency considered all available data on the possible association between Pandemrix and narcolepsy as well as the impact on the overall benefit-risk balance of Pandemrix. Data included results of epidemiological studies in Finland and Sweden, analysis of safety data performed in several Member States, case reports from the EU ([2]) and preliminary results of a study of narcolepsy and pandemic vaccines in eight Member States coordinated by the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control ([3]).

2. The results of studies in Finland and Sweden indicated a six- to thirteen-fold increased risk of narcolepsy in vaccinated children and adolescents. This risk increase has not been found in adults older than 20 years. In accordance with the Agency's scientific conclusions the Commission adopted a decision ([4]) that Pandemrix should be used in persons under 20 years of age only if the recommended annual seasonal trivalent influenza vaccine is not available and if immunisation against H1N1 is considered necessary. In addition, in the 2012 review ([5]) no new concerns for Pandemrix or other vaccines have been raised. As there is currently no pandemic influenza situation, Pandemrix is currently not marketed in the EU.

([1]) The review of Pandemrix and narcolepsy was initiated at the request of the European Commission under Article 20 of Regulation (EC) No 726/2004, on 27 August 2010.
([2]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/news_and_events/news/2011/07/news_detail_001312.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058004d5c1
([3]) http://vaesco.net/vaesco.html
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/html/alfregister.htm
([5]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/news_and_events/news/2012/10/news_detail_001636.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058004d5c1

3. Influenza vaccines are subject to the strong EU legislation framework for medicinal products ([6]). A marketing authorisation is granted to a medicinal product only after its quality, safety and efficacy have been evaluated and a positive benefit-risk balance related to its use has been concluded. After its authorisation, the medicinal product is subject to strict post-marketing surveillance.

([6]) 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, Directive 2001/83/EC on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use, OJ L 311, 28.11.2001, as amended.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001002/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(31 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: RAN — Conferência de alto nível

No dia 29 de janeiro de 2013 teve lugar uma Conferência de alto nível promovida pela Comissão Europeia sobre a necessidade de aumentar o compromisso europeu na prevenção do extremismo violento. Diversos especialistas debateram estas questões com membros da RAN — *Radicalisation Awareness Network*.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que apreciação faz dos resultados da Conferência de alto nível? Esta correspondeu às expectativas que nela foram colocadas?

2. Quais foram os principais pontos destacados e que problemas foram identificados como mais prementes para um esforço comum e bem-sucedido de prevenção do extremismo violento e de envolvimento das diversas comunidades residentes nos Estados-Membros?

3. Como avalia as manifestações de extremismo violento na Europa? Quais são as suas principais causas e consequências?

4. Que medidas concretas tem tomado quanto a esta matéria? Quais foram os seus resultados?

Resposta dada por Cecilia Malmström em nome da Comissão
(14 de março de 2013)

1.-2. Em 29 de janeiro de 2013, a Comissão organizou uma conferência de alto nível intitulada «Responsabilizar os órgãos do poder local no combate ao extremismo violento». Esta conferência contou com mais de duzentos participantes, incluindo representantes das instituições da União Europeia (nomeadamente do Parlamento Europeu), do Conselho da Europa, dos Estados-Membros da UE e da Noruega, bem como representantes da sociedade civil, através da Rede de Sensibilização para a Radicalização (Radicalisation Awareness Network — RAN).

Teve como objetivo reforçar o empenho dos Estados-Membros na sua política de prevenção do extremismo violento e apoiar o envolvimento dos atores locais. A conferência reconheceu o valor acrescentado da RAN e da abordagem que visa o combate a todas as formas de extremismo violento. Os debates vão contribuir para o trabalho da Comissão em matéria de luta contra o extremismo violento.

3.-4. A RAN pretende constituir uma plataforma de coordenação a nível da UE para os profissionais envolvidos na luta contra o extremismo violento a nível local. Já foram criados oito grupos de trabalho no âmbito da RAN, dedicados diferentes temas como a polícia comunitária ou local e as vítimas do terrorismo. O principal objetivo é facilitar a cooperação para a prevenção, bem como partilhar experiências e boas práticas entre os profissionais e os intervenientes locais que estão mais próximos das pessoas mais vulneráveis. Desta forma, propõe-se contribuir para os objetivos definidos pela Comissão na estratégia de segurança interna.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001002/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: RAN — High-level conference

On 29 January 2013 the Commission hosted a high-level conference on the need for Europe to strengthen its commitment to preventing violent extremism. Several experts discussed the issue with members of the RAN — Radicalisation Awareness Network.

1. How does the Commission view the outcomes of this high-level conference? Did the conference meet expectations?

2. What were the main points highlighted and the most pressing issues identified in terms of implementing a joint and successful effort to prevent violent extremism and to involve the various communities living in the Member States?

3. How does it assess manifestations of violent extremism in Europe? What are their main causes and consequences?

4. What specific measures has it taken on this issue? What were the outcomes of these measures?

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

1-2. On 29 January 2013, the Commission organised a High Level Conference on 'empowering local actors to prevent violent extremism'. More than two hundred people attended, including representatives from EU institutions (the European Parliament among them), from the Council of Europe and from EU Member States and Norway, as well as representatives from civil society through the Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN).

The objective of the meeting was to bolster Member States' efforts in their policy on preventing violent extremism and to support the involvement of local players. The Conference recognised the added value of the RAN and the approach aimed at tackling all kinds of violent extremism. The discussions will feed into the Commission's work on Countering Violent Extremism.

3-4. The RAN aims to be an EU-wide umbrella platform for practitioners involved locally in countering violent extremism. Eight working groups have already been set up within the RAN on different topics such as community or local police and victims of terrorism. Its overall is more to facilitate preventative cooperation, and to share experiences and practices amongst practitioners and local actors closest to the most vulnerable individuals. It aims thereby to contribute to the goals set out by the Commission in the Internal Security Strategy.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001003/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(31 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — 13.ª reunião ministerial UE-Índia

No dia 30 de janeiro de 2013 teve lugar a 13.ª reunião ministerial UE-Índia.

Assim, pergunto à Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante:

1. Quais foram os principais temas debatidos?

2. Que decisões foram tomadas?

3. Como avalia a evolução das relações UE-Índia tendo por referência a Cimeira defevereiro de 2012?

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

Na recente reunião ministerial UE-Índia, a Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente e S. Ex.ª o Ministro dos Negócios Estrangeiros da Índia, S. Khurshid, debateram as relações bilaterais entre a União Europeia e a Índia e questões de política externa de interesse comum, em especial nas suas respetivas regiões, como o processo de paz no Médio Oriente e o Irão.

Ambas as partes concordaram com a necessidade de reforçar as relações entre a UE e a Índia, sobretudo no que se refere às questões políticas e de segurança, ao comércio e à cooperação setorial.

A AR/VP e Ministro dos Negócios Estrangeiros indiano também prepararam a 13.ª cimeira anual UE-Índia, que terá lugar em Bruxelas em 2013. Foram igualmente mencionados os recentes casos de violência contra as mulheres.

As relações entre a UE e a Índia continuam a aprofundar-se de forma construtiva. Ambas as partes consideram a próxima cimeira como um passo importante neste processo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001003/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — 13th EU-India Ministerial meeting

The 13th EU-India Ministerial meeting took place on 30 January 2013.

1. What were the main issues discussed?

2. What decisions were made?

3. How does the Vice-President/High Representative assess the development of EU-India relations since the February 2012 Summit?

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

At the recent EU-India Ministerial meeting, the High Representative/Vice-President and the Indian Foreign Minister HE S. Khurshid discussed bilateral relations between the European Union and India and foreign policy issues of common concern, in particular in their respective neighbourhoods, the Middle East Peace Process and Iran.

Both sides agreed on the necessity to enhance EU-India relations, in particular as regards political and security-related issues, trade and sectoral cooperation.

The HR/VP and the Indian External Affairs Minister also prepared the 13th Annual EU-India Summit, to be held in Brussels during 2013. The recent cases of violence against women were also mentioned.

The relations between EU and India continue to deepen in a constructive manner. Both sides look at the next Summit as an important step in this process.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001004/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(31 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Inventariação, estudo e preservação do património europeu no mundo

A herança cultural europeia e a compreensão adequada da sua história não são possíveis sem conhecimentos acerca da presença europeia noutras partes do mundo durante vários séculos e a preservação do património cultural material e imaterial que assinala essa presença e a sua interação com outros povos e culturas.

Boa parte desse património europeu situa-se em países em desenvolvimento, que muitas vezes não dispõem de condições para impedir a sua degradação ou mesmo o seu desaparecimento.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Considera que o património cultural europeu, material e imaterial, situado fora do espaço dos Estados-Membros constitui parte importante da herança cultural europeia?

2. Crê que este património merece cuidado, atenção e proteção por parte de todos os cultores da identidade europeia e que esta não é integralmente entendível sem ele?

3. Apoia, de alguma forma, a inventariação, o estudo e a preservação do património europeu no mundo? Em que termos? Que projetos tem presentemente em curso com este objetivo?

4. Em caso negativo, estaria disponível para considerar semelhante apoio?

Resposta dada por AndroullaVassiliou em nome da Comissão
(26 de março de 2013)

No entender da Comissão, a preservação do património cultural europeu assume grande importância. As iniciativas da Comissão — através, por exemplo, do programa Cultura, das Jornadas Europeias do Património e da Marca do Património Europeu — incidem sobre a proteção, a promoção e a compreensão do património cultural dentro do território da UE e nos países participantes no programa.

No que diz respeito aos países situados fora do território da UE, os programas regionais, como o Euromed Património e o Programa Cultural da Parceria Oriental, incluem igualmente ações destinadas a promover e a preservar o património cultural. Além disso, nos países parceiros orientais e meridionais, estão a ser lançadas iniciativas bilaterais *ad hoc,* tais como uma ação de reforço das capacidades no domínio da gestão do património — que está no centro de um programa importante a desenvolver futuramente com a Argélia — e o apoio concedido ao organismo nacional de conservação do património cultural da Geórgia para o desenvolvimento institucional. Nos países dos Balcãs Ocidentais, a Comissão apoia os esforços envidados pelo Conselho de Cooperação Regional no sentido de prosseguir o processo de Liubliana, designado «Reabilitar o nosso património comum».

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001004/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Identification, examination and preservation of European heritage throughout the world

A thorough understanding of European cultural heritage requires knowledge of centuries of European presence throughout the world and the preservation of material and non-material cultural heritage that marks this presence and interaction with other peoples and cultures.

Much of this European heritage is found in developing countries, which often lack the means to prevent its degradation or even disappearance.

1. Does the Commission believe that material and non-material European cultural heritage found outside the Member States is an important part of European cultural heritage as a whole?

2. Does it believe that this heritage deserves the care, attention and protection of all Europhiles and that the European identity is incomplete without it?

3. Does it provide any support for the identification, examination and preservation of European heritage throughout the world? What does this support entail? What projects is it currently supporting?

4. If not, would it be willing to provide such support?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(26 March 2013)

The Commission is of the opinion that the safeguarding of European cultural heritage is of high importance. Its actions through, for example, the Culture Programme, the European Heritage Days and the European Heritage Label are focused on the protection, enhancement and understanding of cultural heritage within the territory of the EU and participating programme countries.

As for countries outside the EU, regional programmes such as Euromed Heritage and Eastern Partnership Culture also include actions to promote and preserve cultural heritage. Moreover, bilateral ad hoc initiatives are taken in the Eastern and Southern Partner countries, such as a capacity building action in heritage management — which is at the core of an important upcoming programme with Algeria — and support provided for the institutional development of the National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia. In the Western Balkan countries, the Commission supports the efforts of the Regional Cooperation Council to continue the Ljubljana Process 'Rehabilitating our common heritage'.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001005/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(31 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Fuga de capitais em França

O Banco de França veio confirmar a existência de uma enorme fuga de capitais que se deverá agudizar se o governo socialista persistir em penalizar mais as grandes fortunas. A previsão de receitas feita pelo governo, através da coleta de mais impostos, parece, assim, difícil de atingir, dado que os franceses estão a deslocalizar o domicílio fiscal para países com regimes mais favoráveis, nomeadamente a Bélgica.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Tem conhecimento destas declarações do Banco de França? Que avaliação faz destas avaliações?

2. No atual contexto de crise a solução de muitos governos tem sido a de aumentar os impostos sem que tal acabe por significar, efetivamente, um aumento da receita tributária devido à fuga de capitais e de fortunas para regimes mais favoráveis. Como avalia esta situação? Que impacto pode vir a ter no contexto da recuperação económica e do reequilíbrio orçamental dos Estados?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(2 de abril de 2013)

A Comissão não tem conhecimento de qualquer declaração feita pelo Banco de França sobre a existência de uma «fuga de capitais».

Os recentes casos mediáticos de cidadãos franceses famosos que mudam de país de residência com o intuito de evitar a carga fiscal, não nos devem levar a tomar conclusões precipitadas, na ausência de dados fiáveis, sobre o impacto para a economia no seu conjunto.

A estratégia orçamental do Governo francês tem, atualmente assentado, em grande parte, em medidas do lado das receitas, com uma ênfase específica sobre os contribuintes com maior capacidade contributiva. Conforme indicado na Análise Anual do Crescimento, deverão ser realizados esforços a fim de assegurar uma estratégia orçamental equilibrada, em particular em países com um peso relativamente elevado da despesa pública em relação ao PIB, como acontece no caso da França.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001005/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Capital flight in France

The Bank of France has confirmed that a huge capital flight is taking place, which will escalate if the Socialist government persists in further penalising the wealthiest. It appears from this that the French Government's revenue forecast from increased tax collection will be hard to achieve, given that French citizens are moving their tax residence to countries with more favourable regimes, such as Belgium.

1. Is the Commission aware of the Bank of France's statement? What does it think of it?

2. In the current context of crisis, many governments have turned to tax hikes as a solution, without the measure effectively leading to any increase in tax revenue, as it has resulted in the flight of capital and wealth towards more favourable regimes. How does the Commission view this situation? What impact is it likely to have in terms of economic recovery and rebalancing national budgets?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2013)

The Commission is not aware of any statement of the Bank of France on an ongoing 'capital flight'.

The recent mediatised cases of famous French citizens changing country of residence to avoid tax burden should not drive us to any quick conclusion on the impact for the economy as a whole in the absence of reliable data.

The fiscal strategy of the French Government has currently relied mostly on revenue measures, with a specific emphasis on tax payers with the highest capacity to contribute. As indicated in the Annual Growth Survey, efforts should be done to achieve a balanced fiscal strategy, in particular in countries with a relatively high share of public expenditure in GDP, as is the case for France.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001007/13
aan de Commissie
Daniël van der Stoep (NI)
(31 januari 2013)

Betreft: Salarissen en pensioenen van EU-ambtenaren

Graag zou ik u willen verzoeken de volgende vragen ten aanzien van pensioenuitkeringen en de dekkingsgraad van het EU-pensioenfonds te beantwoorden:

1. Welke salaristreden bestaan er voor ambtenaren van de Europese Unie?

2. Hoeveel ambtenaren bevinden zich in deze respectieve salaristreden?

3. Wat is het gemiddelde salaris van een ambtenaar?

4. Wat is de gemiddelde hoogte van het pensioen dat momenteel wordt uitgekeerd aan gepensioneerde ambtenaren?

5. Hoeveel ambtenaren zijn de afgelopen vijf jaar met vervroegd pensioen gegaan op de leeftijd van 55 jaar, zónder aftrek van pensioen? Wat is de gemiddelde hoogte van het pensioen van deze ambtenaren?

6. Hoeveel ambtenaren zijn de afgelopen vijf jaar met vervroegd pensioen gegaan op de leeftijd van 55 jaar, mét aftrek van pensioen? Wat is de gemiddelde hoogte van het pensioen van deze ambtenaren?

7. Wat is het totale bedrag dat momenteel aan pensioenuitkeringen wordt betaald?

8. Wat is het totale bedrag dat aan overige uitkeringen, zoals ziekte- en invaliditeitsuitkeringen wordt betaald?

9. Wat is de grootte van het EU-pensioenfonds?

10. Hoe worden de ingelegde pensioenpremies beheerd? Is er sprake van een vereiste dekkingsgraad? Zo ja, hoe hoog is deze vereiste dekkingsgraad?

11. Wordt aan deze vereiste dekkingsgraad voldaan?

12. Werd de afgelopen tien jaar aan deze vereiste dekkingsgraad voldaan?

13. Kunt u voor de komende tien jaar een raming maken en aangeven of het EU-pensioenfonds aan de vraag naar uitkeringen kan voldoen?

14. Wat gebeurt er met de ingelegde pensioenpremies? Worden deze bijvoorbeeld belegd?

15. Heeft het EU-pensioenfonds een scenario voor het vertrek van Britse ambtenaren bij het eventuele, maar zeker niet ondenkbare, scenario dat Groot-Brittanië de EU verlaat?

Antwoord van de heer Šefčovič namens de Commissie
(8 april 2013)

De salaristabellen zijn vastgesteld in artikel 66 van het personeelsstatuut en in de artikelen 63, 93 en 133 van de RAP. De personeelsstatistieken worden bekendgemaakt op europa.eu ([1]). Het gemiddelde nettosalaris van een EU-ambtenaar bedraagt 4 410 EUR en het gemiddelde nettopensioen 4 200 EUR. De statistieken over vervroegd pensioen zijn te vinden in het verslag over de maatregelen voor vervroegd pensioen ([2]). Voor de vragen 7, 8 en 9 verwijst de Commissie het geachte Parlementslid naar de EU-jaarrekeningen ([3]). Wat de vragen 10 tot en met 14 betreft, werkt de pensioenregeling voor Europese ambtenaren overeenkomstig artikel 83 van het personeelsstatuut en bijlage XII bij dat statuut als een notioneel fonds. Het fonds volgt een principe van actuarieel evenwicht en het mechanisme dat daarvoor wordt aangewend, is het pensioenbijdragepercentage. De werknemers moeten een derde van de vereiste financiering betalen. Aan deze vereiste is en wordt voldaan. Overeenkomstig het principe van actuarieel evenwicht wordt het pensioenbijdragepercentage namelijk elk jaar aangepast om de pensioenrechten voor het volgende jaar volledig te dekken. De bijdragen van de EU-ambtenaren zijn inkomsten voor de algemene begroting van de EU. Hoewel er geen echt beleggingsfonds bestaat, worden de bijdragen geacht te zijn geïnvesteerd in de langetermijnschuld van de lidstaten en de totale waarde ervan tot uiting te komen in de pensioenverplichting zoals opgenomen in de EU-jaarrekeningen. Aangezien het pensioenfonds in actuarieel evenwicht is, kunnen alle toekomstige uitkeringen volledig worden uitbetaald. De Commissie heeft geen scenario's uitgewerkt voor het geval een lidstaat uit de Europese Unie stapt.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/civil_service/about/figures/index_nl.htm
([2]) COM(2010) 28 definitief.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/biblio/publications/2011/eu_annual_accounts_2011_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001007/13
to the Commission
Daniël van der Stoep (NI)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Salaries and pensions of EU officials

The present author would ask the Commission to answer the following questions regarding pension benefits and the EU pension fund coverage:

1. What salary grades exist for civil servants of the European Union?

2. How many civil servants are in these respective salary grades?

3. What is the average salary of a civil servant?

4. What is the average pension currently paid out to retired civil servants?

5. Over the past five years, how many civil servants have taken early retirement at age 55, without deduction of pension? What is the average pension of these civil servants?

6. Over the past five years, how many civil servants have taken early retirement at age 55, with deduction of pension? What is the average pension of these civil servants?

7. What is the total amount currently paid out for pension benefits?

8. What is the total amount paid out for other benefits, such as sickness and disability benefits?

9. What is the size of the EU pension fund?

10. How are the pension contributions managed? Is there a required funding ratio? If so, how high is this required funding ratio?

11. Is this funding requirement met?

12. Has this funding requirement been met over the past 10 years?

13. Can it make an estimate for the next 10 years and indicate whether the EU pension fund can meet the demand for benefits?

14. What happens to the deposited pension contributions? Are these invested, for instance?

15. Does the EU pension fund have a scenario for the departure of British civil servants in the possible, but not unthinkable, event that the United Kingdom leaves the EU?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(8 April 2013)

Salary grids are laid down in Article 66 of the Staff Regulations and Articles 63, 93 and 133 of the CEOS. Staff figures are published on europa.eu ([1]). The average net salary of EU civil servants is EUR 4 410 and the average net pension is EUR 4 200. As regards the early retirement, the figures are provided in the report on early retirement measures ([2]). Concerning questions 7 to 9, the Commission refers the Honourable Member to EU annual accounts ([3]). As regards questions 10 to 14, under Article 83 of the Staff Regulations and Annex XII thereto, PSEO functions as a notional fund. It follows an actuarial balance principle and the pension contribution rate is the mechanism maintaining the scheme in balance. The employees pay 1/3 of the funding requirement. This requirement is and has been met, as under the principle of actuarial balance, the pension contributions is to be adjusted each year to fully cover pension rights acquired in the following year. The EU civil servants pay their contributions that constitute a revenue for the general budget of the EU. Although there is no actual investment fund, it is considered that the contributions have been invested in the long term debt of the Member States and the total value is reflected in the pension liability included in the EU annual accounts. The pension fund can fully pay the future benefits because it is in actuarial balance. The Commission has not developed any scenarios in case a Member State were to leave the Union.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/civil_service/about/figures/index_en.htm
([2]) COM(2010) 28 final.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/biblio/publications/2011/eu_annual_accounts_2011_en.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001008/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(31 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Espianti di organi ai danni di prigionieri di coscienza in Cina

Il problema dell'espianto di organi ai danni di prigionieri di coscienza in Cina ha radici profonde, risalenti al 1999. Il regime cinese ha, infatti, da tempo, dato inizio alla persecuzione contro i praticanti del Falun Gong, un popolare sistema di esercizi cinese, i quali vengono regolarmente arrestati, torturati e uccisi per il loro credo. Come evidenziato nella conferenza al Parlamento europeo «Religious Persecution by China: A Horror Story», del 29 gennaio 2013, siamo di fronte ad un crimine contro l'umanità, visto che molti degli organi usati per i trapianti provengono non solo da detenuti condannati a morte, pratica soggetto dell'interrogazione E-009103/12, ma anche da prigionieri di coscienza costretti nei campi di lavoro.

Considerando che a seguito della risposta alla suddetta interrogazione il Vice Presidente/Alto Rappresentante si compiaceva dell'annuncio del governo di porre fine a tale pratica, ma ad oggi le promesse sembrano essere state disattese;

Considerando che l'Articolo 36 della Costituzione cinese tutela la libertà religiosa affermando che «i cittadini della Repubblica Popolare Cinese godono della libertà religiosa, che nessun organo dello Stato o organizzazione pubblica o individuo possono costringere i cittadini a credere o a non credere in qualunque religione, né possono discriminare i cittadini che credono o non credono in nessuna religione»;

Considerando che, se fossero accertate come vere le notizie di espianti di organi su prigionieri di coscienza non condannati a morte, si configurerebbe un crimine contro l'umanità;

Considerando la Risoluzione P6_TA(2006)0346 del 7 settembre 2006 del Parlamento europeo in cui, nella sezione sui diritti umani e, specificatamente, al punto 66, affermava che «condanna energicamente la detenzione e la tortura in carcere degli adepti del movimento Falun Gong, i campi di "rieducazione attraverso il lavoro", gli ospedali psichiatrici e gli "istituti di istruzione legali"; è preoccupato in relazione alle informazioni secondo cui gli organi di adepti del Falun Gong detenuti sarebbero stati chirurgicamente asportati e venduti a ospedali; sollecita il governo cinese a porre fine alla detenzione e alla tortura di tali persone e a liberarle immediatamente»;

Si chiede al Vice-Presidente/Alto Rappresentante come intenda procedere per ottenere la cessazione immediata e permanente di tali pratiche.

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(14 marzo 2013)

1. L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente condivide le preoccupazioni dell'onorevole parlamentare in merito all'espianto di organi ai danni di prigionieri di coscienza costretti nei campi di «rieducazione attraverso il lavoro» in Cina, nonché riguardo alle pressioni esercitate e alle severe restrizioni imposte dalle autorità cinesi ai praticanti del Falun Gong.

2. Nei suoi contatti con le autorità cinesi, l'Unione europea continuerà a sollevare la questione dell'espianto di organi, in particolare per quanto riguarda i prigionieri di coscienza, compresi gli adepti del movimento Falun Gong.

3. Pur richiedendo l'accordo scritto del donatore, la normativa adottata dalla Cina sui trapianti di organi umani, entrata in vigore il 1° luglio 2006, non affronta adeguatamente la questione del consenso. L'Unione europea conferma altresì la propria apprensione per la mancata pubblicazione da parte della Cina di dati statistici sui trapianti di organi, in assenza dei quali è impossibile sapere di preciso da dove provengano gli organi trapiantati o verificare l'attendibilità delle numerose denunce di presunti espianti di organi da detenuti in rieducazione nei campi di lavoro. L'Unione continua a incoraggiare gli sforzi dalla Cina volti a promuovere la donazione volontaria di organi.

4. L'Unione europea ritiene che il dialogo UE-Cina sui diritti umani rappresenti un'importante sede di discussione delle questioni relative ai diritti umani in Cina. L'Unione ha già sollevato la questione dell'espianto di organi nell'ambito delle precedenti sessioni del dialogo UE-Cina sui diritti umani e intende proseguire su questa linea, insistendo altresì sui singoli casi di persecuzione dei praticanti del Falun Gong.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001008/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Organ harvesting from prisoners of conscience in China

The problem of organ harvesting from prisoners of conscience in China is deep-rooted, dating back as far as 1999. The Chinese regime has for some time persecuted members of Falun Gong, a popular system of Chinese exercises, the practitioners of which are regularly arrested, tortured and killed for their beliefs. As revealed at the European Parliament conference entitled 'Religious Persecution by China: A Horror Story', held on 29 January 2013, we are facing a crime against humanity, given that many of the organs used for transplants come not only from prisoners who have been sentenced to death, a practice which was addressed in Written Question E-009103/12, but also from prisoners of conscience in work camps.

Considering that following the response to the aforementioned written question, the Vice-President/High Representative was satisfied with the Chinese Government's announcement that it would put an end to the practice, but that today the promises seem to have been forgotten;

Considering that Article 36 of the Chinese Constitution protects religious freedom, stating that 'citizens of the People's Republic of China enjoy freedom of religious belief. No state organ, public organisation or individual may compel citizens to believe in, or not to believe in, any religion; nor may they discriminate against citizens who believe in, or do not believe in, any religion'.

Considering that, if it is indeed true that organ harvesting is being performed on prisoners of conscience who are not sentenced to death, this would consist of a crime against humanity;

Considering that in its Resolution P6_TA(2006)0346 of 7 September 2006, in the section on human rights and, specifically, item 66, the European Parliament stated that it 'strongly condemns the detention and torture of Falun Gong practitioners in prisons, "Re-education through Labour" camps, psychiatric hospitals and "legal education schools"; is concerned about reports that organs of detained Falun Gong practitioners have been removed and sold to hospitals; urges the Chinese Government to end the detention and torture of Falun Gong practitioners and to free them immediately';

What will the Vice-President/High Representative do to ensure that these practices are immediately ended once and for all?

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

1. The HR/VP shares the Honourable Member's concern regarding organ harvesting from prisoners of conscience in Re-Education through Labour camps in China, as well as regarding the pressure and severe restrictions imposed by the Chinese authorities upon Falun Gong practitioners.

2. In its contacts with the Chinese authorities, the EU will continue to raise the issue of the organ harvesting, in particular with regard to prisoners of consience, including Falun Gong practitioners.

3. The regulation adopted by China on human organ transplants, which came into effect on 1st July 2006, requires the written agreement of the donor. However, the regulation does not adequately address the issue of donor consent. The EU also remains concerned with the secrecy surrounding organ transplant statistics, which makes it impossible to gain an accurate picture of the source of transplanted organs, and at allegations that many organs are harvested from prisoners in Re-Education through Labour camps. The EU continues to encourage any efforts by China to promote voluntary organ donation.

4. The EU believes that the EU-China human rights dialogue constitutes an important channel for discussion of human rights issues in China. The EU has already addressed the issue of organ harvesting in the framework of past rounds of the EU-China Human Rights Dialogue and will continue to do so, together with individual cases of persecution of individual Falun Gong practitioners.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001009/13
an die Kommission
Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE)
(31. Januar 2013)

Betrifft: Fördermittel Museum „Zum Eisernen Tor“ in Drobeta Turnu Severin (Rumänien)

Das Museum „Zum Eisernen Tor“ in Drobeta Turnu Severin (Rumänien) soll aus dem Kohäsionsfonds der EU bereits am 23.12.2009 die Zusage auf Fördermittel zum Wiederaufbau erhalten haben. 2012 sollte das Projekt fertig gestellt sein. Es umfasste die Sanierung und Renovierung des Museums und der Ausgrabungsstätten. Im August 2012 war der Zustand des Projekts weit entfernt von der Fertigstellung; das Museum war der Öffentlichkeit nicht mehr zugänglich.

1. Ist der Kommission dieses Projekt bekannt?

2. Nach welchen Kriterien erfolgte die Vergabe der Fördermittel? Wie hoch war der zugesagte Betrag?

3. In welchem Umfang wurden die bereitgestellten Mittel schon vergeben? Wurde die Kofinanzierung geleistet?

4. Wer trägt vor Ort die Verantwortung für die Durchführung des Projekts?

5. Welche Firmen haben Fördergelder erhalten?

6. Wie ist die Verzögerung zu erklären?

7. Wie beurteilt die Kommission den aktuellen Stand des Museumsprojekts vor Ort? Wenn er nicht zufriedenstellend ist: Warum hat die Kommission in das Verfahren nicht eingegriffen bzw. wird die Kommission den ordnungsgemäßen Abschluss des Projekts einfordern?

8. Wann rechnet die Kommission mit der Fertigstellung des Projekts?

Antwort von Herrn Hahn im Namen der Kommission
(27. März 2013)

1. Ja, die rumänischen Behörden haben bestätigt, dass dieses Projekt aus dem Europäischen Fonds für regionale Entwicklung (EFRE) im Programmplanungszeitraum 2007-2013 gefördert wird.

2. Die Kriterien für die Vergabe der Fördermittel sind der Beitrag zur regionalen Entwicklungsstrategie, der Mehrwert in Verbindung mit anderen Investitionen, die Qualität und Nachhaltigkeit der geplanten Investitionen sowie die Erfahrung und Sachkenntnis des Begünstigten bei der Projektumsetzung. Die bereitgestellten Mittel belaufen sich auf 42 Mio. Lei, einschließlich 36 Mio. Lei vom EFRE.

3. Dem Begünstigten wurden 19,5 Mio. Lei zugewiesen. Kofinanzierungsmittel in Höhe von 0,25 Mio. Lei wurden bereits ausgezahlt.

4.-5. Kein Unternehmen hat für dieses Projekt finanzielle Unterstützung erhalten. Die Fördergelder gehen an den Kreisrat Mehedinti als zuständige Stelle und Begünstigten.

6. Das Projekt umfasst den Bau neuer Gebäude, die Sanierung des alten Museumsgebäudes und archäologische Arbeiten. Letztere sind wetterabhängig, und unerwartete Probleme mit der Gebäudestruktur führten zu Arbeitsverzögerungen. Mit dem Bau der neuen Gebäude konnte nicht begonnen werden, da eine neue archäologische Fundstätte entdeckt worden war. Der neue Standort dieser Gebäude musste zunächst vom Kulturministerium genehmigt und der technische Entwurf musste überarbeitet werden. Derzeit läuft eine neue Ausschreibung für die Arbeiten. Beim Bau einer Fußgängerbrücke über die Eisenbahn traten technische Probleme auf, und die Genehmigung durch das Eisenbahnunternehmen wurde verspätet erteilt.

7. Die Kommission hat einer Verlängerung der Durchführungsfrist zugestimmt. Die rumänischen Behörden überwachen den Stand des Projekts anhand von Fortschrittsberichten und Vor-Ort-Besichtigungen. Der Begünstigte wurde aufgefordert, die Arbeiten zu beschleunigen. Nach Ansicht der Kommission lag das Hauptproblem (die neue archäologische Fundstätte) außerhalb des Einflussbereichs des Begünstigten.

8. Das Projekt sollte bis Ende 2014 abgeschlossen sein.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001009/13
to the Commission
Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Support for the Iron Gates Museum in Drobeta-Turnu Severin (Romania)

The Iron Gates Museum in Drobeta-Turnu Severin (Romania) supposedly received a commitment as long ago as 23 December 2009 promising support from the EU Cohesion Fund for its reconstruction. The project should have been completed in 2012. It included the restoration and renovation of the museum and the excavation sites. In August 2012, the project was a long way from completion and the museum was no longer open to the public.

1. Is the Commission aware of this project?

2. What are the criteria for granting this financial support? What amount was promised?

3. To what extent have the funds made available already been handed over? Was co-financing achieved?

4. Who is responsible locally for the implementation of the project?

5. Which companies have received financial assistance?

6. What is the explanation for the delay?

7. What is the Commission's assessment of the current status of the museum project at the site? If it is not satisfactory, why has the Commission not intervened in this process, and will it demand the successful completion of the project?

8. When does the Commission expect the project to be completed?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2013)

1. Yes. The Romanian authorities confirmed that this project receives support from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) under the 2007-2013 programme.

2. The criteria for selection are the contribution to the regional development strategy, added value through correlation with other investments, quality and sustainability of proposed investments, the beneficiary's experience and expertise in project implementation. The grant amounts to 42 million Lei, including 36 million Lei from the ERDF

3. The beneficiary has received 19.5 million Lei, Co-financing already paid to the beneficiary is 0.25 million Lei

4.-5. No company has received support for this project, as the responsible body and beneficiary is the Mehedinti County Council.

6. The project includes new buildings, the rehabilitation of the old museum building and archaeological works. The latter are weather dependent and unforeseen problems with the building structure delayed the work. The construction of the new buildings could not start because a new archaeological site was discovered. A new location for these buildings needed approval from the Ministry of Culture and the technical design had to be redone. A new tender procedure for the works is in progress. Work on a pedestrian bridge over the railway met technical problems and agreement from the railway company was delayed.

7. The Commission approved an extension of the implementation time. The Romanian authorities monitor the situation based on progress reports and site visit reports. The beneficiary has been urged to speed up the work. The Commission considers that the main problem encountered (the new archaeological site) was beyond the beneficiary's control.

8. The project should be completed by the end of 2014.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001010/13
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(31 januari 2013)

Betreft: Misleidende informatie van de Commissie

De Financial Times heeft bericht dat de grootste economieën in de eurozone volgens een gedetailleerd voorstel van de Commissie van plan zijn een belasting op financiële transacties te heffen. In het herziene en verstevigde ontwerpverslag staan de precieze voorwaarden van de belasting op financiële transacties (FTT) vastgelegd voor transacties in aandelen, obligaties en derivatieven en de toepassing daarvan op transacties op grond van de plaats waar het financiële product was uitgegeven, zelfs als de handelende partijen zich in Azië, de VS of het VK bevinden ([1]).

In haar vorige schriftelijke antwoord (E-009821/2012) heeft de Commissie verklaard dat de effectbeoordeling over deze kwestie heeft uitgewezen dat er geen gevolgen zouden zijn voor lidstaten die niet deelnemen aan de intensievere samenwerking.

1. Bestaat dit voorstel? Zo ja, kan de Commissie dat ter beschikking stellen?

2. Kan de Commissie uitleggen en aan de hand van een effectbeoordeling bewijzen wat er is veranderd sinds haar eerste beoordeling? Blijft de Commissie erbij dat de invoering van een FTT in het kader van intensievere samenwerking geen gevolgen zal hebben voor de andere lidstaten?

3. Volgens deze bron heeft de Commissie een voorkeur voor de plaats waar een economische activiteit ontplooid zou moeten worden, op grond van belastingprincipes. Staat het de Commissie uit hoofde van de Verdragen vrij dergelijke voorkeuren te hebben, die niet verenigbaar zijn met de regels van de interne markt?

4. Hoe zal de Commissie het beginsel van rechtszekerheid naleven als ze zulke belangrijke maatregelen voorstelt binnen zo'n kort tijdsbestek, zonder overleg en zonder dat het publiek ervan op de hoogte is?

5. Voldoet de intensievere samenwerking voor de belasting op financiële transacties nog steeds aan artikelen 326 en 327 VWEU, waarin onder andere staat dat intensievere samenwerking de bevoegdheden, rechten en plichten van de lidstaten die daar niet aan meedoen in acht moet nemen?

Antwoord van de heer Šemeta namens de Commissie
(22 maart 2013)

1. De Commissie vestigt de aandacht van het geachte Parlementslid op haar voorstel tot uitvoering van de nauwere samenwerking op het gebied van belasting op financiële transacties (FTT) in de EU (COM(2013) 71), dat is gebaseerd op het oorspronkelijke voorstel van de Commissie uit 2011 (COM(2011) 594) Dit voorstel over de inhoud van de nauwere samenwerking is gemachtigd bij Besluit 2013/52/EU van de Raad, dat op 22 januari 2013 is vastgesteld na goedkeuring door het Europees Parlement.

2. De Commissie heeft voor haar oorspronkelijke FTT-voorstel een volwaardige effectbeoordeling uitgevoerd. Deze effectbeoordeling behoudt grotendeels haar geldigheid voor nauwere samenwerking op basis van het huidige voorstel. Er is een aanvullende analyse uitgevoerd met het oog op de invoering van een FTT in het kader van een nauwere samenwerking. De resultaten van deze analyse zijn bekendgemaakt in het werkdocument van de diensten van de Commissie dat een analyse van de beleidsopties en effecten bevat (WDC(2013) 28).

3. Het voorstel van de Commissie is gebaseerd op algemeen aanvaarde beginselen van internationaal belastingrecht. Het is volledig in overeenstemming met de eengemaakte markt en beoogt een betere werking daarvan. De door de Commissie voorgestelde regels discrimineren op geen enkele wijze tussen deelnemende en niet-deelnemende lidstaten.

4-5. De Commissie is van mening dat een nauwere samenwerking op het gebied van FTT in overeenstemming is met alle eisen van het Verdrag. De samenwerking versterkt met name het integratieproces van de Unie en berokkent geen schade aan de werking van de eengemaakte markt, maar draagt integendeel bij tot een betere werking ervan. Bovendien worden de bevoegdheden, rechten en verplichtingen van niet-deelnemende lidstaten erdoor geëerbiedigd. De Raad heeft deze zienswijze bevestigd in zijn bovengenoemd besluit van 22 januari 2013.

([1]) http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/e82a3792-6a2a-11e2-a3db-00144feab49a.html#axzz2JSSVk2gJ.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001010/13
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Misleading information from the Commission

The *Financial Times* has reported that the eurozone's biggest economies intend, according to a detailed Commission proposal, to raise a levy on financial transactions. The revised and strengthened draft report sets out the exact terms of the financial transaction tax (FTT) on equity, bond and derivative transactions and its application to transactions according to where the financial product was issued, even if the parties trading it are in Asia, the US or the UK ([1]).

In its previous written answer (E-009821/2012), the Commission stated that the impact assessment undertaken by it on this matter showed that there would be no effect on Member States not participating in the enhanced cooperation.

1. Does this proposal exist? If yes, could the Commission make it available?

2. Could the Commission explain, and prove by means of an impact assessment, what has changed since its original assessment? Does the Commission still maintain that introducing the FTT under enhanced cooperation would have no impact on the other Member States?

3. According to this source, the Commission has a preference concerning where an economic activity should take place, based on tax principles. Do the Treaties empower the Commission to have this kind of preference, which is not compatible with the rules of the internal market?

4. How will the Commission fulfil the principle of legal certainty if it proposes measures of such importance within such a short period, with no consultation and without the knowledge of the public?

5. Does the enhanced cooperation on the financial transaction tax still comply with Articles 326 and 327 TFEU, which state, *inter alia*, that enhanced cooperation shall respect the competences, rights and obligations of those Member States which do not participate in it?

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

1. The Commission would like to draw the Honourable Member's attention to its proposal for implementing enhanced cooperation in the area of financial transaction tax (FTT) in the EU [COM(2013) 71], which is based on the initial Commission proposal of 2011 [COM(2011) 594]. This is the proposal on the substance of enhanced cooperation authorised by Council Decision 2013/52/EU, adopted on 22 January 2013, following the consent of the European Parliament.

2. The Commission has carried out a fully-fledged impact assessment for its initial FTT proposal which still remains largely valid in case of enhanced cooperation on the basis of this proposal. Additional analysis has been undertaken in view of the FTT implementation under enhanced cooperation. The results of this analysis are published in the Commission's Staff Working Document containing its analysis of policy options and impacts [SWD(2013) 28].

3. The Commission proposal is based on accepted principles of international tax law and in full compliance with the internal market, whose functioning it is intended to improve. The rules proposed by the Commission do not in any way discriminate between non-participating and participating Member States.

4-5. The Commission is of the view that enhanced cooperation in the area of FTT complies with all Treaty requirements. In particular, it reinforces the Union's integration process and does not undermine, but rather improves the functioning of the Single Market, and it also respects the competences, rights and obligations of non-participating Member States. The Council has confirmed this view in its abovementioned decision of 22 January 2013.

([1]) http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/e82a3792-6a2a-11e2-a3db-00144feab49a.html#axzz2JSSVk2gJ.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001011/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: EU PEACE IV programme

The EU PEACE programmes have brought immeasurable benefit to Northern Ireland in recent years. Since the start of the first programme in 1995, the EU has funded projects aimed at developing a positive image of Northern Ireland following years of terrorist violence. The EU has since funded two further PEACE programmes, with current funding finishing in 2013.

Could the Commission confirm whether there are plans for a further funding programme (PEACE IV) for 2014 and beyond?

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

The conclusions of the European Council of 7-8 February 2013 regarding the Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-2020 (MFF) state that 'EUR 150 million will be allocated for the PEACE programme'. The Commission therefore considers that there will be a future PEACE programme for Northern Ireland and the border regions of Ireland, provided that the European Parliament gives its consent to the proposed funding under the provisions of the MFF.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001012/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Construction products

Regulation (EU) No 305/2011 lays down harmonised conditions for the marketing of construction products. Annex I outlines the 'Basic Requirements for Construction Works', which are to form the basis for the preparation of harmonised technical specifications for each product. Article 4(1) affirms that a Declaration of Performance should be drawn up by the manufacturer for each product. Article 8(2) states that a CE mark should be affixed to those construction products for which manufacturers draw up a Declaration of Performance.

1. Can the Commission kindly provide clarity as to whether the CE marking of construction products covered by Regulation (EU) No 305/2011 requires compliance with the seven Basic Requirements outlined in Annex I, and in particular with its Section 3 (hygiene, health and the environment)?

2. Furthermore, have the implementation and enforcement of the environmental requirements for construction products, as outlined in Annex I to the new regulation, been delayed until 2018? If so, what is the rationale for this?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2013)

For construction products, the CE marking should be compliant with the requirements set out in, or based on, the Construction Products Regulation (EU) No 305/2011 (the CPR). The basic requirements for construction works, as outlined in Annex I to the CPR, do not create any obligations for Member States or economic operators. However, manufacturers have to follow the provisions of the CPR when declaring the performance of their products.

Annex I to the CPR contains a list of basic requirements for construction works which encompasses requirements regarding (1) mechanical resistance and stability, (2) safety in case of fire, hygiene, (3) health and environment, (4) safety and accessibility in use, (5) protection against noise, (6) energy economy and heat retention, as well as (7) sustainable use of natural resources. However, it does not lay down environmental requirements for the performance of construction products.

The implementation and enforcement of the CPR will not be delayed. It will become fully applicable on 1 July 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001013/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Human trafficking

What measures is the European External Action Service taking to ensure that the slave trade is eradicated at both the global and the European level?

The issue of human trafficking is a major problem globally. Statistics show that an estimated 27 million men, women and children are living in forced bondage, which means that there are more slaves than at any other time in human history. According to numerous anti-trafficking websites, 600 000-800 000 men, women and children are trafficked into Europe annually, with the majority being forced into the sex trade.

It is universally acknowledged that poverty and vulnerability are the two key factors which lead to such exploitation.

1. What steps have been taken by the Commission to ensure a multidisciplinary approach to tackling this global problem?

2. What level of budget has been allocated in the 2014-2020 multiannual financial framework?

3. What level of cooperation exists between the EU, governments and NGOs?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(12 April 2013)

Preventing and combating trafficking in human beings has been a priority for the European Union and its Member States for several years.

1. In 2009, the Justice and Home Affairs Council adopted in 2009 the 'Action Oriented Paper on strengthening the external dimension on actions against trafficking in human beings', providing for a strategic approach in addressing the different aspects, including the multidisciplinary approach of the EU in its cooperation with third countries and regions. The Commission has dedicated efforts to implementing the Action Oriented Paper as it has been included in the EU Strategy towards the Eradication of Trafficking in Human Beings 2012-2016

2. There is no specific budget for actions related to trafficking in human beings in the next MFF 2014-2020. The Commission has proposed to allocate 1.048 million euro to the Internal Security Fund Police cooperation and trafficking in human beings is foreseen to continue to be addressed in relevant funding instruments, including under the DCI and EIDHR external funding instruments. The modalities of its implementation are still under discussions.

3. The Commission has funded many different projects on addressing trafficking in human beings within the EU and with third countries and regions. The projects address the diverse aspects of trafficking in human beings and include a multiplicity of relevant actors. Many of the projects include cooperation with civil society organisations. All projects can be found on the dedicated EU Anti-Trafficking Website, weblink http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001014/13
aan de Commissie
Philip Claeys (NI)
(31 januari 2013)

Betreft: Censuur in Turkije, lijst van verboden boeken en tijdschriften

Enkele weken geleden werden 453 boeken en 645 tijdschriften die op de censuurlijst in Turkije stonden, van deze lijst gehaald.

Er blijft echter nog altijd een lijst van gecensureerde publicaties bestaan in Turkije. Deze lijst wordt zelfs nog regelmatig aangevuld. Zo wordt momenteel overwogen om „Of mice and men" van John Steinbeck op de censuurlijst te plaatsen.

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van deze lijst?

2. Werd de Turkse regering hierover al benaderd door de Commissie? Zo ja, wat waren de conclusies?

3. Acht de Commissie deze openlijke en brutale vorm van censuur in overeenstemming met de criteria van Kopenhagen?

4. Is het normaal dat een dergelijke lijst nog bestaat, zeven jaar na het opstarten van de toetredingsonderhandelingen met Turkije? Wordt er een deadline gesteld om de lijst af te schaffen? Zo neen, welke gevolgen heeft het handhaven van de censuurlijst voor het verdere verloop van de onderhandelingen?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(5 april 2013)

De Commissie is ervan op de hoogte dat duizenden titels die de afgelopen decennia op de Turkse lijst met verboden boeken stonden, van de lijst zijn gehaald overeenkomstig een bepaling in het derde justitiële hervormingspakket dat in juli 2012 is goedgekeurd. Daarin wordt bepaald dat elke beslissing die vóór 2012 is genomen om de verkoop en verspreiding van gepubliceerde werken te belemmeren, nietig wordt verklaard indien het verbod niet binnen zes maanden door een rechtbank wordt bevestigd. Door het hervormingspakket zijn ook juridische bepalingen ingetrokken die onredelijke publicatieverboden mogelijk maakten. De volledige impact van deze maatregelen moet nog worden geëvalueerd.

De Commissie bespreekt deze kwestie tijdens haar contacten met de Turkse autoriteiten en zal in haar voortgangsverslag 2013 over Turkije, dat in oktober 2013 wordt voorgesteld, verslag uitbrengen over de uitvoering van het derde justitiële hervormingspakket.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001014/13
to the Commission
Philip Claeys (NI)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Censorship in Turkey, list of forbidden books and magazines

A few weeks ago, 453 books and 645 magazines that were on the censure list in Turkey were removed from this list.

However, there is still a list of censored publications in Turkey. This list is even supplemented regularly. Those responsible are currently considering placing *Of Mice and Men* by John Steinbeck on the censure list.

1. Is the Commission aware of this list?

2. Has it already approached the Turkish Government? If so, what were the conclusions?

3. Does it believe that this outright and brutal form of censorship complies with the Copenhagen criteria?

4. Is it normal that such a list still exists, seven years after starting the accession negotiations with Turkey? Is there a deadline to abolish the list? If not, what consequences will maintaining the censure list have on the further progress of the negotiations?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(5 April 2013)

The Commission is aware that the ban on thousands of titles banned by Turkey over past decades has been lifted in accordance with a provision of the third Judicial Reform Package adopted in July 2012. The latter stipulates that any decision taken before 2012 to block the sale and distribution of published works would be void in the absence of a confirmation by a Court of the ban within six months. It also repealed legal provisions allowing for excessive publication bans. The impact of these measures is still to be fully assessed.

The Commission addresses the issue in its contacts with the Turkish authorities and will report on the implementation of the third Judicial Reform Package in its 2013 Progress Report on Turkey, which will be presented in October 2013.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001015/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(31 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Πρόσφατες δηλώσεις εκπροσώπων του ΔΝΤ για υιοθέτηση λανθασμένων πολιτικών στην προσπάθεια αντιμετώπισης της κρίσης

Σύμφωνα με πρόσφατες δηλώσεις στελεχών του ΔΝΤ, καθώς και δημοσιευμένη σχετική μελέτη που έγινε από το Ταμείο, σε μια σύντομη αποτίμηση και αξιολόγηση των πολιτικών που υιοθετήθηκαν και υποδείχτηκαν στα κράτη μέλη που βρίσκονται υπό καθεστώς μνημονίου, φαίνεται να αναγνωρίζεται ότι υπήρξαν λάθη και μάλιστα γίνεται αναφορά στο ζήτημα των πολλαπλασιαστών.

Σε αυτό το πλαίσιο και δεδομένου ότι οι πολιτικές που ακολουθήθηκαν στην Ελλάδα, επί της ουσίας, επέτειναν την ύφεση αφενός με δραματικές συνέπειες για την πραγματική οικονομία, την ανάπτυξη και την απασχόληση και αφετέρου με περιορισμένη αποτελεσματικότητα και αποδοτικότητα, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή ως μέλος της Τρόικα:

— Πώς σχολιάζει τη θέση που εκφράζει το ΔΝΤ; Συμμερίζεται τις απόψεις αυτές;

— Κατά το σχεδιασμό και τη διαπραγμάτευση των δημοσιονομικών προγραμμάτων-μνημονίων στην Ελλάδα, είχε εκφράσει το ΔΝΤ τη διαφοροποίησή του ή η αλλαγή στάσης είναι μεταγενέστερη;

— Πώς σχολιάζει και κατά πόσο συμμερίζεται τα πρόσφατα συμπεράσματα της έκθεσης του αμερικανικού ανεξάρτητου Κέντρου Οικονομικών και Πολιτικών Ερευνών (CEPR) που υποστηρίζει ότι η πολιτική και οικονομική ατζέντα του ΔΝΤ ήταν επιζήμια για τις ευρωπαϊκές κοινωνίες και τις οικονομίες τους, πυροδοτώντας τη δεύτερη ύφεση της Ευρωζώνης τα τελευταία τρία χρόνια και εκτοξεύοντας την ανεργία σε επίπεδα ρεκόρ;

— Θα μπορούσε η διαφορετική αυτή οπτική να αποτελέσει εφαλτήριο για επανεξέταση των προγραμμάτων ή επανακαθορισμό των πολλαπλασιαστών;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(16 Απριλίου 2013)

Η αξιοπιστία των πρόσφατων μελετών σχετικά με τον δημοσιονομικό πολλαπλασιαστή είναι περιορισμένη λόγω του βραχυπρόθεσμου ορίζοντά τους και άλλων παραγόντων που ενδεχομένως επηρέασαν την ανάπτυξη συγκριτικά με τα αναμενόμενα αποτελέσματα. Περιλαμβάνουν τις επιπτώσεις στο κλίμα εμπιστοσύνης οι οποίες διαφαίνονται τώρα και από τις οποίες επωφελούνται οι ευάλωτες χώρες. Αν ληφθεί υπόψη η απώλεια της εμπιστοσύνης εκ μέρους των επενδυτών, όπως εκφράζεται από τα αυξανόμενα επιτόκια των κρατικών ομολόγων, προκύπτει ([1]) ότι τα στοιχεία δεν είναι ασύμβατα με ένα μέσο πολλαπλασιαστή κατώτερο της μονάδας, όπως χρησιμοποιείται στην περίπτωση των κοινών μακροοικονομικών μοντέλων.

Οι πρόσφατες μελέτες είναι ιδιαίτερα περιορισμένης χρησιμότητας στην περίπτωση της Ελλάδας, άποψη η οποία εκφράστηκε σε άρθρο που δημοσιεύθηκε στον ελληνικό Τύπο από τον επικεφαλής οικονομολόγο του ΔΝΤ ([2]).

Το 2009 το δημοσιονομικό έλλειμμα ανήλθε στο 15,6% του ΑΕΠ και οι αγορές δεν ήταν πλέον πρόθυμες να χρηματοδοτήσουν το υψηλό χρέος της Ελλάδος. Το γεγονός αυτό οδήγησε στη δρομολόγηση του προγράμματος χρηματοδοτικής συνδρομής την άνοιξη του 2010. Ωστόσο, η αβεβαιότητα και τα προβλήματα υλοποίησης συνεχίστηκαν κατά τα πρώτα έτη του προγράμματος. Από το περασμένο καλοκαίρι, ελήφθησαν αποφασιστικά μέτρα με αποτέλεσμα το ελληνικό πρόγραμμα να επανέλθει σε ορθή τροχιά. Η συμφωνία που επιτεύχθηκε τον προηγούμενο Δεκέμβριο στο πλαίσιο της Ευρωομάδας απομάκρυνε την επιζήμια αβεβαιότητα που επικρατούσε στην Ελλάδα για μεγάλο χρονικό διάστημα και σηματοδότησε την επιστροφή του κλίματος εμπιστοσύνης. Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, οι εταίροι της ζώνης του ευρώ συμφώνησαν να παρατείνουν κατά δύο έτη τη χρονική περίοδο δημοσιονομικής προσαρμογής.

Εναπόκειται πλέον στις ελληνικές αρχές να διασφαλίσουν με την αποφασιστική εφαρμογή του προγράμματος μεταρρυθμίσεων ότι η εμπιστοσύνη αυτή θα συνεχίσει να αυξάνεται.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2012/pdf/ee-2012-7_en.pdf, σ. 41, Box 1,5.

([2]) Ο επικεφαλής οικονομολόγος του ΔΝΤ δήλωσε ότι το να συνδέσει κανείς τις ανεπαρκείς επιδόσεις της Ελλάδας με τον σχεδιασμό του προγράμματος «αντιπροσωπεύει μια θεμελιωδώς εσφαλμένη ερμηνεία του ιστορικού αρχείου και της έρευνας του ΔΝΤ σχετικά με τους πολλαπλασιαστές. Τα προβλήματα που αντιμετωπίζει η Ελλάδα οφείλονται σε υπερβολές του παρελθόντος. Όσον αφορά το δημοσιονομικό πολλαπλασιαστή, είναι μία μόνο από τις πολλές πιθανές επιδράσεις στα οικονομικά αποτελέσματα, και στην περίπτωση της Ελλάδας, ο αντίκτυπός του ήταν ελάχιστος σε σχέση με άλλους απρόβλεπτους παράγοντες».

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001015/13
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Recent statements by IMF representatives regarding erroneous response to crisis

IMF officials have recently been forced to concede that mistakes have been made, particularly in connection with fiscal multipliers, as confirmed by an IMF summary report outlining and assessing the policies adopted and measures recommended in the Member States to which the Memorandum applies.

On the one hand, the policies adopted in Greece have actually aggravated the recession, with disastrous consequences for the real economy, growth and employment, and, on the other, they have not proved particularly fruitful or effective.

In view of this:

— What view is taken by the Commission, as a member of the Troika, of the IMF's pronouncements? Does it concur?

— Did the IMF express any reservations when the financial measures for Greece were being drawn up and negotiated under the Memorandum, or did its change of heart occur after the event?

— What view does it take of the recent conclusions of the report by the independent American Centre for Economic and Policy Research (CEPR) expressing the view that the IMF's economic policy agenda has been harmful to European countries in both social and economic terms, sparking off the second recession in the euro area over the last three years and driving unemployment figures up to record levels? Does the Commission agree with these conclusions?

— Could this new perspective lead to a re-examination of the strategies adopted and a reassessment of the fiscal multipliers?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(16 April 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 p. 41, 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'.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001016/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(31 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Υποστήριξη παιδιών και ευάλωτων ομάδων με την ευρωπαϊκή συνδρομή

Σε συνέχεια της απάντησης της Επιτροπής στην ερώτηση E-001262/2012 με θέμα «Αναγκαία η άμεση και αποτελεσματική αντιμετώπιση του φαινομένου υποσιτισμού μαθητών σε ελληνικά σχολεία, με την ευρωπαϊκή συνδρομή», ερωτάται:

— Ποιο το ύψος της οικονομικής υποστήριξης που έχει διοχετευθεί στην Ελλάδα από την ΕΕ σε δράσεις που στοχεύουν στη βελτίωση της κατάστασης των παιδιών για το 2011 και το 2012 (π.χ. μέσω του Ευρωπαϊκού Ταμείου Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης και του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινωνικού Ταμείου);

— Όσον αφορά τη στέρηση τροφίμων και το πρόγραμμα «Τρόφιμα υπέρ των πλέον απόρων» (που αποσκοπεί στη διανομή τροφίμων στους πλέον απόρους πολίτες της ΕΕ) ποιο το ύψος των κονδυλίων που τελικά διατέθηκαν στην Ελλάδα στο πλαίσιο του ετήσιου προγράμματος για το 2012;

— Παρουσιάστηκαν οι συστάσεις της Επιτροπής προς τα κράτη μέλη για το 2012 σχετικά με την παιδική φτώχεια, όπως είχε προγραμματιστεί;

— Σε ποιο στάδιο βρίσκεται η προώθηση και βελτίωση των ορθά τεκμηριωμένων πολιτικών όσον αφορά την κατάσταση των ευάλωτων παιδιών, μεταξύ άλλων με την κοινωνική ανοικτή μέθοδο συντονισμού (και το πρόγραμμα της ανασκόπησης από ομότιμους) και με την ευρωπαϊκή συμμαχία για τις οικογένειες;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(2 Απριλίου 2013)

Το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης (ΕΤΠΑ) μπορεί να υποστηρίξει υποδομές παιδικής φροντίδας. Για την Ελλάδα, τα επιλεγέντα σχέδια στον εν λόγω τομέα διαθέτουν προϋπολογισμό που ανέρχεται σε 144 εκατ. ευρώ περίπου. Το 2012, η Ελλάδα έλαβε επιχορήγηση μεγαλύτερη από 21,6 εκατ. ευρώ για τη διανομή τροφίμων στους πλέον απόρους στην Ένωση ([1]).

Το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο (ΕΚΤ) δεν καλύπτει τον υποσιτισμό. Το ΕΚΤ στην Ελλάδα με συνολικό προϋπολογισμό 4,4 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ περίπου αποσκοπεί, μεταξύ άλλων, στην αντιμετώπιση της φτώχειας και του κοινωνικού αποκλεισμού με τη διευκόλυνση της πρόσβασης στην απασχόληση και με την καταπολέμηση της ανεργίας. Για τον σκοπό αυτό, η Επιτροπή παρέχει υποστήριξη σε παιδιά από ευάλωτες ομάδες είτε απευθείας στον τομέα της εκπαίδευσης είτε έμμεσα μέσω μέτρων υποστήριξης της φροντίδας των παιδιών ώστε να προαχθεί η απασχόληση των γονέων τους. Για περισσότερες πληροφορίες σχετικά με τον προϋπολογισμό που διατίθεται για τα μέτρα αυτά, ο κ. βουλευτής καλείται να επικοινωνήσει με την υπηρεσία συντονισμού και παρακολούθησης των δράσεων του ΕΚΤ ([2]).

Η σύσταση «Επένδυση στα παιδιά — Σπάζοντας τον κύκλο της μειονεξίας ([3])» εγκρίθηκε από την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή στις 20 Φεβρουαρίου 2013, ως μέρος της δέσμης κοινωνικών επενδύσεων ([4]) και υποβλήθηκε στην επιτροπή απασχόλησης και κοινωνικών υποθέσεων του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου την ίδια ημέρα.

Η παιδική φτώχεια βρισκόταν στο επίκεντρο ορισμένων δραστηριοτήτων αμοιβαίας μάθησης που έλαβαν χώρα το 2012. Αυτές περιλάμβαναν τη διοργάνωση δύο αξιολογήσεων από ομοτίμους (στο Βέλγιο τον Σεπτέμβριο και στη Νορβηγία τον Νοέμβριο ([5])) και την ετήσια έκθεση της επιτροπής κοινωνικής προστασίας (πρόκειται να δημοσιευτεί σύντομα στην ιστοσελίδα της εν λόγω επιτροπής). Μεταξύ άλλων, η Ευρωπαϊκή Συμμαχία για τις Οικογένειες δημοσίευσε ενημέρωση πολιτικής σχετικά με την υποστήριξη των γονέων.

([1]) Εκτελεστικός κανονισμός (ΕΕ) αριθ. 208/2012 της Επιτροπής, ΕΕ L 72 της 10.3.2012.
([2]) http://www.esfhellas.gr/english/categoryDetails.aspx?iden=49
([3]) C(2013)778 τελικό.
([4]) COM(2013)83 τελικό.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1024&intPageId=1860&langId=en&preview=cHJldmlld0VtcGxQb3J0YWwhMjAxMjAyMTU=

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001016/13
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: EU assistance for children and vulnerable sections of society

Further to the Commission's answer to Question No 001262/2012 on the need for immediate and effective measures and EU assistance in response to malnutrition among Greek pupils:

— Can the Commission indicate the amount of aid channelled towards measures to improve the situation of children in Greece (e.g. through the European Regional Development Fund and the European Social Fund) in 2011 and 2012?

— What was the final level of funding for Greece under the annual programme for 2012 to combat food deprivation under the 'food for the needy' programme (which aims to distribute food products to the neediest citizens of the EU)?

— Were the Commission recommendations for 2012 regarding child poverty presented to the Member States as planned?

— What progress has been made in promoting and improving evidence-based policies to assist vulnerable children, including the social open method of coordination (and its peer review programme) and the European Alliance for Families?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2013)

The European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) can support childcare infrastructures. For Greece, the selected projects in this field amount to approximately EUR 144 million. In 2012, Greece has been allocated over EUR 21.6 million for the distribution of food to the most deprived people in the Union ([1]).

The European Social Fund (ESF) does not address malnutrition. The ESF in Greece with a total budget of approximately EUR 4.4 billion aims, amongst others, to tackle poverty and social exclusion by facilitating the access to employment and by combating unemployment. To this end, it provides support to children from vulnerable groups either directly in the field of education or indirectly through measures supporting childcare in order to promote the employment of their parents. For further information on the budget dedicated to these measures the Honourable Member is invited to contact the ESF Coordination and Monitoring Authority ([2]).

The recommendation 'Investing in Children — Breaking the Cycle of Disadvantage' ([3])was adopted by the European Commission on 20 February 2013 as part of the Social Investment Package ([4]) and presented to the Parliament's EMPL Committee on the same day.

Child poverty was central to a number of mutual learning activities that took place in 2012. These included the organisation of two peer reviews (in Belgium in September and Norway in November ([5])), the Social Protection Committee's Annual Report (to be soon published on the SPC's webpage). Among others things, the European Alliance for Families published a policy briefing on Parenting Support.

([1]) Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 208/2012, OJ L 72, 10.3.2012.
([2]) http://www.esfhellas.gr/english/categoryDetails.aspx?iden=49
([3]) C(2013) 778 final.
([4]) COM(2013) 83 final.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1024&intPageId=1860&langId=en&preview=cHJldmlld0VtcGxQb3J0YWwhMjAxMjAyMTU=

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001017/13
alla Commissione
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(31 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Deroghe e proroghe all'applicazione dell'articolo 12 della Direttiva sui Servizi

La Direttiva 123 del 2006, nota come Direttiva Servizi nel mercato interno, prevede all'articolo 12 le modalità di selezione tra diversi candidati per assegnare le autorizzazioni per lo svolgimento di un'attività destinata ad occupare risorse naturali limitate.

La trasparenza dovrebbe sempre caratterizzare l'azione delle Istituzioni Europee ma, è stata fatta, purtroppo, una comunicazione poco chiara, in questi anni, in merito all'applicazione del Capo III della Direttiva sui Servizi.

1. È possibile sapere quante e quali richieste di proroga circa l'applicazione delle procedure di selezione previste dall'articolo 12 sono giunte alla Commissione? Da quali Stati membri e relativamente a quali settori produttivi o commerciali sono state richieste? Quali proroghe sono state, infine, concesse e con quale scadenza?

2. È possibile avere le medesime informazioni circa eventuali richieste di deroga pervenute?

3. È intenzione della Commissione pubblicare l'elenco dettagliato delle richieste di deroga e proroga pervenute (sia concesse che respinte) da parte degli Stati membri dell'Unione, in maniera da rendere accessibili a cittadini e imprese queste informazioni?

4. Ritiene la Commissione che la Direttiva Servizi potrà essere presto oggetto di una revisione destinata anche a risolvere, una volta per tutte, alcune delle problematiche ancora oggi aperte circa la sua applicazione negli Stati Membri?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(6 marzo 2013)

Alla Commissione non sono pervenute richieste relative alle procedure di selezione previste dall'articolo 12. Va sottolineato che gli Stati membri non sono tenuti a notificare tali procedure alla Commissione. La direttiva 123/2006/CE (direttiva Servizi) non prevede procedure per chiedere e/o concedere proroghe del termine relativo all'applicazione delle procedure di selezione di cui all'articolo 12, né procedure di deroga a tale termine.

Come la Commissione ha spiegato nella recente risposta all'interrogazione E-000407/2013, spetta agli Stati membri fissare opportunamente la durata delle autorizzazioni qualora il numero di tali autorizzazioni sia limitato per via della scarsità delle risorse naturali o delle capacità tecniche utilizzabili (articolo 12, paragrafo 1, della direttiva Servizi). Le suddette autorizzazioni, ai sensi dell'articolo 12, paragrafo 2, della direttiva, sono rilasciate per una durata limitata adeguata e non possono prevedere la procedura di rinnovo automatico. La durata dovrebbe essere tale da garantire l'ammortamento degli investimenti e una remunerazione equa.

Spetta altresì agli Stati membri fissare la procedura di rilascio delle autorizzazioni ai sensi degli articoli 9, 10 e dell'articolo 12, paragrafo 1, della direttiva.

Quanto ad un'eventuale revisione della direttiva Servizi, la Commissione ritiene che nell'immediato occorra soprattutto assicurare un'applicazione più ambiziosa e completa dello strumento vigente, al fine di liberarne pienamente le potenzialità.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001017/13
to the Commission
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Derogations from and extensions to the application of Article 12 of the Services Directive

Article 12 of Directive 2006/123/EC — known as the internal market Services Directive — lays down the procedure for selecting from among several candidates when granting authorisations for carrying out an activity which is liable to use up limited natural resources.

The actions of the EU institutions should always be transparent, but unfortunately, in recent years, communication with regard to the implementation of Chapter III of the Services Directive has been rather unclear.

1. Can the Commission say how many and what kind of requests for an extension of the period relating to the implementation of the selection procedures under Article 12 it has received? From which Member States and relating to which manufacturing or business sectors have such requests been received? What extensions were granted in the end, and with what deadline?

2. Can it provide the same information with regard to any requests for derogation that have been received?

3. Will the Commission publish a detailed list of all the requests for derogation and extension received (both those granted and those rejected) from EU Member States, so as to make this information accessible to citizens and businesses?

4. Does the Commission think that the Services Directive will shortly be able to be revised, in order to resolve, once and for all, some of the issues that are still pending with regard to its implementation in the Member States?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(6 March 2013)

The Commission has not received any requests in relation to Article 12 selection procedures. It should be underlined that there is no obligation on Member States to notify such procedures to the Commission. Directive 123/2006/EC (the Services Directive) does not set out procedures to request and/or grant extensions of the period relating to the implementation of the selection procedures under Article 12, nor procedures to grant derogations to that period.

As the Commission explained in its recent reply to Question E-000407/2013, it is for the Member States to set the appropriate duration of the authorisations when the number of these authorisations is limited because of the scarcity of available natural resources or technical capacity (Article 12(1) of the Services Directive). Those authorisations, according to Article 12(2) of the Services Directive shall be granted for an appropriate limited period and may not be open to automatic renewal. This period should be such as is necessary to enable the provider to recoup the cost of investment and to generate a fair return.

It is also for the Member States to determine the procedure for the grant of authorisations in accordance with Articles 9, 10 and 12(1) of the Services Directive.

Concerning a possible revision of the Services Directive, the Commission considers that the immediate priority is first to ensure a more ambitious and full implementation of the existing Services Directive with a view to releasing its untapped potential.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001018/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Toussas (GUE/NGL)
(31 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ποινικοποίηση της ριζοσπαστικοποίησης

Η ΕΕ και οι αστικές κυβερνήσεις στα κράτη μέλη της, αξιοποιώντας την καπιταλιστική κρίση, έχουν εξαπολύσει μία πρωτοφανή επίθεση ενάντια στη ζωή και τα δικαιώματα της εργατικής τάξης και των λαϊκών στρωμάτων. Εντείνουν τον αυταρχισμό και την καταστολή για το χτύπημα του εργατικού-λαϊκού κινήματος. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή διοργάνωσε στις 29.1.2013 «διάσκεψη υψηλού επιπέδου» του ονομαζόμενου «Δικτύου Ευαισθητοποίησης για τη Ριζοσπαστικοποίηση» (RAN), με τη συμμετοχή υπουργών και κυβερνητικών παραγόντων από τα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ, αξιωματούχων των κατασταλτικών μηχανισμών, «εμπειρογνωμόνων» και ΜΚΟ. Στα συμπεράσματά της η διάσκεψη αυτή ταυτίζει τη «ριζοσπαστικοποίηση» με την «τρομοκρατία». Επιστρατεύει την αντιδραστική θεωρία των άκρων για να συκοφαντήσει και να χτυπήσει τους εργατικούς αγώνες, την ταξική πάλη. Επιδιώκει τη συκοφάντηση κομμάτων και λαϊκών κινημάτων που αμφισβητούν το εκμεταλλευτικό καπιταλιστικό σύστημα. Δημιουργεί, εκσυγχρονίζει και κινητοποιεί δίκτυα «τυπικών» και «άτυπων» μηχανισμών, τους κατασταλτικούς αστυνομικοστρατιωτικούς μηχανισμούς, μυστικές υπηρεσίες, πολυπλόκαμα δίκτυα παρακολούθησης και φακελώματος. Η ΕΕ και οι αστικές κυβερνήσεις των κρατών μελών ποινικοποιούν ανοιχτά την ιδεολογία και συγκροτούν δίκτυα καταστολής που στοχοποιούν άμεσα το ταξικό συνδικαλιστικό κίνημα, ιδίως τα Κομμουνιστικά Κόμματα που αγωνίζονται ενάντια στο εκμεταλλευτικό σύστημα του καπιταλισμού, για ριζικές αλλαγές στο επίπεδο της εξουσίας και της οικονομίας. Άλλωστε είναι γνωστό ότι σε μια σειρά κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ, η κομμουνιστική ιδεολογία έχει ποινικοποιηθεί και τα ΚΚ βρίσκονται υπό διωγμό και απαγορεύσεις, ενώ επίσημη πολιτική της ΕΕ είναι ο αντικομμουνισμός, η συκοφάντηση του σοσιαλισμού και η ανιστόρητη εξίσωση του φασισμού με τον κομμουνισμό.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Ο στόχος της με την ίδρυση του παραπάνω «Δικτύου» και τις δράσεις που αναλαμβάνει είναι να προετοιμάσει ιδεολογικά και πολιτικά το έδαφος και το νομικό οπλοστάσιο της ΕΕ για διώξεις, απαγορεύσεις, καταστολή και ποινικοποίηση της ιδεολογίας των πολιτικών και κοινωνικών δυνάμεων που αμφισβητούν το καπιταλιστικό σύστημα;

Απάντηση της κ. Malmström εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(13 Μαρτίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή διαφωνεί με τις παραδοχές που περιέχονται στην ερώτηση που έθεσε το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου. Από πείρα είναι γνωστό ότι η τρομοκρατία δεν συνδέεται με ένα συγκεκριμένο θρήσκευμα ή πολιτική πεποίθηση, ή κάποια συγκεκριμένη περιοχή. Στόχος του Δικτύου Ευαισθητοποίησης για τη Ριζοσπαστικοποίηση (RAN) είναι να συμβάλει στην πρόληψη βίαιων πράξεων οι οποίες έχουν κοστίσει τη ζωή πάρα πολλών αθώων ανθρώπων, τόσο εντός όσο και εκτός της ΕΕ. Η Επιτροπή δεν είναι αρχή επιβολής του νόμου. Ο ρόλος της είναι να συνδράμει και να στηρίζει τις αρχές των κρατών μελών στις προσπάθειές τους πρόληψης της τρομοκρατίας και της εξτρεμιστικής βίας διευκολύνοντας την ανταλλαγή γνώσεων και εμπειριών σχετικά με μέτρα πρόληψης.

Όπως αναφέρεται στην απάντηση στη γραπτή ερώτηση E-8264/11 ([1]), η Επιτροπή δρομολόγησε το δίκτυο RAN σε συνεδρίαση που πραγματοποιήθηκε στις Βρυξέλλες στις 9 Σεπτεμβρίου 2011. Η συγκεκριμένη πρωτοβουλία εξαγγέλθηκε στην ανακοίνωση για τη στρατηγική εσωτερικής ασφάλειας (ISS) που εγκρίθηκε στις 22 Νοεμβρίου 2010 (COM(2010)673 τελικό), στην οποία η Επιτροπή υπογράμμισε την ανάγκη για παροχή σε κοινότητες των μέσων για την πρόληψη της ριζοσπαστικοποίησης και της στρατολόγησης ατόμων για ενέργειες τρομοκρατίας και εξτρεμιστικής βίας.

Το RAN στοχεύει να αποτελέσει μια κοινή πλατφόρμα σε επίπεδο ΕΕ για τους επαγγελματίες που δραστηριοποιούνται τοπικά στην αντιμετώπιση της εξτρεμιστικής βίας. Οκτώ ομάδες εργασίας έχουν συσταθεί ήδη στο πλαίσιο του RAN με διαφορετικά αντικείμενα όπως κοινοτική ή τοπική αστυνομία και θύματα της τρομοκρατίας. Ο γενικός στόχος είναι η διευκόλυνση της συνεργασίας με σκοπό την πρόληψη και η ανταλλαγή εμπειριών και πρακτικών μεταξύ των ομάδων που έχουν ενεργό ρόλο και βρίσκονται εγγύτερα στα πλέον ευάλωτα άτομα. Στοχεύει επομένως να συμβάλει στους στόχους που έχει θέσει η Επιτροπή στο πλαίσιο της στρατηγικής εσωτερικής ασφάλειας.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2011-008264&language=EN

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001018/13
to the Commission
Georgios Toussas (GUE/NGL)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Outlawing radical movements

The EU and the bourgeois governments of its Member States have seized on the capitalist crisis as an opportunity to unleash an unprecedented onslaught on the working class way of life and workers' rights through the increasingly high-handed repression of the movement representing them. On 29 January 2013, the Commission organised a 'high-level conference' on the 'Radicalisation Awareness Network' (RAM) attended by EU ministers and high-level government representatives, senior law enforcement officers, 'experts' and NGOs. In its conclusions it placed 'radicalisation' on the same footing as 'terrorism', invoking the reactionary 'theory of extremes' in a bid to undermine the working class struggle, downplay the class war and discredit political parties and worker movements opposed to capitalist exploitation. It is seeking to create, update and deploy intricate networks of 'official' and 'unofficial' surveillance, monitoring and other mechanisms, drawing on police, military and secret service resources. The EU and its Member State governments are openly seeking to criminalise the trade union movement and its doctrines, seeking in particular to net those communist parties wishing to end capitalist exploitation and introduce radical political and economic changes. It is no secret that, in a number of EU Member States, communist doctrine has been outlawed and communist parties are being targeted and banned in accordance with the official anticommunist line adopted by the EU, which is seeking to discredit socialism and place communism on an equal footing with fascism, something which has no basis in history.

In view of this:

In setting up the above 'network' and launching the above initiatives, is the Commission seeking to acquire in advance the theoretical, political and legal arsenal necessary for the persecution, outlawing, repression and criminalisation of anti-capitalist political and social ideology?

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

The Commission disagrees with the assumptions contained in the question asked by the Honourable Member. As experience has shown, terrorism cannot be linked to one faith or political persuasion, or any particular region. The aim of the EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN) is to bring a contribution to the prevention of violent actions that have cost the lives of too many innocent people, both inside and outside the EU. The Commission is not a law enforcement authority. Its role is to assist and support Member States' authorities in their efforts to prevent terrorism and violent extremism by facilitating the exchange of knowledge and experience of preventive measures.

As set out in the reply to Written Question E-8264/11 ([1]), the Commission launched the RAN in a meeting held in Brussels on 9 September 2011. This initiative was announced in the communication on the Internal Security Strategy (ISS) adopted on 22 November 2010 (COM(2010) 673 final), where the Commission highlighted the need to empower communities to prevent radicalisation and recruitment leading to terrorism or violent extremism,

The RAN aims to be an EU-wide umbrella platform for practitioners involved locally in countering violent extremism. Eight working groups have already been set up within the RAN on different topics such as community or local police and victims of terrorism. Its overall objective is to facilitate preventative cooperation, and to share experiences and practices amongst the groups of players closest to the most vulnerable individuals. It aims thereby to contribute to the goals set out by the Commission in the ISS.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2011-008264&language=EN

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001019/13
to the Commission
Daniel Hannan (ECR)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Albinos in Tanzania and elsewhere in Africa

Is the Commission aware of the problem albino children are facing in Tanzania and other parts of Africa?

Is there any support the Commission provides or is aiming to provide to projects like 'The Voice School Trust' that work to protect albino children in this region?

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

The Commission is aware of the problems that people affected by albinism face in Tanzania and has already addressed the issue.

It is true that the stigmatisation of persons with albinism continues to be a problem in Tanzania although the Tanzanian Government has stepped up efforts to curb it and the extra-judicial killings of persons with albinism. This has resulted in positive change.

In 2010, under the EIDHR (European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights) Country Based Support Scheme, the EU Delegation in Dar es Salaam launched a call for proposals with the specific objective of addressing the rights of people affected by albinism.

Unfortunately, very few applications were received and their quality and risk assessment were too weak to proceed with a financial commitment.

However, albinos in Tanzania are considered by law as People Living with Disabilities and are amongst the direct beneficiaries of a number of EU-funded initiatives that promote economic, social and political rights and the empowerment of people living with disabilities.

Such projects address special needs such as education (UK non-governmental organisation (NGO) Sense International), labour rights and economic empowerment (Italian NGO CEFA/Radar), health and community based rehabilitation services (CCBRT — Comprehensive Community Based Rehabilitation in Tanzania), voters information and political participation (United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Election Support Programme and Democratic Empowerment Project).

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001020/13
aan de Commissie
Esther de Lange (PPE)
(31 januari 2013)

Betreft: Europese registratie van artsen

De Richtlijn 2005/36/EG betreffende de erkenning van beroepskwalificaties biedt aan personen die hun beroepskwalificaties in een lidstaat hebben behaald, de garantie dat zij toegang hebben tot hetzelfde beroep in een andere lidstaat en dat zij dit kunnen uitoefenen met dezelfde rechten als de onderdanen van dat land.

In Finland is de organisatie Valvira verantwoordelijk voor de registratie van buitenlandse artsen. De kosten voor een beslissing met betrekking tot registratie die nodig is om in Finland als arts aan de slag te gaan, is voor een EU/EEA-arts 400 EUR en voor een arts uit de Noordse landen 200 EUR. De bijkomende kosten liggen rond de 500 EUR en bestaan uit het vertalen van een artsendiploma en de cijferlijst naar het Fins en uit de certificatie van alle overige documenten (paspoort, kopie van diploma en cijferlijst). Ondanks de wederzijdse erkenning van beroepskwalificaties kan een lidstaat (of kunnen meerdere lidstaten) alsnog allerlei kosten opwerpen.

Is dit volgens de Commissie in overeenstemming met de procedure van registratie van artsen in de Richtlijn 2005/36/EG en geen hindering van het vrij verkeer van personen en diensten waarbij de aanvragende arts buitensporig belast wordt en belemmerd wordt door de opgelegde verplichting van hoge registratiekosten?

Is de Commissie op de hoogte van de verschillende registratiekosten in Finland voor artsen uit EU/EEA en de Noordse landen? Is het geen vorm van discriminatie, dat een arts uit Nederland het dubbele moet betalen voor zijn registratie in Finland vergeleken bij een arts uit Zweden of Denemarken?

Antwoord van de heer Barnier namens de Commissie
(13 maart 2013)

Richtlijn 2005/36/EG ([1]) („de richtlijn") vormt het rechtskader voor de erkenning van beroepskwalificaties die in een andere lidstaat zijn behaald.

Krachtens artikel 50 van de richtlijn kunnen de bevoegde autoriteiten van de ontvangende lidstaat zo nodig de in bijlage VII van de richtlijn genoemde documenten en certificaten verlangen voordat zij een beslissing nemen over een aanvraag tot erkenning van de kwalificatie. Aangezien de huidige richtlijn geen specifieke voorschriften bevat betreffende de administratieve heffing voor dergelijke aanvragen, kunnen de lidstaten zelf de hoogte daarvan bepalen. De lidstaten mogen geen andere certificaten of documenten verlangen en ook geen onderscheid maken tussen buitenlandse aanvragers die burgers van de Europese Unie zijn (zie ook artikel 61 VWEU).

De Commissie zal nagaan welke registratievoorschriften in Finland, Zweden en Denemarken gelden voor artsen uit andere dan de Noordse landen. Momenteel verzamelt zij informatie die zou kunnen verduidelijken waarom deze specifieke vereisten zijn ingevoerd.

([1]) Richtlijn 2005/36/EG van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 7 september 2005 betreffende de erkenning van beroepskwalificaties, PB L 255 van 30.9.2005.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001020/13
to the Commission
Esther de Lange (PPE)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: European registration of doctors

Directive 2005/36/EC on the recognition of professional qualifications, provides persons who have obtained their professional qualifications in a Member State with the assurance that they have access to the same profession in another Member State and that they may exercise the same rights as the nationals of that country.

In Finland, the organisation Valvira is responsible for the registration of foreign doctors. The costs required for a registration decision to start working as a doctor in Finland is EUR 400 for an EU/EEA doctor and EUR 200 for a doctor from the Nordic countries. The additional costs are around EUR 500 and include the translation of a doctor's diploma and results into Finnish, plus the certification of all other documentation (passport, copy of diploma and results). Despite the mutual recognition of professional qualifications, a Member State (or multiple Member States) may raise all kinds of costs.

Is this, according to the Commission, in line with the registration procedure of doctors laid down in Directive 2005/36/EC and not interference in the free movement of persons and services whereby the requesting doctor is charged excessively and impeded by the obligation imposed for high registration costs?

Is the Commission aware of the different registration costs in Finland for doctors from the EU/EEA and the Nordic countries? Is it not a form of discrimination that a doctor from the Netherlands must pay double for his registration in Finland compared to a doctor from Sweden or Denmark?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(13 March 2013)

Directive 2005/36/EC ([1]) ('the directive') provides the legal framework for the recognition of professional qualifications obtained in another Member State.

Under Article 50 of the directive the competent authority of the host Member State may demand, if necessary, the certificates and documents listed in Annex VII of the directive before deciding on an application for the recognition of the qualification. As there is no specific requirement under the current text of the directive, it is for Member States to set the administrative fees applicable for such applications. Member States are neither allowed to request further certificates or documents nor to discrimate amongst foreign applicants who are citizens of the European Union (see also Article 61 of the TFEU).

The Commission will examine the registration requirements applicable in Finland, Sweden and Denmark for doctors from other Nordic countries. The Commission is currently collecting information to clarify the reasons which might justify these specific requirements.

([1]) Directive 2005/36/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 7 September 2005 on the recognition of professional qualifications, OJ L 255, 30.9.2005.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001021/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(31 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Tributação do IVA das ajudas Poseima

Considerando que:

Com vista a garantir o abastecimento das regiões ultraperiféricas e a reduzir os custos adicionais decorrentes do seu afastamento e insularidade foram estabelecidas, no Regulamento (CE) n.° 247/2006, de 30 de janeiro, medidas específicas no domínio agrícola a favor destas regiões, no âmbito das quais são concedidas ajudas ao fornecimento de produtos da UE que têm em consideração os custos adicionais de transporte e os preços praticados na exportação para países terceiros, bem como os custos adicionais de insularidade e de ultraperificidade, no caso de produtos agrícolas ou destinados à importação.

No regime de abastecimento das RUP, as vantagens económicas devem, nos termos do referido regulamento, repercutir-se ao nível dos custos de produção, com uma redução dos preços até ao consumidor final. Porém, em Portugal, de acordo com uma norma do Orçamento de Estado de 1998 (art. 34.°, n.° 4 da Lei n.° 127-B/97, de 20 de dezembro) que equipara as ajudas POSEI a subvenções diretamente ligadas ao preço das operações, os beneficiários das ajudas POSEI são obrigados a liquidar o IVA com base nas ajudas recebidas.

A 20 de junho de 2011, questionei a Comissão Europeia (P-006045/2011) sobre uma eventual violação do Direito da UE, em razão da cobrança do IVA no âmbito das ajudas POSEI, chamando a atenção para o facto de que Portugal era o único Estado-Membro a impor a obrigação de liquidação. Na sua resposta, a Comissão comprometeu-se a «analisar o regime de IVA aí aplicável» e a «tomar as medidas necessárias em caso de não-conformidade» com o Direito da UE.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Já efetuou a análise a que se comprometeu na sua resposta de 3 de agosto de 2011? Que conclusões retira da análise do regime de IVA aplicável em Portugal no âmbito das ajudas de abastecimento do POSEI?

2. O regime de IVA aplicável em Portugal no âmbito das ajudas de abastecimento do POSEI está em conformidade com as regras da União Europeia e, nomeadamente, com as normas da Diretiva IVA?

3. Em caso de resposta negativa, quais foram as medidas necessárias que a Comissão tomou para corrigir a situação? Caso ainda não tenha tomado nenhuma medida até à data, que medidas tenciona tomar, e quando, de forma a normalizar o regime?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(25 de março de 2013)

A Comissão examinou recentemente uma denúncia sobre a tributação de uma ajuda concedida ao abrigo do regime específico de abastecimento no âmbito do programa POSEI para a Madeira; a apreciação jurídica preliminar revelou que são cumpridas as disposições da União Europeia aplicáveis.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001021/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: POSEIMA (Programme of Options Specifically Relating to Remoteness and Insularity of Madeira and the Azores) subsidies subject to VAT

In order to guarantee supply to the outermost regions and compensate for the additional costs arising from their remoteness, insularity and distant location, specific measures for agriculture in the outermost regions were established by Council Regulation (EC) No 247/2006 of 30 January 2006. Under these measures, aid is granted for the supply of products of EU origin. Such aid takes account of the additional cost of transport to the outermost regions and the prices applied to exports to third countries and, in the case of agricultural inputs and products intended for processing, the additional costs of insularity and distant location.

In accordance with the regulation, the economic advantages of the specific supply arrangements for the outermost regions must be passed on in terms of production costs and must cut prices up to the end-user stage. However, Article 34(4) of Portuguese Law No 127-B/97 of 20 December (part of the provisions for the 1998 State Budget) makes POSEI subsidies equivalent to subsidies directly linked with the cost of operations. This means that those receiving POSEI subsidies are obliged to pay VAT on the subsidies received.

In my Written Question of 20 June 2011 (P-006045/2011) I asked the Commission whether it believed that Portugal, in charging VAT on POSEI subsidies and being the only Member State to do so, was violating EC law. In its answer, the Commission said that it would 'examine the VAT treatment of the aid for the POSEI's supply arrangements and, if necessary, take the necessary steps if it would appear that the rules applied in Portugal are not in line with the VAT Directive'.

1. Has the Commission carried out the analysis it pledged to undertake in its answer dated 3 August 2011? What conclusions has it drawn from examining the Portuguese VAT regime applicable to POSEI subsidies?

2. Does the Portuguese VAT regime applicable to POSEI subsidies comply with EU legislation including the VAT Directive?

3. If not, what steps has the Commission taken to rectify the situation? If it is yet to take action, what action will it take and when, in order to regulate this regime?

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

The Commission has recently examined a complaint on taxation of aid granted under the specific supply arrangements (SSA) for the POSEI programme for Madeira, and a preliminary legal assessment has indicated that the applicable EU provisions are respected.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-001022/13
alla Commissione
Francesca Barracciu (S&D)
(31 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Recrudescenza fenomeno Blue Tongue Regione Sardegna — Indennizzi e vaccinazioni

Negli ultimi mesi quasi 10.000 capi affetti da Blue tongue sono morti e/o sono stati abbattuti in Regione Sardegna, coinvolgendo circa 600 aziende e provocando danni per più di 2 milioni di euro.

— Considerato che l'art. 18 della Direttiva 2000/75/CE del 20 novembre 2000 stabilisce che «La Commissione esamina i piani (di intervento) allo scopo di determinare se consentano di raggiungere l'obiettivo perseguito e suggerisce allo Stato membro interessato qualsiasi modifica necessaria» e che il piano di profilassi regionale individuava gli interventi integrati di bonifica e di sanificazione/disinfestazione come l'obiettivo contro il riemergere della Blue tongue;

— Considerato che la Commissione europea, il 18 dicembre 2012, ha comunicato la revoca di talune zone di restrizione per la Blue tongue, in particolare la Provincia di Trento, in Italia, e la Francia, esclusa la Corsica, mentre per la Sardegna il Ministero della salute ha confermato, in data 09 novembre 2012, l'esistenza di 15 focolai che parrebbero essere diventati, ad oggi, seppur non ancora censiti ufficialmente, ben 500;

— Considerato che la direttiva 2000/75/CE come modificata dalla direttiva 2012/5/UE del 14 marzo 2012 stabilisce all'articolo 5, lettera b, che «L'autorità competente di uno Stato membro può decidere di autorizzare l'impiego di vaccini contro la febbre catarrale degli ovini, purché la Commissione sia informata prima che tale vaccinazione sia eseguita» e che il periodo utile alla vaccinazione va da gennaio a marzo;

— Considerato che il Regolamento (CE) n. 349/2005, all'art. 2, lettera a, definisce «indennizzo rapido ed adeguato»: il versamento, entro 90 giorni dall'abbattimento degli animali, di un'indennità corrispondente al prezzo di mercato";

— Ritiene, la Commissione che il piano di profilassi della Regione Sardegna fosse adeguato agli obiettivi definiti o che ci siano stati errori e/o omissioni da parte delle autorità italiane competenti?

— Quali iniziative intende assumere la Commissione e/o in che modo intende sollecitare le Autorità italiane affinché anche in Sardegna si inverta il trend della malattia?

— Ha la Commissione ricevuto comunicazione della campagna di vaccinazione 2013 per la Regione Sardegna?

— Ha la Commissione ricevuto, e quando, domanda ufficiale di rimborso per gli allevatori sardi ai sensi dell'art. 7 del Regolamento (CE) n. 349/2005?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(25 febbraio 2013)

L'Italia, in particolare la Sardegna, è stata particolarmente colpita dalla bluetongue sin dal 2000. Il programma italiano di eradicazione della bluetongue per il 2013 ammesso ad un cofinanziamento dalla decisione di esecuzione della Commissione 2012/761/UE ([1]), che comprende anche disposizioni relative alla Sardegna, è fondato su una solida base di conoscenza e di esperienza. Il programma approvato comprende la vaccinazione quale misura volontaria da attuarsi su richiesta degli allevatori. Esso prevede tuttavia che, in caso di cambiamenti intervenuti nella situazione epidemiologica (introduzione di nuovi serotipi, focolai epidemici di serotipi già presenti), dopo un'adeguata valutazione del rischio può essere attuata una campagna di vaccinazione di massa e/o di emergenza.

Nel caso di una grave recrudescenza della patologia, come quella recentemente verificatasi in Sardegna, è essenziale una tempestiva vaccinazione d'emergenza. La Commissione segue da vicino la situazione e l'attuazione delle misure di controllo stabilite nella direttiva 2000/75/CE del Consiglio ([2]), nel regolamento (CE) n. 1266/2007 della Commissione ([3]) e nell'ambito del summenzionato programma di eradicazione. La Commissione continuerà a seguire la questione nel quadro del comitato permanente per la catena alimentare e la salute degli animali.

([1]) GU L 336 dell'8.12.2012.
([2]) GU L 327 del 22.12.2000.
([3]) GU L 283 del 27.10.2007.

La Commissione ha ricevuto nel novembre 2012 dalle autorità competenti italiane centrali l'indicazione dei costi preliminari eventualmente da rimborsare se detti costi fossero ritenuti ammissibili in base alle disposizioni della decisione 2009/470/CE ([4]) e del regolamento (CE) n. 349/2005 della Commissione ([5]). Successivamente non sono pervenute altre informazioni dall'Italia.

([4]) GU L 155 del 18.6.2009.
([5]) GU L 55 dell'1.3.2005.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001022/13
to the Commission
Francesca Barracciu (S&D)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Recurrence of bluetongue in Sardinia — compensation and vaccinations

Almost 10 000 head of livestock have died or been slaughtered in recent months in Sardinia, affecting almost 600 businesses and causing losses of more than EUR 2 million.

— Article 18 of Directive 2000/75/EC of 20 November 2000 states that: 'The Commission shall examine the (contingency) plans, in order to determine whether they enable the desired objective to be attained, and shall suggest to the Member State concerned any modification required'. The region's preventive treatment plan against bluetongue targeted integrated drainage and sanitisation/disinfection measures.

— On 18 December 2012, the Commission lifted bluetongue restrictions in some areas, notably the Italian Province of Trento and the whole of France with the exception of Corsica. However, Sardinia's Ministry of Health confirmed on 9 November 2012 the existence of 15 breeding spots; a number that has since apparently risen to 500, although they have not yet been officially registered.

— Article 5 of Directive 2000/75/EC, as amended by Directive 2012/5/EU of 14 March 2012, states that: '1. The competent authority of a Member State may decide to allow the use of vaccines against bluetongue provided that: … (b) the Commission is informed before such vaccination is carried out'. The best period for vaccination is between January and March.

— Article 2(a) of Regulation (EC) No 349/2005 defines 'swift and adequate compensation' as being 'payment within 90 days of the slaughter of the animal, of compensation corresponding to the market value of the animal'.

In the Commission's opinion, is the Sardinia Region's preventive treatment plan fit for purpose, or have there been mistakes and/or omissions by the Italian authorities concerned?

What action will the Commission take and/or how will it press the Italian authorities to ensure that this disease's prevalence will be reversed in Sardinia too?

Has the Sardinia Region notified the Commission of the 2013 vaccination campaign?

Has the Commission received an official request for breeders in Sardinia to be reimbursed under Article 7 of Regulation (EC) No 349/2005? If so, when was this?

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

Italy, and in particular Sardinia, has been heavily affected by bluetongue as from 2000. The 2013 Italian eradication programme for bluetongue approved for co-financing by Commission Implementing Decision 2012/761/EU ([1]), which also includes provisions relating to Sardinia, is built on solid knowledge and experience. The programme approved includes vaccination as a voluntary measure, to be implemented on request of the farmers. However, it foresees that in the event of any change in the epidemiological situation (introduction of new serotypes, epidemic outbreaks of serotypes already present), after an appropriate risk assessment, a mass and/or emergency vaccination campaign may be implemented.

In case of a serious recrudescence of the disease, like the one that recently occurred in Sardinia, timely emergency vaccination is essential. The Commission is following closely the situation and the implementation of the control measures laid down in Council Directive 2000/75/EC ([2]), Commission Regulation (EC) No 1266/2007 ([3]) and in the abovementioned eradication programme. The Commission will continue to follow this topic in the framework of the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health.

([1]) OJ L 336, 8.12.2012.
([2]) OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.
([3]) OJ L 283, 27.10.2007.

The Commission received information from the Italian central competent authorities in November 2012 indicating the preliminary costs that might deserve reimbursement if the costs are finally deemed eligible under the provisions of Council Decision 2009/470/EC ([4]) and Commission Regulation (EC) No 349/2005 ([5]). No further information has been received from Italy afterwards.

([4]) OJ L 155, 18.6.2009.
([5]) OJ L 55, 1.3.2005.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001023/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(31 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Proposte UE per inviare truppe nella Siria postconflitto

Un certo numero di fonti di informazione ha riferito che il Capo del Comitato militare dell'UE ha suggerito che l'UE invii una Forza di reazione rapida, nota come Gruppo di battaglia, in Siria allorché il conflitto nel paese volga al termine.

Il Generale Patrick de Rousiers, che dirige il Comitato militare, ha riferito che nessuno ha ritenuto che un intervento militare esterno in Siria possa al momento migliorare la situazione. Al contrario, in questa fase, potrebbe peggiorarla. Ha tuttavia aggiunto che la situazione può cambiare e in funzione del modo in cui si modifica, a quel punto l'UE può svolgere un ruolo fondamentale, perché ci sarà la necessità di stabilizzare (il paese). Secondo la Reuters, de Rousiers dice che si è avuto uno scambio d'idee all'interno del Servizio per l'Azione Esterna e non sono ancora state avanzate proposte agli Stati membri.

1. Qual è la posizione della Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante in merito al dispiegamento della Forza di reazione rapida dell'UE in una Siria postconflitto?

2. Quali passi intende effettuare la Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante per discutere con gli Stati membri i piani di un possibile dispiegamento?

3. Quali proposte concrete sono state avanzate riguardo al ruolo di una eventuale Forza di reazione rapida ove fosse inviata in Siria?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(12 aprile 2013)

L'articolo menzionato è stato redatto in seguito ad uno scambio che il Capo del Comitato militare dell'UE ha avuto con i giornalisti il 24 gennaio 2013. Le sue parole sono state citate al di fuori del loro contesto e da sole non rispecchiano lo spirito con cui era stata data la risposta.

I servizi competenti non hanno previsto il dispiegamento di una Forza di reazione rapida dell'UE, in particolare un Gruppo di battaglia, in Siria dopo il conflitto.

L'UE continuerà a collaborare strettamente con i partner internazionali in materia di pianificazione per garantire che, non appena avrà inizio un'autentica transizione democratica, la comunità internazionale sia pronta a offrire un sostegno rapido alla Siria in tutti i settori di interesse reciproco, per soddisfare le esigenze a breve termine e sostenere l'attività di ricostruzione a lungo termine.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001023/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — EU proposals to send troops to post-conflict Syria

A number of media sources have reported that the head of the EU Military Committee has suggested the EU may send a rapid reaction force — known as a battle group — to Syria once the conflict in that country has come to an end.

General Patrick de Rousiers, who heads the Military Committee, said that nobody believed outside military intervention in Syria at present would improve the situation and that it 'would worsen it at this stage'. He added, however, that 'this can change, and depending on the way that it changes, then the EU can play a profound role because there will be the need to stabilise (the country).' According to Reuters, de Rousiers said that ideas were being discussed within the External Action Service and had not yet been proposed to the Member States.

1. What is the position of the Vice-President/High Representative regarding the deployment of the EU's rapid reaction force in a post-conflict Syria?

2. What steps is the VP/HR prepared to take to discuss plans for a possible deployment with the Member States?

3. What concrete proposals have been put forward with regard to the role of a rapid reaction force, should one be sent to Syria?

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

The article mentioned was written as a result of a Chairman EU Military Committee's discussion with journalists on 24 January 2013. He has obviously been quoted out of context and his answer does not reflect the spirit in which it occurred.

There have been no plans drawn by the relevant services regarding the deployment of any EU's rapid reaction force, in particular a Battle Group, in a post-conflict Syria.

The EU will continue to work closely with international partners on planning to ensure that, as soon as genuine democratic transition begins, the international community is ready to provide rapid support to Syria across all areas of mutual interest, addressing the short term needs and the long-term reconstruction efforts.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001106/13
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(1 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: VP/HR — Estado de Emergencia por las movilizaciones políticas en Egipto

El Gobierno de Egipto, encabezado por su presidente Mohamed Morsi, está sufriendo una intensa inestabilidad política debido a que la movilización de la población se ha incrementado exponencialmente en las últimas semanas. El pueblo de Egipto no acepta las imposiciones que el nuevo ejecutivo de los Hermanos Musulmanes, que pretende hacer involucionar al país, desoyendo las demandas de la sociedad civil que gracias a sus movilizaciones consiguió destituir al presidente Mubarak.

El Ejecutivo está implementando la nueva constitución aprobada durante el pasado mes de diciembre, lo que está suponiendo un proceso de regresión social. Se celebra el segundo aniversario del inicio de las protestas de Plaza Tahrir que pusieron en marcha el proceso político de la Primavera Árabe que se extendió por numerosos países. Esta importante movilización supuso un ejemplo que inspiró miles de movimientos de protesta a lo largo de todo el mundo y que sin embargo terminó con la intervención del ejército que, pese a la destitución de Mubarak, marcó el ritmo del cambio político en el país.

En el 25 de enero una plataforma compuesta por diferentes partidos revolucionarios de carácter laico, que fueron los que protagonizaron las protestas dos años atrás, pretende celebrar la memoria de aquella primavera con la lucha contra el nuevo presidente del país. Esta lucha se produce en un ambiente de extrema violencia, acrecentada por la condena a muerte de los culpables de la masacre de Port Said. El Gobierno de Morsi está generando un nuevo estado de violencia como el de su predecesor Mubarak y su gestión está siendo caracterizada por el uso, una vez más, del Ejército egipcio en contra de su propio pueblo. El presidente ha declarado el estado de emergencia ante las numerosas muertes que durante este fin de semana han producido los disturbios en las provincias de Port Said, Ismailia y Suez.

¿Está la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante mediando con las autoridades egipcias para evitar el uso del ejército contra la población civil?

¿Condena la gestión que el Gobierno Egipcio está desarrollando de un proceso de supuesta «transición democrática» que se está caracterizando por la masacre de los opositores al régimen impuesto por los Hermanos Musulmanes?

¿Considera, a la luz del grave conflicto social en Egipto, que se debe reabrir el proceso de negociación política, en lugar de cerrarlo con la nueva constitución, para frenar la violencia en el país?

Respuesta conjunta de la Sra. Asthon, alta representante y vicepresidenta en nombre de la Comisión
(18 de abril de 2013)

La alta representante y vicepresidenta comparte plenamente la preocupación de Su Señoría por las decisiones adoptadas por la presidencia de Egipto, que han llevado a una crisis política de profundas diferencias entre los partidarios de Morsi y el liberal y laico NSF (Frente de Salvación Nacional), que constituye la principal oposición.

La UE se ha mantenido en estrecho contacto con los principales protagonistas políticos y ha insistido en la necesidad de adoptar medidas de distensión y de carácter conciliador. Se ha estimado que esta es la mejor vía de actuación, habida cuenta del grado de polarización existente entre los partidos y la sensibilidad que ambos lados muestran ante toda injerencia del exterior. La alta representante y vicepresidenta ha declarado pública y reiteradamente la importancia de que Egipto prosiga su proceso de transición democrática, exhortando al diálogo entre todas las partes sin excepción.

La Constitución fue adoptada el 25 de diciembre por una ligera mayoría y con escasa participación del electorado. Desde entonces, la UE ha intensificado sus esfuerzos diplomáticos, incluso a través del representante especial de la UE, con el fin de generar confianza y buscar puntos de encuentro en los ámbitos político y económico. La precaria situación de la economía egipcia se suma a la situación política y exige atención urgente. Junto con la comunidad internacional, la Unión Europea seguirá insistiendo para que culmine el acuerdo entre Egipto y el FMI.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001024/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(31 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Rischio di collasso per lo Stato egiziano

Secondo quanto riportato da alcune fonti mediatiche, il generale Abdel Fattah al-Sisi, capo dell'esercito egiziano nonché ministro della Difesa, ha dichiarato che «il prosieguo della lotta tra le diverse forze politiche sulla gestione degli affari di Stato potrebbe condurre il paese al collasso.»

Dato il livello di violenza politica in Egitto, anche la protezione del Canale di Suez è motivo di seria preoccupazione. Le dichiarazioni del generale sono state rilasciate a seguito delle proteste scoppiate nelle città in prossimità del canale, che riveste un'importanza strategica. Numerosi manifestanti hanno sfidato lo stato d'emergenza dichiarato dal Presidente Mohammed Morsi, e almeno cinquantadue persone sono rimaste uccise. Le proteste si sono verificate in centri urbani come Il Cairo, Alessandria, Porto Said, Ismailia e Suez, e l'imposizione dello stato d'emergenza è stata contestata da molti cittadini egiziani. Il quotidiano *Egypt Independent* ha riferito che i Fratelli musulmani stanno elaborando un disegno di legge che conferirà alle forze armate i poteri giudiziari per arrestare e processare i civili.

Può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Qual è la posizione del Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante rispetto alla gestione della crisi in Egitto da parte del governo egiziano?

2. Qual è la valutazione dei funzionari dell'UE che operano al Cairo in merito alle dichiarazioni rilasciate dal generale Abdel Fattah al-Sisi?

3. Quali azioni è disposto il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante ad intraprendere per contribuire a ripristinare la stabilità in Egitto, tenendo conto dei principi dei diritti umani e del diritto internazionale?

Risposta congiunta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(18 aprile 2013)

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente condivide pienamente le preoccupazioni riguardanti le decisioni della presidenza egiziana che hanno condotto a questa profonda crisi politica tra i sostenitori di Morsi e la principale opposizione liberale e laica, l'NSF (Fronte di salvezza nazionale).

L'Unione europea è rimasta a stretto contatto con i principali protagonisti politici e ha perorato la necessità di una mossa di conciliazione e di allentamento della tensione. È stata privilegiata questa modalità di azione, alla luce della polarizzazione tra i partiti e della sensibilità di ambo le parti in tema di interferenze esterne. L'AR/VP ha rilasciato reiterate dichiarazioni pubbliche in cui sottolinea quanto sia importante per l'Egitto continuare la transizione democratica e auspica un dialogo inclusivo.

La costituzione è stata adottata il 25 dicembre con una leggera maggioranza e una bassa affluenza alle urne. Da allora l'Unione europea ha intensificato i propri sforzi diplomatici, anche attraverso il rappresentante speciale dell'UE, per instaurare un clima di fiducia e cercare un approccio comune alle questioni di natura politica ed economica. Alla situazione politica si aggiunge la precaria situazione dell'economia egiziana, che richiede immediata attenzione. Unitamente alla comunità internazionale, l'Unione europea continuerà a sollecitare la conclusione dell'accordo tra l'Egitto e il Fondo monetario internazionale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001024/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Egyptian state at risk of collapse

A number of media sources have reported that the head of the Egyptian military, General Abdel Fattah al-Sisi, who is also defence minister, has said that the 'continuation of the struggle of the different political forces … over the management of state affairs could lead to the collapse of the state.'

Protection of the Suez Canal is also of critical concern, given the level of political violence in Egypt. The general's comments were made in the light of protests in towns close to the strategically-important canal. Many protesters have defied the state of emergency declared by President Mohammed Morsi, and at least fifty-two people have been killed. Protests have taken place in towns and cities such as Cairo, Alexandria, Port Said, Ismailia and Suez. Many Egyptians have taken issue with the imposition of the state of emergency. The Egypt Independent has reported that the Muslim Brotherhood is behind a draft law that will give the Armed Forces judicial powers to arrest and try civilians.

1. What is the position of the Vice-President/High Representative regarding the Egyptian government's handling of the crisis in Egypt?

2. What is the assessment of the EU officials based in Cairo regarding the comments made by General Abdel Fattah al-Sisi?

3. What steps is the VP/HR prepared to take to help restore stability inside Egypt which take into account the principles of human rights and international law?

Question for written answer E-001106/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — State of emergency declared in Egypt due to political protests

The Egyptian Government, led by President Mohammed Morsi, is going through a period of extreme political instability due to the dramatic rise in popular protests over the last few weeks. The Egyptian people oppose the rules being imposed by the new Muslim Brotherhood government, which is seeking to turn the clock back while ignoring demands from civil society, whose protests brought about the fall of President Mubarak.

The Government is implementing the new constitution, which was approved in December 2012, and which has triggered a return to the social situation of the past. Egyptians recently marked the second anniversary of the start of the Tahrir Square protests, which fuelled the Arab Spring movement that spread to many other countries. The major uprising in Egypt served as a precedent and inspired thousands of other protest movements across the world, even though it did culminate with army intervention, which, despite Mubarak's fall from power, set the tone for political change in the country.

On 25 January 2013, a group made up of various secular revolutionary parties that had played a central role in the original protests two years earlier commemorated the beginning of the Arab Spring by protesting against Egypt's new president. The current wave of protests is taking place against a backdrop of extreme violence, which escalated after those implicated in the Port Said massacre were sentenced to death. President Morsi's government is creating a violent atmosphere reminiscent of the mood that existed when former President Mubarak was in power, and the present government's handling of the situation also involves deploying the Egyptian army against the country's own people. The President declared a state of emergency after outbreaks of violence at the end of January in Port Said, Ismailia and Suez left many people dead.

Is the Vice-President/High Representative mediating and communicating with the Egyptian authorities to avoid the army being deployed against civilians?

Does the Vice-President/High Representative condemn the way in which the Egyptian Government is overseeing a so-called 'transition to democracy' which is being defined by the massacre of opponents of the Muslim Brotherhood regime?

Given the serious social conflict in Egypt, does the Vice-President/High Representative think that Egypt should return to the negotiating table with a view to ending the violence, instead of ruling out negotiation by implementing the new constitution as it stands?

Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(18 April 2013)

The HR/VP fully shares the concerns regarding the decisions of the Egyptian Presidency leading to this deeply divisive political crisis between pro-Morsi supporters and the main liberal, secular opposition, the NSF.

The EU has been in close contact with the main political protagonists insisting on the need for de-escalation and conciliatory moves. This was judged the preferred course of action given the degree of polarisation between the parties and also the sensitivity on both sides about external interference. The HR/VP has made repeated public statements stressing the importance of Egypt continuing its democratic transition and calling for an inclusive dialogue.

The Constitution was adopted on 25 December with a slight majority and with low voter participation. Since then, the EU has stepped up its diplomatic efforts, including through the EU Special Representative, in order to build confidence and to look for common ground on political and economic issues. The precarious situation of Egypt's economy comes on top of the political situation and requires urgent attention. Together with the international community, the EU will continue to push for the finalisation of the Egypt-IMF arrangement.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001025/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(31 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Rischi della centrale di Bushehr in Iran

Il 23 gennaio 2013, l'agenzia di stampa Reuters ha riferito che i cittadini residenti in prossimità della centrale nucleare di Bushehr, nell'Iran sudoccidentale, nutrono preoccupazioni circa eventuali rischi di contaminazione. In una dichiarazione pubblicata su un blog nel 2010, alcuni abitanti dei paesi costieri di Heleylah e Bandargah avevano affermato quanto segue: «Siamo estremamente preoccupati per la nostra salute e per quella delle nostre famiglie». Il blog indicava inoltre che «secondo le norme internazionali, la distanza tra una centrale nucleare e l'abitazione più vicina dovrebbe essere di almeno un chilometro … ma il villaggio di Heleylah e l'impianto distano appena sei metri!». Il governo iraniano starebbe altresì soffocando il dibattito sui vantaggi e gli svantaggi del suo programma nucleare, sull'ubicazione dei siti e sui rischi di un'emergenza.

L'impianto di Bushehr è situato nelle vicinanze di cinque paesi del Golfo Persico. Durante una riunione del Consiglio di cooperazione del Golfo, l'Emiro del Kuwait ha affermato che l'Iran dovrebbe collaborare con l'Agenzia internazionale dell'energia atomica al fine di «garantire la sicurezza dei paesi della regione e dei loro abitanti contro gli effetti della radioattività». Poiché l'Iran poggia su una linea di faglia, vi sono preoccupazioni riguardo alla possibilità che si verifichi un incidente simile a quello accaduto alla centrale nucleare di Fukushima in Giappone. Inoltre, l'Iran è l'unico paese che gestisce una centrale nucleare a non avere aderito alla Convenzione sulla sicurezza nucleare, sottoscritta da 75 paesi, negoziata a seguito del disastro nucleare di Cernobil del 1986.

Può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Quali azioni intende l'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente intraprendere al fine di monitorare la sicurezza delle centrali nucleari in Iran e i rischi che queste rappresentano per i paesi limitrofi nel Golfo Persico?

2. Quali azioni ha intrapreso il VP/HR nell'ambito dei precedenti negoziati con il governo iraniano allo scopo di sollevare la questione della sicurezza nucleare, e quali sono stati i risultati ottenuti?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(18 marzo 2013)

L'AR/VP, insieme al gruppo di paesi E3+3, è impegnata in un'intensa attività diplomatica per giungere a una soluzione negoziata sulla questione nucleare iraniana. Negli ultimi anni, il gruppo di paesi E3+3 ha avanzato diverse proposte volte a far fronte alle gravi preoccupazioni destate dalla natura del programma nucleare dell'Iran.

La questione della sicurezza nucleare rimane una priorità assoluta per l'UE che, nel corso di colloqui con l'Iran, ha offerto al paese cooperazione e supporto in questo settore.

Pur perseguendo un rilevante programma di energia nucleare, l'Iran non è parte delle pertinenti convenzioni internazionali (convenzione sulla sicurezza nucleare, convenzione sulla protezione fisica dei materiali nucleari, convenzione congiunta sulla sicurezza della gestione del combustibile esaurito e dei rifiuti radioattivi).

L'UE continuerà a sollecitare l'Iran a diventare parte di tutti gli strumenti internazionali in materia di sicurezza nucleare.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001025/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Hazards at the Bushehr power plant in Iran

On 23 January 2013, Reuters reported that residents living close to the Bushehr nuclear power plant in south-western Iran are concerned over potential contamination hazards. A number of residents of the coastal villages of Heleylah and Bandargah wrote, in a statement published on a blog in 2010, that 'we are extremely worried about our health and the health of our families'. The blog also stated that 'according to international standards, the distance between a nuclear power plant and the nearest residence should be at least one kilometre … but the distance between the village of Heleylah and this power plant is just six metres!' The Iranian government is also allegedly stifling debate on the advantages and disadvantages of its nuclear programme, the location of sites and the risks of an emergency.

The Bushehr site is located close to five Persian Gulf states. The Emir of Kuwait has said, at a Gulf Cooperation Council meeting, that Iran should cooperate with the International Atomic Energy Agency to 'ensure the safety of the region's states and its people from any effect of radioactivity'. There are concerns over the possible occurrence of an incident similar to that which happened at the Fukushima power plant in Japan, since Iran lies on a fault line. Iran is also the only country operating a nuclear power plant that has not acceded to the 75-nation Convention on Nuclear Safety negotiated after the 1986 nuclear disaster at Chernobyl.

1. What steps is the High Representative/Vice-President taking to monitor the safety of Iran's nuclear power plants and the risks they pose to neighbouring states in the Persian Gulf?

2. In previous negotiations with the Iranian Government, what steps were taken by the HR/VP to raise the question of nuclear safety, and what were the outcomes?

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

The HR/VP, together with the E3+3 countries, has been engaged in intensive diplomatic efforts to find a negotiated solution on the Iranian nuclear issue. In recent years, the E3+3 have put forward several proposals aimed at addressing the serious concerns on the nature of Iran's nuclear programme.

The issue of nuclear safety and security remains an absolute priority for the EU. In the talks with Iran, cooperation as well as support in the area of nuclear safety and security was offered.

Iran has a significant nuclear power programme but is not party to the relevant international conventions (Convention on nuclear Safety, Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and the Safety of Radiological Waste Management).

The EU continues to urge Iran to become party to all relevant international nuclear safety instruments.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001027/13
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(31 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Misure per l'accesso al credito delle piccole e medie imprese

Lo scorso gennaio i governatori del comitato di vigilanza bancaria di Basilea hanno raggiunto un accordo circa la tempistica degli standard di liquidità previsti da Basilea III.

Dal 2015 gli istituti di credito dovranno garantire il 60 % dell'obiettivo ottimale per poi incrementarlo di un 10 % annuo. Questo approccio graduale è stato deciso per assicurare che l'introduzione del Liquid coverage ratio (Lcr) non ostacoli il finanziamento delle attività economiche e il sostegno all'economia reale.

Ciò nonostante, migliaia di piccole e medie imprese soffrono a causa di una contrazione del credito che ormai dura dal 2011 e che viene definita come la seconda ondata del «credit crunch» malgrado la liquidità immessa dalla Banca centrale europea e i tassi applicati (in Italia a fine 2012 il calo dei crediti bancari alle imprese ha registrato, con — 3,4 %, la massima variazione annua dall'inizio della serie nel luglio 2011).

Inoltre da parte del sistema bancario si assiste al fenomeno per cui le aziende, soprattutto medio-grandi, vengono incoraggiate a utilizzare il «corporate bond», ovvero un rapporto diretto delle imprese con il mercato (vale a dire che le imprese per estinguere debiti bancari o non potendo rinnovare il credito bancario, emettono propri bond e con il ricavato saldano i debiti o ricevono la liquidità di cui hanno bisogno).

Ciò premesso, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. in che modo il nuovo accordo mira a tutelare le piccole e medie imprese (PMI), che in Italia rappresentano il 98 % del sistema produttivo e che, avendo dimensioni medie inferiori a livello UE, risultano maggiormente dipendenti dal credito bancario;

2. se è prevista l'introduzione di un moltiplicatore detto «PMI Supporting Factor», un meccanismo di supporto agli impieghi bancari verso le PMI che, applicato al calcolo del rischio del credito, consenta di evitare un'ulteriore flessione nell'erogazione del credito alle PMI;

3. come valuta l'utilizzo crescente del «corporate bond» e le possibili implicazioni legate all'esposizione delle imprese ai mercati;

4. quali misure intende adottare al fine di ridurre i costi di gestione dei conti bancari, tra cui le commissioni;

5. se è in grado di fornire un quadro generale della situazione?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(8 marzo 2013)

Nel gennaio 2013 il Comitato di Basilea ha apportato importanti cambiamenti all'indicatore di breve termine (*liquidity coverage ratio — LCR*). I tassi di deflusso per i depositi non operativi integralmente assicurati e i depositi non operativi collocati da società non finanziarie sono stati ridotti (rispettivamente dal 40 % al 20 % e dal 75 % al 40 %). Il tasso di deflusso di cassa relativo alla quota inutilizzata delle linee di liquidità irrevocabili a favore di società non finanziarie è stato ridotto dal 100 % al 30 % Queste modifiche contribuiranno ad alleviare possibili restrizioni ai finanziamenti a favore delle PMI.

L'attuazione dell'LCR sarà inoltre soggetta a un periodo di osservazione nell'UE, in cui l'ABE monitorerà attentamente i potenziali impatti della riforma. Inoltre, lo studio della BCE sull'attività creditizia delle banche (*bank lending survey*) monitorizza le condizioni applicate dalle banche nei prestiti alle PMI.

La priorità assoluta della Commissione è ripristinare la fiducia, vista l'urgenza di riportare l'Europa verso una crescita intelligente, sostenibile e inclusiva. È questo l'obiettivo del programma per la riforma finanziaria (programma del G20) e dell'unione bancaria, che prevede anche l'istituzione del *single rulebook*, ossia di un'insieme di regole comuni.

La riduzione della leva finanziaria da parte delle banche è dovuta a sovraesposizioni del passato. Pertanto la Commissione invita gli Stati membri a promuovere l'accesso a fonti di finanziamento alternative come il capitale di rischio e l'emissione di obbligazioni societarie.

A tal fine, la Commissione ha proposto di istituire un regime UE per il capitale di rischio e fondi per l'imprenditoria sociale. Essa prevede inoltre di creare un mercato per le PMI nel quadro della MiFID II e mira a ridurre i costi per le PMI con le direttive sulla trasparenza e sul prospetto.

La Commissione sta inoltre dando attuazione alle 18 azioni previste nel quadro del piano d'azione del dicembre 2011 per migliorare l'accesso delle PMI ai finanziamenti. Inoltre in marzo adotterà un Libro verde sugli investimenti a lungo termine e nell'anno in corso introdurrà un pacchetto legislativo sui conti bancari per una maggiore trasparenza, per un confronto più semplice tra le varie commissioni bancarie e per la riduzione dei costi di trasferimento.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001027/13
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Measures to facilitate access to credit for small and medium-sized enterprises

This January, the governing body of the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision reached an agreement on the implementation of the liquidity standards under Basel III.

From 2015, banks will have to guarantee 60 % of the optimal target and then increase it by 10 % per year. This gradual approach was adopted to ensure that the introduction of the Liquidity Coverage Ratio (LCR) does not hinder the funding of economic activity or support for the real economy.

Nevertheless, thousands of small and medium-sized enterprises are suffering from a credit squeeze that has been going on since 2011 and which is defined as the second wave of the credit crunch, despite the liquidity provided by the European Central Bank and the interest rates (in Italy at the end of 2012 the decline in bank lending to businesses was -3.4 %, the highest annual drop recorded since July 2011).

Furthermore, there is a phenomenon in the banking system by which enterprises, especially medium-to-large ones, are being pushed into using corporate bonds, creating a direct relationship between enterprises and the market (in other words, in order to pay off bank debt or where they are unable to renew bank loans, enterprises issue their own bonds and use the proceeds either to pay off their debts or to obtain the liquidity they need).

Can the Commission say:

1. How the new agreement aims to protect small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), which in Italy make up 98 % of the manufacturing sector and, being smaller compared with the EU average, are more dependent on bank credit;

2. Whether there are plans to introduce a multiplier known as the 'SME Supporting Factor', in other words, a support mechanism for banks investing in SMEs that, applied to the credit risk calculation, could prevent a further decline in the supply of credit to SMEs;

3. How it regards the growing use of corporate bonds and the possible implications of exposing enterprises to the markets;

4. What measures it will take to reduce the costs of bank accounts, including commissions;

5. Whether it can provide an overview of the situation?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(8 March 2013)

The Basel Committee agreed major changes to the Liquidity Coverage Ratio in January 2013. Outflow rates on fully insured non-operational deposits and non-operational deposits by non-financial corporates were reduced (respectively from 40% to 20% and from 75% to 40%). The drawdown rate on the unused portion of committed liquidity facilities to non-financial corporates has decreased from 100% to 30%. These changes will help easing potential funding constraints to SMEs.

The LCR implementation will also be subject to an observation period in the EU, where EBA will closely monitor the potential impacts of the reform. Additionally, the ECB bank lending survey monitors the conditions applied by banks to SME loans.

The top priority of the Commission is to reinstal confidence, as it is necessary to put Europe back on the path of smart, sustainable, inclusive growth. This is the drive of the programme of financial reform (G20 agenda) and of the Banking Union including the single rulebook.

Bank deleveraging is due to excessive past exposures. The Commission therefore encourages Member States to promote the access to alternative sources of financing such as venture capital and the issuance of corporate bonds.

To that aim, the Commission has proposed the creation of a EU regime for Venture capital and Social Entrepreneurship Funds, foresees the creation of an SME market regime in MiFID II and aims at reducing costs for SMEs with the Transparency and the Prospectus Directives.

The Commission is also implementing the 18 actions of the December 2011 Action Plan on SME access to finance, will adopt in March a Green Paper on Long Term Financing and launch in 2013 a Bank Account Package to increase transparency and comparability of bank fees and reduce switching costs.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001028/13
aan de Commissie
Philip Claeys (NI)
(31 januari 2013)

Betreft: Verklaringen van Turkse minister over journalisten in de gevangenis

Tijdens een bezoek aan Brussel verklaarde de Turkse minister van Justitie Ergin dat er in Turkije geen enkele journalist in de gevangenis zit omwille van het uiten van een mening ([1]). Volgens de minister gaat het enkel om mensen die misdaden gepleegd hebben zoals het plegen van een moord of van een bankoverval, of van terroristische activiteiten.

Meerdere rapporten van mensenrechtenorganisaties spreken dat tegen. In Turkije zitten meer journalisten in de gevangenis dan in China.

Is de Commissie op de hoogte van de bewering van de minister?

Nam de Commissie contact op met de Turkse regering om uitleg te vragen over deze controversiële bewering? Wat waren de conclusies?

Is de Commissie van mening dat dergelijke uitspraken bevorderlijk zijn voor de toetredingsonderhandelingen?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(27 maart 2013)

De Commissie geeft geen commentaar op artikelen die in de pers verschijnen.

Wat de vrijheid van meningsuiting in Turkije betreft, heeft de Commissie reeds meermaals haar bezorgdheid geuit over het stijgende aantal schendingen van het recht op vrijheid van meningsuiting. Zij heeft consequent benadrukt dat de huidige wetgeving de vrijheid van meningsuiting overeenkomstig het Europees Verdrag voor de rechten van de mens en de rechtspraak van het Europees Hof voor de rechten van de mens, niet voldoende waarborgt en leidt tot een restrictieve uitlegging door de rechterlijke autoriteiten. Dit moet hoognodig veranderen, en de Commissie verheugt zich op de aanneming van het vierde pakket justitiële hervormingen om dit probleem ten gronde aan te pakken. De Commissie stelt deze kwestie geregeld aan de orde in het kader van haar lopende contacten met de Turkse autoriteiten.

([1]) Zie bijvoorbeeld www.hurriyetdailynews.com/PrintNews.aspx?PageID=383&NID=39664.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001028/13
to the Commission
Philip Claeys (NI)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Statement by Turkish Minister about journalists in prison

During a visit to Brussels, the Turkish Minister of Justice stated that no journalists were being held in Turkish prisons for expressing an opinion ([1]). According to the Minister, only those who had committed crimes, such as murder, bank robbery or terrorist activities, were being held.

Several reports from human rights organisations contradict this statement. There are more journalists in prison in Turkey than in China.

Is the Commission aware of the Minister's statement?

Has it contacted the Turkish Government to request an explanation about this controversial statement? What were the conclusions?

Does it believe that such statements are beneficial to the accession negotiations?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2013)

It is the Commission policy not to comment on articles appearing in the press.

With regard to the freedom of expression in Turkey, the Commission has on many occasions stressed its concerns regarding the increase in violations of the right to freedom of expression. It has consistently underlined that the present legal framework does not sufficiently guarantee freedom of expression in line with the European Convention on Human Rights and case-law of the European Court of Human Rights, and leads to restrictive interpretation by the judiciary. This needs to be changed urgently, and the Commission is looking forward to the adoption of the fourth judicial reform package to address the core of the problem. The Commission regularly raises this matter in its ongoing contacts with the Turkish authorities.

([1]) For example, see www.hurriyetdailynews.com/PrintNews.aspx?PageID=383&NID=39664.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001029/13
an die Kommission
Philip Claeys (NI) und Andreas Mölzer (NI)

(31. Januar 2013)

Betrifft: Erklärungen des türkischen Premierministers zum Beitritt zu der Gruppe der „Fünf von Shanghai"

Der türkische Premierminister Erdogan hat im Fernsehsender Kanal 24 erklärt, dass er erwägt, einen Antrag auf die Mitgliedschaft der Türkei in der Shanghaier Organisation für Zusammenarbeit als Alternative zur Europäischen Union zu beantragen. Nach der Ausstrahlung soll der Premierminister unter anderem ausgeführt haben, dass die Shanghaier Organisation für Zusammenarbeit „besser und viel mächtiger" ist als die Europäische Union.

Es handelt sich hier um einen wenig subtilen Versuch, die Europäische Union unter Druck zu setzen, damit sie der Türkei den Beitritt gestattet, ohne dass das Land die Kriterien von Kopenhagen erfüllt. Andererseits liegt hier wieder einmal ein Beleg dafür vor, dass die Türkei mehr und mehr eine gegen den Westen gerichtete politische Linie verfolgt.

Sind der Kommission die Erklärungen von Premierminister Erdogan bekannt?

Wurde die türkische Regierung in diesem Zusammenhang bereits um Erläuterungen ersucht? Wenn ja, welches waren die Schlussfolgerungen?

Welche Auswirkungen haben die Drohungen von Premierminister Erdogan auf den weiteren Verlauf der Beitrittsverhandlungen?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001272/13
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)

(7. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: Beendigung der Beitrittsverhandlungen mit der Türkei

Der türkische Regierungschef Erdoğan hat in einem Fernsehinterview bestätigt, dass der den russischen Präsidenten Putin um die Aufnahme der Türkei in die von Russland und China dominierte „Shanghaier Organisation für Zusammenarbeit" gebeten hat. In selbigem Interview fügte er hinzu: „Wir brauchen die EU nicht". „Die Shanghai Five sind besser und mächtiger als die EU". „So sagen wir der EU auf Wiedersehen".

1. Erachtet die Kommission weitere Beitrittsverhandlungen mit der Türkei als sinnhaft?

2. Wie sieht die Kommission die Tatsache, dass die Türkei über Alternativen zum EU-Beitritt nachdenkt?

3. Ist nach Aussagen von Ministerpräsident Erdoğan: („… man wird der EU auf Wiedersehen sagen …") eine Weiterführung der Heranführungshilfe sinnhaft? Wenn nein: warum nicht?

4. Wird die Kommission die bereits investierten Milliarden an Heranführungshilfe zurückfordern?

5. Wenn nein: warum nicht?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Füle im Namen der Kommission

(15. März 2013)

Die Kommission wurde darüber unterrichtet, dass der Antrag der Türkei auf Dialogpartner-Status bei der Shanghaier Organisation für Zusammenarbeit (SOZ) am 7. Juni 2012 angenommen wurde. Das türkische Außenministerium gab am 5. Februar 2013 eine Erklärung ab, wonach die Beziehungen der Türkei zur SOZ keine Alternative zu den Beziehungen der Türkei mit der EU oder der Nordatlantikvertrags-Organisation (NATO) darstellen.

Die Kommission weist darauf hin, dass sowohl der türkische Ministerpräsident Erdoğan als auch die Mitgliedstaaten erst kürzlich ihr Bekenntnis zu den Beitrittsverhandlungen zwischen der Türkei und der EU unmissverständlich zum Ausdruck gebracht und betont haben, wie wichtig es ist, dass die EU weiterhin als Maßstab für Reformen in der Türkei dient. Vor diesem Hintergrund setzt sich die Kommission in Einklang mit den Rahmenbedingungen für die Verhandlungen weiterhin uneingeschränkt für die Verhandlungen ein.

Die Kommission erstattet dem Parlament in ihrem jährlichen Fortschrittsbericht ([1]) ausführlich Bericht über den Stand der Beitrittsverhandlungen mit der Türkei.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_de.htm

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001174/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(5 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Τουρκία και «Οργανισμός Συνεργασίας της Σαγκάης»

Ο Τούρκος πρωθυπουργός, Ταγίπ Ερντογάν δήλωσε πρόσφατα ότι ο «Οργανισμός Συνεργασίας της Σαγκάης (ΟΣΣ)» (The Shangai Cooperation Organization) αποτελεί μία εναλλακτική προοπτική που υπόσχεται περισσότερα στην Τουρκία από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Ανάφερε χαρακτηριστικά πως «οι πέντε της Σαγκάης (δηλαδή: Κίνα, Ρωσία, Καζακστάν, Κιργιζία και Τατζικστάν) είναι καλύτεροι, πιο δυνατοί». Σημειωτέον πως σε παρόμοια δήλωση είχε προβεί και τον Ιούλιο του 2012, μετά από επίσκεψη που είχε πραγματοποιήσει τότε στη Μόσχα.

Ερωτάται λοιπόν, η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή:

1. Πώς ερμηνεύει η Επιτροπή τη θέση αυτή του Τούρκου πρωθυπουργού;

2. Ποίες υποσχέσεις ανέλαβε η ΕΕ έναντι της Τουρκίας και δεν τις εκπλήρωσε, κατά την άποψη του Τούρκου πρωθυπουργού, ώστε να δικαιολογείται η όποια δυσφορία του;

3. Τηρεί η Τουρκία τις δικές της υποσχέσεις προς την ΕΕ, ώστε να συνεχιστεί απρόσκοπτα η ενταξιακή της πορεία;

4. Με δεδομένο πως ο ΟΣΣ είναι διακυβερνητικός οργανισμός αμοιβαίας στρατιωτικής ασφάλειας για να επιλύει κυρίως διασυνοριακές αμφισβητήσεις, πως θα επηρεάζονταν οι σχέσεις Τουρκίας-ΕΕ σε περίπτωση υλοποίησης των προθέσεων του Τούρκου πρωθυπουργού;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(15 Μαρτίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή πληροφορήθηκε ότι στις 7 Ιουνίου 2012 έγινε δεκτή η αίτηση της Τουρκίας για συμμετοχή στον Οργανισμό Συνεργασίας της Σαγκάης στο πλαίσιο καθεστώτος εταιρικού διαλόγου (dialogue partnership). Το τουρκικό υπουργείο εξωτερικών εξέδωσε στις 5 Φεβρουαρίου 2013 ανακοίνωση σημειώνοντας ότι οι σχέσεις της Τουρκίας με τον ΟΣΣ δεν αποτελούν εναλλακτική επιλογή έναντι των σχέσεών της με την ΕΕ ή το Βορειοατλαντικό Σύμφωνο (ΝΑΤΟ).

Η Επιτροπή υπενθυμίζει ότι ο τούρκος πρωθυπουργός Erdoğan και τα κράτη μέλη τόνισαν προσφάτως κατηγορηματικά τη δέσμευσή τους στις ενταξιακές διαπραγματεύσεις μεταξύ Τουρκίας και ΕΕ, καθώς και τη σημασία να εξακολουθήσει η ΕΕ να αποτελεί σημείο αναφοράς για τις μεταρρυθμίσεις στην Τουρκία. Με αυτά τα δεδομένα, η Επιτροπή παραμένει πλήρως προσηλωμένη στις διαπραγματεύσεις σε συμφωνία με το διαπραγματευτικό πλαίσιο.

Η Επιτροπή υποβάλλει λεπτομερή αναφορά στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο για την πορεία των ενταξιακών διαπραγματεύσεων με την Τουρκία στην ετήσια έκθεση ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001238/13
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(6 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Opportunità che l'UE non ceda alle minacce della Turchia

Fonti di stampa turche rivelano che il capo del governo turco, Recep Tayyip Erdogan, ha nuovamente minacciato di porre fine alle trattative di adesione all'UE e di cercare possibili alternative, ovvero aderire al Patto di Shangai (organizzazione di cooperazione intergovernativa fra Russia, Cina, Kazakistan, Tagikistan, Uzbekistan e Kirghizistan) se i negoziati non verranno accelerati.

Si rileva inoltre che, ad oggi, su 35 capitoli negoziali, ne sono stati aperti 13 e uno solo è stato chiuso.

Come intende reagire la Commissione reagire all'ennesima esternazione del Premier Erdogan?

Può specificare la Commissione quali sono i 13 capitoli negoziali aperti e qual è l'unico capitolo negoziale chiuso con la Turchia?

Inoltre, secondo un sondaggio dell'Università del Bosforo, i turchi che hanno un'opinione positiva dell'UE oggi sono il 47,1 % contro il 73 % nel 2003. Il 46 %, contro il precedente 70 %, ritiene ora che la Turchia faccia parte dell'Europa, e il 64 % teme che una ipotetica adesione vada a scapito dei valori religiosi del paese (contro il 54 % di 12 anni fa). Nel 2003 il 74 % avrebbe votato «sì» a un possibile referendum sull'adesione. Oggi c'è ancora una maggioranza, ma ridotta al 51 %. E solo il 14 % dei turchi pensa che in caso di adesione potrebbe trasferirsi in un altro paese UE.

Anche alcuni Stati membri dell'UE hanno dimostrato scetticismo nei confronti dell'adesione della Turchia all'UE.

Alla luce di quanto sopra, la Commissione non ritiene sia legittimo rispettare sia l'opinione dei cittadini turchi, da una parte, sia quella degli Stati membri, dall'altra, e non forzare quindi la mano su una questione che ormai pare non interessi più neppure ai turchi in primis?

Risposta congiunta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(15 marzo 2013)

La Commissione è stata informata che il 7 giugno 2012 la candidatura della Turchia come partner del dialogo presso l'Organizzazione di cooperazione di Shanghai (SCO) è stata accettata. Il 5 febbraio 2013 il ministero turco degli Affari esteri ha dichiarato che le relazioni della Turchia con la SCO non sono un'alternativa alle relazioni del paese con l'Unione europea e con l'Organizzazione del Trattato dell'Atlantico del Nord (NATO).

La Commissione ricorda che recentemente sia il primo ministro turco Erdoğan che gli Stati membri hanno ribadito in maniera inequivocabile il loro impegno a favore dei negoziati di adesione tra la Turchia e l'UE e l'importanza per l'UE di restare il parametro di riferimento per le riforme in Turchia. In questo contesto, la Commissione conferma il suo impegno per i negoziati in linea con il quadro negoziale.

La Commissione riferisce in dettaglio al Parlamento in merito allo stato di avanzamento dei negoziati di adesione con la Turchia nella sua relazione annuale ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001029/13
aan de Commissie
Philip Claeys (NI) en Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(31 januari 2013)

Betreft: Verklaringen Turkse eerste minister over toetreding tot „Shanghai Five"

De Turkse eerste minister Erdogan verklaarde op de televisiezender Kanal 24 dat hij het lidmaatschap van Turkije bij de „Shanghai Cooperation Organisation" overweegt aan te vragen, als alternatief voor de Europese Unie. Na de uitzending zou de eerste minister onder meer gezegd hebben dat de Shanghai Cooperation Organisation „beter en veel machtiger" is dan de Europese Unie ([1]).

Het gaat om een weinig subtiele poging om de Europese Unie onder druk te zetten Turkije te laten toetreden zonder dat het land voldoet aan de criteria van Kopenhagen. Anderzijds is het een zoveelste aanwijzing dat Turkije meer en meer een antiwesterse politieke lijn volgt.

Is de Commissie op de hoogte van de verklaringen van de heer Erdogan?

Werd hierover al uitleg gevraagd aan de Turkse regering? Zo ja, wat waren de conclusies?

Welke gevolgen hebben de dreigementen van de heer Erdogan voor het verdere verloop van de toetredingsonderhandelingen?

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001041/13
aan de Commissie
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(31 januari 2013)

Betreft: Turkije wil zich bij „Shanghai Five" aansluiten

Turkije probeert druk uit te oefenen op de toetredingsonderhandelingen met de EU door te dreigen zich bij de „Shanghai Samenwerkingsorganisatie" aan te sluiten, bestaande uit China, Kazachstan, Rusland, Kirgizië, Tadzjikistan en Oezbekistan. Eigenlijk doet Turkije dit uit frustratie vanwege de kritiek vanuit de EU op het land.

De Turkse premier Erdoğan heeft gezegd dat de „Shanghai Samenwerkingsorganisatie" „beter en veel machtiger" dan de EU zou zijn.

Turkije is reeds „dialoogpartner" van de „Shanghai Samenwerkingsorganisatie", waarbij het zich vooral met militaire en economische samenwerking bezighoudt.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht „Türkei: „Dann sagen wir der EU auf Wiedersehen"" ([2])?

2. Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie het dat Turkije, puur uit frustratie, probeert druk uit te oefenen op de toetredingsonderhandelingen door te dreigen zich bij de „Shanghai Samenwerkingsorganisatie" aan te sluiten? Verwerpt de Commissie deze chantage?

3. Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie het dat Erdoğan stelt dat de „Shanghai Samenwerkingsorganisatie" „beter en veel machtiger" dan de EU zou zijn? Concludeert de Commissie hieruit dat Turkije niet (meer) in EU-lidmaatschap is geïnteresseerd? Is de Commissie er derhalve toe bereid alle toetredingsonderhandelingen met én alle EU-geldstromen naar Turkije onmiddellijk te beëindigen? Zo neen, hoe kan de Commissie nog langer over toetreding tot de EU onderhandelen met een land dat helemaal niet bij de EU wil?

([1]) http://diepresse.com/home/politik/eu/1339046/Tuerkei_Dann-sagen-wir-der-EU-auf-Wiedersehen?_vl_backlink=/home/index.do.
([2]) http://diepresse.com/home/politik/eu/1339046/Tuerkei_Dann-sagen-wir-der-EU-auf-Wiedersehen?from=home.meinung.gastkommentar.sc.p1

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(15 maart 2013)

De Commissie is ervan in kennis gesteld dat de Shanghai-samenwerkingsorganisatie (SSO) op 7 juni 2012 de Turkse aanvraag tot status van dialoogpartner heeft goedgekeurd. Op 5 februari 2013 heeft het Turkse ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken verklaard dat de Turkse betrekkingen met de SSO geen alternatief vormen voor de betrekkingen met de EU of de Noord-Atlantische Verdragsorganisatie (NAVO).

De Commissie herinnert eraan dat zowel de Turkse premier Erdoğan als de lidstaten onlangs op ondubbelzinnige wijze hebben benadrukt dat zij veel belang hechten aan de toetredingsonderhandelingen tussen Turkije en de EU en dat de EU het ijkpunt voor hervormingen in Turkije moet blijven. Tegen die achtergrond blijft de Commissie zich ten volle inzetten voor de onderhandelingen in overeenstemming met het onderhandelingskader.

In haar jaarlijkse voortgangsverslag ([3]) brengt de Commissie uitvoerig verslag uit aan het Parlement over de stand van zaken van de toetredingsonderhandelingen met Turkije.

([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001029/13
to the Commission
Philip Claeys (NI) and Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Statement by the Turkish Prime Minister on joining the 'Shanghai Five'

Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan has stated on the television channel Kanal 24 that he is considering the possibility of Turkey joining the 'Shanghai Cooperation Organisation', as an alternative to the European Union. After the broadcast, the Prime Minister apparently said among other things that the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation was 'better and far more powerful' than the European Union ([1]).

This is a blatant attempt to pressurise the European Union into ratifying Turkey's accession, despite the country not having complied with the Copenhagen criteria. Moreover, it is the umpteenth indication that Turkey is following an increasingly anti-Western political line.

Is the Commission aware of Mr Erdogan's statements?

Has the Turkish Government been asked for an explanation yet? If so, what were the conclusions?

What consequences do Mr Erdogan's threats have for the further progress of the accession negotiations?

Question for written answer E-001041/13
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Turkey wants to join the 'Shanghai Five'

Turkey is trying to put pressure on the EU accession negotiations by threatening to join the 'Shanghai Cooperation Organisation', comprising China, Kazakhstan, Russia, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan. Turkey is doing this out of sheer frustration caused by the EU's criticism of the country.

Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan has said that the 'Shanghai Cooperation Organisation' would be 'better and far more powerful' than the EU.

Turkey is already a 'dialogue partner' of the 'Shanghai Cooperation Organisation', and is mainly involved in military and economic cooperation.

1. Is the Commission familiar with the message 'Türkei: "Dann sagen wir der EU auf Wiedersehen"'? ([2])

2. How does it view the fact that Turkey is trying to put pressure on the accession negotiations out of sheer frustration, by threatening to join the 'Shanghai Cooperation Organisation'? Does the Commission reject this blackmail?

3. How does it view Prime Minister Erdogan's statement that the 'Shanghai Cooperation Organisation' would be 'better and far more powerful' than the EU? Does it conclude from this that Turkey is (no longer) interested in EU membership? Is it therefore willing to terminate all accession negotiations with and all EU funds to Turkey? If not, how can it continue to negotiate EU accession with a country that does not want to join the EU at all?

([1]) http://diepresse.com/home/politik/eu/1339046/Tuerkei_Dann-sagen-wir-der-EU-auf-Wiedersehen?_vl_backlink=/home/index.do.
([2]) http://diepresse.com/home/politik/eu/1339046/Tuerkei_Dann-sagen-wir-der-EU-auf-Wiedersehen?from=home.meinung.gastkommentar.sc.p1.

Question for written answer E-001174/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: Turkey and the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation

Turkish Prime Minister Tayyip Erdogan stated recently that the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO) is an alternative that promises Turkey more than the European Union. He said that 'the Shanghai Five [China, Russia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan] are much better, they are much more powerful'. He made a similar statement in July 2012, shortly after visiting Moscow.

1. What is the Commission's interpretation of this stand by the Turkish Prime Minister?

2. What promises did the EU make to Turkey and break, in the Turkish Prime Minister's view, to incur his displeasure?

3. Is Turkey keeping its promises to the EU, thereby ensuring that it can continue unimpeded on the road to accession?

4. Given that the SCO is an intergovernmental organisation set up to deepen military trust in border regions, what would be the effect on EU-Turkey relations if the Turkish Prime Minister were to go through with his intention?

Question for written answer E-001238/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Does the EU intend to stand up to threats from Turkey?

Turkish press sources have revealed that the head of the Turkish Government, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, has recently threatened to put an end to the EU accession negotiations and to seek possible alternatives, namely to sign up to the Shanghai Pact (an intergovernmental cooperation organisation between Russia, China, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan) if the negotiations are not accelerated.

Furthermore they report that, so far, out of the 35 negotiating chapters, 13 have been opened and only one closed.

How does the Commission intend to react to the latest pronouncement from Prime Minister Erdoğan?

Can the Commission specify which 13 negotiating chapters have been opened and which is the only chapter to have been closed with Turkey?

Furthermore, according to a survey conducted by the University of the Bosphorus, 47.1 % of Turks have a positive opinion of the EU today, compared with 73 % in 2003. 46 %, compared with 70 % in the past, now believe that Turkey is part of Europe and 64 % fear that a hypothetical accession will damage the country's religious values (compared with 54 % 12 years ago). In 2003, 74 % would have voted 'yes' in a referendum on accession. Today there is still a majority, but it has been reduced to 51 %. And only 14 % of Turks think that, in the event of accession, they would be able to move to another EU country.

Even some EU Member States have displayed scepticism with regard to Turkey's accession to the EU.

In light of the above, does the Commission not believe that it is right to respect the opinion of Turkish citizens, on the one hand, and that of the Member States, on the other, and not force people's hand about an issue which now no longer seems of interest, not even to the Turks themselves?

Question for written answer E-001272/13
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: Ending accession negotiations with Turkey

The Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan has confirmed in a TV interview that he has asked Russian President Vladimir Putin for Turkey to be admitted to the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation, dominated by Russia and China. In the same interview he added: 'We do not need the EU'; 'the Shanghai Five are better and more powerful than the EU'; and 'then we will say goodbye to the EU'.

1. Does the Commission consider it makes any sense to continue accession negotiations with Turkey?

2. How does the Commission view the fact that Turkey is pondering alternatives to the EU?

3. Following Mr Erdoğan's statements ('…we will say goodbye to the EU'), is there any point in continuing to provide pre-accession aid to Turkey? If not, why not?

4. Will the Commission demand the return of the billions already invested in pre-accession aid?

5. If not, why not?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(15 March 2013)

The Commission has been informed that on 7 June 2012 Turkey's application for dialogue partnership status at the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO) has been accepted. The Turkish Ministry for Foreign Affairs issued a statement on 5 February 2013 that Turkey's relations with the SCO are not an alternative to Turkey's relations with the EU or the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO).

The Commission recalls that both Turkish Prime Minister Erdoğan and the Member States have recently unequivocally underlined their commitment to the accession negotiations between Turkey and the EU and the importance for the EU to remain the benchmark for reforms in Turkey. Against this background, the Commission remains fully committed to the negotiations in line with the Negotiating Framework.

The Commission reports in its annual Progress Report ([3]) in detail to Parliament on the state of play of the accession negotiations with Turkey.

([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001030/13
à la Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(31 janvier 2013)

Objet: Baisse drastique des restitutions à l'exportation de la filière avicole

Le règlement d'exécution (UE) nº 33/2013 de la Commission du 17 janvier 2013 fixant les restitutions à l'exportation dans le secteur de la volaille a amputé de moitié les subventions perçues en France pour l'exportation de volaille.

Cette baisse drastique et violente affaiblie davantage un secteur déjà en grande difficulté. Le groupe Doux placé en en redressement judiciaire depuis juin a ainsi annoncé qu'il allait payer moins cher ses volailles à ses fournisseurs du fait de cette baisse. 240 éleveurs sous contrat, de manière directe ou indirecte, sont touchés. Le volailler Tilly-Sabco a lui aussi annoncé des mesures similaires à la centaine d'éleveurs de volaille qui sont en contrat avec lui. Cette décision brutale prise sans concertation peut conduire à plus de 5 000 suppressions d'emplois dans la seule région de Bretagne (France).

1. Sachant que la Commission motive sa décision par «la situation actuellement observée sur le marché de la viande de volaille», cette situation justifie-t-elle pour autant une baisse aussi subite des restitutions à l'exportation et sans période de transition?

2. Quel est le niveau exact des réductions de subventions aux groupes Doux et Tilly-Sabco?

3. Quelles mesures la Commission compte-t-elle mettre en place afin de compenser les pertes de revenus dans la filière avicole? La Commission est-elle d'avis que de grands groupes industriels peuvent répercuter de façon aussi violente les risques financiers sur ses fournisseurs, c'est-à-dire les producteurs avicoles? Que pense-t-elle de la création d'un statut social particulier pour l'éleveur intégré afin de le protéger et de l'indemniser si la situation se dégrade?

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(26 mars 2013)

1. La fixation des restitutions à l'exportation pour la viande de volaille a lieu régulièrement, à savoir tous les trois mois. Dans une situation de marché qui conjugue des prix élevés, des prix d'aliments pour animaux stables et une augmentation des exportations de produits qui ne font pas l'objet de restitutions, les restitutions ne se justifient plus autant que par le passé. De ce fait, le montant des restitutions concernant la viande de volaille a été progressivement réduit durant l'année GATT en cours, plus précisément en octobre 2012 et en janvier 2013. Un certain nombre de produits ne sont accompagnés d'aucune restitution à l'exportation, la viande de volaille étant l'unique produit qui en bénéficie encore.

2. Le montant des restitutions a été réduit d'un tiers en octobre 2012, passant de 32,5 euros à 21,7 euros/100 kg, puis de moitié en janvier, pour atteindre 10,85 euros/100 kg. Par le passé, le montant des restitutions avait été réduit en juin 2010, passant de 40 euros à 32,5 euros/100 kg.

3. Les restitutions à l'exportation ne peuvent être considérées en tant que mesures de soutien au revenu. Par ailleurs, les règlements de l'Union européenne ne prévoient aucune mesure compensatoire à la perte de revenus provenant d'une subvention.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001030/13
to the Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Drastic reduction in export refunds in the poultry sector

The subsidies that France receives for its poultry exports have been slashed in half under Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 33/2013 of 17 January 2013 fixing the export refunds on poultry meat.

This drastic and harsh reduction is further weakening a sector that is already in great difficulty. The Doux group, which has been in receivership since June, has accordingly announced its intention to pay its suppliers less for its poultry as a result of this reduction. Some 240 contract farmers are directly or indirectly affected. The poultry company Tilly-Sabco has also announced similar measures to the 100 or so poultry farmers that are under contract with it. This sudden decision, which was taken without consultation, may result in more than 5 000 job losses in the region of Brittany (France) alone.

1. Since the Commission is citing 'the current situation on the market in poultry meat' as justification for its decision, does that situation justify reducing export refunds so suddenly and without a transition period?

2. To what extent exactly have the subsidies granted to the Doux and Tilly-Sabco groups been reduced?

3. What measures does the Commission intend to take to compensate for loss of income in the poultry sector? Does it believe that large industrial groups may pass the financial risks on to their suppliers — poultry producers — in an equally brutal way? What is its view on the creation of a specific social status for contract farmers in order to protect them and to compensate them if the situation worsens?

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

1. The export refunds for poultry meat are fixed on a regular basis every three months. In a market situation which combines high prices, stable feed costs and growing exports of the products without refunds, the use of refunds is not needed to the extent as it was required in the past. Thus, the poultry meat refunds have been reduced successively in the running GATT year: in October 2012 and in January 2013. Export refunds are fixed at zero for a number of products, poultry meat being the only product where refunds remain.

2. In October 2012, the refunds were reduced by one third from EUR 32.5 to EUR 21.7 /100kg and in January by another 50% to EUR 10.85/100kg. Previously, the refund had been reduced in June 2010 from EUR 40 to EUR 32.5/100kg.

3. The export refunds cannot be considered an income support measure. Moreover, in the Community regulations no measures are foreseen to compensate for the loss of income coming from a subsidy.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001031/13
alla Commissione
Giancarlo Scottà (EFD)
(31 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Calcolo delle piccole quantità (articolo 9, paragrafo 1, lettera c) della direttiva 147/2009/CE)

In ambito venatorio, l'Unione europea si avvale delle consulenze fornite da BirdLife, dall'EBCC (European Bird Census Council) e dalla FACE Italia (Anlc, AnuuMigratoristi, Enalcaccia, FIdC) per quanto riguarda l'Italia. In particolare, l'EBCC, sempre per l'Italia, ha previsto uno schema di studio denominato «MITO 2000» (Monitoraggio ITaliano Ornitologico). All'interno di questo schema esistono due rapporti di andamento delle popolazioni degli uccelli comuni in Italia:

1. «Uccelli comuni in Italia; Gli andamenti di popolazione dal 2000 al 2010», e

2. «Andamenti delle specie comuni nidificanti in Italia (2000-2011)».

Considerato che dall'anno 2006, a seguito del riscontro di non univoca interpretazione fornito dalla Commissione europea alla richiesta di parere formulata dall'INFS (attuale ISPRA), si è generata una sostanziale interruzione della funzione di consulenza espletata dall'Istituto nazionale di riferimento, che a partire da quell'anno non ha più dato riscontro alle richieste di calcolo delle piccole quantità avanzate dalle amministrazioni regionali e, inoltre, che, come espressamente scritto nella «Guida sulla disciplina della caccia nell'ambito della direttiva Uccelli», è necessario aggiornare regolarmente i dati e le informazioni, può la Commissione far sapere se gli studi compiuti attraverso MITO 2000 possano fungere da fonte di calcolo per le piccole quantità indicate nell'articolo 9, paragrafo 1, lettera c) della direttiva 147/2009/CE?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(14 marzo 2013)

Come spiegato nei punti 3.5.31 e 3.5.32 della *Guida alla disciplina della caccia nell'ambito della direttiva «Uccelli selvatici»* ([1]) della Commissione, un elemento fondamentale per il calcolo delle piccole quantità è la determinazione della popolazione alla quale è destinata la deroga, che implica la necessità di delimitare tale popolazione a quella presente nel territorio in cui si applica la deroga nel momento in cui viene effettuato il prelievo. È evidente che ciò è particolarmente difficile per le specie migratorie e per le specie su cui esistono meno dati. I due rapporti citati dall'onorevole deputato non paiono fornire dati sufficienti e adeguati per calcolare correttamente le piccole quantità, come sono tenuti a fare gli Stati membri che intendono richiedere deroghe a titolo dell'articolo 9, paragrafo 1, lettera c), della direttiva 2009/147/CE ([2]) (direttiva Uccelli).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/wildbirds/hunting/docs/hunting_guide_it.pdf
([2]) GU L 20 del 26.1.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001031/13
to the Commission
Giancarlo Scottà (EFD)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: The calculation of birds in small numbers (Article 9(1)(c) of Directive 147/2009/EC)

With regard to hunting, the European Union is advised by BirdLife, the EBCC (European Bird Census Council) and FACE Italia (Anlc, AnuuMigratoristi, Enalcaccia, FIdC) where Italy is concerned. Specifically, the EBCC has produced a draft study for Italy entitled 'MITO 2000' (Monitoraggio ITaliano Ornitologico) [Italian Bird Monitoring Scheme]. This draft identifies two trends for common bird populations in Italy:

1. 'Common birds in Italy: Population Trends from 2000 to 2010', and

2. 'Trends in Common Nesting Species in Italy (2000-2011)'.

Considering that during 2006, following the non-univocal interpretation provided by the European Commission in response to the request for an opinion made by the INFS (National Wildlife Institute) (now ISPRA [Institute for Environmental Protection and Research), the advisory service of the National Institute in question was significantly interrupted; that, as of that year, it no longer responded to requests from regional administrations for the calculation of birds in small numbers; and, furthermore, that, as expressly stated in the 'Guide to Sustainable Hunting Under the Birds Directive' that there will be a need to regularly update the data and the information, can the Commission state whether the studies carried out through MITO 2000 can serve as a basis on which to calculate the small numbers indicated in Article 9(1)(c) of Directive 147/2009/EC?

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

As explained under points 3.5.31 and 3.5.32 of the Commission's Guide to sustainable hunting ([1]) under the Birds Directive, a key element for the calculation of the small numbers is the determination of the population concerned by the derogation, which implies the need to restrict it to that occurring in the territory to which the derogation applies at the time when the taking takes place. This is obviously particularly difficult for migratory species and for those species for which fewer data are available. The two reports mentioned by the Honourable Member do not appear to provide sufficient and appropriate data for a proper calculation of small numbers, as required of Member States wishing to apply for derogations under Article 9.1(c) of Directive 2009/147/EC ([2]) ('Birds Directive').

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/wildbirds/hunting/docs/hunting_guide_en.pdf
([2]) OJ L 020, 26.1.2010.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001033/13
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(31 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Informazioni circa l'utilizzo dei finanziamenti comunitari del periodo 2007-2013 da parte dei Comuni di: Arezzo, Grosseto, Firenze, Pistoia, Carrara, Pisa, Massa, Livorno

Nell'ambito del quadro finanziario dell'Unione europea 2007-2013 sono stati inseriti numerosi programmi intesi a sostenere le politiche comunitarie in varie aree tematiche quali, ad esempio, ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico, programmi di formazione, promozione della cultura, ambiente, trasporti, energia nonché tutela della salute e del consumatore.

Per quanto riguarda i Comuni di Arezzo, Grosseto, Firenze, Pistoia, Carrara, Pisa, Massa, Livorno, può la Commissione far sapere se:

1. Questi Comuni hanno presentato progetti per i seguenti Programmi, in particolar modo nel corso dell'anno 2012:

— Citizenship (Cittadinanza)

— Culture (Cultura)

— Life+ (Vita +)

— Youth on the move (Gioventù in movimento).

2. Quali sono i progetti presentati e a quanto ammonta lo stanziamento per la realizzazione di ciascun progetto.

3. Fornire un quadro dettagliato circa la situazione dell'utilizzo dei finanziamenti diretti, gestiti dalla Commissione europea o da Agenzie ad essa delegate.

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001034/13
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(31 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Informazioni circa l'utilizzo dei finanziamenti comunitari del periodo 2007-2013 da parte dei Comuni di: Arezzo, Grosseto, Firenze, Pistoia, Carrara, Pisa, Massa, Livorno

Nell'ambito del quadro finanziario dell'Unione europea 2007-2013 sono stati inseriti numerosi programmi intesi a sostenere le politiche comunitarie in varie aree tematiche quali, ad esempio, ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico, programmi di formazione, promozione della cultura, ambiente, trasporti, energia nonché tutela della salute e del consumatore.

Per quanto riguarda i Comuni di Arezzo, Grosseto, Firenze, Pistoia, Carrara, Pisa, Massa, Livorno, può la Commissione far sapere se:

1. Questi Comuni hanno presentato progetti per i seguenti Programmi, in particolar modo nel corso dell'anno 2012:

— ICT-PSP

— Protezione Civile

— Progress

— Daphne.

2. Quali sono i progetti presentati e a quanto ammonta lo stanziamento per la realizzazione di ciascun progetto.

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001035/13
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(31 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Informazioni circa l'utilizzo dei fondi comunitari nel periodo 2007-2013 da parte dei Comuni di Arezzo, Grosseto, Firenze, Pistoia, Carrara, Pisa, Massa e Livorno

Nell'ambito del quadro finanziario dell'Unione europea 2007-2013 sono stati inseriti numerosi programmi intesi a sostenere le politiche comunitarie in varie aree tematiche quali, ad esempio, ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico, programmi di formazione, promozione della cultura, ambiente, trasporti, energia nonché tutela della salute e del consumatore.

Per quanto riguarda i Comuni di Arezzo, Grosseto, Firenze, Pistoia, Carrara, Pisa, Massa e Livorno, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se questi comuni hanno presentato progetti per i seguenti programmi, in particolar modo nel corso dell'anno 2012:

— Lifelong learning;

— Intelligent energy for Europe;

— Sanità pubblica;

— European neighbourhood policy (ENPI);

— Safer internet;

2. quali sono i progetti presentati e a quanto ammonta lo stanziamento per la realizzazione di ciascun progetto?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001036/13
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(31 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Informazioni circa l'utilizzo dei fondi strutturali nel periodo 2007-2013 da parte della Regione Toscana

Considerato che in Italia la spesa certificata al 31 dicembre 2012 relativa all'utilizzo dei fondi comunitari per il periodo 2007-2013 si attesta al 37 %, può la Commissione:

1. fornire un quadro dettagliato e aggiornato circa la situazione dell'utilizzo dei fondi comunitari da parte della Regione Toscana;

2. fornire un quadro circa l'utilizzo dei seguenti fondi:

— Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale (FESR);

— Fondo di coesione (FC);

— Fondo sociale europeo (FSE)

— Fondo europeo agricolo per lo sviluppo regionale (FEARS);

— Fondo europeo per la pesca (FEP);

3. fornire un quadro dettagliato per la Regione Toscana sullo stato di utilizzo dei fondi direttamente gestiti dalla Commissione europea o da agenzie a essa delegate?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001083/13
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(1º febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Informazioni circa l'utilizzo dei fondi strutturali da parte della regione Umbria nel periodo 2007-2013

Considerando che in Italia la spesa certificata al 31 dicembre 2012 relativa all'utilizzo dei fondi comunitari per il periodo 2007-2013 si attesta al 37 %, può la Commissione:

1. fornire un quadro dettagliato ed aggiornato circa l'utilizzo dei fondi comunitari da parte della regione Umbria?

2. Fornire un quadro circa l'utilizzo dei fondi seguenti:

— Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale (FESR)

— Fondo di coesione (FC)

— Fondo sociale europeo (FSE)

— Fondo europeo agricolo per lo sviluppo regionale (FEASR)

— Fondo europeo per la pesca (FEP)?

3. Fornire un quadro dettagliato, per la regione Umbria, dell'utilizzo dei fondi diretti gestiti dalla Commissione o da agenzie da essa delegate?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001084/13
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(1º febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Informazioni circa l'utilizzo dei fondi comunitari da parte dei comuni di Perugia, Terni, Città di Castello, Spoleto, Gubbio, Narni, Corciano e Amelia nel periodo 2007-2013

Nel quadro finanziario dell'Unione europea 2007-2013 sono compresi numerosi programmi a sostegno di politiche comunitarie in varie aree tematiche quali, ad esempio, ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico, programmi di formazione, promozione della cultura, ambiente, trasporti, energia nonché tutela della salute e del consumatore.

Per quanto riguarda i comuni di Perugia, Terni, Città di Castello, Spoleto, Gubbio, Narni, Corciano e Amelia, può la Commissione:

1. far sapere se questi comuni hanno presentato progetti per i seguenti programmi, in particolar modo nel corso dell'anno 2012:

— Citizenship

— Culture

— Life+

— Youth on the move?

2. Far sapere quali progetti sono stati presentati e a quanto ammonta lo stanziamento per la realizzazione di ciascun progetto?

3. Fornire un quadro dettagliato circa la situazione dell'utilizzo dei fondi diretti gestiti dalla Commissione o da Agenzie da essa delegate?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001085/13
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(1º febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Informazioni circa l'utilizzo dei fondi comunitari nel periodo 2007-2013 da parte dei comuni di Perugia, Terni, Città di Castello, Spoleto, Gubbio, Narni, Corciano, Amelia

Nell'ambito del quadro finanziario dell'Unione europea 2007-2013 sono stati inseriti numerosi programmi intesi a sostenere le politiche comunitarie in varie aree tematiche quali, ad esempio, ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico, programmi di formazione, promozione della cultura, ambiente, trasporti, energia nonché tutela della salute e del consumatore.

Per quanto riguarda i comuni di Perugia, Terni, Città di Castello, Spoleto, Gubbio, Narni, Corciano, Amelia, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se questi comuni hanno presentato progetti per i seguenti programmi, in particolar modonelcorso dell'anno 2012:

— Lifelong learning

— Intelligent Energy — Europe

— Sanità pubblica

— European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP)

— Safer Internet

2. quali sono i progetti presentati e a quanto ammonta lo stanziamento per la realizzazionedi ciascun progetto?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001086/13
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(1º febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Informazioni circa l'utilizzo dei fondi comunitari nel periodo 2007-2013 da parte dei comuni di Perugia, Terni, Città di Castello, Spoleto, Gubbio, Narni, Corciano, Amelia

Nell'ambito del quadro finanziario dell'Unione europea 2007-2013 sono stati inseriti numerosi programmi intesi a sostenere le politiche comunitarie in varie aree tematiche quali, ad esempio, ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico, programmi di formazione, promozione della cultura, ambiente, trasporti, energia nonché tutela della salute e del consumatore.

Per quanto riguarda i comuni di Perugia, Terni, Città di Castello, Spoleto, Gubbio, Narni, Corciano, Amelia, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se questi comuni hanno presentato progetti per i seguenti programmi, in particolar modonel corso dell'anno 2012:

— ICT-PSP

— Protezione civile

— Progress

— Daphne

2. quali sono i progetti presentati e a quanto ammonta lo stanziamento per la realizzazionedi ciascun progetto?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001087/13
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(1º febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Informazioni circa l'utilizzo dei fondi comunitari nel periodo 2007-2013 da parte dei comuni di Urbino, Ancona, Pesaro, Macerata, Chiaravalle

Nell'ambito del quadro finanziario dell'Unione europea 2007-2013 sono stati inseriti numerosi programmi intesi a sostenere le politiche comunitarie in varie aree tematiche quali, ad esempio, ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico, programmi di formazione, promozione della cultura, ambiente, trasporti, energia nonché tutela della salute e del consumatore.

Per quanto riguarda i comuni di Urbino, Ancona, Pesaro, Macerata, Chiaravalle, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se questi comuni hanno presentato progetti per i seguenti programmi, in particolar modonelcorso dell'anno 2012:

— Lifelong learning

— Intelligent Energy — Europe

— Sanità pubblica

— European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP)

— Safer Internet

2. quali sono i progetti presentati e a quanto ammonta lo stanziamento per la realizzazionedi ciascun progetto?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001088/13
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(1º febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Informazioni circa l'utilizzo dei fondi comunitari del periodo 2007-2013 da parte dei Comuni di Urbino, Ancona, Pesaro, Macerata, Chiaravalle

Nell'ambito del quadro finanziario dell'Unione europea 2007-2013 sono stati inseriti numerosi programmi intesi a sostenere le politiche comunitarie in varie aree tematiche quali, ad esempio, ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico, programmi di formazione, promozione della cultura, ambiente, trasporti, energia nonché tutela della salute e del consumatore.

Per quanto riguarda i Comuni di Urbino, Ancona, Pesaro, Macerata, Chiaravalle, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. questi Comuni hanno presentato progetti per i seguenti programmi, in particolar modo nel corso dell'anno 2012:

— ICT-PSP

— Protezione civile

— Progress

— Daphne?

2. Quali sono i progetti presentati e a quanto ammonta lo stanziamento per la realizzazione di ciascun progetto?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001100/13
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(1º febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Informazioni circa l'utilizzo dei fondi strutturali da parte della regione Marche nel periodo 2007-2013

Considerando che in Italia la spesa certificata al 31 dicembre 2012 relativa all'utilizzo dei fondi comunitari per il periodo 2007-2013 si attesta al 37 %, può la Commissione:

1. fornire un quadro dettagliato ed aggiornato circa l'utilizzo dei fondi comunitari da parte della regione Marche?

2. Fornire un quadro circa l'utilizzo dei fondi seguenti:

— Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale (FESR)

— Fondo di coesione (FC)

— Fondo sociale europeo (FSE)

— Fondo europeo agricolo per lo sviluppo regionale (FEASR)

— Fondo europeo per la pesca (FEP)?

3. Fornire un quadro dettagliato, per la regione Marche, dell'utilizzo dei fondi diretti gestiti dalla Commissione o da agenzie da essa delegate?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001101/13
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(1º febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Informazioni circa l'utilizzo dei fondi comunitari del periodo 2007-2013 da parte dei Comuni di Urbino, Ancona, Pesaro, Macerata, Chiaravalle

Nell'ambito del quadro finanziario dell'Unione europea 2007-2013 sono stati inseriti numerosi programmi intesi a sostenere le politiche comunitarie in varie aree tematiche quali, ad esempio, ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico, programmi di formazione, promozione della cultura, ambiente, trasporti, energia nonché tutela della salute e del consumatore.

Per quanto riguarda i Comuni di Urbino, Ancona, Pesaro, Macerata, Chiaravalle, può la Commissione:

1. far sapere se questi Comuni hanno presentato progetti per i seguenti programmi, in particolar modo nel corso dell'anno 2012:

— Citizenship

— Culture

— Life+

— Youth on the move;

2. indicare quali sono i progetti presentati e a quanto ammonta lo stanziamento per la realizzazione di ciascun progetto;

3. fornire un quadro dettagliato circa la situazione dell'utilizzo dei fondi diretti, gestiti dalla Commissione o da Agenzie da essa delegate?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001394/13
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(11 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Utilizzo dei fondi dell'UE diretti ed indiretti da parte del Comune di Pisa (Toscana)

In Italia la spesa certificata al 31 dicembre 2012 relativa all'utilizzo dei fondi dell'UE per il periodo 2007-2013 si attesta al 37 %.

Alla luce di tale dato, può la Commissione chiarire nel dettaglio se il comune di Pisa ha recentemente usufruito di finanziamenti relativi ai seguenti fondi:

— Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale (FESR)

— Fondo di coesione (FC)

— Fondo sociale europeo (FSE)

— Fondo europeo agricolo per lo sviluppo regionale (FEARS)

— Fondo europeo per la pesca (FEP)?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001396/13
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(11 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Informazioni circa l'utilizzo dei fondi dell'UE per il periodo 2007-2013 da parte del Comune di Pisa (Regione Toscana)

Nell'ambito del quadro finanziario dell'Unione europea 2007-2013 sono stati inseriti numerosi programmi intesi a sostenere le amministrazioni locali in diversi settori e tematiche.

Per quanto riguarda il comune di Pisa (Toscana), può la Commissione far sapere se tale comune ha presentato progetti per i seguenti programmi:

— ICT-PSP (Tecnologie dell'Informazione e della Comunicazione)

— Protezione Civile

— Progress

— Daphne

— Apprendimento permanente (Lifelong Learning)

— Energia Intelligente per l'Europa

— Sanità pubblica

— Safer Internet

— Cittadinanza

— Cultura

— Life+

— Youth on the Move

— Europa per i cittadini?

Inoltre, può la Commissione fornire:

1. un quadro dei finanziamenti concessi direttamente al comune di Pisa a titolo di programmi dell'UE gestiti dalla Commissione;

2. un quadro dei finanziamenti concessi al comune di Pisa relativi alla gestione corrente;

3. un quadro dei fondi europei (2007-2013) destinati alla Regione Toscana e il loro livello di attuazione;

4. qualora questi fossero consultabili online, i riferimenti delle pagine web che contengono tali informazioni?

Risposta congiunta di Lewandowski a nome della Commissione
(26 marzo 2013)

Per quanto concerne i progetti gestiti direttamente dalla Commissione, si prega l'onorevole parlamentare di consultare il sistema di trasparenza finanziaria al seguente indirizzo:
http://ec.europa.eu/beneficiaries/fts/index_en.htm.

Si invita inoltre l'onorevole parlamentare a contattare le autorità che sono incaricate della gestione dei progetti in Italia, in quanto non esiste un'unica banca dati generale contenente informazioni su tutti i progetti gestiti dai singoli Stati membri. I dati per contattare le competenti autorità italiane sono reperibili ai seguenti indirizzi:
http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/manage/authority/authorities.cfm?lan=EN&pay=it,
http://ec.europa.eu/esf/main.jsp?catId=386&langId=en,
http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-funding/beneficiaries/shared/index_en.htm,
http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/cfp/eff/apply_for_funding/national_authorities.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001033/13
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Information about the use of EU funds for 2007-2013 by the Municipalities of: Arezzo, Grosseto, Florence, Pistoia, Carrara, Pisa, Massa, Livorno

Numerous programmes have been included within the scope of the EU budget for 2007-2013 with the aim of supporting EU policies on various issues, such as, for example, technological research and development, training programmes, promotion of culture, environment, transport, energy, health, and consumer protection.

With regard to the Municipalities of Arezzo, Grosseto, Florence, Pistoia, Carrara, Pisa, Massa and Livorno, can the Commission state:

1. Whether these municipalities have presented projects for the following programmes, and specifically, for 2012:

— Citizenship

— Culture

— Life+

— Youth on the Move.

2. Which projects have been presented and what is the allocation granted to implement each one?

3. Provide a detailed description of funding granted directly, managed by the European Commission or by Agencies delegated to it.

Question for written answer E-001034/13
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Information about the use of EU funds for 2007-2013 by the Municipalities of: Arezzo, Grosseto, Florence, Pistoia, Carrara, Pisa, Massa, Livorno

Numerous programmes have been included within the scope of the EU budget for 2007-2013 with the aim of supporting EU policies on various issues, such as, for example, technological research and development, training programmes, promotion of culture, environment, transport, energy, health, and consumer protection.

With regard to the Municipalities of Arezzo, Grosseto, Florence, Pistoia, Carrara, Pisa, Massa and Livorno, can the Commission state:

1. Whether these municipalities have presented projects for the following programmes, and specifically, for 2012:

— ICT-PSP (Information and Communication Technologies Policy Support Programme)

— Civil Protection

— Progress

— Daphne.

2. Which projects have been presented and what is the allocation granted to implement each one?

Question for written answer E-001035/13
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Information about the use of EU funds for 2007-2013 by the Municipalities of Arezzo, Grosseto, Florence, Pistoia, Carrara, Pisa, Massa and Livorno (Tuscany)

Numerous programmes have been included within the scope of the EU budget for 2007-2013 with the aim of supporting EU policies on various issues, such as, for example, technological research and development, training programmes, promotion of culture, environment, transport, energy, health, and consumer protection.

With regard to the Municipalities of Arezzo, Grosseto, Florence, Pistoia, Carrara, Pisa, Massa and Livorno, can the Commission state:

1. Whether these municipalities have presented projects for the following programmes, and specifically, for 2012:

— Lifelong learning;

— Intelligent Energy for Europe;

— Public health;

— European neighbourhood policy (ENPI);

— Safer Internet;

2. Which projects have been presented and what is the allocation granted to implement each one?

Question for written answer E-001036/13
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Information on the use of the Structural Funds by the Tuscany Region in the period 2007-2013

Given that, in Italy, certified expenditure for the use of EU funds for the period 2007-2013 stood at 37 % as at 31 December 2012, can the Commission:

1. provide up-to-date details on the situation regarding the use of EU funds by the Tuscany Region;

2. provide information on the use of the following funds:

— European Regional Development Fund (ERDF);

— Cohesion Fund (CF);

— European Social Fund (ESF);

— European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD);

— European Fisheries Fund (EFF);

3. provide details on the situation of the Tuscany Region in relation to the use of the direct funds that are managed by the Commission or its delegated agencies?

Question for written answer E-001083/13
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Information on the use of the Structural Funds by the Umbria Region for the period 2007-2013

Given that, in Italy, certified expenditure at 31 December 2012 for the use of EU funds for the period 2007-2013 stood at 37 %, can the Commission:

1. provide up-to-date details on the use of EU funds by the Umbria Region;

2. provide information on the use of the following funds:

— European Regional Development Fund (ERDF)

— Cohesion Fund (CF)

— European Social Fund (ESF)

— European Agricultural Fund for Regional Development (EAFRD)

— European Fisheries Fund (EFF);

3. provide details on the situation of the Umbria Region in relation to the use of the direct funds that are managed by the Commission or its delegated agencies?

Question for written answer E-001084/13
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Information on the use of EU funds for the period 2007-2013 by the municipalities of Perugia, Terni, Città di Castello, Spoleto, Gubbio, Narni, Corciano and Amelia

Under the EU financial framework for the period 2007-2013 many programmes make funding available to support EU policies in a number of thematic areas, such as research and technological development, training programmes, promotion of culture, the environment, transport, energy, and health and consumer protection.

With regard to the municipalities of Perugia, Terni, Città di Castello, Spoleto, Gubbio, Narni, Corciano and Amelia, can the Commission:

1. say whether they have submitted projects for the following programmes, in particular in 2012:

— Citizenship

— Culture

— Life+

— Youth on the move;

2. say which projects have been submitted and what the budget is for implementing each one;

3. provide details on the situation regarding the use of direct funds that are managed by the Commission or its delegated agencies?

Question for written answer E-001085/13
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Information on the use of EU funds for the period 2007-2013 by the municipalities of Perugia, Terni, Città di Castello, Spoleto, Gubbio, Narni, Corciano and Amelia

Under the EU financial framework for the period 2007-2013 many programmes make funding available to support EU policies in a number of thematic areas, such as research and technological development, training programmes, promotion of culture, the environment, transport, energy, and health and consumer protection.

With regard to the municipalities of Perugia, Terni, Città di Castello, Spoleto, Gubbio, Narni, Corciano and Amelia, can the Commission say:

1. whether they have submitted projects for the following programmes, in particular in 2012:

— Lifelong learning

— Intelligent Energy Europe

— Public health

— European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP)

— Safer Internet;

2. which projects have been submitted and what the budget is for implementing each one?

Question for written answer E-001086/13
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Information on the use of EU funds for the period 2007-2013 by the municipalities of Perugia, Terni, Città di Castello, Spoleto, Gubbio, Narni, Corciano and Amelia

Under the EU financial framework for the period 2007-2013 many programmes make funding available to support EU policies in a number of thematic areas, such as research and technological development, training programmes, promotion of culture, the environment, transport, energy, and health and consumer protection.

With regard to the municipalities of Perugia, Terni, Città di Castello, Spoleto, Gubbio, Narni, Corciano and Amelia, can the Commission say:

1. whether they have submitted projects for the following programmes, in particular in 2012:

— ICT Policy Support Programme (ICT PSP)

— Civil protection

— Progress

— Daphne;

2. which projects have been submitted and what the budget is for implementing each one?

Question for written answer E-001087/13
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Information on the use of EU funds for the period 2007-2013 by the municipalities of Urbino, Ancona, Pesaro, Macerata and Chiaravalle

Under the EU financial framework for the period 2007-2013 many programmes make funding available to support EU policies in a number of thematic areas, such as research and technological development, training programmes, promotion of culture, the environment, transport, energy, and health and consumer protection.

With regard to the municipalities of Urbino, Ancona, Pesaro, Macerata and Chiaravalle, can the Commission say:

1. whether they have submitted projects for the following programmes, in particular in 2012:

— Lifelong learning

— Intelligent Energy Europe

— Public health

— European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP)

— Safer Internet;

2. which projects have been submitted and what the budget is for implementing each one?

Question for written answer E-001088/13
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Information about the use of EU funds in the period 2007-2013 by the municipalities of Urbino, Ancona, Pesaro, Macerata, Chiaravalle

The EU's financial framework for the years 2007-2013 includes many programmes aimed at supporting EU policies in various areas, including technological research and development, training programmes, promotion of culture, environment, transport, energy, as well as health and consumer protection.

With regard to the municipalities of Urbino, Ancona, Pesaro, Macerata and Chiaravalle, please could the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Have these municipalities submitted projects related to the following programmes, particularly during the course of 2012:

— ICT-PSP

— Civil defence

— Progress

— Daphne?

2. Which projects have been presented and what is the amount of funding granted to implement each one?

Question for written answer E-001100/13
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Information on the use of the Structural Funds by the Marche Region for the period 2007-2013

Given that, in Italy, certified expenditure at 31 December 2012 for the use of EU funds for the period 2007-2013 stood at 37 %, can the Commission:

1. provide up-to-date details on the use of EU funds by the Marche Region;

2. provide information on the use of the following funds:

— European Regional Development Fund (ERDF)

— Cohesion Fund (CF)

— European Social Fund (ESF)

— European Agricultural Fund for Regional Development (EAFRD)

— European Fisheries Fund (EFF);

3. provide details on the situation of the Marche Region in relation to the use of the direct funds that are managed by the Commission or its delegated agencies?

Question for written answer E-001101/13
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Information on the use of EU funds for the period 2007-2013 by the municipalities of Urbino, Ancona, Pesaro, Macerata and Chiaravalle

Under the EU financial framework for the period 2007-2013, many programmes make funding available to support EU policies in a number of thematic areas, such as research and technological development, training programmes, promotion of culture, the environment, transport, energy, and health and consumer protection.

With regard to the municipalities of Urbino, Ancona, Pesaro, Macerata and Chiaravalle, can the Commission:

1. state whether they have submitted projects for the following programmes, in particular during 2012:

— Citizenship

— Culture

— Life+

— Youth on the move;

2. indicate which projects have been submitted and what the budget is for implementing each one;

3. provide details on the situation regarding the use of direct funds that are managed by the Commission or its delegated agencies?

Question for written answer E-001394/13
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(11 February 2013)

Subject: Use of direct and indirect EU funds by the municipality of Pisa (Tuscany)

In Italy, certified expenditure as at 31 December 2012 with regard to the use of EU funds for the period 2007-2013 stood at 37%.

In the light of this, can the Commission clarify in detail whether the municipality of Pisa has recently made use of funding from the following funds:

— European Regional Development Fund (ERDF)

— Cohesion Fund (CF)

— European Social Fund (ESF)

— European Agricultural Fund for Regional Development (EAFRD)

— European Fund for Fisheries (EFF)?

Question for written answer E-001396/13
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(11 February 2013)

Subject: Information on the use of EU funds for the period 2007-2013 by the municipality of Pisa (Region of Tuscany)

The EU financial framework 2007-2013 includes many programmes to support local authorities in a number of areas and concerning a variety of subjects.

Can the Commission therefore say whether the municipality of Pisa (Tuscany) has submitted any projects for the following programmes:

— ICT-PSP (Information and Communication Technology)

— Civil Protection

— Progress

— Daphne

— Lifelong Learning

— Intelligent Energy for Europe

— Public health

— Safer Internet

— Citizenship

— Culture

— Life+

— Youth on the Move

— Europe for Citizens?

In addition, can the Commission give an overview of the following:

1. the funding granted directly to the municipality of Pisa under EU programmes managed by the Commission;

2. the funding granted to the municipality of Pisa in relation to everyday management;

3. EU funding (2007-2013) earmarked for the Region of Tuscany and its level of implementation;

4. if the latter information is available online, can the Commission provide the references to the relevant web pages?

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

For projects managed directly by the Commission, the Honourable Member is invited to consult the Financial Transparency System at: http://ec.europa.eu/beneficiaries/fts/index_en.htm

The Honourable Member is invited to contact relevant authorities in Italy for projects managed by them as there is no unique comprehensive database with all projects managed by individual Member States. The contact details of relevant Italian authorities can be found at:
http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/manage/authority/authorities.cfm?lan=EN&pay=it
http://ec.europa.eu/esf/main.jsp?catId=386&langId=en
http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-funding/beneficiaries/shared/index_en.htm
http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/cfp/eff/apply_for_funding/national_authorities.pdf

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-001037/13
aan de Commissie
Thijs Berman (S&D)
(31 januari 2013)

Betreft: Belastingontwijking door bedrijfsleven door gebrek aan Europese harmonisatie van o.a. vennootschapsbelasting

Is de Commissie van mening dat belastingstelsels zoals die van Nederland en Groot-Brittannië, waarin onder meer dividenden en royalty's niet belast worden, bijdragen aan de belastingontwijking van grote bedrijven in de EU en de wereld?

Vindt de Commissie dat de open interne markt zich verdraagt met de grote verschillen tussen nationale niveaus van vennootschapsbelasting? Kan de Commissie aangeven of het huidige gebrek aan harmonisatie van tarieven leidt tot concurrentie op belastingen en uiteindelijk kan leiden tot een „race to the bottom"?

Is de Commissie van mening dat sommige lidstaten een deel van hun belastinginkomsten mislopen, doordat bedrijven hun winsten met handige constructies kunnen onderbrengen in lidstaten met een „gunstiger" belastingklimaat?

Vindt de Commissie dat bedrijven momenteel buitenproportioneel voordeel kunnen halen uit de grote verschillen in vennootschapsbelasting?

Vindt de Commissie dat een bedrijf belasting zou moeten betalen in het land waar het daadwerkelijk winst maakt?

Vindt de Commissie dat de we in de EU over moeten stappen op een uniform tarief voor de vennootschapsbelasting?

Antwoord van de heer Šemeta namens de Commissie
(4 maart 2013)

Wat het gedrag van ondernemingen en de problematiek van de fiscale planning betreft, verwijst de Commissie naar het standpunt dat ze in haar mededeling van 6 december 2012 over een actieplan ter versterking van de strijd tegen belastingfraude en belastingontduiking ([1]) en in twee aanbevelingen ([2]) uiteengezet heeft.

Wat het belastingstelsel van Nederland en het Verenigd Koninkrijk betreft, wijst zij erop dat het verlenen van vrijstelling voor dividenden in concernverband een algemeen toegepaste internationale praktijk is om economische dubbele belasting te voorkomen; het is trouwens ook een van de methoden waarin de moeder-dochterrichtlijn ([3]) voorziet. Een (gedeeltelijke) vrijstelling of een lager belastingtarief voor inkomsten uit octrooien kan onderzoek en innovatie helpen bevorderen. Bij het nastreven van dergelijke doelstellingen is het evenwel zaak maatregelen te nemen om misbruik te voorkomen; dat is ook de reden waarom de Commissie de aanbeveling over agressieve fiscale planning, waarnaar hierboven is verwezen, heeft aangenomen.

Er is geen directe tegenspraak tussen het beginsel van de interne markt en de uiteenlopende vennootschapsbelastingtarieven in de lidstaten. In sommige gevallen kan de goede werking van de interne markt wel worden gehinderd door structurele verschillen tussen de vennootschapsbelastingstelsels, zoals bijvoorbeeld bij incongruenties tussen de verschillende stelsels. Voor die gevallen heeft de Commissie in haar actieplan en aanbevelingen oplossings-richtingen aangegeven. De vennootschapsbelastingtarieven hebben een neerwaartse ontwikkeling doorgemaakt, maar zij zijn niet tot nul gedaald. Ondanks de verlaging van de nominale tarieven is de verhouding tussen de belastinginkomsten en het bnp relatief stabiel gebleven. De Commissie acht het dan ook niet nodig naar een uniform belastingtarief te streven. Aan schadelijke belastingconcurrentie moet echter wel een eind worden gemaakt. De beginselen en criteria die in de gedragscode inzake de belastingregeling voor ondernemingen zijn opgenomen, moeten in de EU helpen om dit doel te verwezenlijken.

([1]) COM(2012) 722 final van 6.12.2012 — Actieplan ter versterking van de strijd tegen belastingfraude en belastingontduiking.
([2]) C(2012) 8805 final (Aanbeveling van de Commissie met betrekking tot maatregelen om derde landen aan te moedigen minimumnormen voor goed bestuur in belastingzaken toe te passen) en C(2012) 8806 final (Aanbeveling van de Commissie over agressieve fiscale planning).
([3]) Richtlijn 2011/96/EU van de Raad van 30 november 2011 betreffende de gemeenschappelijke fiscale regeling voor moedermaatschappijen en dochterondernemingen uit verschillende lidstaten (PB L 345 van 29.12.2011, blz. 8).

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001037/13
to the Commission
Thijs Berman (S&D)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Tax evasion by businesses due to lack of European harmonisation of (*inter alia*) corporation tax

Does the Commission consider that taxation systems such as those of the Netherlands and the UK, in which — *inter alia* — dividends and royalties are not taxed, promote tax evasion by big businesses in the EU and in the world at large?

Does the Commission believe that the open internal market is compatible with the major disparities in national levels of corporation tax? Can the Commission indicate whether the current lack of harmonisation of tax rates leads to tax competition and could ultimately result in a 'race to the bottom'?

Do some Member States forfeit part of their tax revenue because businesses can use cleverly devised structures to move their profits to Member States where the tax climate is 'more favourable'?

Are businesses currently able to derive disproportionate advantages from the major disparities in corporation tax?

Ought businesses to pay tax in the country where they genuinely make their profits?

Should we introduce a uniform rate of corporation tax in the EU?

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

On the questions referring to businesses behaviour and problems related to tax planning, the Commission has set out its position in the communication of 6 December 2012 on an Action Plan to strengthen the fight against tax fraud and tax evasion ([1]) and two Recommendations ([2]).

Concerning the tax system of The Netherlands and the United Kingdom, an exemption for dividends in intergroup situations is widely applied internationally to prevent economic double taxation and is also one of the methods foreseen in the Parent-Subsidiary Directive ([3]). A (partial) exemption or lower tax rate for income from patents can contribute to promoting research and innovation. However, in pursuing such aims it is important that action is taken to prevent abuse which is why the Commission adopted the recommendation referred to above on aggressive tax planning.

There is no direct contradiction between the principle of the internal market and the fact corporate tax rates differ as between Member States. In some instances the proper functioning of the internal market can be adversely affected by structural differences between corporate tax regimes such as for example mismatches between systems. The action plan and Recommendations outline how the Commission proposes these should be resolved. There has been a downward trend in corporate income tax rates, but this trend has not driven those rates to zero. Tax revenue to GDP ratios have remained fairly stable despite decreasing nominal rates. The Commission therefore does not see a need to promote a uniform tax rate. However, harmful tax competition needs to be eliminated. Within the EU, the principles and criteria of the Code of Conduct for business taxation serve this objective.

([1]) COM(2012)722 final (An Action Plan to strengthen the fight against tax fraud and tax evasion) of 6/12/2012.
([2]) C(2012)8805 final (Commission Recommendation regarding measures intended to encourage third countries to apply minimum standards of good governance in tax matters) and C(2012)8806 final (Commission Recommendation on aggressive tax planning).
([3]) Council Directive 2011/96/EU of 30 November 2011 on the common system of taxation applicable in the case of parent companies and subsidiaries of different Member States, OJ L 345, 29.12.2011, p. 8.

(Leagan Gaeilge)

Ceist i gcomhair freagra scríofa E-001039/13
chuig an gCoimisiún
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(31 Eanáir 2013)

Ábhar: Cúbláil cluichí san AE

Tá fadhb mhór san Eoraip i láthair na huaire a mhéid a bhaineann leis an gcúbláil cluichí agus de réir tuairisce a foilsíodh le déanaí tá 6.8 milliún duine as 19 de na 27 mBallstát bainteach leis an gcúbláil sin. Tá méadú suntasach tagtha ar luach an mhargaidh idirnáisiúnta sa chearrbhachas ar líne le cúpla bliain anuas, ó EUR 15.3 billiún i 2004 go EUR 50.7 billiún i 2012.

Molann an tuarascáil maidir le cearrbhachas ar líne sa mhargadh inmheánach do na Ballstáit bearta áirithe a chur i bhfeidhm ar mhaithe le deireadh a chur leis an gcúbláil cluichí, mar shampla uirlis dhlíthiúil ar leith a bhunú don chúbláil cluichí agus comhoibriú a spreagadh idir earnáil an chearrbhachais agus na haonaid speisialta atá ann chun an chúbláil cluichí a chomhrac.

An bhféadfadh an Coimisiún eolas a thabhairt maidir leis an dul chun cinn atá déanta ó thaobh cabhrú leis na Ballstáit agus iad ag cur na moltaí sin i bhfeidhm?

An bhféadfadh an Coimisiún eolas a thabhairt faoin méid atá déanta agus an méid atá á dhéanamh ag eagraíochtaí spóirt chun dul i ngleic leis an gcúbláil cluichí, go háirithe a mhéid a bhaineann le clár cuimsitheach a chur i bhfeidhm chun an chúbláil a chomhrac?

Mhol an Tuarascáil freisin go ndéanfadh earnáil an chearrbhachais agus eagraíochtaí spóirt breis comhoibrithe lena chéile ar mhaithe le monatóireacht a dhéanamh ar chluichí agus, mar sin, dul i ngleic leis an gcúbláil. An bhféadfadh an Coimisiún muid a chur ar an eolas faoin méid atá á dhéanamh chun na críche sin?

Freagra ón gCoimisinéir Vassiliou thar ceann an Choimisiúin
(15 Márta 2013)

Tá an Coimisiún in ann a chur in iúl don Fheisire Onórach go bhfuil eagraíochtaí spóirt ag cur bearta i bhfeidhm chun comhrac a chur ar an gcúbláil cluichí. Tá siad á dhéanamh sin trí bhearta oideachasúla agus ardaithe feasachta, trí bhearta lena n-úsáidtear córais theicniúla chun patrúin agus gníomhaíochtaí amhrasacha sa ghealltóireacht a fhaire agus a aithint agus freisin trí chóid cleachtais agus gléasanna eile a bhunú a dhéanfaidh níos éasca é cur chuigí calaoiseacha a thuairisciú; ar na gléasanna sin tá teolínte, agus oifigigh sláine a cheapadh.

Tá sé i gceist ag an gCoimisiún tacú leis an líonrú agus le malartú dea-chleachtas idir Bhallstáit sa réimse seo. Dá thairbhe sin, roghnaíodh cúig cinn de thionscadail in 2012 mar chuid de na Gníomhartha Ullmhúcháin don 'Chomhpháirtíocht Eorpach um an Spórt' agus táthar i mbun na dtionscadal sin faoi láthair. Táthar ag súil go mbeidh na torthaí ar fáil sa chéad leath de 2014.

Sa Teachtaireacht ón gCoimisiún 'Ionsar chreat cuimsitheach Eorpach um an gcearrbhachas ar líne', d'fhógair an Coimisiún go nglacfadh sé, in 2014, moladh maidir leis an dea-chleachtas i dtaca le comhrac agus cosc a chur ar chúbláil cluichí atá bainteach le gealltóireacht. Tá an troid in aghaidh na cúblála cluichí mar chuid den phlé atá á dhéanamh ag an nGrúpa Saineolaithe ar an gcearrbhachas, grúpa a bhunaigh an Coimisiún de bhun a Theachtaireachta. Chomh maith leis sin, chuaigh údaráis phoiblí, eagraíochtaí spóirt agus oibreoirí geallghlacadóireachta i gcomhar le chéile in 2012 faoi chreat Ghrúpa Saineolaithe ar an 'dea-rialachas', grúpa a bhunaigh an Coimisiún i gcomhthéacs na hoibre atá ag dul ar aghaidh ar an bplean oibre don spórt.

Maidir le caibidlíocht amach anseo i dtaca le coinbhinsiún de chuid Chomhairle na hEorpa in éadan mí-ionramhála comórtas spóirt, tá moladh curtha ag an gCoimisiún chuig an gComhairle ag iarraidh údaráis chun tús a chur le caibidlíocht thar ceann an Aontais. Tá comhlachtaí ullmhúcháin na Comhairle ag plé an mholta sin faoi láthair.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001039/13
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Match fixing in the EU

There is currently a major problem in Europe regarding match fixing and, according to a report recently published, 6.8 million people from 19 of the 27 Member States are involved in this fixing. There has been a significant increase in the value of the international market for online gambling in the past few years, from EUR 15.3 billion in 2004 to EUR 50.7 billion in 2012.

The report on online gambling in the internal market for the Member States recommends the implementation of certain measures in order to eliminate match fixing, such as the establishment of a separate legal instrument for match fixing and encouraging cooperation between the gaming sector and special existing units for combating match fixing.

Could the Commission provide information on the progress made in assisting the Member States in implementing these recommendations?

Could the Commission provide information about what has been done and is being done by sport organisations to tackle match fixing, particularly in relation to the implementation of a comprehensive programme to combat match fixing?

The report also recommended that there would be greater cooperation between the gaming sector and sporting organisations for the purpose of monitoring games and, therefore, tackling match fixing. Could the Commission inform us about what has been done so far in that respect?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(15 March 2013)

The Commission can inform the Honourable Member that sports organisations are implementing various measures to combat match-fixing, notably education and awareness-raising actions, measures to monitor and detect suspicious betting patterns via technical systems and the establishment of codes of conduct and tools to facilitate the reporting of fraudulent approaches, such as hotlines and the appointment of integrity officers.

The Commission intends to support the networking and exchange of good practices between Member States in this field. In this respect, five projects were selected under the 2012 Preparatory Action 'European Partnership on Sports' and are currently under way, with results expected by the first half of 2014.

In its communication 'Towards a comprehensive European framework on online gambling', the Commission announced the adoption of a recommendation on best practices in the prevention and combatting of betting-related match fixing in 2014. The fight against match-fixing is part of the discussions of the Expert Group on gambling which was established by the Commission as a follow-up to its communication. In addition, in 2012 cooperation between public authorities, sport organisations and betting operators took place in the framework of an Expert Group on 'Good Governance' which was set up by the Commission in the context of the ongoing work plan on Sport.

For the negotiations of a future Council of Europe convention against the manipulation of sports competitions, the Commission has sent a recommendation to the Council requesting the authorisation to open negotiations on behalf of the Union. The recommendation is currently under discussion in the Council preparatory bodies.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-001040/13
a Bizottság számára
Gáll-Pelcz Ildikó (PPE)
(2013. január 31.)

Tárgy: A „Horizont 2020” és a női vállalkozók

A strukturális alapok és a keretprogram közötti szinergiák létrehozásának szükségességét a vonatkozó rendeletek mindig elismerték, de a végrehajtás meglátásom szerint nem hozott egyenletes sikereket. Jómagam úgy vélem, hogy az „Európa 2020” stratégia pártfogásába vett, a foglalkoztatás, a termelékenység és a társadalmi kohézió magas szintjén alapuló gazdasági modell csak akkor lehet sikeres, ha mind a gazdasági, mind pedig az emberi erőforrások tekintetében garantált a kutatási és innovációs rendszer stabilitása.

Ugyancsak rendkívül helyénvalónak tartom azt, hogy a kis- és középvállalkozásokat támogató eszköz egyre erősebb figyelmet kap ennek érdekében, hiszen számos ehhez kapcsolódó terület önálló költségvetéssel rendelkezik. Azonban egy terület kevésbé érvényesül, ez pedig a női vállalkozások, a női kutatók kérdése. Meggyőződésem, hogy a női humántőke hatékonyabb kihasználása lehetővé teszi ugyanis az újabb tapasztalatok beépítését és új elgondolások létrejöttét, ami új lehetőségeket teremt ahhoz, hogy az innováció megnyilvánuljon a gazdasági fejlődésben.

Kérdésem ezzel kapcsolatban a következő: nem gondolja-e azt a Bizottság, hogy a „Horizont 2020” keretprogramnak még tovább kell lépnie a példaadás terén, és e programokban még többet kell foglalkozni a nemek közötti egyenjogúság kérdésével? Ha igen, milyen további lépéseket javasolna?

Máire Geoghegan-Quinn válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. március 19.)

A kutatásért, az innovációért és a tudományért felelős biztos 2010. januári parlamenti meghallgatásakor vállalta, hogy a Bizottság jó példával elöl járva fogja előmozdítani a nemek közötti egyenlőség ügyét a kutatás és az innováció területén. Ez a vállalás a Horizont 2020 keretprogramról szóló javaslat aktuális szövegében is megjelenik.

Az említett javaslat szerint a Horizont 2020 programnak eredményesen elő kell mozdítania a nemek közötti egyenlőséget, valamint – a kutatás és az innováció tartalmában – a nemekkel kapcsolatos dimenzió érvényesülését. A nemek kérdése ezenkívül a több területet érintő fellépésekben és a Horizont 2020 keretprogram időközi értékelése során is kiemelt figyelmet kap majd. Az említett átfogó megközelítés az egyedi programokra vonatkozó javaslatokban szintén megjelenik, hiszen a javaslat szerint a nemek kérdését a férfiak és nők közötti egyensúly hiányának orvoslása, valamint a nemek dimenziójának a kutatási és innovációs programozásba és tartalomba történő integrálása érdekében több területet érintő kérdésként kell kezelni. Továbbmenve, az „inkluzív, innovatív és biztonságos társadalmak” különös célkitűzés keretében továbbra is támogatást kapnak az egyetemeken és a kutatási intézményekben megvalósuló, a nemek közötti egyenlőség ügyét előmozdító intézményi átalakítások. Ugyanakkor mivel a Horizont 2020 keretprogramról szóló javaslatról jelenleg is folynak a tárgyalások az Európai Parlamentben és a Tanácsban, a Bizottság ezeknek a vitáknak a kimenetét nem tudja megelőlegezni.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001040/13
to the Commission
Ildikó Gáll-Pelcz (PPE)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Horizon 2020 and female entrepreneurs

The relevant regulations have always acknowledged the need to create synergies between the Structural Funds and the framework programme; however, I find that in practice, the achievements made in this regard have not been uniform. I for one believe that this economic model, which is being implemented under the auspices of the Europe 2020 strategy and is based on a high level of employment, productivity and social cohesion, can only be successful if the stability of the system for research and innovation is guaranteed in terms of both economic and human resources.

Similarly, I find it extremely appropriate that the instrument for supporting SMEs is being given increasing attention, as several related areas have their own budgets. However, there is one area that has been less prominent: namely the issue of female entrepreneurs and female researchers. Indeed, I am convinced that a more efficient use of female human resources could enable the integration of new experiences and the formation of new ideas, creating new opportunities for innovation in economic development.

Does the Commission not think that the Horizon 2020 framework programme should take further steps to set an example and give the issue of gender equality greater consideration in the programmes involved? If so, what further steps does it recommend?

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

Ensuring that the Commission leads by example in promoting gender equality in research and innovation was one of the pledges of the Commissioner for Research and Innovation during her parliamentary hearing in January 2010. This commitment is mirrored in the current Horizon 2020 proposal.

The proposal for the framework Programme says that Horizon 2020 shall ensure the effective promotion of gender equality and the gender dimension in research and innovation content. Gender is also given a particular attention within the cross-cutting actions as well as in the interim evaluation of Horizon 2020. Likewise, the proposal for the Specific Programmes reflects the cross-cutting approach by saying that gender will be addressed as a cross-cutting issue in order to rectify imbalances between women and men and to integrate a gender dimension in research and innovation programming and content. Furthermore the Societal Challenge on 'Inclusive, Innovative and Secure Societies' will continue to support institutional changes in universities and research institutions in order to promote gender equality. However, the Horizon 2020 proposals being currently under negotiation with the European Parliament and the Council, the Commission cannot prejudge the outcome of these discussions.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-001042/13
à la Commission
Philippe Lamberts (Verts/ALE)
(31 janvier 2013)

Objet: Respect des règles de la concurrence par ArcelorMittal (article 102)

La sidérurgie liégeoise va d'un drame social (phase du chaud) à un autre (phase à froid). En quelques mois à peine, ce sont donc un peu plus de 800 emplois directs et aujourd'hui quelque 1 300 qu'ArcelorMittal a détruits.

En janvier 2012, Laplace Conseil, un consultant indépendant, remettait au gouvernement wallon un rapport qui montrait que le site liégeois du groupe avait été sacrifié au profit d'autres sites, ce qui, par ailleurs, n'était pas sans poser de question du point de vue d'une «concurrence libre et non faussée». Selon le rapport,

1. «le Groupe a été le précurseur dès la fin de 2008 d'une réduction forte de sa production afin de préserver ses marges commerciales et semble prêt aujourd'hui à faire de même»;

2. aucun représentant du site liégeois n'était présent dans la centrale d'affectation des commandes de la Business Unit Nord, ce qui a permis de favoriser de manière disproportionnée et en dehors de toute justification technique ou économique les autres sites;

3. le site de Liège a fait l'objet d'un sous-investissement chronique et était alimenté en matière première de moindre qualité;

4. «la véritable raison de la fermeture du Chaud de Liège est de permettre les augmentations de capacités de production de ces trois usines [de Brême, Dunkerque et Gand] et de rentabiliser ces augmentations quelles qu'en soient les conséquences pour Liège».

Ainsi, le groupe a adopté un comportement qui a nui à ses clients et le site liégeois a fait face à des conditions de transaction non équitables.

La récente décision de fermer 7 des 12 lignes de la phase à froid (beaucoup étant qualifiées de «benchmark mondial» par le groupe lui-même) est motivée par l'affaiblissement de la demande européenne et la situation des secteurs en aval. Mais cette fermeture, qui va jusqu'à étonner l'ancienne direction d'Arcelor, surprend car il s'agit de produits de niche. En outre, les autres sites n'ont pas été affectés de la même manière.

Il semble donc que les comportements d'ArcelorMittal à Liège soient en infraction avec l'article 102 du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne qui déclare que «limiter la production, les débouchés ou le développement technique au préjudice des consommateurs» est une pratique abusive qui «est incompatible avec le marché intérieur et interdit[e], dans la mesure où le commerce entre États membres est susceptible d'en être affecté».

Qu'en pense la Commission et, le cas échéant, que compte-t-elle entreprendre au regard de l'article 105?

Réponse donnée par M. Alumnia au nom de la Commission
(8 mars 2013)

La Commission a conscience des conséquences sociales des fermetures annoncées par ArcelorMittal sur son site sidérurgique de Liège. Cependant, elle considère que l'article 102 du TFUE ne s'applique pas dans ce cas.

L'article 102 du TFUE interdit l'exploitation abusive, par une entreprise, d'une position dominante sur le marché intérieur ou dans une partie substantielle de celui-ci, dans la mesure où le commerce entre les États membres est susceptible d'en être sensiblement affecté.

Même si ArcelorMittal devait être considérée comme occupant une position dominante, il n'est pas illégal en soi pour une entreprise d'occuper une position dominante.

L'article 102 du TFUE interdit, notamment, les abus de position dominante consistant à «*limiter la production, les débouchés ou le développement technique au préjudice des consommateurs*».

Par conséquent, bien que la Commission soit consciente des conséquences sociales des mesures prises par ArcelorMittal, elle n'a pas connaissance, à ce stade, d'éléments indiquant que ces mesures pourraient enfreindre l'article 102 du TFUE.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001042/13
to the Commission
Philippe Lamberts (Verts/ALE)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: ArcelorMittal's compliance with the competition rules laid down in Article 102 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU)

Liège's steel industry is lurching from one crisis to the next. On top of the recent closures of its blast furnaces, ArcelorMittal has now announced that the steel finishing lines are also going to be shut down. The company had already made 800 workers redundant; in just a few months, that figure has risen to 1300.

In January 2012, Laplace Conseil, an independent consultancy firm, delivered a report to the Walloon Government which revealed that ArcelorMittal had sacrificed the Liège steelworks in order to focus on its other sites, which also raised doubts as to whether the principle of 'free and undistorted competition' was being properly observed. According to the report,

1. 'in 2008, ArcelorMittal cut production sharply in order to protect its profit margins, and it appears ready to do the same again today';

2. not a single representative of the Liège site worked at the central buying office in Business Division North, which meant that other steelworks were unfairly prioritised over the Liège site, with no technical or economic justification;

3. the Liège site suffered from chronic underinvestment and was supplied with substandard raw materials;

4. 'the real reason for the closure of the Liège blast furnace was to increase the production capacities of three other ArcelorMittal steelworks (Bremen, Dunkirk and Ghent) and make these economically viable, whatever the consequences for the Liège plant'.

The ArcelorMittal group has acted in a manner detrimental to its clients and the Liège site has been forced to operate under unfair trading conditions.

ArcelorMittal has defended its decision to close seven out of 12 steel finishing lines in Liège (several of which the company itself had described as 'world-class'), citing the drop in European demand and the uncertainty surrounding the sectors downstream from the steel industry. However, this latest closure — which took even the former bosses of Arcelor by surprise — was unexpected because the Liège finishing lines produce niche items. Furthermore, ArcelorMittal's other steelworks have not been dealt with in the same way.

Consequently, ArcelorMittal's actions at the Liège site appear to infringe Article 102 TFEU, which states that 'limiting production, markets or technical development to the prejudice of consumers' constitutes abuse which 'shall be prohibited as incompatible with the internal market in so far as it may affect trade between Member States'.

Does the Commission agree that ArcelorMittal's actions infringe Article 102 TFEU? If so, and in view of the obligations laid down in Article 105 TFEU, what measures is the Commission planning to take to enforce Article 102?

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

The Commission is aware of the social consequences of the announced closures by ArcelorMittal at its Liège's steel site. However the Commission does not consider that Article 102 TFEU applies in this case.

Article 102 TFEU prohibits undertakings from abusing a dominant position within the internal market or in a substantial part of it, insofar as it may appreciably affect trade between Member States.

Even if ArcelorMittal were to be considered as holding a dominant position, it is not in itself illegal for an undertaking to be in a dominant position.

Article 102 TFEU prohibits, *inter alia*, abuses by dominant firms that take the form of 'limiting production, markets or technical development to the prejudice of consumers'.

Consequently, although the Commission is conscious of the social consequences of ArcelorMittal's actions, it does not possess at this stage any indications that these actions might infringe Art. 102 TFEU.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001043/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(31 janvier 2013)

Objet: Numéro d'identification unique pour les PME

Quelle est la position de la Commission quant à la mise en place d'un numéro d'identification unique pour les PME, qui sera enregistré dans une base de données européenne unique pour les PME, ainsi que l'ensemble des informations financières, ce qui permettra aux PME de postuler plus facilement au bénéfice des programmes et financements européens et nationaux?

Réponse donnée par M. Tajani au nom de la Commission
(26 mars 2013)

La Commission reconnaît le rôle important que jouent les PME dans l'économie européenne et est fermement résolue à encourager leur participation aux programmes de soutien de l'Union. C'est pourquoi elle s'efforce de simplifier, dans toute la mesure du possible, leur participation aux programmes proposés pour la prochaine période financière (2014-2020).

Pour l'heure, il n'est prévu ni de créer un numéro d'identification unique pour les PME européennes qui sont plus de 20 millions ([1]), ni de mettre en place une base de données européenne unique. En revanche, la Commission a récemment proposé d'étudier la possibilité d'instaurer un numéro d'identification fiscale européen ([2]). En outre, la directive 2012/17/UE du Parlement européen et du Conseil ([3]) exige l'établissement d'un identifiant unique pour les sociétés de capitaux. Cet identifiant vise à garantir l'interopérabilité des registres centraux, du commerce et des sociétés et la communication électronique transfrontalière entre ceux-ci.

([1]) Source: Analyse des performances des PME — Rapport annuel sur les PME européennes: (http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/facts-figures-analysis/performance-review/files/supporting-documents/2012/annual-report_en.pdf).
([2]) COM(2012) 722 final.
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexplus!prod!CELEXnumdoc&lg=FR&numdoc=32012L0017

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001043/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Single identification number for SMEs

What view does the Commission take regarding the introduction of a single identification number for SMEs, stored in an SME-specific European database, along with all relevant financial data, which will make it easier for SMEs to apply for support under EU and national programmes and funding instruments?

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

The Commission recognises the important role that SMEs play in the European economy and is strongly committed to encouraging their participation in EU support programmes. For this reason, efforts are focusing on simplifying, to the extent possible, their participation in the programmes proposed for the forthcoming financial period 2014-2020.

It is not currently planned to create a single identification number for the more than 20 million European SMEs ([1]), nor a single European database. However, the Commission recently proposed to study the possibility of introducing an EU Tax Identification Number ([2]). Moreover, Directive 2012/17/EU ([3]) of the European Parliament and of the Council requires the establishment of a unique identifier for limited liability companies. This identifier is aimed at ensuring the interoperability of central, commercial and companies registers and the cross-border electronic communication between them.

([1]) *Source:* SME Performance Review — Annual Report on European SMEs, http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/facts-figures-analysis/performance-review/files/supporting-documents/2012/annual-report_en.pdf
([2]) COM(2012) 722 final.
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexplus!prod!CELEXnumdoc&lg=EN&numdoc=32012L0017

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001044/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(31 janvier 2013)

Objet: PME et transparence

Les études récentes de la Commission montrent que tant l'accès au financement que l'accès aux compétences, notamment en matière de gestion, de finance et de comptabilité, constituent des facteurs essentiels pour permettre aux PME d'accéder aux financements, d'innover, de rivaliser avec la concurrence et de croître.

1. La Commission envisage-t-elle de soumettre les nouvelles dispositions intéressant les PME à une évaluation globale et exhaustive de leurs incidences, et notamment à un contrôle complet, en tenant compte des besoins et des épreuves auxquels les PME sont confrontées?

2. La Commission compte-t-elle proposer, comme le lui suggère le Parlement, le renforcement de la transparence de tous les contrats de remboursement anticipé pour les PME et étudier la possibilité de fixer un plafond pour limiter les coûts de ce type d'opération?

Réponse donnée par M. Tajani au nom de la Commission
(10 avril 2013)

La Commission réalise des analyses d'impact pour toutes les initiatives ayant une forte incidence économique, sociale et/ou environnementale. Selon les lignes directrices concernant l'analyse d'impact de la Commission (2009), les PME doivent être prises en compte à chacune des étapes d'une analyse d'impact. Ce «test PME» suit les recommandations du «Small Business Act» pour l'Europe ([1]). En outre, depuis janvier 2012, les futures propositions législatives de la Commission partent du principe que les micro-entreprises ([2]) en particulier doivent être exclues du champ d'application de la législation proposée, à moins que la proportionnalité d'une couverture de ces entreprises puisse être prouvée ([3]). S'il n'est pas possible d'accorder des exemptions, des solutions adaptées et des régimes plus souples seront recherchés en ce qui concerne toutes les formes de charge réglementaire, et notamment les exigences administratives. Cette évaluation est réalisée dans le cadre du système d'analyse d'impact existant et s'appuie sur des orientations opérationnelles spécifiques ([4]).

S'agissant de la question des remboursements anticipés, les prêts destinés aux PME ne sont actuellement pas réglementés au niveau de l'UE.

([1]) Communication de la Commission «Think Small First»: priorité aux PME, un «Small Business Act» pour l'Europe [COM(2008)394 final du 25.6.2008].
([2]) PME de moins de 10 salariés dont le chiffre d'affaires ou le total du bilan est inférieur ou égal à 2 millions d'euros.
([3]) Comme annoncé dans le rapport intitulé «Alléger les charges imposées aux PME par la réglementation — Adapter la réglementation de l'UE aux besoins de micro-entreprises» [COM(2011) 803 final du 23.11.2011].
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/key_docs/docs/meg_guidelines.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001044/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: SMEs and transparency

Recent Commission surveys show that not only access to finance but also access to skills, including managerial skills and financial and accountancy knowledge, are critical factors for SMEs when it comes to accessing funds, innovating, competing and growing.

1. Does the Commission intend to subject new regulations relevant to SMEs to an overall and inclusive impact assessment, including a comprehensive test, taking into account the needs and challenges that SMEs have to face?

2. Does it intend to propose, as Parliament suggests, more transparency in all contracts on early repayment for SMEs and to study the possibility of a cap to limit the costs of this kind of operation?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2013)

The Commission carries out impact assessments for all initiatives with significant economic, social and/or environmental impacts. According to the 2009 Commission Impact Assessment Guidelines, SMEs must be taken into consideration in each of the analytical steps of an impact assessment. This 'SME Test' follows the recommendations of the 'Small Business Act' for Europe ([1]). Furthermore, as of 2012, the Commission's preparation of future legislative proposals is based on the premise that in particular micro-entities ([2]) should be excluded from the scope of the proposed legislation unless the proportionality of their being covered can be demonstrated ([3]). When exemptions cannot be granted, adapted solutions and lighter regimes will be sought concerning all forms of regulatory burden, including in particular administrative requirements. This assessment is carried out within the existing impact assessment system and is supported by specific operational guidance ([4]).

With regards to the issue of early repayments, loans to SMEs are not currently regulated at EU level.

([1]) Commission Communication 'Think Small First' — A 'Small Business Act' for Europe, COM(2008) 394 final, 25.6.2008.
([2]) SMEs with less than 10 employees and a turnover or balance sheet total equal to or less than EUR 2 million.
([3]) As announced in the report on 'Minimising regulatory burden for SMEs — Adapting EU regulation to the needs of micro-enterprises' COM(2011) 803 final, 23.11.2011.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/key_docs/docs/meg_guidelines.pdf

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001046/13
aan de Commissie
Patricia van der Kammen (NI)
(31 januari 2013)

Betreft: Commissie wil quota oplaadstations elektrische auto's

Op 24 januari jl. heeft Eurocommissaris Kallas tijdens een persconferentie gesteld dat er in de EU quota voor oplaadstations voor elektrische auto's moeten komen: in 2020 moet in elke EU-lidstaat 10 % van deze oplaadstations publiekelijk toegankelijk zijn.

De uitwerking van deze plannen zal naar schatting 10 miljard euro kosten. Volgens de heer Kallas zal het merendeel daarvan door de industrie worden gefinancierd. De heer Kallas verwacht dat zijn plannen zonder problemen uitgevoerd kunnen worden; hij noemt ze zelfs betaalbaar en gewenst. Uit onderzoek is echter gebleken dat de overstap van diesel naar elektrisch rijden een te verwaarlozen verschil oplevert. Verder bewijst onderzoek dat elektrische auto's niet geschikt zijn voor lange afstanden.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met de berichten „Brussels mandates roll-out of electric-car „recharging points"" ([1]) en „Electric cars „no greener than diesel", study claims" ([2])?

2. Waarop baseert de Commissie zich als zij impliceert dat er in de EU een groeiende behoefte aan het gebruik van elektrische auto's zou zijn, wetende dat dergelijke auto's niet geschikt zijn voor lange afstanden?

3. Waarop is de kostenraming van 10 miljard euro gebaseerd? Kan de Commissie het bedrag onderbouwen en onderbouwen hoeveel de bijdrage van de industrie zal zijn en door wie het restant zal moeten worden opgehoest?

4. Indien elektrisch rijden voor de consument zoveel beter en voordeliger zou zijn, is de Commissie het dan met de PVV eens dat de markt en de branche vanzelf voor oplaadpunten zullen zorgen?

5. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat termen als „betaalbaar en gewenst" (vanuit de overheid) niet passen als het gaat om zaken die de markt zelf makkelijk moet kunnen oplossen, en dat m.a.w. de overheid zich hiermee niet met beleid, noch met financiële bijdragen moet bemoeien?

6. Deelt de Commissie de mening dat de EU-lidstaten zelf moeten kunnen bepalen of, en zo ja hoeveel oplaadstations voor elektrische auto's zij wenselijk achten? Deelt de Commissie de mening dat de door de heer Kallas geplande quota voor oplaadstations in strijd zijn met het in artikel 5 van het VEU neergelegde subsidiariteitsbeginsel en derhalve ongewenst zijn? Is de Commissie bereid ervoor te zorgen dat de plannen van de heer Kallas van tafel verdwijnen?

Antwoord van de heer Kallas namens de Commissie
(18 maart 2013)

Elektrische voertuigen, die een zeer efficiënte elektrische motor gebruiken voor de aandrijving, kunnen worden voorzien van elektriciteit uit het net, die in toenemende mate wordt geproduceerd uit koolstofarme bronnen. Flexibele oplading van voertuigaccu's, in tijden van een lage vraag of een overvloedig aanbod, ondersteunt de integratie van hernieuwbare energie in het elektriciteitssysteem. Elektrische voertuigen stoten geen verontreinigende stoffen uit en maken geen lawaai en zijn daarom bij uitstek geschikt voor gebruik in de stad.

10 miljard euro is de geraamde totale kostprijs voor de volledige infrastructuur voor alternatieve brandstoffen die wordt vooropgesteld in het voorstel voor een richtlijn betreffende de uitrol van infrastructuur voor alternatieve brandstoffen ([3]). Dit voorstel omvat niet alleen de invoering van elektrische oplaadpunten. De kostprijs voor 10 % openbaar toegankelijk elektrische oplaadpunten ([4]) wordt geraamd op 4,2 miljard euro. Voor de uitrol van de infrastructuur voor alternatieve brandstoffen zijn geen overheidsmiddelen nodig indien de lidstaten de talrijke regelgevende en juridische instrumenten waarover zij beschikken, aanwenden om private investeringen te stimuleren. Nadere informatie vindt u in de effectbeoordeling bij het voorstel ([5]).

([1]) http://www.euractiv.com/climate-environment/brussels-clears-road-electric-ve-news-517378
([2]) http://www.euractiv.com/climate-environment/electric-cars-greener-diesel-stu-news-299831
([3]) COM(2013)321 final.
([4]) 800 000 voor de hele Unie.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/urban/cpt/doc/swd(2013)5-2-impact-assessment-part1.pdfhttp://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/urban/cpt/doc/swd(2013)5-2-impact-assessment-part1.pdf

Door het ontbreken van schaalvoordelen en het kleine aantal voertuigen op alternatieve brandstoffen is infrastructuur voor alternatieve brandstoffen aanvankelijk meestal duurder dan voor brandstoffen op basis van aardolie. In dit verband creëert het voorstel een beleidskader dat ervoor moet zorgen dat voor brandstofleveranciers en -verdelers een aantrekkelijk investeringsklimaat ontstaat. Versnippering van de interne markt door de ongecoördineerde marktintroductie van alternatieve brandstoffen moet worden vermeden. Derhalve is het noodzakelijk om in dit voorstel een minimale dekking van elektrische laadstations in de Unie voor te schrijven en gemeenschappelijk technische specificaties vast te stellen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001046/13
to the Commission
Patricia van der Kammen (NI)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Commission wants quota for electric car charging stations

On 24 January this year, Commissioner Kallas stated during a press conference that, by 2020, 10 % of electric car charging stations in the EU must be publicly accessible in each EU Member State.

The implementation of these plans will cost an estimated EUR 10 billion, most of which, according to Mr Kallas, will be funded by the industry. Mr Kallas expects his plans to be carried out without any problems; he even calls them affordable and desirable. However, research has shown that the switch from diesel to electric cars will have a negligible effect. Furthermore, research proves that electric cars are not suitable for long distances.

1. Is the Commission aware of the reports 'Brussels mandates roll-out of electric-car recharging points' ([1]) and 'Electric cars "no greener than diesel", study claims'? ([2])

2. On what evidence does the Commission base its claims that there is a growing need for electric cars in the EU, given that such cars are not suitable for long distances?

3. On what does it base the cost estimate of EUR 10 billion? Can it corroborate this amount, how much the industry will contribute and who will have to cough up the remainder?

4. If electric cars are so much better and more beneficial to consumers, does the Commission agree with the PVV (Party for Freedom) that the market and the industry should automatically provide charging stations?

5. Does it agree with the PVV that terms such as 'affordable and desirable' (used by the Government) are inappropriate when they concern matters that the market should be able to resolve easily and, therefore, that the Government should not interfere with policy or financial contributions?

6. Does it agree that the EU Member States should determine how many electric car charging stations are appropriate? Does it agree that the quota for charging stations planned by Mr Kallas contravenes the principle of subsidiarity set out in Article 5 of the Treaty on European Union and is therefore undesirable? Is it prepared to ensure that Mr Kallas's plans disappear under the table?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(18 March 2013)

Electric vehicles (EVs) using a highly efficient electric motor for propulsion can be supplied by electricity from the grid, coming increasingly from low-CO2 energy sources. Flexible recharging of vehicle batteries, at times of little demand or ample supply, supports the integration of renewable energy into the power system. EVs emit no pollutants and no noise and are therefore particularly suited for urban areas.

EUR 10 billion is the overall estimated cost for the entire alternative fuels infrastructure covered by the proposal for a directive on the deployment of alternative fuels infrastructure ([3]). This proposal goes beyond the deployment of electric charging points. The cost for 10% publicly accessible electric charging stations ([4]) is estimated at EUR 4.2 billion. No public spending would be required for the build-up of alternative transport fuel infrastructure if the Member States use the wide range of legislative and regulatory measures available to mobilise private investment. The relevant information is available in the impact assessment accompanying the proposal ([5]).

([1]) http://www.euractiv.com/climate-environment/brussels-clears-road-electric-ve-news-517378
([2]) http://www.euractiv.com/climate-environment/electric-cars-greener-diesel-stu-news-299831
([3]) COM(2013)018final.
([4]) 800 000 for the entire EU.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/urban/cpt/doc/swd(2013)5-2-impact-assessment-part1.pdf
http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/urban/cpt/doc/swd(2013)5-2-impact-assessment-part2.pdf

The initial costs for alternative fuel infrastructure are generally higher than for petroleum-based fuels due to the lack of economies of scale and availability of alternative fuel vehicles. In this respect, the proposal sets up a policy framework to create the conditions for fuel suppliers and distributors to make investments with reasonable assurances of returns. Fragmentation of the internal market through uncoordinated market introduction of alternative fuels should be avoided. Therefore it is necessary that a minimum coverage of electric recharging stations in the Union and its implementation with common technical specifications is addressed in this proposal.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001047/13
aan de Raad
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(31 januari 2013)

Betreft: Hernieuwde stemming na misleidende informatie van de Commissie

De Financial Times heeft bericht dat de grootste economieën in de eurozone volgens een gedetailleerd voorstel van de Commissie van plan zijn een belasting op financiële transacties te heffen. In het herziene en verstevigde ontwerpverslag staan de precieze voorwaarden van de belasting op financiële transacties (FTT) vastgelegd voor transacties in aandelen, obligaties en derivatieven en de toepassing daarvan op transacties op grond van de plaats waar het financiële product was uitgegeven, zelfs als de handelende partijen zich in Azië, de VS of het VK bevinden ([1]).

In haar vorige schriftelijke antwoord (E-009821/2012) heeft de Commissie verklaard dat de effectbeoordeling over deze kwestie heeft uitgewezen dat er geen gevolgen zouden zijn voor lidstaten die niet deelnemen aan de intensievere samenwerking.

1. Is de Raad ervan op de hoogte dat een dergelijk voorstel momenteel in voorbereiding is?

Volgens de genoemde bron heeft de Commissie een nieuwe effectbeoordeling voorbereid waaruit blijkt dat de intensievere samenwerking op het vlak van de belasting op financiële transacties wel degelijk gevolgen zou hebben voor de interne markt. De goedkeuring die de lidstaten in de Raad hebben uitgesproken over het vorige voorstel voor een belasting op financiële transacties is dus niet van toepassing op de nieuwe, gewijzigde situatie.

2. Is de Raad ook van mening dat er in dit geval een nieuw voorstel nodig is dat vervolgens ook in stemming moet worden gebracht?

3. Kan de Raad zijn interpretatie geven van artikel 329 VWEU? Wat voor meerderheid is er vereist als er opnieuw gestemd wordt over deze kwestie?

Antwoord
(22 april 2013)

Bij Besluit 2013/52/EU van de Raad van 22 januari 2013 is machtiging verleend om een nauwere samenwerking aan te gaan op het gebied van belasting op financiële transacties ([2]).

De Commissie heeft op 14 februari 2013 haar voorstel ingediend voor een richtlijn van de Raad tot uitvoering van de nauwere samenwerking op het gebied van belasting op financiële transacties ([3]); dat voorstel wordt op dit moment door de Raad bestudeerd.

De Raad heeft een eventuele nieuwe machtiging voor nauwere samenwerking nog niet besproken.

([1]) http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/e82a3792-6a2a-11e2-a3db-00144feab49a.html#axzz2JSSVk2gJ.
([2]) PB L 22 van 25.1.2013, blz. 11.
([3]) 6442/13.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001047/13
to the Council
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Revote following misleading information from the Commission

The *Financial Times* has reported that the eurozone's biggest economies intend, according to a detailed Commission proposal, to raise a levy on financial transactions. The revised and strengthened draft report sets out the exact terms of the financial transaction tax (FTT) on equity, bond and derivative transactions and its application to transactions according to where the financial product was issued, even if the parties trading it are in Asia, the US or the UK ([1]).

In its previous written answer (E-009821/2012), the Commission stated that the impact assessment undertaken by it on this matter showed that there would be no effect on Member States not participating in the enhanced cooperation.

1. Is the Council aware that such a proposal is being prepared?

According to this source, the Commission has prepared a new impact assessment which shows that this enhanced cooperation relating to the financial transaction tax would have an impact on the internal market. Thus, the Member States' consent expressed in Council regarding the previous proposal for a financial transaction tax does not apply to the new, changed situation.

2. Does the Council agree that a new proposal and a revote are needed in this case?

3. Could the Council explain how it interprets Article 329 TFEU? What kind of majority would be required should there be a fresh vote on the matter?

Reply
(22 April 2013)

Council Decision 2013/52/EU of 22 January 2013 authorised enhanced cooperation in the area of financial transaction tax ([2]).

On 14 February 2013, the Commission submitted its proposal for a Council Directive implementing enhanced cooperation in the area of financial transaction tax ([3]), which is being examined within the Council.

The Council has not discussed the question of a possible new authorisation for enhanced cooperation.

([1]) http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/e82a3792-6a2a-11e2-a3db-00144feab49a.html#axzz2JSSVk2gJ.
([2]) OJ L 22, 25.1.2013, p. 11.
([3]) 6442/13.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001048/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(31 janvier 2013)

Objet: PME et financements mezzanine

La Commission a invité, il y a plusieurs mois, des banquiers et des organisations de petites entreprises afin d'identifier et de réduire les obstacles auxquels ces dernières sont confrontées lorsqu'elles sont à la recherche d'un financement. Pour plus d'informations, voir les sections consacrées à l'emprunt banquier (garanties, financement de l'amorçage et microcrédit) et aux tables rondes entre banquiers et PME. Il y a notamment été question des financements mezzanine.

1. Quelles sont les pistes de la Commission afin d'améliorer le marché européen des quasi-fonds propres, notamment celui des financements mezzanine?

2. Quelles sont les pistes de la Commission afin de renforcer la Facilité d'investissement mezzanine pour la croissance du Fonds européen d'investissement (FEI) et de trouver de nouveaux instruments mezzanine, comme une garantie pour les prêts mezzanine?

3. La Commission possède-t-elle des données et des analyses relatives aux instruments financiers afin de réduire les obstacles qui empêchent les intermédiaires financiers qui le souhaiteraient d'explorer le marché des crédits pour des financements mezzanine au sein de l'Union européenne?

Réponse donnée par M. Tajani au nom de la Commission
(27 mars 2013)

Le programme-cadre pour l'innovation et la compétitivité (2007-2013) comporte un mécanisme de garanties (GPME) pour faciliter l'accès des PME, entre autres, au financement en quasi-fonds propres. Dans ce cas, la garantie est accordée aux intermédiaires financiers pour couvrir le financement de quasi-fonds propres pour les PME ([1]). Cet instrument est géré par le Fonds européen d'investissement (FEI) au nom de la Commission.

Dans le cadre du programme COSME (2014-2020), la Commission propose aussi des instruments pour promouvoir les financements mezzanine. La facilité EFG (*Equity Facility for Growth*) se concentrera sur les fonds qui fournissent du capital-risque et du financement mezzanine — sous forme, par exemple, de prêts subordonnés ou participatifs — à des entreprises en expansion et en phase de croissance, en particulier à celles qui exercent une activité transfrontalière ([2]).

La facilité LGF (*Loan Guarantee Facility*) encouragera le financement par l'emprunt au moyen de prêts, y compris des prêts subordonnés et participatifs, ou de crédit-bail. Il réduira ainsi les difficultés particulières auxquelles les PME sont confrontées pour accéder au financement, en raison soit de leur risque élevé perçu, soit de leur manque de garanties suffisantes ([3]).

La facilité d'investissement mezzanine pour la croissance, que le FEI gère au nom de la BEI, a été étendue fin 2012 pour fournir un milliard d'euros supplémentaire en soutien aux PME.

L'OCDE, dans un récent rapport intitulé «Alternative Financing Instruments for SMEs and Entrepreneurs: the Case of Mezzanine Finance» (instruments de financement non conventionnels pour les PME et les entrepreneurs: le cas du financement mezzanine) a examiné les pratiques de marché actuelles et les dispositifs publics en matière de financement mezzanine dans les pays de l'OCDE ([4]).

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2007:226:0002:0003:FR:PDF.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/cip/files/cosme/com_2011_0834_proposition_de_reglement_fr.pdf
([3]) Ibid.
([4]) http://search.oecd.org/officialdocuments/publicdisplaydocumentpdf/?cote=CFE/SME(2012)9/FINAL&docLanguage=En.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001048/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: SMEs and mezzanine financing

Some months ago the Commission hosted a meeting of bankers and small-business organisations with a view to identifying and reducing the obstacles that small businesses face when they seek financing. (For more information, see the Commission's webpages on bank lending — loan guarantees, start-up financing and microcredit — and on the Round Tables for Banks and SMEs.) In particular, there was discussion about mezzanine financing.

1. By what means is the Commission seeking to improve the European market in quasi equity, especially mezzanine financing?

2. By what means is the Commission seeking to strengthen the European Investment Fund's mezzanine facility for growth and to identify new mezzanine instruments, such as a guarantee for mezzanine loans?

3. Does the Commission have information about and analyses of financial instruments designed to reduce the obstacles that face financial intermediaries wishing to explore the market for mezzanine financing loans in the European Union?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2013)

The Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme (2007-2013) includes a guarantee facility (SMEG) to facilitate SMEs' access to, among others, quasi-equity financing. In this case the guarantee is provided to financial intermediaries to cover quasi-equity finance for SMEs ([1]). The instrument is managed by the European Investment Fund (EIF) on behalf of the Commission.

Under the COSME programme (2014-2020) the Commission has proposed instruments to foster mezzanine financing, too. The Equity Facility for Growth shall focus on funds that provide venture capital and mezzanine finance, such as subordinated and participating loans, to expansion and growth-stage enterprises, in particular those operating across borders ([2]).

The Loan Guarantee Facility shall stimulate debt financing via loans, including subordinated and participating loans, or leasing. This will reduce the particular difficulties that SMEs face in accessing finance either due to their perceived high risk or their lack of sufficient available collateral ([3]).

The Mezzanine Facility for Growth mandate, which the EIF invests on behalf of EIB, was extended at the end of 2012 to provide an additional EUR 1bn to support SMEs.

The OECD in a recent report titled 'Alternative Financing Instruments for SMEs and Entrepreneurs: the Case of Mezzanine Finance' reviewed current market practices and public schemes in mezzanine financing in OECD countries ([4]).

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2007:226:0002:0003:EN:PDF.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/cip/files/cosme/com_2011_0834_proposition_de_reglement_en.pdf
([3]) Ibid.
([4]) http://search.oecd.org/officialdocuments/publicdisplaydocumentpdf/?cote=CFE/SME(2012)9/FINAL&docLanguage=En.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001049/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(31 janvier 2013)

Objet: Faciliter l'accès au financement pour les PME

1. La Commission est-elle d'avis qu'il est bon de créer une plateforme européenne de garantie permanente dans le cadre du Fonds européen de financement, afin de faciliter l'accès des PME au financement et permettre ainsi de renforcer le développement des garanties ou des produits de crédit sur la base des garanties européennes, de réduire les exigences de fonds propres pour les banques et de limiter l'exposition au risque des intermédiaires financiers?

2. La Commission compte-t-elle garantir un cadre approprié et sur mesure pour les fournisseurs de financements aux PME, qui ne soit pas contraignant pour elles et qui inspire confiance aux investisseurs (dans le respect de la législation européenne sur les normes de comptabilité, de la directive sur les prospectus, de la directive sur la transparence, de la directive sur les abus de marché et de la directive MIF)?

Réponse donnée par M. Tajani au nom de la Commission
(11 avril 2013)

La Commission est consciente qu'une organisation professionnelle européenne a soumis l'idée d'une plateforme européenne de garantie. Des discussions préliminaires à ce sujet ont déjà eu lieu. Le FEI ([1]) a contribué aux recherches initiales dans deux États membres et un rapport a été élaboré et diffusé auprès des membres de l'organisation professionnelle en vue de recueillir leurs réactions.

Il est à noter que le FEI est l'institution européenne spécialisée dans la fourniture de garanties aux PME de l'UE. L'année dernière, le FEI a engagé 1,2 milliard d'euros ([2]) dans des garanties et des opérations de titrisation, stimulant ainsi de nouveaux portefeuilles de prêt destinés aux PME d'une valeur de 5,2 milliards d'euros. En outre, la Commission a proposé de mettre en place des instruments de garantie pour les PME à l'échelle de l'UE dans le cadre du programme pour la compétitivité des entreprises et les PME ainsi que de l'initiative Horizon 2020 au titre du prochain cadre financier pluriannuel.

Entre-temps, la réglementation ayant trait au financement des PME a connu des évolutions. La proposition de la Commission concernant un fonds de capital-risque européen permettra aux gestionnaires de fonds de capital-risque de commercialiser leurs fonds dans l'ensemble de l'UE tout en utilisant un ensemble de règles unique. Chaque fonds utilisant le nouveau label devra démontrer qu'une proportion conséquente de ses ressources sera dédiée au soutien des entreprises jeunes et innovantes. Grâce à l'introduction de règles communes, les fonds de capital-risque et d'entrepreneuriat social ont le potentiel d'attirer davantage d'investissements.

La révision de la directive sur les exigences de fonds propres ([3]) encouragera les prêts aux PME en réduisant ces exigences pour les expositions envers les PME via l'application d'un facteur de soutien. Les révisions des directives sur la transparence, les prospectus et les abus de marché ont introduit des mesures visant à réduire la charge administrative des PME. La MiFID II créera un régime du marché des PME pour mieux répondre aux besoins de ces entreprises.

([1]) Fonds européen d'investissement.
([2]) Fonds issus des ressources propres et des mandats de l'UE.
([3]) CRD IV.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001049/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Improving access to finance for SMEs

1. Does the Commission agree that it would make sense to establish a permanent European guarantee platform under the European Investment Fund in order to make it easier for SMEs to access finance? Doing so would ensure that guarantees or credit products which are based on European guarantees are more readily available, would reduce bank capital requirements and would minimise the risks for financial intermediaries.

2. Does it intend to establish an appropriate and specific regulatory framework for SME funding providers which does not impose a burden on SMEs and which boosts investor confidence (and is consistent with European legislation on accounting standards, the Prospectus Directive, the Transparency Directive, the Market Abuse Directive and MiFID)?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(11 April 2013)

The Commission is aware that a European business organisation has proposed the idea of a European guarantee platform and preliminary discussions on this subject have already taken place. The EIF ([1]) has assisted with some initial research in two Member States and a report has been prepared and circulated to members of the business organisation for their reaction.

It should be noted that the EIF itself is the European institution specialised in providing SME guarantees throughout the EU. Last year, the EIF has committed EUR 1.2 bn ([2]) into guarantees and securitisation transactions, stimulating new loan portfolios for SMEs worth EUR 5.2 billion. Furthermore, the Commission proposed to pursue EU-wide SME guarantee instruments under the Programme for the Competitiveness of Enterprises and SMEs and Horizon 2020 under the next MFF.

In the meantime, there have been several regulatory developments relevant to SME funding. The Commission's European Venture Capital Funds proposal will allow venture capital fund managers to market their funds across the EU while using a single set of rules. Each fund using the new label will have to show that a significant proportion of its resources will be used to support young and innovative enterprises. By introducing common rules, venture capital and social entrepreneurship funds have the potential to attract more investment.

The review of the Capital Requirements Directive ([3]) will encourage lending to SMEs by reducing the capital charges for exposures to SMEs through the application of a supporting factor. The reviews of the Transparency, Prospectus and Market Abuse directives have included measures to ease administrative burden on SMEs. MiFID II will create an SME market regime to better address SMEs' needs.

([1]) European Investment Fund.
([2]) from own resources and EU mandates.
([3]) CRR-CRD IV.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001050/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(31 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Sigaretta elettronica: maggiore informazione per i cittadini su rischi e benefici

Fumare danneggia gravemente la salute. La sigaretta elettronica è stata per molto tempo venduta quale infallibile sistema indolore per smettere di fumare. Tuttavia, l'OMS la definisce «strumento che sabota le strategie messe in atto nella lotta contro il fumo». L'European Respiratory Society (ERS), in accordo con la comunità scientifica americana, ritiene che non siano disponibili studi che ne evidenzino l'efficacia e la sicurezza e autorizzino quindi a consigliarle per favorire la disassuefazione dal fumo di sigaretta.

In Italia la vendita di questo prodotto avviene nelle farmacie così come in negozi dedicati che si stanno diffondendo sul territorio. La preoccupazione degli esperti del settore medico si concentra sugli effetti che questo strumento può avere sulla salute delle persone, nonché sulla sfera psichica dei più giovani, i quali potrebbero emulare il comportamento di suzione ritenendolo non dannoso per la propria salute se svolto con l'ausilio di sigaretta elettronica. Una recente ricerca condotta da un'università greca ha dimostrato che questi prodotti possono essere potenzialmente dannosi. Dopo un utilizzo per 10 minuti è stato rilevato un immediato aumento della resistenza delle vie aeree, il che sembrerebbe suggerire che le sigarette elettroniche possano causare un danno immediato.

Considerate le ormai note conseguenze che il fumo, attivo e passivo, provoca sull'apparato respiratorio e sulla salute delle persone e dato che spesso gli studi scientifici riportano risultati controversi, in particolare sotto il profilo psicologico, sul soddisfacimento degli aspetti olfattivo e visivo dell'uso di sigaretta elettronica, può la Commissione far sapere se intende pubblicare nuovi studi o valutazioni di impatto al fine di informare correttamente i cittadini dei rischi possibili e sciogliere definitivamente i dubbi sull'uso di questo prodotto?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(6 marzo 2013)

La Commissione è consapevole delle discussioni sui rischi per la salute legati alle sigarette elettroniche. Di ciò si tiene anche conto nella valutazione d'impatto che correda la proposta revisione della direttiva sui prodotti del tabacco.

Nel contesto della proposta della Commissione relativa a una direttiva riveduta sui prodotti del tabacco le sigarette elettroniche rientrerebbero nel campo di applicazione della normativa sui prodotti medicinali se contenessero livelli di nicotina superiori a certe soglie. Pertanto, l'immissione sul mercato di tali sigarette elettroniche richiederebbe l'autorizzazione previa in forza della legislazione farmaceutica. Le soglie di nicotina in questione sono state identificate esaminando il contenuto di nicotina delle terapie di sostituzione della nicotina che hanno già ricevuto dagli Stati membri un'autorizzazione alla commercializzazione.

Per le sigarette elettroniche che si situano al di sotto delle soglie in questione si prevede che rechino avvertimenti sanitari. Esse dovrebbero inoltre ottemperare al disposto della direttiva sulla sicurezza generale dei prodotti che adesso già si applica.

In un'ottica di protezione della salute la proposta della Commissione intende incoraggiare la ricerca, l'innovazione e lo sviluppo di prodotti soggetti ad analisi rischi/benefici e atti ad indurre alla cessazione del fumo di tabacco. In questa fase la Commissione non intende commissionare ulteriori studi nel merito.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001050/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Electronic cigarettes: more information for the public about risks and benefits.

Smoking seriously damages your health. Electronic cigarettes have been sold for a long time as an infallible and painless method to quit smoking. However, the WHO defines them as a tool that undermines strategies implemented in the fight against smoking. According to the European Respiratory Society (ERS) and the American scientific community, there are no studies that prove the efficacy and safety of electronic cigarettes and legitimately allow them to be recommended as a way of weaning people off cigarette smoke.

In Italy, the product is sold in pharmacies as well as dedicated shops that are becoming increasingly widespread. Medical experts are concerned about the effects this method can have on people's health and about the psychological impact it may have on young people, who might emulate the sucking action, believing it to be harmless if done using an electronic cigarette. Research conducted by a Greek university has recently shown that these products can be potentially harmful. An immediate increase in airway resistance was observed in subjects who had been using an electronic cigarette for 10 minutes. This seems to suggest that electronic cigarettes can cause immediate harm to people's health.

Considering the well-known consequences of both active and passive smoking on the respiratory system and overall health, and considering that the outcome of scientific research is ambiguous, particularly in psychological terms, regarding gratification of the sense of smell and sight that the use of electronic cigarettes can provide, could the Commission state whether it is planning to publish new studies or impact assessments in order to inform the public properly about the potential risks of this product and, therefore, definitively remove any uncertainties about its use?

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

The Commission is aware of the discussions about adverse health risks associated with electronic cigarettes. This is also reflected in the impact assessment accompanying the proposed revision of the Tobacco Products Directive.

According to the Commission proposal for a revised Tobacco Products Directive, electronic cigarettes would fall under the legal framework for medicinal products if they contain levels of nicotine above certain thresholds. Thus, their bringing on the market would require prior authorisation under pharmaceutical legislation. The nicotine thresholds in question have been identified by considering the nicotine content of nicotine replacement therapies that have already received a marketing authorisation by Member States.

For electronic cigarettes below the thresholds, it is foreseen that they must carry health warnings. They would also have to comply with the General Product Safety Directive as it is already the case at the moment.

From a health protection perspective, the Commission proposal seeks to encourage research, innovation and development of products which have undergone a prior risk/benefit balance and which are suitable for smoking cessation. The Commission at this stage does not plan to ask for further studies on this subject.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001051/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(31 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Coltivazione di sorgo e creazione di biomassa per una nuova filiera di bioenergia agraria

La riforma dell'Organizzazione comune del mercato di cui al regolamento unico (CE) n. 1234/2007 del Consiglio e la ristrutturazione dell'industria europea dello zucchero hanno avuto un grande impatto per il settore bieticolo-saccarifero italiano. L'Italia, infatti, ha rinunciato a 1.049.064 tonnellate di quota zucchero, passando dalle 1.557.443 prima della riforma alle attuali 508.379. Contestualmente si è assistito a una «scomparsa» degli zuccherifici passati da 19 a 4, con la chiusura di ben 15 stabilimenti mentre le superfici a barbabietola sono scese da 250 mila a circa 50-60 mila ettari. La quota di produzione di zucchero dell'Italia nell'UE è passata dall'8,6 % al 3,8 % e oggi l'Italia produce circa il 30 % del suo fabbisogno nazionale.

I drastici tagli a questo settore hanno stimolato gli agricoltori a esplorare la possibilità di coltivare biomassa sulle migliaia di ettari di campi della pianura padana e per far fronte allo stravolgimento della vita di un intero territorio e di tutti gli equilibri del settore saccarifero è stato necessario un radicale ripensamento delle proprietà agricole del territorio. Ad esempio nel territorio padano la scelta è stata prevalentemente orientata verso la creazione di una filiera di bioenergia agraria utilizzando i terreni ove un tempo si piantava barbabietola e ora coltivati a sorgo. Il sorgo è una pianta resistente, con scarsa esigenza di azoto e irrigazione, ma soprattutto che si presta a diventare biomassa.

Considerato che:

— il sorgo non potrà mai sostituire il reddito della barbabietola;

— la coltivazione di sorgo permette comunque la creazione di biomassa per alimentare una filiera di bioenergia agraria;

— la costruzione di una centrale a biomassa può offrire nuovi posti di lavoro a persone in cassa integrazione prima impiegate nel settore saccarifero,

può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se ritiene opportuno incentivare studi di settore al fine di indicare chiaramente quale sia il rapporto tra tipologia di biomassa, rendimento energetico e costi correlati;

2. come intende incentivare coltivazioni di nicchia della barbabietola da zucchero onde favorire in ogni Stato membro il raggiungimento di una quota di produzione sufficiente per il soddisfacimento del fabbisogno nazionale?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(12 marzo 2013)

1. La Commissione, con la sua proposta per il prossimo programma quadro per la ricerca e l'innovazione, Orizzonte 2020, riconosce l'esigenza di sostituire l'energia e i prodotti di origine fossile con una maggiore produzione e un maggior utilizzo di biomassa, bioprodotti e altre energie rinnovabili. Orizzonte 2020 propone forme di partenariato tra settore pubblico e privato nell'ambito delle bioindustrie, al fine di destinare importi consistenti allo sviluppo della bioeconomia.

I progetti di ricerca finanziati dal Settimo programma quadro tengono già conto del ruolo sempre più importante che le colture di biomassa rivestono nell'agricoltura. Il progetto «Sweetfuel», ad esempio, prevede attività di ricerca agronomica finalizzate ad aumentare la resa del sorgo. In questo stesso settore, a partire dai primi anni '90, sono state condotte ampie ricerche nell'ambito di programmi di ricerca sia nazionali che europei. Per ulteriori informazioni si rimanda al sito ufficiale del progetto.

Anche il partenariato europeo per l'innovazione «Produttività e sostenibilità dell'agricoltura» si propone di sviluppare soluzioni innovative per la bioraffinazione, il riciclaggio e l'uso intelligente della biomassa prodotta dai materiali di scarto delle colture e dei boschi, così come dai rifiuti alimentari.

2. Il regime delle quote zucchero limita la produzione saccarifera e ne impedisce l'adattamento alle forze di mercato. Tuttavia, con la soppressione delle quote prevista per il 2015, gli agricoltori di tutti gli Stati membri avranno la possibilità di coltivare la barbabietola o qualunque altro seminativo in un contesto concorrenziale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001051/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Cultivation of sorghum and creation of biomass for a new agricultural bioenergy supply chain.

The reform of the Common Organisation of the Market contained in Council Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 and the reorganisation of the European sugar industry have had a considerable impact on the Italian sugar beet sector. Italy has given up 1 049 064 tonnes of its sugar quota, which has fallen from 1 557 443 tonnes prior to the reform to the current 508 379 tonnes. The number of sugar refineries has also fallen at the same time from 19 to 4, with the closure of 15 factories, while the land dedicated to growing sugar beet has decreased in overall size from 250 000 to about 50 000-60 000 hectares. The percentage of Italian sugar production in the EU has fallen from 8.6 % to 3.8 % and Italy currently produces about 30 % of its national requirement.

The drastic cutbacks made to this industry have encouraged farmers to explore the potential of cultivating biomass on thousands of hectares in the Po valley. In order to cope with the upheaval caused to life throughout this area and to all the balances in the sugar industry, a radical rethink of agricultural properties in the area has been necessary In the Po valley, for instance, farmers have mainly opted for establishing an agricultural bioenergy supply chain, using the fields where the beetroot used to be grown to grow sorghum. Sorghum is a resistant plant with a low nitrogen and water requirement that is above all highly suited to being transformed into biomass.

Given that:

— Sorghum will never replace the revenue from beetroot.

— Sorghum cultivation nevertheless allows biomass to be created that can support an agricultural bioenergy supply chain.

— The construction of a biomass power station could provide new jobs to people formerly employed in the sugar industry who are currently laid off.

Can the Commission state:

1. Whether it considers it appropriate to provide incentives for industry-based studies aimed at clearly establishing the relationship between the type of biomass, energy performance and related costs.

2. How it intends to incentivise the niche cultivation of sugar beet in order to achieve a production quota in every state that is sufficient to fulfil the national requirement.

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(12 March 2013)

1. In its proposal for the forthcoming Framework Programme for Research and Innovation, Horizon 2020, the Commission acknowledges the need to substitute fossil-based energy and products through increased production and use of biomass, bio-based products and other renewable energies. Under Horizon 2020 a Public Private Partnership on bio-based industries is proposed, intended to channel substantial funds for the development of bio-economy.

Research projects under the current 7th Research Framework Programme are already addressing the increasing role of biomass crops in agriculture. Project 'SWEETFUEL' e.g. is undertaking research on breeding and agronomy to improve the performance of sorghum. Indeed extensive research into sorghum has been carried out in EU and National research programmes since the early 1990's. For more information please see the official project website.

The European Innovation Partnership 'Agricultural Productivity and Sustainability' also aims at developing innovative solutions for bio-refinery and recycling and the smart use of biomass from crops, forest, and food waste.

2. The sugar quota system limits production and prevents its adjustment to market forces. The end of sugar quotas is foreseen in 2015. This will offer farmers in all Member States the possibility to produce beet or any other arable crop in a competitive environment.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001052/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(31 gennaio 2013)

Oggetto: Morso da zecca e gravi patologie: possibili terapie per una diagnosi efficace

La malattia di Lyme è oggi la più diffusa e rilevante patologia trasmessa da vettori stanziati nelle zone geografiche temperate ed è seconda, per numero di casi, solo alla malaria fra le malattie che richiedono un vettore artropode per la diffusione. Questa patologia viene trasmessa dalle zecche, artropodi appartenenti alla classe degli Aracnidi, genere Ixodes, e forse anche dalle Amblyomma e Dermacentor, mentre l'agente patogeno, la Borrelia, è un genere di batterio. Inoltre, ricerche scientifiche hanno dimostrato che, nelle aree geografiche in cui la zecca è presente, il numero di zecche è nei prati sfalciati notevolmente inferiore a quello che si può riscontrare nei prati abbandonati e nei boschi (sia di conifere che di latifoglie).

Clinicamente i primi sintomi della malattia sono intermittenti e mutevoli. L'infezione colpisce prevalentemente la pelle, le articolazioni, il sistema nervoso e gli organi interni. I sintomi sono fluttuanti, possono durare mesi e cronicizzarsi. La malattia può manifestarsi con sintomi gravi, persistenti e, se non curata, assumere un decorso cronico. La malattia non porta a sviluppare immunità, per cui l'infezione può essere contratta più volte nel corso della vita. Una recente ricerca ha scoperto che persone precedentemente colpite dal morso della zecca sviluppano anticorpi verso il batterio che vive in simbiosi con la zecca stessa (allo studio attuale c'è il batterio midichloria mitochondrii). In base a questo approccio sarà possibile esaminare soggetti affetti da patologie che si sospetta possano essere associate alla puntura di zecca, conducendo analisi epidemiologiche su larga scala e chiarendo se effettivamente le zecche siano coinvolte nello sviluppo di malattie degenerative.

Considerato che:

— la malattia non porta a sviluppare immunità, per cui l'infezione può essere contratta più volte nel corso della vita;

— in seguito al morso di zecca nell'uomo si possono sviluppare disturbi neurologici precoci caratterizzati da artralgie migranti, mialgie, meningiti, polineuriti, linfocitoma cutaneo, miocardite e disturbi della conduzione atrio-ventricolare,

può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se ritiene importante disporre linee guida inerenti le migliori tecniche di prevenzione per il morso di zecca e di comportamento nel caso in cui questo venga individuato sull'epidermide;

2. se intende promuovere e sostenere studi di ricerca che possano creare una rete informativa di migliori pratiche per l'individuazione precoce e quindi il trattamento delle malattie correlate al morso di artropodi?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(18 marzo 2013)

La Commissione è ben consapevole della situazione epidemiologica delle malattie portate dalle zecche nell'UE, in particolare la malattia di Lyme o borreliosi, una delle più diffuse malattie veicolate da insetti in Europa.

L'azione concertata a livello europeo sulla borreliosi di Lyme (EUCALB) e le linee guida della Federazione europea delle società neurologiche hanno già fornito definizioni cliniche della malattia. Il Centro europeo per la prevenzione e il controllo delle malattie (ECDC) ha ulteriormente sviluppato un kit di comunicazione ([1]) all'indirizzo degli Stati membri. Le misure protettive personali, consistenti nell'evitare i morsi di zecca e nel rimuovere rapidamente la zecca in caso di morso, sono ritenute importanti misure preventive della malattia e dovrebbero essere oggetto di azioni di sensibilizzazione e educazione del pubblico.

([1]) http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/healthtopics/tick_borne_diseases/public_health_measures/Pages/communication_toolkit.aspx

L'ECDC ha commissionato un riesame sistematico sulla valutazione dell'affidabilità dei test di laboratorio per l'individuazione della borreliosi di Lyme nell'UE. Per rivedere le linee guida diagnostico-terapeutiche e agevolare la ricerca, la European Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases ospita un gruppo di studio sulla borreliosi di Lyme (ESGBOR) che costituisce una risorsa informativa paneuropea sulla patologia. Esiste anche un sito web che consolida informazioni all'indirizzo degli operatori professionali ([2]). Grazie ai finanziamenti del Settimo programma quadro di ricerca e sviluppo (PQ 7) sono in corso diversi progetti di ricerca relativi alla biologia della zecca e a strumenti innovativi per la diagnosi delle malattie portate dalle zecche. Inoltre, il programma di lavoro 2013 per il capitolo Salute nell'ambito del PQ 7 ([3]) contiene un invito a presentare proposte di ricerca sulle malattie infettive trascurate, tra cui la borreliosi.

([2]) http://www.escmid.org/research_projects/study_groups/esgbor/

([3]) https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/call_FP7?callIdentifier=FP7-HEALTH-2013-INNOVATION-1&specificProgram=COOPERATION#wlp_call_FP7

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001052/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Tick bites and serious diseases: potential treatments for effective diagnosis

Lyme disease is currently the most widespread and significant disease transmitted by vectors in temperate regions and, in terms of case numbers, it is second only to malaria among the diseases that require an arthropod vector. The disease is transmitted by ticks, arthropods belonging to the Ixodidae family of Arachnids, but may also be transmitted by the Amblyomma and the Dermacentor; while the pathogenic agent, the Borrelia, is a genus of bacteria. Scientific research has shown that, in geographical areas where the tick is present, the number of ticks in mown meadows is considerably smaller than the average number found in abandoned meadows and in both coniferous and deciduous forests.

Clinically, the first symptoms of the disease are intermittent and variable. The infection primarily affects the skin, joints, nervous system and internal organs. The symptoms fluctuate and may last for months before becoming chronic. The disease can manifest itself with serious and persistent symptoms, which, if not treated, may become chronic. The subject does not develop immunity against the disease, which means it can be contracted several times in a lifetime. Recent research has found that people previously affected by tick bites develop antibodies against the bacterium that lives in symbiosis with the tick itself (the midichloria mitochondrii bacterium is currently being studied). This approach will allow the study of subjects affected by diseases suspected to be linked to tick bites, conducting epidemiological analyses on a large scale and clarifying whether ticks are actually involved in the development of degenerative diseases.

Given that:

— The subject does not develop immunity against this disease and the disease can thus be contracted several times in a lifetime.

— Following a tick bite, early neurological disorders can develop in humans. These neurological disorders are characterised by migratory arthralgia, myalgia, meningitis, polyneuritis, lymphocytoma cutis, myocarditis and disorders of the atrio-ventricular conduction.

Can the Commission state:

1. Whether it considers it important to set up guidelines regarding best practices for preventing tick bites and taking action in the event of it being found on the skin.

2. Whether it intends to promote and support research that could create an information network of best practices for the early identification of the disease and therefore treatment of diseases related to arthropod bites.

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

The Commission is fully aware of the epidemiological situation of tick-borne diseases in the EU, in particular lyme borreliosis, one of the most prevalent vector-borne diseases in Europe.

The European Concerted Action on Lyme borreliosis (EUCALB) and the European Federation of Neurological Societies guidelines have already provided clinical definitions of the disease. The European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) has further developed a communication tool kit ([1]) for Member States. Personal protective measures, avoiding tick bites and quick removal of the tick in case of bite, are considered important preventive measures of the disease, which should be part of a public awareness and education action.

([1]) http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/healthtopics/tick_borne_diseases/public_health_measures/Pages/communication_toolkit.aspx

The ECDC commissioned a systematic review on the appraisal of the reliability of laboratory test for lyme borreliosis in the EU. To review diagnostic and treatment guidelines and facilitate research, the European Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases hosts a study group on Lyme Borreliosis (ESGBOR) which provides a pan-European information resource for the disease. There is also a website which consolidates information for health professionals ([2]). Various research projects concerning tick vector biology and innovative tools for diagnosis of tick-borne diseases are ongoing funded by the 7th Framework Programme for Research (FP7). Moreover, the Work Programme 2013 for Health in FP7 ([3]) contains a call for research proposals on neglected infectious diseases, including borreliosis.

([2]) http://www.escmid.org/research_projects/study_groups/esgbor/

([3]) https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/call_FP7?callIdentifier=FP7-HEALTH-2013-INNOVATION-1&specificProgram=COOPERATION#wlp_call_FP7

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001054/13
à Comissão
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(31 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Atraso no pagamento das verbas destinadas à Capital Europeia da Cultura, Guimarães 2012

Tivemos conhecimento de que Guimarães 2012, inserida no programa «Capital Europeia da Cultura», tem uma dívida de sete milhões de euros nos pagamentos a artistas, participantes e fornecedores, tendo a Fundação Cidade de Guimarães garantido que estas serão saldadas assim que receba as verbas europeias.

Sabendo da difícil tarefa de planificação, organização e gestão de um evento desta envergadura e da importância de que todos os financiamentos cheguem atempadamente, nomeadamente o financiamento comunitário do programa CEC, de forma a garantir os pagamentos, questiono a Comissão sobre o seguinte:

1. O que conhece acerca desta situação? Qual o ponto da situação em relação às verbas mencionadas em atraso?

2. Sendo da responsabilidade da Comissão, que medidas tenciona tomar para desbloquear o quanto antes o dinheiro em falta?

3. Não considera que a burocracia associada à obtenção dos fundos comunitários para este programa é demasiado complexa, devendo ser simplificada?

Resposta dada por AndroullaVassiliou em nome da Comissão
(15 de março de 2013)

A Comissão gostaria de sublinhar que incumbe a cada cidade anfitriã da iniciativa «Capital Europeia da Cultura» (CEC) decidir a que nível pretende investir, em consonância com os compromissos que assume quando se candidata. Consequentemente, os orçamentos variam consideravelmente de uma cidade para outra. Em média, estima-se que 77 % do orçamento de uma CEC provenham de fontes públicas que, na maioria dos casos, são nacionais, regionais e locais.

Neste contexto, a contribuição da União Europeia assume a forma de uma subvenção única de 1,5 milhões de euros — o prémio Melina Mercouri — paga ao abrigo do programa «Cultura» da UE. O prémio é concedido e pago pela Comissão à CEC o mais tardar três meses antes do início do evento, desde que a cidade tenha cumprido os seus compromissos e aplicado as recomendações formuladas pelos painéis de seleção, acompanhamento e orientação.

No caso de Guimarães 2012, as condições necessárias foram satisfeitas e a Comissão pagou o prémio na íntegra em setembro de 2011.

Além desta subvenção, a Capital Europeia da Cultura pode também candidatar-se a um financiamento a título dos fundos estruturais. Em função das informações recebidas da autoridade de gestão do programa Norte, a Fundação da Cidade de Guimarães é elegível para um financiamento no montante de 9 478 363,30 euros. Deste montante, a Fundação pediu já 5 394 456,93 euros e recebeu 5 183 740,40 euros.

Como é do conhecimento do Senhor Deputado, a Comissão não é responsável pelos pagamentos aos projetos no âmbito do FEDER. Por conseguinte, a Comissão sugere ao Senhor Deputado que contacte diretamente a autoridade de gestão regional do FEDER para quaisquer outras informações ([1]).

([1]) Gabinete de Gestão do Programa Operacional «Regional do Norte»
Rua Rainha D. Estefânia, 251
4150-304 Porto
Telefone: +351 226 086 300
Fax: +351 226 061 489
Correio eletrónico: novonorte@ccdr-n.pt
Web: http://www.novonorte.qren.pt/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001054/13
to the Commission
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Delay in disbursement of funds for the European Capital of Culture, Guimarães 2012

It has been brought to my attention that Guimarães 2012, part of the European Capital of Culture (ECC) programme, owes EUR 7 million to artists, participants and suppliers, which the City of Guimarães Foundation has promised will be paid as soon as it receives the European funding for it.

In view of the difficulty involved in planning, organising and managing an event of this size and the importance of all funding being received on time, particularly Community funding granted under the ECC programme, so that payment can be guaranteed, can the Commission answer the following:

1. What information does the Commission have about this situation? What is the state of play regarding the abovementioned delayed funds?

2. Since the Commission is responsible for this matter, what action does it intend to take to release the missing funds as soon as possible?

3. Does it not consider that the bureaucracy involved in obtaining Community funding under this programme is too complex and that it should be simplified?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(15 March 2013)

The Commission would like to stress that it is up to each city hosting the 'European Capital of Culture' (ECoC) initiative to decide how much they intend to invest, in line with the commitments they make when bidding for the title. As a consequence budgets vary considerably from one city to another. On average it is estimated that 77% of the budget of an ECoC comes from public sources and in most of the cases the national, regional and local levels contribute.

In this context, the European Union contribution takes the form of a one-off grant of EUR 1.5 million — called the Melina Mercouri Prize — paid under the EU Culture Programme. The prize is awarded and paid by the Commission to the ECoC no later than three months before the start of the event provided that the cities have fulfilled their commitments and implemented the recommendations made by the selection as well as the monitoring and advisory panels.

In the case of Guimarães 2012 the necessary conditions were met and the Commission paid the prize in full in September 2011.

On the top of this grant, European Capitals of Culture may also apply for funding under the Structural Funds. On the basis of information received from the managing authority of the Norte programme, the Guimarães City Foundation is eligible for a funding of EUR 9 478 363.30. From this amount the Foundation has asked for an amount of EUR 5 394 456.93 and has already received an amount of EUR 5 183 740.40.

As the Honourable Member is aware, the Commission is not responsible for the payments to projects under ERDF. The Commission therefore suggests the Honourable Member contacts the ERDF regional managing authority for any further information ([1]).

([1]) Gabinete de Gestão do Programa Operacional Regional do Norte
Rua Rainha D. Estefânia, 251
4150-304 Porto
Tel.: +351 226 086 300
Fax.: +351 226 061 489
E-mail.: novonorte@ccdr-n.pt.
Web: http://www.novonorte.qren.pt/

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001055/13
à Comissão
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(31 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Pagamento de docentes através do POPH

O Programa Operacional para o Potencial Humano (POPH) está inscrito no QREN, em Portugal, recebendo fundos do FSE, e tem como objetivos, entre outros, superar o défice estrutural em termos de qualificações da sociedade portuguesa.

Tivemos conhecimento, comprovado através da leitura do Ofício-Circular n.° 1/DGPGF/2012 (Ministério da Educação e Ciência, Portugal), que salários de docentes de escolas do ensino secundário, tanto contratados como efetivos, a lecionar nos Cursos Profissionais e nos Cursos de Educação e Formação, estariam a ser pagos através dos fundos comunitários do POPH.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Tem conhecimento desta situação?

2. Considera que é adequado utilizar os fundos provenientes do FSE para pagar salários de docentes contratados e, inclusive, de docentes com contratos efetivos?

3. Considera que, a confirmar-se esta situação, não colocará em causa a estabilidade e os direitos laborais e sociais dos docentes abrangidos?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(21 de março de 2013)

1.-2. A Comissão tem conhecimento de que o Fundo Social Europeu pode financiar os salários dos professores nos Estados-Membros onde trabalham em operações do FSE. Em conformidade com o artigo 11.°, n.° 3, alínea a) do Regulamento (CE) n.° 1081/2006 ([1]), os salários desembolsados em benefício dos participantes numa operação e certificados ao beneficiário são elegíveis para uma contribuição do FSE, desde que incorridos em conformidade com a regulamentação nacional, incluindo as regras contabilísticas. De acordo com informações recebidas do Estado-Membro, o pagamento de salários de estagiários e professores envolvidos em cursos de ensino e formação profissional apoiados pelo FSE respeita o principio da regulamentação nacional e da UE neste domínio

3. A Comissão considera que esta situação não põe em risco a estabilidade laboral ou os direitos dos trabalhadores. Os contratos dos professores são celebrados entre o Ministério da Educação e os trabalhadores em causa, e têm de cumprir a legislação portuguesa, independentemente da sua fonte de financiamento.

([1]) Regulamento (CE) n.° 1081/2006 do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 5 de julho de 2006, relativo ao Fundo Social Europeu e que revoga o Regulamento (CE) n.° 1784/1999, JO L 210 de 31.7.2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001055/13
to the Commission
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Payment of teachers under the Operational Programme for Human Potential (POPH)

The Operational Programme for Human Potential (POPH), forms part of Portugal's National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF) and receives funding from the European Social Fund (ESF). It aims, among other things, to overcome the structural deficit of qualifications in Portuguese society.

I have learned, from reading the Portuguese Ministry of Education and Science's official bulletin No 1/DGP GF/2012, that Community funds under the NSRF are being used to pay the salaries of teachers at secondary schools, on both temporary and permanent contracts, employed to teach vocational training courses and education and training courses.

1. Is the Commission aware of this situation?

2. Does the Commission consider it appropriate to use ESF funds to pay the salaries of temporary teachers and even teachers on permanent contracts?

3. Does it not consider that, if this situation indeed exists, it will jeopardise the job stability and labour rights of the teachers concerned?

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

1 and 2. The Commission is aware that the European Social Fund can finance teachers' salaries in the Member States where they are working on ESF operations. In accordance with Article 11(3)(a) of Regulation (EC) No 1081/2006 ([1]), salaries disbursed for the benefit of the participants in an operation and certified to the beneficiary are eligible for a contribution from the ESF, provided they are incurred in accordance with national rules, including accountancy rules. According to information received from the Member State, the payment of salaries of trainees and teachers involved in educational and vocational training courses supported by the ESF complies with the EU and national regulations in this area.

3. The Commission does not consider that this situation jeopardises job stability or labour rights. Teachers' contracts are signed by the Ministry of Education with the employees concerned, and must comply with Portuguese legislation, irrespective of the source of funding.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1081/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 July 2006 on the European Social Fund and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1784/1999, OJ L 210, 31.7.2006.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001056/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(31 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Coerência entre as políticas setoriais da UE — um exemplo

A Comissão Europeia diz que se preocupa com a coerência das políticas setoriais da UE. Por exemplo, a Comissão Europeia justificou a sua proposta de revisão dos regimes de IVA, na qual propõe a supressão das taxas reduzidas deste imposto nos serviços de abastecimento de água, com a necessidade de coerência com as políticas ambientais da UE.

Entre as preocupações ambientais da UE, avulta, como bem sabemos, a questão das alterações climáticas. Será, por isso, natural que a Comissão se preocupe com a coerência de outras políticas setoriais com os seus objetivos neste domínio. A política comercial, por exemplo, será uma das que certamente será tida em conta. Ora, é bem sabido como a liberalização do comércio mundial contribuiu para o aumento dos fluxos de energia e de matéria associados à satisfação de algumas das necessidades humanas (alimentação, por exemplo, e não só), e, nessa medida, contribuiu para o aumento da queima de combustíveis fósseis e, nessa medida, para ao aumento das emissões de gases com efeito de estufa (GEE). Apesar disso, a liberalização e a desregulação do comércio mundial tem sido o eixo central da política comercial da UE. Assim sendo, perguntamos à Comissão:

1. Como avalia a aparente incoerência entre a política comercial da UE e as preocupações enunciadas relativamente às alterações climáticas?

2. Dispõe de estudos relativamente ao efeito da liberalização do comércio mundial no aumento das emissões de GEE? Pensa promovê-los?

Resposta dada por Karel De Gucht em nome da Comissão
(11 de março de 2013)

No âmbito da estratégia Europa 2020, a UE estabeleceu um quadro global e coerente para as políticas destinadas a promover a transição para uma economia mais eficiente na utilização dos recursos e de baixo teor de carbono. A política comercial desempenha um papel importante no apoio à transição para esse tipo de economia. Além disso, um dos principais objetivos da política comercial da UE, como salientado na Comunicação «Comércio, Crescimento e Questões Internacionais» de outubro de 2010, é assegurar a articulação entre as políticas em matéria de comércio internacional e de alterações climáticas, reforçando o contributo positivo que o comércio pode dar à luta contra as alterações climáticas (por exemplo, liberalizando o comércio de bens e serviços ambientais), e evitando ou, pelo menos, minimizando, os impactos negativos. A liberalização comercial incentiva a especialização internacional, a inovação e o investimento na produção com baixas emissões de carbono, contribuindo também para a difusão de bens, serviços e tecnologias verdes.

No que se refere à segunda questão relativa aos estudos sobre comércio e alterações climáticas, a Comissão remete os Senhores Deputados para a resposta à pergunta 010638/2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001056/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Coherency of the EU's sectoral policies: an example

The Commission says that it is concerned about the coherency of the EU's sectoral policies. For example, the Commission has justified its proposal to review VAT regimes, in which it proposes the abolition of VAT reduced rates on water supply services, on the grounds that they need to be coherent with the EU's environmental policies.

We all know that climate change looms large among the EU's environmental concerns. This naturally means that the Commission is concerned that its other sectoral policies should be coherent with its objectives in this sphere. Trade policy, for example, will certainly be examined in this light. It is also well known that the liberalisation of world trade has helped to increase the flow of energy and goods destined to meet some human needs (including, but not only, food) and has, to the same extent, led to increased consumption of fossil fuels and, therefore, greater emission of greenhouse gases. Despite this situation, the deregulation of world trade has been the pivotal axis of the EU's trade policy.

In light of this, can the Commission answer the following:

1. How does it view the apparent incoherence between the EU's trade policy and recently expressed concerns about climate change?

2. Does it have access to any studies on the impact made by the liberalisation of world trade on greenhouse gas emissions? Does it intend to promote such studies?

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

Under the Europe 2020 strategy the EU has established a comprehensive and coherent framework for policies to support the shift towards a resource-efficient and low-carbon economy. Trade policy plays an important role in supporting transition towards such economy. Moreover, one of the key objectives of the EU trade policy, as highlighted in the communication Trade, Growth and World Affairs of October 2010, is to ensure the mutual supportiveness between international trade and climate change policies both by enhancing the positive contribution trade can make to combating climate change, for instance by liberalising the trade of environmental goods and services, and by preventing or at least minimising any negative impacts. Trade liberalisation encourages international specialisation, innovation, investment in low-carbon production, and helps the diffusion of green goods, services and technologies.

Concerning the second question on the studies on trade and climate change the Commission refers the Honourable Member to its reply to question 010638/2012.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001057/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(31 de janeiro de 2013)

Assunto: Acesso à água e revisão das taxas reduzidas do IVA

A Comissão lançou uma consulta pública sobre a sua proposta de revisão dos regimes de IVA, na qual propõe a supressão das taxas reduzidas deste imposto nos serviços de abastecimento de água.

Num momento em que se agravam as desigualdades sociais e em que se verifica uma quebra dos rendimentos da generalidade da população, o fim da taxa reduzida de IVA nos serviços de água (e resíduos) teria consequências sociais e económicas profundamente negativas, aumentando a exclusão do acesso a este bem essencial à vida.

A justificação avançada pela Comissão relaciona-se com uma suposta incoerência entre as políticas ambientais da UE, de desincentivo do consumo de água ou de incentivo à sua utilização racional, e a aplicação de taxas reduzidas de IVA nos serviços de abastecimento.

Considerando que:

— Em alguns países, como Portugal, já se aplica uma taxa de recursos hídricos (TRH), precisamente com a justificação de que visa incentivar o uso racional da água;

— Em alguns países, como Portugal, já se aplicam tarifas por escalões, visando desincentivar os consumos elevados;

— O consumo dos agregados familiares representa uma parte francamente minoritária do uso de água na UE;

— Esta medida afetaria sobretudo os mais pobres e os que enfrentam maiores riscos de exclusão e não necessariamente os maiores consumidores de água;

— A Assembleia-Geral da ONU considerou recentemente o direito à água e ao saneamento como um direito humano fundamental que deve ser assegurado a todos, sem exclusão.

Solicitamos à Comissão que nos informe sobre a forma como foi tido em conta cada um dos cinco pontos supracitados na sua proposta.

Resposta dada por Algirdas Šemeta em nome da Comissão
(8 de março de 2013)

Em 8 de outubro de 2012, a Comissão lançou uma consulta pública sobre o reexame da legislação existente sobre as taxas reduzidas de IVA ([1]) para recolher pareceres relevantes e específicos das partes interessadas, em relação aos três princípios orientadores do reexame, designadamente a coerência entre a política de IVA e outras políticas da UE, tal como se refere na Comunicação sobre o Futuro do IVA ([2]).

Esta consulta faz parte do processo de avaliação global, lançado em 2012, e contribuirá para a preparação da nova proposta em matéria de taxas de IVA, que a Comissão pretende apresentar até ao final de 2013.

No entanto, a Comissão ainda não tomou qualquer decisão política sobre o aumento ou a redução dos fornecimentos a que se podem aplicar a taxa reduzida de IVA, incluindo o abastecimento de água referido pelos Senhores Deputados.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/common/consultations/tax/2012_vat_rates_en.htm
([2]) COM(2011) 851 final de 6.12.2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001057/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Access to water and review of VAT reduced rates

The Commission opened a public consultation on its proposal to review existing legislation on VAT reduced rates, in which it proposes the abolishment of reduced VAT rates on water supply services.

At a time when social inequalities are becoming more pronounced and the population as a whole is undergoing a drop in incomes, the removal of VAT reduced water (and sewage) rates will have a profoundly negative social and economic impact and increase exclusion from access to this vital resource.

The justification put forward by the Commission points to an alleged inconsistency between the EU's environmental policies, which encourage reduced water consumption and rational use of water resources, and the application of reduced VAT rates on water supply services.

Given that:

— in some countries, such as Portugal, a water resources tax is already applied, precisely in order to encourage a rational use of water;

— some countries, such as Portugal, already apply graduated rates to discourage high water consumption;

— household consumption represents only a small part of the water used in the EU;

— this measure will mostly affect the poorest and those most at risk of exclusion and will not necessarily have any impact on the biggest consumers of water;

— the United Nations General Assembly recently declared the right to water and sanitation to be a fundamental human right which should be guaranteed to all, without exception;

We ask the Commission to provide information as to how each of the five points listed above was taken into account in its proposal.

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

On 8 October 2012 the Commission launched a public consultation on the review of the existing legislation on reduced VAT rates ([1]) in order to gather well-targeted and relevant feedback from stakeholders as regards the three guiding principles for the review, in particular the coherence between VAT and other EU policies, as set out in the communication on the future of VAT ([2]).

This consultation is part of the overall assessment process launched in 2012 and will feed into the preparation of a new proposal on VAT rates, which the Commission intends to table by the end of 2013.

The Commission has however not yet taken any policy decisions on increasing or reducing the scope of supplies to which the reduced VAT rate can be applied, including the supply of water to which the Honourable Member refers.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/common/consultations/tax/2012_vat_rates_en.htm
([2]) COM(2011)851 final of 6.12.2011.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-001058/13
à la Commission
Isabelle Durant (Verts/ALE)
(31 janvier 2013)

Objet: Aides européennes reçues par ArcelorMittal

ArcelorMittal, dont le budget R&D est un des plus importants de la métallurgie (215 millions d'euros en 2011), possède 14 centres de recherche dans le monde dont 12 au sein de l'UE. Cette société bénéficie substantiellement des fonds de recherche européens: Programme-Cadre de Recherche et Développement (53,2 milliards d'euros pour la période 2007-2013) et Fonds de Recherche pour le Charbon et l'Acier (FRCA — environ 55 millions d'euros/an).

La Commission est-elle capable de présenter une cartographie (mapping) des activités de recherche d'ArcelorMittal qui ont reçu ou reçoivent des fonds européens? La Commission peut-elle confirmer qu'il s'agit du principal acteur du budget de recherche FRCA? La Commission pourrait-elle préciser les montants reçus annuellement par ArcelorMittal et ses filiales depuis 2006 à la fois via le PCRD et via le fonds CECA, ainsi que le nom complet des programmes (9 à l'heure actuelle dans le 7e PC)?

Concernant ESTEP (the European Steel Technology Platform) nous souhaitons savoir à quels projets déposés par cette plateforme ArcelorMittal a pris part, si ESTEP en tant que tel reçoit de l'argent, par exemple pour son secrétariat, et le cas échéant quels montants, et s'il existe une évaluation des possibles chevauchements entre les projets du 7e PC et ceux du fonds FRCA.

Réponse donnée par Mme Geoghegan-Quinn au nom de la Commission
(26 février 2013)

Il convient de préciser que les chiffres cités par l'Honorable Parlementaire, à savoir 53,2 milliards d'euros au titre du programme-cadre de recherche et développement (PC) pour la période 2007-2013 et environ 55 millions d'euros par an au titre du Fonds de recherche pour le charbon et l'acier (FRCA), sont les montants totaux, pour l'ensemble du budget «Recherche et développement», mis à la disposition de l'ensemble des participants, tous pays confondus, sur la période 2007-2013 pour le PC et chaque année pour le FRCA. Le financement alloué à ArcelorMittal (et aux entités qui y sont liées) est beaucoup plus faible.

Les candidatures d'ArcelorMittal à des crédits de recherche de l'UE émanent de diverses sociétés, établies chacune en tant qu'entité juridique distincte dans un État membre, par exemple ArcelorMittal Espagne ou ArcelorMittal Maizières (France). Globalement, ArcelorMittal a bénéficié au titre du FRCA des financements détaillés aux annexes 1 et 2, qui ont été envoyées directement à l'Honorable Parlementaire ainsi qu'au secrétariat du Parlement ([1]). Le total cumulé des montants alloués par le FRCA aux sociétés du groupe ArcelorMittal sur la période 2006-2012 est d'environ 29,5 millions d'euros.

La Commission confirme qu'en effet, le conglomérat ArcelorMittal est le principal bénéficiaire des fonds du FRCA.

Les activités de recherche d'ArcelorMittal financées au titre du 7e PC ([2]) sont des activités de recherche qui ne concernent pas spécifiquement la recherche sur l'acier, mais qui par exemple ont trait à de nouvelles technologies de production; ces activités sont détaillées à l'annexe 3. Le total cumulé des montants alloués par le 7e PC aux sociétés du groupe ArcelorMittal est d'environ 0,65 million d'euros.

ESTEP (la plate-forme technologique sur l'acier) ne soumet pas de propositions dans le cadre du FRCA ou du PC et ne reçoit pas de financement au titre de ces programmes pour son secrétariat. En revanche, la Commission héberge effectivement le site web d'ESTEP ([3]) sur son serveur «Europa», service qu'elle offre à de nombreuses plates-formes technologiques. ArcelorMittal est membre d'ESTEP en sa qualité de grand producteur d'acier.

([1]) Des informations complémentaires sont disponibles ici: (http://cordis.europa.eu/coal-steel-rtd/synopsis_en.html).
([2]) Septième programme-cadre pour des actions de recherche, de développement technologique et de démonstration (2007-2013).
([3]) De plus amples informations sont disponibles sur le site web d'ESTEP: (http://cordis.europa.eu/estep).

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001058/13
to the Commission
Isabelle Durant (Verts/ALE)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: EU aid received by ArcelorMittal

ArcelorMittal, which has one of the biggest R & D budgets in the entire metal industry (EUR 215 million in 2011), has 14 research centres worldwide, 12 of which are in the EU. This company receives substantial EU research funds: EUR 53.2 billion under the Research and Development Framework Programme (RDFP) in the period 2007-2013, and around EUR 55 million a year under the Research Fund for Coal and Steel (RFCS).

Can the Commission detail the research activities of ArcelorMittal which have received, or are still receiving, EU funds? Can the Commission confirm whether ArcelorMittal is the biggest recipient under the RFCS research budget? Can the Commission specify the amounts received annually by ArcelorMittal and its subsidiaries since 2006 via both the RDFP and the RFCS, as well as the full title of the programmes involved (currently nine under the 7th FP)?

As far as the European Steel Technology Platform (ESTEP) is concerned, we would like to know which projects submitted by this platform ArcelorMittal has taken part in, whether ESTEP as such receives money, for example for its secretariat, and if so, how much, and whether any assessment has been carried out into potential overlaps between FP7 projects and those of the RFCS?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(26 February 2013)

The Honourable Member refers to figures of EUR 53.2 billion under the Research and Development Framework Programme (FP) in the period 2007-2013, and around EUR 55 million a year under the Research Fund for Coal and Steel (RFCS), but it should be clarified that these are the total figures for the entire Research and Development budget, available to all participants across all countries for the period 2007-2013 for the FP and annually for the RFCS. The funding allocated to ArcelorMittal (or associated entities) is much lower.

ArcelorMittal presents itself for EU research funding as a variety of companies, each established as a separate legal entity in a different Member State, e.g. ArcelorMittal Espagne or ArcelorMittal Mézière (France). Overall, ArcelorMittal has received funding from the RFCS as detailed in Annexes 1 and 2 sent directly to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's Secretariat ([1]). The aggregated total allocated over the years 2006-2012 by RFCS to ArcelorMittal companies amounts to about EUR 29.5 million.

The Commission confirms that, indeed, ArcelorMittal conglomerate of companies are the largest recipient of RFCS funding.

The research activities of ArcelorMittal funded by FP7 ([2]) correspond to research activities not specifically dealing with steel research, such as new production technologies, as detailed in Annex 3. The aggregated total allocated by FP7 to ArcelorMittal companies amounts to about EUR 0.65 million.

The European Steel Technology Platform (ESTEP) does not submit proposals to the RFCS or the FP and does not receive funding from these programmes for its secretariat. The Commission does however host the ESTEP website ([3]) on its 'Europa' server as a service offered to many Technology Platforms. As one of the major steel producers ArcelorMittal is member of ESTEP.

([1]) Additional information is available at http://cordis.europa.eu/coal-steel-rtd/synopsis_en.html
([2]) The Seventh Framework for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013).
([3]) Further information is available on the ESTEP website http://cordis.europa.eu/estep

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés P-001059/13
a Bizottság számára
Morvai Krisztina (NI)
(2013. január 31.)

Tárgy: Az Unió mentse ki a külföldön túszként fogva tartott állampolgárait

A nemzetközi közösség felé intézett segélykiáltása és megbízható bizonyítékok hosszú listája szerint egy uniós és magyar állampolgár nő ellen rendszeresen súlyos testi sértést követ el a férje, egy francia állampolgár, immár több éve, a terhessége óta. A bántalmazás a gyermek jelenlétében zajlott, a férj pedig megfenyegette a feleséget, hogy megöli, illetve hogy öngyilkosságot követ el a kisfiúval együtt. Kiderült, hogy a gyermek is súlyos bántalmazás áldozata volt, és mindkét áldozat komoly veszélyben van. A családon belüli erőszak bonyolult folyamatának részeként a férj a Francia Polinéziához tartozó Bora Bora szigetére vitte a családot, hosszú és pihentető nyaralást, valamint egy utolsó és komoly kísérletet ígérve a házasságuk és a családi életük megmentésére. Mint később kiderült, csupán a francia polinéziai igazságszolgáltatás hatálya alá akart kerülni, hogy kizárólagos felügyeleti jogot szerezzen a gyermek felett, és hogy „elvegye a gyermeket az anyjától", egy olyan igazságszolgáltatási rendszerben felhasználva az anyagi forrásait és a felső körökben kiépített kapcsolatait, amelyhez egyiküket sem fűzi jogi vagy más kötelék. Nem sokkal a megérkezésük után folytatódott az erőszak, a nő pedig azt akarta, hogy a család térjen vissza Európába. A férj elvette az útleveleket, valamint a felesége és a fia összes többi dokumentumát, és kidobta a család menettérti repülőjegyét.

Emellett hamis dokumentumokat állított elő azt igazolandó, hogy jogszerűen tartózkodnak Bora Borán, ezeket pedig bírósági eljárások kezdeményezésére használta, kizárólagos felügyeleti jogot kérve a gyermek felett magának. A helyi bíróság ideiglenes határozatban közös felügyelet alá helyezte a gyermeket, aki most egy hetet az anyával, egy hetet pedig az apával tölt, és megtiltotta, hogy a gyermek elhagyja Francia Polinézia területét (a nő gyakorlatilag nem szólalhatott meg a bíróságon).

A szinte összes emberi jogától megfosztott anya nem hajlandó maga mögött hagyni a gyermekét. Ezt a két magyar/uniós állampolgárt tehát túszként tartják fogva Franciaország egy tengerentúli területén, és veszélyben van az életük. Az uniós állampolgárok jogainak védelme az Unió területén, valamint a nők és a gyermekek védelme a családon belüli erőszak ellen mind uniós prioritások – legalábbis elvileg és papíron.

Mit tud és mit fog tenni az Unió ebben a helyzetben igazi uniós állampolgárok jogainak védelmében, amikor jogaik megsértésének igazi és valós helyzetéről van szó?

Vivien Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. március 5.)

A Bizottság szigorúan elítéli a nők elleni erőszak minden megnyilvánulását, különösen a nemi alapú erőszak családon belüli előfordulásának valamennyi formáját. Ebben a vonatkozásban a határon átnyúló helyzetekben az európai állampolgárok védelmét számos, az ilyen bűncselekmények polgári és büntetőjogi vetületét lefedő eszköz biztosítja.

Léteznek emellett a határokon átnyúló tényállások esetében alkalmazható, a szülői felelősségre és a gyermekvédelemre vonatkozó uniós vívmányok. Az EUMSZ 355. cikkének (2) bekezdése, az EUMSZ II. mellékletével összefüggésben nem vonatkozik a Francia Polinéziához tartozó Bora Bora szigetére, ezért az uniós jog által biztosított egyik igazságügyi együttműködési eszköz sem alkalmazható. A felügyeleti jog biztosításának és gyakorlásának kérdését továbbá a tagállamok nemzeti joga szabályozza, mivel a Brüsszel IIa rendelet ([1]) csak határkeresztező eljárásokra vonatkozik.

Van azonban a szülői felelősségre és gyermekelhelyezési ügyekre vonatkozó nemzetközi keretszabály, amelyet a Hágai Nemzetközi Magánjogi Konferencia ([2]) dolgozott ki. Ebben az összefüggésben a gyermekek magas szintű védelmének biztosítása érdekében a Bizottság 2011-ben kezdeményezte nyolc szerződő állam csatlakozását az 1980. évi egyezményhez. A kezdeményezés sajnos a Tanácsban elakadt ([3]).

([1]) HL L 338., 2003.12.23., 1. o.

([2]) A gyermekek jogellenes külföldre vitelének polgári jogi vonatkozásairól szóló 1980. október 25-i egyezmény, valamint a szülői felelősséggel és a gyermekek védelmét szolgáló intézkedésekkel kapcsolatos együttműködésről, valamint az ilyen ügyekre irányadó joghatóságról, alkalmazandó jogról, elismerésről és végrehajtásról szóló 1996. október 19-i egyezmény.

([3]) A 2011. december 21-én elfogadott COM(2011) 904, 908, 909, 911, 912, 915, 916, 917. 8 tanácsi határozatra irányuló javaslat bizonyos harmadik országoknak (Oroszország+7 másik ország) a gyermekek jogellenes külföldre vitelének polgári jogi vonatkozásairól szóló, 1980. október 25-i Hágai Egyezményhez való csatlakozásának elfogadására vonatkozóan, a tagállamok által az Európai Unió érdekében tett nyilatkozatról.

Az Unió szülői felelősséggel és a gyermekek védelmével kapcsolatos külső hatáskörére tekintettel a Bizottság mérlegelni fogja az említett nemzetközi eszközök erre a konkrét esetre vonatkozó alkalmazhatóságát, valamint az eset vizsgálatához szükséges további információkért felveszi a kapcsolatot a francia hatóságokkal.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001059/13
to the Commission
Krisztina Morvai (NI)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Need for the EU to rescue its citizens held as hostages abroad

According to her international cry for help and a long list of reliable evidence, a woman who is a citizen of the EU and of Hungary has been severely battered by her husband, a French citizen, for several years now and ever since her pregnancy. The violence took place in front of the child, and the father not only threatened the wife with killing her, but also with committing suicide with the little boy. It follows that the child has been also severely abused and both victims have been in serious danger. As an integral part of a complex process of domestic violence the husband took the family to the French Polynesian island of Bora Bora, promising a long and relaxing holiday and a last and serious attempt to save their marriage and family life. As it later turned out, he only wanted to falsely 'establish' jurisdiction in French Polynesia in order to obtain sole custody of the child and 'take the child away from his mother', using his financial resources and high society connections in a jurisdiction with which none of them have any legal or other ties. Soon after their arrival the violence resumed, and the woman wanted the family to return to Europe. The husband confiscated the passports and all other documents belonging to his wife and his son, and threw away the family's return air ticket.

Moreover, he created false documents establishing 'legal' residency in Bora Bora, and used these to initiate court proceedings, claiming full custody of the child for himself. In a provisional decision, the local court ordered shared custody of the child, who now spends one week with the mother and one week with the father, and banned the child from leaving the territory of French Polynesia (the woman was basically not allowed to speak in court).

The mother, who has been deprived of almost all her human rights, refuses to leave her child behind. These two Hungarian/EU citizens are thus being held as hostages in a French overseas territory, and their lives are at risk. Both the protection of the legal rights of EU citizens within Union territory and the protection of women and children from family violence are priorities for the EU — at least in principle and on paper.

What can and will the EU do in this situation to protect the rights of actual EU citizens in an actual and real situation of deprivation of their rights?

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

The Commission strongly condemns all acts of violence against women, and in particular all forms of gender-based violence in the family. In this context, citizens in Europe are protected in cross-border situations by the means of several instruments to cover civil and criminal aspects of such an offence.

Furthermore, there is Union *acquis* on parental responsibility and child protection in cross-border situations. According to Article 355(2) TFEU read in conjunction with its Annex II, EC law does not apply to the territory of the French Polynesian island of Bora Bora. Therefore, none of the judicial cooperation instruments provided by EC law may find its application. In addition, the matter of granting the custody and its exercise are governed by national law of the Member States, as the Brussels IIa regulation ([1]) applies only to cross-border procedures.

However, there is an international framework on parental responsibility and custody issues, in particular the one developed by The Hague Conference on Private International Law ([2]). In this context the Commission, to ensure a high level protection of children, proposed in 2011 an initiative concerning the accession of 8 contracting States to the 1980 Convention, which is unfortunately blocked in the Council ([3]).

Given the external competence of the EU in the matters relating to parental responsibility and protection of children, the Commission will consider the relevance of these international instruments for this particular case and will contact the French authorities for more information needed to assess it.

([1]) OJ L 338, 23.12.2003, p. 1.
([2]) Convention of 25 October 1980 on the Civil Aspects of the International Child Abduction and Convention of 19 October 1996 on Jurisdiction, Applicable Law, Recognition, Enforcement and Cooperation in respect of Parental Responsibility and Measures for the Protection of Children.
([3]) COM(2011) 904, 908, 909, 911, 912, 915, 916, 917 adopted on 21/12/2011 .
8 Proposals for Council Decisions on the declaration of acceptance by the Member States, in the interest of the European Union, of the accession of some third States (Russia +7) to the 1980 Hague Convention on International Child Abduction.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-001067/13
do Komisji
Tomasz Piotr Poręba (ECR)
(1 lutego 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wstrzymanie środków na projekty drogowe w Polsce

W związku z ogłoszoną wczoraj (30 stycznia 2013 r.) decyzją Komisji Europejskiej o wstrzymaniu środków na budowę dróg w Polsce, w związku z wykrytymi nieprawidłowościami w procedurze przetargowej i kontrolnej stosowanej przez polskie władze, chciałem zapytać o następujące rzeczy:

1. Jaka dokładnie kwota została wstrzymana przez Komisję na realizację projektów drogowych w Polsce? Jak realnym jest zagrożenie utraty przez Polskę kwoty aż 4 mld EUR przeznaczonej na ten cel?

2. Po spełnieniu jakich warunków przez polski rząd będzie możliwe jak najszybsze odblokowanie środków na drogi w Polsce?

3. Jakie zdaniem Komisji są największe wady proceduralne systemu przetargów i kontroli stosowanej przez polskie władze, które doprowadziły do zamrożenia funduszy strukturalnych na budowę dróg?

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-001131/13
do Komisji
Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)
(4 lutego 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wyjaśnienie doniesień na temat pozbawienia Polski 3,5 mld Euro na inwestycje drogowe

Z informacji podanych przez polskie media i potwierdzonych przez przedstawicieli Rządu RP, dowiedziałem się, że Komisja pozbawiła Polskę 3,5 mld Euro na inwestycje drogowe.

Proszę o informację, jakie zarzuty ma Komisja w stosunku do Polski. Z jakich ustaleń te zarzuty wynikają?

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-001158/13
do Komisji
Ryszard Antoni Legutko (ECR)
(4 lutego 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wstrzymanie środków na projekty drogowe w Polsce

W związku z ogłoszoną wczoraj (30 stycznia 2013 r.) decyzją Komisji Europejskiej o wstrzymaniu środków na budowę dróg w Polsce w związku z wykrytymi nieprawidłowościami w procedurze przetargowej i kontrolnej stosowanej przez polskie władze, chciałem zapytać o następujące rzeczy:

1. Jaka dokładnie kwota została wstrzymana przez Komisję na realizację projektów drogowych w Polsce? Jak realnym jest zagrożenie utraty przez Polskę kwoty aż 4 mld EUR przeznaczonej na ten cel?

2. Po spełnieniu jakich warunków przez polski rząd będzie możliwe jak najszybsze odblokowanie środków na drogi w Polsce?

3. Jakie, zdaniem Komisji, są największe wady proceduralne systemu przetargów i kontroli stosowanej przez Polskie władze, które doprowadziły do zamrożenia funduszy strukturalnych na budowę dróg?

Wspólna odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Johannesa Hahna w imieniu Komisji
(7 marca 2013 r.)

1. Całkowita kwota wstrzymanych płatności wynosi 941 mln EUR. Kwota 4 mld EUR dotyczy pozostałych środków przydzielonych na realizację projektów drogowych w Polsce. Polska nie utraci środków finansowych, pod warunkiem że podejmie wszystkie działania naprawcze wymagane przez Komisję. Jeśli władze polskie wycofają nierozliczone wnioski o płatności dotyczące dwóch programów i prześlą ich skorygowane wersje, z których usunięte zostaną nowe pozycje wydatków na drogi, wówczas duża część środków z puli 941 mln EUR mogłaby zostać wypłacona i nie podlegałaby wstrzymaniu.

2. Oczekuje się, iż instytucja zarządzająca oszacuje zakres problemu, wskaże inne potencjalne przypadki, których on dotyczy, oraz stworzy odpowiednie zabezpieczenia, które zminimalizują ryzyko pojawienia się podobnych przypadków w przyszłości.

3. Komisja postanowiła wstrzymać płatności, po tym jak władze polskie potwierdziły opublikowane w polskiej prasie informacje o toczących się dochodzeniach w sprawie trzech projektów współfinansowanych w ramach programu „Infrastruktura i środowisko". Z informacji tych wynika, że prokurator oskarżył 11 osób o zmowę na rzecz próby utworzenia kartelu (10. byłych i obecnych dyrektorów wyższego szczebla dużych przedsiębiorstw budowlanych i jeden dyrektor GDDKiA). Zarzuty te, o ile zostaną potwierdzone, wskazują na naruszenie przepisów UE dotyczących zamówień publicznych i prawa konkurencji, jak również na potencjalne poważne braki systemu zarządzania i kontroli. Komisja czeka na dodatkowe informacje od władz polskich.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001067/13
to the Commission
Tomasz Piotr Poręba (ECR)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Freezing of funds for road projects in Poland

Further to the decision adopted by the Commission yesterday (30 January 2013) to block funds for road building in Poland following the detection of irregularities in the tender procedure and the controls applied by the Polish authorities, I should like to put the following questions to the Commission:

1. What precise amount of funds for road projects in Poland was frozen by the Commission? How real is the risk of Poland losing up to EUR 4 billion in funding for such projects?

2. What are the conditions that the Polish Government must meet before it will be possible to unblock, without delay, the funds for road building in Poland?

3. In the Commission's view, what were the most significant procedural flaws in the tenderprocedure and the controls applied by the Polish authorities that led to the structural fundsfor road building being frozen?

Question for written answer P-001131/13
to the Commission
Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: Reports of Poland being deprived of EUR 3.5 billion in investment in roads

According to information in the Polish media, and confirmed by representatives of the Polish Government, the Commission has deprived Poland of road-investment funding amounting to EUR 3.5 billion.

Could the Commission state what Poland is alleged to have done wrong? What findings are these allegations based on?

Question for written answer P-001158/13
to the Commission
Ryszard Antoni Legutko (ECR)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: Withholding of funds for road projects in Poland

Further to the decision adopted by the Commission yesterday (30 January 2013) to block funds for road building in Poland following the detection of irregularities in the tender and control procedures applied by the Polish authorities, I should like to put the following questions to the Commission:

1. What precise amount of funds for road projects in Poland was frozen by the Commission? How real is the risk of Poland losing up to EUR 4 billion in funding for such projects?

2. What are the conditions that the Polish Government must meet before it will be possible to unblock immediately the funds for road building in Poland?

3. In the Commission's view, what were the most significant procedural flaws in the tenderprocedure and the controls applied by the Polish authorities that led to the structural fundsfor road building being frozen?

Joint answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(7 March 2013)

1. The total amount of interrupted payments is EUR 941 million. The amount of EUR 4 billion refers to the remaining allocations for road construction projects in Poland. Provided that Poland undertakes all the remedial actions requested by the Commission, there will be no loss of money. If the Polish authorities withdraw the currently pending payment claims for the 2 programmes, and resubmit revised claims excluded new road-related expenditure, then a large part of the EUR 941 million could be paid and would no longer be affected by the interruption.

2. The managing authority is expected to estimate the scope of the problem, to identify potential other affected cases and to create adequate safeguards which will minimise the risk of such cases occurring in the future.

3. The Commission decided to interrupt payments after the Polish authorities had confirmed the information published in the Polish press about ongoing investigations affecting three co-financed projects within the programme Infrastructure and Environment. According to this information, the Public Prosecutor has accused 11 persons of collusion for attempting to create a cartel (10 former and current senior managers of large construction companies and one director of GDDKiA). These allegations constitute, if confirmed, a breach of EU public procurement rules and of EU competition law, as well as a potential serious weakness in the management and control system. The Commission is waiting for additional information to be provided by the Polish authorities.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001071/13
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Products containing nicotine

The proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States concerning the manufacture, presentation and sale of tobacco and related products sets out as a primary objective the prevention of use of tobacco products by young people.

While it is essential that prevention should be a primary objective, the Commission must not lose sight of the fact that a single-minded pursuit of prevention may work to the detriment of those young people who already smoke but who are trying to quit and have found e-cigarettes an effective means of doing so.

Has the Commission conducted a quality, safety, efficacy and positive risk/benefit balance on e-cigarettes, as called for in Directive 2001/83/EC? If so, can the Commission provide the results?

Does the Commission recognise e-cigarettes as a viable means of smoking cessation, as attested to by leading scientific journals and anti-smoking charities?

Does the Commission admit that this proposal will lead to a de facto ban on e-cigarettes, which in the UK alone have helped 6 % of the UK's estimated 10 million smokers to quit?

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

The sales of electronic cigarettes have increased substantially in recent years and the products are often placed on the market without appropriate control. Member States take different approaches on how to regulate electronic cigarettes. This leads to fragmentation of the market and justifies action at the EU level.

According to the proposal for a revised Tobacco Products Directive, when electronic cigarettes contain levels of nicotine above certain thresholds, they would be allowed on the market provided they have been authorised as medicinal products on a case by case basis. The nicotine thresholds have been identified by considering the nicotine content of nicotine replacement therapies that have already received a marketing authorisation by Member States. Thus, from a health perspective, the Commission proposal seeks to encourage research, innovation and development of products, which have undergone a prior risk/benefit balance and which are more adapted for smoking cessation.

Electronic cigarettes below the thresholds can be brought on the market as consumer products provided they carry health warnings as defined in the proposal for a revised Tobacco Products Directive.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001072/13
aan de Commissie
Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE)
(1 februari 2013)

Betreft: Langeafstandsvervoer van niet-gespeende dieren

Verordening (EG) nr. 1/2005 van de Raad stelt dat niet-gespeende dieren die vervoerd worden over lange afstanden voldoende vloeistof moeten krijgen tussen twee vervoersperioden van elk negen uur. Het is echter onmogelijk niet-gespeende dieren goed te voeren in een vrachtwagen, aangezien deze dieren niet goed kunnen omgaan met de drinkhulpmiddelen (bijtspenen), en het onmogelijk is de vloeistof te gebruiken die kalveren nodig hebben. Die vloeistof moet worden opgewarmd, wat niet mogelijk is in standaard uitgeruste wegvoertuigen. Bovendien moeten de dieren eigenlijk één voor één handmatig worden gevoerd om ervoor te zorgen dat ze de juiste hoeveelheid vloeistof binnenkrijgen, wat niet haalbaar is in een vrachtwagen.

De technische rapportage „Project to develop animal welfare risk assessment guidelines on transport" (Project voor het opstellen van richtsnoeren voor de risicobeoordelingen van dierenwelzijn tijdens vervoer), die in 2009 is ingediend bij de Europese Autoriteit voor voedselveiligheid, vormt de wetenschappelijke grondslag voor bovenstaande bewering. Deze luidt als volgt: „Tijdens het vervoer is het technisch onmogelijk om kalveren in een voertuig te voeden met melk of een melkvervanger ([1])."

Zelfs vertegenwoordigers van de centrale bevoegde instanties van de lidstaten hebben bevestigd dat „het in de praktijk niet mogelijk is niet-gespeende dieren in rijdende voertuigen te voorzien van de juiste voeding" ([2]).

Desondanks worden niet-gespeende dieren massaal vervoerd over lange en zeer lange afstanden, wat indruist tegen Verordening (EG) nr. 1/2005, zoals in het geval van kalveren die van Ierland naar Spanje werden vervoerd (zie ook de onderzoeken uitgevoerd door Animals' Angels). Als gevolg daarvan kampen niet-gespeende dieren tijdens langeafstandsvervoer regelmatig met voedsel-/vloeistoftekort.

De aanbevelingen die de Commissie naar de lidstaten heeft gestuurd (SANCO D5/DS/dj D(2009)450351) zijn niet toereikend om de hierboven beschreven tekortkomingen te verhelpen.

Wat is de Commissie van zins te doen tegen het stelselmatige en permanente verzuim van lidstaten om Verordening (EG) nr. 1/2005 ten uitvoer te leggen bij het voeden van niet-gespeende dieren tussen twee vervoersperioden van elk negen uur?

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

Overeenkomstig bijlage I, hoofdstuk VI, punt 2.2., van Verordening (EG) nr. 1/2005 inzake de bescherming van dieren tijdens het vervoer ([3]) moeten drinkautomaten ontworpen en geplaatst zijn voor de soorten dieren die aan boord van het voertuig moeten worden gedrenkt. Alvorens toestemming te verlenen voor langeafstandsvervoer van niet-gespeende dieren, moeten de lidstaten garanderen dat deze dieren zullen worden vervoerd met een vrachtwagen die voor dat soort vervoer geschikt is, rekening houdend met de specifieke behoeften van de dieren. Opgemerkt zij dat niet-gespeende kalveren op het landbouwbedrijf van oorsprong niet noodzakelijk alleen melk krijgen, maar tussendoor ook vrije toegang hebben tot water. Kalveren kunnen ook vertrouwd zijn met verschillende drinkautomaten.

Het Voedsel- en Veterinair Bureau van het directoraat-generaal Gezondheid en Consumenten van de Commissie controleert of de lidstaten Verordening (EG) nr. 1/2005 naleven en verifieert onder meer of de voedersystemen voor kalveren geschikt zijn. Wanneer wordt geconstateerd dat een of andere bepaling van de verordening niet word nageleefd, wordt de bevoegde autoriteit verzocht de nodige corrigerende maatregelen te nemen.

([1]) Technische rapportage „Project to develop animal welfare risk assessment guidelines on transport", 2009, blz. 30.
([2]) Verslagen 2010-8387-MR FINAL en 2010-8384-MR FINAL van DG SANCO over de controles die zijn uitgevoerd in Polen tussen 23.2.2010 en 4.3.2010 en in Tsjechië tussen 1.6.2010 en 10.6.2010, blz. 19.
([3]) PB L 3 van 5.1.2005, blz. 1.

Aangezien de situatie wat het vervoer van niet-gespeende kalveren betreft geval per geval sterk verschilt, is de Commissie het niet eens met het geachte Parlementslid dat er sprake is van stelselmatig en permanent verzuim van de lidstaten om deze bepaling van Verordening (EG) nr. 1/2005 ten uitvoer te leggen. Zij heeft bijgevolg niet de intentie hieromtrent verdere maatregelen te nemen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001072/13
to the Commission
Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Long-distance transport of unweaned animals

Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 requires that unweaned animals transported on long-distance journeys be given adequate liquid in between two transport periods of nine hours each. It is, however, impossible to feed unweaned animals adequately on board a truck, since these animals cannot adequately use the drinking devices (bite nipples) and it is impossible to use the liquid unweaned calves need. That liquid needs to be heated up, which is not possible on standard road vehicles. Furthermore, in order to guarantee that each animal drinks the correct amount of liquid, it would be necessary to feed them by hand, one by one, which is not feasible on board a truck.

The technical report entitled 'Project to develop animal welfare risk assessment guidelines on transport', submitted to the European Food Safety Authority in 2009, provides the scientific basis for the above assertion. It states: 'During transport it is technically impossible to feed calves on board of the vehicle with milk or milk replacer' ([1]).

Even representatives of the central competent authorities of Member States have confirmed that 'in practice it is not possible to provide adequate feeding […] to unweaned animals on board vehicles' ([2]).

Nevertheless, unweaned animals are being transported in large numbers over long and very long distances in violation of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, as in the case of unweaned calves transported from Ireland to Spain (see the investigations carried out by Animals' Angels). Consequently, unweaned animals are regularly suffering from feed/liquid deprivation during long-distance transport.

The recommendations sent by the Commission to the Member States (SANCO D5/DS/dj D(2009)450351) are insufficient to rectify the shortcomings described above.

How does the Commission intend to rectify the systematic and permanent failure of Member States to enforce Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 as regards the feeding of unweaned animals in between two transport periods of nine hours each?

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

According to Annex I, Chapter VI, paragraph 2(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 ([3]) on the protection of animals during transport, watering devices shall be designed and positioned for the categories of animals to be watered on board the vehicle. It is for the Member States to ensure that, before approving long transports of unweaned animals, they will be transported on a truck that is suitable for such transport, taking into account their particular needs. It should be noted that unweaned calves are not necessarily only receiving milk at the farm of origin and often have ad lib access to water between milk feeds. Calves may also be familiar with different drinking devices.

The Food and Veterinary Office of the Commission's Health and Consumers Directorate General audits Member States' compliance to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, including reviewing the adequacy of feeding systems for calves. When non-compliances with any part of the regulation are detected, the competent authority is requested to take adequate corrective measures.

As there is a lot of case by case variation in the transport of unweaned calves, the Commission does not share the view of the Honourable Member that there is a systematic and permanent failure of Member States to enforce this requirement of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005. It therefore does not intend to take any further measures in this regard.

([1]) Technical report entitled 'Project to develop animal welfare risk assessment guidelines on transport', 2009, p. 30.
([2]) DG SANCO reports 2010-8387-MR FINAL and 2010-8384-MR FINAL on the specific audits carried out in Poland from 23.2.2010-4.3.2010 and in the Czech Republic from 1.6.2010-10.6.2010), p. 19.
([3]) OJ L 3, 5.1.2005, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001073/13
to the Commission
Claude Moraes (S&D)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Modern-day slavery/human trafficking

The International Labour Organisation estimates that more than 21 million people worldwide are currently bonded in modern-day slavery. This is a crime which neither stops at any border nor precludes any race. For millions of our fellow human beings it is the bleakest, meanest and most grinding existence imaginable, and yet it happens in every European city, to thousands of people, every day. In London and the UK alone, an estimated 5 000 people are being trafficked at any one time.

In 2010, Anti-Slavery International produced a report stating that in the UK 'there has been little to no meaningful engagement in the area of prevention' of trafficking. Since then, the UK Government has opted into a 2011 directive on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings.

A new report from Anti-Slavery International has found that, despite this new directive, the UK Government remains 'without a coherent prevention strategy' and that 'there is a lack of clarity on how sustained trafficking prevention has been built into the UK's anti-trafficking efforts on a strategic level'.

Anti-Slavery International identified the 2012 Summer Olympic Games in London as an event which would put large numbers of persons vulnerable to trafficking at high risk. In the aftermath of the Games, it is crucial that measures are taken by the UK Government to prevent the opportunities for growth in trafficking that the Olympics have afforded. Yet the government has still done too little to address these problems.

In the light of the above, can the Commission provide details on how it will ensure UK compliance with Directive 2011/36/EU in order to prevent trafficking in human beings in London and the UK?

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

Directive 2011/36/EU ([1]) requires the Member States to take appropriate measures and actions, such as awareness-raising campaigns, education programmes and training for officials likely to come in contact with victims, to discourage and reduce the demand that fosters all forms of exploitation. In order to prevent trafficking more effectively, Member States shall consider taking measures to establish as a criminal offence the use of services which are the objects of exploitation, with the knowledge that the person is a victim.

The deadline for transposition is 6 April 2013. The Commission will, by 6 April 2015, submit a report to the European Parliament and the Council, assessing the extent to which the Member States have taken the necessary measures to comply with the directive, including a description of action taken under Article 18(4) on prevention, accompanied, if necessary, by legislative proposals. By 2016, the Commission will also submit a report assessing the impact of existing national law, establishing as a criminal offence the use of services which are objects of exploitation of trafficking in human beings, on the prevention of trafficking in human beings.

In addition, under the priority 'Stepping up the prevention of trafficking in human beings', the EU Strategy towards the eradication of trafficking in human beings ([2]) identified a number of actions which the European Commission propose to implement in concert with Member States including an analysis of prevention initiatives already in place carried out by various actors and EU-wide awareness-raising activities targeting specific vulnerable groups and situations such as major sporting events.

([1]) Directive 2011/36/EU on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2002/629/JHA.
([2]) The EU Strategy towards the Eradication of Trafficking in Human Beings 2012-2016, COM(2012) 286 final.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001074/13
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(1 februari 2013)

Betreft: Roemenië door en door corrupt

Uit het laatste verslag van de Commissie inzake de rechtsstaat in Roemenië blijkt dat het land nog altijd te kampen heeft met aanzienlijke problemen op het gebied van corruptie, de onafhankelijkheid van het gerechtelijk apparaat en de geloofwaardigheid van zowel de regering als het parlement. Een aantal ministers is ongeschikt verklaard voor hun functie vanwege belangenconflicten en er zijn gevallen bekend van onwettige verrijking van ambtenaren, doch geen van hen heeft ontslag genomen. Tegen twee regeringsleden loopt momenteel ook een onderzoek op verdenking van corruptie ([1]).

1. Heeft Roemenië de eerdere aanbevelingen van de Commissie ten uitvoer gelegd? Zo niet, welke juridische stappen gaat de Commissie ondernemen vanwege de niet-naleving door Roemenië van zijn verplichtingen?

2. Kan de Commissie bewijs leveren van het feit dat de toetreding van Roemenië en Bulgarije tot het Schengengebied een positieve bijdrage zal leveren aan de doelstellingen van het gebied?

3. Is de Commissie van mening dat Roemenië kan voldoen aan de vereisten in artikel 67 VWEU, ondanks het feit dat het land niet in staat blijkt de door zijn hoogste ambtenaren gepleegde misdrijven aan te pakken? Denkt de Commissie dat het intrekken van haar voorstel inzake de toetreding van Roemenië en Bulgarije tot het Schengengebied in dit geval een passende oplossing is?

4. Denkt de Commissie dat de strenge regels voor toetreding tot de EU en het Schengengebied nog steeds van kracht zijn en tevens in de toekomst toepasbaar, zelfs al zijn deze in het geval van Roemenië, Bulgarije en Kroatië niet in acht genomen?

Antwoord van mevrouw Malmström namens de Commissie
(21 maart 2013)

In haar verslag van 30 januari 2013 over de vooruitgang van Roemenië in het kader van het mechanisme voor samenwerking en toetsing ([2]) concludeert de Commissie dat Roemenië verschillende, maar niet alle aanbevelingen van de Commissie voor het herstel van de rechtsstaat en de onafhankelijkheid van het gerechtelijk apparaat heeft opgevolgd. De Commissie merkt ook op dat haar aanbevelingen betreffende de hervorming van het gerechtelijk apparaat, de integriteit van ambtenaren en de bestrijding van corruptie sneller moeten worden uitgevoerd. Zij zal nauwlettend blijven volgen of er vooruitgang wordt geboekt en voortdurend contact onderhouden met de Roemeense autoriteiten. Eind 2013 zal zij verslag uitbrengen over de hervormingen.

Zoals in de toetredingsakte is vastgelegd, besluit de Raad over de toetreding van Roemenië en Bulgarije tot het Schengengebied, na raadpleging van het Europees Parlement en nadat is vastgesteld dat aan de voorwaarden voor de toepassing van alle desbetreffende onderdelen van het Schengenacquis is voldaan.

Dit besluit wordt niet genomen op basis van een voorstel van de Commissie. De Commissie van haar kant heeft echter herhaaldelijk duidelijk gemaakt dat zij de toetreding van Roemenië en Bulgarije tot het Schengengebied alsook de inspanningen van de voorzitterschappen in die richting ten volle steunt.

Het Europees Parlement heeft op 8 juni 2011 zijn wetgevingsresolutie ter goedkeuring van de toetreding van Roemenië en Bulgarije met grote meerderheid aangenomen. De Raad Justitie en Binnenlandse Zaken is op 9 juni 2011 unaniem tot de conclusie gekomen dat Roemenië en Bulgarije beide voldoen aan de Schengencriteria, d.w.z. dat beide lidstaten het Schengenacquis op het gebied van buitengrenzen, visa, politiële samenwerking, SIS en gegevensbescherming correct toepassen.

De vereiste unanimiteit in de Raad voor een besluit tot opheffing van de controles aan de binnengrenzen is echter nog niet bereikt.

([1]) http://euobserver.com/justice/118881.
([2]) COM(2013) 47 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001074/13
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Romania floating in corruption

According to the Commission's latest report on the rule of law in Romania, the country still has huge problems with corruption, the independence of the judiciary and the credibility of both government and parliament. Some ministers have been deemed unfit for their jobs because of conflicts of interest and there have been cases of unlawful enrichment of officials, but none of them have resigned. Two members of the government are also under investigation for corruption at the moment ([1]).

1. Did Romania implement the Commission's earlier recommendations? If not, what kind of legal steps will the Commission take in view of Romania's failure to meet its obligations?

2. Can the Commission provide evidence of the fact that the accession of Romania and Bulgaria to the Schengen area will make a positive contribution to the area's aims and objectives?

3. Does the Commission consider that Romania will be able to meet the requirements under Article 67 TFEU, despite the fact that it is unable to deal with the crimes committed by its most senior officials? Does the Commission think that the withdrawal of its proposal on the accession of Romania and Bulgaria to the Schengen area would be an appropriate solution in this case?

4. Does the Commission believe that the strict rules for accession to the EU and Schengen area are still in force and will be applicable in the future as well, even though they have been ignored in the cases of Romania, Bulgaria and Croatia?

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

The Commission's Report on Progress in Romania under the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism adopted on 30 January 2013 ([2]) concludes that Romania has implemented several, but not all, of the Commission's recommendations aiming at restoring rule of law and the independence of the judiciary. The Commission also notes the need to accelerate progress on its recommendations of the reform of the judiciary, integrity and the fight against corruption. It will monitor progress closely, in a constant dialogue with the Romanian authorities, and will report at the end of 2013 on the reform process.

As for the membership of Romania and Bulgaria in the Schengen area, as laid down in the respective Acts of Accession, the decision is taken by the Council, after consultation of the European Parliament and after verification that the necessary conditions for the application of all parts of the Schengen *acquis* concerned have been met.

This decision is not taken on the basis of a proposal from the Commission. For its part, the Commission has however made clear repeatedly that it fully supports Romanian and Bulgarian accession to Schengen as well as the Presidencies' efforts in this direction.

The European Parliament adopted its legislative resolution approving the accession of Romania and Bulgaria by a large majority on 8 June 2011. The Justice and Home Affairs Council of 9 June 2011 unanimously concluded that both Romania and Bulgaria fulfil the Schengen criteria, that is, the two Member States were found to correctly apply the Schengen *acquis* concerning external borders, visa, police cooperation as well as SIS and data protection.

However, the necessary unanimity in Council for a decision on the lifting of internal border control has not yet been reached.

([1]) http://euobserver.com/justice/118881
([2]) COM(2013) 47 final.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001077/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papastamkos (PPE)
(1 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Έκνομες εμπορικές πρακτικές εναντίον ελληνικών εξαγωγών

Σύμφωνα με στοιχεία εθνικών αντιπροσωπευτικών φορέων, πληθαίνουν τα φαινόμενα έκνομων εμπορικών πρακτικών έναντι των ελληνικών εξαγωγών, τόσο από τρίτες χώρες όσο και από κράτη μέλη της Ένωσης. Συγκεκριμένα, έχουν καταγραφεί περιστατικά κακόβουλης κατοχύρωσης εμπορικών σημάτων γνωστών ελληνικών εταιρειών σε χώρες της Ανατολικής Ασίας, καθώς επίσης και εξαπάτησης ελλήνων εξαγωγέων στα Βαλκάνια αλλά και σε κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ (αποστολή χρηματικών ποσών για τη «διευθέτηση» ανύπαρκτων τελωνειακών διατυπώσεων και εκτελωνισμών ή ακόμη και πιστοποιήσεων, αποστολή δειγμάτων σχετικά υψηλής αξίας, προκειμένου να διευκολυνθεί η είσοδος ενός προϊόντος σε μία ξένη αγορά χωρίς να ολοκληρώνεται η επίσημη παραγγελία, ίδρυση επιχειρήσεων για λίγες ημέρες, προκειμένου να εισαχθεί το εμπόρευμα και διάλυσή τους πριν την πληρωμή του εξαγωγέα).

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Έχουν περιέλθει σε γνώση της οι σχετικές έκνομες εμπορικές πρακτικές έναντι των ελληνικών εξαγωγέων και των προϊόντων τους;

— Διαθέτει στοιχεία σχετικά με το μέγεθος της οικονομικής ζημιάς που προκαλείται εξαιτίας των πρακτικών αυτών τόσο στο πλαίσιο του ενδοενωσιακού εμπορίου όσο και του εμπορίου με τρίτες χώρες;

— Προτίθεται να λάβει συγκεκριμένα μέτρα προκειμένου να προστατευθούν οι εξαγωγές τόσο των ελλήνων εμπόρων όσο και των εμπόρων άλλων κρατών μελών;

Απάντηση του κ. De Gucht εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(30 Απριλίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει τις έκνομες εμπορικές πρακτικές τρίτων χωρών που αντιμετωπίζουν πολλοί ευρωπαίοι εξαγωγείς, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των ελληνικών εταιρειών, λόγω των κακόπιστων καταχωρίσεων ευρωπαϊκών εμπορικών σημάτων. Όσον αφορά την εξαπάτηση των ελλήνων εξαγωγέων σε άλλα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ, ισχύουν οι κανόνες της ενιαίας αγοράς. Η αξιολόγηση των ζημιών που οφείλονται σε αυτού του είδους τις έκνομες εμπορικές πρακτικές απαιτεί συγκεκριμένα παραδείγματα.

Η στρατηγική της ΕΕ για την πρόσβαση στις αγορές (MAS) ([1]) συμπληρώνει τις πολυμερείς και διμερείς εμπορικές διαπραγματεύσεις της ΕΕ, διασφαλίζοντας ότι οι εμπορικές ευκαιρίες που δημιουργούνται από τη σύναψη εμπορικών συμφωνιών μετατρέπονται σε πραγματικές εμπορικές ροές. Δίνοντας ιδιαίτερη έμφαση στην επιβολή, η στρατηγική της ΕΕ για την πρόσβαση στις αγορές (MAS) βοηθά τους εξαγωγείς στην αντιμετώπιση θεμάτων όπως αυτά που αναφέρει ο κύριος βουλευτής. Τα ζητήματα πρόσβασης στις αγορές που αντιμετωπίζουν οι εξαγωγείς της ΕΕ σε τρίτες χώρες αποτελούν αντικείμενο συζητήσεων σε διεθνή βήματα, όπως η συμβουλευτική επιτροπή για την πρόσβαση στις αγορές και οι τοπικές ομάδες για την πρόσβαση στις αγορές που υπάρχουν σε τρίτες χώρες, γεγονός που αποτελεί μια καλή βάση για να αναλάβει η ΕΕ συγκεκριμένη δράση για την άρση των επιμέρους εμποδίων. Οι έλληνες εξαγωγείς καλούνται να χρησιμοποιήσουν τις δομές αυτές για να γνωστοποιήσουν συγκεκριμένες υποθέσεις στην Επιτροπή.

Ειδικότερα, όσον αφορά τα θέματα ΔΔΙ ([2]) (όπως ιδίως οι κακόπιστες καταχωρίσεις των ευρωπαϊκών εμπορικών σημάτων), η Επιτροπή αντιμετωπίζει τέτοιου είδους προβλήματα σε πολύ τακτική βάση με τους ασιάτες εταίρους της. Στην Κίνα το ζήτημα αυτό εξετάζεται σε πολιτικό επίπεδο στον ετήσιο διάλογο για τη ΔΙ ([3]) και σε τεχνικό επίπεδο στις εξαμηνιαίες συναντήσεις της ομάδας εργασίας για τη ΔΙ. Το θέμα αυτό έχει τεθεί και με άλλες χώρες του ASEAN ([4]) με τις οποίες η ΕΕ έχει διάλογο για τη ΔΙ, όπως η Ταϊλάνδη. Επιπλέον, οι εταιρείες της ΕΕ μπορούν να ζητούν την υποστήριξη από τα γραφεία βοήθειας για θέματα ΔΔΙ για τις ΜΜΕ ([5]) στην Κίνα και σε χώρες του ASEAN, που αποσκοπούν στην υποστήριξη και την παροχή συμβουλών στις επιχειρήσεις της ΕΕ οι οποίες επιθυμούν να εισέλθουν σε χώρες της Ανατολικής Ασίας.

([1]) Στρατηγική πρόσβασης στην αγορά.
([2]) Δικαιώματα Διανοητικής Ιδιοκτησίας.
([3]) Διανοητική Ιδιοκτησία.
([4]) Σύνδεσμος Κρατών Νοτιοανατολικής Ασίας.
([5]) Μικρομεσαίες επιχειρήσεις.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001077/13
to the Commission
Georgios Papastamkos (PPE)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Unlawful trading practices affecting Greek exports

A number of national associations representing the Greek export sector are complaining that it is increasingly being affected by unlawful trading practices on the part of both third countries and EU Member States. More specifically, they have listed cases of malicious registration of well known Greek trademarks in a number of East Asian countries and the defrauding of Greek exporters in certain Balkan countries and EU Member States (requests for payment to cover the 'administrative costs' of dealing with non-existent customs formalities, clearance and certification or for the sending of quite valuable samples to facilitate penetration of a foreign market without the orders ever being finalised, or the setting-up of companies for a few days only for the purpose of importing goods and the winding up thereof before payment to exporters).

In view of this:

— Is the Commission aware of these unlawful trading activities at the expense of Greek exporters?

— Does it have any information regarding the losses incurred as a result of such practices in the course of trade between Member States and with third countries?

— Will it take specific measures to protect exporters in Greece and other Member States?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(30 April 2013)

The Commission is aware of unlawful trading practices of third countries faced by many European exporters including Greek companies, as a result of bad-faith registration of European trademarks. As regards the defrauding of Greek exporters in other Member States, the rules of the Single Market apply. The evaluation of losses incurred by such unlawful trading practices would require specific examples.

The EU MAS ([1]) complements the EU's multilateral and bilateral trade negotiations by making sure that trade opportunities created by trade agreements are translated into actual trade flows. With its focus on enforcement, the EU MAS helps exporters to overcome issues such as those quoted by the Honourable Member. Market access issues that EU exporters face in third countries are discussed in fora such as the Market Access Advisory Committee and local Market Access Teams in third countries which provides a good basis for specific EU action to tackle individual barriers. Greek exporters are invited to use these structures to bring concrete cases to the knowledge of the Commission.

More specifically with regard to IPR ([2])-related issues (such as notably the bad-faith registration of European trademarks), the Commission is adressing such problems on a very regular basis with its Asian partners. In China this issue is raised at political level in the annual IP ([3]) Dialogue and at technical level in the bi-annual IP Working Group. This topic is equally raised with other ASEAN ([4]) countries with which the EU has an IP Dialogue such as Thailand. Furthermore, EU companies can receive the support of the SME ([5]) IPR Helpdesks in China and in ASEAN countries aimed at supporting and advising EU companies in the markets of East Asian countries.

([1]) Market Access Strategy.
([2]) Intellectual Property Rights.
([3]) Intellectual Property.
([4]) Association of Southeast Asian Nations.
([5]) Small and Medium-sized Enterprise.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001078/13
adresată Comisiei
Ramona Nicole Mănescu (ALDE)
(1 februarie 2013)

Subiect: Raportul Comisiei Europene privind progresele înregistrate de România în cadrul mecanismului de cooperare și verificare

Având în vedere faptul că Raportul CE privind progresele înregistrate de România în cadrul mecanismului de cooperare și verificare, făcut public în data de 30 ianuarie 2013, prezintă o serie de inadvertențe și neadevăruri, având la bază, sper, necunoașterea situației reale din România, și nu reaua voință, doresc să vă adresez următoarele întrebări:

1. Vă rog să precizați sursele de informare care au stat la baza elaborării acestui raport, având în vedere faptul că raportul nu a fost prezentat în prealabil Guvernului în vederea corectării eventualelor erori.

2. În comparație cu rapoartele de evaluare din 2010, prezentul raport exprimă o îngrijorare nejustificată a CE în ceea ce privește numărul de ordonanțe de urgență emise de guvern, precum și neutralitatea Avocatului Poporului. Deși doar în anul 2010 Guvernul Boc a emis peste 130 de ordonanțe de urgență, iar Avocatul Poporului de la acea vreme nu a făcut nimic în acest sens, CE nu a considerat aceste aspecte ca fiind suficient de grave pentru a fi menționate în rapoartele de țară din acel an. Cum justificați lipsa de obiectivitate a CE în această situație?

3. Cum poate exercita mass-media, care are tocmai rolul de a informa, „presiuni nejustificate și acte de intimidare asupra sistemului judiciar"? Care sunt dovezile Comisiei în acest sens?

4. Cum este posibil ca un raport de evaluare al CE, care se vrea clar, bine documentat și foarte obiectiv să cuprindă exprimări precum: „hotărârile Curții Constituționale PAR să fi fost publicate în timp util în Monitorul Oficial"?

Răspuns dat de dl Barroso în numele Comisiei
(11 martie 2013)

1. Comisia utilizează toate sursele disponibile, în special surse provenite de la Guvernul și de la alte instituții din România, din lucrări academice, de la organizații internaționale, ONG-uri, din corespondența privată și din alte surse neoficiale, atât din interiorul României, cât și din alte state membre. Activitatea desfășurată de Comisie cu privire la MCV se bazează, de asemenea, pe contactele dintre Comisie și România în alte domenii relevante ale politicilor UE.

2. Comisia respinge acuzația de „lipsă de obiectivitate". Comisia nu a făcut observații privind numărul ordonanțelor de urgență, ci privind preocuparea că acestea nu au fost utilizate în conformitate cu prevederile Constituției din România. Astfel de preocupări au fost reluate de Comisia de la Veneția ([1]). Recomandările cuprinse în raportul din iulie 2012, care au fost acceptate de autoritățile române, se refereau la necesitatea de a numi un Avocat al Poporului care să se bucure de sprijinul diferitelor partide. Întrucât noul Avocat al Poporului a primit sprijinul deplin al coaliției aflate la guvernare, dar nu și pe cel al opoziției, este deosebit de important ca acesta să dovedească, în acțiunile sale, că se poată ridica deasupra partizanatelor politice.

3. Libertatea presei este recunoscută în Carta drepturilor fundamentale și este legată intrinsec de valorile libertății și democrației. Cu toate acestea, Comisia a aflat din numeroase surse, inclusiv din partea unor instituții-cheie precum Curtea Constituțională, Consiliul Superior al Magistraturii și Înalta Curte de Casație și Justiție, că sistemul judiciar a fost vizat de anumite mass-media, inclusiv, după cum se menționează în raportul din ianuarie 2013, de campanii mediatice de hărțuire. Acest lucru este larg recunoscut în România ca fiind o problemă care trebuie rezolvată.

4. Comisia consideră că raportul său este clar și lipsit de ambiguitate.

([1]) http://www.venice.coe.int/webforms/documents/CDL-AD(2012)026-e.aspx

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001078/13
to the Commission
Ramona Nicole Mănescu (ALDE)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Commission Report on Progress in Romania under the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism

Since the Commission's report on the progress in Romania under the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism, which was published on 30 January 2013, contains a series of inadvertent mistakes and inaccuracies that stem, one would hope, from lack of knowledge of the real situation Romania rather than from any ill will, can the Commission state:

1. What sources of information the report was based on, given that it was not presented to the government prior to publication so that any errors could be corrected?

2. Whether, in comparison to the 2010 assessment report, this report does not show unjustified concern on the part of the Commission as to the number of emergency decrees issued by the government and the neutrality of the Ombudsman? Despite the fact that in 2010 alone the Boc Government issued over 130 emergency decrees and the Ombudsman at the time did nothing in that respect, the Commission did not find this sufficiently serious to merit mention in the reports on Romania for that year. How does the Commission justify its lack of objectivity in this regard?

3. How can the mass media have exercised 'undue pressure or intimidation' against the judiciary, when its role is specifically to inform? What evidence does the Commission have of this?

4. How is it possible for the Commission's assessment report, which claims to be clear, well-documented and highly objective, to contain statements such as: the 'decisions of the Constitutional Court, APPEAR to have been published in a timely fashion in the Official Journal'?

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

1. The Commission uses all sources available, most notably from the Romanian government and other institutions, academic work, international organisations, NGOs, private correspondence and other informal sources, both within Romania and from other Member States. The Commission's work on the CVM also draws on the contacts between the Commission and Romania in other relevant areas of EU policy.

2. The Commission rejects the allegation of 'lack of objectivity'. The Commission has not commented on the number of ordinances, but on concerns that these were not used in accordance with Romanian Constitutional requirements. Such concerns have been echoed by the Venice Commission. ([1]) The recommendations of the July 2012 Report, which have been accepted by the Romanian authorities, referred to the need to appoint an Ombudsman enjoying cross-party support. As the new Ombudsman received the full support of the ruling coalition but not the opposition it is particularly important for him to show in his actions that he can rise above party lines.

3. Freedom of the media is recognised by the Charter of Fundamental Rights and is intrinsically linked to the values of freedom and democracy. However, the Commission has become aware of the fact that the judiciary has been targeted by certain media, including, as mentioned in the January 2013 Report, media campaigns amounting to harassment, from numerous sources including key institutions such as the Constitutional Court, by the Superior Council of the Magistracy and the High Court of Cassation and Justice. This is widely recognised inside Romania as an issue which needs to be addressed.

4. The Commission considers its report to be clear and unambiguous.

([1]) http://www.venice.coe.int/webforms/documents/CDL-AD(2012)026-e.aspx.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001079/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(1 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: Semestre europeo

El Gobierno del Reino de España ha decidido cancelar las transferencias al Museo MACBA de Barcelona alegando que la administración autonómica catalana no ha cumplido los objetivos de déficit para el año 2012 ([1]).

Huelga decir que dichos objetivos de déficit, establecidos por el Estado español, no han podido ser cumplidos debido, en gran parte, a la cancelación de transferencias del Estado a la administración autonómica catalana. El fondo de competitividad o la liquidación de la disposición adicional tercera del Estatut (ley orgánica que regula aspectos básicos institucionales en Cataluña) son claros ejemplos en este sentido ([2]).

1. ¿Piensa la Comisión aplicar en el mismo sentido y con el mismo rigor con que lo hace el Estado español con las otras administraciones públicas la ley de estabilidad en la EU?

2. ¿En caso de incumplimiento de los objetivos de déficit por parte del Gobierno español, cancelará las transferencias de la UE al Estado español tal y como lo hace el Estado español con las otras administraciones públicas?

3. ¿Va a ser la Comisión igualmente inflexible?

4. ¿Si no va a ser igualmente inflexible, puede explicar la Comisión los motivos por los que no lo va a ser?

Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión
(18 de abril de 2013)

La Comisión se ha comprometido a aplicar estrictamente las normas de vigilancia económica de la UE, de conformidad con sus responsabilidades en virtud del Tratado y el Derecho derivado (en particular, el denominado «six-pack»). Estas responsabilidades se reforzarán cuando se adopte la legislación correspondiente al «two-pack».

En lo que respecta a los Fondos Estructurales, la Comisión ha presentado una propuesta de proyecto de Reglamento por el que se establecen normas comunes al efecto de contemplar mecanismos eficaces de condicionalidad macroeconómica. La eficacia de los fondos de la UE se mejorará al hacer depender las ayudas de una políticas macroeconómicas equilibradas o al redestinar los fondos a la solución de las deficiencias económicas reconocidas en las recomendaciones por país y otros procedimientos de gobernanza económica, a fin de maximizar el crecimiento y el empleo.

([1]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/cultura/20130124/54362286307/hacienda-cancela-ayuda-macba-deficit-catalan.html
([2]) http://www.cincodias.com/articulo/economia/cataluna-queda-978-millones-pendientes/20120403cdscdseco_21/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001079/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: European Semester

The Spanish Government has decided to withhold funding from the MACBA museum in Barcelona on the grounds that the Catalan autonomous government has not met its deficit targets for 2012 ([1]).

Needless to say, one of the main reasons that the Catalonian government has failed to meet these targets set by the central government is that payments of money that it should be receiving from the state have been suspended. The amounts that should have been transferred to Catalonia from the competition fund and in investment corresponding to the third additional provision of the Catalan Statute (the organic law laying down the basic institutional regulations in Catalonia) are specific examples of such non-payments ([2]).

1. Does the Commission intend to enforce stability regulations in the EU in the same way and as strictly as the Spanish Government has applied its Budgetary Stability Law to the autonomous community administrations?

2. If Spain falls short of its deficit targets, will transfers of funds from the EU to Spain be withheld, in the same way that Spain's central government has suspended payments to autonomous community administrations?

3. Will the Commission be as unyielding as the Spanish Government?

4. If not, could the Commission explain why?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(18 April 2013)

The Commission is committed to strictly enforcing EU economic surveillance rules, in accordance with the responsibilities it has under the Treaty and secondary legislation (in particular the so-called 'six-pack'). These responsibilities will be reinforced when the two-pack legislation is adopted.

Concerning structural funds, the Commission has made a proposal for a draft Regulation setting out common rules with aim at providing effective mechanisms of macroeconomic conditionality. The effectiveness of the EU funds will be enhanced by making assistance dependent on sound macroeconomic policies or by refocusing the funds to address economic weaknesses identified through country-specific recommendations and other economic governance procedures in order to maximise growth and employment.

([1]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/cultura/20130124/54362286307/hacienda-cancela-ayuda-macba-deficit-catalan.html
([2]) http://www.cincodias.com/articulo/economia/cataluna-queda-978-millones-pendientes/20120403cdscdseco_21/.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001080/13
an die Kommission
Rainer Wieland (PPE)
(1. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: Sprachregelung bei nationalen Bürgerbeauftragten

Zu den Rechten eines jeden Unionsbürgers gehört die Freizügigkeit, und diese wird aktiv von der Europäischen Union gefördert. Die Reisefreiheit bringt jedoch verstärkt mit sich, dass Unionsbürger auf Probleme mit der Verwaltung eines Mitgliedstaats, das nicht ihr Heimatland ist, stoßen. Hierbei haben sie die Möglichkeit, sich an den dort zuständigen nationalen Bürgerbeauftragten oder einen Petitionsausschuss zu wenden. Dies muss jedoch in den meisten Fällen in der Landessprache geschehen. Ebenfalls sind Informationen über die Aufgaben und Regeln der nationalen Bürgerbeauftragten meist nur in der Landessprache zu finden.

1. Ist dieser Umstand der Kommission bekannt?

2. Gibt es eine Übersicht über die diesbezügliche Handhabung in den Mitgliedstaaten?

3. Sieht die Kommission in diesem Umstand eine Verletzung des Diskriminierungsverbots der Unionsbürgerschaft?

4. Falls ja, was gedenkt die Kommission gegen diese Diskriminierung zu tun?

Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(10. April 2013)

Nach Artikel 24 Absatz 4 AEUV kann sich jeder Unionsbürger schriftlich in einer der Vertragssprachen an jedes Organ oder jede Einrichtung wenden, die in diesem Artikel genannt sind (beispielsweise Europäisches Parlament, Europäischer Bürgerbeauftragter), und eine Antwort in derselben Sprache erhalten.

Bei nationalen Einrichtungen — z. B. den nationalen Bürgerbeauftragten und Petitionsausschüssen — finden Sprachenregelungen Anwendung, die nicht unter das EU-Recht fallen und für die die Kommission nicht zuständig ist. Das in Artikel 18 AEUV verankerte Verbot der Diskriminierung aus Gründen der Staatsangehörigkeit gilt nur im Anwendungsbereich des Vertrags.

Soweit der Kommission bekannt ist, räumen einige nationale Bürgerbeauftragte die Möglichkeit ein, sich in mehreren Sprachen an sie zu wenden ([1]).

Die Kommission unterstützt eine Reihe von Initiativen zur Förderung der Mehrsprachigkeit in der EU ([2]).

([1]) Z. B.: http://en.ombudsmanden.dk/ oder http://www.federalombudsman.be/fr
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/languages/index_de.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001080/13
to the Commission
Rainer Wieland (PPE)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Language arrangements in connection with national ombudsmen

The rights of every EU citizen include the freedom of movement, and this is actively promoted by the European Union. However, the freedom to travel also increases the number of problems EU citizens encounter with the administration of a Member State that is not their home state. In this situation, they have the option of turning to the competent national ombudsman in that state or to a petitions committee. In most cases, however, this has to be carried out in the official language of the host state. Information on the duties and rules of the national ombudsmen is also usually only available in the official language of the host state.

1. Is the Commission aware of this situation?

2. Is there an overview of how these matters are handled in the Member States?

3. Does the Commission consider this situation to be a violation of the principle of non-discrimination associated with Union citizenship?

4. If so, what does it intend to do to prevent this discrimination?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2013)

According to the fourth sub-paragraph of Article 24 TFEU, citizens of the Union may write to any of the institutions and bodies referred to in this Article (such as the European Parliament and the European Ombudsman) in any of the Treaty languages and to obtain a reply in the same language.

When it comes to national bodies, such as national Ombudsmen and petition committees, national linguistic regimes apply which are not covered by EC law and on which the Commission has no competence. Prohibition of discrimination on grounds of nationality enshrined in Article 18 TFEU only applies within the scope of the Treaty.

To the Commission's knowledge some national Ombudsmen offer the possibility to address them in more than one language ([1]).

The Commission is promoting a number of initiatives to enhance multilingualism in the EU ([2]).

([1]) For example http://en.ombudsmanden.dk/ or http://www.federalombudsman.be/fr
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/languages/index_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001081/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(1º febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: India: il business degli uteri in affitto — quale futuro per i diritti delle donne?

Per molte famiglie, il problema dell'infertilità può essere risolto in India con qualche migliaio di dollari. Negli ultimi anni, tale paese è diventato uno dei maggiori centri di concentrazione di cliniche per l'infertilità, una sorta di nuovo polo della «maternità surrogata» o «uteri in affitto». Tale pratica consiste nell'impiantare, dopo un processo di concepimento in vitro, il seme e gli ovuli dei futuri genitori genetici nell'utero di una «madre portatrice». La gestazione sarà portata avanti da quest'ultima la quale, al momento del parto, darà alla luce un bambino avente il patrimonio genetico dei due genitori naturali.

Si osservano, tuttavia, alcuni aspetti preoccupanti:

— i bassi prezzi delle cliniche indiane hanno alimentato un'industria della medicina dell'infertilità da 2,3 miliardi di dollari l'anno, di fatto eliminando la concorrenza delle cliniche statunitensi e britanniche;

— il costo dell'intera operazione è tra i 25mila e i 30mila dollari mentre, per lo stesso trattamento, negli USA si arriva fino a 50mila dollari;

— le volontarie entrano in contatto con le cliniche tramite il passaparola e ricevono tra gli 8-9mila dollari a gestazione.

Secondo stime non ufficiali, in India vi è oggi oltre 1 migliaio di cliniche per l'infertilità, che ospitano annualmente migliaia di coppie provenienti da tutto il mondo; ogni anno nascono oltre 1.500 bambini da madri in affitto indiane. Il fenomeno è in continua crescita, ma non ci sono dati attendibili in quanto non è in vigore un sistema di monitoraggio delle cliniche e non vi è un registro di trasparenza per le cliniche operanti nel paese, dove il tasso di alfabetizzazione non è elevato. Il rischio maggiore di tale lacuna normativa è la mancanza d'informazioni alle «madri in affitto»: le donne firmano contratti tra le parti che non prevedono sostegno medico o economico in caso di malori postnatali e sono esposte senza cognizione di causa al business parallelo illegale degli intermediari locali. Nonostante gli orientamenti per il monitoraggio e la regolamentazione dell'industria medica dell'infertilità presentati dall'Indian Council for Medical Research (ICMR) nel 2005, la proposta di legge sulla surrogazione di maternità è ancora al vaglio.

Alla luce di tale situazione, si chiede se la Commissione intenda, nell'ambito del documento di strategia nazionale per l'India 2007-2013:

1. predisporre azioni e campagne a tutela delle donne indiane contro lo sfruttamento delle stesse nelle pratiche di «utero in affitto»;

2. aprire nuovi canali di finanziamento per la creazione di sistemi di informazione e monitoraggio;

3. pubblicare dati ufficiali sul fenomeno descritto, che è in continua crescita?

Risposta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione
(22 marzo 2013)

Sin dai primi anni novanta l'UE è impegnata con il governo indiano e con le organizzazioni della società civile indiana per il miglioramento della salute materna, la riduzione della mortalità infantile e la tutela dei diritti delle donne.

Una delle principali priorità di sviluppo identificata nel documento strategico nazionale 2007-2013 UE-India consiste nell'aiutare tale paese a raggiungere gli obiettivi di sviluppo del millennio attraverso il sostegno al bilancio settoriale per i servizi sanitari e scolastici di base. L'UE sta sostenendo il governo indiano in maniera olistica attraverso, ad esempio, il programma congiunto NRHM/RCH2" ([1]), che ha l'obiettivo di ridurre le disparità regionali nella fornitura di servizi a sostegno della salute materna, riproduttiva e infantile.

([1]) Il programma «NRHM/RCH2» (Missione nazionale per la salute nelle zone rurali/Programma per la salute riproduttiva e infantile, fase 2), del valore di 110 milioni di EUR, ha come obiettivo il sostegno della missione nazionale per la salute nelle zone rurali che unisce l'India e i partner per lo sviluppo.

Il documento strategico nazionale 2007-2013 UE-India è stato pienamente attuato e non vi sono fondi disponibili per la creazione di sistemi di informazione e monitoraggio o per la produzione e pubblicazione di dati relativi al fenomeno del business degli uteri in affitto in India.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001081/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: India: the business of surrogate motherhood — what future for women's rights?

For many families, infertility problems can be solved in India for a few thousand dollars. In recent years, India has become one of the major centres for infertility clinics, a sort of new 'surrogacy hub'. Surrogacy involves in vitro fertilisation using the sperm and eggs from the future genetic parents, after which the embryo is transferred into the womb of a 'surrogate mother'. The pregnancy will be carried by the surrogate, who will give birth to a child that is the genetic offspring of the two biological parents.

Some worrying issues have, however, been raised:

— low prices at Indian clinics have fuelled an infertility medicine industry worth USD 2.3 billion a year, thus *de facto* eliminating competition from US and UK clinics;

— the cost of the entire operation is between USD 25 000 and 30 000, whereas the same treatment in the US costs up to USD 50 000;

— the volunteer surrogates come into contact with the clinics through word of mouth and receive USD 8-9 000 per gestation.

According to unofficial estimates, India now has over 1 000 infertility clinics, which annually treat thousands of couples from all over the world; every year, more than 1 500 children are born to Indian surrogate mothers. The phenomenon is growing, but there are no reliable data as there is no monitoring system for the clinics, and there is no transparency register for clinics operating in a country where the literacy rate is not high. The greatest risk of such a regulatory gap is the lack of information given to the surrogate mothers: the women sign contracts between the parties that do not provide for medical or financial support in the event of postnatal illness, and in their ignorance they are exposed to illegal parallel business practices on the part of local intermediaries. Despite the guidelines for monitoring and regulating the medical infertility industry presented by the Indian Council for Medical Research (ICMR) in 2005, the draft law on surrogacy is still being examined.

In light of this situation, can the Commission state whether, as part of the Country Strategy Paper for India 2007-2013, it intends to:

1. draw up measures and develop campaigns to protect Indian women against exploitation in surrogacy cases;

2. open up new funding channels for the creation of information and monitoring systems;

3. publish official data on the phenomenon described, which is continuously on the increase?

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

The EU has engaged with the Government of India and Indian civil society organisations since the early 1990s, on improvement of maternal health, reducing child mortality and protecting women's rights.

The EU-India Country Strategy Paper 2007-2013 has identified supporting India in reaching the Millennium Development Goals, by providing sector budget support for basic health and education, as one of the main development priorities. The EU is supporting the Government of India in a holistic way, e.g. through the EU National Rural Health Mission / Reproductive and Child Health phase 2 programme ([1]), aimed at reducing regional inequalities in the provision of services in the areas of maternal health, reproductive and child health.

([1]) 'NRHM/RCH2', worth EUR 110 million — aims to support India's National Rural Health Mission (NRHM) that brings together India and supporting development partners.

The EU-India Country Strategy Paper 2007-2013 has been fully implemented and there is no funding available for the creation of information, monitoring systems or to produce and publish data with regard to the phenomenon of business of surrogate motherhood in India.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001082/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(1º febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Il principio del solve et repete tributario: quale conformità rispetto ai principi del giusto processo dell'ordinamento europeo

In Italia, la legge n. 122 del 30 luglio 2010 prevede che, dal 2011, l'avviso di accertamento ai fini IRPEF-IRAP e IVA emesso dall'Agenzia delle entrate sia immediatamente esecutivo: gli avvisi di accertamento sono esecutivi senza la «famosa» cartella esattoriale, poiché la principale agenzia di riscossione italiana può dar subito corso ad esecuzione forzata. Tale procedura, assolutamente penalizzante per i contribuenti, è stata «attenuata» dalle disposizioni degli articoli 29-30 del cosiddetto decreto legge sullo sviluppo (decreto legge n. 70 del 13 maggio 2011). Queste norme, di fatto, ripropongono un'odiosa vessazione da parte dello Stato nei confronti dei cittadini italiani: il principio tributario del *solve et repete*, ossia «prima paghi e poi contesti». Come clausola contrattuale, il *solve et repete* è considerato lecito, poiché le parti possono liberamente decidere che l'eventuale debitore in un rapporto contrattuale prima paghi e poi faccia valere le sue ragioni. Tuttavia, nel diritto tributario, il principio è da considerarsi illegittimo: pubblica amministrazione e cittadino non sono sullo stesso piano e imporre al cittadino di pagare un debito che deve essere accertato, senza che egli abbia previamente espresso la sua volontà di pagare prima e discutere poi, viola il diritto del cittadino a difendersi e a mantenere nella propria disponibilità beni che sono oggetto di un debito «inesigibile», in quanto non ancora oggettivo e dimostrato. La Corte costituzionale ha dichiarato illegittimo il *solve et repete* dal 1961 con la sentenza n. 21/1961, espungendolo dall'ordinamento tributario e confermando il rigetto di una misura lesiva della sfera non solo patrimoniale, ma anche personale (dato il valore che i beni hanno nella vita di ciascuno).

Considerato che:

— i requisiti della domanda d'ingiunzione di pagamento europea sono disciplinati in modo esauriente dal diritto comunitario e che gli Stati non possono quindi prevedere requisiti aggiuntivi (sentenza del 13 dicembre 2012 della Corte di giustizia europea, sezione I, causa C-215/11); quindi, anche sotto il profilo della normativa europea il *solve et repete* tributario è in palese contrasto con il principio di eguaglianza tra i cittadini, il diritto di agire in giudizio a tutela dei propri diritti e l'inammissibilità di limitare il medesimo diritto, compresa la tutela del cittadino per il risarcimento danni nei confronti dello Stato,

si chiede alla Commissione se ritiene ammissibile estendere i parametri d'illegittimità alla violazione del principio di rango comunitario del giusto processo, laddove si prevede l'equità dei procedimenti e la parità di armi tra «accusa» e «difesa» (poiché il *solve et repete* inverte i tempi tra accertamento del debito e pagamento e pone l'onere della prova a carico del debitore)?

Risposta di Algirdas Šemeta a nome della Commissione
(27 marzo 2013)

Allo stadio attuale di evoluzione del diritto tributario dell'Unione europea le norme procedurali sulla riscossione delle imposte ([1]) sono scarsamente armonizzate e restano prevalentemente di competenza degli Stati membri. In altre parole, gli Stati membri sono liberi di designare le autorità competenti incaricate della riscossione delle imposte e di stabilire le relative procedure di recupero. Il diritto dell'Unione vieta tuttavia agli Stati membri di introdurre misure che operino una discriminazione, diretta o indiretta, nei confronti di cittadini di altri Stati o di persone che hanno esercitato le loro libertà fondamentali.

Secondo la Corte di giustizia dell'Unione europea ([2]), le norme procedurali nazionali che disciplinano l'esercizio dei diritti conferiti ai cittadini dalla legislazione dell'Unione non possono essere meno favorevoli di quelle relative all'esercizio di analoghi diritti nazionali e non possono rendere impossibile o eccessivamente difficile l'esercizio di tali diritti

Dalle informazioni di cui dispone la Commissione non risulta che le autorità italiane applichino norme procedurali discriminatorie o meno favorevoli ai contribuenti non residenti per quanto riguarda gli accertamenti fiscali e le modalità di recupero.

([1]) Direttiva 2010/24/UE del Consiglio, del 16 marzo 2010, sull'assistenza reciproca in materia di recupero dei crediti risultanti da dazi, imposte ed altre misure.
([2]) Cfr. la causa C-33/76, Rewe, del 16.12.1976, e la causa C-45/76, Comet, del 16.12.1976.

Le disposizioni relative all'ingiunzione di pagamento europea ([3]) non sono pertinenti nel caso in esame ([4]), che riguarda esclusivamente le procedure di accertamento applicate dall'Italia.

In tale contesto la Commissione deve osservare che, allo stadio attuale, il principio dell'immediata esecutività degli avvisi di accertamento emessi dall'Agenzia delle entrate e il suo corollario del «solve et repete» non sembrano essere in contrasto con il diritto dell'Unione.

([3]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1896/2006 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 12 dicembre 2006, che istituisce un procedimento europeo d'ingiunzione di pagamento (GU L 399 del 30.12.2006, pag. 1).

([4]) Per l'interpretazione della Corte di giustizia si veda il punto 30 della causa C-215/11, Szyrocka, del 13.12.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001082/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: The *solve et repete* principle of taxation: what conformity with the principles of due process under European law?

Under Italian Law No 122 of 30 July 2010, from 2011 onwards, assessment notices for income tax, IRAP [Italian regional corporate tax] and VAT issued by the Revenue Office are immediately enforceable: assessment notices are enforceable without the infamous recovery notice, as the main Italian collection agency is entitled to make them subject to immediate enforcement proceedings. This procedure, which is absolutely detrimental to the taxpayer, was 'attenuated' by the provisions of Articles 29-30 of the so-called Development Decree-Law (Decree-Law No 70 of 13 May 2011). These rules, in fact, reintroduce abhorrent harassment of Italian citizens by the State, using the *solve et repete*, or 'pay first and then claim' principle of taxation. As a contractual clause, *solve et repete* is considered legitimate, since the parties are free to agree that the debtor in a contractual relationship should first pay up and then take out a case. However, in tax law, the principle is to be considered illegitimate, as public administrations and citizens are not on the same level — forcing citizens to pay a debt that has still to be proven, without their having previously expressed willingness to pay first and then claim, violates their right to defend themselves and to keep hold of the goods which are the subject of a debt that is 'unenforceable', since it is not yet objective and proven. The Italian Constitutional Court declared *solve et repete* illegal in 1961 under Ruling No 21/1961, thus wiping it from the Italian tax code and confirming the rejection of a measure that adversely affects not only assets but also the personal sphere (given the value that property has in everyone's life).

Given that:

— the requirements for applying for a European order for payment are comprehensively governed by EC law and that States cannot therefore introduce additional requirements (judgment of the European Court of Justice (First Chamber) of 13 December 2012 in Case C-215/11); therefore, even in terms of European legislation *solve et repete* taxation is in stark contrast to the principle of equality among citizens, the right to take legal action to protect one's rights and the inadmissibility of limiting said right, including the protection of the citizen in claiming damages against the State,

does the Commission regard it as permissible to extend the parameters of illegitimacy to include an infringement of the EU's principle of due process, where fairness of proceedings and equality of arms are expected between 'prosecution' and 'defence' (given that *solve et repete* inverts the natural order between assessment and payment of the debt and places the burden of proof upon the debtor)?

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

At the present stage of development of EU tax law, there is very little harmonisation at EU level of procedural rules concerning the collection of taxes ([1]) and they remain largely within the Member States' competence. In other words, Member States are free to designate the competent authorities in charge of the collection of taxes and to lay down the relevant recovery procedures. However, EC law prevents Member States from introducing measures which discriminate, directly or indirectly, against non-nationals or against persons who have exercised their fundamental freedoms.

According to the CJEU ([2]) the national procedural rules governing the exercise of rights that citizens derive from EC law should not be less favourable than those governing the exercise of similar domestic rights and should not render the exercise of these rights impossible or excessively difficult.

On the basis of the information available to the Commission, it does not appear that the Italian authorities apply discriminatory or less favourable procedural rules to non-resident taxpayers as it concerns the tax assessments and recovery mechanisms.

([1]) Council Directive 2010/24/EU of 16 March 2010 concerning mutual assistance for the recovery of claims relating to taxes, duties and other measures.
([2]) See Case C-33/76, *Rewe*, of 16.12.1976 and C-45/76, *Comet*, of 16.12.1976.

The provisions related to the European order of payment ([3]) are not relevant in the case at hand ([4]) which concerns exclusively the Italian assessment procedures.

In these circumstances, the Commission has to observe that, at this stage, the principle of the immediate enforceability of the assessment notices issued by the Tax Revenue Office and its *solve et repete* corollary do not seem to contravene the EC law.

([3]) Provided by Regulation (EC) No 1896/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006 creating a European order for payment procedure, OJ L 399.

([4]) For the interpretation of the ECJ see paragraph 30 of Case C-215/11, *Szyrocka*, of 13.12.2012.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001090/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(1 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Επίπεδο πληρωμών έως τις 31 Ιανουαρίου 2013

Μετά την έγκριση του Σχεδίου Διορθωτικού Προϋπολογισμού (ΣΔΠ) αριθ. 6/2012, η αρμόδια για τον προϋπολογισμό αρχή αναμένει από την Επιτροπή να υποβάλει Σχέδιο Διορθωτικού Προϋπολογισμού για την κάλυψη του ποσού των 2,9 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ απαιτήσεων του 2012 που έχουν ανασταλεί, το οποίο αποτελούσε μέρος του ΣΔΠ 6/2012 (που καλύπτει απαιτήσεις πληρωμών έως την 31η Οκτωβρίου 2012).

Επιπλέον, το Νοέμβριο και το Δεκέμβριο του 2012 πρόσθετες αιτήσεις πληρωμών βάσει επιμερισμένης διαχείρισης για ένα συνολικό ποσό ύψους 16 δισεκατομμυρίων ευρώ υποβλήθηκαν στην Επιτροπή και θα πρέπει να αποπληρωθούν κατά τη διάρκεια του 2013.

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη όλα τα ανωτέρω και δεδομένου του γεγονότος ότι το επίπεδο πληρωμών για τον προϋπολογισμό της ΕΕ του 2013 είναι 5 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ κατώτερο από τους υπολογισμούς της Επιτροπής για ανάγκες πληρωμών στο σχέδιό της για τον προϋπολογισμό, θα μπορούσε η Επιτροπή να μας παράσχει λεπτομερείς πληροφορίες σχετικά με το επίπεδο των πληρωμών που εισπράχθηκαν έως την 31η Ιανουαρίου 2013; Ειδικότερα, θα μπορούσε η Επιτροπή να μας ενημερώσει σχετικά με τις πληρωμές που εισπράχθηκαν κατά το μήνα Ιανουάριο του 2013, αναλυτικά ανά κράτος μέλος και τομέα πολιτικής/πρόγραμμα;

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

Οι αιτήσεις πληρωμής για τα επιχειρησιακά προγράμματα της περιόδου 2007-2013, τα οποία συγχρηματοδοτούνται από το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο (ΕΚΤ), το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης (ΕΤΠΑ), το Ταμείο Συνοχής (ΤΣ), το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Αλιείας (ΕΤΑ) και το Ευρωπαϊκό Γεωργικό Ταμείο Αγροτικής Ανάπτυξης (ΕΓΤΑΑ) υποβάλλονται από τα κράτη μέλη στην Επιτροπή μέσω του συστήματος «SFC2007».

Η αναλυτική κατανομή των έγκυρων αιτήσεων πληρωμής ([1]), που υποβλήθηκαν τον Ιανουάριο για τα χρηματοδοτούμενα από το ΕΚΤ, το ΕΤΠΑ και το ΤΣ επιχειρησιακά προγράμματα της περιόδου 2007-2013, παρατίθεται στο Παράρτημα Ι της παρούσας απάντησης. Τα αριθμητικά στοιχεία του πίνακα προκύπτουν από τη σύγκριση των αιτήσεων πληρωμής που υποβλήθηκαν έως το τέλος Ιανουαρίου 2013 με εκείνες που υποβλήθηκαν έως το τέλος Δεκεμβρίου 2012. Όσον αφορά στο ΕΤΑ και το ΕΤΠΑ, τα δεδομένα αφορούν τις έγκυρες αιτήσεις πληρωμής, οι οποίες υποβλήθηκαν μεταξύ της 24ης Δεκεμβρίου 2012 και της 27ης Ιανουαρίου 2013 (βλ. Παράρτημα ΙΙ).

Η Επιτροπή μπορεί να αποφασίσει την αλλαγή κατάστασης μιας αίτησης πληρωμής, στο SFC2007, από «Αποδεκτή» σε «Πλήρως απορριφθείσα» ή «Επιστραφείσα προς διόρθωση». Συνεπώς, τα αριθμητικά στοιχεία των παραρτημάτων της παρούσας απάντησης ενδέχεται να αποτελέσουν αντικείμενο περαιτέρω προσαρμογών. Τα αρνητικά υπόλοιπα του ΕΚΤ για τη Γερμανία και την Κύπρο είναι αποτέλεσμα αλλαγής κατάστασης από «Επιστραφείσα προς διόρθωση» (Γερμανία) και «Πλήρως απορριφθείσα» (Κύπρος). Ενδεχόμενες αλλαγές στην κατάσταση των αιτήσεων πληρωμής από τον ένα μήνα στον άλλον καθιστούν δύσκολη τη σύγκριση μεταξύ διαδοχικών μηνών.

([1]) Με εξαίρεση τα ποσά που έχουν απορριφθεί πλήρως.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001090/13
to the Commission
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Level of payments as of 31 January 2013

After the approval of Draft Amending Budget (DAB) No 6/2012, the Budgetary Authority is now waiting for the Commission to come forward with a Draft Amending Budget to cover the EUR 2.9 million of suspended claims from 2012 which formed part of DAB 6/2012 (covering payment claims until 31 October 2012).

On top of that, in November and December 2012 additional payment requests under shared management for an overall amount of EUR 16 billion were submitted to the Commission and will have to be paid out during the course of 2013.

Taking all the above into consideration and given the fact that the level of payments for the 2013 EU budget is EUR 5 billion lower than the Commission's estimates for payment needs in its draft budget, could the Commission provide us with detailed information on the level of payment received by 31 January 2013? Specifically, could the Commission inform us regarding the payments received in the month of January 2013, broken down by Member State and policy area/programme?

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

Payment claims for the 2007-2013 operational programmes co-financed by the European Social Fund (ESF), European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), Cohesion Fund (CF), European Fisheries Fund (EFF) and the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) are submitted by Member States to the Commission via the so-called 'SFC2007-system'.

The detailed breakdown of the valid payment claims ([1]) received in January for the 2007-2013 ESF, ERDF and CF-funded operational programmes is provided in Annex I to this reply. The figures in the table result from comparing valid payment claims submitted until the end of January 2013 with those submitted until the end of December 2012. For the EFF and EAFRD the data refers to valid payment claims submitted between 24 December 2012 and 27 January 2013 (see Annex II).

The Commission may decide to change the status of a payment claim in SFC2007 from 'Accepted' to 'Fully rejected' or 'Returned for corrections' and therefore the figures presented in the annexes to this reply could still undergo further adjustments. Negative ESF balances for Germany and Cyprus are the result of such changes in status: 'Returned for corrections' (Germany) and 'Fully rejected' (Cyprus). Possible changes in payment claims' status from one month to another makes comparison between successive months difficult.

([1]) Excluding fully rejected amounts.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001092/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(1er février 2013)

Objet: Carafes filtrantes toxiques pour le consommateur

Alors que les fabricants de carafes filtrantes multiplient les opérations marketing, diverses associations de protection des consommateurs à travers l'Europe fustigent la totalité des produits ainsi que le procédé et soulignent le danger pour le consommateur européen.

Aujourd'hui, 25 % des buveurs d'eau du robinet utilisent une carafe ou un système de filtration. Mais dans bien des cas, l'eau filtrée est pire que l'eau du robinet. Primo, les producteurs de carafes disent filtrer le chlore, ce qui est vrai mais inutile, voire dangereux. En effet, les cartouches au charbon actif retiennent le chlore, ce qui débarrasse en partie l'eau du robinet de son mauvais goût. Mais cette filtration favorise aussi l'apparition de bactéries… Secundo, les producteurs de carafes affirment que ces dernières filtrent le calcaire, ce qui serait faux et c'est tant mieux car, jusqu'à preuve du contraire, le calcium est un minéral indispensable à l'organisme et son apport via l'eau permet une bonne assimilation sans apporter de calories. Tertio, ces carafes filtreraient les nitrates, ce qui serait faux et de toute façon tendancieux car l'argument anti-nitrates, largement utilisé par les fabricants de carafes, surfe sur l'inquiétude des femmes enceintes ou des jeunes mères. Quarto, les filtres à eau relâchent du charbon actif. Quinto, l'eau filtrée contiendrait des phtalates.

Au lieu de filtrer l'eau et d'améliorer sa qualité, les carafes exposent les consommateurs à des substances absentes dans l'eau du robinet d'origine (phtalates, argent, charbon actif, résines d'ions). Circonstance aggravante, la déchloration de l'eau et la manipulation des filtres exposent les consommateurs à des risques de contamination bactériologique. Quant à la filtration des nitrates, les résultats médiocres rendent scandaleux cet argument marketing qui laisse penser qu'une eau filtrée de ses nitrates pourrait convenir à l'hydratation des jeunes enfants ou des nourrissons.

1. La Commission a-t-elle mené ou compte-t-elle mener des recherches à ce propos? Une étude sur la qualité sanitaire de l'eau filtrée ne serait-elle pas dans l'intérêt du consommateur européen?

2. La Commission entend-elle, si les résultats vont dans le sens des éléments déclinés dans la présente question, faire interdire ces produits dont les arguments sont mensongers et qui mettent en péril la santé du citoyen?

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

1. La Commission n'a mené aucune recherche à ce propos. En réponse aux préoccupations des autorités italiennes concernant le dégagement d'ions ammonium par les filtres à eau, elle a demandé un avis scientifique à l'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments (EFSA). Celle-ci estime ([1]) que ce dégagement est négligeable et ne présente pas de risques pour la santé humaine.

2. La Commission renvoie l'auteur de la question à sa réponse aux questions écrites E-3304/2012 et E-3529/2012 ([2]).

([1]) http://www.efsa.europa.eu/fr/efsajournal/pub/2918.htm
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001092/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Health hazard posed by water filter jugs

At a time when water filter jug manufacturers are launching ever more elaborate marketing campaigns to promote their products, they are being pilloried by consumer protection organisations throughout Europe for advertising products that are not only useless but also pose a health hazard to consumers.

At present, a quarter of all people who drink tap water use water filter jugs or a filtering system. However, filtered water is actually less healthy than tap water. Firstly, filter jug manufacturers like to stress the fact that the jugs filter out the chlorine in tap water, and although this is true, it is also pointless and even dangerous. While the active carbon filters do indeed absorb chlorine, thereby making tap water taste less unpleasant, this results in bacterial growth. Secondly, manufacturers also claim that the filters remove the calcium in tap water, which is untrue (although this is actually a good thing, because until proven otherwise calcium is a mineral vital to human health and consuming it in tap water is an effective way of absorbing it calorie-free). Thirdly, manufacturers maintain that the filters absorb the nitrates in tap water, which is not only false but also tendentious, as the scaremongering about nitrates — which is primarily fuelled by filter jug manufacturers themselves — plays on the concerns of pregnant women and young mothers. Fourthly, the filters release active carbon into the water. Finally, filtered water is thought to contain phthalates.

Consequently, rather than improving the quality of tap water by filtering it, water filter jugs actually expose consumers to substances that are not present in unfiltered tap water, i.e. phthalates, silver, active carbon and ion resin. Worse still, because the jugs filter out chlorine, handling the filters puts consumers at risk of bacterial infections. Moreover, given the mediocre results obtained in tests, marketing claims that filtered tap water is nitrate-free and therefore suitable for young children and babies are nothing short of scandalous.

1. Has the Commission conducted any research into this issue? If not, is it planning to do so? Does the Commission not agree that conducting a study into the health risks of filtered tap water would be in the interests of consumers in the EU?

2. If the results of such a study were to substantiate the above statements, proving that manufacturers' claims are indeed misleading and that water filter jugs pose a health risk, will the Commission ensure that such products are banned?

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

1. The Commission has not conducted any research in this issue. Following concerns from the Italian authorities as regards the release of ammonium ions from the water filters the Commission has asked the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) for scientific assistance. The EFSA states ([1]) that the release of ammonium is negligible and does not pose a risk to human health.

2. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its reply to Written Question E-3304/2012 and E-3529/2012 ([2]).

([1]) http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/2918.htm
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001094/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(1er février 2013)

Objet: Pénurie d'importation de sucre?

Jusqu'à ce jour, les cours mondiaux élevés du sucre ont protégé les producteurs de sucre des ACP des pires effets des réductions du prix de référence de l'Union européenne. En 2010 et 2011, les prix du marché libellés en dollars étaient inférieurs de 16,7 % et 12,8 % au prix moyen en dollars de 2006, le prix de référence de l'Union ayant quant à lui été réduit de 36 %. Dans le contexte de l'abolition des obligations d'approvisionnement des ACP au titre de l'ancien Protocole sucre, les prix élevés du sucre sur le marché mondial ont engendré des pénuries de sucre sur le marché européen. Ceci a posé des problèmes financiers aux raffineurs traditionnels de sucre de canne de l'Union européenne en particulier, tout en améliorant considérablement le chiffre d'affaires des opérateurs de betterave sucrière, qui se sont lancés dans le raffinage aussi bien du sucre de canne que de betterave. Au cours de l'année 2011, le fonctionnement du système de quotas de production de sucre de l'Union a aggravé les déficits d'approvisionnement, malgré de bonnes récoltes de betterave sucrière. Cela a nécessité l'adoption de mesures provisoires pour pallier les déficits d'approvisionnement (élargissement des contingents tarifaires/libération de sucre hors quota sur le marché alimentaire national). Ces difficultés de marché ont eu pour effet d'augmenter la pression pour une réforme supplémentaire du régime sucrier de l'Union européenne, l'abolition des quotas de production sucriers étant maintenant fermement inscrite à l'agenda politique et les demandes de libéralisation supplémentaire des accords d'importation du sucre de l'Union se faisant plus pressantes. Avec l'abolition des garanties de prix pour le sucre ACP à compter du 1er octobre 2012, et des cours sucriers mondiaux qui devraient rester élevés, la manière dont les chaînes d'approvisionnement spécifiques du sucre ACP-UE fonctionneront déterminera de plus en plus le volume de sucre ACP exporté vers l'Union européenne et les prix obtenus par les exportateurs de sucre ACP.

À la lumière des récents accords bilatéraux conclus et des augmentations des importations à droit nul d'origine préférentielle prévues par le Groupe ACP/PMA de Londres, la Commission estime-t-elle réaliste le risque d'une pénurie d'importations de sucre dans l'Union européenne dans les années à venir?

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(26 mars 2013)

Les importations provenant des pays d'Afrique, des Caraïbes et du Pacifique (ACP) et des pays les moins avancés (PMA) augmentent progressivement chaque année. La production de sucre de l'Afrique australe en particulier est toujours plus importante. La situation du marché dans les pays producteurs et dans l'Union européenne constitue clairement un facteur clé qui déterminera si cette production croissante de sucre sera exportée vers l'UE.

Le cas échéant, l'Union européenne continuera à prendre les mesures nécessaires en vue de garantir une offre suffisante de sucre sur le marché de l'UE, comme elle l'a fait au cours des campagnes de commercialisation précédentes et durant la campagne 2012/2013.

Le régime de quotas applicable au sucre, en vigueur jusqu'au 30 septembre 2015, limite la production et empêche son ajustement aux forces du marché. La disparition de ces quotas permet la production de sucre provenant de l'UE (sucre de betterave) et de sucre importé (sucre de canne) dans un environnement compétitif et en quantités appropriées.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001094/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Potential shortages of imported sugar

Until now, high world sugar prices have protected ACP sugar producers against the worst effects of the drop in the EU reference price for sugar. In 2010 and 2011, the dollar-based reference price for sugar was, respectively, 16.7 % and 12.8 % lower than the 2006 average price; by contrast, the EU reference price has been reduced by 36 %. Following the EU's decision to end the sugar protocol — which committed the ACP countries to exporting fixed volumes of sugar to the EU — high world sugar prices have resulted in sugar shortages on the European market. While this has caused financial problems for traditional cane sugar refiners in the EU in particular, the turnover of sugar beet producers — who have started refining cane sugar as well as beet sugar — has gone up considerably. In 2011, despite a successful beet harvest, the EU's system of quotas for sugar beet production compounded sugar shortages, necessitating temporary measures to make up for the shortfall in supplies (i.e. increasing tariff quotas and allowing out-of-quota sugar to be sold in Member States). Against a background of growing calls for sugar production quotas to be abolished and for additional liberalisation of EU sugar import agreements, the sugar shortages have increased the pressure on the EU to further reform its sugar policy. The fact that as of 1 October 2012 the EU no longer pays ACP producers a guaranteed minimum price for sugar, combined with the likelihood of world sugar prices remaining high, means that the effectiveness of ACP-EU sugar supply chains will increasingly determine how much ACP sugar is exported to the EU and how much ACP producers are paid.

In the light of the recent bilateral agreements and the increase in duty-free access for imports from the ACP states and Least Developed Countries (LDC) secured by the London Sugar Group, does the Commission believe it is likely that the EU will suffer from a shortfall in sugar imports in years to come?

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

The imports from the ACP/LDC countries are gradually increasing year by year. Southern Africa sugar production in particular is increasing. Market circumstances in the producing countries and the EU are obviously key factors which will determine whether this additional sugar will be exported to the EU.

If needed, the EU will continue to take the necessary measures to secure sufficient supply of sugar to the EU market as it has done in previous marketing years and in the current marketing year 2012/2013.

The sugar quota system, in place until 30 September 2015, limits production and prevents its adjustment to market forces. The end of sugar quotas allows EU (beet) sugar and imported (cane) sugar to be produced in a competitive environment at the appropriate levels.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001095/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(1er février 2013)

Objet: Raffineries de sucre de canne et RPA

L'Union européenne produit environ 50 % du sucre de betterave consommé dans le monde, ce qui en fait le premier producteur mondial. Toutefois, le sucre de betterave ne représente que 20 % de la production mondiale de sucre. Le reste est issu de la canne à sucre.

1. Les raffineries de sucre de canne dans l'Union européenne peuvent-elles utiliser le Régime de Perfectionnement Actif (RPA) afin d'importer du sucre de canne brut en franchise de droits et d'exporter du sucre blanc raffiné?

2. Dans l'affirmative, pourquoi les raffineurs de sucre de canne brut ne l'utilisent-ils pas afinde fonctionner à pleine capacité?

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloș au nom de la Commission
(8 mars 2013)

1. Les raffineurs sont libres d'utiliser des régimes de perfectionnement actifs pour introduire temporairement dans l'Union européenne, en exemption de droits à l'importation, les quantités souhaitées de sucre de canne destiné à la transformation et de réexporter les quantités de sucre raffiné qui en résultent. Les États membres sont compétents pour accorder les autorisations requises pour l'utilisation du perfectionnement actif comme prévu dans le règlement (CEE) nº 2913/92 ([1]) du Conseil établissant le code des douanes communautaire. Les autorisations accordées par un État membre peuvent être utilisées par les raffineurs de canne à sucre, les producteurs de sucre de betterave et les transformateurs alimentaires utilisant du sucre brut ou du sucre blanc qui sont établis dans cet État membre.

2. Les quantités de sucre utilisées pour le perfectionnement actif dépendent de la facilité avec laquelle les opérateurs concernés ont accès au marché. Au cours des deux dernières campagnes de commercialisation, à savoir 2010/2011 et 2011/2012, respectivement 400 000 tonnes et 173 000 tonnes de sucre brut ont été expédiées dans le cadre du programme de perfectionnement actif.

([1]) JO L 302 du 19.10.1992.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001095/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Cane sugar refineries and inward processing arrangements

The EU is the world's leading producer of beet sugar, accounting for around 50 % of the total. However, beet sugar makes up only 20 % of the sugar produced worldwide, with the other 80 % coming from sugar cane.

1. Can EU cane sugar refineries use inward processing arrangements to import raw cane sugar duty-free and export refined white sugar?

2. If so, why do cane sugar refiners not take advantage of inward processing arrangements so that their refineries can operate at full capacity?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(8 March 2013)

1. Refiners are free to use inward processing arrangements to temporarily introduce in the EU, free of import duty, the desired quantities sugar cane for processing and re-export the resulting quantities of refined sugar. The Member States are competent for granting the required authorisations for the use of inward processing as provided for in Council Regulation (EEC) No 2913/92 ([1]) establishing the Community Customs Code. Authorisations granted by a Member State can be used by cane refiners, beet sugar producers and food processors using raw or white sugar established in that Member State.

2. The quantities used for inward processing depend on the market convenience of the concerned operators. During the two last marketing years, 2010/11 and 2011/12, respectively 400 000 tonnes and 173 000 tonnes of raw sugar were shipped in the framework of the inward processing scheme.

([1]) OJ L 302, 19.10.1992.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001234/13
an die Kommission
Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE)
(6. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: Zuckermarktordnung nach 2015

1. Kann die Kommission Auskunft über die Mengen an importiertem Zucker sowie über die Mengen des auf dem EU-Markt freigegebenen Nichtquotenzuckers erteilen? Kann die Kommission erklären, warum die außergewöhnlichen Import-Mengen bisher höher waren als die Mengen von auf den EU-Markt freigegebenem Nichtquotenzucker? Gibt es eine Bewertung, aus der hervorgeht, dass dieses Vorgehen nicht zum Nachteil für den EU-Rübenzuckersektor erfolgte?

2. Im Verwaltungsausschuss wurden Marktmaßnahmen in Bezug auf die Verwaltung des Zuckerwirtschaftsjahres 2012/13 beschlossen. Kann die Kommission die Bedeutung der Freigabe von Nichtquotenzucker auf den EU-Markt als zeitlich befristetes Marktinstrument zur Bewältigung von Unterversorgungssituationen auf dem EU-Zuckermarkt erklären?

3. Teilt die Kommission den Standpunkt des Parlaments, der am 23. Januar 2013 im Landwirtschaftsausschuss verabschiedet wurde, dass die Freigabe von Nichtquotenzucker als zeitlich befristetes Instrument dienen kann? Ist die Kommission der Ansicht, dass dies auch in der Zukunft ein nützliches Werkzeug sein kann, um außergewöhnliche Unterversorgungssituationen auf dem EU-Zuckermarkt zu bewältigen?

4. Hält die Kommission vor dem Hintergrund der jüngsten bilateralen Abkommen und in Zusammenhang mit dem Anstieg der zollfreien Präferenz-Einfuhren — wie von der London Sugar Group vorgesehen — die Gefahr eines Mangels von Zuckerimporten in die EU in den kommenden Jahren für realistisch? Wenn ja, aus welchen Gründen?

5. Machen Rohrohrzucker-Raffinerien in der EU Gebrauch vom aktiven Veredelungsverkehr (IPR), so dass sie zollfreien Rohrohrzucker importieren und raffinierten Weißzucker exportieren können? Wenn ja, warum greifen die Rohrohrzucker-Raffinerien nicht auf diesen IPR zurück, um auf voller Kapazität zu laufen?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Cioloş im Namen der Kommission
(21. März 2013)

Im Wirtschaftsjahr 2010/2011 wurden 500 000 t Nichtquotenzucker auf dem Binnenmarkt in Verkehr gebracht und weitere 856 566 t Einfuhren mit ermäßigtem Zollsatz auf dem EU-Markt zugelassen, von denen es sich bei 483 939 t um zur Raffination bestimmten Rohzucker handelte.

Innerhalb der bestehenden CXL-Kontingente wurde der Zollsatz von 98 EUR/t auf Null herabgesetzt; dies betraf 389 053 t von zur Raffination bestimmtem Rohzucker.

Im Wirtschaftsjahr 2011/2012 wurden 650 000 t Nichtquotenzucker auf dem Binnenmarkt in Verkehr gebracht und weitere 399 014 t Einfuhren mit ermäßigtem Zollsatz auf dem EU-Markt zugelassen, von denen es sich bei 384 000 t um zur Raffination bestimmten Rohzucker handelte.

Für die Wirtschaftsjahre 2010/2011 und 2011/2012 ist die Kommission der Ansicht, dass zur Behebung der Zuckerknappheit auf dem EU-Markt das Inverkehrbringen von 1 150 000 t Nichtquotenzucker auf dem EU-Markt und die Einfuhr von 1 256 992 t von zur Raffination bestimmtem Rohzucker mit ermäßigtem Zollsatz sowie 387 641 t Weißzucker mit ermäßigtem Zollsatz den Interessen der verschiedenen Beteiligten in der Zuckerversorgungskette ausgewogen Rechnung trägt.

Für alle Wirtschaftsjahre ist die Kommission der Ansicht, dass das Inverkehrbringen von Nichtquotenzucker auf dem EU-Markt sowie zusätzliche Einfuhren gleichermaßen wichtig sind, um Engpässen auf dem EU-Markt zu begegnen.

Nach Meinung der Kommission besteht die wirksamste Maßnahme zur Verhinderung von Engpässen auf dem EU-Markt in der Abschaffung des Zuckerquotensystems gemäß der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1234/2007 des Rates ([1]).

Was die Frage Nr. 5 der Anfragen E-001234/2013 und E-001301/2013 betrifft, verweist die Kommission auf die Antwort auf Anfrage E-001095/2013.

([1]) ABl. L 299 vom 16.11.2007.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001096/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(1er février 2013)

Objet: Gestion du marché du sucre et organisation commune du marché (OCM) du sucre après 2015

Copenhague a illustré le profond bouleversement du paysage sucrier après la réforme de l'OCM de 2006. Cette dernière fut loin d'être une grande réussite au niveau social et sur le plan des conditions de travail. Pourtant la Commission s'est félicitée de voir l'Union, qui a diminué de 30 % sa production de sucre et importe désormais 25 % de sa consommation, passer du rang de deuxième exportateur à celui de deuxième importateur mondial. La réforme, souvent citée comme une «réussite», a toutefois eu un impact très fort dans de nombreux pays, qui ont soit mis fin à leur activité betteravière, soit restructuré drastiquement leur production et fermé des usines. Dois-je rappeler à quel point les conséquences ont été fortes dans de nombreuses régions en termes d'emploi et de développement rural? Il y a peu, le chef du cabinet du commissaire européen chargé de l'agriculture s'est attaché à rassurer les planteurs sur plusieurs sujets sensibles, comme l'après-2015 pour l'OCM sucre, le contrôle des importations, le prix du marché et l'exportation. Toutefois, peu de planteurs européens ont partagé sa sérénité quant aux conséquences pour la filière sucre des propositions qui se trouvent actuellement sur la table des négociations de l'OMC, qu'ils estiment très préoccupantes.

1. La Commission pourrait-elle détailler les quantités finales d'importations exceptionnelles et les quantités finales de sucre hors-quotas remises sur le marché de l'Union depuis les campagnes 2010/2011 et 2011/2012?

2. La Commission pourrait-elle expliquer pourquoi les quantités exceptionnelles importées ont été plus élevées que les quantités de hors-quota remises sur le marché de l'Union et si cette mesure n'est pas au désavantage du secteur betterave-sucre de l'Union?

3. À la suite des mesures exceptionnelles de marché récemment votées en comité de gestion pour ce qui concerne la gestion de la campagne sucrière 2012/2013, la Commission pourrait-elle expliquer l'importance de la remise sur le marché de l'Union de hors-quota comme outil temporaire pour gérer les situations de pénurie du marché du sucre de l'Union?

4. Étant donné la position du Parlement européen, adoptée par la commission de l'agriculture le 23 janvier 2013, qui suggère l'introduction de la remise sur le marché de hors-quota comme un outil temporaire, la Commission estime-t-elle que cela pourrait être un outil efficace à l'avenir pour gérer une situation exceptionnelle de pénurie sur le marché du sucre de l'Union?

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001301/13
à la Commission
Agnès Le Brun (PPE)
(7 février 2013)

Objet: Gestion du marché du sucre et OCM sucre post-2015

1. La Commission pourrait-elle détailler les quantités finales d'importations exceptionnelles et les quantités finales de sucre hors-quota remises sur le marché de l'UE depuis les campagnes 2010/2011 et 2011/2012? La Commission pourrait-elle expliquer pourquoi les quantités exceptionnelles importées ont été plus élevées que les quantités de hors-quota remises sur le marché de l'UE et confirmer que cette procédure n'est pas au désavantage du secteur betterave à sucre de l'UE?

2. Suite aux mesures exceptionnelles de marché récemment votées en comité de gestion pour ce qui concerne la gestion de la campagne sucrière 2012/2013, la Commission pourrait-elle expliquer l'importance de la remise sur le marché de l'UE de hors-quota comme outil temporaire pour gérer les situations de pénurie du marché du sucre de l'UE?

3. Étant donné la position adoptée le 23 janvier 2013 par la commission de l'agriculture et du développement rural du Parlement européen, qui suggère l'introduction de la remise sur le marché de hors-quota comme un outil temporaire, la Commission estime-t-elle que cette option pourrait être un outil efficace dans l'avenir pour gérer une situation exceptionnelle de pénurie du marché du sucre de l'UE?

4. À la lumière des récents accords bilatéraux conclus et de l'augmentation des importations à droit nul d'origines préférentielles, prévue par les pays ACP/PMA (pays les moins avancés) du groupe de Londres, la Commission estime-t-elle réaliste le risque d'une pénurie d'importations de sucre dans l'UE dans les années à venir?

5. Les raffineries de sucre de canne dans l'UE peuvent-elles utiliser le régime de perfectionnement actif (RPA) afin d'importer du sucre de canne brut en franchise de droits et d'exporter du sucre blanc raffiné? Si oui, pourquoi les raffineurs de sucre de canne brut ne l'utilisent pas afin de fonctionner à pleine capacité?

Réponse commune donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(21 mars 2013)

Lors de la campagne de commercialisation 2010/11, 500 000 tonnes de sucre hors quota ont été mises sur le marché intérieur. L'importation à droit réduit sur le marché de l'UE de 856 566 tonnes supplémentaires a également été autorisée, dont 483 939 tonnes de sucre brut pour raffinage.

Dans le cadre des contingents CXL actuels, le droit de 98 euros/tonne a été réduit à zéro, réduction qui concerne 389 053 tonnes de sucre brut pour raffinage.

Pour ce qui est de la campagne 2011/12, 650 000 tonnes de sucre hors quota ont été mises sur le marché intérieur. 399 014 tonnes supplémentaires ont été importées à droit réduit sur le marché de l'UE, dont 384 000 tonnes de sucre brut pour raffinage.

Pour les campagnes 2010/2011 et 2011/2012, la Commission considère que remédier à la pénurie de sucre sur le marché de l'UE par la mise sur le marché de 1 150 000 tonnes de sucre hors quota et par l'importation à droit réduit de 1 256 992 millions de tonnes de sucre brut à raffiner et de 387 641 tonnes de sucre blanc est un bon compromis entre les intérêts des différentes parties prenantes de la chaîne d'approvisionnement en sucre.

Pour toutes les campagnes de commercialisation, la Commission estime que la mise sur le marché de l'UE de sucre hors quota et les importations supplémentaires sont deux outils d'égale importance pour remédier à la pénurie sur le marché de l'UE.

Selon la Commission, la mesure la plus efficace pour éviter les pénuries sur le marché de l'UE serait de mettre fin au régime de quotas pour le sucre, comme prévu dans le règlement (CE) n° 1234/2007 du Conseil ([1]).

Quant à la question n° 5 des questions E-001234/2013 et E-001301/2013, la Commission renvoie à la réponse donnée à la question E-001095/2013.

([1]) JO L 299 du 16.11.2007.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001096/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Managing the sugar market and the common market organisation (CMO) for sugar after 2015

The Copenhagen sugar conference illustrated the profound effect that the 2006 CMO reform had on the sugar industry. The CMO reform was far from successful in terms of its impact on employment and working conditions. Nevertheless, the Commission congratulated itself on the fact that, following the reform, EU sugar production fell by 30 %, with the result that imports now account for 25 % of the sugar consumed in the EU; in other words, the EU went from being the second largest exporter of sugar in the world to being the second largest importer. Although the sugar reform is often cited as an EU success story, it rocked the sugar industries of many countries, which found themselves forced to end sugar beet production or restructure drastically by closing plants. Do I really need to remind the Commission just how serious the consequences of the sugar reform were for many regions in terms of employment and rural development? Only recently, the EU Commissioner for Agriculture's Head of Cabinet was at great pains to reassure sugar beet farmers about a number of sensitive issues, such as what will happen to the sugar CMO after 2015, import control, market prices and exports. However, few farmers in the EU share his confidence about the proposals currently being discussed in the World Trade Organisation, whose implications they find extremely worrying.

1. Can the Commission provide figures for the total volume of exceptional imports and out-of-quota sugar sold on the EU market since the 2010/11 and 2011/12 sugar marketing years?

2. Can the Commission explain why the total volume of exceptional imports exceeds the quantity of out-of-quota sugar sold on the EU market? Does this not go against the interests of the EU sugar beet industry?

3. In the light of the exceptional measures taken by the Management Committee for the 2012/13 sugar marketing year, can the Commission explain exactly why allowing out-of-quota sugar to be sold on the EU market is seen as such an effective way of dealing with temporary sugar shortages in the EU?

4. In the light of Parliament's position (as adopted by the Committee on Agriculture on 23 January 2013), which is that out-of-quota sugar should be allowed to be sold on the EU market as a temporary measure, does the Commission agree that this could be a useful tool for dealing with serious sugar shortages in the EU in the future?

Question for written answer E-001234/13
to the Commission
Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Sugar regime after 2015

1. Can the Commission provide information about the volume of sugar imported into the EU and the volume of out-of-quota sugar released into the EU market? Can the Commission explain why the unusually large volume of imports was greater than the volume of out-of-quota sugar released into the EU market? Is there any analysis available to indicate that this approach has not been to the detriment of the EU beet sugar sector?

2. Market measures for managing the marketing year 2012/2013 for sugar were agreed in the Management Committee for Sugar. Can the Commission explain the significance of releasing out-of-quota sugar into the EU market as a temporary market instrument for managing undersupply in the European sugar market?

3. Does the Commission share the position of Parliament, agreed in the Committee on Agriculture on 23 January 2013, that the release of out-of-quota sugar into the EU market can be used as a temporary market instrument? Does the Commission consider that this may also be a useful tool in the future for dealing with unusual undersupply in the European sugar market?

4. In the context of the latest bilateral agreements and the increase in duty-free preferential imports, as envisaged by the London Sugar Group, does the Commission consider the risk of a shortage of sugar imports to the EU to be realistic? If so, for what reasons?

5. Do raw cane sugar refineries in the EU make use of active inward processing (IPR), so that they can import duty-free raw cane sugar and export refined white sugar? If so, why do the raw cane sugar refineries not use this IPR option to operate at full capacity?

Question for written answer E-001301/13
to the Commission
Agnès Le Brun (PPE)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: Sugar market management and the CMO in sugar after 2015

1. Could the Commission provide details, from the marketing years 2010/2011 and 2011/2012 onwards, of the total quantities under exceptional import quotas and the total out-of-quota quantities placed on the EU sugar market? Could the Commission explain why quantities under exceptional import quotas exceeded out-of-quota quantities, and whether this has not been detrimental to the EU sugar beet sector?

2. In the light of the exceptional market measures adopted by the Management Committee for the management of sugar marketing year 2012/2013, could the Commission explain exactly why it is important that out-of-quota quantities should be placed on the market to manage shortages on the EU sugar market?

3. Given the European Parliament's position, as adopted by the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development on 23 January 2013, suggesting that out-of-quota quantities be put back on the market as a temporary measure, does the Commission think that this could be an efficient way of managing serious shortages on the EU sugar market in the future?

4. In the light of the recent bilateral agreements and of the increase in duty-free imports of preferential origin envisaged by the ACP/LDC London sugar group, does the Commission think that there is likely to be a shortfall in sugar imports into the EU in the coming years?

5. Can EU cane sugar refiners avail themselves of inward processing arrangements to import raw cane sugar free of duty and export refined white sugar? If they can, why are raw cane sugar refiners not taking advantage of this opportunity to work at full capacity?

Joint answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(21 March 2013)

In marketing year 2010/11, 500 000 tons of out-of-quota sugar were released on the internal market and 856 566 additional imports at reduced duty were allowed on the EU market, of which 483 939 raw sugar for refining.

Within the existing CXL quotas the tariff of EUR 98/ton was reduced to zero, affecting 389 053 tons raw sugar for refining.

In marketing year 2011/12, 650 000 tons of out-of-quota sugar were released on the internal market and 399 014 additional imports at reduced duty were allowed on the EU market, of which 384 000 raw sugar for refining.

In the marketing years 2010/11 and 2011/12 the Commission considers that addressing the shortage of sugar on the EU market by releasing 1 150 000 tons of out-of-quota sugar on the EU market, importing 1 256 992 million tons of raw sugar for refining at reduced duty and 387 641 tons of white sugar at reduced duty strikes the right balance between the interests of the different stakeholders in the sugar supply chain

For all marketing years the Commission considers that releasing out-of-quota sugar on the EU market as well as additional imports is equally important in addressing shortages on the EU market.

According to the Commission, the most efficient measure to prevent shortages on the EU market is the end of the sugar quota system as foreseen in Council Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 ([1]).

As regards question number 5 of Questions E-001234/2013 and E-001301/2013 the Commission would like to refer to the answer given to Question E-001095/2013.

([1]) OJ L 299, 16.11.2007.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001097/13
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(1º febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Soglie sonore anche in mare per tutelare le specie marine

Secondo uno studio condotto dal laboratorio bioacustico del politecnico della Catalogna, i rumori prodotti dalle imbarcazioni, dai porti, dalle piattaforme marine, dalle pale eoliche in mare aperto e dai sonar militari creerebbero grossi problemi ad alcune specie marine, soprattutto ai cetacei, rendendoli incapaci sia di orientarsi sia di difendersi in modo naturale dai predatori e comprometterebbero l'equilibrio faunistico marino e alta mortalità di specie, come già osservato in Australia in seguito a una moria straordinaria di conchiglie Saint Jacques.

Ha la Commissione analizzato il fenomeno?

Intende stabilire delle soglie sonore a tutela delle specie più a rischio, quali i cetacei?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(20 marzo 2013)

La Commissione conduce da molti anni studi sui rischi emergenti dell'inquinamento acustico sottomarino di carattere antropico per l'ecosistema marino e le sue specie. Sia il rumore impulsivo provocato dalla posa di pali o dai sondaggi sismici che il rumore continuo delle imbarcazioni rientrano tra i criteri che gli Stati membri devono valutare nella determinazione dello stato delle loro acque marine nell'ambito della direttiva quadro sulla strategia per l'ambiente marino (MSFD) (2008/56/CE) ([1]).

Inoltre, il disturbo che le fonti di inquinamento acustico arrecano ai cetacei deve essere disciplinato dagli Stati membri conformemente alle disposizioni della direttiva Habitat 92/43/CEE ([2]). Al momento la Commissione non intende stabilire delle soglie sonore a livello europeo. La Commissione analizzerà, tuttavia, le relazioni sull'avanzamento dell'attuazione presentate dagli Stati membri secondo quanto previsto dalla MSFD.

([1]) GU L 164 del 25.6.2008.
([2]) GU L 206 del 22.7.1992.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001097/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Noise level thresholds, including at sea, to protect marine species

According to a study carried out by the Polytechnic University of Catalonia's Bioacoustic Applications Laboratory, the noise produced by boats, ports, offshore platforms, offshore wind farms and military sonar causes major problems for some marine species, especially cetaceans, by preventing them from finding their bearings and protecting themselves naturally from predators. It also disturbs the marine-life balance, resulting in a high mortality rate among species, as has already been seen in Australia following an extraordinary spate of scallop deaths there.

Has the Commission analysed the situation?

Does it intend to establish noise level thresholds in order to protect those species most at risk, such as cetaceans?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(20 March 2013)

The Commission has been analysing the emerging risks of anthropogenic underwater noise to the marine ecosystem and its species for many years. Both impulsive noise from piling or seismic surveys and ambient noise from ships are among the criteria Member States have to assess when determining the status of their marine waters under the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) (2008/56/EC) ([1]).

Furthermore, disturbance to cetaceans from underwater noise sources has to be regulated by Member States in accordance with the provisions of the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC ([2]). The Commission does not intend to establish noise level thresholds at EU level at this stage. The Commission will, however, analyse the implementation progress reports by Member States under the MSFD.

([1]) OJ L 164, 25.6.2008.
([2]) OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001098/13
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(1º febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Tutela dei leoni africani

Se fino agli anni '60 del secolo scorso si contavano ancora 100 000 leoni in Africa, il loro numero attuale, ovvero meno di 35 000 esemplari, pone particolare preoccupazione per la sopravvivenza del leone africano.

L'Ufficio statunitense della pesca e della vita selvaggia sta decidendo di porre questa specie sotto protezione, impedendo ogni ingresso negli Stati Uniti di materiale derivante dalla sua uccisione.

Quali forme di tutela ha stabilito la Commissione per questa specie in pericolo?

Intende stabilire una qualche forma di partenariato con i Paesi africani in cui il bracconaggio e la caccia mettono a serio rischio questa specie per imporne la tutela?

Risposta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione
(5 aprile 2013)

L'UE si adopera con il massimo impegno per evitare che il commercio internazionale di leoni sia dannoso per questa specie. Al commercio di leoni si applicano le disposizioni contenute nell'appendice II della convenzione sul commercio internazionale delle specie di flora e di fauna selvatiche minacciate di estinzione (CITES) e nell'allegato B del regolamento (CE) n. 338/97 del Consiglio (regolamento UE sul commercio della flora e della fauna selvatiche) ([1]), il che significa che tale commercio è rigorosamente regolamentato per garantirne la sostenibilità. L'UE esamina, sulla base delle norme suddette, tutte le domande di importazione di leoni e opera in collaborazione con i paesi esportatori. Il commercio internazionale può essere assoggettato a divieto ove non sia possibile dimostrarne la sostenibilità, e a un certo numero di paesi africani si applica già un divieto di importazione nell'UE.

La Commissione fornisce dal 2002 un sostegno finanziario, stimato in 300 milioni di euro, per la protezione delle specie e delle zone naturali in Africa. Tra i programmi finanziati figurano: un sostegno per il parco W nell'Africa occidentale, un sostegno per il parco Zakuma in Ciad, il programma regionale ECOFAC per la gestione delle risorse naturali e un sostegno al programma regionale MIKE (monitoraggio delle uccisioni illegali di elefanti), che sarà esteso prossimamente ad altre specie minacciate incluse negli elenchi CITES.

([1]) Regolamento (CE) n. 338/97 del Consiglio, del 9 dicembre 1996, relativo alla protezione di specie della flora e della fauna selvatiche mediante il controllo del loro commercio, GU L 61 del 3.3.1997.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001098/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Protection of African lions

Given that, until the 1960s, there were still 100 000 African lions, the current figure — less than 35 000 — raises particular concerns about their survival.

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service is debating whether to protect this species, and hence to ban any material from lions that have been killed from entering the United States.

What forms of protection has the Commission introduced for this endangered species?

Does it intend to establish a partnership of any kind with African countries in which poaching and hunting pose serious risks to this species, so as to ensure its protection?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(5 April 2013)

The EU is very active in ensuring that international trade in lions is not detrimental to the species. A number of requirements apply to trade in lions which are included in Appendix II to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) and in Annex B to Council Regulation (EC) No 338/97 (EU Wildlife Trade Regulation) ([1]) which means that trade is strictly regulated to make sure that it is sustainable. On the basis of these rules, the EU is scrutinizing all import applications for lions and works in cooperation with exporting countries. When it is not possible to demonstrate that international trade is sustainable, trade bans can be decided and a ban on imports into the EU is already in place for a number of African countries.

Furthermore, since 2002, the Commission has provided financial support, estimated at EUR 300 million for the protection of species and natural areas in Africa. The programmes financed include: support for Park W in West Africa; support for Park Zakuma in Chad; the ECOFAC regional programme for natural resources management; and support for the MIKE (Monitoring Illegal Killing of Elephants) regional programme, which will be soon expanded to include other threatened CITES-listed species.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 338/97 of 9 December 1996 on the protection of species of wild fauna and flora by regulating trade therein, OJ L 61, 3.3.1997.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001099/13
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(1º febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Indagini della Commissione sulla destinazione dei fondi per la ricerca erogati in Italia

Sei miliardi e duecento milioni di euro erogati dal ministero della Ricerca fra il 2010 e il 2012 e che la Commissione europea aveva destinato allo sviluppo di imprese in aree disagiate sarebbero invece stati versati ad aziende prive dei requisiti richiesti. Questo sarebbe stato reso possibile da connivenze all'interno del ministero della Ricerca con le aziende coinvolte.

La procura italiana ha già aperto un dossier su una truffa simile perpetrata ai danni dei fondi comunitari destinati al tema «sicurezza e sviluppo».

Può la Commissione indicare quali azioni ha intrapreso per tutelarsi e per recuperare i fondi indebitamente erogati?

L'OLAF era a conoscenza di tali pratiche o le indagini sono state effettuate solo a livello nazionale?

Come intende la Commissione tutelarsi in futuro da questo tipo di illeciti?

Risposta di Algirdas Šemeta a nome della Commissione
(18 marzo 2013)

La Commissione condivide appieno le preoccupazioni dell'onorevole parlamentare riguardo alle possibili irregolarità a danno del bilancio dell'Unione europea negli Stati membri.

In base al principio della gestione concorrente, spetta innanzitutto agli Stati membri procedere all'attuazione delle misure strutturali, al loro audit e al loro controllo. Le autorità nazionali sono quindi responsabili in primo luogo del controllo di tali fondi strutturali, compreso il recupero delle somme indebitamente versate. In quest'ambito, gli Stati membri hanno inoltre l'obbligo regolamentare di trasmettere alla Commissione entro un determinato periodo di tempo informazioni dettagliate sulle irregolarità riscontrate.

Il programma a cui si riferisce l'onorevole parlamentare (programma operativo nazionale «Ricerca e competitività» cofinanziato dal Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale con una dotazione complessiva di circa 4,42 miliardi di euro) rientra nella gestione concorrente della direzione generale della Politica regionale e urbana della Commissione europea e delle autorità italiane competenti.

La questione cui fa riferimento l'onorevole parlamentare è attualmente all'esame dell'OLAF, della DG REGIO e dell'autorità nazionale di audit, l'Ispettorato generale per i rapporti finanziari con l'Unione europea (IGRUE).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001099/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: The Commission's investigations into the allocation of research funds disbursed in Italy

A total of EUR 6.2 billion, disbursed by the Italian Ministry of Research between 2010 and 2012 and earmarked by the Commission for the development of enterprises in disadvantaged areas, is said to have been paid out instead to enterprises which did not meet the requirements for funding. This is said to have been made possible by connivance within the Ministry of Research with the enterprises involved.

The Italian Public Prosecutor's Office has already opened a file on a similar scam involving EU funds allocated to 'security and development'.

Can the Commission say what steps have been taken to protect its interests and to recover any illegitimately paid subsidies?

Was the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) aware of such practices or were investigations carried out only at national level?

How does the Commission intend to protect itself against such abuse in future?

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

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

Due to the shared management principle , Member States are responsible in the first instance for the implementation of structural measures, their audit and control. The national authorities are thus primarily responsible for the control of such structural funds 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 (NOP Research and Competitiveness co-funded by the European Regional Development Fund with total budget of around EUR 4.42 billion) falls under the shared management of Directorate General for Regional and Urban Policy of the European Commission and the competent Italian authorities.

The issue the Honourable Member is referring to is currently being evaluated by OLAF, DG REGIO and the National Audit Authority, the General Inspectorate for Financial Relations with the European Union (IGRUE).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001102/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(1º febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Direttiva Nitrati: Italia a rischio di una nuova procedura di infrazione

Con la lettera che il 16 gennaio 2013 il commissario all'Ambiente Janez Potočnik ha inviato al governo italiano si riapre quello che doveva essere un capitolo chiuso sull'attuazione della direttiva 91/676/CEE relativa alla protezione delle acque dall'inquinamento provocato dai nitrati provenienti da fonti agricole. Il commissario solleva la questione sulla norma prevista dalla legge 221 del 17 dicembre 2012 che concede una deroga di 12 mesi durante la quale si equiparano le zone vulnerabili ai nitrati di origine agricola (ZVN) alle zone non vulnerabili, affinché le regioni che ancora non hanno fatto un aggiornamento della mappatura delle ZVN possano provvedervi.

Questa norma di fatto permette l'immissione nell'ambiente di quantitativi di nitrati di origine zootecnica non in linea con la normativa europea, contravvenendo ai programmi d'azione che l'Italia aveva concordato con la Commissione al fine di chiudere la procedura d'infrazione aperta nel 2008.

Ha la Commissione ricevuto risposte ufficiali da parte del governo italiano in merito?

Quali tempi ha a disposizione l'Italia per evitare l'apertura di una procedura di infrazione?

Può indicare la Commissione quali sono le regioni o gli enti italiani che non hanno proceduto entro i termini stabiliti ad ottemperare agli obblighi in materia di politica economica ed agricola?

Conferma che una delle azioni che potrebbero essere intraprese nei confronti dell'Italia è quella del blocco di parte dei contributi PAC?

Nell'eventualità che si intraprenda questa strada, può indicare come avverranno tali blocchi: se colpiranno indiscriminatamente il nostro Paese, comprese quelle regioni che si sono messe in regola con la normativa, oppure saranno mirati verso quelle che non hanno rispettato i termini?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(4 aprile 2013)

Oltre alla lettera del commissario per l'Ambiente ai ministri dell'Ambiente e dell'Agricoltura, il 18 gennaio 2013 la Commissione ha aperto una procedura EU Pilot per chiedere chiarimenti sulle modalità di applicazione della legge 221/2012 da parte delle regioni. L'8 febbraio l'Italia ha presentato la propria risposta, che è stata considerata non soddisfacente dai servizi della Commissione. Il 21 febbraio è stata perciò inviata all'Italia una lettera di costituzione in mora, la cui risposta è pervenuta l'8 marzo ed è attualmente all'esame.

Ad oggi, tutte le diciotto regioni che hanno designato almeno una zona vulnerabile ai nitrati hanno adottato dei decreti regionali che confermano l'effettiva designazione della zona vulnerabile ai nitrati, confermando così la validità e l'applicabilità dei propri programmi d'azione.

Poiché la direttiva sui nitrati è parte del quadro di riferimento per molti provvedimenti dei programmi di sviluppo rurale ed è altresì parte della condizionalità (articoli 4 e 5 del regolamento (CE) n. 73/2009 ([1])), la sua mancata applicazione avrebbe un impatto sia sul primo che sul secondo pilastro della politica agricola comune.

([1]) GU L 30 del 31.1.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001102/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Nitrates Directive: Italy at risk of another infringement procedure

The letter sent by the Environment Commissioner, Janez Potočnik, to the Italian Government on 16 January 2013 reopens what should have been a closed chapter on the implementation of Directive 91/676/EEC concerning the protection of waters against pollution caused by nitrates from agricultural sources. The Commissioner raises the issue of the rule laid down by Law No 221 of 17 December 2012, which grants a 12-month derogation for comparing zones vulnerable to nitrates of agricultural origin (NVZ) with non-vulnerable zones, so that regions that have not yet updated their NVZ maps can do so.

That rule in fact permits quantities of nitrates of animal origin that do not comply with EU legislation to be released into the environment, in breach of the action programmes that Italy had agreed with the Commission in order to close the infringement procedure opened in 2008.

Has the Commission received any formal replies from the Italian Government on this issue?

How long does Italy have to prevent the opening of an infringement procedure?

Can the Commission say which Italian regions or institutions have failed to meet their economic and agricultural policy obligations by the deadline set?

Can it confirm that one of the measures that could be taken with regard to Italy is to freeze part of the CAP contributions?

In the event of such a measure, can it say what form that freeze will take: will it affect the whole country, including those regions that have complied with the legislation, or will it be targeted at regions that have failed to meet the deadline?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(4 April 2013)

In addition to the letter from the Commissioner responisble for Environment to the Ministers for Environment and for Agriculture, the Commission opened an EU Pilot procedure on 18 January 2013, seeking clarification on how Law 221/2012 is implemented by the Regions. Italy submitted its reply on 8 February, which the Commission services considered not satisfactory. Consequently, on 21 February a Letter of Formal Notice has been addressed to Italy and a reply has been received on 8 March, which is now under analysis.

To date, all eighteen regions having designated at least one nitrates vulnerable zone have adopted regional decrees confirming their current nitrate vulnerable zone designation, thus confirming the validity and applicability of their action programmes.

Since Nitrates directive forms part of the baseline for several measures of Rural Development Programmes and is also a part of cross-compliance (Articles 4 and 5 of regulation (EC) 73/2009 ([1])), its non-implementation would have impacts to both first and second pillar of Common Agricultural Policy.

([1]) OJ L 30, 31.1.2009.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-001104/13
komissiolle
Sari Essayah (PPE)
(1. helmikuuta 2013)

Aihe: Rakennustuotteiden ympäristöselosteiden pakollisuudesta

Heinäkuun alussa jäsenmaiden lainsäädännön osaksi tulevan Rakennustuoteasetuksen (CPR) sisältämä seitsemäs perusvaatimus luonnonvarojen kestävästä käytöstä antaa jäsenmaille mahdollisuuden asettaa vaatimuksia rakentamisen ja rakennusten ympäristöystävällisyydelle. Tämä on hyvä, sillä rakentaminen ja rakennusten käyttö aiheuttavat erittäin suuret ympäristövaikutukset.

Rakennusten ja rakentamisen ympäristöystävällisyyden arvioimiseksi ja vertaamiseksi Euroopan standardisointiorganisaatio CEN on kehittänyt yhtenäiset eurooppalaiset indikaattorit ja laskentatavat (standardi EN 15804). Rakennustuotteiden valmistajat ilmoittavat tuotteidensa valmistuksen ympäristövaikutukset yhtenäisillä ympäristöselosteilla. Jotta laskenta olisi kattavaa, kaikista tuotteista tulisi olla saatavilla ympäristöselosteet, ts. ympäristöselosteiden tulisi olla pakollisia.

Uudessa rakennustuoteasetuksessa ei kuitenkaan suoraan oteta kantaa siihen, ovatko rakennustuotteiden ympäristöselosteet pakollisia vai ei. Rakennustuoteasetuksen johdanto-osan 56 kappaleen mukaan ”Resurssien kestävän käytön ja rakennuskohteen ympäristövaikutusten arvioimiseksi olisi käytettävä ympäristötuoteselosteita (Environmental Product Declarations), mikäli sellaisia on saatavilla”.

Tämä muotoilu mahdollistaa sen, että teollisuuden kieltäytyessä laatimasta selosteita, koko järjestelmää ei voida käyttää. Liitteen I kohdassa 7 puolestaan edellytetään ympäristöystävällisten rakennusmateriaalien käyttöä muttei kerrota miten se todennetaan. Tässä voitaisiin suoraan edellyttää EN-standardien käyttöä.

Asetuksen epämääräinen linjaus on ristiriidassa sen kanssa, että rakennustuotedirektiivi haluttiin muuttaa asetukseksi, jotta siitä saatiin jäsenmaita velvoittava mm. rakennustuotteiden CE-merkinnän osalta.

Edellä olevaan viitaten tiedustelen, mikä on komission kanta asetuksen epämääräiseen linjaukseen: ovatko rakennustuotteiden ympäristöselosteet sen mukaan pakollisia, ja jos eivät ole, mihin toimiin komissio aikoo ryhtyä, jotta jäsenmaita sitovilla tavoilla muutoin pienennetään rakentamisen jo ennestään suuria ympäristövaikutuksia?

Antonio Tajanin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(22. maaliskuuta 2013)

Rakennustuotteita koskevan asetuksen ([1]) tavoitteena on helpottaa rakennustuotteiden kaupan pitämistä EU:ssa säätämällä asianmukaisista vaatimuksista. Siinä ei tehdä ympäristötuoteselosteista pakollisia kaikissa jäsenvaltioissa, eikä sitä voida käyttää oikeusperustana sellaisen velvollisuuden asettamiseksi. Jäsenvaltiot ovat vastuussa asetuksen liitteessä I määriteltyjen rakennuskohteen perusvaatimusten täyttymisen sääntelystä omalla alueellaan.

Näin ollen tuotteiden valmistajat, jotka aikovat pitää tuotteitaan kaupan ainoastaan niissä jäsenvaltioissa, jotka eivät sääntele luonnonvarojen kestävää käyttöä (perusvaatimus 7), eivät ole velvollisia antamaan tuotteistaan suoritustasoilmoitusta tämän vaatimuksen suhteen. Tämä noudattaa asetuksen 6 artiklan 3 kohdan c alakohtaa, jossa valmistajia vaaditaan ilmoittamaan ”vähintään yhden rakennustuotetta koskevan perusominaisuuden suoritustaso”.

Sen vuoksi ympäristötuoteselosteen tekeminen pakolliseksi kaikissa jäsenvaltioissa edellyttäisi sitä, että komissio tekisi ehdotuksen uudesta lainsäädännöstä ja esittäisi sen Euroopan parlamentille ja neuvostolle.

([1]) Euroopan parlamentin ja neuvoston asetus (EU) N:o 305/2011, annettu 9 päivänä maaliskuuta 2011, rakennustuotteiden kaupan pitämistä koskevien ehtojen yhdenmukaistamisesta ja neuvoston direktiivin 89/106/ETY kumoamisesta, EUVL L 88, 4.4.2011, s. 5.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001104/13
to the Commission
Sari Essayah (PPE)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Construction products: mandatory nature or otherwise of environmental product declarations

The Construction Products Regulation (CPR) will become law in the Member States at the beginning of July. By virtue of its seventh 'basic requirement', relating to the sustainable use of natural resources, Member States may lay down the standards of environment-friendliness which construction and buildings will have to meet. This is a good thing because construction and the use of buildings have a particularly far-reaching environmental impact.

To enable the environment-friendliness of buildings and construction to be assessed and compared, the European Committee for Standardisation, CEN, has developed common European indicators and methods of calculation (standard EN 15804). Construction product manufacturers have to declare the environmental impact entailed in the making of their products and for that purpose must use standard environmental product declarations. If calculation is to be comprehensive, environmental product declarations would need to be obtainable for all products; in other words, they should be mandatory.

The new Construction Products Regulation does not, however, directly answer the question whether environmental product declarations for construction products are mandatory or not. Recital 56 stipulates that 'For the assessment of the sustainable use of resources and of the impact of construction works on the environment Environmental Product Declarations should be used when available'.

What this wording might mean is that any refusal by the industry to draw up declarations could render the entire system unworkable. Annex I, point 7, by contrast, does lay down a requirement to use environment-friendly building materials, but does not say how compliance is to be ascertained. One way to do so would be to call explicitly for the EN standards to be observed.

The vagueness of the regulation is an inconsistency to the extent that the object of converting the Construction Products Directive into a regulation was to impose binding obligations on the Member States, for instance as regards CE marking.

In the light of the foregoing, what does the Commission think about the vague approach evident in the regulation? Does it consider environmental product declarations for construction products to be mandatory? If the declarations are not mandatory, how will the Commission provide other binding means to make Member States reduce the considerable environmental impact already resulting from construction?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(22 March 2013)

The Construction Products Regulation (CPR) ([1]) aims at facilitating the marketing of construction products in the EU by laying down appropriate requirements. It does not make environmental product declarations compulsory in all Member States and cannot be used as the legal basis to impose such an obligation. Member States are responsible for regulating the satisfaction of the Basic Work Requirements (BWR) as defined in Annex I to the CPR within their own territory.

Hence, product manufacturers intending to market their products only in those Member States which do not regulate the sustainable use of natural resources (BWR 7), are not obliged to make a declaration on the performance of their products in relation to this requirement. This is in line with Article 6(3)c of the CPR which requires manufacturers to declare 'at least one of the essential characteristics of the construction product'.

Therefore, imposing an obligatory environmental performance declaration for all Member States would require the Commission to propose new legislation and submit it to the European Parliament and the Council.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 305/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 9 March 2011 laying down harmonised conditions for the marketing of construction products and repealing Council Directive 89/106/EEC, OJ L 88, 4.4.2011, pp. 5.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001105/13
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(1 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: Bancarrota en Islandia

Desde la crisis financiera internacional iniciada en 2007 han empezado a estallar numerosos casos de fraude financiero, de malas prácticas, todo tipo de estafas, etc. El sector financiero ha resultado ser la más grande de las burbujas que permitió el desarrollo del crecimiento durante los últimos años anteriores a la crisis.

Pese a la «putrefacción», engaño y prácticas criminales de este sector, la totalidad de los Estados miembros de la Unión Europea están ahogándose financieramente con tal de rescatar sus grandes bancos y cubrir sus multimillonarias deudas con el dinero de todos los ciudadanos. El caso de Islandia resulta un ejemplo que demuestra que es posible dejar caer a estos bancos respetando completamente la legalidad nacional e internacional. La sentencia, publicada el 28 de enero, por el Tribunal de la Asociación Europea de Libre Comercio (AELC), da la razón al Gobierno islandés de no devolver el 100 % de los fondos debidos a 300 000 ahorradores de Gran Bretaña y Holanda desde la quiebra de su sistema bancario en 2008. Esta sentencia establece un precedente para los países de la Unión que han visto multiplicada su deuda por asumir los agujeros financieros de sus sistemas bancarios, cuyo principal ejemplo podría ser España.

La decisión judicial implica que los Estados no tienen porqué responder del 100 % de unas deudas odiosas, cuyos datos han sido falsificados a través de prácticas bancarias delictivas y por tanto existe la posibilidad de optar por un impago parcial de estas deudas. Islandia, sin embargo, ha decidido reembolsar a los inversores las cantidades mínimas estipuladas por la ley nacional, a diferencia de países como España que han hecho suyas las deudas íntegras de los bancos del país. El Gobierno español asumió toda la deuda del sector bancario incrementando unos problemas de deuda pública que antes apenas existían. La opción de haber dejado quebrar al sistema bancario, al menos a aquella parte que estaba en bancarrota, se configura no solo como la más lógica en términos económicos, sino que ahora se convierte en la más apropiada en términos legales. Esta sentencia debe llevar a considerar la política económica de Islandia, que la ha llevado al crecimiento en estos tiempo de crisis, como una opción viable y legal que podría hacer frente a los problemas del sector financiero sin perjudicar las arcas públicas.

¿Qué opinión tiene la Comisión de dicha sentencia?. ¿Se está desarrollando la nueva Directiva de garantía de depósitos para precisar lo defendido en esta sentencia y garantizar que los Estados no respondan por las deudas de sus bancos?. ¿Propondrá en sus recomendaciones específicas a los Estados miembros la opción islandesa al resultar económicamente eficiente y perfectamente legal?

Respuesta del Sr. Barnier en nombre de la Comisión
(2 de abril de 2013)

La Comisión, si bien toma nota de la sentencia del Tribunal de la AELC, la Comisión sigue creyendo que la Directiva sobre el sistema de garantía de depósitos (SGD) se aplica independientemente de la magnitud de las quiebras bancarias y, por lo tanto, también en caso de crisis sistémica. Los Estados miembros tienen la responsabilidad de garantizar que los sistemas de garantía de depósitos nacionales abonen efectivamente la indemnización garantizada por el Derecho de la UE en todo el mercado único.

Esto vale tanto para la Directiva sobre el sistema de garantía de depósitos original, aplicable en el momento del asunto mencionado, como para la Directiva modificada en 2009 y aplicable en la actualidad. Los Estados miembros no solo están sujetos, en virtud de una obligación de procedimiento, a establecer un sistema de garantía de depósitos, sino que deben velar también, como último recurso, por que los SGD dispongan de fondos suficientes en un momento dado para poder abonar la indemnización a los depositantes con arreglo a las condiciones de la Directiva.

Por lo tanto, la refundición de la Directiva SGD que se está negociando actualmente se ajusta plenamente a la legislación vigente. No hacen falta adoptar recomendaciones específicas por países.

Importa señalar que, en este caso como en cualquier otro caso de quiebra bancaria que se haya producido en la EU o el EEE, ningún depositante ha sufrido nunca pérdidas en lo referido a los importes garantizados por la Directiva SGD.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001105/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Bankruptcy in Iceland

Since the international economic crisis hit in 2007, cases of financial fraud, malpractice, embezzlement, etc. have abounded. The banking bubble turned out to have been the biggest of all the bubbles that had generated rapid growth in the years preceding the crisis.

Despite clear signs of decay, fraud and criminal activity in the banking sector, all EU Member States have got themselves into a financial mess in an attempt to save their large banks and pay off their multimillion euro debts with money that belongs to all EU citizens. What happened in Iceland shows that it is possible to leave the banks to pick up the pieces without breaching national or international law. On 28 January 2013, the Court of Justice of the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) ruled that the Icelandic government did not have to reimburse 100 % of the savings that 300 000 account holders from Great Britain and the Netherlands lost when Iceland's banking system collapsed in 2008. This ruling sets a precedent for the EU countries whose debt has multiplied since the governments decided to prop up their banking systems — a prime example being Spain.

This verdict means that states may not necessarily have to take on all odious debts, records of which have been falsified through illegal banking practices, and governments may therefore opt for a partial default on such debt. Iceland has chosen to reimburse the investors the minimum amounts stipulated by its national law, in contrast to countries such as Spain which have taken on all their banks' debt. By burdening itself with the banking sector's debts, the Spanish Government exacerbated public debt problems, which had previously posed only a minor threat. Choosing to stand back and let the banking system collapse, or at least the banks that were facing bankruptcy, would have made most economic sense, and now the Iceland ruling has validated it as the most sensible legal option. In the light of this case, Iceland's economic policy, which has led to growth despite the current crisis, should be looked at as a viable and legal option that could enable governments to deal with financial sector problems without putting public funds at risk.

What is the Commission's view on this ruling? Is the new directive on deposit-guarantee schemes being drafted in line with the Iceland ruling with the aim of ensuring that Member States do not have to take on their banks' debts? Given that the Icelandic precedent is economically efficient and entirely legal, will the Commission include it in its country-specific recommendations to Member States?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2013)

While the Commission takes note of the EFTA Court, it still considers that the Deposit Guarantee Scheme (DGS) Directive applies regardless of the magnitude of bank failures, and therefore also in the event of a systemic crisis. Member States are responsible to ensure that national deposit guarantee schemes effectively pay the compensation guaranteed by EC law within the whole single market.

This applies to the original DGS Directive applicable at the time of the abovementioned case as well as to the currently applicable Directive as amended in 2009. Member States are not only bound by a procedural obligation to put in place a deposit guarantee scheme but they must, should everything else fail, ensure that DGSs are at any given moment sufficiently funded to be able to pay compensation for depositors under the conditions of the directive.

The recast of the DGS Directive currently under negotiation is therefore entirely consistent with the state of the law. No specific country-recommendation is required.

It is important to highlight that, in this case as in any other bank failure in the EU or in the EEA, no depositor has ever suffered losses on the amounts guaranteed by the DGS Directive.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-001107/13
до Комисията
Mariya Gabriel (PPE)
(1 февруари 2013 г.)

Относно: Фалшиви продукти за растителна защита в Европа

Въпреки че продуктите за растителна защита са сред едни от най-строго регулираните продукти на територията на Европейския съюз, в последните месеци се отчита нарастване на броя на фалшивите продукти за растителна защита, разпространявани в Европа. По данни на Европейската асоциация за растителна защита *близо 10 % от използваните в Европа пестициди са фалшиви и техният трафик носи на престъпните организации приходи от над един милиард евро годишно*. Според доклад на Европейската организация за полицейско сътрудничество, Европол, в някои държави членки нелегалните продукти достигат една четвърт от всички използвани.

Фалшивите продукти могат да застрашат добивите на фермерите или да унищожат реколтата не само за текущата година — вредните химически съставки във фалшификатите често се задържат в почвата за повече от една година. Използването на фалшиви продукти създава риск както за здравето на потребителите на селскостопанска продукция, така и за безопасността на околната среда.

В тази връзка:

1. Системата за бързо предупреждение за храни и фуражи (RASFF) регистрира ли и сигнали за разпространение на фалшиви продукти за растителна защита?

2. Какви мерки предприема ЕК за засилване на борбата срещу нелегалните продукти за растителна защита?

3. Съществува ли единна европейска система за регистриране на фалшивите продукти за растителна защита?

4. Има ли информация ЕК за щетите, нанесени на европейското земеделие от използването на фалшиви пестициди?

Отговор, даден от г-н Борг от името на Комисията
(15 март 2013 г.)

Комисията е обезпокоена от фалшифицирането на продукти за растителна защита (ПРЗ) и възможните отрицателни последици от това за земеделските стопани и промишлеността, както и за човешкото здраве или околната среда.

Нотификациите за фалшивите ПРЗ не се регистрират в Системата за бързо предупреждение за храни и фуражи (RASFF), тъй като ПРЗ не са предназначени за пряка консумация от хора или животни.

Комисията редовно обръщаше внимание на държавите членки за задължението им да гарантират, че на пазарите им не се пускат нелегални ПРЗ. От 2012 г. контролът върху нелегалните ПРЗ е част от годишния мониторингов план на Хранителната и ветеринарна служба, след като през 2011 г. беше предоставено на Комисията правно основание за целта.

Съществуват две системи за регистрация и обмен на информация за нелегалните и фалшивите ПРЗ:

— RAPEX — системата за бързо предупреждение за опасни нехранителни продукти, и

— група по интереси в CIRCABC (Комуникационен и информационен ресурсен център за администрации, предприятия и граждани — комуникационна платформа, осигурена от Комисията), която е достъпна само за определените звена за контакт в държавите членки и която им дава възможност за обмен на информация за незаконната употреба на ПРЗ.

Комисията не разполага със солидни данни за очакваните щети за земеделието в резултат на употребата на фалшиви ПРЗ. Публикуваната досега информация обикновено касае отделни случаи и се основава по-скоро на частни проучвания, отколкото на официално събиране на данни.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001107/13
to the Commission
Mariya Gabriel (PPE)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Counterfeit crop protection products in Europe

Although crop protection products are among the most strictly-regulated products in the EU, there has in recent months been a growth in the number of counterfeit versions of these products circulating in Europe. European Crop Protection Association statistics show that nearly 10% of the pesticides used in Europe are counterfeit and that their trafficking provides criminal organisations with an annual revenue of over EUR 1 billion. According to a report by the European police cooperation body Europol, illegal products account for up to one quarter of all the crop protection products used in some Member States.

Counterfeit products can jeopardise farmers' yields and decimate harvests beyond the year in which they are used, since the dangerous chemical components they contain often remain in the soil for longer than a year. The use of these counterfeit products not only creates health risks for consumers of agricultural products, but also poses a threat to the environment.

Can the Commission state, in this regard:

1. Whether alert notifications concerning counterfeit crop protection products are recorded under the Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed (RASFF);

2. What measures it is taking to step up the fight against illegal crop protection products?

3. Whether a European system exists for recording details of counterfeit crop protection products?

4. Whether it has any information on the losses occasioned to EU agriculture by the use of these counterfeit products?

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

The Commission is concerned about counterfeit of plant protection products and its possible negative consequences for farmers and industry, but also about possible negative consequences for human health or the environment.

Notifications concerning counterfeited plant protection products (PPP) are not recorded under the Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed (RASFF), because PPP are not intended for direct consumption by humans or animals.

The Commission regularly reminded Member States their obligation to assure that no illicit PPP are placed on their markets. Control activities on illicit PPP are part of the annual monitoring plan of Food and Veterinary Office since 2012, after a legal basis for such monitoring was given to the Commission in 2011.

Two systems exist for recording and exchange of information on illegal and counterfeited PPP:

— RAPEX, the rapid alert system for non-food dangerous products and

— an Interest Group on CIRCABC (Communication and Information Resource Centre for Administrations, Businesses and Citizens, a communication platform provided by the Commission), which is only accessible for designated contact points in Member States and allows them to exchange information on illegal use of PPP.

The Commission is not aware of robust estimations about expected agricultural losses by the use of counterfeited PPP. Information published so far usually refers to single cases and is rather based on private investigations than on official collection of data.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001108/13
an den Rat
Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)
(1. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: Richtlinie 2004/82/EG und die Übermittlung von API-Daten

Die Richtlinie 2004/82/EG hat das Ziel, Grenzkontrollen zu verbessern.

1. Welche Verbesserungen konnten seit der Annahme der Richtlinie im Bereich der Verbesserungen der Grenzkontrollen konkret erzielt werden?

2. Wie beurteilt der Rat die Implementierung der Richtlinie in den einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten in Bezug auf die Verbesserung der Grenzkontrollen?

3. Welche Schritte müssen in welchem Umfang in welchen Staaten nach Ansicht des Rates noch unternommen werden, um dem Ziel der Verbesserungen der Grenzkontrollen gerecht werden zu können?

4. In welchem Umfang werden bisher Advanced Passenger Information (API) innerhalb der EU ausgetauscht? Sieht der Rat in diesem Bereich Verbesserungsmöglichkeiten? Falls ja, welche?

5. In welchem Umfang werden bisher Advanced Passenger Information (API) zwischen EU-Mitgliedstaaten und Drittstaaten ausgetauscht? Sieht der Rat in diesem Bereich Verbesserungsmöglichkeiten? Falls ja, welche?

Antwort
(15. April 2013)

Es ist Aufgabe der Kommission als Hüterin der Verträge, die Anwendung des Unionsrechts durch die Mitgliedstaaten zu überwachen; der Rat wird generell nicht über die Einzelheiten der Umsetzung der Rechtsvorschriften der Union durch die Mitgliedstaaten unterrichtet.

Der Rat misst Verbesserungen im Bereich der Grenzkontrollen große Bedeutung bei, wie dies insbesondere in Abschnitt 5.1 des Stockholmer Programms ([1]) zum Ausdruck kommt. Als Mitgesetzgeber bei Gesetzgebungsinitiativen im Zusammenhang mit den Kontrollen an den Außengrenzen, wie der technischen Änderung des Schengener Grenzkodexes ([2]), dem Eurosur-Vorschlag ([3]) und im Rahmen der Vorschläge für die Verwaltung des Schengen-Systems ([4]), leistet der Rat ständig einen wesentlichen Beitrag zur Verbesserung der Kontrollen an den Außengrenzen. Zudem sei darauf hingewiesen, dass 2011 durch die Annahme der Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zur Änderung der Frontex-Verordnung ([5]) substanzielle Fortschritte erzielt worden sind.

Was insbesondere die Richtlinie 2004/82/EG anbelangt, so umfasst die vom Rat auf seiner Tagung vom 26./27. April 2012 angenommene „EU-Aktion gegen Migrationsdruck — Eine strategische Antwort“ ([6]) einen Strategischen Prioritätsbereich II mit dem Titel „Verstärktes Grenzmanagement an den Außengrenzen“. Zu diesem Prioritätsbereich gehören eine Reihe von Herausforderungen, einschließlich der „Verhütung und Bekämpfung der illegalen Einwanderung durch Gewährleistung strenger und effizienter Kontrollen an den Außengrenzen“. In die Auflistung der Ziele, die im Rahmen dieser Herausforderung zu erreichen sind, hat der Rat unter Buchstabe C eine Empfehlung aufgenommen, wonach die Mitgliedstaaten, wenn dies sachdienlich ist, in Einklang mit der Richtlinie 2004/82/EG ([7]) die Angaben von beförderten Personen zur Verbesserung der Grenzkontrollen und zur Bekämpfung der illegalen Einwanderung nutzen sollten. Der obengenannte Aktionsplan wird regelmäßig aktualisiert.

([1]) Ratsdokument 17024/09, angenommen vom Europäischen Rat auf der Tagung vom 10./11. Dezember 2009.
([2]) 18006/12.
([3]) 18666/11.
([4]) 14358/11, 14359/11.
([5]) ABl. L 304 vom 22.11.2011, S. 1.
([6]) 9650/12.
([7]) ABl. L 261 vom 6.8.2994, S. 24.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001108/13
to the Council
Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Directive 2004/82/EC and the communication of Advanced Passenger Information

Directive 2004/82/EC is intended to improve border control.

1. What tangible improvements have been made in the area of border control since the directive was adopted?

2. What is the Council's opinion of the various Member States' implementation of the directive in terms of improving border control?

3. How much, and what, action does the Council consider still needs to be taken, and in which Member States, in order to achieve the objective of improved border control?

4. How much Advanced Passenger Information (API) has been exchanged within the EU up to now? Does the Council see any possibility of improvements in this area? If so, in what respect?

5. How much Advanced Passenger Information (API) been exchanged between EU Member states and third countries up to now? Does the Council see any possibility of improvements in this area? If so, in what respect?

Reply
(15 April 2013)

The Commission, as guardian of the Treaties, is responsible for overseeing Member States' application of Union law, and the Council is generally not informed about the detailed implementation of Union legislation by Member States.

The Council attaches great importance to improvements in the area of border control, as shown in particular in point 5.1 of the Stockholm Programme ([1]). It is in the process of providing a substantial contribution to improving control of the external borders as co-legislator in external border control-related legislative initiatives such as the technical amendment of the Schengen Borders Code ([2]), the Eurosur proposal ([3]) and in the framework of the Schengen governance proposals ([4]). It is also recalled that substantive progress was made in 2011 by the adoption of the regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending the Frontex Regulation. ([5])

More specifically in relation to Directive 2004/82/EC, the 'EU Action on Migratory Pressures — A Strategic Response' ([6]), adopted by the Council at its meeting on 26-27 April 2012, includes a strategic priority area II about 'Enhanced border management at the external borders'. This priority area includes several challenges, which includes that of 'Preventing and combating illegal immigration by ensuring strong and efficient external border control'. In the list of goals to be achieved as part of this challenge, the Council has included under point D a recommendation that Member States should, where relevant, make use of passenger data for improving border controls and combating illegal immigration in accordance with requirements in Directive 2004/82/EC ([7]). The action plan referred to above is updated on a regular basis.

([1]) Council document 17024/09, adopted by the European Council on 10/11 December 2009.
([2]) 18006/12.
([3]) 18666/11.
([4]) 14358/11, 14359/11.
([5]) OJ L 304, 22.11.2011, p. 1.
([6]) 9650/12.
([7]) OJ L 261, 6.8.2004, p. 24.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001109/13
an die Kommission
Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)
(1. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: Richtlinie 2004/82/EG und die Übermittlung von API-Daten

Die Richtlinie 2004/82/EG hat das Ziel, Grenzkontrollen zu verbessern.

1. Welche Verbesserungen konnten seit der Annahme der Richtlinie im Bereich der Verbesserungen der Grenzkontrollen konkret erzielt werden?

2. Wie beurteilt die Kommission die Implementierung der Richtlinie in den einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten in Bezug auf die Verbesserung der Grenzkontrollen?

3. Welche Schritte müssen in welchem Umfang in welchen Staaten nach Ansicht der Kommission noch unternommen werden, um dem Ziel der Verbesserungen der Grenzkontrollen gerecht werden zu können?

4. In welchem Umfang werden bisher Advanced Passenger Information (API) innerhalb der EU ausgetauscht? Sieht die Kommission in diesem Bereich Verbesserungsmöglichkeiten? Falls ja, welche?

5. In welchem Umfang werden bisher Advanced Passenger Information (API) zwischen EU-Mitgliedstaaten und Drittstaaten ausgetauscht? Sieht die Kommission in diesem Bereich Verbesserungsmöglichkeiten? Falls ja, welche?

Antwort von Frau Malmström im Namen der Kommission
(2. April 2013)

Zweck der Richtlinie 2004/82/EG vom 29. April 2004 ist es, die Grenzkontrollen zu verbessern und die illegale Einwanderung zu bekämpfen, indem die Luftfahrtunternehmen vorab Angaben über die von ihnen von Drittstaaten in das Hoheitsgebiet der EU beförderten Passagiere an die zuständigen nationalen Behörden übermitteln. Die Richtlinie gilt weder für den Austausch von Informationen zwischen Mitgliedstaaten noch für die Übermittlung von Informationen von Mitgliedstaaten an Drittstaaten.

Die Ergebnisse und Auswirkungen der Richtlinie wurden in einer im Jahr 2012 im Auftrag der Kommission erstellten Studie bewertet. Darin wurden die Maßnahmen und Praktiken, die in den einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten umgesetzt wurden, eingehend untersucht. Die wichtigste Erkenntnis der Studie war, dass sich die Richtlinie in den Mitgliedstaaten positiv ausgewirkt hat. Es mag jedoch angesichts des frühen Stadiums der Durchführung der Richtlinie noch zu früh sein, um Schlussfolgerungen im Hinblick auf die Gesamtkosten und den allgemeinen Nutzen der Richtlinie zu ziehen.

Die Studie steht in ihrer Langfassung auf der Website der Kommission zur Verfügung (nur in englischer Sprache) ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/e-library/documents/policies/immigration/irregular-immigration/docs/evaluation_of_the_api_directive_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001109/13
to the Commission
Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Directive 2004/82/EC and the communication of Advanced Passenger Information

Directive 2004/82/EC is intended to improve border control.

1. What tangible improvements have been made in the area of border control since the directive was adopted?

2. What is the Commission's opinion of the various Member States' implementation of the directive in terms of improving border control?

3. How much, and what, action does the Commission consider still needs to be taken, and in which Member States, in order to achieve the objective of improved border control?

4. How much Advanced Passenger Information (API) has been exchanged within the EU up to now? Does the Commission see any possibility of improvements in this area? If so, in what respect?

5. How much Advanced Passenger Information (API) been exchanged between EU Member states and third countries up to now? Does the Commission see any possibility of improvements in this area? If so, in what respect?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2013)

Directive 2004/082/EC of 29 April 2004 aims to improve border control and combat irregular immigration through the transmission by air carriers to the responsible national authorities of advance information on the passengers they are carrying from third countries into EU territory. The directive does not apply to exchanges of information between Member States or the transmission of information from Member States to third countries.

A study prepared for the Commission in 2012 evaluated the results and impact of the directive. It includes a detailed analysis of the national measures and practices implemented in each Member State. The key findings of the study were that it had a positive impact in Member States. However, it may be premature to draw conclusions on the overall costs and benefits of the directive given the early stage of its implementation.

This study is available in full on the Commission website ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/e-library/documents/policies/immigration/irregular-immigration/docs/evaluation_of_the_api_directive_en.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001110/13
an die Kommission
Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)
(1. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: PNR-Datenübermittlung an die USA

Die USA unterhält ein Flugsicherungsprogramm, welches von der Transportation Security Agency mit dem Ziel durchgeführt wird, die Flugsicherheit zu gewährleisten.

Dazu gehört, Personen, die auf einer „No Fly List" stehen, das Einsteigen zu verweigern bzw. Personen, die auf einer „Selectee List" genannt sind, einer besonderen Kontrolle zu unterziehen.

Darüber hinaus hat die EU ein Abkommen mit den USA zur Übermittlung von Fluggastdaten (PNR) abgeschlossen. Dabei werden auch Advanced Passenger Information (API) übermittelt.

Kann die Kommission ausschließen, dass PNR- oder API-Daten, die im Rahmen des EU-USA-PNR-Abkommens an die USA übermittelt werden, von den USA dazu herangezogen werden, Entscheidungen darüber zu treffen, welche Personen auf einer „No Fly List" oder einer „Selectee List" erfasst werden?

Antwort von Frau Malmström im Namen der Kommission
(26. März 2013)

Die Fragen beziehen sich anscheinend auf das Flugsicherungsprogramm der Vereinigten Staaten, das von der „Transportation Security Agency" (TSA) mit dem Ziel durchgeführt wird, die Flugsicherheit durch den vorherigen Abgleich von Flugdaten mit einer Liste von Personen, die eine Bedrohung für die Flugsicherheit darstellen, zu gewährleisten.

In diesem Rahmen haben die Fluggesellschaften im Auftrag der TSA bestimmte Daten über Passagiere zu erfassen und an sie weiterzuleiten. Die Daten dienen dazu, Personen, die auf der „No Fly List" der Vereinigten Staaten stehen, daran zu hindern, an Bord der Flugzeuge zu gehen, und Personen, die in der „Selectee List" genannt sind, einer besonderen Kontrolle zu unterziehen. Praktisch heißt das, dass die TSA die Fluggesellschaften auffordert, das Einsteigen zu verweigern oder die Behörden (oder Verbindungsbeamte des Drittlandes) zu informieren, damit sie die betreffenden Personen genauer kontrollieren.

Die Datenübermittlung im Rahmen des US-Flugsicherungsprogramms fällt nicht unter das Abkommen über Fluggastdaten (PNR) zwischen der EU und den Vereinigten Staaten.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001110/13
to the Commission
Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Transfer of PNR data to the US

The United States maintains an air traffic control programme, implemented by the Transportation Security Agency, with the aim of ensuring air traffic safety.

It includes refusing to allow anyone appearing on a 'No Fly List' to board a plane and subjecting anyone named on a 'Selectee List' to special screening.

Furthermore, the EU has concluded an agreement with the United States for the transfer of passenger name record (PNR) data. This also involves the transfer of Advanced Passenger Information (API).

Can the Commission rule out the possibility that PNR or API data transferred to the United States within the framework of the EU-US PNR Agreement will be used by the US to decide who should be placed on a 'No Fly List' or 'Selectee List'?

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

The questions appear to relate to the Secure Flight Program of the United States which is managed by the Transportation Security Agency (TSA) to safeguard aviation security by pre-screening information for flights against watch lists of persons who pose a threat to the security of a flight.

Under the program, air carriers are required to collect on behalf of, and provide to, TSA certain data elements on passengers. TSA uses the data to prevent individuals on the United States No Fly List from boarding an aircraft and to identify individuals on the United States Selectee List for enhanced screening. In practice, this is done by the TSA requesting air carriers to deny boarding or informing the authorities (or liaison officers of the third country) to closer examine the individuals in question.

The transfer of data under the United States Secure Flight Program does not fall within the scope of the EU-US PNR Agreement.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001111/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(1 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Χωρίς περιβαλλοντική αδειοδότηση το έργο στίβου θαλάσσιου σκι στη Λίμνη Παμβώτιδα

Καταγγελία ([1]) κατέθεσαν στον Εισαγγελέα Περιβάλλοντος ο Σύλλογος Προστασίας Περιβάλλοντος Ιωαννίνων και η Ελληνική Ορνιθολογική Εταιρεία μετά από επανειλημμένες εκκλήσεις για την παύση των παράνομων χωματουργικών εργασιών, εκσκαφής και κοπής καλαμιώνα για την κατασκευή πίστας θαλασσίου σκι στον υγρότοπο Αμφιθέας, που εκτελεί ο Δήμος Ιωαννιτών. Οι περιβαλλοντικοί φορείς ελπίζουν ότι θα αποδοθεί έτσι το περιβαλλοντικό και κοινωνικό δίκαιο.

Το έργο συνεχίζεται μέχρι και σήμερα χωρίς τεχνική μελέτη και δίχως την απαραίτητη περιβαλλοντικήα αδειοδότηση ([2]), παρότι είναι σε γνώση των αρχών ότι υπάρχει άμεσος κίνδυνος υποβάθμισης του περιβάλλοντος.

Η περιοχή όπου χωροθετείται το έργο ανήκει στο δίκτυο Natura 2000 ως Ζώνη Ειδικής Διατήρησης (ΖΕΔ) για τους οικότοπους και Ζώνη Ειδικής Προστασίας (ΖΕΠ) για τα άγρια πουλιά (GR 2130005). Η αξία της περιοχής έγκειται στην παρουσία και την αναπαραγωγή παγκοσμίως απειλούμενων και προστατευόμενων ειδών, όπως η Βαλτόπαπια, ο Ήταυρος, ο Καλαμόκιρκος και το ενδημικό ορθόπτερο Chortippus lacustris. Για την προστασία των ειδών αυτών η ευρωπαϊκή και εθνική νομοθεσία απαιτεί πρώτα την εκτίμηση και έπειτα την πρόληψη αρνητικών επιπτώσεων στο βιότοπό τους. Παράλληλα προβλέπεται η εκ των προτέρων γνωμοδότηση του Φορέα Διαχείρισης Λίμνης Παμβώτιδας ο οποίος δυστυχώς παρακάμφθηκε και μάλιστα προβλέπεται να καταργηθεί.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Έχει γνώση από τις ελληνικές αρχές για αυτή τη κατάφωρη παραβίαση των Οδηγιών 92/43/ΕΟΚ ([3]) του Συμβουλίου, της 21ης Μαΐου 1992, για τη διατήρηση των φυσικών οικοτόπων καθώς και της άγριας πανίδας και χλωρίδας, καθώς και 2009/147/ΕΚ ([4]) του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 30ής Νοεμβρίου 2009, περί της διατηρήσεως των αγρίων πτηνών, στη λίμνη Παμβώτιδα;

— Σε ποιες ενέργειες θα προβεί για τη προστασία αυτού του πολύ ευαίσθητου οικοσυστήματος και το σταμάτημα του έργου που ενδέχεται να υποβαθμίσει σημαντικά τον υγρότοπο;

Απάντηση του κ. Potočnik εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(12 Μαρτίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή δεν έχει ενημερωθεί από τις ελληνικές αρχές για το εν λόγω έργο, δεδομένου ότι δεν προβλέπεται τέτοια υποχρέωση. Η Λίμνη των Ιωαννίνων (Παμβώτιδα) περιλαμβάνεται στο δίκτυο Natura 2000 και, συνεπώς, υπόκειται στις διατάξεις προστασίας και διαχείρισης που προβλέπονται στο άρθρο 6 της οδηγίας για τους οικοτόπους 92/43/ΕΟΚ ([5]). Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, θα πρέπει να ληφθούν μέτρα για την πρόληψη της επιδείνωσης της κατάστασης στην περιοχή, ενώ κάθε έργο με ενδεχόμενες πιθανές σοβαρές επιπτώσεις, όπως οι επίμαχες εγκαταστάσεις θαλάσσιου σκι, πρέπει να υποβάλλεται σε κατάλληλη αξιολόγηση και να εγκρίνεται μόνο εάν δεν επηρεάζεται η ακεραιότητα της περιοχής. Είναι ευθύνη των ελληνικών αρμόδιων αρχών να εξασφαλίσουν τη συμμόρφωση με τις απαιτήσεις αυτές και να θέσουν τέλος σε κάθε ζημιογόνο δραστηριότητα που δεν έχει λάβει σχετική άδεια. Βάσει πιο πρόσφατων πληροφοριών, η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει ότι η αρμόδια αρχή (η Αποκεντρωμένη Διοίκηση Δυτικής Ηπείρου-Μακεδονίας) έχει πλέον ζητήσει, μετά από καταγγελίες, την παύση των χωματουργικών έργων της λίμνης και την αποκατάσταση του υδάτινου οικοσυστήματος που υπέστη ζημίες. Επομένως, η Επιτροπή δεν σκοπεύει να παρέμβει προς το παρόν.

([1]) http://www.ecoioannina.gr/, http://www.ecoioannina.gr/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/2013_01_28-kataggelia-kalamwnas.pdf

([2]) Για την κατασκευή στίβου σκι είναι, σύμφωνα με τον Ν. 4014/21.9.2011, απαραίτητη η Απόφαση Έγκρισης Περιβαλλοντικών Όρων από την Αποκεντρωμένη Διοίκηση μετά από ειδική οικολογική αξιολόγηση. Τούτο δεν έχει λάβει χώρα, καθώς οι εργασίες εκτελούνται από τις 22.12.2012 χωρίς άδεια, ενώ εκπρόθεσμα ζητήθηκε η άδεια αναρμόδιας αρχής, της Περιφέρειας Ηπείρου. Παράλληλα, η ενέργεια του Δήμου Ιωαννιτών έρχεται σε αντίθεση με την Ειδική Περιβαλλοντική Μελέτη και το Διαχειριστικό Σχέδιο Λίμνης Παμβώτιδας, όπου είχαν προβλεφθεί ήδη από το 2004 οι καταστροφικές επιπτώσεις του έργου: πχ. Παράγραφος 6.2. Α «Παρόμοια, η πρόταση δημιουργίας υποδομών πίστας σκι εντός της ζώνης Α1 στην περιοχή της Αμφιθέας θα είναι βλαπτική και καταστροφική για τις ρηχές εκτάσεις της λίμνης εκεί».

([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:31992L0043:EL:NOT

([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32009L0147:EL:NOT

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001111/13
to the Commission
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Water ski facilities projected on Lake Pamvotida without environmental authorisation

The Ioannina Environmental Protection Association and the Greek Ornithological Society have lodged a complaint ([1]). with the Environmental Advocacy Service, having repeatedly called for a halt to illegal earthworks, excavation and reed cutting to make way for water ski facilities being projected by the Ioannina municipal authorities in the Amfithea wetlands area. The organisations in question hope that, as a result of their actions, environmental and social law will be upheld.

Works on the project are continuing despite the fact that to date no technical survey has been carried out and the necessary environmental authorisation has not been issued and despite the fact that the authorities are aware of the immediate danger to the environment ([2]).

The intended site of the project is located in a Natura 2000 Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Special Protection Area (SPA) for wild birds (GR 2130005) and is of great value as a habitat and breeding ground for threatened and protected species recognised as such throughout the world, for example, ferruginous duck (*Aythya nyroca*), bittern (*Botaurus stellaris*) marsh harrier (*Circus aeruginosus*) and indigenous orthoptera (Chortippus lacustris). Under European and national law, impact assessments, followed by measures to prevent any damage to the habitats of these protected species, are mandatory. However, the Lake Pamvotida Management Authority, which should also have been informed in advance, was unfortunately bypassed and it appears that there are plans afoot to dismantle this authority altogether.

In view of this:

— Has the Commission been informed by the Greek authorities of this project for Lake Pamvotida, which directly infringes Council Directive 92/43/EEC ([3]) of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and Directive 2009/147/EC ([4]) of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds?

— What action will it take to halt the project, which will seriously damage this wetland area, and protect what is an extremely delicate ecosystem?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(12 March 2013)

The Commission has not been informed by the Greek authorities of the project in question as there is no such obligation to do so.

([1]) http://www.ecoioannina.gr/, http://www.ecoioannina.gr/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/2013_01_28-kataggelia-kalamwnas.pdf

([2]) Under the terms of Law 4014 of 21 September 2011, the construction of water ski facilities requires a decision of the decentralised authority, following a special ecological assessment, to the effect that the project complies with environmental standards. Despite the fact that these preconditions have not been met and no authorisation has been issued, the works have been under way since 22 December 2012. The request for authorisation, which was made too late, was submitted to the Epirus regional authority, which is not competent in the matter. At the same time, the project being carried out by the Ioannina municipal authorities runs counter to the findings of the special environmental survey and the Lake Pamvotida management plan, the disastrous consequences of the project having already been foreseen by it as early as 2004, for example in paragraph 6.2 A, which reads as follows: 'Similarly, the projected water ski infrastructures within zone A 1 of the Amfithea area will be harmful to the lake shallows'.

([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:31992L0043:EL:NOT

([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32009L0147:EL:NOT

The Lake of Ioaninna (Lake Pamvotida) is included in the Natura 2000 network and it is therefore subject to the protection and management provisions laid down in Article 6 of the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC ([5]). In that regard, measures need to be taken to prevent the deterioration of the area, while any project with a likely significant effect on it, such as the water ski facilities in question, needs to undergo an appropriate assessment and can only be authorised if it does not affect the integrity of the area. It is the responsibility of the Greek competent authorities to ensure compliance with these requirements and put an end to any unauthorised damaging activities. On the basis of more recent information the Commission understands that the competent authority (decentralised administration of Epirus-W. Macedonia) has now, following complaints, ordered the cessation of earthworks in the lake and the restoration of the damaged wetland ecosystem. The Commission does not therefore intend to intervene for now.

([5]) Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora, OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001112/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(1 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Αξιοποίηση αδρανών καταθέσεων στις ελληνικές τράπεζες

Σε σχέδιο νόμου της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης, ρυθμίζονται θέματα που αφορούν στη μεταβίβαση στο ελληνικό δημόσιο των αδρανών καταθέσεων που «λιμνάζουν» μέχρι σήμερα στις ελληνικές τράπεζες, χωρίς ουσιαστικά να εφαρμόζεται η ελληνική νομοθεσία, η οποία προβλέπει ότι τα αδέσποτα ακίνητα καθώς και οι περιουσίες όσων πεθαίνουν χωρίς κληρονόμο ανήκουν στο δημόσιο.

Με βάση τη δύσκολη οικονομική κατάσταση της Ελλάδας, αλλά και την ανάγκη να παρέχεται η αναγκαία «διαφάνεια» από τις τράπεζες, προκειμένου οι δικαιούχοι των αδρανών λογαριασμών, και ενδεχομένως οι κληρονόμοι τους, να διευκολύνονται να αναλάβουν εκ νέου την περιουσία τους, όταν την αναζητήσουν, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Γνωρίζει την τάξη μεγέθους των αδρανών καταθέσεων σε ελληνικές τράπεζες; Γνωρίζει τι ποσά έχουν μεταβιβασθεί από αδρανείς καταθέσεις στο ελληνικό δημόσιο π.χ. την τελευταία δεκαετία;

— Μπορεί να σχολιάσει αν μέχρι σήμερα οι ελληνικές τράπεζες παρείχαν την αναγκαία διαφάνεια προς τους ιδιώτες-πελάτες τους και προς το ελληνικό δημόσιο, προκειμένου να αναζητήσουν τις αδρανείς καταθέσεις; Υπήρχε σχετική «ικανή» διαδικασία που εφάρμοζαν οι τράπεζες; Ποια είναι η συνήθης πρακτική στις χώρες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης;

— Μπορεί να βεβαιώσει ότι οι όποιες ρυθμίσεις γίνουν στην ελληνική νομοθεσία θα έχουν αναδρομικό χαρακτήρα;

Απάντηση του κ. Barnier εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(2 Απριλίου 2013)

Δεν υπάρχει νομοθεσία της ΕΕ που να ρυθμίζει τη χρήση αδρανών λογαριασμών και οι συνθήκες διαφέρουν από το ένα κράτος μέλος στο άλλο. Σύμφωνα με στοιχεία που διαβίβασαν 23 κράτη μέλη το 2012, τα οποία δεν ήταν διαθέσιμα για την Ελλάδα, υπάρχουν 3 κύριοι τύποι προσεγγίσεων όσον αφορά τους αδρανείς λογαριασμούς:

Σε ορισμένα κράτη μέλη, τα ποσά που τηρούνται σε αδρανείς λογαριασμούς παραμένουν για πάντα στην κυριότητα των πελατών και συνεπώς δεν είναι διαθέσιμα για άλλο σκοπό.

Σε αρκετά κράτη μέλη η νομοθεσία προβλέπει την παραγραφή ή τον αποκλεισμό του δικαιώματος, που σημαίνει ότι ο πελάτης παύει να έχει δικαίωμα επί της κατάθεσης μετά την παρέλευση συγκεκριμένου χρονικού διαστήματος κατά το οποίο ο λογαριασμός παρέμεινε αδρανής. Ωστόσο, δεν υπάρχει συγκεκριμένη νομοθετική διάταξη που να προβλέπει τι συμβαίνει με τις καταθέσεις μετά την πάροδο του εν λόγω χρονικού διαστήματος.

Σε ορισμένα κράτη μέλη, τα κεφάλαια είτε μεταβιβάζονται στο Δημόσιο είτε χρησιμοποιούνται για ειδικούς σκοπούς από την κυβέρνηση. Σε δύο από τα εν λόγω κράτη μέλη, μέρος των αδρανών καταθέσεων διοχετεύεται σε έργα κοινωνικής πρόνοιας, ενώ το μεγαλύτερο μέρος τους παραμένει διαθέσιμο για ενδεχόμενες διεκδικήσεις.

Η Επιτροπή δεν διαθέτει στοιχεία σχετικά με την προσέγγιση που ακολουθούν οι ελληνικές τράπεζες έναντι των πελατών τους. Η ερώτηση αυτή θα πρέπει να απευθυνθεί στις ελληνικές δημόσιες αρχές.

Στην Ελλάδα, ο νόμος 1195/1942 προβλέπει ότι τα ποσά που τηρούνται σε αδρανείς καταθέσεις μεταβιβάζονται από τα χρηματοπιστωτικά ιδρύματα στο Ελληνικό Δημόσιο μετά την παρέλευση 20 ετών από την τελευταία κίνηση του λογαριασμού.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001112/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Utilisation of dormant deposits in Greek banks

A draft law by the Greek Government regulates issues relating to the transfer to the Greek state of dormant deposits that have so far been 'stagnating' in Greek banks, essentially without Greek law being applied, which provides that unclaimed assets and the estates of persons who have died without leaving heirs fall to the state.

In the difficult economic situation obtaining in Greece, and also given the need for the banks to provide the necessary 'transparency', so that the beneficiaries of dormant accounts, and possibly the heirs of the deceased, receive assistance in recovering their property when they so request, will the Commission say:

— Is it aware of the scale of the dormant deposits in Greek banks? Does it know what amounts have been transferred from dormant deposits to the Greek state e.g. over the last decade?

— Can it state whether until now Greek banks have provided the necessary transparency for individual customers and the Greek state to identify dormant deposits? Have the banks used an 'efficient' procedure in this connection? What is the standard practice in other European Union countries?

— Can it confirm that any rules adopted by Greek legislation will have retrospective effect?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2013)

There is no EC law regulating the use of dormant accounts and the situation varies from one Member State to another. According to information provided by 23 Member States in 2012, which was not available for Greece, there are 3 main types of approaches to dormant accounts:

— In a number of Member States, funds held on dormant accounts always remain the property of customers and therefore are not available for any other purposes.

— Several Member States have a law of limitation or preclusion meaning that the customer's claim on the deposit expires after a certain period of inactivity. However, there is no specific legislation on dormant accounts regulating what happens with deposits after the expiry of those limits.

— In some Member States, funds are transferred to the state or used for special purposes by the government. In two of those Member States part of dormant funds is channelled into social welfare projects while the majority remains available for possible claims.

The Commission does not have information on the approach of Greek banks towards their customers. This question should be addressed to the Greek public authorities.

In Greece, Law 1195/1942 foresees that amounts held in dormant deposits are transferred by the Credit Institutions to the Greek state after the elapse of a twenty-year period of the last movement of the account.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001113/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(1 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Δήλωση του Eurogroup για την Ελλάδα της 21.1.2013 σχετικά με τις ανανεώσιμες πηγές ενέργειας

Η απόφαση του Eurogroup της 21.1.2013 για την Ελλάδα, αναφέρει, μεταξύ άλλων, ότι το Eurogroup «εκφράζει την ικανοποίησή του για την προσαρμογή των εισφορών για ανανεώσιμες πηγές ενέργειας». Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Ποιο ακριβώς ήταν το αίτημα που ικανοποίησε η ελληνική κυβέρνηση; Είχε εκφράσει σχετική γνώμη η Επιτροπή επ' αυτού; Ποια ήταν;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(19 Μαρτίου 2013)

Την 10η Ιανουαρίου, η Ρυθμιστική Αρχή Ενέργειας αύξησε την ειδική εισφορά ΑΠΕ για τα νοικοκυριά κατά 9% περίπου (από 8,74 ευρώ/MWh σε 9,53 ευρώ/MWh). Η αύξηση αυτή ήταν ένα από τα μέτρα που έπρεπε να ληφθούν πριν από την εκταμίευση των 2 δισ. ευρώ της πρώτης επιμέρους δόσης της δεύτερης εκταμίευσης του δανείου που συνδέεται με το ελληνικό πρόγραμμα οικονομικής προσαρμογής. Η Επιτροπή, σε συνεννόηση με την ΕΚΤ και το ΔΝΤ, ανέφερε στην Ευρωομάδα ότι η προϋπόθεση αυτή έχει εκπληρωθεί. Η αξιολόγηση είναι διαθέσιμη στον δικτυακό τόπο της Επιτροπής ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/assistance_eu_ms/greek_loan_facility/pdf/reportcompliancedisbursement-012013_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001113/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Statement by the Eurogroup on Greece of 21.1.2013 regarding renewable energy sources

The decision by the Eurogroup on Greece of 21.1.2013 states, *inter alia*, that the Eurogroup 'notes with satisfaction that … the levy on renewable energy sources (has) been adjusted.'

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

— What exactly was the demand that the Greek Government satisfied? Had the Commission expressed an opinion on this? If so, what was it?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(19 March 2013)

On 10 January, the Energy Regulator raised the RES special levy by some 9% for households from EUR 8.74/MWh to EUR 9.53/MWh. This increase was among the measures to be adopted ahead of the disbursement of the EUR 2 billion first sub-tranche of the 2nd disbursement of the loan linked to the Greek Economic Adjustment programme. The Commission in liaison with ECB and IMF staff, reported to the Eurogroup that the condition had been met. The assessment is available at the Commission website ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/assistance_eu_ms/greek_loan_facility/pdf/reportcompliancedisbursement-012013_en.pdf

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001114/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(1 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Πρόγραμμα ενεργειακής απόδοσης κτιρίων

Το συγχρηματοδοτούμενο πρόγραμμα που αφορά στην ενεργειακή απόδοση των κτιρίων στην Ελλάδα θα μπορούσε, ταυτόχρονα με τα θετικά περιβαλλοντικά του αποτελέσματα, να δώσει κάποια στήριξη στον κατασκευαστικό κλάδο, ο οποίος έχει πλήρως αποδυναμωθεί.

Σύμφωνα με πληροφορίες, η μέχρι σήμερα εξέλιξη του προγράμματος εμφανίζει εξαιρετικά χαμηλούς ρυθμούς προόδου, και η όλη καθυστέρηση αποδίδεται κυρίως στην άρνηση των τραπεζών να προχωρήσουν στις τελικές εγκρίσεις και εκταμιεύσεις των αναγκαίων κονδυλίων.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Ποιος είναι μέχρι σήμερα, ο ρυθμός απορρόφησης του προγράμματος; Πόσες αιτήσεις έχουν υποβληθεί; Πόσες έχουν εγκριθεί και τι ποσά έχουν εκταμιευτεί;

— Ποια είναι η κύρια αιτία των καθυστερήσεων;

— Τι μέτρα θα λάβει η Επιτροπή, σε συνεργασία με την ελληνική κυβέρνηση, για την ταχύτερη προώθηση του προγράμματος;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(2 Απριλίου 2013)

1-2. Το πρόγραμμα βελτίωσης της ενεργειακής απόδοσης των κτηρίων στην Ελλάδα ([1]) καταρτίστηκε το 2010 και προβλέπει δάνεια και άμεσες επιχορηγήσεις σε νοικοκυριά, ώστε να πετύχουν τους στόχους εξοικονόμησης ενέργειας. Ο συνολικός προϋπολογισμός ανέρχεται στα 396 εκατομμύρια ευρώ. Το 2012, έγινε ανασχεδιασμός του προγράμματος, και η αναλογία δανείων/επιχορηγήσεων άλλαξε σε 30%/70% αντίστοιχα για τα νοικοκυριά χαμηλού εισοδήματος και έκτοτε το πρόγραμμα παρουσιάζει σχετικά ικανοποιητικό βαθμό απορρόφησης. Τον Δεκέμβριο του 2012, τα εγκεκριμένα δάνεια ανέρχονταν στο 40% του προϋπολογισμού.

3. Έως τις 31 Δεκεμβρίου 2012, είχαν παραληφθεί 29 451 αιτήσεις, εκ των οποίων κρίθηκαν επιλέξιμες οι 19 001 και έλαβαν επιχορήγηση οι 11 377. Οι πληρωμές για τις 8 129 αιτήσεις που είχαν επιτύχει τους στόχους εξοικονόμησης ενέργειας, αναλύονται ως εξής: δάνεια 46 εκατομμύρια ευρώ, άμεση βοήθεια 27 εκατομμύρια ευρώ και κόστος πιστοποιητικού ενεργειακής αναβάθμισης 4 εκατομμύρια ευρώ.

4-5. Η Επιτροπή θεωρεί τις συνέπειες της δημοσιονομικής και οικονομικής κρίσης στην ελληνική οικονομία έναν από τους λόγους της αργής εκκίνησης του προγράμματος. Ωστόσο, η πρόοδος πλέον είναι ικανοποιητική, με ορισμένες περιοχές να έχουν δεσμεύσει πάνω από το 90% των διαθέσιμων πιστώσεων.

([1]) ΕΞΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΩ.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001114/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Programme to improve energy efficiency in buildings

In addition to its environmental benefits, the co-funded programme to improve energy efficiency in buildings could also help breathe new life into Greece's flagging construction sector.

However, it is being reported that the programme has made remarkably slow progress to date, mainly because of the refusal of the banks finally to approve and deploy the necessary funding.

In view of this:

— Can the Commission indicate the take-up of funding under the programme?

— How many applications have been submitted?

— Which have been approved and what amounts have been disbursed?

— What are the principal reasons for the delays?

— What action will be taken by the Commission and the Greek Government to speed things up?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2013)

1-2. The programme to improve energy efficiency in buildings in Greece ([1]) was established in 2010. It provides loans and direct grants to households in order to achieve the target energy saving goals. The total budget is EUR 396 million. In 2012, the programme was redesigned, changing the ratio of loans to grants to 30%/70% respectively for low income households, and since then the programme has witnessed a relatively satisfactory take-up rate. In December 2012, the level of approved loans was 40% of the budget.

3. By 31 December 2012, 29 451 applications have been received of which 19 001 have been declared eligible and 11 377 have been granted. Payments for 8 129 applications, having achieved their energy savings goals, can be broken down as follows: loans, EUR 46 million, direct assistance, EUR 27 million and Energy Upgrading Certificate cost, EUR 4 million.

4-5. The Commission considers the consequences of the financial and economic crisis in the Greek economy as one of the reasons for the slow start of the programme. However, progress is now satisfactory, with some regions having over 90% of available allocations committed.

([1]) EXOIKONOMO.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001115/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(1 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Πράσινο Ταμείο στην Ελλάδα

Με το νόμο 3889/2010 ιδρύθηκε στην Ελλάδα το λεγόμενο Πράσινο Ταμείο. Οι πόροι του Πράσινου Ταμείου προέρχονται από διάφορες πηγές (εισφορές των διανομέων ενέργειας, ειδικός φόρος κατανάλωσης βενζίνης, πρόστιμα για την ανέγερση και διατήρηση αυθαιρέτων, προστίμων για περιβαλλοντικές παραβάσεις, κ.ά.). Σκοπός του Ταμείου είναι «η ενίσχυση της ανάπτυξης μέσω της προστασίας του περιβάλλοντος με τη διαχειριστική, οικονομική, τεχνική και χρηματοπιστωτική υποστήριξη προγραμμάτων, μέτρων, παρεμβάσεων και ενεργειών που αποβλέπουν στην ανάδειξη και αποκατάσταση του περιβάλλοντος και την αντιμετώπιση της κλιματικής αλλαγής …».

Από το 2011, με νομοθετικές παρεμβάσεις, τα κεφάλαια που εισπράχθηκαν υπέρ του Ταμείου άρχισαν να μεταφέρονται σε άλλες κατευθύνσεις. Με τον πρόσφατο νόμο 4111/2013, το διαθέσιμο ποσό για τις δράσεις και τα λειτουργικά έξοδα του Ταμείου περιορίστηκε στο 2,5% επί του συνόλου.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Γνωρίζει το ύψος των πόρων που εισέπραξε ή «κληρονόμησε» το εν λόγω Ταμείο από το 2010 μέχρι το 2012; Μπορεί να παράσχει τα αναγκαία στοιχεία για το πού πήγαν οι πόροι του Πράσινου Ταμείου;

— Οι αποφάσεις (νόμος 4024/2011 και νόμος 4011/2013) για μεταφορά των εσόδων του Πράσινου Ταμείου για τη μείωση του ελλείμματος της γενικής κυβέρνησης ήταν σε εφαρμογή προσυμφωνημένων δράσεων που συνδέονται με την εκταμίευση δόσεων του δανείου που έλαβε η Ελλάδα από τα κράτη μέλη και το ΔΝΤ;

— Μπορεί να εξηγηθεί στους έλληνες πολίτες γιατί τους επιβάλλεται να εξακολουθούν να πληρώνουν «πράσινους» φόρους, όταν τα χρήματα αυτά μόνο σε ποσοστό 2,5% πηγαίνουν σε περιβαλλοντικές δράσεις;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(7 Μαΐου 2013)

1. Οι πόροι του Πράσινου Ταμείου προέρχονται από τρεις πηγές: από το καθεστώς των παραβάσεων χρήσης γης, την τακτοποίηση των αυθαιρέτων και τα δικαιώματα εκπομπών CO_2. Οι πρώτες δύο πηγές προέρχονται από καθεστώτα περιβαλλοντικών παραβάσεων, τα οποία επιβάλλουν πρόστιμα που εισπράττονται εν μέρει από το κράτος και εν μέρει από το ίδιο το Ταμείο, ενώ η τελευταία πηγή προέρχεται από τον «πράσινο φόρο». Σύμφωνα με συνταγματικές διατάξεις, οι πόροι του Πράσινου Ταμείου πρέπει να χρησιμοποιούνται μόνο για τη στήριξη περιβαλλοντικών έργων. Αν και η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί το συνολικό επίπεδο των δαπανών του Πράσινου Ταμείου, δεν διαθέτει λεπτομερή στοιχεία όσον αφορά τα ειδικά σχέδια που επιλέγει, διαχειρίζεται ή χρηματοδοτεί το Ταμείο.

2. Η εισαγωγή αυστηρότερου κανόνα σχετικά με τις δαπάνες του Πράσινου Ταμείου ήταν ένα εκ των μέτρων για την ενίσχυση της δημοσιονομικής πειθαρχίας και τη μείωση του δημοσιονομικού ελλείμματος κατά την περίοδο 2013-14. Από την άποψη αυτή, οι αποφάσεις για τη μεταφορά των εσόδων αποτελούσαν μέρος των όρων του προγράμματος.

3. Ο αυστηρότερος κανόνας σχετικά με τις δαπάνες, που βρίσκεται σε ισχύ έως το 2016, συνεπάγεται ότι το Πράσινο Ταμείο θα δαπανήσει μεγάλο μέρος των πόρων του για περιβαλλοντικά έργα, κυρίως μετά το 2016. Ο ρυθμός των εν λόγω δαπανών εμπίπτει στην αρμοδιότητα της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001115/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Green Fund in Greece

The 'Green Fund' in Greece was set up under Law 3889/2010 with revenue from various sources (energy distributors, excise duty on petrol, fines for the erection and maintenance of unauthorised buildings, fines for environmental infringements, etc.). The objective of the fund is to stimulate growth through protecting the environment and providing administrative, economic, technical and financial support for programmes, measures, interventions and initiatives to improve and restore the environment and combat climate change.

From 2011, a number of legislative provisions were adopted diverting Green Fund appropriations in other directions. Under recently adopted Law 4111/2013, appropriations for Green Fund initiatives and administrative expenditure were limited to 2.5% of the total.

In view of this:

— Does the Commission know what resources were received or 'inherited' by the fund between 2010 and 2012? Can it say how Green Fund appropriations were used?

— Were the decisions (Law 4024/2011 and Law 4011/2013) to transfer Green Fund appropriations for the purpose of reducing the general government deficit in force prior to the measures agreed as a condition for the disbursement of loan instalments to Greece by the Member States and IMF?

— Can Greek taxpayers be told why they must continue paying 'green' taxes, while only 2.5% of the funds are actually being used for environmental initiatives?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(7 May 2013)

1. The revenue of the Green Fund comes from three sources: the land-use violations scheme, the settlement of illegal buildings and CO_2 emissions rights. The first two sources are environment infringements schemes which impose fines collected partly by the State and partly by the Fund itself while the latter is a green tax. According to Constitutional provisions the revenues of the Green Fund have to be used for supporting environmental projects only. Although the Commission monitors the aggregate level of Green Fund expenditures, it does not have detailed information on the specific projects choosen, managed or supported by the Fund.

2. The introduction of a tighter spending rule for the Green Fund was one of the measures to strengthen fiscal discipline and reduce the fiscal deficit in 2013-14. In this respect it was part of programme conditionality.

3. The tighter spending rule in force until 2016 entails that the Green Fund will spend a large part of its revenue for environmental projects mainly after 2016. The pace of these expenditures falls under the Greek Government decision.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001116/13
an die Kommission
Nadja Hirsch (ALDE), Jorgo Chatzimarkakis (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE) und Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(1. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: Ausfuhr lebender Tiere aus der EU in Drittländer

Immer noch werden viele lebende Tiere aus der EU in Drittländer ausgeführt. Diese Transporte dauern extrem lang — bis zu mehreren Tagen. Jüngste Recherchen von NRO zu solchen Beförderungen in Drittländer zeigen, dass die Tiere auf diesen langen Strecken unermesslich leiden und dass die dort bei ihrer Schlachtung angewandten Methoden entsetzlich sind.

Bei Recherchen 2012 wurde beispielsweise aufgedeckt, dass Schafe über sechs Tage von Südspanien nach Beirut transportiert und anschließend auf einem absolut ungeeigneten Straßenfahrzeug weiterbefördert wurden. Sie wurden dann auf einen Schutthaufen entladen. Das Fahrzeug hatte keine Rampe, und mehrere Schafe fielen von ihm auf ihren Rücken. Ferner war zu sehen, wie Vieh aus Frankreich, Belgien und der Tschechischen Republik und Schafe aus Spanien in einem Schlachthof in Libanon auf grausamste Art getötet wurden. Ein bei diesen kürzlich durchgeführten Nachforschungen aufgenommenes Video ([1]) zeigt einen Fall von Tierquälerei bei der Ausfuhr in ein Drittland. Doch in vielen anderen Fällen wird über ähnliche Umstände nicht berichtet, und sie bleiben undokumentiert.

Die EU zahlt gar Ausfuhrerstattungen, wenn Schafe zum Zwecke der Zucht ausgeführt werden. Hierdurch werden Ausfuhren lebender Tiere gefördert, die häufig Transporte über große Entfernungen mit sich bringen und im Hinblick auf den Tierschutz problematisch sind. Hierbei ist zu berücksichtigen, dass selbst für die Zucht ausgeführte Tiere früher oder später im Drittland der Einfuhr geschlachtet werden — oft unter in der EU illegalen Bedingungen. 2010 wurden für mehr als 70 000 lebende Rinder solche Erstattungen gezahlt ([2]).

1. Hält es die Kommission — angesichts der wiederholt auftretenden, nachgewiesenen Fälle leidender Tiere bei der Ausfuhr in Drittländer und bei der dortigen Schlachtung — nicht für an der Zeit, keine weiteren Anreize zur Ausfuhr dieser Tiere zu schaffen und die Ausfuhrerstattungen für zur Zucht ausgeführte Rinder abzuschaffen?

2. Wie viele lebende Tiere (Rinder, Schafe und Schweine) wurden 2009, 2010, 2011 und 2012 aus Mitgliedstaaten in Drittländer ausgeführt (aufgeteilt nach ausführenden Mitgliedstaaten und Bestimmungsländern)?

3. Wie viele dieser Tiere wurden zur Schlachtung exportiert, wie viele zur Mast und wie viele zur Zucht?

Antwort von Herrn Cioloş im Namen der Kommission
(27. März 2013)

1. Entsprechend der allgemeinen Marktsituation (hohe Preise in der EU, starke weltweite Nachfrage, knappes Angebot) sind alle Ausfuhrerstattungen für Rindfleisch und für lebende Rinder (zur Zucht) ab 21. September 2012 ausgelaufen. Die Ausfuhrerstattungen für lebende Rinder zur Schlachtung waren bereits im Jahr 2005 auf null gesetzt worden. Ausfuhrerstattungen wurden nur bei Einhaltung aller einschlägigen Tierschutzvorschriften gewährt, die in der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 817/2010 der Kommission ([3]) festgelegt sind.

2. Während der betreffenden vier Jahre erhöhten sich die Ausfuhren an lebenden Rindern von 403 143 Tieren im Jahr 2009 auf 768 572 Tiere im Jahr 2012. Hauptbestimmungsländer waren die Türkei, Kroatien, Libanon, Israel und Algerien.

Bei lebenden Schafen stiegen die Ausfuhren von 225 177 Tieren im Jahr 2009 auf 1 635 546 Tiere im Jahr 2012, mit Libyen, Jordanien und der Türkei als Hauptbestimmungsländer.

Die Ausfuhren an lebenden Ziegen erhöhten sich von 2 311 Tieren im Jahr 2009 auf 11 564 Tiere im Jahr 2012, mit Jordanien, Libanon, der Türkei und Albanien als Hauptbestimmungsländer.

([1]) Zu sehen unter: http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=Fi1iJueFcR8
([2]) Arbeitspapier der Kommissionsdienststellen: „Report on the recovery of export refunds for live bovine animals in 2010“ (Bericht über die Wiedereinziehung von Ausfuhrerstattungen bei der Ausfuhr von Lebendvieh 2010), (SEK(2011)1115), S. 6.
([3]) ABl. L 245 vom 17.9.2010.

Schließlich noch gingen die Gesamtausfuhren an lebenden Schweinen zurück von 2 211 220 Tieren im Jahr 2009 auf 1 239 751 Tiere im Jahr 2012. Hauptbestimmungsländer waren Kroatien, die Ukraine und Russland.

3. Nach den betreffenden drei Kategorien aufgeschlüsselte Angaben können nur für lebende Rinder gemacht werden. Bei lebenden Schweinen, Schafen und Ziegen liegen getrennte Zahlen nur für die Ausfuhr zur Zucht vor.

Die Kommission wird den Damen und Herren Abgeordneten und an das Sekretariat des Parlaments auf direktem Wege vier Tabellen mit den unter den Fragen 2 und 3 gewünschten detaillierten Statistiken übersenden.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001116/13
alla Commissione
Nadja Hirsch (ALDE), Jorgo Chatzimarkakis (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE) e Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(1º febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Esportazione di animali vivi dall'UE verso paesi terzi

Molti animali vivi sono ancora esportati dall'UE verso paesi terzi. I tempi di trasporto sono estremamente lunghi — fino a diversi giorni. Come recenti indagini di talune ONG in relazione a siffatti trasporti verso paesi terzi dimostrano, gli animali sono esposti a sofferenze immense nel corso di questi lunghi viaggi e i metodi utilizzati per la macellazione una volta giunti a destinazione sono terribili.

Ad esempio, un'indagine condotta nel 2012 parla di una partita di pecore che è stata spedita dal sud della Spagna a Beirut, un transito di sei giorni, e poi trasferita in un veicolo stradale grossolanamente inadeguato. Le pecore sono poi state scaricate su un cumulo di macerie. Il veicolo non era dotato di rampa e diverse pecore sono cadute dal camion sulla schiena. Gli investigatori hanno anche osservato come, in un macello in Libano, bestiame proveniente da Francia, Belgio e Repubblica Ceca e le pecore dalla Spagna, venivano abbattuti nel modo più crudele. Una registrazione video realizzata durante la recente indagine documenta un caso di sofferenza degli animali durante l'esportazione verso paesi terzi ([1]), ma in molti altri casi simili circostanze non vengono segnalate e non sono documentate.

L'UE paga anche le restituzioni all'esportazione per il bestiame esportato a scopo di riproduzione. Questo meccanismo favorisce l'esportazione di animali vivi, che spesso comporta trasporti su lunghe distanze, con i relativi problemi per il benessere degli animali. Va tenuto presente che anche gli animali esportati a fini di riproduzione prima o poi saranno macellati nel paese terzo d'importazione — spesso in circostanze che sono illegali nell'Unione europea. Nel 2012, sono state pagate restituzioni per l'esportazione di oltre 70 000 animali vivi della specie bovina ([2]).

1. Alla luce delle ripetute prove della sofferenza animale durante l'esportazione verso, e la macellazione in paesi terzi, non ritiene la Commissione che sia giunto il momento di abolire il pagamento delle restituzioni all'esportazione per i bovini esportati a scopo di allevamento, onde non incoraggiare ulteriormente l'esportazione di questi animali?

2. Quanti animali vivi (bovini, ovini e suini) sono stati esportati dagli Stati membri verso paesi terzi negli anni 2009, 2010, 2011 e 2012, ripartiti per Stato membro di esportazione e paese di destinazione?

3. Quanti di questi animali sono stati inviati rispettivamente alla macellazione, all'ingrasso e alla riproduzione per l'allevamento?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(27 marzo 2013)

1. Compatibilmente con le condizioni generali del mercato (prezzi elevati nell'UE, consistente domanda mondiale, scarsità dell'offerta) tutte le restituzioni all'esportazione di carni bovine e di animali vivi della specie bovina (destinati alla riproduzione) sono state abolite a partire dal 21 settembre 2012. Le restituzioni all'esportazione di animali vivi destinati alla macellazione erano già state azzerate nel 2005. Le restituzioni all'esportazione erano subordinate al rispetto di tutte le pertinenti norme in materia di benessere animale, nella fattispecie il regolamento (UE) n. 817/2010 della Commissione ([3]).

2. Negli ultimi quattro anni le esportazioni di bovini vivi sono aumentate, passando da 403 143 capi nel 2009 a 768 572 capi nel 2012. Le destinazioni principali sono state Turchia, Croazia, Libano, Israele e Algeria.

Le esportazioni di ovini vivi sono anch'esse aumentate: da 225 177 capi nel 2009 a 1 635 546 capi nel 2012, con destinazioni principali Libia, Giordania e Turchia.

In aumento anche le esportazioni di caprini vivi: da 2 311 capi nel 2009 a 11 564 nel 2012; destinazioni principali Giordania, Libano, Turchia e Albania.

Si è registrato invece un calo nelle esportazioni di suini vivi, che sono passate da 2 211 220 capi nel 2009 a 1 239 751 capi nel 2012; destinazioni principali Croazia, Ucraina e Russia.

([1]) Disponibile su: http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=FiliJueFcR8.
([2]) Documento di lavoro del personale della Commissione, «Report on the recovery of export refunds for live bovine animals in 2012» (SEC(2011)1115), pag. 6.
([3]) GU L 245 del 17.9.2010.

3. I dati disaggregati delle esportazioni in base alle tre categorie richieste sono disponibili solo per i bovini vivi. Per quanto riguarda gli animali vivi delle specie suina, ovina e caprina sono disponibili dati separati solo per le esportazioni a scopo di riproduzione.

La Commissione ha inviato direttamente all'onorevole deputato e al Segretariato del Parlamento quattro tabelle in cui figurano le statistiche dettagliate richieste nei punti 2 e 3 dell'interrogazione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001116/13
to the Commission
Nadja Hirsch (ALDE), Jorgo Chatzimarkakis (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE) and Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Export of live animals from the EU to third countries

Many live animals are still being exported from the EU to third countries. The transport times are extremely long — up to several days. As recent NGO investigations concerning such transports to third countries show, the animals are exposed to immense suffering during these long journeys, and the methods used to slaughter them once they reach their destinations are horrendous.

For example, an investigation carried out in 2012 mentions a consignment of sheep that was shipped from southern Spain to Beirut, a transit of six days, and then transferred to a grossly inadequate road vehicle. The sheep were then offloaded onto a pile of rubble. The vehicle had no ramp and several sheep fell from the truck onto their backs. The investigators also observed how, in a slaughterhouse in Lebanon, cattle from France, Belgium and the Czech Republic, and sheep from Spain, were killed in the cruellest way. A video recording made during this recent investigation documents one instance of animal suffering during export to third countries ([1]), but in many other cases similar circumstances remain unreported and undocumented.

The EU even pays export refunds for cattle exported for breeding purposes. This mechanism encourages the export of live animals, often involving transports over long distances, with the associated animal welfare problems. It must be borne in mind that even animals exported for breeding purposes will sooner or later be slaughtered in the importing third country — often under circumstances that are illegal in the EU. In 2010, refunds were paid for the export of more than 70 000 live bovine animals ([2]).

1. In the light of the repeated evidence of animal suffering during export to, and slaughter in, third countries, does the Commission not think it is time to abolish the payment of export refunds for bovine animals exported for breeding purposes, in order not to give further encouragement to the export of these animals?

2. How many live animals (bovine, ovine and porcine) were exported from Member States to third countries in the years 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012, broken down by exporting Member State and country of destination?

3. How many of these animals were sent for slaughter, further fattening and breeding, respectively?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2013)

1. In line with general market conditions (high EU prices, important worldwide demand, shortage in supply) all export refunds for beef and live bovine animals (intended for breeding) were phased out as from the 21st of September 2012. Export refunds for live cattle intended for slaughter were already put to zero in 2005. Export refunds were only granted if all relevant animal welfare rules were respected, i.e. Commission Regulation (EU) No 817/2010 ([3]).

2. Over these four years exports of live bovine animals increased from 403 143 heads in 2009 to 768 572 heads in 2012. The main destinations were Turkey, Croatia, Lebanon, Israel, and Algeria.

For live sheep, exports grew from 225 177 heads in 2009 to 1 635 546 heads in 2012, with main destinations Libya, Jordan and Turkey.

Live goats exports increased from 2 311 heads in 2009 to 11 564 in 2012 with main destinations Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey and Albania.

Finally, total live swine exports decreased from 2 211 220 heads in 2009 to 1 239 751 heads in 2012 and main destinations were Croatia, Ukraine and Russia.

3. The differentiation for the requested three categories can only be made for live bovine animals. For the live swine, sheep and goat exports only separate figures for breeding are available.

([1]) Available at: http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=Fi1iJueFcR8.
([2]) Commission staff working paper, 'Report on the recovery of export refunds for live bovine animals in 2010' (SEC(2011)1115), p. 6.
([3]) OJ L 245, 17.9.2010.

The Commission is sending directly to the Honourable Member and to Parliament Secretariat four tables containing the detailed statistics requested under questions 2 and 3.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001117/13
à la Commission
Tokia Saïfi (PPE)
(1er février 2013)

Objet: Renforcement de la coopération et de l'intégration régionale au Maghreb: Algérie, Libye, Mauritanie, Maroc et Tunisie

La Commission et le SEAE ont adopté, le 17 décembre 2012, la communication conjointe «Soutenir le renforcement de la coopération et de l'intégration régionale au Maghreb: Algérie, Libye, Mauritanie, Maroc et Tunisie». Cette communication mentionne le «dialogue 5+5», l'Union pour la Méditerranée (UpM) et l'Union du Maghreb Arabe (UMA).

1. L'utilisation simultanée de ces structures pourrait conduire à une dérégionalisation des programmes en cours et à des double-emplois. Comment la Commission entend-elle concrètement mettre en œuvre sa stratégie?

2. La Commission peut-elle indiquer pourquoi l'UpM n'est pas mentionnée davantage dans la communication? Comment la Commission envisage-t-elle de renforcer la coordination de ses politiques avec celles de l'UpM dans les domaines économiques, migratoires, environnementaux et énergétiques?

3. La Commission peut-elle préciser l'évolution, les objectifs et les moyens d'action de l'UMA? La Commission peut-elle nous indiquer si l'UMA a déjà fixé la date de sa prochaine réunion?

La communication mentionne le développement des énergies renouvelables.

4. La Commission peut-elle indiquer sa stratégie pour atteindre son objectif alors que la région rencontre des difficultés économiques et un manque d'investissements?

5. Étant donné l'environnement économique et politique de la région, la Commission peut-elle préciser les moyens et financements qu'elle compte mettre en œuvre pour y développer les énergies renouvelables?

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001118/13
à la Commission (Vice-Présidente / Haute Représentante)
Tokia Saïfi (PPE)
(1er février 2013)

Objet: VP/HR — Renforcement de la coopération et de l'intégration régionale au Maghreb: Algérie, Libye, Mauritanie, Maroc et Tunisie

La Commission et le SEAE ont adopté, le 17 décembre 2012, la communication conjointe «Soutenir le renforcement de la coopération et de l'intégration régionale au Maghreb: Algérie, Libye, Mauritanie, Maroc et Tunisie». Cette communication mentionne le «dialogue 5+5», l'Union pour la Méditerranée (UpM) et l'Union du Maghreb Arabe (UMA).

1. L'utilisation simultanée de ces structures pourrait conduire à une dérégionalisation des programmes en cours et à des double-emplois. Comment la Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante entend-elle concrètement mettre en œuvre sa stratégie?

2. La Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante peut-elle indiquer pourquoi l'UpM n'est pas mentionnée davantage dans la communication? Comment la Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante envisage-t-elle de renforcer la coordination de ses politiques avec celles de l'UpM dans les domaines économiques, migratoires, environnementaux et énergétiques?

3. La Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante peut-elle préciser l'évolution, les objectifs et les moyens d'action de l'UMA. La Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante peut-elle nous indiquer si l'UMA a déjà fixé la date de sa prochaine réunion?

La communication de décembre 2012 ne mentionne que très peu la Stratégie pour la sécurité et le développement au Sahel, adoptée par le SEAE le 23 juillet 2011.

4. La Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante peut-elle indiquer si un document viendra compléter cette partie de la communication?

5. Comment la Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante entend-elle appliquer concrètement la stratégie aux domaines de la protection civile, du terrorisme et de la criminalité organisée dans la région du Maghreb?

La communication mentionne le développement des énergies renouvelables.

6. La Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante peut-elle indiquer sa stratégie pour atteindre son objectif alors que la région rencontre des difficultés économiques et un manque d'investissements?

7. Étant donné l'environnement économique et politique de la région, la Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante peut-elle préciser les moyens et financements qu'elle compte mettre en œuvre pour y développer les énergies renouvelables?

Réponse commune donnée par M. Füle au nom de la Commission
(21 mars 2013)

1. Chacune des initiatives mentionnées possède son propre cadre et ses propres objectifs et la communication conjointe vise précisément à assurer la cohérence et l'utilisation rationnelle des ressources. Un dialogue étroit est prévu avec l'Union du Maghreb arabe (UMA) dans le cadre du «dialogue 5 + 5» afin d'assurer la cohérence.

2. La communication présente des idées concrètes pour renforcer la coopération entre les pays du Maghreb et l'UE. L'Union pour la Méditerranée (UpM) est un instrument important pour atteindre une partie des objectifs mentionnés dans la communication grâce aux initiatives de coopération qu'elle peut promouvoir et financer.

3. La Commission suggère à l'Honorable Parlementaire de s'adresser au secrétariat de l'UMA à Rabat, qui est mieux placé pour répondre à cette question.

4. La communication mentionne explicitement les défis liés à la sécurité dans la région et fait expressément référence à la stratégie. Elle propose également plusieurs mesures concrètes. Aucun nouveau document n'est prévu à ce stade.

5. Les pays du Maghreb ont été consultés sur les principaux points de la communication au cours du processus de rédaction. La Commission prévoit d'entamer un dialogue avec chaque pays de la région concernant la mise en œuvre de la communication afin d'identifier les mesures concrètes à prendre.

6. Les pays de la région disposent de stratégies ambitieuses et crédibles en matière de développement des énergies renouvelables. L'UE facilite la mise en œuvre de ces stratégies en appuyant les réformes nécessaires des cadres législatif et réglementaire et en cofinançant les projets d'investissement pertinents.

7. Les réformes des cadres réglementaire et législatif sont soutenues financièrement grâce à des programmes d'appui aux réformes, des projets d'assistance technique et des jumelages. La Facilité d'investissement en faveur de la politique de voisinage (FIPV) est l'instrument de financement approprié pour soutenir les projets d'investissement.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001117/13
to the Commission
Tokia Saïfi (PPE)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Closer cooperation and regional integration in the Maghreb: Algeria, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco and Tunisia

On 17 December 2012, the Commission and the EEAS adopted the Joint Communication 'Supporting closer cooperation and regional integration in the Maghreb: Algeria, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco and Tunisia'. This communication makes reference to the '5+5' dialogue, the Union for the Mediterranean (UfM) and the Arab Maghreb Union (AMU).

1. The simultaneous use of these structures could lead to deregionalisation of the programmes underway and to duplications. How does the Commission intend to implement its strategy in concrete terms?

2. Can the Commission explain why the UfM is not mentioned more in the communication? How does the Commission plan to strengthen the coordination of its policies with those of the UfM in the areas of economy, migration, environment and energy?

3. Can the Commission describe the development, objectives and means of action of the AMU? Can the Commission tell us whether the AMU has already set the date for its next meeting?

The communication mentions the development of renewable energies.

4. Can the Commission explain its strategy for achieving its goal when the region faces economic difficulties and a lack of investment?

5. Given the economic and political environment of the region, can the Commission state what means and financing it intends to apply for developing renewable energies there?

Question for written answer E-001118/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Tokia Saïfi (PPE)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Closer cooperation and regional integration in the Maghreb: Algeria, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco and Tunisia

On 17 December 2012, the Commission and the EEAS adopted the Joint Communication 'Supporting closer cooperation and regional integration in the Maghreb: Algeria, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco and Tunisia'. This communication makes reference to the '5+5' dialogue, the Union for the Mediterranean (UfM) and the Arab Maghreb Union (AMU).

1. The simultaneous use of these structures could lead to deregionalisation of the programmes underway and to duplications. How does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to implement her strategy in concrete terms?

2. Can the Vice-President/High Representative explain why the UfM is not mentioned more in the communication? How does the Vice-President/High Representative plan to strengthen the coordination of her policies with those of the UfM in the areas of economy, migration, environment and energy?

3. Can the Vice-President/High Representative describe the development, objectives and means of action of the AMU? Can the Vice-President/High Representative tell us whether the AMU has already set the date for its next meeting?

The December 2012 Communication makes very little mention of the strategy for Security and Development in the Sahel, adopted by the EEAS on 23 July 2011.

4. Can the Vice-President/High Representative indicate whether a document will be added to this part of the communication?

5. How does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to apply the strategy in concrete terms to the areas of civil protection, terrorism and organised crime in the Maghreb region?

The communication mentions the development of renewable energies.

6. Can the Vice-President/High Representative explain her strategy for achieving her goal when the region faces economic difficulties and a lack of investment?

7. Given the economic and political environment of the region, can the Vice-President/High Representative state what means and financing she intends to apply for developing renewable energies there?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(21 March 2013)

1. Each of the mentioned initiatives has its own framework and objectives and the joint Communication aims precisely at facilitating coherence and rational use of resources. A close dialogue is planned with AMU and 5+5 to ensure coherence.

2. The communication is about concrete ideas to strengthen cooperation among the Maghreb countries and the EU. The UfM is an important instrument to reach part of the objectives mentioned in the communication thanks to the cooperation initiatives that it can promote and fund.

3. It is suggested to the Honourable Member that the AMU Secretariat in Rabat is best placed to answer this question.

4. The communication mentions explicitly the security challenges in the region and makes express reference to the strategy. It also suggests several concrete actions. No further document is planned at this stage.

5. The Maghreb countries were consulted on the main lines of the communication during the drafting process. The Commission plans to start a dialogue with each country of the region on the implementation of the communication to identify concrete actions.

6. The countries in the region have ambitious and credible strategies for developing renewable energy. The EU facilitates the implementation of these strategies by supporting the necessary reforms of the regulatory and legislative framework and by co-funding relevant investment projects.

7. Reforms of the regulatory and legislative framework are financially supported through reform support programmes, technical assistance projects and twinnings. The Neighbourhood Investment Facility (NIF) is the appropriate financing instrument to support investment projects.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001119/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Barbara Matera (PPE)
(1º febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Uguaglianza di genere e diritti della donna in Tunisia

In Tunisia il 71 % delle donne è istruito, un quinto del totale ha un impiego e quasi la metà dei membri dei sindacati del lavoro sono donne. Inoltre, le donne hanno giocato un ruolo chiave durante la Primavera araba. Questa situazione ha ricevuto l'appellativo di «paradosso democratico», poiché le donne, pur essendo soggetti attivi dei processi rivoluzionari, sono messe ai margini della società quando si tratta dei processi decisionali. Le donne, rappresentano un elemento chiave in questa transizione democratica.

Nonostante le donne abbiano avuto un ruolo importante durante le Primavera araba, la rivolta non ha avuto gli effetti sperati. In Tunisia, la nuova Assemblea costituente, nel redigere la nuova costituzione provvisoria, ha inserito nell'articolo. 28 quanto segue: «Lo stato assicura la protezione dei diritti della donna, sotto il principio della complementarità con l'uomo in seno alla famiglia, e in qualità di associata all'uomo nello sviluppo della patria». Il suddetto articolo è in contraddizione con l'articolo. 22, in cui si legge che «i cittadini sono uguali per quanto concerne diritti e libertà davanti alla legge senza discriminazione di sorta». Con il verbo «proteggere» la donna rappresenta il sesso debole, necessitando quindi la protezione dell'uomo. Molto spesso la protezione viene mal interpretata tanto da sfociare in delitto poiché, tenendo conto dell'opinione pubblica, l'uomo non è stato in grado di controllarla, perdendo così egli stesso il proprio onore. Inoltre, la nozione di «complementarità» è spesso intesa come un modo per sottomettere la donna all'altro sesso; infatti, negli ultimi tempi, in Tunisia è aumentato il numero delle donne che subiscono violenza, anche solo per il semplice fatto di uscire in pubblico senza velo.

In questo contesto, malgrado gli sforzi fatti, la figura della donna ha subito una forte regressione per quanto riguarda l'uguaglianza di genere.

Pertanto si chiede alla Vice-Presidente/Alto Rappresentante:

1. L'UE può far pressione per esortare i membri dell'Assemblea nazionale costituente a ritirare la proposta in nome del principio di uguaglianza tra uomo e donna, rendendo «incostituzionale» l'inferiorità della donna nei confronti dell'uomo?

2. La Delegazione dell'UE in Tunisia sta monitorando attentamente gli sviluppi negativi della condizione delle donne in Tunisia?

3. L'UE intende adottare sanzioni economiche e commerciali nei confronti della Tunisia qualora non vi sia garanzia di piena uguaglianza di genere nella nuova Costituzione?

Risposta dell'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(20 marzo 2013)

1. L'UE sta seguendo da vicino l'elaborazione della nuova Costituzione. Nell'ambito del dialogo politico, e nel pieno rispetto della sovranità tunisina, sono stati avviati numerosi contatti e sono state intraprese azioni discrete per esprimere alle autorità e alle varie forze politiche il punto di vista dell'Unione europea su alcuni aspetti del progetto di testo che hanno sollevato preoccupazioni, anche per quanto riguarda l'uguaglianza di genere.

2. La delegazione sta monitorando gli sviluppi della situazione in Tunisia, anche sulla questione menzionata nell'interrogazione in oggetto. Oltre al dialogo politico, per sostenere la transizione democratica, inclusa la promozione dei diritti delle donne, l'UE usa anche strumenti finanziari.

3. L'Unione europea è impegnata appieno nel sostegno alla transizione tunisina. In tale contesto, la questione delle sanzioni non è attualmente oggetto di discussione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001119/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Barbara Matera (PPE)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Gender equality and women's rights in Tunisia

In Tunisia, 71% of women are educated, one fifth are employed and almost one half of trade union members are women. Moreover, women played a key role during the Arab Spring. This situation has been referred to as the 'democratic paradox' since, although women were active participants in the revolutionary processes, they have been relegated to the sidelines of society when decision-making processes are at stake. Women are a key element in this democratic transition.

Although women played an important role during the Arab Spring, the revolt did not have the desired effects. When drafting the new provisional constitution, the new Constituent Assembly in Tunisia inserted the following clause into Article 28: 'The state shall ensure protection for the rights of women, in accordance with the principle of complementarity with men within the family, and as men's partners in the development of the nation'. The aforementioned Article contradicts Article 22, which provides that 'all citizens are equal in rights and freedoms before the law, without discrimination of any kind'. The verb 'protect' depicts women as the weaker sex, who therefore need to be protected by men. Very often, protection is misinterpreted to the point where an offence is committed, when a man, being conscious of public opinion, has not been able to control a woman, and has thus himself lost his honour. Moreover, the concept of 'complementarity' is often understood as a way of making women subservient to the opposite sex; in fact, in recent years, the number of women who have suffered violence in Tunisia, in some cases simply because they have gone out in public without a veil, has increased.

Therefore, despite the efforts made, women have suffered a serious setback as regards their equal status in society.

Can the Vice-President/High Representative therefore say:

1. whether the EU can exert pressure in order to encourage the members of the National Constituent Assembly to withdraw the proposal in the name of the principle of equality between men and women and conclude that women's subservience to men is 'unconstitutional';

2. whether the EU Delegation in Tunisia is closely monitoring negative developments in the situation of women in Tunisia;

3. whether the EU intends to impose economic and trade sanctions against Tunisia if there is no guarantee of full gender equality in the new Constitution?

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

1. The EU is following closely the drafting of the new Constitution. In the framework of our poltical dialogue, and in full respect of Tunisian sovereignety, numerous contacts and discrete demarches have taken place to express to the authorities and to the different poltical forces the EU point of view on some aspects of the draft text which have raised concern, including on the issue of gender equality.

2. The Delegation is monitoring the development of the situation in Tunisia, including on the issue mentioned by this question. In addition to political dialogue, EU financial instruments are also used to support the democratic transition, including the promotion of women rights.

3. The EU is fully engaged in the support to the Tunisian transition. In this context, the question of sanctions is currently not under discussion.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-001120/13
a Bizottság számára
Mészáros Alajos (PPE) és Bagó Zoltán (PPE)
(2013. február 1.)

Tárgy: Anyakönyvi igazgatással kapcsolatos rendelkezések

A Bizottság E-007049/2012 kérdésünkre adott válaszában – anyakönyvek kiállításával kapcsolatban – kifejtette, hogy „nem áll módjában annak értékelése, hogy a kibocsátás jelentős hátránynak minősül-e". A Bizottság indoklásában hivatkozott az Európai Unió Bíróságának gyakorlatára, miszerint az „illetékes nemzeti bíróság feladata a hátrány súlyosságának értékelése, az adott eset egyedi körülményeinek figyelembe vételével".

Álláspontunk szerint, ha az Európai Unió Bizottságához – az eljárási szabályzat 117. cikke értelmében – egy európai parlamenti képviselő kérdést intéz egyes tagállami rendelkezések uniós joggal való összeegyezethetőségével kapcsolatban, akkor arra nem vonatkoznak az előzetes döntéshozatali eljárás „kötöttségei" ([1]), többek között az, hogy az Európai Unió Bíróságának csak valós jogvita esetén van hatásköre. Az előzetes döntéshozatali eljárás „kötöttségeitől" eltekintve, egy tagállami jogszabály – vagy állandó közigazgatási gyakorlat – abban az esetben is sértheti az uniós jogot, ha az nincs összhangban az Európai Unió Bíróságának gyakorlatával. Az uniós jog sértésére nem adhat igazolást, hogy egy tagállam a gyakorlatban nem alkalmaz bizonyos, uniós joggal nem összeegyeztethető jogszabályokat.

A Bíróság gyakorlata alapján nehezen képzelhető el, hogy határokon átnyúló viszonylatban ne okozzon személyes, vagy szakmai hátrányt ([2]), ha a szülő és nagyszülő más néven van anyakönyvezve, és ezzel a köztük lévő kapcsolat bizonyítása nehézségekbe ütközik. Érvelésünkre további indokot adhat ([3]), hogy a kérdéses szabályozás értelmében a gyermek születési anyakönyvi kivonatán szüleinek neve csakis a gyermek születésének idején ismert formában állítható ki, a később történt kisebbségi nyelvi szabályok szerinti változtatásokat a hatóságok nem vezetik át ([4]) az anyakönyvi okmányokra.

Kérdezzük a Bizottságot, hogy jogi vagy politikai kritériumok alapján tartja úgy, hogy nem áll módjában annak értékelése, hogy jelentős hátránynak minősül-e a kibocsátás megtagadása, valamint változott-e az álláspontja az új körülmények bemutatásával? Amennyiben a Bizottság jogi kritériumok alapján tartja úgy, hogy nem áll módjában választ adni a kérdésre, mivel indokolható, hogy a Bíróság gyakorlatában az életkoron alapuló hátrányos megkülönböztetés ([5]) területén is előfordul, hogy a nemzeti bíróság hatáskörébe „utalja" bizonyos, egyedi mérlegelést igénylő kérdések eldöntését, ugyanakkor ennek ellenére a Bizottság az adott ügyben Magyarország ellen kötelezettségszegési eljárást indított, és ezt – tudomásunk szerint – tisztán jogi kérdésnek tartotta?

Viviane Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. április 17.)

Amint a Bizottság az írásbeli kérdésre adott, E-7049/2012 számú válaszában ismertette, a kérelmezett nevet tartalmazó anyakönyv kiállításának elutasítása akkor minősül az EUMSZ 21. cikke által elismert szabadságok korlátozásának, ha alkalmas arra, hogy „az érintettek számára jelentős adminisztratív, szakmai vagy magánjellegű hátrányt" okozzon ([6]).

A Bíróság hangsúlyozta, hogy a hatáskörrel rendelkező nemzeti bíróság feladata értékelni az EUMSZ 21. cikke által elismert szabadságok korlátozását jelentő jelentős hátrány fennállását, a korlátozás objektív indokait és arányosságát ([7]). A korlátozás tényleges hatását és lehetséges indokait csak eseti alapon, valamennyi releváns tény és bizonyíték alapos elemzését követően lehet értékelni. Az említett információkhoz hozzáféréssel rendelkező nemzeti bíróságok különösen alkalmasak e feladat elvégzésére.

A Bizottság nincs abban a helyzetben, hogy megítélhesse, a tisztelt Képviselő Urak által leírt konkrét helyzetben teljesülnek-e a Bíróság által meghatározott követelmények.

([1]) Az előzetes döntéshozatali eljárás egy alá-fölérendeltséget nélkülöző, kooperációs mechanizmusként értelmezhető. E korlátok azonban nem akadályozzák az uniós jog érvényesülését, amelynek monopóliumával a Bíróság rendelkezik.
([2]) Határokon átnyúló viszonylatban a család egységének biztosítása, vagy határokon átnyúló örökségek, szerzői jogok viszonylatában.
([3]) Vyhlaska 320/1994 Ministerstva vnútra Slovenskej republiky 25 § (2).
([4]) A Bizottság is elismerte annak fontosságát (E-008365/2011), hogy az uniós jog védje a szabad mozgáshoz és tartózkodáshoz való jogukkal élő polgárokat, hogy azok ne kerüljenek hátrányosabb helyzetbe amiatt, hogy nevük nem azonos formában van bejegyezve.
([5]) Bíróság, C-250/09.
([6]) C–391/09. sz. ítélet 76. pontja.
([7]) C–391/09. sz. ítélet 77., 78., 83., 91. pontja.

A C-286/12. sz. ügy ([8]) körülményei nem hasonlíthatók össze a C-391/09. sz. ügy körülményeivel. Az előbbi tárgya egy olyan, a nyugdíjkorhatár csökkentésére irányuló jogszabály, amely azonos következményekkel jár a hatálya alá tartozó összes személyre nézve. Ezzel szemben az, hogy a kérelmezett nevet tartalmazó anyakönyv kiállításának elutasítása (mint a C-391/09. sz. ügyben) hátrányt okoz-e az egyedi uniós polgár számára, valamint hogy az esetleges hátrány jelentősnek minősül-e, az érintett uniós polgár sajátos helyzetétől függ, és egyedi tényeken alapuló értékelést tesz szükségessé.

([8]) 2012. november 6-i ítélet.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001120/13
to the Commission
Alajos Mészáros (PPE) and Zoltán Bagó (PPE)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Provisions concerning the administration of civil registry documents

In its reply to our Question E-007049/2012 concerning the way in which civil registry documents are made out, the Commission stated that 'the Commission is not in a position to assess whether the refusal at issue gives rise to … serious inconvenience'. In its arguments, the Commission referred to the case-law of the Court of Justice of the EU, under which 'it would be up to the competent national court to evaluate the seriousness of the inconvenience taking into account the particular circumstances of the case'.

We believe that, if a Member of the European Parliament tables a question to the Commission of the European Union pursuant to Rule 117 of the Rules of Procedure concerning the compatibility of the provisions in force in an individual Member State with European Union law, the 'restrictions' of the preliminary ruling procedure do not apply ([1]), including the limitation that the Court of Justice only has powers in relation to actual legal proceedings. Irrespective of the 'restrictions' of the preliminary ruling procedure, a legal provision of a Member State — or its consistent administrative practice — may also breach Union law if it does not accord with the case-law of the Court of Justice. A breach of Union law cannot be justified by the fact that a Member State does not in practice apply particular legal provisions which are incompatible with Union law.

On the basis of the case-law of the Court of Justice, it is difficult to imagine that no personal harm or material damage would be caused in a cross-border situation ([2]) if a parent and a grandparent were entered in the civil registry under different names, thus making it difficult to ascertain their relationship. Our assessment may be further borne out by the fact ([3]) that, under the legislation in question, an extract from the civil registry concerning the birth of a child indicates the parents' names only in the form which was recognised at the time of the child's birth, while the authorities do not transfer to civil registry documents any changes made subsequently under legislation on minority languages ([4]).

We wish to ask the Commission whether it is on the basis of legal or political criteria that it does not consider itself to be in a position to assess whether the refusal gives rise to serious inconvenience, and whether its view has changed under the new circumstances. If the Commission considers on the basis of legal criteria that it is unable to answer the question, how can it be justified that in the case-law of the Court of Justice, with regard to damaging discrimination on grounds of age ([5]), it also occurs that the Court 'refers' certain issues requiring individual assessment to the national court for a decision; at the same time, despite this, the Commission, in the case at issue, brought infringement proceedings against Hungary and — as far as we are aware — regarded this as a purely legal issue?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(17 April 2013)

As the Commission stated in its answer to Written Question E-7049/2012, in order to constitute a restriction on the freedoms recognised by Article 21 TFEU, the refusal to issue civil status documents with the name in a requested form 'must be liable to cause "serious inconvenience" to those concerned at administrative, professional and private levels' ([6]).

The Court of Justice stressed that it is for the competent national court to assess the existence of a serious inconvenience amounting to a restriction on the freedoms recognised by Article 21 TFEU, of the objective grounds justifying such restriction, as well as its proportionality ([7]). The actual impact of the restriction and its possible justification can only be assessed on a case-by-case basis, after having thoroughly analysed all the relevant facts and the evidence. National courts, having access to this information, are particularly well equipped to carry out this task.

The Commission is not in a position to assess whether the specific situation described by the Honourable Member fulfils the criteria set by the Court of Justice.

([1]) The preliminary ruling procedure should be seen as a cooperative procedure not entailing a relationship of subordination. However, these limitations do not prevent the enforcement of Union law, on which the Court of Justice has a monopoly.
([2]) In cross-border situations, ensuring the unity of the family, or cross-border inheritances, in relation to copyright.
([3]) Vyhlaska 320/1994 Ministerstva vnútra Slovenskej republiky 25 § (2).
([4]) The Commission likewise (E-008365/2011) acknowledged that it was important for Union law to protect citizens exercising their rights to freedom of movement and residence, to ensure that they did not suffer because their names were not registered in the same form.
([5]) Court of Justice, C-250/09.
([6]) C-391/09 par. 76.
([7]) C-391/09 pars. 77, 78, 83, 91.

As regards Case C-286/12 ([8]), the circumstances are not comparable to those of Case C-391/09. The former case concerns a legal rule providing for the lowering of a retirement age with similar effects for all persons within its scope. By contrast, whether the refusal to issue a civil status document with the name in the requested form, at issue in Case C-391/09, results or not in an inconvenience for an individual EU citizen and whether such inconvenience, if found, is serious depends on his/her specific situation and calls for an individual fact-based assessment.

([8]) Judgment of 6 November 2012.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-001121/13
à la Commission
Jean-Jacob Bicep (Verts/ALE)
(1er février 2013)

Objet: Définition de l'autorité locale compétente, modification du règlement (CE) nº 1370/2007

Dans le cadre du quatrième paquet ferroviaire, la Commission a publié une proposition de règlement modifiant le règlement (CE) n° 1370/2007 en ce qui concerne l'ouverture du marché des services nationaux de transport de voyageurs par chemin de fer.

L'article premier du règlement propose une modification de l'article 2, point c), du règlement (CE) nº 1370/2007 en ce qui concerne la définition de l'autorité locale compétente précisant désormais qu'il s'agit de «toute autorité compétente dont la zone géographique de compétence n'est pas nationale et qui couvre les besoins en transport d'une agglomération urbaine ou d'une localité rurale».

Cette modification pose des questions concernant les aires urbaines larges telles que l'Île-de-France, au sein de laquelle l'autorité organisatrice des transports a de fait sous sa responsabilité la gestion des RER (réseau express régional), qui sont des trains régionaux, et dont l'inter-modalité est garantie dans toute l'aire de compétence afin d'assurer la cohésion de l'ensemble du territoire concerné.

La Commission peut-elle fournir une clarification juridique concernant les implications légales du nouvel article 2, point c), concernant les trains régionaux dans le cas où ils remplissent une mission de service public à la fois au sein d'une agglomération urbaine et d'un point de vue interurbain?

Réponse donnée par M. Kallas au nom de la Commission
(22 février 2013)

Tel qu'il figure dans la proposition de modification du règlement (CE) nº 1370/2007 ([1]) présentée par la Commission dans le cadre du 4e paquet ferroviaire, le projet de définition modifiée du terme «autorité locale compétente» auquel l'Honorable Parlementaire fait référence englobe la responsabilité des activités de transport public qui couvrent les besoins d'une agglomération urbaine ou d'une localité rurale. Cette définition inclurait la responsabilité des services de transport ferroviaire à l'intérieur d'une agglomération urbaine ou dans une localité rurale, ainsi que les services de transport reliant cette agglomération urbaine ou cette localité rurale à d'autres zones urbaines ou rurales voisines.

([1]) COM(2013)28 du 30.01.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001121/13
to the Commission
Jean-Jacob Bicep (Verts/ALE)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Definition of 'competent local authority' — amendment of Regulation (EC) No 1370/2007

As part of the Fourth Railway Package, the Commission has published a proposal for a regulation amending Regulation (EC) No 1370/2007 concerning the opening of the market for domestic passenger transport services by rail.

Article 1 of the proposal amends the definition of 'competent local authority' in Article 2(c) of Regulation (EC) No 1370/2007 to mean 'any competent authority whose geographical area of competence is not national and which covers the transport needs of an urban agglomeration or a rural district'.

This change raises questions about large urban areas such as Île-de-France, in which the transport authority is in effect responsible for managing RER regional express trains, which must be inter-modal throughout the area for which the authority is responsible so as to ensure consistency throughout the area concerned.

Can the Commission provide legal clarification on the legal implications of the new Article 2(c) with regard to regional trains that are providing a public service both within one urban agglomeration and between that agglomeration and other urban areas?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(22 February 2013)

The draft amended definition of 'competent local authority' that the honorable member quotes from the Commisson's proposal for an amendment of Regulation 1370/2007 ([1]) in the framework of the 4th railway package covers responsibility for public transport operations that serve the needs of an urban agglomeration or a rural district. This definition would include responsibility for rail transport services within an urban agglomeration or within a rural district as well as such transport services linking this urban agglomeration or rural district with other neigbouring urban/rural areas.

([1]) COM(2013) 28 of 30 January 2013.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-001122/13
do Komisji
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(1 lutego 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wstrzymanie wypłat funduszy na rozbudowę dróg w Polsce

W związku z informacjami o wstrzymaniu przez Komisję wypłaty 3,5 miliarda zł na prace przy rozbudowie drogi ekspresowej Jeżewo-Białystok, przystosowaniu do parametrów drogi ekspresowej drogi krajowej nr 8 (odcinek Piotrków Trybunalski-Rawa Mazowiecka), jak również odcinka Radymno-Korczowa autostrady A4, a także doniesieniami o możliwym wstrzymaniu dalszych środków przeznaczonych na budowę dróg w Polsce, proszę o odpowiedź na poniższe pytania:

1. Jakie w ocenie Komisji jest rzeczywiste prawdopodobieństwo wstrzymania kolejnych kwot (szacowanych na ok. 4 mld euro) przeznaczonych na budowę dróg w Polsce?

2. Na czym polegać ma zalecone przez Komisję sprawdzenie przez Polskę systemów zarządzania i kontroli unijnych projektów oraz w jakim terminie ma ono zostać dokonane?

3. Czy kroki w przedmiotowej kwestii podjęte do tej pory przez polską stronę Komisja uznała za niewystarczające?

4. Czy przed wstrzymaniem wypłat strona polska została szczegółowo poinformowana przez Komisję o działaniach, jakie powinna podjąć w celu uniknięcia zaistniałej sytuacji?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Johannesa Hahna w imieniu Komisji
(28 lutego 2013 r.)

1. Kwota 4 mld EUR to pozostałe fundusze przydzielone na projekty dotyczące rozbudowy dróg. Obecnie wstrzymano płatności w wysokości około 900 mln EUR. Polska nie utraci środków finansowych pod warunkiem, że podejmie wszelkie działania naprawcze wymagane przez Komisję. Ponadto, gdyby Polska wycofała nierozliczone wnioski o płatności dotyczące dwóch programów i po usunięciu problematycznych pozycji wydatków na drogi ponownie je przesłała, możliwe byłoby niezwłoczne wypłacenie około 500 mln EUR.

2. Oczekuje się, iż instytucja zarządzająca oszacuje zakres problemu w celu określenia innych potencjalnych przypadków, których on dotyczy oraz stworzy odpowiednie zabezpieczenia, które zminimalizują ryzyko pojawienia się podobnych przypadków w przyszłości. Dla tych działań nie wyznaczono konkretnego terminu.

3. Nie, kroki podjęte dotychczas przez polskie władze nie są wystarczające i w związku z tym Komisja oczekuje na dalsze informacje.

4. Wszystkie państwa członkowskie mają obowiązek realizacji swoich programów zgodnie z zasadami należytego i skutecznego zarządzania finansami. Krajowe organy kontrolne powinny nadzorować realizację programów zgodnie z tą zasadą. W przypadkach, w których Komisja ma wątpliwości odnośnie do realizacji programu, ma prawo (i obowiązek) dokonania bardziej szczegółowej kontroli i może wstrzymać płatności dla danego programu. Wstrzymanie płatności nie powinno być postrzegane jako „zamrożenie budżetu", ale jako „przerwa", w trakcie której państwo członkowskie ma możliwość przekazania dodatkowych wyjaśnień i informacji.

W tym konkretnym przypadku, w celu ochrony pieniędzy unijnych podatników Komisja wstrzymała płatności niezwłocznie po wykryciu problemów z określonymi wydatkami na rozbudowę dróg w Polsce. W piśmie dotyczącym wstrzymania płatności Komisja przedstawiła szczegółowe kroki, które Polska powinna podjąć.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001122/13
to the Commission
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Freezing of funds for the development of roads in Poland

In light of the Commission's freezing of the payment of PLN 3.5 billion to develop the Jeżewo-Białystok express road and to bring the Piotrków Trybunalski-Rawa Mazowiecka stretch of National Road No 8 and the Radymno-Korczowa stretch of the A4 motorway into line with standards for express roads, and given the reports on the possible withholding of additional funds earmarked for the construction of roads in Poland, I should like to put the following questions:

1. What, in the Commission's view, is the likelihood of additional sums (estimated at approximately EUR 4 billion) earmarked for road construction in Poland being frozen?

2. What should the audit that the Commission called on Poland to undertake on its management and control systems for EU projects entail, and within what time frame should it be completed?

3. Does the Commission consider the steps taken thus far by Poland in this matter to be insufficient?

4. Prior to the freezing of funds, did the Commission provide Poland with detailedinformation on the steps it should take to prevent the funds from being frozen?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(28 February 2013)

1. The amount of EUR 4 billion refers to the remaining allocations for road construction projects. Currently about EUR 900 million is interrupted. Provided that Poland undertakes all remedial actions requested by the Commission, there will be no loss of money. Furthermore, if Poland were to withdraw the currently pending payment claims for the two programmes, and resubmit them with the problematic roads expenditure removed, then around EUR 500 million could be paid immediately.

2. The managing authority is expected to estimate the scope of the problem, to identify other potential cases affected and to create adequate safeguards which will minimise the risk of such cases occurring in the future. There is no specific deadline for these actions.

3. No, the steps undertaken by the Polish authorities are not sufficient thus far, and the Commission is therefore waiting for more information.

4. All Member States have to implement their programmes in line with the principles of sound and efficient financial management. The national audit authorities should check the implementation of their programmes in line with this principle. In cases where the Commission has doubts about programme implementation, it has the right (and duty) to check in further detail and can interrupt payments to a programme. This interruption should not be seen as 'freezing the budget' but as a 'time out' where the Member State is given the chance to give further explanations and information.

In this particular case, as soon as the Commission discovered the problems with the specific expenditure on roads in Poland, it interrupted payments immediately in order to safeguard EU taxpayers' money. In the interruption letter, the Commission set out the detailed steps to be taken.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-001123/13
till kommissionen
Mikael Gustafsson (GUE/NGL)
(1 februari 2013)

Angående: Tvångsarbete för barn i Uzbekistan

Den 15 december 2011 antog Europaparlamentet en resolution om utvidgning av bestämmelserna i EU:s partnerskaps och samarbetsavtal med Uzbekistan. I resolutionen påpekas bland annat den allvarliga situationen vad gäller de mänskliga rättigheterna i Uzbekistan.

Resolutionen betonar särskilt, i 14 specifika punkter, vikten av kraftfulla åtgärder mot användningen av tvångsarbete för barn i Uzbekistan. Resolutionen understryker att Europaparlamentet ”inte kommer att ge sitt godkännande förrän ILO-observatörer getts tillstånd av de uzbekistanska myndigheterna att göra en noggrann granskning utan att hindras, och har bekräftat att konkreta reformer har genomförts och gett påtagliga resultat på ett sådant sätt att praxis med tvångsarbete för barn och annat tvångsarbete i praktiken är på väg att avskaffas på nationell, regional och lokal nivå.”

Jag skulle vilja veta vilka åtgärder kommissionen vidtagit för att följa upp denna resolution, och hur den uzbekistanska regeringen har reagerat på dessa åtgärder?

Svar från den höga representanten/kommissionens vice ordförande Catherine Ashton på kommissionens vägnar
(16 april 2013)

EU tar regelbundet upp frågor om mänskliga rättigheter och barnarbete med Uzbekistan, bland annat i samband med mitt besök i Uzbekistan i november 2012.

När det gäller de frågor parlamentet berör, anordnades ett seminarium om tillämpningen av Internationella arbetsorganisationens konventioner i Tashkent i maj 2012, där både ILO och EU deltog aktivt. Även om de internationella organisationerna har framhållit att märkbart färre barn (under 16 år) deltog i bomullsskörden 2012, fortsätter EU att verka för att samarbetet mellan Uzbekistan och ILO ska återupptas.

Vi vill framhålla att det allmänna preferenssystemet är ett verktyg som bygger på incitament och att preferensbehandlingen tillfälligt kan dras in på grund av allvarliga och systematiska överträdelser av ILO:s centrala arbetsrättsliga konventioner.

EU försöker även utveckla samarbetet med Uzbekistan. Ett program för landsbygdsutveckling värt 10 miljoner euro antogs i mitten av 2012, för att främja diversifieringen på landsbygden och minska landets beroende av ensidig bomullsodling. EU fortsätter sina diplomatiska insatser i förhållande till Uzbekistan och sin samverkan med internationella organisationer, eftersom det krävs ett helhetsgrepp för att effektivt motverka barnarbete.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001123/13
to the Commission
Mikael Gustafsson (GUE/NGL)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Forced child labour in Uzbekistan

On 15 December 2011, the European Parliament adopted a resolution on extending the provisions of the EU's Partnership and Cooperation Agreement with Uzbekistan. The resolution highlighted among other things the serious human rights situation in Uzbekistan.

In particular, in 14 specific points, the resolution stresses the importance of strong measures to combat forced child labour in Uzbekistan. It states that Parliament 'will only consider the consent if the ILO observers have been granted access by the Uzbek authorities to undertake close and unhindered monitoring and have confirmed that concrete reforms have been implemented and yielded substantial results in such a way that the practice of forced labour and child labour is effectively in the process of being eradicated at national, viloyat [regional] and local level'.

What measures has the Commission taken to follow up this resolution, and how has the Uzbek Government reacted to these measures?

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

The EU regularly raises with Uzbekistan the issues referring to human rights and child labour, including on the occasion of the HR/VP's visit to Uzbekistan in November 2012.

To address the concerns expressed by Parliament, a seminar on the implementation of the International Labour Organisation (ILO) conventions was convened in Tashkent in May 2012, in which both the ILO and the EU actively participated. While international organisations point to a noticeable decline in the participation of young children (under 16) in the 2012 cotton harvest, the EU keeps advocating the resumption of cooperation between Uzbekistan and the ILO.

We recall that, while the Generalised Scheme of Preferences (GSP) is an incentive-based tool, preferences can be temporarily withdrawn in case of serious and systematic violations of the international core labour rights conventions as ascertained by ILO.

The EU has also sought to develop cooperation responses with Uzbekistan. A EUR 10 million Rural Development programme was signed in mid-2012, with a view to promote agricultural diversification and diminish the country's reliance on cotton monoculture. The EU continues to deploy all diplomatic efforts with Uzbekistan and to liaise with international organisations, mindful that only a holistic approach will ultimately be efficient in combatting child labour.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001124/13
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(1 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: VP/HR — Nuevo bombardeo de Israel en territorio sirio

El 31 de enero de 2013 el ejército de Israel ha vuelto a bombardear posiciones dentro de Siria. Esta vez se trata de posiciones cerca de Damasco. El Gobierno de Israel ha intervenido directamente en territorio sirio de manera unilateral, alegando objetivos de seguridad interna y volviendo a violar la práctica totalidad del derecho internacional.

El pasado mes de noviembre el Ejército israelí ya bombardeó posiciones en Siria ante un supuesto ataque de mortero a sus fronteras. El peligro que supone que este Estado se tome una completa libertad de intervenir dentro de las fronteras de otro Estado soberano supone un nuevo golpe a la paz y la seguridad en una de las zonas más militarizadas del mundo. Con esta nueva intervención militar se vuelve a violar la integridad territorial de Siria. Esta es la preocupación que ha expresado el Ministro de Exteriores Ruso en el Consejo de Seguridad de la ONU. Esta preocupación del ejecutivo ruso refleja la atención que la comunidad internacional está prestando a los conflictos en la zona, en los que uno tras otro Israel está interviniendo de manera unilateral e ilegal.

Pese a que Israel pueda alegar su preocupación por la seguridad de sus fronteras, existe el cuerpo del derecho internacional desarrollado para evitar la «ley de la selva» a nivel global. Sin embargo este sistema normativo parece ser que no es materia que concierna a Israel puesto que lo viola continuamente y la comunidad internacional no plantea medidas para evitarlo. La Unión Europea no es menos en la concesión de este cheque en blanco que Israel parece poseer para violar el derecho internacional, puesto que le premia con el acuerdo de asociación UE-Israel y diferentes acuerdos de colaboración, en lugar de cancelar cualquier tipo de diálogo y condenar al país. La UE presume de perseguir la meta de la paz y el cumplimiento de los derechos humanos en Oriente Próximo, pero esta paz es inalcanzable colaborando con el Estado terrorista de Israel, que sin duda es el país del mundo que más viola el derecho internacional.

¿Considera la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante la inmediata congelación del Acuerdo de Asociación UE-Israel como medida de presión para el cumplimiento del Derecho internacional por parte de Israel? ¿Qué opina de las declaraciones de Rusia frente a este último ataque? ¿Considera que el acuerdo de asociación UE-Israel está promoviendo la impunidad de un Estado en la región al colaborar con el país que más viola el derecho internacional?

Respuesta de la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(9 de abril de 2013)

A la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta le sigue preocupando la seguridad y la estabilidad de la región y, en particular, las posibles repercusiones de la crisis de Siria en los países vecinos, y continúa reclamando a todas las partes que den muestras de moderación y eviten la escalada en el conflicto. La UE concede la máxima importancia al respeto de la legislación internacional sobre derechos humanos y del Derecho internacional humanitario.

La posición de la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta respecto a la posibilidad de congelar el Acuerdo de Asociación UE-Israel ya se expuso en la respuesta a la pregunta escrita E-010294/2011 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/es/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001124/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — New Israeli strike on Syrian territory

The Israeli army launched another attack on sites inside Syria on 31 January 2013. On this occasion the targeted area was close to Damascus. The Israeli Government took unilateral action inside Syrian territory on the grounds of protecting Israel's national security and once again breached international law almost in its entirety.

The Israeli army also targeted Syrian sites in November 2012 in response to an alleged mortar attack along its borders. Israel's decision to intervene in another sovereign State at will is another threat to peace and security in one of the world's most militarised areas. This renewed military intervention represents a fresh violation of Syria's territorial integrity. The Russian Foreign Minister expressed the same concern to the UN Security Council, and in doing so reflected the international community's close interest in the Middle East conflicts, in which Israel is intervening unilaterally and illegally time after time.

Although Israel can cite its concern over the security of its borders, there is a body of international law designed to avoid the 'law of the jungle' taking over. However, it seems that international law does not concern Israel, as it continually violates it and the international community has not proposed any steps that could be taken to stop such breaches. The European Union has also been playing its part in handing Israel what seems to be free rein to violate international law; it rewards Israel with the EU-Israel Association Agreement and other cooperation agreements, instead of ceasing all dialogue and taking a stand against the country. The EU claims to be seeking peace and promoting respect for human rights in the Middle East, but this peace is unattainable if the EU continues to collaborate with a terrorist state such as Israel, which has undoubtedly violated more counts of international law than any other country.

Is the Vice-President/High Representative considering the immediate suspension of the EU-Israel Association Agreement, as a way of putting pressure on Israel to abide by international law? What is her view on the statements from Russia concerning the latest Israeli attack? Does the Vice-President/High Representative agree that the EU-Israel Association Agreement promotes impunity for an individual state in the Middle East, given that Israel has violated more counts of international law than any other country?

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

The HR/VP remains concerned about security and stability in the region, particularly about the possible spill-over effects of the Syrian crisis in neighbouring countries, and continues to call on all sides to show restraint and prevent escalation. The EU accords utmost importance to the respect of International Human Rights Law and International Humanitarian Law.

The HR/VP's position with regard to the possibility of freezing the EU-Israel Association Agreement was set out in the reply to previous Written Question E-010294/2011 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001125/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(1 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Αναστολή πλειστηριασμών — απειλή κατασχέσεων για χιλιάδες υπερχρεωμένα νοικοκυριά

Πρόσφατα δημοσιεύματα στον ελληνικό Τύπο κάνουν λόγο για αίτημα εκ μέρους της Τρόικα για άρση της απαγόρευσης πλειστηριασμών για την πρώτη κατοικία, η οποία ισχύει με νόμο του ελληνικού κράτους μέχρι το τέλος του 2013. Σε μια τέτοια περίπτωση, ο εφιάλτης της κατάσχεσης είναι πλέον ορατός για περισσότερα από 100 000 υπερχρεωμένα νοικοκυριά, που αυτή τη στιγμή αδυνατούν να ανταποκριθούν σε πλήθος φόρων και ήδη αντιμετωπίζουν συνθήκες ένδειας.

Βάσει αυτού ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Είναι ενήμερη για το εν λόγω αίτημα; Ως μέλος της Τρόικα, ποια είναι η επίσημη θέση της στο θέμα της άρσης της απαγόρευσης των πλειστηριασμών για την πρώτη κατοικία που στην ουσία αποτελεί και το τελευταίο ανάχωμα προστασίας του μίνιμουμ της περιουσίας και αξιοπρέπειας των ελλήνων πολιτών;

— Απαντώντας σε προηγούμενη ερώτησή μας (E-005517/2011), ο Επίτροπος M. Barnier επισήμανε ότι «(…) η Επιτροπή θεωρεί σημαντικό τα κράτη μέλη να συνεχίσουν να παρακολουθούν στενά την οικονομική κατάσταση και να εξετάζουν το ενδεχόμενο, εάν απαιτείται, καθιέρωσης κανόνων με στόχο είτε την πρόληψη των κατασχέσεων, είτε, στις περιπτώσεις που έχουν θεσπιστεί τέτοιου είδους διαδικασίες, τον περιορισμό των κοινωνικών και οικονομικών τους επιπτώσεων». Σύμφωνα με την Επιτροπή, η δυσμενής κατάσταση που επικρατεί στην ελληνική κοινωνία δεν καθιστά αναγκαία την προστασία τουλάχιστον της πρώτης κατοικίας;

— Πώς αξιολογεί την ενδεχόμενη λήψη ενός τέτοιου μέτρου, που όχι μόνο δεν προστατεύει αλλά συμβάλλει στην επιδείνωση της κοινωνικής κατάστασης στην Ελλάδα, και πώς η Επιτροπή, ως μέλος της Τρόικα, μπορεί να συμβάλει στην αντιμετώπιση μιας τόσο επώδυνης κοινωνικής αδικίας;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(8 Μαρτίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει τη δυσχερή οικονομική κατάσταση των νοικοκυριών λόγω της οικονομικής κρίσης στην Ελλάδα. Το θέμα αυτό συζητήθηκε με τις ελληνικές αρχές κατά την πρώτη αναθεώρηση του δεύτερου προγράμματος οικονομικής προσαρμογής για την Ελλάδα, το οποίο έληξε τον Δεκέμβριο του 2012. Προκειμένου να εξευρεθεί ισορροπημένη λύση για τη χρέωση των νοικοκυριών, στην παράγραφο 3.6 του μνημονίου συμφωνίας ([1]) (ΜΣ) (επανεξέταση των πλαισίων αφερεγγυότητας) προβλέπεται ότι οι αρχές, σε συνεννόηση με τους εκπροσώπους των ΕΕ/ΕΚΤ/ΔΝΤ, θα επανεξετάσουν το υφιστάμενο πλαίσιο για τα υπερχρεωμένα νοικοκυριά. Η διαδικασία αυτή περιλαμβάνει τροποποιήσεις στην ισχύουσα νομοθεσία (Νόμος 3869/2010) και ενδεχόμενη θέσπιση νέων μέτρων για την προστασία των νοικοκυριών που βρίσκονται σε δεινή οικονομική κατάσταση. Συμφωνήθηκε ότι η διαδικασία αυτή θα ολοκληρωθεί έως το τέλος Φεβρουαρίου του 2013. Επί του παρόντος συνεχίζονται οι διαβουλεύσεις μεταξύ των αρχών και των εκπροσώπων των ΕΕ/ΕΚΤ/ΔΝΤ.

Η ελληνική κυβέρνηση αποφάσισε να παρατείνει την απαγόρευση των πλειστηριασμών των ακινήτων που αποτελούν κύρια κατοικία του νοικοκυριού έως τις 31.12.2013. Περαιτέρω συζητήσεις με τις αρχές σχετικά με το θέμα αυτό θα πραγματοποιηθούν κατά την επόμενη αποστολή ελέγχου στην Ελλάδα, η οποία προβλέπεται να αρχίσει στα τέλη Φεβρουαρίου του 2013.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2012/pdf/ocp123_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001125/13
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Suspension of auctions — threat of foreclosure for thousands of over-indebted households

Recent reports in the Greek press refer to the demand made by the Troika to lift the ban on auctions of primary dwellings, which is enshrined in a Greek state law until the end of 2013. If this were to occur, the nightmare of foreclosure would become a reality for over 100 000 over-indebted households which are currently unable to pay a whole raft of taxes and are already facing poverty.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

— Is it aware of this issue? As a member of the Troika, what is its official position on the issue of lifting the ban on the auctioning of primary dwellings which is essentially the last line of defence for protecting a minimum of property and dignity for Greek citizens?

— In response to our earlier question (E-005517/2011), Commissioner Barnier had noted that '(…) the Commission believes it essential that Member States continue to monitor the economic situation closely and consider, if appropriate, to introduce rules aimed either at preventing foreclosures or, where such procedures are launched, at limiting their social and economic impact.' Does the Commission not agree that the unfavourable situation facing Greek society makes it necessary to protect at least people's primary dwellings?

— How does it view the possible adoption of such a measure, which would not only fail to protect but would actually contribute to the deterioration of the social situation in Greece and how can the Commission, as a member of the Troika, help to overcome such a flagrant social injustice?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(8 March 2013)

The Commission is aware of the difficult financial situation of households due to the economic crisis in Greece. This issue was discussed with the Greek Authorities during the first review of the Second Economic Adjustment Programme for Greece, which finished in December 2012. In order to find a balanced solution for household indebtedness, it is envisaged in the memorandum of understanding [1] (MoU) Paragraph 3.6 (review of insolvency frameworks) that the Authorities in consultation with the EC/ECB/IMF staff will revise the existing framework for indebted households. This process includes amendments to the current legislation (Law 3869/2010) and the possible introduction of new measures to safeguard households in dire economic situation. It was agreed that this process will be finished by end-February 2013. At the moment consultations between the Authorities and the EC/ECB/IMF staff continue.

The Greek Government has decided to extend the ban on real-estate auctions for the main residence of household until 31.12.2013. Further discussions with the Authorities on this subject will take place during the next review mission to Greece, which is envisaged to begin at the end of February 2013.

[1] http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2012/pdf/ocp123_en.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001126/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(1º febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Problemi del commercio al dettaglio in Italia e in Europa

Nel 2010 la Commissione ha pubblicato una relazione in merito all'esercizio di sorveglianza del mercato nel settore del commercio e della distribuzione. In tale relazione si è esaminato il funzionamento del settore del commercio al dettaglio e la sua interazione con altri servizi ad esso connessi.

Come riportato nella risposta alla mia interrogazione E-005193/2012, la relazione ha individuato circa venti problemi che stavano minando il buon funzionamento del settore del commercio al dettaglio, tra i quali norme in materia di stabilimento, questioni relative all'accessibilità dei consumatori, pratiche sleali tra imprese e problematiche connesse all'impiego della manodopera.

In Italia le associazioni di categoria lamentano oggi nuove e ulteriori difficoltà, come l'aumento delle tasse e dei costi di gestione. Nel mese di dicembre una commerciante al dettaglio si è tolta la vita non potendo più far fronte alla situazione debitoria creatasi per la troppa pressione fiscale.

Trascorsi circa tre anni dalla pubblicazione dello studio, quale è lo stato di salute attuale del commercio al dettaglio in Europa?

La Commissione intende procedere a un nuovo studio che aggiorni il precedente?

Quali misure intende attuare per sostenere il settore in Italia e in Europa?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(13 marzo 2013)

La Commissione è consapevole dell'importanza del settore del commercio al dettaglio e delle difficoltà che esso sta attualmente affrontando. La relazione della Commissione sull'esercizio di sorveglianza del mercato nel settore del commercio e della distribuzione, adottata nel 2010, ha evidenziato numerosi fattori che ostacolano il corretto funzionamento del mercato unico in questo settore. L'entità di questi ostacoli è stata confermata dalla relazione del PE «su un commercio al dettaglio più efficace e più equo», pubblicata nel 2011.

Al fine di affrontare le principali difficoltà individuate e migliorare la competitività e le prestazioni sociali, ambientali ed economiche del settore della distribuzione, il 31 gennaio 2013 la Commissione ha adottato il piano di azione europeo per il commercio al dettaglio.

Poiché gli ostacoli spesso interessano settori di intervento diversi, il piano di azione intende mettere in atto una strategia europea coerente, proponendo undici azioni concrete aventi un impatto diretto nel settore del commercio al dettaglio e miranti ad affrontare i problemi individuati. Queste azioni sono legate a cinque priorità:

— dare maggiori diritti ai consumatori informandoli meglio;

— migliorare l'accessibilità dei servizi al dettaglio promuovendo lo scambio di buone pratiche tra Stati membri sulla pianificazione commerciale e territoriale;

— favorire relazioni commerciali corrette e sostenibili lungo la catena di fornitura dei prodotti alimentari e non alimentari;

— collegare meglio tra loro il commercio al dettaglio e l'innovazione;

— migliorare l'ambiente di lavoro, ad esempio grazie a una migliore corrispondenza tra le esigenze dei datori di lavoro e le competenze del personale.

La Commissione istituirà un gruppo permanente per la competitività del commercio al dettaglio che contribuirà a sviluppare ulteriori obiettivi specifici per i settori individuati, a monitorare i progressi conseguiti e a formulare raccomandazioni per assicurare la piena attuazione delle azioni incluse nel piano di azione europeo, oltre a prestare consulenza, se necessario, alla Commissione stessa in merito ad altre nuove iniziative che potrebbero essere proposte.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001126/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: Retail problems in Italy and in Europe

In 2010, the Commission published a retail market monitoring report. That report examined the operation of the retail sector and its interaction with other related services.

As was stated in the answer to my question E-005193/2012, the report identified around 20 problems which were undermining the smooth functioning of the retail sector, including rules on establishment, issues relating to consumer accessibility, unfair practices between undertakings and problems associated with the employment of the workforce.

In Italy, sectoral associations are now complaining about new additional difficulties, such as increased taxes and operating costs. In December, a retailer committed suicide because he could no longer deal with his debts, which were created as a result of the excessive tax burden.

Some three years after the study came out, what is the state of retail today in Europe?

Does the Commission intend to carry out a new study to update the previous one?

Which measures does it intend to implement in order to support the sector in Italy and in Europe?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(13 March 2013)

The Commission is aware of the importance of the retail sector and of the difficulties it currently faces. Numerous barriers to the Single Market in Retail had been identified in the Commission's Retail Market Monitoring Report adopted in 2010. The significance of these barriers was confirmed by the EP's 'Report on a more efficient and fairer retail market' published in 2011.

In order to address the key obstacles identified and to improve the competitiveness and economic, environmental and social performance of the retail sector, the Commission adopted, on 31 January 2013, the European Retail Action Plan.

Since the obstacles often concern different policy areas, the action plan forms a coherent European strategy by putting forward eleven concrete actions that have a direct impact on retail and address the issues identified. These actions relate to five key priorities:

— Empowering consumers through better information

— Improving accessibility to retail services by promoting an exchange of good practices between Member States on commercial and spatial planning

— Fairer and more sustainable trading relationships along the food and non-food supply chain

— Ensuring a better link between retail and innovation

— Creating a better work environment, for example through better matching the needs of employers and staff skills.

The Commission will set up a permanent Group on Retail Competitiveness that will help develop further specific objectives for the areas identified, monitor the progress achieved, issue recommendations to ensure full implementation of the actions included in the European Action Plan and, where necessary, will advise the Commission on additional new actions that could be proposed.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001127/13
do Komisji
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(1 lutego 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Działania UE w Birmie a wspieranie dziennikarstwa

W związku z rozpoczęciem nadawania przez BBC trzech kanałów telewizyjnych (BBC World News, BBC Entertainment i CBeebies), jak również prowadzoną działalnością przez BBC Media Action, która polega na organizacji szkoleń z zakresu odpowiedzialnego i niezależnego dziennikarstwa, zwracam się z pytaniem do Wysokiej Przedstawiciel:

1. Jak Unia, między innymi poprzez ESDZ i jej biuro w Rangoon, angażuje i wspiera dziennikarzy w Birmie?

2. Czy ESDZ prowadzi w Birmie projekty, które wspierają rozwój młodych adeptów dziennikarstwa (podobnie jak BBC Media Action)?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(15 marca 2013 r.)

UE od dawna wspiera niezależne dziennikarstwo w Birmie/Mjanmie. Łącznie 212 dziennikarzy zostało przeszkolonych w zakresie dziennikarstwa gospodarczego i politycznego oraz w relacjonowaniu wyborów przed wyborami w 2010 r. UE uważa rozwój mediów za jeden z głównych elementów transformacji demokratycznej i politycznej państwa. Dlatego w planach są dalsze projekty mające wspierać wolne i prężne media, obejmujące w szczególności etykę mediów, jak również pokój między grupami etnicznymi; są one skierowane szczególnie do młodych dziennikarzy. Dla nich też organizowano już wizyty studyjne, tak aby mogli odwiedzić instytucje unijne w Brukseli.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001127/13
to the Commission
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: EU action in Burma and support for journalism

In connection with the BBC beginning to broadcast three TV channels in Burma (BBC World News, BBC Entertainment and CBeebies) and with the work by BBC Media Action to organise training in responsible and independent journalism, could the High Representative answer the following questions:

1. How is the EU involved in supporting journalists in Burma, including through the EEAS and its office in Rangoon?

2. Does the EEAS carry out projects in Burma to support the development of young journalists (in a similar manner to BBC Media Action)?

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

The EU has long supported independent journalism in Burma/Myanmar. A total of 212 journalists have been trained in economic, political and election-related reporting prior to the 2010 elections. The EU continues to consider media development as as one of the central elements of the country's democratic and political transition. Thus, EU plans for further projects to support a free a vibrant media are already under way, covering particularly media ethics, as well as ethnic peace, and especially addressed to young journalists. Study visits have also been arranged for young journalists to visit EU institutions in Brussels.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001128/13
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(1 lutego 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Protesty w Birmie przeciw rozbudowie kopalni miedzi w pobliżu Latpadaung

W związku z niepokojącymi doniesieniami z Birmy o wielokrotnych brutalnych rozpędzeniach protestów i aresztach dla aktywistów przeciwko rozbudowie kopalni miedzi niedaleko Latpadaung, które miały miejsce w listopadzie i grudniu 2012 roku, zwracam się z następującymi pytaniami do Wysokiej Przedstawiciel:

1. Jakie stanowisko zajmuje Unia wobec masowych wysiedleń w Birmie?

2. Czy w rozmowach z rządem Birmy Unia wyraźnie podkreśla, jak ważna i kluczowa jest ochrona praw człowieka, szczególnie tych podstawowych?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(19 marca 2013 r.)

Unia Europejska śledzi z wielką uwagą wydarzenia w Birmie, włącznie z tym wszystkim, co dotyczy promocji i ochrony praw człowieka. Unia Europejska była głównym wnioskodawcą rezolucji Zgromadzenia Ogólnego ONZ w sprawie sytuacji praw człowieka w tym kraju, przyjętej po raz pierwszy jednogłośnie w 2012 r. Z zadowoleniem przyjmujemy poprawę sytuacji w dziedzinie praw człowieka, będącą wynikiem szeregu przeprowadzonych ostatnio reform, jednocześnie jednak uznajemy, że pozostają nierozwiązane problemy i poruszamy tę sprawę podczas wszystkich spotkań z rządem Birmy. Związane z planowaną rozbudową kopalni miedzi wydarzenia w Letpadaung były rzeczywiście bardzo przykre. Za pozytywną uznajemy decyzję rządu o ustanowieniu komisji śledczej, która między innymi zbada działania sił porządkowych oraz konsekwencje projektu dla sytuacji społecznej i stabilności gospodarczej. Szczególnie cieszy nas mianowanie Daw Aung San Suu Kyi na przewodniczącą tej komisji i oczekujemy, że w odpowiednim czasie będziemy mogli zapoznać się z jej ustaleniami.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001128/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Protests against expansion of the Latpadaung copper mine in Burma

Worrying reports have been coming in from Burma about numerous brutal crackdowns on protests and arrests of activists demonstrating against the expansion of a copper mine near Latpadaung in November and December 2012. With this in mind:

1. What is the EU's position with regard to mass displacements in Burma?

2. In its talks with the Burmese Government, is the EU clearly emphasising how important and crucial it is to uphold human rights, and fundamental rights in particular?

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

The European Union follows very closely the developments in Burma/Myanmar including in relation to the promotion and protection of human rights. The EU was the main sponsor of the UN General Assembly's resolution on the situation of human rights in the country, adopted for the the first time by consensus in 2012. We welcome improvement to the situation of human rights achieved through a series of recent reforms, but, at the same time, we recognise the challenges ahead which we raise on every occasion in meetings with the Government. The events at the Letpadaung copper mine project were indeed regrettable. The decision of the government to constitute an Investigative Commission which will review, among others, the actions of the security forces, and the project's social and economic sustainability, is a welcome response. We are particularly heartened by the appointment of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi as the Chair of the Commission and we look forward to its findings in due course.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001129/13
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(1 lutego 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Pomoc dla krajów nawiedzonych przez huragan *Evan*

W ostatnim czasie media donosiły o poważnych skutkach przejścia huraganu *Evan* przez obszar Fidżi i Samoa.

Huragan i powodzie będące następstwem ulewnych deszczy zniszczyły domy, drogi, wodociągi. Zerwane zostały również linie energetyczne. Kilka osób poniosło śmierć na Samoa.

W związku z powyższym zwracam się z pytaniem do Wysokiej Przedstawiciel:

1. Czy i jakie działania Unia podjęła lub zamierza podjąć w związku z następstwami huraganu?

2. Czy w wyniku huraganu ucierpieli obywatele Unii przebywający na Fidżi lub Samoa?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Kristalinę Georgiewą w imieniu Komisji
(8 marca 2013 r.)

1. Wkrótce po tym, jak tropikalny huragan Evan przeszedł przez wyspiarskie kraje Fidżi i Samoa, Dyrekcja Generalna Komisji Europejskiej ds. Pomocy Humanitarnej i Ochrony Ludności wysłała do dotkniętego huraganem regionu specjalną grupę z zadaniem przeprowadzenia oceny szkód. Komisja uwolniła również 1,8 mln EUR na nadzwyczajną pomoc w celu wsparcia najbardziej dotkniętej i najbardziej zagrożonej ludności poprzez zapewnienie jej schronienia, żywności, wody i dostępu do urządzeń sanitarnych. Ocenia się, że około dwóch trzecich tych środków wykorzystane zostanie na pomoc dla Samoa, gdzie skutki huraganu są szczególnie dotkliwe. Program pomocy humanitarnej realizowany będzie przez agencje ONZ, organizacje pozarządowe oraz Czerwony Krzyż.

Fidżi i Samoa udzielona zostanie poza tym pomoc rozwojowa na likwidację skutków katastrofy. Aby pomóc w zaopatrzeniu Samoa w wodę, w grudniu 2012 r. uwolniono w trybie pilnym 750 000 EUR z jednego z obowiązujących programów. Także w grudniu 2012 r. zatwierdzony został nowy czteroletni program wsparcia budżetowego w wysokości 18,1 mln EUR na zaopatrzenie w wodę i infrastrukturę sanitarną. Pierwsze uwolnienie środków w kwocie 3,4 mln EUR oczekiwane jest w okresie kwiecień-maj 2013 r. Pomimo obowiązujących sankcji, pomoc UE dla Fidżi w ramach środków towarzyszących do Protokołu w sprawie cukru (49 mln EUR na lata 2011-2013) obejmuje działania mające na celu zapobieganie skutkom powodzi oraz zmiany klimatu, łagodzenie takich skutków oraz polepszenie warunków życia ludności.

2. Wielu mieszkających na Samoa i Fidżi obywateli UE dotkniętych zostało skutkami huraganu zarówno bezpośrednio (np. na skutek powodzi, braku elektryczności, braku wody pitnej), jak i finansowo (np. w związku ze stratami materialnymi i finansowymi należących do obywateli UE przedsiębiorstw). Komisja nie dysponuje jednak żadnymi informacjami na temat obywateli UE, którzy w wyniku huraganu mogliby ponieść śmierć lub doznać obrażeń.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001129/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(1 February 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Assistance for countries hit by Cyclone Evan

Recent media reports have described the trail of destruction left by Cyclone Evan in Fiji and Samoa.

The cyclone and flooding that occurred following torrential rain destroyed homes, roads and water supply systems. Power lines were also brought down. In Samoa several people were killed.

With this in mind:

1. Has the EU taken action to address the consequences of the cyclone? If not, does it intend to do so? What action has been or will be taken?

2. Have any EU citizens resident in Fiji or Samoa suffered as a result of the cyclone?

Answer given by Ms Georgieva on behalf of the Commission
(8 March 2013)

1. Shortly after Tropical Cyclone Evan had hit the island nations of Fiji and Samoa the Commission's Directorate-General for Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection deployed an assessment team to the affected region and the Commission released EUR 1.8 million of emergency aid with the objective of assisting the most affected and most vulnerable populations through the provision of shelter, food, water and sanitation. Some two thirds of the allocation is expected to benefit Samoa which has been hit particularly hard. The humanitarian aid programme will be implemented by United Nations (UN) agencies, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and the Red Cross.

Furthermore, development assistance will be used to help Fiji and Samoa to recover from the disaster. To support water supply in Samoa, EUR 750 000 from an existing programme was released urgently in December 2012. Also in December 2012, a new EUR 18.1 million four year budget support programme for water and sanitation was approved. The first release of EUR 3.4 million is expected for April-May 2013. In Fiji — despite the current sanctions — the EU support in the framework of the Accompanying Measures (AMSP) for the Sugar protocol (EUR 49 million for the period 2011-2013) encompasses measures aiming at preventing and alleviating the adverse effect of floods and climate change and improve the livelihoods of the population.

2. Many EU citizens living in Samoa and Fiji suffered from the effects of the cyclone both directly (e.g. flooding, lack of electricity, lack of drinking water, etc.) and economically (e.g. physical and financial impact on business interests owned by EU citizens). However, the Commission is not aware of any EU citizen having been killed or physically harmed as a result of the cyclone.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001130/13
an die Kommission
Silvana Koch-Mehrin (ALDE)
(4. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: Einbeziehung von Interessengruppen bei Folgenabschätzungen

Im Einklang mit der von der Kommission verfolgten Politik der Transparenz, der besseren Rechtsetzung sowie der Offenheit für die Zivilgesellschaft und die Einbeziehung von Interessengruppen sind Folgenabschätzungen unerlässlich für eine wirkungsvolle und effiziente Politikgestaltung.

In den Leitlinien der Kommission zur Folgenabschätzung vom 15. Januar 2009 ([1]) (besonders im Kapitel 4 „Informationen einholen und Interessengruppen konsultieren") wird die Bedeutung der Mitwirkung der Öffentlichkeit und der betroffenen Gruppen bei der Entwicklung politischer Maßnahmen betont.

In den Leitlinien heißt es unter anderem, dass die Interessengruppen rechtzeitig konsultiert und dass alle von einer politischen Maßnahme betroffenen oder an deren Umsetzung beteiligten Interessengruppen angehört werden sollen. Des weiteren ist dort angeführt, dass ausreichend Zeit zur Teilnahme gelassen und dass solche Zusammenkünfte 20 Arbeitstage im Voraus angekündigt werden sollten.

In einem Workshop für Interessenträger zum Vorschlag der Kommission über Maßnahmen zur Umsetzung der Richtlinie über die Kraftstoffqualität am 20. Dezember 2012 wurden viele dieser Leitlinien nicht ausreichend berücksichtigt. Die Teilnehmer bemängelten die späte Ankündigung (etwa 10 Arbeitstage im Voraus) und den ungünstigen Zeitpunkt des Workshops (am letzten Arbeitstag vor Weihnachten, was potenzielle Teilnehmer aus vielen Mitgliedstaaten an der Mitwirkung hinderte). Außerdem wurde den Interessengruppen für schriftliche Beiträge nur eine Frist bis zum 11. Januar 2013 eingeräumt, obwohl in den Leitlinien von 2009 ein Zeitrahmen von acht Wochen empfohlen wird.

Die Fragestellerin bittet die Kommission in diesem Zusammenhang zu erklären, inwieweit die Leitlinien zur Folgenabschätzung von den Kommissionsdienststellen befolgt werden.

Ferner beklagten sich einige betroffene Interessengruppen darüber, dass sie keine Einladung zum Workshop erhalten hätten. Nach welchen Kriterien wird entschieden, wer zu solchen Konsultationen eingeladen wird?

Inwieweit werden die Ergebnisse von Interessengruppenkonferenzen anschließend bei der Ausarbeitung politischer Maßnahmen berücksichtigt?

Die Fragestellerin ersucht die Kommission um einen umfassenden Überblick über die Folgenabschätzungen und Konferenzen für Interessengruppen im Jahr 2012 sowie um eine chronologische Auflistung der Befolgung der Leitlinien zur Folgenabschätzung bei den obengenannten Konsultierungsverfahren für Interessengruppen.

Antwort von Präsident Barroso im Namen der Kommission
(26. März 2013)

Die Übereinstimmung der Folgenabschätzungen (FAs) der Kommission mit den Leitlinien zur Folgenabschätzung wird durch den unabhängigen Ausschuss für Folgenabschätzung (IAB) überprüft ([2]). Der Europäische Rechnungshof stellte vor kurzem fest, dass die Folgenabschätzungen der Kommission in Einklang mit den Leitlinien zur Folgenabschätzung stehen ([3]).

Interessengruppen werden in Einklang mit den im Mindeststandard B für Konsultationen der Kommission festgelegten Grundsätzen ausgewählt. Dabei werden sowohl die Art und die Ziele jeder einzelnen Konsultation als auch Zeit- und Ressourcenverfügbarkeit sowie die Besonderheiten der verwendeten Konsultationsmethode berücksichtigt ([4]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/commission_guidelines/docs/iag_2009_de.pdf
([2]) Einschlägige Statistiken werden in den Jahresberichten des IAB zur Verfügung gestellt: http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/key_docs/docs/iab_report_2012_en_final.pdf
Stellungnahmen des IAB zu einzelnen FAs finden sich unter: http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/ia_carried_out/cia_2013_en.htm
([3]) Europäischer Rechnungshof, Sonderbericht Nr. 3/2010, „Folgenabschätzungen in den EU-Organen: Helfen sie bei der Entscheidungsfindung?" (http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/docs/coa_report_3_2010_de.pdf) Seite 7.
([4]) KOM(2002)704.

Beiträge von Interessengruppen werden, unabhängig von der Form der Konsultation, in die Entwicklung politischer Maßnahmen einbezogen. Dabei werden die Repräsentativität und die relative Bedeutung von unterschiedlichen Interessengruppen berücksichtigt.

Öffentlich zugängliche FA-Berichte enthalten einen Überblick über das Konsultationsverfahren und die geäußerten Standpunkte sowie über die Art ihrer Berücksichtigung ([5]). Im Jahr 2012 wurden 72 FAs veröffentlicht, die sich alle auf eine Art von Konsultation stützen. Es stehen keine Statistiken zu der Anzahl der abgehaltenen Interessengruppenkonferenzen zur Verfügung.

In Zusammenhang mit den Umsetzungsmaßnahmen im Rahmen der Richtlinie über die Kraftstoffqualität fanden in den letzten drei Jahren zahlreiche Sitzungen von Experten und Interessengruppen sowie umfangreiche Konsultationen statt, und es wurde eine Reihe von Fragen maßgeblichen Interessengruppen zugesandt ([6]). Nach den Anmerkungen der Interessengruppen wurde die Frist für Stellungnahmen, die ursprünglich bis zu dem Ende 2012 abgehaltenen Workshop einzureichen waren, bis zum 31. Januar verlängert, und ein weiterer Workshop ist in Planung. Die Einladungen zum Workshop im Dezember gingen an die zuständigen Behörden und Dachorganisationen, die einzelne Interessengruppen mit gewichtigen Handelsinteressen am Kraftstoffmarkt der EU vertreten oder an Organisationen, die Interessen in den Bereichen Umwelt und Soziales vertreten. Die Interessengruppen wurden aufgrund ihres früheren oder jüngst bekundeten Interesses für das Thema ausgewählt.

([5]) Sie sind auf folgender Internetseite abrufbar: http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/ia_carried_out/cia_2012_en.htm
([6]) https://circabc.europa.eu/faces/jsp/extension/wai/navigation/container.jsp

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001130/13
to the Commission
Silvana Koch-Mehrin (ALDE)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: Stakeholder involvement in impact assessments

In line with the Commission's policy of transparency, better regulation and openness towards civil society and stakeholder involvement, impact assessments are an essential tool to ensure effective and efficient policy-making.

The Commission Guidelines on Impact Assessments of 15 January 2009 (especially their Chapter 4, on 'Gathering information and consulting stakeholders' ([1])) underline the importance of exchanges with the public and interested parties for developing public policies.

These guidelines state amongst other things that stakeholders should be consulted in a timely manner and that all stakeholders affected by a policy or involved in its implementation should be heard. It also says that sufficient time should be allowed for participation and that 20 working days' notice should be given for meetings.

In a stakeholder workshop on the Commission's proposal on implementing measures for the Fuel Quality Directive which took place on 20 December 2012, many of these guidelines were not sufficiently respected. Participants complained about the short notice period (approximately 2 working weeks) and the unfortunate timing (last working day before the Christmas break, which prevented people from many Member States from attending in person). Also, initially stakeholders were given only until 11 January 2013 to provide written contributions, although the 2009 guidelines suggest a timeframe of eight weeks.

In this context, could the Commission clarify how far the impact assessment guidelines are actually observed by its services?

Also, a number of relevant stakeholders complained that they had not received an invitation to the workshop. What are the criteria for who receives such invitations?

To what extent are the result of stakeholder conferences taken into account in the subsequent policy formulations?

Could the Commission provide a comprehensive overview of impact assessments and stakeholder conferences for 2012, as well as a chronology regarding compliance with the impact assessment guidelines in the above stakeholder consultation procedures?

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

Compliance of Commission impact assessments (IA) with IA guidelines is checked by the independent Impact Assessment Board ([2]). The European Court of Auditors recently found Commission IAs to comply with the IA guidelines ([3]).

Stakeholders are selected in line with the criteria set by the Commission's minimum consultation standard B, taking into account the specific nature and objectives of each consultation, time and resource availability and the specificities of consultation method used ([4]).

Regardless the form of consultation, stakeholder input feeds into policy development, taking into account the representativeness and relative importance of different categories of respondents.

Publicly available IA reports give an overview of the consultation process, the positions expressed and how they are taken into account ([5]). There were 72 IAs published in 2012, all based on some type of consultation. There are no statistics available on the number of stakeholder conferences held.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/commission_guidelines/docs/iag_2009_en.pdf
([2]) Relevant statistics are provided in the IAB annual reports: http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/key_docs/docs/iab_report_2012_en_final.pdf IAB opinions on individual IAs can be accessed at: http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/ia_carried_out/cia_2013_en.htm
([3]) European Court of Auditors, Special Report No 3, 2010, 'Impact assessments in the EU institutions: do they support decision-making?' (http://eca.europa.eu/portal/pls/portal/docs/1/7912856.PDF), page 7.
([4]) COM(2002) 704.
([5]) They can be accessed at: http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/ia_carried_out/cia_2012_en.htm

Concerning the implementing measures under the Fuel Quality Directive, extensive consultations, including sending a set of questions to leading stakeholders and a series of expert and stakeholder meetings, took place over the last 3 years ([6]). Following stakeholders remarks, the deadline for comments requested at the end-2012 workshop was extended to 31 January and another workshop is being planned. The invitations to the December workshop were sent to competent authorities and umbrella organisations for individual stakeholders with sizable commercial interests in the EU's fuel market or organisations representing social or environmental interests. Stakeholders were selected on the basis of past and recent interest in the topic.

([6]) https://circabc.europa.eu/w/browse/3d2aa2c7-e514-47ee-a412-be400694de2a

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001132/13
an die Kommission
Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE), Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE) und Paul Murphy (GUE/NGL)
(4. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: Weiterbehandlung der schriftlichen Anfrage E-011230/2012

In ihrer Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-011230/2012 begründet die Kommission die Aufnahme eines Mechanismus zur Beilegung von Streitigkeiten zwischen Investor und Staat (Investor-State Dispute Settlement, ISDS) in das umfassende Wirtschafts- und Handelsabkommen (Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement, CETA) EU-Kanada, indem sie anführt, dass es Fälle von Enteignungen gegeben habe, in denen europäische oder andere Investoren offenbar keine Entschädigung erhalten hätten und in Kanada kein Gerichtsverfahren anstrengen konnten.

1. Welche Unternehmen waren betroffen, und wie viele Fälle sind der Kommission bekannt, in denen europäische Investoren Verluste dieser Art erlitten haben?

2. Die Kommission wird ersucht, die genauen Aktenzeichen der genannten Fälle oder andere Angaben zu ihrer Dokumentation zu übermitteln.

3. Die Kommission wird ersucht, die folgenden Angaben zu den Fällen zu machen:

a) Um welche Art der Enteignung handelte es sich?

b) Welche Hindernisse haben bewirkt, dass die betreffenden Unternehmen im Rahmen des kanadischen Rechtssystems keine Rechtsmittel einlegen konnten?

c) Hat die Kommission Erkundigungen darüber eingezogen, ob kanadische Investoren einer ähnlichen Behandlung unterworfen wurden?

Antwort von Herrn De Gucht im Namen der Kommission
(22. März 2013)

Der Kommission sind zwei Fälle bekannt, in denen ein Investor von einer kanadischen Provinz enteignet wurde und dafür keine oder keine angemessene Entschädigung erhalten hat und auch der Rechtsweg vor den lokalen Gerichten ausgeschlossen blieb.

Im Fall AbitibiBowater/Kanada (Entscheidung vom 15. Dezember 2010) wurde AbitibiBowater, ein amerikanischer Investor, von der Provinz Neufundland enteignet. Die Provinz verabschiedete mit dem „Abitibi-Consolidated Rights and Assets Act“ ein Gesetz, das die komplette Vermögensenteignung des Unternehmens bewirkte (siehe Artikel 5 des Gesetzes). Dabei war keine Entschädigungszahlung vorgesehen (siehe Artikel 10) und auch der Rechtsweg vor den lokalen Gerichten blieb dem ausländischen Investor verwehrt (siehe Artikel 11). Zwischen dem Investor und Kanada wurde schließlich eine Schlichtungsvereinbarung getroffen.

Im Fall Gallo/Kanada (Entscheidung vom 15. September 2011) behauptete der US-amerikanische Staatsbürger Vito Gallo, er sei Besitzer des kanadischen Unternehmens 1532382 Ontario Inc., das die verwaltungsbehördliche Erlaubnis von der Provinz Ontario erhalten habe, die „Adams-Mine“ zur Abfallentsorgung zu nutzen. Mit dem „Adams Lake Act“ verabschiedete die Legislativversammlung von Ontario ein Gesetz, laut dem die Abfallentsorgung in besagter Mine unter Verbot gestellt wurde. Gleichzeitig widerrief sie die vorherige verwaltungsbehördliche Erlaubnis (siehe Artikel 2 und 3 des Gesetzes) und schloss den Rechtsweg vor den lokalen Gerichten aus (Artikel 5 bis 7). Gallo hielt dagegen, dass die gezahlte Entschädigung nicht ausreichen würde, um den entstandenen Verlust auszugleichen. Die Klage wurde jedoch abgewiesen, da das Schiedsgericht zu dem Schluss kam, Gallo sei zu dem Zeitpunkt der Enteignung kein Investor gewesen.

Es ist möglich, dass europäische Investoren in ähnliche Fälle involviert waren oder es in Zukunft sein werden. Solche Fälle sind aber nicht dem Schiedsgericht übergeben worden. Daher gibt es in diesem Zusammenhang nur wenige öffentlich zugängliche Informationen. Es ist auch nicht auszuschließen, dass kanadische Investoren eine ähnliche Behandlung erfahren haben. Der Kommission liegen dazu jedoch keinerlei Informationen vor.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-001132/13
till kommissionen
Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE), Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE) och Paul Murphy (GUE/NGL)
(4 februari 2013)

Angående: Följdfråga till skriftlig fråga E-011230/2012

I sitt svar på skriftlig fråga E-011230/2012 säger kommissionen att det är motiverat att införa en mekanism för tvistlösning mellan investerare och stat i det övergripande avtalet om ekonomi och handel mellan EU och Kanada eftersom det har förekommit fall då europeiska eller andra investerare drabbats av expropriation i Kanada och uppenbarligen nekats kompensation och tillgång till kanadensiska domstolar.

1. Vilka företag rörde det sig om, och hur många fall känner kommissionen till där europeiska investerare har lidit sådan skada?

2. Kan kommissionen ge exakta fallreferenser eller annan dokumentation om de nämnda fallen?

3. Kommissionen ombes ge följande upplysningar om fallen:

a) Vilken typ av expropriation handlade det om?

b) Vad var det för hinder som gjorde att de berörda företagen inte kunde vända sig till det kanadensiska rättsväsendet?

c) Har kommissionen undersökt om kanadensiska investerare har råkat ut för liknande behandling?

Svar från Karel De Gucht på kommissionens vägnar
(22 mars 2013)

Kommissionen känner till två fall där kanadensiska provinser har utsatt investerare för expropriation utan att betala skälig ersättning, eller erbjuda någon ersättning alls, och utan att ge investerarna tillgång till lokala domstolar.

I fallet AbitibiBowater mot Kanada (skiljedom av den 15 december 2010) blev den amerikanske investeraren AbitibiBowater utsatt för expropriation av provinsen Newfoundland. Provinsen hade antagit en lag rörande företagets rättigheter och tillgångar (*Abitibi-Consolidated Rights and Assets Act*), som innebar att alla företagets tillgångar exproprierades (se paragraf 5 i lagen) utan ersättning (se paragraf 10) och att den utländske investeraren nekades tillgång till lokala domstolar (se paragraf 11). Ett förlikningsavtal ingicks mellan investeraren och Kanada.

I fallet Gallo mot Kanada (skiljedom av den 15 september 2011) gjorde en amerikansk medborgare gällande att han var ägare till det kanadensiska företaget 1532382 Ontario Inc., som hade fått ett administrativt godkännande från provinsen Ontario för att använda en gruva för deponering av avfall. Provinsen Ontario antog en lag (*Adams Lake Act*) som upphävde det tidigare administrativa godkännandet och förbjöd deponering av avfall i gruvan (se paragraferna 2 och 3 i lagen). Tillgång till lokal domstol nekades också (paragraferna 5–7). Gallo hävdade att den ersättning som betalades ut inte var tillräcklig för att täcka förlusterna, men talan avvisades eftersom skiljedomstolen inte ansåg Gallo vara en investerare vid tidpunkten för expropriationen.

Liknande fall kan ha förekommit eller kan komma att uppstå i framtiden med europeiska investerare, men eftersom dessa fall inte har lett till skiljedom finns det mycket lite offentlig information att tillgå. Det är möjligt att kanadensiska investerare har utsatts för liknande behandling, men kommissionen har inte någon information om detta.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001132/13
to the Commission
Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE), Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE) and Paul Murphy (GUE/NGL)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: Follow-up to Written Question E-011230/2012

In its answer to Written Question E-011230/2012, the Commission justifies the inclusion of an investor-to-state dispute settlement (ISDS) mechanism in the EU-Canada Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) by saying that there have been cases of expropriation in which European or other investors apparently did not receive any compensation and were not able to start legal proceedings in Canada.

1. Which companies were concerned, and how many cases does the Commission know of in which European investors suffered such a loss?

2. Can the Commission give the exact case citations or other documentation on the cases mentioned?

3. Can the Commission give the following details about the cases:

a) What kind of expropriation was involved?

b) What were the obstacles which meant that the companies concerned could not seek remedy within the Canadian legal system?

c) Has the Commission enquired whether Canadian investors have been subjected to similar treatment?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(22 March 2013)

The Commission is aware of two cases where a Canadian Province expropriated an investor without paying due compensation, or without compensating at all, and without granting the investor access to local courts.

In AbitibiBowater v. Canada (Award of 15 December 2010), AbitbiBowater, an American investor, was expropriated by the Province of Newfoundland. The Province had passed the 'Abitibi-Consolidated Rights and Assets Act' which expropriated all of the company's assets (see Section 5 of the Act) without compensation (see Section 10) and denying access to local courts to the foreign investor (see Section 11). A settlement agreement was concluded between the investor and Canada.

In Gallo v. Canada (award of 15 September 2011), a US national claimed that it was the owner of a Canadian company called 1532382 Ontario Inc. which had received the administrative approval from Ontario to use a mine for waste disposal. The Ontario legislature passed the Adams Lake Act, prohibiting the disposal of waste in that mine and revoking the previous administrative approval (see Section 2 and 3 of the Act), denying access to local courts (sections 5 to 7). M. Gallo argued that the compensation paid was not sufficient to cover its loss but the action was dismissed because the tribunal considered that M. Gallo was not an investor at the time of the expropriation.

Such cases may have arisen or arise in the future involving European investors, but these have not gone to arbitration, hence there is little publicly available information available in this context. It is possible that Canadian investors have been subject to similar treatment, but the Commission does not have information in this regard.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001134/13
à la Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(4 février 2013)

Objet: Pour un «Fonds européen d'aide aux plus démunis» plus ambitieux

Le Fonds européen d'aide aux plus démunis, proposé par la Commission le 24 octobre dernier, ne cesse de surprendre: non seulement il aura des missions plus larges que celles de son prédécesseur, le PEAD, mais en plus son budget, déjà resserré, semble se réduire à chaque nouvelle annonce. Pourtant, le nombre de ceux qui en ont besoin ne cesse de croître.

La Commission a certes travaillé avec sérieux à la recherche d'un compromis acceptable par tous, pour éviter la disparition de l'aide alimentaire. Mais doit-on pour autant tout accepter sous prétexte que «c'est déjà mieux que rien»?

Aujourd'hui, près d'un Européen sur cinq est menacé de pauvreté ou d'exclusion. Plus de 43 millions d'Européens ne parviennent pas à se nourrir de façon suffisante ou appropriée.

Pourtant, le 24 octobre, la Commission a choisi de ne consacrer que 2,5 milliards d'euros à ce fonds, soit un budget déjà inférieur de 1 milliard à celui du PEAD. Depuis, on parle d'un budget de seulement 2,1 milliards sur 7 ans, alors que les associations ont un besoin évalué à au moins 4,5 milliards d'euros.

Avec le FEAD, les États auront le choix de privilégier la fourniture de nourriture ou de biens de base. Alors que le programme précédent n'est pas parvenu à garantir que tous les Européens aient de quoi manger au quotidien, il est hors de question de reléguer cet objectif essentiel au rang de simple option.

C'est pourquoi je demande, au vu de l'urgence de la situation, que la Commission nous procure des chiffres précis et des propositions d'actions concrètes pour les acteurs de terrain, centrées sur la fourniture de l'aide alimentaire. Nous avons une responsabilité envers les plus démunis. Ne nous rendons pas coupables d'un compromis au rabais qui les condamnerait.

Réponse donnée par Mr Andor au nom de la Commission
(26 mars 2013)

Le Fond européen d'aide aux plus démunis ne suffira pas à répondre à lui seul au dénuement des citoyens européens les plus vulnérables. Il y contribuera néanmoins et la proposition de la Commission prévoit un cofinancement des États membres qui augmentera les ressources disponibles. Le Fond européen d'aide aux plus démunis viendra en outre en complément des dispositifs nationaux qui fournissent une assistance non-financière aux plus pauvres, en aide alimentaire, mais aussi en biens de consommation de base pour les personnes sans-abris ou les enfants confrontés à la très grande pauvreté.

La Commission propose un instrument qui assure à la fois une grande prévisibilité des ressources et une grande flexibilité. En effet, le Fond serait mis en œuvre par les États membres à travers des programmes multi-annuels. Chaque pays serait donc en mesure d'adapter l'assistance en privilégiant une des formes d'assistance, par exemple l'aide alimentaire, ou en les combinant, afin de répondre au mieux aux situations nationales.

Cette proposition de la Commission a été transmise au Parlement européen et au Conseil de l'Union européenne. Il est maintenant de leur ressort d'entériner la création de ce nouveau fond et d'adopter ses modalités de fonctionnement. De ce point de vue, il est très positif que l'accord du Conseil européen du 7 et 8 février dernier sur le futur cadre financier prévoit effectivement la mise en place de ce fond en rétablissant la proposition initiale de la Commission d'une enveloppe financière de 2.5 milliards d'euros.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001134/13
to the Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: For a more ambitious Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived

Who knows what the Commission will announce next about the Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived it proposed on 24 October 2012. Not only will the fund have a broader remit than its predecessor, the MDP, but its budget (which has already been cut in comparison with the MDP) seems to be getting smaller and smaller with each new announcement. This is at a time when more and more people are in need of European aid.

The Commission has no doubt worked hard to find a compromise acceptable to all so that the European aid programme can continue. But that does not mean we should accept any proposal on the grounds that anything is better than nothing.

Currently almost one in every five Europeans is at risk of poverty or exclusion. More than 43 million Europeans cannot afford enough food or the right kinds of food.

On 24 October however, the Commission decided to earmark only EUR 2.5 billion for the fund, which is EUR 1 billion less than the MDP budget. Since then, there has been talk of a seven-year budget of EUR 2.1 billion, notwithstanding the fact that the associations concerned have said that they need at least EUR 4.5 billion.

Under the proposed fund, States would be free to decide whether to focus on providing basic foods or basic goods. Whilst the MDP was unable to ensure that everyone in Europe had enough to eat every day, there should be no question of transforming this core objective into something optional.

In view of the above and the pressing nature of the situation, can the Commission provide detailed figure and proposals for practical food aid distribution measures that can be implemented by people on the ground? We have a responsibility towards the most deprived members of society. We should not accept cheap compromises which would worsen their plight.

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission
(26 mars 2013)

Le Fond européen d'aide aux plus démunis ne suffira pas à répondre à lui seul au dénuement des citoyens européens les plus vulnérables. Il y contribuera néanmoins et la proposition de la Commission prévoit un cofinancement des États membres qui augmentera les ressources disponibles. Le Fond européen d'aide aux plus démunis viendra en outre en complément des dispositifs nationaux qui fournissent une assistance non-financière aux plus pauvres, en aide alimentaire, mais aussi en biens de consommation de base pour les personnes sans-abris ou les enfants confrontés à la très grande pauvreté.

La Commission propose un instrument qui assure à la fois une grande prévisibilité des ressources et une grande flexibilité. En effet, le Fond serait mis en œuvre par les États membres à travers des programmes multi-annuels. Chaque pays serait donc en mesure d'adapter l'assistance en privilégiant une des formes d'assistance, par exemple l'aide alimentaire, ou en les combinant, afin de répondre au mieux aux situations nationales.

Cette proposition de la Commission a été transmise au Parlement européen et au Conseil de l'Union européenne. Il est maintenant de leur ressort d'entériner la création de ce nouveau fond et d'adopter ses modalités de fonctionnement. De ce point de vue, il est très positif que l'accord du Conseil européen du 7 et 8 février dernier sur le futur cadre financier prévoit effectivement la mise en place de ce fond en rétablissant la proposition initiale de la Commission d'une enveloppe financière de 2.5 milliards d'euros.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001135/13
à la Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(4 février 2013)

Objet: Droits de plantation: des inquiétudes demeurent

Le groupe de haut niveau (GHN) sur les droits de plantation, lors de sa dernière réunion tenue le 14 décembre dernier, a présenté des recommandations encourageantes pour l'ensemble de la filière vinicole européenne.

Prenant en compte les préoccupations exprimées par les producteurs, le GHN a proposé de maintenir un système de protection pour toutes les catégories de vins, avec notamment l'établissement de plafonds de plantation.

Il revient désormais à la Commission de préciser les aspects de ce nouveau dispositif dans sa proposition législative, en répondant aux interrogations persistantes des professionnels de la filière, notamment concernant la durée du nouveau dispositif et le niveau des plafonds de plantation.

Il est essentiel, pour la stabilité de la filière, de mettre en place un dispositif pérenne et suffisamment protecteur pour tous les vins européens. Fixer une durée de six ans pour l'application de ce nouveau régime fait craindre une libéralisation des droits de plantation à l'expiration du dispositif. Par ailleurs, déterminer un niveau optimal pour le plafonnement des autorisations de plantation s'avère essentiel pour garantir un système de régulation équilibré.

En conséquence, la Commission peut-elle préciser le niveau des plafonds de plantation qu'elle envisage de proposer? La Commission peut-elle par ailleurs préciser si le nouveau dispositif a vocation à devenir pérenne ou si elle le conçoit comme un dispositif temporaire?

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(8 avril 2013)

Une discussion a eu lieu au cours de l'année 2012 concernant les plantations vinicoles dans l'Union européenne, dans le cadre d'un groupe de haut niveau (GHN). Ce groupe de haut niveau a été créé après que plusieurs États membres producteurs de vin, certains membres du Parlement européen et un certain nombre d'organisations concernées à l'échelon de l'UE ont fait part de leurs préoccupations. Sa dernière réunion a eu lieu le 14 décembre 2012 et un rapport final contenant leurs conclusions respectives est disponible sur le site web de la DG AGRI ([1]).

La suite à donner à ces conclusions sera examinée dans le cadre des discussions relatives à la réforme de la PAC, notamment en ce qui concerne les détails relatifs à la conception d'un système d'autorisations de nouvelles plantations vinicoles. La définition du seuil annuel au niveau européen pour la délivrance des autorisations de nouvelles plantations vinicoles doit être basée sur un équilibre entre, d'une part, la nécessité pour le secteur de répondre avec dynamisme aux nouveaux défis liés à l'augmentation de la consommation de vin sur les marchés des pays tiers et, d'autre part, la nécessité d'assurer une croissance harmonieuse des plantations vinicoles. Il convient en outre de souligner que, selon les conclusions du groupe de haut niveau, les États membres auront la possibilité de réduire ce seuil au niveau national ou régional, ainsi que pour certaines AOP et IGP et pour les vins sans indication géographique.

Dans ce contexte, il faut également tenir compte du fait que tout système fondé sur une restriction des droits fondamentaux des citoyens de l'UE (tels que la liberté d'entreprise et le droit à la propriété) doit respecter le contenu essentiel de ces droits et libertés et est soumis au principe de proportionnalité, de sorte que des limitations ne peuvent être apportées que si elles sont nécessaires et répondent effectivement à des objectifs d'intérêt général reconnus par l'Union ou au besoin de protection des droits et libertés d'autrui ([2]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/wine/high-level-group/docs/final-report_en.pdf
([2]) Voir l'article 52 de la Charte des droits fondamentaux de l'Union européenne, JO C 364 du 18.12.2000.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001135/13
to the Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: Concerns remain over issue of planting rights

At its most recent meeting on 14 December 2012, the High Level Group on wine planting rights put forward a number of recommendations which are good news for the European wine industry as a whole.

In the light of producers' misgivings, the group proposed maintaining a regulatory framework for all categories of wine, for example by establishing planting ceilings.

It is now for the Commission to set out in its legislative proposal details of the new framework and so respond to the concerns repeatedly expressed by wine industry professionals about the period for which the new arrangements will apply and what the planting ceilings will be.

In the interests of industry stability, the framework needs to be permanent and provide sufficient protection for all European wines. Applying the new arrangements for only six years would spark fears that the restrictions on planting rights would be relaxed once that period comes to an end. Setting the right ceiling for planting authorisations is a sine qua non-for a balanced regulatory system.

Can the Commission therefore specify the planting ceilings it intends to propose? Will the new arrangements become permanent or does it envisage them as a temporary measure?

Answer given by Mr Cioloș on behalf of the Commission
(8 April 2013)

A discussion took place during 2012 on vine plantings in the European Union, in the context of a High Level Group (HLG). This HLG was established following the concerns expressed by several wine-producing Member States, certain European Parliament MEP's and a number of stakeholder organisations at EU level. Its last meeting took place on 14 December 2012, and a final report with respective conclusions is already available in DG AGRI's website ([1]).

The follow-up to those conclusions will be done in the context of discussions related to the CAP reform, including in what concerns any details on the design of a scheme of authorisations for new vine plantings. The definition of the annual threshold at EU level for the issuing of authorisations for new vine plantings must be based on a balance between, on the one hand, the need for the sector to answer with dynamism to the new challenges posed by the increase of wine consumption in third country markets, and on the other hand the need to have an orderly growth of vine plantings. It should also be highlighted that, according to the HLG conclusions, Member States shall have the possibility to reduce that threshold at national or regional levels, as well as for specific PDO, PGI or for wines without geographical indication.

In this context it also needs to be taken into account that any system based on restrictions to fundamental rights of the EU citizens (such as the freedom to conduct a business and the right to property) needs to respect the essence of those rights and freedoms and is subject to the principle of proportionality, so that limitations may be made only if they are necessary and genuinely meet objectives of general interest recognised by the Union or the need to protect rights and freedoms of others ([2]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/wine/high-level-group/index_en.htm
([2]) See Article 52, Charter of fundamental rights of the European Union, OJ C 364, 18.12.2000.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001136/13
al Consiglio
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD) e Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(4 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Violazione dei principi di sussidiarietà e proporzionalità nella proposta di direttiva COM(2012)0788 relativa ai prodotti del tabacco

Con riferimento alla proposta di direttiva COM(2012)0788 sul ravvicinamento delle disposizioni legislative, regolamentari e amministrative degli Stati membri relative alla lavorazione, alla presentazione e alla vendita dei prodotti del tabacco e dei prodotti correlati, il Senato della Repubblica italiana ha espresso un parere motivato, rilevando che vi sono elementi contrari ai principi di sussidiarietà e proporzionalità enunciati dal Protocollo n. 2 del TFUE.

Si consideri che l'articolo 24 della proposta, in cui si afferma che gli Stati membri sono liberi di adottare differenti regolamentazioni del settore, potrebbe essere in contrasto con l'articolo 114 del TFUE che la Commissione ha posto come base giuridica della proposta.

Inoltre, tenendo presente che uno degli scopi basilari e universalmente condivisi della proposta è la tutela della salute dei cittadini, alcune disposizioni restrittive ivi contenute paiono andare in contrasto al principio di proporzionalità, in quanto potrebbero disincentivare o rendere meno efficaci gli investimenti da parte dell'UE e degli Stati membri in ricerca e innovazione finalizzati ad introdurre politiche sanitarie di riduzione del rischio derivato dal fumo.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può il Consiglio rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Ritiene opportuno rivedere le disposizioni della proposta tenendo in debita considerazione sia i principi di sussidiarietà e proporzionalità, sia le ricadute economiche sui lavoratori interessati dalle proposte modifiche della legislazione in vigore?

2. Ritiene opportuno modificare la base giuridica della proposta, aggiungendo l'art. 168 TFUE all'art. 114?

3. Ritiene opportuno valutare adeguatamente le ripercussioni della proposta in termini economici e occupazionali su tutta la filiera del tabacco, dai coltivatori, ai rivenditori, alle entrate erariali degli Stati membri?

Risposta
(15 maggio 2013)

Il Consiglio ha ricevuto il parere motivato del Senato della Repubblica italiana, insieme ad una serie di altri pareri motivati (Repubblica ceca — camera bassa, Italia — Camera dei deputati, parlamento svedese, parlamento greco, Romania — camera bassa, parlamento portoghese e parlamento danese), in merito alla proposta della Commissione concernente una direttiva sul ravvicinamento delle disposizioni legislative, regolamentari e amministrative degli Stati membri relative alla lavorazione, alla presentazione e alla vendita dei prodotti del tabacco e dei prodotti correlati, conformemente al protocollo n. 2 sull'applicazione dei principi di sussidiarietà e di proporzionalità.

La proposta della Commissione è attualmente all'esame del Consiglio. Le questioni relative alla sussidiarietà e proporzionalità, nonché la base giuridica e le ripercussioni della proposta, saranno esaminate durante le deliberazioni.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001136/13
to the Council
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD) and Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: Violation of the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality in the proposal for a directive COM(2012)0788 on tobacco products

The Senate of the Italian Republic has issued a reasoned opinion on the proposal for a directive COM(2012)0788 on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States concerning the manufacture, presentation and sale of tobacco products and related products, stating that there are aspects of it which breach the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality laid down in Protocol No 2 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU).

It should be noted that Article 24 of the proposal, which states that the Member States are free to adopt different regulations for the sector, could be contrary to Article 114 TFEU, which the Commission used as the legal basis of the proposal.

Moreover, bearing in mind that one of the fundamental and universally accepted objectives of the proposal is to protect public health, some of the restrictive provisions contained in it appear to go against the principle of proportionality, as they could discourage or render less effective investments by the EU and the Member States in research and innovation aimed at introducing healthcare policies to lower the risk associated with smoking.

In the light of the above, can the Council answer the following questions:

1. Does it believe that the provisions of the proposal should be reviewed, with due regard both for the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality and for the financial impact on workers affected by the proposed changes to current legislation?

2. Does it believe that the legal basis of the proposal should be amended in order to add Article 168 TFEU to Article 114?

3. Does it believe that there should be a proper assessment of the financial and employment-related impact of the proposal on the entire tobacco industry, from growers and retailers through to the tax revenue for Member States?

Reply
(15 May 2013)

The Council has received the reasoned opinion of the Senate of the Italian Republic as well as a number of other reasoned opinions (Czech Republic — lower chamber, Italy — lower chamber, Swedish Parliament, Greek Parliament, Romania — lower chamber, Portuguese Parliament and Danish Parliament) on the Commission proposal for a directive on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States concerning the manufacture, presentation and sale of tobacco products and related products, in accordance with Protocol No 2 on the application of the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality.

The Commission proposal is currently under consideration in the Council. The issues of subsidiarity and proportionality, as well as the legal basis and impact of the proposal, will be examined in the course of deliberations.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001137/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(4 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Consequências do temporal que afetou Portugal no distrito de Leiria e medidas a tomar

Na sequência de uma visita recente ao distrito de Leiria, para avaliar as consequências do temporal que se abateu sobre a região no passado mês de janeiro, pude constar a dimensão dos estragos provocados, bem como as falhas clamorosas no domínio do restabelecimento das normais condições de funcionamento da vida económica e social, em várias das localidades afetadas.

No norte do distrito, no concelho de Pombal, foram várias as famílias, empresas e serviços públicos afetados pelo temporal. O corte de eletricidade que afetou algumas freguesias do concelho, como a freguesia do Louriçal, prolongou-se por vários dias, o mesmo sucedendo com as telecomunicações (rede fixa e rede móvel). Assim, a somar aos estragos diretos provocados pelo temporal — habitações e outros edifícios danificados, equipamentos públicos parcialmente destruídos, produções agrícolas e florestais destruídas — existem ainda os prejuízos decorrentes do bloqueio da normal atividade económica e social, nos dias subsequentes ao temporal.

Estes acontecimentos vêm demonstrar a importância da propriedade e gestão públicas de setores estratégicos da economia, como a energia e telecomunicações, dos quais depende, em última instância, a própria segurança das populações e a segurança nacional.

Impõe-se agora um trabalho centrado em duas preocupações essenciais: a reparação dos estragos causados pelo temporal e o ressarcimento pelos prejuízos causados às famílias e empresas; e a adoção de medidas estruturais de prevenção de novas catástrofes no futuro.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que apoios da UE poderão ser mobilizados em cada uma destas vertentes — reparação dos estragos e medidas estruturais de prevenção de novas catástrofes?

2. Tendo em conta a pressão feita pela Comissão Europeia para a privatização do setor energético português (assim como de outros setores estratégicos), fez alguma avaliação dos impactos e consequências futuras desta opção no domínio da segurança das populações e da segurança nacional?

3. Tendo em conta as recomendações feitas pelo Parlamento Europeu, no relatório Ferreira, aprovado em setembro de 2010, relativo à prevenção de catástrofes, quais dessas recomendações foram, até à data, implementadas pela Comissão?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(8 de abril de 2013)

1. As autoridades portuguesas podem apresentar um pedido para beneficiar do apoio do Fundo de Solidariedade da UE, se os danos excedem o limiar de 987 milhões de euros. O pedido deve ser apresentado no prazo de 10 semanas a contar do início da catástrofe. A Comissão está pronta a fornecer aconselhamento sobre a preparação da candidatura. O Fundo de Solidariedade não pode compensar perdas privadas de indivíduos ou empresas.

O Fundo Europeu de Desenvolvimento Regional não pode ser utilizado para operações de emergência. Poderá, no entanto, ser pertinente para a reconstrução a mais longo prazo e investimentos para as empresas. Para 2007-2013, o programa «Valorização do Território» pode igualmente financiar as medidas de prevenção e gestão de riscos.

2. O debate sobre a necessidade de mecanismos de capacidade revela que podem igualmente ocorrer problemas de segurança do aprovisionamento num mercado dominado por empresas do setor da energia estatais ou privadas. Todos os operadores de redes de transporte são obrigados, pelo direito nacional e europeu, a garantir a segurança do aprovisionamento nas suas redes, independentemente da natureza da sua propriedade. Em muitos Estados-Membros, a privatização da antiga empresa estatal de energia deu origem a mercados mais concorrenciais nos quais novos concorrentes introduzem fontes alternativas de abastecimento, o que pode beneficiar a segurança do aprovisionamento.

3. Desde 2010, a Comissão intensificou a cooperação com os Estados-Membros em matéria de gestão do risco de catástrofes, centrando-se no intercâmbio de boas práticas, avaliações dos riscos e planeamento, sensibilização, etc. Estas ações foram integradas nas principais políticas e instrumentos financeiros da UE ([1]) e serão reforçadas pela proposta da Comissão de um novo mecanismo de proteção civil ([2]). Com base nas avaliações fornecidas pelos Estados-Membros, a Comissão publicará ainda em 2013 uma primeira visão global dos atuais e dos futuros riscos.

([1]) Como a política de coesão, adaptação às alterações climáticas, saúde, segurança nuclear, legislação de proteção ambiental, investigação.
([2]) COM(2011) 0934 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001137/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: Aftermath of the storm that hit Leiria, Portugal and action to be taken

Following a recent visit to the district of Leiria to assess the aftermath of the storm that hit the region in January, I witnessed the scale of the damage caused as well as the blatant failure to restore normal economic and social activity in several of the affected areas.

Many families, businesses and public services in the municipality of Pombal, in the north of the district, were affected by the storm. The electricity outage that affected some parishes in the municipality, such as the parish of Louriçal, lasted for several days, and telephone lines (landline and mobile) were also down. As a result, in addition to the direct damage caused by the storm — damage to homes and other buildings, some damage to public amenities and the destruction of agricultural and forestry products — families and businesses suffered losses due to the failure to restore normal economic and social activity in the days that followed.

These events highlight the importance of public ownership and management of strategic economic sectors such as energy and telecommunications, which ultimately affect public safety and national security.

Two key issues must now be addressed: repairing the damage caused by the storm and compensating families and businesses for the losses suffered; and adopting structural measures to prevent new disasters in the future.

1. What EU support could be mobilised in each of these areas, namely repairing the damage caused and adopting structural measures to prevent new disasters?

2. Given that the Commission has pressured Portugal into privatising its energy sector (as well as other strategic sectors), has it assessed the impacts and future consequences of this privatisation on public safety and national security?

3. Which of Parliament's recommendations from the Ferreira report on disaster prevention, adopted in September 2010, has the Commission implemented to date?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(8 April 2013)

1. The Portuguese authorities may consider applying for EU Solidarity Fund aid, if the damage exceeds the threshold of EUR 987 million. The application should be submitted within 10 weeks of the start of the disaster. The Commission stands ready to give advice on preparing the application. The Solidarity Fund may not compensate private losses of individuals or businesses.

The European Regional Development Fund cannot be used for emergency operations. It might however be relevant, for longer term reconstruction and investments for businesses. The 2007-2013 programme 'Valorização do Território' can also finance risk prevention and management measures.

2. The debate on the need for capacity mechanisms shows that security of supply problems may equally occur in markets dominated by state-owned or by privately-owned energy companies. All transmission system operators are obliged under European and national law to guarantee security of supply in their grids, regardless of the nature of their ownership. In many Member States, privatisation of former state-owned energy incumbents leads to more competitive markets where new competitors bring in alternative sources of supply, which can benefit the security of supply.

3. Since 2010, the Commission has stepped up cooperation with Member States in disaster risk management, focusing on exchange of good practices, risk assessments and planning, awareness raising etc. These actions have been integrated into key EU policies and financial instruments ([1]) and will be further strengthened with the Commission's proposal for a new Civil Protection Mechanism ([2]). On the basis of assessments provided by the Member States, the Commission will publish a first overview of present and future risks later in 2013.

([1]) Such as cohesion policy, climate change adaptation, heath, nuclear safety, environmental protection legislation, research.
([2]) COM(2011) 0934 final.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001138/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(4 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Esquema Europeu de Comércio de Emissões — ponto da situação

O preço da tonelada métrica de carbono no Esquema de Comércio de Emissões (ETS) atingiu um novo mínimo de 2,81 euros, deixando ainda mais longínquo qualquer incentivo para a transição para tecnologias hipocarbónicas. De acordo com alguns analistas, para que o ETS constituísse um estímulo efetivo para o investimento nestas tecnologias, o preço da tonelada métrica de carbono teria que atingir pelo menos os 20 euros. Ou seja, os mecanismos de mercado, tão aclamados pela Comissão Europeia, revelam, assim, a sua ineficácia e perversidade. Depois de fraudes e de lucros fabulosos para os poluidores, o mercado do carbono revela, uma vez mais, a sua essência: incentivar a especulação e o «*business as usual*» no que às emissões diz respeito.

Em face desta situação, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Não considera existirem evidências suficientes do falhanço do ETS?

2. Que medidas vai tomar em caso de falhanço da opção de retirada de licenças do mercado («*backloading*»)?

3. Considera a possibilidade de propor abordagens alternativas às abordagens de mercado?

Resposta dada por Connie Hedegaard em nome da Comissão
(22 de março de 2013)

A Comissão não considera que o regime de comércio de licenças de emissão da UE (RCLE) tenha falhado enquanto abordagem. Dito isto, a desaceleração da economia suprimiu a procura de numerosas mercadorias importantes e levou à contração da atividade económica em geral, o que teve um impacto profundo na procura de licenças de emissão. Além disso, um conjunto de outros fatores ligados à transição para a fase 3 do RCLE (2013-20) contribui para a criação de desequilíbrios temporários adicionais entre a oferta e a procura. O preço do carbono reflete a resultante abundância de licenças.

A Comissão concorda que o sinal dado pelos preços atuais do carbono constitui um obstáculo ao investimento em tecnologias hipocarbónicas. A Comissão tomou, por isso, a iniciativa de optar pela retirada de 900 milhões de licenças do mercado, do início ao fim da fase 3. O próximo passo consiste em debater e determinar medidas estruturais (opções delineadas no relatório da Comissão ao Parlamento Europeu sobre a situação do mercado europeu do carbono ([1])) para dar resposta ao excedente de um modo sustentável.

O que é necessário é muito simplesmente vontade política para fazer frente aos impactos imprevistos que a crise teve no sistema. Outros atores a nível internacional também introduziram (por exemplo, a Austrália, a Coreia do Sul e a Califórnia) ou preparam-se para introduzir os seus próprios sistemas de comércio de licenças de emissão (por exemplo, a China). Se queremos desenvolver uma ação ao nível internacional, precisamos que o mercado europeu volte a melhorar, de modo a garantir que este continuará a inspirar confiança.

([1]) COM(2012) 652.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001138/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: EU Emissions Trading System — state of play

The price of a metric tonne of carbon under the Emissions Trading System (ETS) has hit an all-time low of EUR 2.81, further reducing any incentive to switch to low-carbon technologies. According to some analysts, the price of a metric tonne of carbon would have to reach at least EUR 20 for the ETS to effectively stimulate investment in these technologies. In other words, the market mechanisms so highly acclaimed by Commission have proven to be ineffective and ill-advised. Polluters continue to evade taxes and make huge profits, once again revealing the essence of the carbon market: to encourage speculation and business as usual as far as emissions are concerned.

1. Does the Commission not think that there is sufficient evidence to prove that the ETS has failed?

2. What measures will it take should the option to remove allowances from the market (backloading) fail?

3. Will it consider proposing alternatives to the market approaches?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(22 March 2013)

The Commission does not think that the EU ETS has failed as an approach. This said the economic downturn has supressed the demand for numerous major commodities and led to the contraction of economic activity in general, which has had a profound impact on the need for emissions allowances. In addition a number of other factors relate to the transition to Phase 3 (2013-2020) of the ETS contributes to temporary additional imbalances between supply and demand. The carbon price reflects the resulting abundance of allowances.

The Commission agrees that the prevailing carbon price signal hampers low-carbon investment; which is why it has taken the initiative to backload the auctioning of 900 million allowances from early in Phase 3 towards the end. Next step is to discuss and decide about structural measures (options outlined in the Commission report on the state of the carbon market ([1]) as requested by the European Parliament) to address the surplus sustainably.

What is needed is very simple — political will to address the unforeseen impacts the crisis had on the system. Other actors at the international level have also introduced (e.g. Australia, South Korea and California) or are about to introduce (e.g. China) their own ETS. If we want to pursue international action, we need a better European market again to ensure that it continues to inspire confidence.

([1]) COM(2012) 652.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001139/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(4 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Montantes do empréstimo do FEEF e do MEE a Portugal

Nas últimas semanas foram divulgadas informações contraditórias sobre o montante global do empréstimo do Fundo Europeu de Estabilização Financeira (FEEF) a Portugal. Primeiro, a Comissão Europeia anunciou um aumento de cerca de 2 mil milhões, aos 26 mil milhões de euros inicialmente previstos. Posteriormente, o Presidente do FEEF, Klaus Regling, disse tratar-se de um erro da Comissão, afirmando que «o desembolso líquido a Portugal durante o período 2011-2014 será de 26 mil milhões de euros, como inicialmente planeado». A própria Comissão Europeia corrigiu depois as afirmações inicialmente feitas, apontando novos valores, distintos dos divulgados no relatório da sexta avaliação.

Em face desta confusão, solicitamos à Comissão que nos informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Qual é afinal o montante proveniente do FEEF que será recebido por Portugal e quais os prazos previstos?

2. Quanto será pago por Portugal ao FEEF (amortização do empréstimo, mais juros e comissões) e quais os prazos previstos?

3. Qual o montante proveniente do MEE que será recebido por Portugal e quanto será pago por Portugal ao MEE (a título de amortização do empréstimo, mais juros e comissões)? Quais os prazos previstos em cada caso?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(11 de março de 2013)

A Comissão, ao preparar o sexto relatório de avaliação ([1]), consultou todos os mutuantes ([2]) com vista a obter valores exatos relativamente aos respetivos desembolsos, passados e futuros, a Portugal. A pedido expresso das autoridades portuguesas, a Comissão, em colaboração com o FEEF, concordou em rever esse relatório no que toca à concessão de empréstimos por parte do FEEF, sublinhando os montantes dos desembolsos líquidos do FEEF.

O montante principal da assistência financeira a Portugal desembolsada pelo FEEF deverá atingir 28,4 mil milhões de euros. Este montante é relevante na perspetiva dos mutuantes, uma vez que define o montante das garantias do FEEF pelos Estados-Membros fiadores. O montante do desembolso líquido do FEEF deverá ser igual a 26 mil milhões de euros, sendo este o montante relevante do ponto de vista da gestão de tesouraria, uma vez que é este o montante que entra nas contas do Tesouro do país. A diferença entre os dois montantes corresponde essencialmente à «reserva de segurança específica para o empréstimo» e à «margem pré-paga» que estavam previstas no quadro jurídico do FEEF quando este foi criado e foram aplicadas às primeiras *tranches* dos desembolsos a Portugal. De acordo com as estimativas mais recentes do FEEF, Portugal deverá previsivelmente reembolsar 26,3 mil milhões de euros ao FEEF, dada a alteração do quadro jurídico do FEEF e o mecanismo de correção acordado.

A taxa de juro cobrada pelo FEEF é variável; depende do custo de financiamento do FEEF, ou seja, da taxa de juro a que o FEEF se financia no mercado. O FEEF cobra a Portugal taxas normais. Cada empréstimo do FEEF a Portugal tem um prazo de vencimento definido; o prazo médio de vencimento dos empréstimos do FEEF a Portugal situa-se atualmente em 14,7 anos. A possibilidade de uma extensão dos prazos de vencimento dos empréstimos concedidos a Portugal e à Irlanda está a ser ponderada pelos Estados-Membros.

O MEE, de acordo com o plano financeiro do atual programa, não desembolsará quaisquer fundos a Portugal.

([1]) Os dados e explicações recebidos dos mutuantes foram apresentados no relatório original.
([2]) O MEEF, o FEEF e o FMI.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001139/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: EFSF and ESM: loan amounts to Portugal

In recent weeks contradictory information has come to light regarding the total loan amount that Portugal will receive from the European Financial Stability Facility (EFSF). Initially, the Commission announced that around EUR 2 billion had been added to the EUR 26 billion initially provided for. Subsequently, the President of the EFSF, Klaus Regling, said that the Commission had made a mistake and that the net disbursements to Portugal during the period 2011-2014 would amount to EUR 26 billion as initially planned. The Commission later corrected its initial statement and indicated new values that were different to those disclosed in the sixth evaluation report.

1. How much will Portugal receive from the EFSF and what deadlines have been set?

2. How much will Portugal pay to the EFSF (loan amortisation, plus interest and fees) and what deadlines have been set?

3. How much will Portugal receive from the European Stability Mechanism (ESM) and how much will Portugal pay to the ESM (loan amortisation, plus interest and fees)? What deadlines have been set in each case?

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

The Commission, when preparing the 6th review report ([1]), consulted all the lenders ([2]) for precise estimates of their past and future disbursements to Portugal.. Upon the explicit request by the Portuguese authorities the Commission, in consultation with the EFSF, agreed to revise the report with respect to the EFSF lending part and to stress the EFSF net disbursement amounts in the report.

The principal financial assistance to Portugal disbursed by the EFSF is projected to be equal to EUR 28.4 billion. This amount is relevant from the lenders' perspective as it defines the amount of EFSF guarantees by the guarantor MS. The net EFSF disbursement amount is projected to be equal to EUR 26 billion, which is relevant from the cash management perspective as this is the amount that reaches the country's Treasury account. The difference between the two amounts is mainly attributable to the 'loan specific cash buffer' and the 'prepaid margin' that were present in the EFSF legal framework when the EFSF was created and were applied to the first tranches of disbursements to Portugal. According to the EFSF latest estimates, Portugal may be expected to repay EUR 26.3 bn to the EFSF, given the change of the EFSF legal framework and the agreed rebate mechanism.

The interest rate charged by the EFSF is variable; it depends on the EFSF funding cost, ie the interest rate at which the EFSF borrows in the market. The EFSF charges Portugal standard fees. Each EFSF loan to Portugal has a defined maturity; the average maturity of EFSF loans to Portugal is currently 14.7 years. Extension of loan maturities to Portugal and Ireland is under consideration by MS.

The ESM, according to the current programme financing plan, will not disburse any funds to Portugal.

([1]) The data and explanations received from the lenders were presented in the original report.
([2]) The EFSM, the EFSF and the IMF.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001140/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(4 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Nacionalização da banca como meio para a recuperação económica

Por um lado, a Comissão Europeia, em sucessivas avaliações à execução do programa UE-FMI em Portugal, vem instigando ao despedimento de funcionários públicos e a cortes crescentes nos salários e nas despesas sociais, em áreas como a saúde, a educação, a generalidade dos serviços públicos, a segurança social ou as transferências para o poder local. Estes cortes, para além de terem mergulhado o país numa profunda recessão, que por sua vez é indissociável do disparar do peso da dívida, vêm deteriorando as condições de vida da esmagadora maioria do povo português.

Por outro lado, alguns dos principais bancos privados continuam, mesmo neste cenário, a acumular lucros significativos. Bancos que foram capitalizados com dinheiros públicos; bancos que ganharam com a especulação sobre a dívida pública (financiando-se junto do BCE a taxas de juro de 1 % e adquirindo dívida pública portuguesa a taxas de juro várias vezes superiores); bancos que restringem o crédito à economia, mas que, não obstante, justificam o comprometimento, por parte do Estado, de 20 mil milhões de euros em garantias; bancos que, nalguns casos, não pagaram os impostos devidos e justos ao Estado.

Ou seja: a banca privada tem manifestamente saído cara ao Estado português e aos contribuintes, o mesmo sucedendo, de resto, noutros países.

Em face do exposto, solicitamos à Comissão que nos informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Tendo em conta que vem defendendo a necessidade imperiosa de cortes na despesa pública, visando o equilíbrio das finanças públicas, e tendo em conta o desequilíbrio causado pela banca privada nessas mesmas contas públicas, acaso considerou a Comissão a possibilidade de sugerir a nacionalização da banca?

2. Por que razão considerou recentemente o Comissário Olli Rehn não ser aconselhável orientar para outros fins o dinheiro destinado pela troika à recapitalização da banca privada?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(17 de abril de 2013)

A neutralidade no que se refere ao regime de propriedade (artigo 345.° do TFUE) e a livre circulação de mercadorias, pessoas, serviços e capitais são princípios básicos da União. Neste contexto, tal como é referido no Memorando de Entendimento, a Comissão não vai sugerir a nacionalização de bancos privados em Portugal. A Comissão considera que a nacionalização de empresas privadas, que podem permanecer razoavelmente nas mãos do setor privado, é suscetível de provocar efeitos negativos a longo prazo na economia portuguesa, na medida em que vai desencorajar o tão necessário investimento estrangeiro. No entanto, de acordo com as condições segundo as quais os bancos foram capitalizados com fundos públicos em Portugal, enquanto estes fundos aí permanecerem, o Estado tem uma importante a palavra a dizer na sua gestão de modo a proteger o dinheiro dos contribuintes.

A finalidade do dinheiro do Instrumento de apoio à solvência dos bancos é a de servir como mecanismo de apoio no caso de um banco privado não ser capaz de mobilizar quantidades adequadas de capital nos mercados. O Instrumento de apoio cumpre, portanto, uma função de garantia importante para a preservação da estabilidade macrofinanceira em Portugal, um dos principais objetivos do Programa de Ajustamento Económico e também uma condição prévia essencial para a conclusão do programa por parte de Portugal. Ao esgotar os recursos do Instrumento de apoio à solvência dos bancos para outros efeitos esta função de garantia seria perdida. Por esta razão, o Comissário responsável pelos Assuntos Económicos e Monetários reafirmou que os fundos destinados ao Instrumento de apoio não podem ser utilizados para outros fins.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001140/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: Nationalising banks to stimulate economic recovery

In successive reviews regarding the implementation of the EU-IMF programme in Portugal, the Commission has called for the dismissal of public sector workers and increased cuts to wages and social spending in areas such as health, education, public services, social security and transfers to local government. These cuts, as well as having plunged the country into a deep recession, which in turn has led to the debt burden, have caused living conditions to deteriorate for the overwhelming majority of Portuguese people.

Despite this economic climate, however, some major private banks continue to make significant profits: banks that were capitalised using public money; banks that have profited from speculation on public debt (using ECB funding at interest rates of 1 % to buy Portuguese public debt at interest rates several times higher); banks that restrict credit to the economy, yet justify the EUR 20 billion State commitment in guarantees; banks that, in some cases, have not paid taxes duly owed to the State.

In other words, private banks have proved expensive for Portugal and its taxpayers, and the same can be said for other countries.

1. Given that the Commission has called for urgent public spending cuts in order to balance public finances, and that private banks have led to imbalance in these public accounts, will the Commission consider suggesting that these banks be nationalised?

2. Why did Commissioner Olli Rehn recently advise against using money allocated by the troika to recapitalise private banks for other purposes?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(17 April 2013)

Neutrality as regards the system of property ownership (Article 345 TFEU), and the free movement of goods, persons, services and capital are basic principles of the Union. Against this background, as also reflected in the memorandum of understanding, the Commission will not suggest the nationalisation of private banks in Portugal. The Commission considers that the nationalisation of private enterprises that can reasonably stay in private hands are likely to have negative long-term effects on the Portuguese economy as it will deter much-needed foreign investment. Nevertheless, according to the terms under which individual banks have been capitalised with public funds in Portugal and as long as these funds will remain in the banks the State will have a strong say in the management of these banks so as to protect taxpayers' money.

The purpose of the money in the Portuguese Bank Solvency Support Fund (BSSF) is to serve as a backstop in the event of a private bank not being able to raise adequate amounts of capital on the market. The BSSF therefore fulfils an insurance function which is important for the preservation of macro-financial stability in Portugal, a major goal of the Economic Adjustment Programme and an essential pre-condition for Portugal's graduation from the programme. By depleting the funds in the BSSF for other purposes this insurance function would be lost. For this reason, the Commissioner responsible for Economic and Monetary Affairs has re-affirmed that money earmarked for the BSSF cannot be used for other purposes.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001141/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(4 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Relatório anual da OIT sobre tendências mundiais de emprego

No seu relatório anual sobre as tendências mundiais do emprego, publicado em Genebra, a Organização Internacional do Trabalho (OIT) prevê um aumento de 5,1 milhões de desempregados em 2013 e mais três milhões em 2014. Isto depois de o desemprego ter aumentado quatro milhões em 2012.

De acordo com este relatório, o desemprego no mundo vai ultrapassar o patamar dos 202 milhões de pessoas em 2013 e bater o recorde absoluto de 199 milhões, registado em 2009.

O Diretor-Geral da OIT responsabilizou em particular as políticas na Zona Euro pela diminuição do emprego, assinalando que 73,8 milhões de jovens estão desempregados e que aumentam de forma preocupante os jovens desempregados de longa duração.

Em face do exposto, perguntamos à Comissão:

1. Que avaliação faz deste relatório?

2. Que avaliação faz da afirmação do Diretor-Geral da OIT sobre as responsabilidades da UE na evolução assustadoramente negativa do desemprego?

3. Determinarão este relatório e estas afirmações alguma mudança de atitude e de políticas por parte da Comissão?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(9 de abril de 2013)

1. A Comissão partilha das preocupações da OIT, expressas no seu relatório de 2013, e gostaria de remeter os Senhores Deputados para a publicação «Evolução do emprego e da situação social na Europa» ([1]) no que diz respeito à análise das tendências europeias.

2.-3. O apelo da OIT em prol de uma abordagem da recuperação económica centrada no emprego vem confirmar a abordagem adotada pela própria Comissão, refletida na Análise Anual do Crescimento de 2013 e no Pacote do Emprego adotado em 2012. A Análise Anual do Crescimento de 2013 recomenda que os Estados-Membros reforcem a cobertura e a eficácia dos serviços de emprego e das políticas ativas do mercado de trabalho. Fornece orientações firmes aos Estados-Membros em matéria de políticas de emprego e do mercado de trabalho, colocando a tónica no desemprego de longa duração, no desemprego juvenil, na flexibilidade interna e na aprendizagem ao longo da vida. A Análise Anual de Crescimento de 2013 também insiste na criação de emprego e no potencial de setores em expansão, por exemplo a economia verde, os cuidados de saúde e as TIC.

As iniciativas da Comissão no domínio do emprego dos jovens ([2]) e do investimento social ([3]) estão de acordo com o apelo da OIT à criação de programas de garantia destinados a grupos específicos do mercado de trabalho. É o que se verifica, em especial, no caso de uma recomendação recentemente adotada sobre mecanismos de garantia destinados aos jovens com vista a garantir que todos os jovens até aos 25 recebem uma oferta de emprego com qualidade, prosseguem estudos ou iniciam uma formação ou um estágio profissional no prazo de quatro meses depois de terem deixado o ensino formal.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=113&newsId=1774&furtherNews=yes
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=1036&newsId=1731&furtherNews=yes
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=750&newsId=1807&furtherNews=yes

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001141/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: Annual ILO report on global employment trends

In its annual report on global employment trends, published in Geneva, the International Labour Organisation (ILO) predicts an increase of 5.1 million in the number of unemployed in 2013 and a further increase of 3 million in 2014. This comes after global unemployment rose by 4 million in 2012.

According to this report, the number of unemployed worldwide will rise to more than 202 million in 2013, surpassing the all-time record of 199 million reached in 2009.

The Director-General of the ILO laid particular blame on EU policies for the rise in unemployment, highlighting the fact that 73.8 million young people are currently unemployed and the number experiencing long-term unemployment is increasing at an alarming rate.

1. What is the Commission's assessment of this report?

2. How does it view the Director-General of the ILO's statement regarding the EU's accountability for the alarming rise in unemployment?

3. Will this report and the Director-General's statement change the Commission's attitude and policies?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2013)

1. The Commission shares the ILO's concerns expressed in its 2013 report and would like to refer the Honourable Member to the Employment and Social Developments in Europe Review ([1]) for the analysis of European trends.

2-3. The ILO's call for a jobs-centred approach to economic recovery confirms the Commission's own approach, as reflected in the Annual Growth Survey (AGS) 2013 and the Employment Package adopted in 2012. The AGS 2013 recommends that Member States reinforce the coverage and effectiveness of employment services and active labour market policies. It presents strong guidance to Member States for their employment and labour market policies by focusing on long term unemployment, on youth unemployment and on internal flexibility and life-long learning. The 2013 AGS also puts a strong emphasis on job creation and the potential of expanding sectors, such as the green economy, healthcare and ICT.

The Commission's initiatives on youth employment ([2]) and social investment ([3]) are in line with the ILO's plea for guarantee programmes for targeted labour market groups. This is in particular the case for the recently adopted recommendation on youth guarantee schemes ensuring that all young people up to age 25 receive a quality offer of a job, continued education, an apprenticeship or a traineeship within four months of leaving formal education.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=113&newsId=1774&furtherNews=yes
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=1036&newsId=1731&furtherNews=yes
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=750&newsId=1807&furtherNews=yes

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001142/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(4 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Relatório da Oxfam sobre os custos da desigualdade

A organização não governamental Oxfam divulgou recentemente um relatório intitulado «The cost of inequality: how wealth and income extremes hurt us all», preparado por ocasião do Fórum Económico Mundial de Davos.

Segundo dados deste relatório, o rendimento líquido dos 100 multimilionários mais ricos ascendeu, no ano passado, a 240 mil milhões de dólares (180 milhões de euros). Este montante, afirma a Oxfam, é quatro vezes superior ao necessário para acabar com a pobreza extrema.

Neste relatório, a Oxfam critica a existência de paraísos fiscais, onde «os mais ricos beneficiam de um sistema económico mundial falseado que os favorece». A organização calcula que o fim dos paraísos fiscais, onde se escondem 32 biliões de dólares (24 biliões de euros), ou seja um terço da riqueza mundial, geraria um aumento das receitas fiscais aos Estados na ordem dos 189 mil milhões de dólares (142 mil milhões de euros). A Oxfam pronuncia-se contra a atual tendência para formas mais regressivas da fiscalidade, pugnando por uma taxa mínima de tributação das empresas à escala mundial.

No mesmo sentido, defende o incentivo dos rendimentos em vez dos rendimentos do capital e o aumento dos investimentos nos serviços públicos gratuitos e na Segurança Social.

Em face do exposto, perguntamos à Comissão:

1. Que avaliação faz deste relatório?

2. Dispõe de informações relativas à evolução das desigualdades na UE? Que avaliação faz desta evolução?

3. Que medidas e políticas pensa adotar para diminuir as desigualdades na UE?

4. Que medidas tomou até à data para erradicar os paraísos fiscais? Vai propor alguma taxa mínima de tributação das empresas à escala mundial ou à escala da UE?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(2 de abril de 2013)

1. O relatório da Oxfam «*The Cost of Inequality*: *How Wealth and Income Extremes Hurt Us All*» é um contributo valioso para o debate em matéria do aumento das desigualdades e cita factos e dados importantes relativos à coesão social e ao desempenho socioeconómico.

2. A Comissão tem estado a monitorizar as tendências de desigualdades salariais usando os mecanismos acordados com os Estados-Membros, nomeadamente o sistema de recolha de dados da EU sobre o rendimento das famílias, o SILC ([1]). A Comissão debateu os recentes desenvolvimentos relativamente à disparidade salarial, aos elevados níveis de riqueza e de rendimentos e à equidade da tributação, assim como as limitações dos métodos de recolha de dados atuais em termos de salários e riqueza nos seus relatórios sobre a evolução do emprego e da situação social na Europa ([2]) em 2011 e 2012.

3. Combater as desigualdades socioeconómicas é fundamental, não só para uma UE inclusiva, mas também para o crescimento económico. A estratégia «Europa 2020» promove o crescimento inteligente, sustentável e inclusivo, contribuindo assim para lutar contra as desigualdades socioeconómicas ao possibilitar o aumento da participação no emprego, e abordando as questões das desigualdades a nível dos rendimentos e dos serviços sociais eficazes. As recomendações específicas por país, relativas a 2012 convidam os Estados Membros em causa a tomarem medidas que concorram para melhorar o nível de vida, reduzir a pobreza e favorecer o crescimento inclusivo. As medidas tomadas ao abrigo da Plataforma Europeia contra a Pobreza e a Exclusão Social apoiam os progressos realizados para a consecução do grande objetivo de resgatar 20 milhões de pessoas da pobreza até 2020.

([1]) Dados Estatísticos Europeus sobre Rendimentos e Condições de Vida.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=738&langId=pt&pubId=7315

4. A posição da Comissão sobre os paraísos fiscais está definida no Plano de Ação para reforçar a luta contra a fraude e a evasão fiscais ([3]) e numa das suas recomendações ([4]). A Comissão não pretende propor uma taxa mínima de tributação das empresas à escala mundial ou da EU.

([3]) COM(2012) 722 final de 6.12.2012, «Plano de Ação para reforçar a luta contra a fraude e a evasão fiscais».

([4]) C (2012)8805 final, «Recomendação da Comissão no que se refere às medidas destinadas a encorajar os países terceiros a aplicar normas mínimas de boa governação em matéria fiscal».

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001142/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: Oxfam report on the cost of inequality

The non-governmental organisation Oxfam recently released a report entitled 'The cost of inequality: how wealth and income extremes hurt us all', ahead of the World Economic Forum in Davos.

According to this report, the 100 richest billionaires earned a net income of USD 240 billion (EUR 180 billion) last year. Oxfam claims that this amount is enough to end extreme poverty four times over.

In the report, Oxfam criticises the existence of tax havens, where 'the richest benefit from a global economic system which is rigged in their favour'. The organisation estimates that closing tax havens, which hold as much as USD 32 trillion (EUR 24 trillion) or a third of all global wealth, would yield around USD 189 billion (EUR 142 billion) in additional tax revenues. Oxfam calls for a reversal of the current trend towards more regressive forms of taxation, and advocates a global minimum corporation tax rate.

Similarly, it supports measures to boost wages compared with returns available to capital and increased investment in free public services and social security.

1. What is the Commission's assessment of this report?

2. Does it have any information regarding the evolution of inequality in the EU? How does it evaluate this evolution?

3. What measures and policies will it adopt to reduce inequality in the EU?

4. What measures has it taken to date to eradicate tax havens? Will it propose a global or an EU minimum corporation tax rate?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2013)

1. Oxfam's report 'The Cost of Inequality: How Wealth and Income Extremes Hurt Us All' is a valuable contribution to the debate on growing inequalities and quotes facts and figures important for social cohesion and socioeconomic performance.

2. The Commission has been monitoring the tendencies in income inequalities using the mechanisms agreed with the EU Member States, notably the household data collection scheme of EU SILC ([1]). The Commission has discussed the recent developments in wage polarisation, top incomes and wealth and social fairness of taxation as well as the limitations of the current data collection methods on income and wealth in its reports on Employment and Social Developments in Europe ([2]) in 2011 and 2012.

3. Combating socioeconomic inequalities is fundamental not only to an inclusive EU, but also to economic growth. The Europe 2020 strategy promotes growth that is smart, sustainable and inclusive, thus helping fight socioeconomic inequalities through enhanced participation in employment, addressing wage inequalities and effective social services. Dedicated 2012 Country Specific Recommendations call concerned Member States to undertake measures to help raise standards of living, alleviate poverty, and foster inclusive growth. Actions under the European Platform against Poverty and Social Exclusion support the progress towards the headline target of lifting 20 million people out of poverty by 2020.

4. The Commission position on tax havens is set out in the action plan to strengthen the fight against tax fraud and tax evasion ([3]) and one of its Recommendations ([4]). The Commission has no plans to propose a global or an EU minimum corporation tax rate.

([1]) European Statistics on Income and Living Conditions.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=738&langId=en&pubId=7315
([3]) COM(2012) 722 final, An Action Plan to strengthen the fight against tax fraud and tax evasion) of 6.12.2012.
([4]) C(2012)8805 final, Commission Recommendation regarding measures intended to encourage third countries to apply minimum standards of good governance in tax matters.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001143/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(4 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Situação da indústria de confeções em Portugal

Numa visita recente à empresa Sindutex — Sociedade Industrial de Confeções, Lda., situada na freguesia do Louriçal, concelho de Pombal, na região Centro de Portugal, pude constatar algumas das principais dificuldades enfrentadas pelos empresários deste setor.

A forte contração do mercado interno (em resultado da profunda e duradoura recessão em que o país mergulhou na sequência da aplicação do programa UE-FMI); a forte e crescente concorrência nos mercados internacionais, em especial oriunda dos países asiáticos (agravada pela crescente liberalização e desregulação do comércio internacional promovida pela UE); a escassez e os elevados custos do crédito, bem como o elevado peso de outros custos de contexto comparativamente com outros concorrentes internacionais (energia, telecomunicações, combustíveis — problema que se agravou com a privatização destes setores estratégicos) são alguns dos principais problemas hoje enfrentados por um setor de mão de obra intensiva, que continua a ser um importante empregador a nível regional e nacional.

Os empresários assinalam, por um lado, a dificuldade de entrada dos seus produtos nalguns mercados emergentes — caso do Brasil — devido às elevadas tarifas sobre as importações europeias praticadas nesses países. Por outro lado, a UE celebra acordos de comércio livre que desprotegem estes setores, utilizados como moeda de troca de outros interesses industriais e dos serviços.

Em face desta situação, solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Que avaliação faz das críticas destes empresários?

2. Que medidas tomou ou pensa tomar para facilitar a entrada da produção europeia em mercados emergentes, como é o caso do Brasil?

3. Considera a possibilidade de inverter decisões que ameaçam a viabilidade da indústria têxtil e de confeções europeia, nomeadamente revendo o enquadramento deste setor nos acordos de comércio livre já celebrados e nas concessões comerciais atribuídas a alguns países asiáticos?

Resposta dada por Karel De Gucht em nome da Comissão
(26 de março de 2013)

1. A indústria da UE tem vindo a confrontar-se com um decréscimo do consumo no mercado interno nos últimos anos. Em tal contexto, as oportunidades de crescimento fora da UE significam que o acesso aos mercados internacionais se tornou muito importante para a indústria europeia, incluindo o setor dos têxteis e do vestuário. É por esta razão que a Comissão leva a cabo uma ambiciosa agenda de negociações comerciais e em matéria de execução da legislação. Tal como afirmou recentemente a Confederação Europeia do Vestuário e dos Têxteis, as decisões no sentido de iniciar negociações comerciais, como o acordo global de comércio e investimento com os EUA, são notícias positivas num momento em que a indústria dos têxteis e do vestuário depende das exportações como motor de crescimento. Esta agenda está associada a propostas específicas — por exemplo, relativas ao mercado único no que diz respeito a fundos de capital de risco, aos Fundos Europeus de Empresariado Social, etc. — com o objetivo de facilitar o acesso ao financiamento para as empresas da UE, incluindo as pequenas e médias empresas (PME).

2. A Comissão tem conhecimento das tarifas aduaneiras elevadas aplicadas pelo Brasil às importações de têxteis, assim como do grande interesse que a indústria de têxteis e vestuário da UE tem em exportar para o Brasil. A Comissão terá este aspeto em conta no contexto das negociações UE-Mercosul em curso. Estas negociações constituem a melhor perspetiva de resolução desta questão de forma satisfatória, conferindo aos produtores de têxteis da UE um melhor acesso aos mercados em fase de crescimento acelerado do Brasil e do Mercosul.

3. Os Acordos de Comércio Livre (ACL) atualmente em vigor, ou já celebrados com diferentes regiões ou países, oferecem à indústria de têxteis e vestuário da UE oportunidades consideráveis e, consequentemente, a Comissão não considera a possibilidade de os rever. Bem pelo contrário, uma vez que estes ACL provaram ser vantajosos para a indústria de têxteis e vestuário da UE, a Comissão tenciona prosseguir a sua agenda de comércio livre e equitativo com outros parceiros — incluindo no referido setor.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001143/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: Situation of the clothing industry in Portugal

In a recent visit to the Sindutex (Sociedade Industrial de Confeções, Lda) factory, in the parish of Louriçal, in the municipality of Pombal, central Portugal, I witnessed some of the main difficulties facing employers in the clothing industry.

This labour-intensive industry, which continues to be a major employer at regional and national level, is experiencing major problems such as: the sharp contraction of the domestic market (as a result of the deep and lasting recession triggered by the implementation of the EU-IMF programme); strong and increasing competition in international markets, especially from Asian countries (exacerbated by the increasing liberalisation and deregulation of international trade promoted by the EU); and the shortage and high cost of credit, in addition to higher operational costs (energy, telecommunications and fuel) than its international competitors — a situation which has worsened since the privatisation of these strategic sectors.

Employers complain that it is difficult to market their products in some emerging markets — such as Brazil — due to the high import tariffs placed on European goods. They also claim that the EU concludes free trade agreements that fail to protect the industry, which is used as a bargaining chip for other industrial interests and services.

1. What does the Commission make of these employers' criticisms?

2. What measures has it taken or will it take to help market European products in emerging markets, such as Brazil?

3. Will it consider reversing decisions that threaten the viability of the European textile and clothing industry, namely by reviewing the industry's inclusion in free trade agreements that have already been concluded and in trade concessions granted to some Asian countries?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(26 March 2013)

1. EU Industry has been facing a decrease in consumption in the internal market over recent years. In such context, the growth opportunities outside the EU mean that access to international markets has become very important for EU industry including the Textile and Clothing (T&C) sector. This is why the Commission is pursuing an ambitious trade negotiation and enforcement agenda. As recently stated by the European Apparel and Textile Confederation, decisions to start trade negotiations such as the Comprehensive Trade and Investment Agreement with the US are positive news in a moment when the T&C industry is relying on exports as an engine for growth. This agenda is coupled with specific proposals, e.g. Single Market for Venture Capital funds, European Social Entrepreneurship funds, etc., aimed at facilitating access to finance for EU enterprises, including small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs).

2. The Commission is aware of the high tariffs applied by Brazil on imported textiles and on strong interest the EU T&C industry has in exporting to Brazil. The Commission bears this in mind in the context of the ongoing EU-Mercosur negotiations. They offer the best prospect for addressing this issue satisfactorily, allowing EU textiles producers improved access to the Brazilian and Mercosur fast-growing markets.

3. The free trade agreements (FTAs) currently in force or concluded with different regions or countries present the EU T&C industry with considerable opportunities and, therefore, the Commission does not envisage the option of reviewing them. On the contrary, since these FTAs have proved to be beneficial to the EU T&C industry, the Commission intends to pursue its agenda of free and fair trade with other partners — including in the T&C sector.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001144/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(4 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Políticas e programas para as cidades no âmbito do QFP 2014-2020

A cidade de Lisboa enfrenta hoje um conjunto complexo e difícil de problemas e de desafios, seja em resultado de uma evolução nacional caracterizada pelo declínio económico e por uma inquietante regressão no plano social, fruto da aplicação do programa UE-FMI, seja em resultado de problemas específicos, alguns há muito aguardando solução, outros que se vêm agravando nos últimos anos.

Emprego, habitação, serviços públicos, cultura, educação, desporto, espaços verdes, mobilidade e transportes, qualificação e fruição do espaço público são algumas das áreas a carecer de intervenção e de investimentos diversos, combatendo chagas como a pobreza, a exclusão, as desigualdades e as injustiças sociais, que crescem de forma preocupante (isto apesar de a região de Lisboa e Vale do Tejo, por razões estatísticas, ter deixado de integrar o objetivo da convergência).

Esta intervenção e estes investimentos, no presente e no futuro, são essenciais para fazer de Lisboa uma cidade onde o bem-estar individual e coletivo seja uma realidade.

Solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Que programas e medidas, no âmbito do próximo Quadro Financeiro Plurianual (QFP) (2014-2020), poderão apoiar intervenções e investimentos nas áreas supramencionadas, em cidades como Lisboa? Quais as taxas de cofinanciamento previstas?

2. De que forma será a política para as cidades contemplada no próximo QFP 2014-2020?

3. Que instrumentos do atual QFP (2007-2013) poderão ainda ser mobilizados com estes objetivos? Quais as taxas de cofinanciamento previstas?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(2 de abril de 2013)

1. De acordo com as propostas da Comissão relativas ao regulamento que estabelece disposições comuns para os Fundos Estruturais e os Fundos de Investimento para o período de 2014-2020, e os seus respetivos projetos de regulamentos específicos correlativos, o Fundo Europeu de Desenvolvimento Regional (FEDER) e o Fundo Social Europeu podem ser utilizados para apoiar uma vasta gama de investimentos, a fim de promover a inclusão social, a criação de emprego e a redução da pobreza. A taxa de cofinanciamento para o apoio prestado pelos fundos às regiões mais desenvolvidas, como Lisboa, não poderá ser superior a 50 %, ao nível de cada prioridade.

2. No que se refere ao apoio às cidades, a Comissão propôs, no quadro do Regulamento do FEDER para 2014-2020 que se reservassem pelo menos 5 % dos recursos do FEDER atribuídos a nível nacional para o desenvolvimento urbano sustentável integrado, desde que determinadas tarefas relacionadas com ações integradas de desenvolvimento urbano sustentável sejam delegadas nas autoridades urbanas. A proposta da Comissão inclui igualmente a possibilidade de o FEDER apoiar, por iniciativa da Comissão, ações inovadoras de desenvolvimento urbano sustentável. Será criada uma plataforma de desenvolvimento urbano, complementar dos programas e organismos existentes, de modo a promover o reforço das capacidades, a ligação em rede e o intercâmbio de experiências entre as autoridades urbanas e os organismos responsáveis pela implementação de estratégias de desenvolvimento urbano sustentável e ações inovadoras neste domínio.

Estas propostas estão atualmente em fase de negociação com o Conselho e o Parlamento Europeu.

3. No atual período de 2007-2013, o programa de Lisboa pode financiar prioridades urbanas a título da prioridade 2 «valorização do território» e da prioridade 3 «coesão social». A taxa de cofinanciamento para as prioridades 2 e 3 é 66 %.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001144/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: Policies and programmes for cities under the MFF 2014-2020

The city of Lisbon is currently facing a complex and difficult array of problems and challenges as a result of the national economic downturn and worrying social decline triggered by the implementation of the EU-IMF programme and of specific issues that have long needed resolving or have come to light in recent years.

Employment, housing, public services, culture, education, sport, green spaces, transport and mobility, skills and use of public space are some of the areas in need of intervention and investment in order to tackle problems such as poverty, exclusion, inequality and social injustice, which are increasing at an alarming rate (even though the region of Lisbon and the Tagus Valley, for statistical reasons, is not covered by the convergence objective).

This intervention and investment, both now and in the future, is essential for Lisbon to become a city where individual and collective welfare is a reality.

1. What programmes and measures under the next multiannual financial framework (MFF) (2014-2020), may be used to support intervention and investment in the abovementioned areas, in cities such as Lisbon? What are the corresponding co-financing rates?

2. How will the policy for cities be included in the next MFF 2014-2020?

3. What instruments under the current MFF (2007-2013) may also be mobilised to achieve these goals? What are the corresponding co-financing rates?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2013)

1. According to the proposals by the Commission on the Common Provisions Regulation for the European Structural and Investment Funds 2014-2020, and their respective draft Fund-specific regulations, the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and the European Social Fund, may be used to support a broad range of investments in order to promote social inclusion, create employment and reduce poverty. The co-financing rate for support from the Funds to more developed regions like Lisbon shall not be higher than 50% at the level of each priority.

2. As regards support to cities, the Commission has proposed in the ERDF regulation for 2014-2020 to ring-fence at least 5% of the ERDF resources allocated at national level for integrated sustainable urban development, provided that certain tasks related to integrated actions for sustainable urban development shall be delegated to urban authorities. The Commission proposal also includes the possibility for the ERDF to support, at the initiative of the Commission, innovative actions for sustainable urban development. An urban development platform, complementary to the existing programmes and bodies, would be established to promote capacity building, networking and exchanges of experience between urban authorities and bodies responsible for implementing sustainable urban development strategies and innovative actions in this field.

These proposals are currently being negotiated with the Council and the European Parliament.

3. In the current period, the 2007-2013 Lisbon programme can finance urban priorities under priority 2, 'Territorial Enhancement' and priority 3, 'Social Cohesion'. The rate of co-financing for both priorities 2 and 3 is 66%.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-001145/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. február 4.)

Tárgy: Saját kezdeményezésű jelentés, 10. és 59. bekezdés – Erasmus program

A fogyatékossággal élő személyek mobilitásáról és befogadásáról, valamint a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékosságügyi stratégiáról szóló, 2011. október 25-én elfogadott jelentés 10. és 59. bekezdése egyértelművé teszi, hogy a befogadó oktatás rendkívül fontos és a fogyatékossággal élők – különösen a fogyatékossággal élő tanulók és egyetemi hallgatók – Európán belüli integrációjának középpontjában áll, figyelembe véve az egész Európát érintő gazdasági és társadalmi válságot, amelyben jelenleg a fiatalok a munkanélküliség növekvő és súlyos következményekkel járó szintjeivel néznek szembe.

Mit kíván tenni a Bizottság – tekintettel a mobilitás és az európai polgárok közötti megkülönböztetésmentesség európai értékeire – azzal kapcsolatban, hogy szükség van az Erasmus program hozzáférhetőségének javítására annak érdekében, hogy elegendő és megfelelő segítséget és pénzügyi támogatást lehessen nyújtani a jelnyelvet anyanyelvként használó egyetemi hallgatók számára?

Milyen módon nyújt megfelelő támogatást az Erasmus program a jelnyelvet használó egyetemi hallgatóknak, és mi alapján tudja kezelni a jelnyelvi tolmácsolás különböző tagállamokban való biztosításával kapcsolatban felmerülő költségeket, annak érdekében, hogy egyenlő oktatási lehetőségeket tudjon biztosítani a különböző nemzetiségű siket egyetemi hallgatók számára?

Andrula Vasziliu válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. március 26.)

A Bizottság elkötelezett amellett, hogy lehetővé tegye a fogyatékossággal élő személyek számára az összes európai oktatási és képzési program teljes mértékű kihasználását.

Az Erasmus program kiegészítő támogatást nyújt a fogyatékossággal élő hallgatók számára, ezzel elősegítve számukra az akadályok leküzdését a tanulással kapcsolatos mobilitási programokban való részvétel alatt. A hallgatók felhasználhatják ezt az összeget a magasabb utazási vagy lakhatási költségek fedezésére, különleges felszerelések vagy szolgáltatások kifizetésére vagy személyes asszisztens felfogadására a mobilitási időszak alatt. A jelnyelv használatával kapcsolatos igények szintén fedezhetők ebből a pénzösszegből. A 2010/2011-es tanév alatt a 230 000 mobilitási programban részt vevő hallgató közül 255 fogyatékossággal élő diák részesült ilyen ösztöndíjból. Bár számuk évről évre növekszik, ez az alacsony szám tükrözi a felsőoktatásban részt vevő, fogyatékossággal élő hallgatók általánosan alacsony számát.

A különleges támogatáson felül a tavalyi évben két, fogyatékossággal élő hallgatót választottak meg Erasmus-nagykövetnek, akik feladata, hogy tanulással kapcsolatos mobilitási programokban való részvételre biztassák fogyatékossággal élő diáktársaikat.

Az „Erasmus mindenkinek” 2014–2020 közt tartó program még többet fog tenni a fogyatékossággal élő személyek programba való bevonásáért. Egy új felsőoktatási charta fogja megerősíteni a megkülönböztetésmentesség elvének teljes tiszteletben tartását és az azonos részvételi lehetőségek biztosítását, ezenkívül a fogyatékossággal élő személyek számára több és kedvezőbb mobilitási lehetőséget fog biztosítani.

Az egész életen át tartó tanulás programja, amelynek része az Erasmus program is, számos, jelnyelvvel kapcsolatos projektet támogatott már. A közelmúltban indult programok egyike a EuroSign Interpreter (http://www.eurosign.uni-hamburg.de/es_overview.php), amely a jelnyelvi tolmácsok új, szakmai szerepének kialakítását segíti elő, valamint a „Signs2Cross: az európai siketek nyelvi mobilitása” elnevezésű projekt.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001145/13
to the Commission
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: INI report, paragraphs 10 and 59 — Erasmus programme

It is made clear in paragraphs 10 and 59 of the report on mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and EU Disability Strategy 2010-2020 adopted on 25 October 2011 that inclusive education is of the utmost importance and lies at the heart of the integration of people with disabilities in Europe, especially for disabled pupils and students and taking account of the economic and social crisis throughout Europe, with young people now facing increasing and devastating levels of unemployment.

With regard to the fundamental European values of mobility and non-discrimination among European citizens, what does the Commission intend to do with regard to the need for increasing accessibility of the Erasmus programme, in order to provide sufficient and proper help and financial support for students having sign language as a mother tongue?

How does the Erasmus programme provide suitable funding for students who are sign language users, and on what basis can it handle the costs involved in providing sign interpretation in the different Member States in order to ensure equal educational opportunities for deaf students of different nationalities?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(26 March 2013)

The Commission is committed to ensuring that people with disabilities can benefit fully from all European education and training programmes.

The Erasmus programme provides additional funding for students with disabilities to help them overcome barriers when going on a learning mobility programme. Students can use this funding to cover higher travel or accommodation costs, special equipment or services, or to have a personal assistant during their mobility period. Needs related to the use of sign language may also be covered. During the academic year 2010/2011, 255 students with disabilities received such a grant, out of the 230,000 mobile students. While it has increased year on year, this low number reflects the low number of students with disabilities in higher education generally.

In addition to special funding, two Erasmus student ambassadors with disabilities were selected last year to encourage other students with disabilities to take part in learning mobility programmes.

The 'Erasmus for All' programme 2014-2020 will do even more to integrate people with disabilities. Full respect for the principles of non-discrimination and equal access to opportunities will be reinforced through a new higher education charter and should ensure more and better mobility opportunities for persons with disabilities.

The Lifelong Learning Programme, of which Erasmus is one component, has funded numerous projects related to sign language. Recent examples include, EuroSign Interpreter (http://www.eurosign.uni-hamburg.de/es_overview.php), which promotes the development of a new professional role for interpreters between sign languages and 'Signs2Cross: Linguistic mobility for Deaf people in Europe'.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-001146/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. február 4.)

Tárgy: Az INI-jelentés 74. pontjának kérdésköre a fogyatékos emberek többletköltségei tekintetében

Mint ismeretes, a 2011 októberében elfogadott, a fogyatékossággal élő személyek mobilitásáról és befogadásáról, valamint a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékosságügyi stratégiáról szóló EP-jelentés (P7_TA(2011)0453) rögzíti, hogy a mindennapi életvitel során a fogyatékos emberek többletköltségekkel szembesülnek, ami jelentős hatással van az életminőségükre (74. pont).

Mutassa be az Bizottság, hogy a fogyatékos embereknek fogyatékossági típusonként (látás, hallás, mozgás, értelmi, autista stb.) átlagosan milyen extra költségekkel kell szembesülniük, annak érdekében, hogy a döntéshozók számára egyértelműbbé váljon a felmerülő kiadások nagyságrendje tagállamonként, a szegénység elleni küzdelem jegyében.

Viviane Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. március 25.)

A Bizottság elismeri, hogy számos fogyatékos személy fogyatékosságából adódóan többletköltségekkel szembesül mindennapi élete során. A Bizottság nem rendelkezik arra vonatkozó részletes adatokkal, hogy a fogyatékos személyek említett kategóriái esetében mekkora a fenti többletköltség. Nagy valószínűséggel feltételezhető ugyanakkor, hogy e költségek szintje jelentős eltérést mutat a fogyatékosság természete, fokozata, illetve az egyéni életkörülmények – többek között a lakóhely – szerint. Mindebből fakadóan nagyon bonyolult lenne e témakörben olyan hiteles átlagadatokat kiszámítani, amelyek a szegénység elleni küzdelmet érintő szakpolitikai döntéshozatal alapjául szolgálhatnának. E tekintetben ugyanis a tagállamok rendelkeznek közvetlen hatáskörrel. A Bizottságnak nincsen ismerete arról, hogy a tagállamok, illetve bármilyen, fogyatékossággal foglalkozó szervezet rendelkezik-e a Tisztelt Képviselő Úr által kért összesített adatokkal.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001146/13
to the Commission
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: The subject matter of point 74 of the INI Report in relation to the additional costs incurred by people with disabilities

As you know, the European Parliament resolution of October 2011 on mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) states that people with disabilities face additional costs in their daily lives, which has a considerable impact on their quality of life (point 74).

The Commission should present the average extra costs incurred by people with disabilities in each disability category (sight or hearing impairment, reduced mobility, mental disability, autism, etc.) in order to clarify the magnitude of the expenses incurred in each Member State to decision-makers in the context of the fight against poverty.

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

The Commission recognises that many persons with disabilities are facing additional costs in their daily lives as a consequence of their disability. It does not dispose of detailed data about such extra costs incurred by the mentioned different categories of persons with disabilities. One can, however, safely assume that there will be a great variety in the levels of costs depending on the nature of the disability, of its degree and also of the personal living circumstances including the place of residence. This will make it a complex exercise to calculate meaningful average data on this subject as a basis for policy making in the context of the fight against poverty. The direct competence for such policy making lies with the Member States. The Commission does not know whether any Member State or any organisation active in the field of disabilities disposes of the kind of aggregated data that the Honourable Member is requesting.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-001147/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. február 4.)

Tárgy: Az INI-jelentés 72. pontjának kérdésköre a fogyasztói magatartások tekintetében

Mint ismeretes, a 2011 októberében elfogadott, a fogyatékossággal élő személyek társadalmi befogadásáról és mobilitásáról és a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékosságügyi stratégiáról szóló európai parlamenti állásfoglalás (P7_TA(2011)0453) rögzíti, hogy egy fenntartható Európa érdekében szükség van a felelősebb fogyasztói szokások kialakítására (72. pont).

Mit tett és mit kíván tenni az Bizottság annak érdekében, hogy a fogyatékosságok kialakulásához is vezető káros fogyasztói szokásokért ne a társadalom vállaljon felelősséget, hanem a polgárokban tudatosuljanak egészségkárosító magatartásuk következményei?

Milyen jó gyakorlatok találhatóak a tagállamokban arra, hogy minél kevesebb fogyatékosság alakuljon ki?

Tonio Borg válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. április 3.)

A Bizottság az egészségre kiható magatartásformákkal a táplálkozásra és a testmozgásra, az alkohollal kapcsolatos károkra, illetve a dohányfogyasztásra vonatkozó fellépései keretében foglalkozik.

A táplálkozással, túlsúllyal és elhízással kapcsolatos egészségügyi kérdésekre vonatkozó, 2007-es európai stratégia több elsődleges cselekvési területet is meghatároz, köztük a gyermekek étkezési szokásainak javítását és az egészséges életmód előmozdítását.

A tagállamokat az alkohollal kapcsolatos károk csökkentésében támogató 2006-os uniós stratégia egyik prioritása felhívni a figyelmet a káros és veszélyes alkoholfogyasztás hatásaira. A Bizottság a tagállamokkal közös fellépést kezdeményezett az alkoholfogyasztás okozta károkról való tájékoztatás bevált gyakorlatainak megosztása érdekében.

A dohánytermékekről szóló irányelv felülvizsgálatára irányuló közelmúltbeli bizottsági javaslat arra törekszik, hogy a dohánytermékek piacának szabályozása tükrözze a dohányzás egészségkárosító hatását. A javaslat célja csökkenteni a dohánytermékek vonzerejét, és ezáltal elriasztani a fiatalokat attól, hogy maguk is fogyasztókká váljanak. A Bizottság emellett „A volt dohányosok megállíthatatlanok” címmel a dohányzásról való leszokásra buzdító uniós szintű kampányt is finanszíroz, a reklám- és közösségi felületeken keresztül a 28 millió 25–34 év közötti dohányost célozva meg.

Végezetül a közegészségügyi program keretében a Bizottság is részt vállal az EUROCAT együttes fellépés és a ritka betegségekre vonatkozó nemzeti tervek kifejlesztését célzó európai projekt, az EUROPLAN finanszírozásában. A fenti projektek nyomán a Bizottság a közelmúltban a születési rendellenességek elsődleges megelőzésére vonatkozó ajánlásokat tett közzé a ritka betegségekhez kapcsolódó nemzeti tervek és stratégiák számára.

A Bizottság valamennyi felsorolt politikai területen támogatja a jó gyakorlatok kialakítását és tagállamok közötti megosztását a kockázatkereső magatartás visszaszorítása érdekében.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001147/13
to the Commission
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: The subject matter of point 72 of the INI Report in relation to consumer habits

As you know, the European Parliament resolution of October 2011 on mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) states that if a sustainable Europe is to be achieved, more responsible consumer habits are required (point 72).

What efforts has the Commission made and what efforts does it intend to make to ensure that it is not society that takes responsibility for the harmful consumer habits that can also give rise to disabilities, but that citizens are made aware of the consequences of their health-endangering behaviour?

What good practices exist in Member States for reducing to a minimum the number of occurrences of disabilities?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(3 April 2013)

The Commission addresses health related behaviours through its work on nutrition and physical activity, alcohol related harm, and tobacco consumption.

The 2007 Strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity-related health issues identifies several priority areas for action including improving eating habits among children, and promoting a healthier lifestyle.

One of the priorities of the 2006 EU Strategy to support Member States in reducing alcohol related harm is to raise awareness about the impact of harmful and hazardous alcohol consumption. The Commisison has started a Joint Action with the Member States to exchange good practice to inform people on the harm caused by alcohol consumption.

In addition, the recent Commission proposal to revise the Tobacco products Directive aims to regulate the internal market in tobacco products in a way that reflects tobacco's negative impact on people's health. The proposal seeks to make tobacco products less attractive as a means to discourage young people from starting to use them. The Commission also finances an EU-wide smoking cessation campaign 'Ex-Smokers are Unstoppable', aimed at the 28 million smokers aged 25 to 34, which runs through advertising and social media.

Finally, the Commission is co-financing, under the Health Programme, the EUROCAT Joint Action, and EUROPLAN — European Project for Rare Diseases National Plans Development. These projects have recently led to the publication of recommendations for the primary prevention of congenital anomalies in National Plans and Strategies on Rare Diseases.

In all these policy areas the Commission fosters the development and exchange of best practices among Member States with the aim to reduce risk taking behaviours.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-001148/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. február 4.)

Tárgy: Az INI-jelentés 68. pontjának kérdésköre az uniós intézmények és tisztviselők érzékenyítésének vonatkozásában

Mint ismeretes, a 2011 októberében elfogadott, a fogyatékossággal élő személyek társadalmi befogadásáról és mobilitásáról és a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékosságügyi stratégiáról szóló európai parlamenti állásfoglalás (P7_TA(2011)0453) rögzíti, hogy fontos az uniós tisztviselők érzékenyítése a fogyatékkal élő személyek társadalmi befogadása kapcsán (68. pont).

Mit tett és milyen lépéseket szándékozik tenni a Bizottság annak érdekében, hogy az uniós tisztviselők a fogyatékos emberekkel, illetve a foglalkoztatásukkal kapcsolatos bánásmódról, szükségleteiről értesüljenek?

Mit tesz a Bizottság, hogy az EPSO-vizsgák – a siketek és nagyothallók számára is – teljes körűen akadálymentesek legyenek?

Hogyan kívánja a foglalkoztatott fogyatékos emberek számát, arányát növelni a nagyobb mértékű sokszínűség elérése érdekében?

Hogyan kívánja továbbá a Bizottság a nyilvánosan hozzáférhető dokumentumait a jelnyelvet használók számára is akadálymentesíteni?

Maroš Šefčovič válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. március 27.)

Az Európai Bizottság valamennyi helyi humánerőforrás szolgálata keretében működik esélyegyenlőségi tájékoztató központ, amely a fogyatékkal élő foglalkoztatottak problémáit kezeli. A Humánerőforrás-ügyi Főigazgatóságon belül a főigazgatóság szervezeti tájékoztató központként működő esélyegyenlőségi szolgálata foglalkozik a fogyatékkal élők problémáival. Az esélyegyenlőségről szóló honlap valamennyi alkalmazott számára tájékoztatást nyújt a fogyatékossággal kapcsolatos kérdésekről. A Bizottság még idén képzést indít kifejezetten a fogyatékossággal kapcsolatos ügyekkel foglalkozó belső szakemberek számára.

Az Európai Személyzeti Felvételi Hivatal (EPSO) jelenleg is számos intézkedést alkalmaz annak érdekében, hogy bármely uniós kiválasztási eljárás teljes mértékben hozzáférhető legyen a siket és nagyothalló jelentkezők számára. Ennek megfelelően, valamint az esélyegyenlőség biztosítása érdekében a jelentkezőknek, amennyiben szükséges és kellően indokolt, lehetőségük van speciális körülmények között részt venni a teszteken. Minden egyes erre irányuló kérelem egyedi elbírálásban részesül, hogy a jelentkező megfelelően indokolt igényei és az uniós kiválasztási folyamatok során alkalmazandó elvek, azaz az arányosság és az egyenlő bánásmód, a lehető legtökéletesebb összhangba kerüljenek.

A nyílt versenyvizsga-felhívások kimondják a versenyvizsgák akadálymentességét. A Bizottság érvényesíti a személyzeti szabályzat 1d. cikkének (4) bekezdésében lefektetett elvet, miszerint egy fogyatékkal élő személy akkor felel meg a személyzeti szabályzat által előírt toborzási feltételeknek, ha – megfelelő intézkedések megtétele után – el tudja látni az állással kapcsolatos alapvető feladatokat. Az Európai Bizottság a meghatározott fogyatékkal élők kérésére számukra hozzáférhető elektronikus dokumentumokat bocsát rendelkezésre.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001148/13
to the Commission
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: The subject matter of point 68 of the INI Report in relation to increasing the sensitivity of EU institutions and officials

As you know, the European Parliament resolution of October 2011 on mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) states that it is important to increase the sensitivity of EU officials with regard to the social inclusion of people with disabilities (point 68).

What steps has the Commission taken and what steps does it intend to take in order to ensure that EU officials are informed about the treatment of people with disabilities, including their employment, and their needs?

What efforts is it making to ensure that the EPSO examinations are fully accessible to the deaf and hard of hearing?

How does it intend to increase the number and rate of people with disabilities in employment in order to increase diversity?

Furthermore, how does it intend to ensure that its open-access documents are accessible to users of sign language?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2013)

Each local human resource service of the European Commission has an equal opportunities focal point treating issues related to staff with disabilities. Within the Directorate General of Human Resources issues related to persons with disabilities are addressed by its equal opportunities service, which functions as a corporate focal point. The equal opportunities website provides information regarding disability to all staff. The Commission is to launch this year training targeted specifically to in-house professionals responsible for dealing with disability issues.

EPSO already implements a large number of measures to ensure that all EU selection processes are fully accessible to the deaf and hard of hearing candidates. In this context, and in order to ensure equality of opportunities, such candidates can be granted special accommodations whenever necessary and duly justified to take the tests. Each file is processed individually to ensure the best possible match between the justified needs of the candidate and the principles of both proportionality and equal treatment applicable in EU selection processes.

Open competitions notices specify that competitions are accessible to persons with disabilities. The Commission implements Article 1d(4) of the Staff Regulations laying down that a person with a disability satisfies the recruitment conditions foreseen by the Staff Regulations if he can perform the essential functions of the job when reasonable accommodation is made. The European Commission provides at request accessible electronic documents for persons with specific disabilities.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-001149/13
a Tanács számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. február 4.)

Tárgy: Az INI-jelentés 57. pontjának kérdésköre: az előítéletek csökkentése a gyermekek körében

Mint ismeretes, a 2011 októberében elfogadott, a fogyatékossággal élő személyek mobilitásáról és befogadásáról, valamint a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékosságügyi stratégiáról szóló jelentés (P7_TA(2011)0453) rögzíti, hogy a fogyatékos emberekkel kapcsolatos előítéletek még mindig magasak, és az ő befogadásuk nélkül aligha érhetőek el az EU 2020-as célok (57. pont).

Mit kíván tenni az Tanács azért, hogy különösen a gyermekek és a fiatalok körében a fogyatékos emberekkel kapcsolatos negatív előítéletek csökkenjenek?

Hasznosnak tartja a Tanács az olyan kezdeményezéseket, amelyek célja, hogy már az óvodákban és iskolákban is többet tudjanak a diákok a fogyatékos emberek erőfeszítéseiről, kudarcairól és sikereiről?

Milyen követendő példákról, jó gyakorlatokról tud a tagállamokban?

Válasz
(2013. április 4.)

A Tanács elismeri a fogyatékossággal élő személyekkel szembeni előítéletek és megkülönböztetés elleni küzdelem fontosságát, és már eddig is hozott intézkedéseket ezen a területen.

Az EKSZ 13. cikkén (az EUMSZ 19. cikke) alapuló 2000/78/EK tanácsi irányelv ([1]) tiltja a foglalkoztatás és a munkavégzés során történő, valláson, meggyőződésen, *fogyatékosságon*, életkoron vagy szexuális irányultságon alapuló megkülönböztetést. A Bizottság 2008. július 2-án egy olyan javaslatot fogadott el, amely a valláson, meggyőződésen, *fogyatékosságon*, életkoron vagy szexuális irányultságon alapuló megkülönböztetés elleni védelmet olyan területekre is kiterjesztené, amelyekre a 2000/78/EK irányelv hatálya még nem terjed ki, így például a szociális védelemre, ideértve a szociális biztonságot és az egészségügyi ellátást, továbbá a szociális előnyökre, *az oktatásra*, valamint az árukhoz és szolgáltatásokhoz, köztük a lakhatáshoz való hozzáférésre és azok nyújtására ([2]). A javaslatot a Tanács jelenleg vizsgálja ([3]). A javaslat elfogadásához egyhangú döntésre lesz szükség, és a Tanács jelenleg nem tudja előre jelezni a folyamatban lévő tárgyalások kimenetelét.

Emellett, amint azt a tisztelt képviselő is bizonyára tudja, a Tanács és a tagállamok kormányainak a Tanács keretében ülésező képviselői 2010. június 7-én állásfoglalást ([4]) fogadtak el az új európai fogyatékosságügyi keretről. Az állásfoglalásban felkérték a tagállamokat és a Bizottságot, hogy hatáskörüknek megfelelően „ösztönözzék és tartsák fenn a fogyatékossággal élőkkel és az őket képviselő szervezetekkel folytatott párbeszédet a tájékozottság növelése és a jó irányítási kereten belüli hatékony együttműködés érdekében”, valamint hogy „mozdítsák elő az oktatási rendszerek továbbfejlesztését azzal a céllal, hogy megszüntessék a sztereotípiákat, valamint hogy fokozzák a fogyatékossággal élők iránti érzékenységet és toleranciát”.

Az állásfoglalás emellett kifejezetten elismeri a fogyatékossággal élők befogadása előmozdításának fontosságát az Európa 2020 stratégiával összefüggésben, és felkéri a tagállamokat és a Bizottságot, hogy „többek között megfelelő, a képzést és a foglakoztatást érintő intézkedésekkel használják ki a fogyatékossággal élőkben rejlő humán tőkét; ez is hozzájárulhat az Európa 2020 stratégia keretében meghatározott kiemelt cél – azaz a 20–64 éves nők és férfiak 75%-os foglalkoztatási arányának – elérésére irányuló törekvésekhez”.

Emlékeztetünk arra is, hogy a Tanács 2009. november 26-án elfogadta a fogyatékossággal élő személyek jogairól szóló ENSZ-egyezménynek az Európai Közösség által történő megkötéséről szóló határozatot ([5]). Az EU és majdnem minden tagállama részes fele az egyezménynek, amely sokféle területre vonatkozóan – többek között a tájékoztatással és szemléletformálással kapcsolatban is – tartalmaz rendelkezéseket.

([1]) A Tanács 2000/78/EK irányelve a foglalkoztatás és a munkavégzés során alkalmazott egyenlő bánásmód általános kereteinek létrehozásáról (HL L 303., 2000.12.2., 16. o., magyar nyelvű különkiadás, 5. fejezet, 4. kötet, 79. o.).
([2]) 11531/08.
([3]) Az elért eredményekről szóló legutóbbi jelentés: 16063/12.
([4]) 10173/10.
([5]) A Tanács határozata a fogyatékossággal élő személyek jogairól szóló ENSZ-egyezménynek az Európai Közösség által történő megkötéséről (HL L 23., 2010.1.27., 35. o.).

A tisztelt képviselő utolsó kérdésével kapcsolatban azt a tájékoztatást adhatjuk, hogy a Tanács közvetlenül nem érintett a bevált gyakorlatok tagállamok közötti cseréjében. Mindazonáltal a Bizottság, a Tanács és az Európai Parlament közös erőfeszítéseket tesz az erre a területre vonatkozó tevékenységek ösztönzése érdekében, többek között az egész életen át tartó tanulás programján ([6]) keresztül, amely támogatást nyújt az érintett szereplőknek, például az Európai Ügynökség a Sajátos Nevelési Igényű Tanulók Oktatásának Fejlesztéséért elnevezésű európai ügynökségnek.

([6]) Az Európai Parlament és a Tanács 2006. november 15-i 1720/2006/EK határozata az egész életen át tartó tanulás terén egy cselekvési program létrehozásáról (HL L 327., 2006.11.24., 45. o.).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001149/13
to the Council
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: The subject matter of point 57 of the INI Report in relation to the reduction of prejudice among children

As you know, the European Parliament resolution of October 2011 on mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) states that prejudice against people with disabilities is still rife, and that without their inclusion, it is unlikely that the aims of the EU 2020 strategy can be achieved (point 57).

What efforts does the Council intend to make in order to reduce prejudice against people with disabilities, in particular among children and young people?

Does it find initiatives aimed at teaching children as early as in kindergarten and in school about the struggles, failures and successes of people with disabilities useful?

What good examples and practices in Member States is it aware of?

Reply
(4 April 2013)

The Council has recognised the importance of fighting the prejudice and discrimination faced by persons with disabilities, and has already taken action in this area:

Council Directive 2000/78/EC, based on Article 13 of the EC Treaty (now Article 19 TFEU), prohibits discrimination on the grounds of religion or belief, *disability*, age or sexual orientation as regards employment and occupation ([1]). On 2 July 2008, the Commission adopted a proposal that would extend the protection against discrimination on the grounds of religion or belief, *disability*, age or sexual orientation, in order to cover areas not yet included in Directive 2000/78/EC, such as social protection, including social security and healthcare, social advantages, *education*, and access to and supply of goods and services, including housing ([2]). This proposal is currently under examination by the Council ([3]). Unanimity between the Members of the Council will be required before it can be adopted, and the Council is not in a position to anticipate the outcome of the ongoing negotiations.

Also, as the Honourable Member is certainly aware, on 7 June 2010 the Council and the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States, meeting within the Council, adopted a Resolution on a new European Disability Framework ([4]). In this Resolution, the Member States and the Commission are invited, in accordance with their respective competences, to 'support and maintain dialogue with persons with disabilities and their representative organisations with a view to awareness-raising, and to ensuring effective cooperation within a good governance framework' and 'to promote improvements in education systems, with the aim of eliminating stereotypes and promoting awareness and tolerance towards persons with disabilities.' The Resolution explicitly recognised the importance of promoting the inclusion of persons with disabilities in the context of the Europe 2020 strategy, inviting the Member States and the Commission 'to tap the human capital of persons with disabilities, including by developing the appropriate training and employment measures; this can also contribute to the efforts to reach the headline target set within the context of the Europe 2020 strategy aiming to bring to 75% the employment rate for women and men aged 20-64.'

It could be also recalled that on 26 November 2009 the Council adopted a decision concerning the conclusion, by the European Community, of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) ([5]). The EU and almost all the Member States are now parties to the UNCRPD, which includes a wide range of provisions, including awareness-raising requirements.

([1]) Council Directive 2000/78/EC establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation, OJ L 303, 2.12.2000, p. 16.
([2]) 11531/08.
([3]) Latest Progress Report: 16063/12.
([4]) 10173/10.
([5]) Council Decision concerning the conclusion, by the European Community, of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, OJ L 23, 27.1.2010, p. 35.

Concerning the Honourable Member's last question, the Council is not directly involved in the exchange of good practice between the Member States. However, the Commission, the Council and the European Parliament have already joined forces to encourage activities in this area, including through the Lifelong Learning Programme ([6]), which has supported relevant players such as the European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education.

([6]) Decision 1720/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 November 2006 establishing an action programme in the field of lifelong learning, OJ L 327, 24.11.2006, p. 45.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-001150/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. február 4.)

Tárgy: INI-jelentés 51., 52. és 62. pontjainak kérdésköre a tranzitfoglalkoztatás vonatkozásában

Mint ismeretes, a 2011 októberében elfogadott, a fogyatékos emberek társadalmi befogadásáról és mobilitásáról, valamint a 2010-2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékosságügyi stratégiáról szóló parlamenti jelentés (P7_TA(2011)0453) rögzíti az ún. átlépési programok (tranzitfoglalkoztatás) fontosságát (51., 52., illetve 62. pontok).

Mit tett és mit kíván tenni az Bizottság, hogy a fogyatékos emberek nyílt munkaerő-piaci foglalkoztatását nagyobb mértékben elősegítse, különösen (a cégek és szervezetek helyett/mellett) az adott személy közvetlen támogatása révén?

Milyen tagállami, különösen közép-európai példákat tud felhozni, amelyek ebbe az irányba tettek lépéseket, és mi volt a tartalmuk?

Viviane Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. április 18.)

A 2010–2020 közötti időszakra szóló európai fogyatékosságügyi stratégia kötelezettséget vállal annak lehetővé tételére, „hogy minél több, fogyatékos személy dolgozhasson a nyitott munkaerőpiacon” ([1]). A stratégia felsorolja a 2010–2015 közötti időszakban végrehajtandó bizottsági intézkedéseket ([2]). A foglalkoztatás területén a Bizottság elemzéssel, politikai iránymutatással, információcserével és pénzügyi támogatással látja el a tagállamokat a strukturális alapok együttes gazdálkodás keretében megvalósuló programjain keresztül.

A nemrégiben elfogadott szociális beruházási csomagban ([3]) a Bizottság az alulreprezentált munkavállalók munkaerő-piaci részvételét akadályozó tényezőket felszámoló olyan szakpolitikák létrehozására és elfogadására szólít fel, amelyek e munkavállalók speciális igényeit integrált megközelítésen keresztül kezelik. Az egyes személyeknek nyújtott közvetlen gyakorlati támogatás megvalósítása azonban a tagállami hatóságok feladata.

A fogyatékos személyek nyitott munkaerőpiacra történő átmenetét támogató legújabb tagállami (köztük a Cseh Köztársaságból származó) bevált gyakorlatok terén a „*Compendium of good practice*” (Bevált gyakorlatok kézikönyve) ([4]) szolgál példákkal. A kézikönyv célja annak ösztönzése, hogy más országok is hasonló, támogatott foglalkoztatási projekteket dolgozzanak ki. Továbbá az Eurofund közreadott egy tanulmányt a fogyatékossággal élő fiatalok aktív befogadásáról ([5]), amely feltérképezi tizenegy tagállam azon jogszabályait, szakpolitikáit és programjait, amelyek célja a fiatal fogyatékosok elmozdítása az inaktivitásból a foglalkoztatás felé.

Az Európa 2020 stratégiához és a gazdaságpolitikai koordináció európai szemeszteréhez kapcsolódó politikai folyamatok során a Bizottság folyamatosan szem előtt tartja annak szükségességét, hogy előmozdítsa a fogyatékos személyek nyitott munkaerőpiac általi befogadását. A Bizottság továbbá nyomon követi az aktív befogadási politikák reformját.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636:hu:NOT
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010SC1324:EN:NOT
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=1044&newsId=1807&furtherNews=yes
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/supported_employment_study.compendium_good_practice_ en.pdf
([5]) http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/publications/htmlfiles/ef12261_hu.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001150/13
to the Commission
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: The subject matter of points 51, 52 and 62 of the INI Report in relation to transitional employment

As you know, the European Parliament resolution of October 2011 on mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) stresses the importance of 'transition programmes' (transitional employment) (points 51, 52 and 62).

What efforts has the Commission made and what efforts does it intend to make to facilitate to a greater degree the employment of people with disabilities in the open labour market, in particular by providing support directly to the persons concerned (instead of or in addition to companies and organisations)?

Can it give examples of the steps that some Member States, particularly in Central Europe, have taken in this regard, and what these steps involved?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(18 April 2013)

The European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 undertakes to 'enable many more people with disabilities to earn their living on the open labour market' ([1]). It contains a list of actions for the Commission for 2010-2015 ([2]). In the area of employment, the Commission provides Member States with analysis, political guidance, information exchange and financial support through the jointly managed programmes of the Structural Funds.

In the recently adopted Social Investment Package ([3]) the Commission calls for activating and enabling policies for overcoming the barriers to underrepresented workers' participation on the labour market by addressing their specific needs through an integrated approach. Direct practical support to individuals remains however in the competence of the Member State authorities.

Examples of recent good Member State practice, including from the Czech Republic, in supporting the transition of people with disabilities to the open labour market can be found in the Compendium of good practice ([4]). The Compendium aims to be an encouragement for others to set up similar supported employment projects. Furthermore Eurofund has released a study on the active inclusion of young people with disabilities ([5]) where it maps the legislation, policies and programmes in 11 Members States which aim at moving young disabled people from inactivity to employment.

Within the policy processes related to the Europe 2020 strategy and the European Semester of economic policy coordination, the Commission systematically takes into account the need to promote the inclusion of persons with disabilities in the open labour market. It monitors reform of the active inclusion policies.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636:en:NOT.
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010SC1324:EN:NOT.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=1044&newsId=1807&furtherNews=yes.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/supported_employment_study.compendium_good_practice_ en.pdf
([5]) http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/publications/htmlfiles/ef12261.htm

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-001151/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. február 4.)

Tárgy: Az INI-jelentés 47. pontjának kérdésköre a kkv-k tájékoztatására vonatkozóan

Mint ismeretes, a 2011 októberében elfogadott, a fogyatékossággal élő személyek mobilitásáról és befogadásáról, valamint a 2010-2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékosságügyi stratégiáról szóló EP-jelentés (P7_TA(2011)0453) rögzíti, hogy a kkv-k rendkívül fontos szerepet játszanak a fogyatékos emberek foglalkoztatása terén (47.pont).

Mit tett és kíván tenni a Bizottság annak érdekében, hogy a kkv-k megfelelő és jobb minőségű információkhoz jussanak a fogyatékos emberek foglalkoztatásának előnyeiről, összhangban a jelentés 47. pontjában foglaltakkal?

Viviane Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. április 8.)

Amint azt a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra szóló Európai fogyatékosságügyi stratégia ([1]) 2010–2015-re meghatározott intézkedéseinek listája ([2]) jelzi, a Bizottság arra kíván „összpontosítani, hogy mit tudnak tenni az emberek, illetve hogy meggyőző érvekkel vegye rá a munkáltatókat a fogyatékossággal élők alkalmazására”.

A Bizottság a tagállamok által átruházott hatáskörök keretén belül cselekszik. A fogyatékossággal élők alkalmazásának elősegítését szolgáló, vállalatoknak nyújtott támogatást illetően az általános csoportmentességi rendelet ([3]) lehetővé teszi, hogy a tagállamok jelentős támogatást nyújtsanak azoknak a vállalkozásoknak, amelyek munkahelyeket teremtenek a fogyatékossággal élők számára. A közvetlen gyakorlati segítségnyújtás és a vállalatok tájékoztatása változatlanul elsősorban az illetékes tagállami hatóságok feladata marad. A vállalatok a strukturális alapoknak a tagállamokkal közösen kezelt programjai keretében részesülhetnek anyagi támogatásban.

Az információgyűjtés és tájékoztatás szintén része a Bizottság e területen folytatott támogató tevékenységének. A Bizottság széles körben terjesztette például a támogatott foglalkoztatás kiemelkedő példáit, amelyek a bevált gyakorlatok gyűjteményében ([4]) szerepelnek. A gyűjtemény a COWI A/S tanácsadó cég „A fogyatékossággal élők támogatott alkalmazása az EU és az EFTA-EGT területén” ([5]) című, a Bizottság által finanszírozott tanulmányának melléklete. A Bizottság szintén terjeszteni fogja az autizmus spektrum zavarral diagnosztizált személyek foglalkoztatását célzó kísérleti projektek eredményeit, miután valamennyi projekt lezárul.

Ezen túl az Eurofound nemrégiben közzétette a fogyatékkal élő fiatalok helyzetét vizsgáló tanulmányát ([6]), amely 11 tagállamban, köztük Szlovákiában, térképezi fel mindazon jogszabályokat, szakpolitikákat és programokat, amelyek célja, hogy a fogyatékkal élő fiatalokat az inaktivitástól a foglalkoztatottság irányába mozdítsák. A tanulmány 44 esettanulmányt is magában foglal különféle innovatív szolgáltatók bevált gyakorlatairól.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0636:FIN:HU:PDF
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010SC1324:EN:NOT
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2008:214:0003:0047:hu:PDF
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/supported_employment_study.compendium_good_practice_en.pdf
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/cowi.final_study_report_may_2011_final_en.pdf
([6]) http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/publications/htmlfiles/ef12261_hu.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001151/13
to the Commission
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: The subject matter of point 47 of the INI Report in relation to the provision of information to SMEs

As you know, the European Parliament resolution of October 2011 on mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) states that SMEs play a crucial role in giving people with disabilities access to employment (point 47).

What efforts has the Commission made and what efforts does it intend to make to ensure that SMEs are provided with appropriate and better quality information regarding the benefits of employing people with disabilities, in accordance with point 47 of the resolution?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(8 April 2013)

As indicated in the list of actions for 2010-2015 ([1]) of the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 ([2]) the Commission undertakes to 'focus on what people can do and to persuade potential employers with convincing arguments and support to employ people with disabilities'.

The Commission acts within the limits of competences delegated to it by the Member States. Regarding support for companies with the aim of increasing employment of people with disabilities, the 'General Block Exemption Regulation' (GBER) ([3]) allows the Member States to provide substantial subsidies to enterprises that create jobs for persons with disabilities. Competent Member State authorities remain the main actors in giving direct practical support and information to their companies. They can benefit from financial support through the jointly managed programmes of the Structural Funds.

Gathering and disseminating information is also part of the supporting role of the Commission in this area. It has, for example, disseminated examples of supported employment projects that are found in the Compendium of good practice ([4]) annexed to a study by COWI A/S on 'Supported Employment for people with disabilities in the EU and EFTA-EEA' ([5]), financed by the Commission. The Commission will also disseminate results of Pilot Projects for the employment of persons with Autism Spectrum Disorder after all projects have been concluded

Furthermore Eurofund has recently released a study examining the situation of young people with disabilities ([6]) in 11 Members States, including Slovakia, mapping the legislation, policies and programmes which aim at moving young disabled people from inactivity to employment. The study also includes 44 case studies of good practice from diverse and innovative service providers.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010SC1324:EN:NOT
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636:en:NOT
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2008:214:0003:0047:en:PDF
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/supported_employment_study.compendium_good_practice_en.pdf
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/cowi.final_study_report_may_2011_final_en.pdf
([6]) http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/publications/htmlfiles/ef12261.htm

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-001152/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. február 4.)

Tárgy: INI-jelentés 20. pontjának kérdésköre az uniós konzultációk tekintetében

Mint ismeretes, a 2011 októberében elfogadott, a fogyatékos emberek társadalmi befogadásáról és mobilitásáról, valamint a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékosságügyi stratégiáról szóló parlamenti jelentés (P7_TA(2011)0453) rögzíti, hogy a fogyatékos emberek hozzáférése az európai uniós konzultációkban való részvételhez nem teljesen akadálymentes (20. pont).

Mit kíván tenni a Bizottság ezen a téren, többek között a jelnyelvhasználók hozzáférésének javítása terén?

Reding biztos válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. április 3.)

A Bizottság 2002. évi „Towards a reinforced culture of consultation and dialogue – General principles and minimum standards for consultation of interested parties by the Commission" (A konzultáció és a párbeszéd magasabb kultúrája felé – Az érdekelt felek Európai Bizottság által történő megkérdezésének általános elvei és minimális követelményei) című közleménye ([1]) tartalmazza az érdekelt felek Bizottság által történő megkérdezésének általános elveit és minimális követelményeit.

A közlemény széles mozgásteret biztosít a konzultációk szervezői számára a konzultáció paramétereinek meghatározásához. Jóllehet egyértelmű nyelvi követelményeket nem állapít meg, de utal a hozzáférésre: „Amennyiben szükséges és megvalósítható, indokolt, hogy a Bizottság más formátumokban is rendelkezésre bocsásson konzultációs dokumentumokat, hogy azok jobban hozzáférhetők legyenek a fogyatékosok számára" ([2]).

Az uniós konzultációkra írásos formában kerül sor, és a jó hozzáférési módszereknek köszönhetően elektronikusan is hozzáférhetők.

Az Európai Bizottság ösztönzi a jelnyelvet használók részvételét a konzultációkon. Konkrét hozzáférési kérés esetén a Bizottság minden tőle telhetőt meg fog tenni, hogy megfelelő formátumokat biztosítson, elsősorban hozzáférhető elektronikus változatok alkalmazása révén.

A Bizottság megkezdett egy olyan kísérleti projekt végrehajtásával kapcsolatos munkát, amely megoldásokat kíván nyújtani a siketek és nagyothallók, valamint az uniós intézmények közötti kommunikáció javítása érdekében. A Bizottság indokolt esetben alkalmazni fogja e munka eredményét, hogy bővítse a siketek és nagyothallók részvételi lehetőségeit a konzultációs folyamatokban.

([1]) COM(2002) 704 végleges – http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2002:0704:FIN:en:PDF
([2]) COM(2002) 704 végleges, 20. o.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001152/13
to the Commission
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: The subject matter of point 20 of the INI Report in relation to EU consultations

As you know, the European Parliament resolution of October 2011 on mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) states that EU consultations are not fully accessible to people with disabilities (point 20).

What steps does the Commission intend to take in this regard, for example to make consultations more accessible to sign language users?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(3 April 2013)

The 2002 Communication from the Commission 'Towards a reinforced culture of consultation and dialogue' contains the General principles and minimum standards for consultation of interested parties by the Commission ([1]).

This communication leaves organisers of consultations considerable freedom in the parameters of the consultation. While it does not explicitly specify linguistic requirements there is a reference to accessibility: 'Where appropriate and feasible, the Commission should provide consultation documents in alternative formats so as to make them more accessible to the disabled' ([2]).

EU consultations are done in written form and they are also available electronically following good accessibility practices.

The European Commission encourages the participation of sign language users in consultations. In case of a specific request concerning accessibility the Commission will do its best to provide suitable formats, mainly through the use of accessible electronic versions.

The Commission has started working on the implementation of the Pilot Project regarding solutions for improving the communication between deaf and hard of hearing persons and the EU institutions. Where adequate the Commission will use the outcome of the work to enhance their opportunities for participation in consultation processes.

([1]) COM(2002) 704 final — http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2002:0704:FIN:en:PDF
([2]) COM(2002) 704 final, p. 20.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-001153/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. február 4.)

Tárgy: Az INI-jelentés 11. pontjának kérdésköre az igazságszolgáltatás tekintetében

Mint ismeretes, a 2011 októberében elfogadott, a fogyatékossággal élő személyek mobilitásáról és befogadásáról, valamint a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékosságügyi stratégiáról EP-jelentés (P7_TA(2011)0453) rögzíti, hogy a fogyatékos emberek megkülönböztetésnek vannak kitéve a törvény előtti egyenlőség területén (11. pont).

Milyen lépéseket tett a Bizottság annak érdekében, hogy a tagállamokban az igazságszolgáltatásban dolgozók megfelelő képzést kapjanak?

Viviane Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. április 4.)

Az Európai Bizottság az uniós hatáskörökre kiterjedően az EU számára 2011. január 22-e óta kötelező hatállyal bíró, a fogyatékossággal élő személyek jogairól szóló egyezménnyel összhangban teljes mértékben elkötelezett a fogyatékossággal élő személyek jogainak védelme és előmozdítása iránt.

Az egyezmény gyakorlatban történő európai végrehajtásának előmozdítása érdekében a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra szóló európai fogyatékosságügyi stratégiába a 2010–2015 közötti időszakra vonatkozó intézkedések egyikeként bekerült a jogi és a szakpolitikai területen dolgozó szakembereknek az egyezménnyel összefüggő jogi kérdésekkel kapcsolatos képzése is ([1]).

Nyílt közbeszerzési eljárás eredményeként ([2]) a trieri Európai Jogi Akadémia kapott megbízást arra, hogy az Európai Bizottság nevében képzéseket szervezzen a jogi és az érintett szakpolitikai területen dolgozó szakemberek, többek között bírók részére a fogyatékossággal élő személyek jogairól szóló egyezménnyel és a vonatkozó uniós szabályozással kapcsolatos tájékozottság növelése és az ismeretek bővítése céljából.

Az Akadémia 2011–2012 folyamán a hat szemináriumi előadásból álló képzés első ciklusát bonyolította le, 2012–2013-ban kerül sor a második ciklusra ([3]). A fogyatékossággal élő személyek törvény előtti egyenlőségének kérdése, ideértve a jogképességet is, rendszeresen megvitatásra kerül a képzések keretében.

([1]) A Bizottság közleménye: „Európai fogyatékosságügyi stratégia 2010–2020: megújított elkötelezettség az akadálymentes Európa megvalósítása iránt", COM(2010) 636 végleges: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0636:FIN:HU:HTML és a 2010–2015 közötti időszakra szóló intézkedések, SEC(2010) 1324 final, 20.o.: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SEC:2010:1324:FIN:EN:PDF

([2]) VT/2010/079 sz. nyílt pályázati felhívás: a jogi és a szakpolitikai területen dolgozó szakembereknek a fogyatékossággal élő személyek jogairól szóló egyezménnyel kapcsolatos képzése: http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=5585&langId=en

([3]) További információk és háttéranyagok az alábbi címen érhetők el: http://www.era-comm.eu/dalaw/home.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001153/13
to the Commission
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: The subject matter of point 11 of the INI Report in relation to the administration of justice

As you know, the European Parliament resolution of October 2011 on mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) states that people with disabilities suffer discrimination with regard to the lack of equal recognition before the law (point 11).

What steps has the Commission taken in order to ensure that persons working in the field of administration of justice receive appropriate training in Member States?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(4 April 2013)

The European Commission is fully committed to protecting and promoting the rights of persons with disabilities in line with the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) that since 22 January 2011 binds the EU within the limits of its competences.

In order to promote the effective implementation of the UNCRPD in Europe, the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 includes, as one of its specific actions for 2010-2015, the organisation of training for legal and policy practitioners on legal matters related to the UNCRPD ([1]).

Based on an open call for tenders ([2]), the Academy of European Law in Trier has been contracted to carry out, on behalf of the European Commission, training seminars designed to raise awareness and promote greater knowledge and understanding of the UNCRPD and related European legislation among legal and policy practitioners, including judges.

In 2011/2012 a first cycle of six seminars were organised and a second cycle is being carried out in 2012/2013 ([3]). The issue of equal recognition of persons with disabilities before the law including legal capacity is regularly addressed at the trainings.

([1]) 'A renewed commitment to a barrier-free Europe', COM(2010) 0636, final http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636:en:NOT and the list of actions for 2010-2015, SEC(2010)1324 final, p. 20, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010SC1324:EN:NOT

([2]) Open invitation to tender No VT/2010/079 — Training of legal and policy practitioners on the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=5585&langId=en

([3]) Further information and background material are available at http://www.era-comm.eu/dalaw/home.html

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-001154/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. február 4.)

Tárgy: Az INI-jelentés 11. pontjának kérdésköre a választójog hozzáférhetőségének tekintetében

Mint ismeretes, a 2011 októberében elfogadott, a fogyatékossággal élő személyek mobilitásáról és befogadásáról, valamint a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékosságügyi stratégiáról szóló EP-jelentés (P7_TA(2011)0453) 11. pontja rögzíti, hogy a választójog területén a fogyatékos emberek hozzáférhetősége és garanciái alapvető fontosságúak.

Mit tett a Bizottság a fogyatékossággal élő emberek politikai és közéletben való egyenlő részvételének biztosítása területén, összhangban az Alapjogi Charta rendelkezéseivel?

Milyen intézkedéseket kíván foganatosítani a következő, 2014-es EP választások tekintetében?

Viviane Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. április 10.)

A Bizottság számára kiemelt fontosságú ügy az európai uniós polgárság kézzelfogható valósággá tétele valamennyi uniós polgár számára, beleértve a sebezhetőbb és a fogyatékossággal élő embereket is, valamint annak biztosítása, hogy mindennapi életükben, Európa bármely pontján élhessenek az alapszerződésekben lefektetett jogaikkal, különös tekintettel politikai jogaikra.

Az Európai fogyatékosságügyi stratégia 2010–2020 ([1]) révén a Bizottság teljes mértékben elkötelezett aziránt, hogy elhárítsa azokat az akadályokat, amelyek miatt a fogyatékossággal élők nem tudják gyakorolni alapvető jogaikat – beleértve az európai uniós polgársághoz fűződő jogaikat –, és amelyek korlátozzák másokkal egyenlő társadalmi szerepvállalásukat, a közélet és a politikai élet terén is.

Ebben a vonatkozásban a stratégia célja, hogy kezelje az akadálymentes szavazással kapcsolatos kérdéseket, valamint hogy támogassa a tagállamok erőfeszítéseit az akadálymentes választási megoldásokra és kampányanyagokra vonatkozó normák kialakítása és terjesztése, illetve az uniós intézményekkel való kommunikációban a jelnyelv és a Braille-írás használatát ösztönző lehetőségek terén.

Ebben az összefüggésben a Bizottság kísérleti projekt kidolgozásába kezdett, amely a siketek és nagyothallók és az uniós intézmények közötti kommunikáció javítását célzó megoldásokkal foglalkozik.

Ezenkívül a Bizottság a 2012-ben a fogyatékossággal élők európai napján tartott konferenciát a közélet különböző területein – például politika, média, sport – való tevékeny szerepvállalás témájának szentelte ([2]).

([1]) „Megújított elkötelezettség az akadálymentes Európa megvalósítása iránt”, COM(2010) 636 végleges: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0636:FIN:HU:HTML; valamint a 2010–2015-re szóló intézkedések listája, SEC(2010) 1324 final: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010SC1324:EN:NOT

([2]) Az eseménnyel kapcsolatos további információk, előadások és a konferenciáról készült jelentés az alábbi címen érhetők el: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/newsroom/discrimination/events/eventedpd2012_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001154/13
to the Commission
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: The subject matter of point 11 of the INI Report in relation to the accessibility of the right to vote and stand for election

As you know, the European Parliament resolution of October 2011 on mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) states that in respect of the right to vote and stand for election, accessibility and guarantees for people with disabilities are of prime importance (point 11).

What efforts has the Commission made in order to promote the equal participation of people with disabilities in political and public life, in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of Fundamental Rights?

What measures does it intend to take with regard to the upcoming EP elections in 2014?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2013)

It is a priority for the Commission to make EU citizenship a tangible reality for all EU citizens, including the more vulnerable and the disabled, and to ensure that they can enjoy, in their daily lives and wherever they are in Europe, the rights they have under EU Treaties and in particular their political rights.

Through the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 ([1]) the Commission is fully committed to remove the obstacles that prevent people with disabilities from exercising their fundamental rights — including their EU citizenship rights — and that limit their participation in society on an equal basis with others, including in public and political life.

In this respect the strategy aims to address accessibility to voting and to support Member States' efforts developing and disseminating standards on accessible election facilities and campaign material and to explore ways of facilitating the use of sign language and braille in dealing with the EU institutions.

In this context, the Commission has started working on a Pilot Project addressing solutions for improving the communication between deaf and hard of hearing persons and the EU institutions.

The Commission also devoted the 2012 European Day of Persons with Disabilities conference to active participation in different areas of public life, such as politics, the media and sports ([2]).

([1]) 'A renewed commitment to a barrier-free Europe', COM(2010) 0636 final http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636:en:NOT and the list of actions for 2010-2015 SEC(2010)1324 final http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010SC1324:EN:NOT.

([2]) Further information on this event, including presentations and a report, is available at http://ec.europa.eu/justice/newsroom/discrimination/events/eventedpd2012_en.htm

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-001155/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. február 4.)

Tárgy: INI-jelentés 9. pontjának kérdésköre az inkluzív oktatásra vonatkozóan

Mint ismeretes, a 2011 októberében elfogadott, a fogyatékos emberek társadalmi befogadásáról és mobilitásáról, valamint a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékosságügyi stratégiáról szóló parlamenti jelentés (P7_TA(2011)0453) rögzíti, hogy a fogyatékos gyermekek esetében is biztosítani kell a gyermekek jogairól szóló ENSZ-egyezmény előírásait, elősegítendő legteljesebb társadalmi integrációjukat (9. pont).

A Bizottság hogyan kívánja érvényesíteni ezt a szempontot, különösen olyan esetekben, amikor maga is fenntartóként vagy támogatóként vesz részt egy oktatási intézmény működtetésében?

Továbbá milyen lépéseket tett, illetve kíván tenni a Bizottsága a korai fejlesztés tekintetében?

Milyen álláspontot képvisel az Európai Iskolák megfelelő testületeiben a hozzáférhetőség és az akadálymentesítés tekintetében?

Maroš Šefčovič válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. április 12.)

Az egyetlen eset, amikor a Bizottság közvetlenül részt vesz egy oktatási intézmény működtetésében, az Európai Iskolák esete, minthogy a Bizottság az aláírója az Európai Iskolák alapszabályát megállapító egyezménynek, és tagja az Európai Iskolák igazgatótanácsának, ahol az uniós intézményeket és szerveket képviseli.

A Bizottság a fogyatékos tanulóknak az Európai Iskolákba történő minél szorosabb integrálását támogatja. Bár konkrét esetekre vonatkozó döntések meghozatalába soha nem avatkozik be, mindig azt szorgalmazza, hogy az Európai Iskolák tegyenek meg mindent ezen tanulók integrálásának érdekében. Jelenleg 702 sajátos nevelési igényű tanuló van az iskolákban (a 2009/2010-es tanévben számuk 574 volt).

A fogyatékossággal élő személyek jogairól szóló ENSZ-egyezmény előírja, hogy a részes államok kötelesek minden tanuló számára egyenlő hozzáférést biztosítani az oktatáshoz és minden iskolai lehetőséghez. Az Európai Iskolák rendszere nem hasonlítható a nemzeti iskolarendszerekhez, hiszen ez csak általános oktatást biztosít (nincs se szak-, se technikusképzés). Ezt az Európai Iskolák Felülbírálati Bizottságának 2009. augusztus 31-i határozata is megerősítette, melyet egy olyan ügyben hoztak, ahol a szülők azért tettek panaszt, mert az Európai Iskola úgy ítélte meg, hogy nem tud megfelelni gyermekük speciális igényeinek. A sajátos nevelési igényű tanulókra vonatkozó egyezmény is rögzíti, hogy „valamely Európai Iskola alkalmatlannak minősítheti magát az olyan tanuló felvétele kérdésében, akinek nem tud a speciális igényeinek megfelelő szolgáltatást nyújtani”. Ezek azonban kivételes esetek, és az uniós költségvetés ilyen esetekben is támogatást tud nyújtani olyan iskolák tandíjának megfizetéséhez, melyek felkészültek arra, hogy e tanulóknak a megfelelő szolgáltatást biztosítsák.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001155/13
to the Commission
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: The subject matter of point 9 of the INI Report in relation to inclusive education

As you know, the European Parliament resolution of October 2011 on mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) states that respect for the provisions of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child must be ensured in the case of children with disabilities as well, in order to facilitate their fullest possible social integration (point 9).

In what way does the Commission intend to implement this criterion, in particular in cases where the Commission itself participates in the operation of an educational institution as operator or sponsor?

Furthermore, what steps has the Commission taken and what steps does it intend to take in order to ensure early support?

What is the position it represents in the appropriate bodies of European schools regarding accessibility and a barrier-free environment?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(12 April 2013)

The case where the Commission itself participates in the operation of an educational institution concerns only the European schools (ES), as it is signatory of the Convention defining the Statute of the ES and is a member of the Board of Governors of the ES representing the EU institutions and bodies.

The Commission wants the pupils with special needs to be integrated as much as possible in the ES. Even if the Commission is never involved in decisions concerning individual cases, it always encourages all ES to do their utmost to integrate those pupils. There are currently 702 pupils under SEN ('special education needs') conventions (compared to 574 in 2009/2010).

The UN Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities stipulates that the States Parties must provide equal access to education and all schooling possibilities to all pupils. The ES system cannot be assimilated to a national education system, since it only provides a general academic education (neither professional nor technical). This was confirmed by a decision of the Complaints Board of the ES on 31/08/2009 following a complaint from the parents of a child for whom the ES declared itself incompetent to meet his special needs. The SEN agreement stipulates indeed that 'a ES may declare itself incompetent to admit a pupil whose special needs are such that it is unable to offer the support required'. However these are exceptional cases and the EU budget can contribute financially to the school fees of the schools which are able to accept these pupils.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-001156/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. február 4.)

Tárgy: Az INI-jelentés 33. pontjának kérdésköre az egységesebb minősítési rendszer vonatkozásában

Mint ismeretes, a 2011 októberében elfogadott, a fogyatékossággal élő személyek mobilitásáról és befogadásáról, valamint a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékosságügyi stratégiáról EP-jelentés (P7_TA(2011)0453) rögzíti, hogy egyre inkább összhangba kellene hozni a fogyatékosság minősítését is a tagállamokban (33. pont).

Mit tett és mit kíván tenni az Bizottság a tagállamokban fennálló minősítések harmonizációjáért, fejlesztéséért?

Amennyiben ezen a téren is várható együttműködés vagy új kezdeményezés, esetleg az Európai Bíróság 2006. július 11-én született ítéletével (C-13/05) összhangban egy egységes definíció, akkor az Európai Bizottság kívánatosnak tartja-e a WHO 2001-ben elfogadott, új klasszifikációs rendszerére való támaszkodást?

Viviane Reding biztos válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. március 25.)

A Bizottság kizárólag a tagállamok által rá átruházott hatáskörök keretei között léphet fel. A fogyatékosság minősítése az Unió tagállamaiban a nemzeti, illetőleg helyi hatóságok hatáskörébe tartozik.

Mindazonáltal a Bizottság az uniós polgárok erre vonatkozó, rendszeres megkereséseire reagálva megvizsgálta a fogyatékkal élők számára kiállított igazolványok és a kapcsolódó jogosultságok Európai Unión belüli kölcsönös elismerésének kérdését.

Konkrétan a 2010–2020-as európai fogyatékosságügyi stratégiához ([1]) mellékelt, a 2010–2015 közötti időszakra vonatkozó intézkedéseket tartalmazó lista egyik tételének keretében az európai fogyatékosságügyi szakértők tudományos hálózata (ANED) tanulmányt ([2]) készített „Disability Benefits and Entitlements in European Countries" (Rokkantsági ellátások és jogosultságok az európai országokban) címmel, valamint összeállított egy magyarázó jegyzetekkel ellátott, példákat tartalmazó adatbázist ([3]).

E tanulmány megállapításainak nyomán a Bizottság ösztönözte a tagállamok közötti információcserét és a tapasztalatok átadását, különösen az EU fogyatékossággal foglalkozó magas szintű munkacsoportjának keretei között.

Az Európai Bíróság a C-13/05 sz. ügyben 2006. július 11-án hozott ítéletében kimondja, hogy a 2000/78/EK irányelv értelmében vett „fogyatékosság" fogalmát önállóan és egységesen kell értelmezni (42. bekezdés). Ezért kifejezetten különbséget tesz a betegség és a fogyatékosság között (44. bekezdés), ugyanakkor nem foglal állást a fogyatékosság minősítésével kapcsolatban, amely továbbra is a tagállami hatóságok hatáskörébe tartozik.

A funkcióképesség, fogyatékosság és egészség WTO által elfogadott nemzetközi osztályozása (International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health – ICF) nem bír kötelező erővel az Európai Unió számára, és jelenleg nincsenek is erre vonatkozó tervek.

A Bizottság folytatni fogja a témával kapcsolatos lehetséges támogató kezdeményezésekről folytatott vitát a fogyatékossággal foglalkozó magas szintű munkacsoport keretei között.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636:HU:NOT
([2]) http://www.disability-europe.net/content/aned/media/ANED%202010%20Task%207%20-%20Disability%20Benefits%20and%20Entitlements%20-%20Report%20-%20FINAL%20%282%29.pdf
([3]) http://www.disability-europe.net/content/aned/media/ANED%202010%20Task%207%20-%20Report%20Annex%201%20-%20database%20summary%20FINAL.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001156/13
to the Commission
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: The subject matter of point 33 of the INI Report in relation to a more harmonised system of certification

As you know, the European Parliament resolution of October 2011 on mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) states that the certification of disability status should be increasingly harmonised across Member States (point 33).

What efforts has the Commission made and what efforts does it intend to make in order to harmonise and develop the systems of certification used in Member States?

If we can also expect cooperation or new initiatives in this field, or maybe a uniform definition in accordance with the Judgment of the European Court of Justice of 11 July 2006 in Case C-13/05, does the Commission find it desirable that we rely on the new classification system adopted by the WHO in 2001?

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

The Commission can only act within the boundaries of competences that have been delegated to it by the Member States. Certification of disability status falls under the competence of national or local authorities in the EU Member States.

Nevertheless, the Commission, in response to similar questions that it regularly receives from citizens, has been examining the issue of mutual recognition of disability cards and related entitlements across the European Union.

In particular, one of the items included in the list of actions for 2010-2015, annexed to the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 ([1]), the Academic Network of European Disability Experts (ANED) has delivered a study on 'Disability Benefits and Entitlements in European Countries' ([2]) and an annotated database of examples ([3]).

Based on the findings of this study, the Commission has promoted exchange of information and mutual learning among Member States, notably within the EU High-Level Group on Disability.

The judgment of the European Court of Justice of 11 July 2006 in Case C-13/05 refers to the need for an autonomous and uniform interpretation of the term 'disability' for the purposes of Directive 2000/78 (paragraph 42). It therefore only specifically differentiates sickness from disability (paragraph 45) and takes no position on the certification of disability, which remains in the competence of the Member State authorities.

The International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) adopted by the WTO is not binding for the European Union and there are no current plans to make it binding.

The Commission will continue to discuss in the Disability High-Level Group possible support initiatives in this area.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636:EN:NOT.
([2]) http://www.disability-europe.net/content/aned/media/ANED%202010%20Task%207%20-%20Disability%20Benefits%20and%20Entitlements%20-%20Report%20-%20FINAL%20%282%29.pdf
([3]) http://www.disability-europe.net/content/aned/media/ANED%202010%20Task%207%20-%20Report%20Annex%201%20-%20database%20summary%20FINAL.pdf

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-001157/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. február 4.)

Tárgy: INI-jelentés 8. pontjának kérdésköre az egyetemes tervezés vonatkozásában

Mint ismeretes, a 2011 októberében elfogadott, a fogyatékos emberek társadalmi befogadásáról és mobilitásáról, valamint a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékosságügyi stratégiáról szóló parlamenti jelentés (P7_TA(2011)0453) rögzíti, hogy az Európai Unió Alapjogi Chartájának való megfelelés tekintetében az ún. egyetemes tervezés („universal design") és a mindenki számára történő tervezés („design for all") jelenthet megfelelő garanciát a fogyatékossággal élő emberek hozzáférésére nézve (8. pont).

Tervezi-e a Bizottság, hogy segítséget, támogatást nyújt egy olyan központ vagy szolgáltatás létesítésére, amely ennek az elvnek a gyakorlatba való átültetését segíti, többek között például a belső piac fejlesztése érdekében, összhangban a jelentés 12., 23. és 46. pontjával?

Készült-e olyan átfogó szakmai anyag és kimutatás, amely a jelentés 70. pontjába foglalt követelményeknek is megfelel, és ez közérthető módon be is mutatja?

Viviane Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. április 3.)

A Bizottság a kutatási keretprogramok különféle projektjei révén támogatást nyújtott az EDeAN (European Design for all eAccessibility Network) ([1]) számára.

Az EDeAN egy körülbelül 160 szervezetből álló hálózat, amely támogatást és erőforrásokat biztosít a mindenki számára történő tervezéshez (Design for All) kapcsolódó témákhoz. E területen a kiválósági központ szerepét betöltve minden tagállamban működik egy ilyen szervezet, amely számos jelentést és tanulmányt készít, valamint biztosítja a tudáshoz és az információkhoz való kapcsolatokat.

A Bizottság továbbá mandátumot adott az európai szabványügyi szervezeteknek (M/473 mandátum), hogy a „mindenki számára történő tervezés" koncepcióját illesszék be a megfelelő szabványosítási kezdeményezésekbe. Ez hozzájárul majd az akadálymentes európai környezet kialakításához.

([1]) www.edean.org/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001157/13
to the Commission
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: The subject matter of point 8 of the INI Report in relation to universal design

As you know, the European Parliament resolution of October 2011 on mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) states that in respect of compliance with the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, the principles of 'universal design' and 'design for all' could be the appropriate guarantees to ensure accessibility for people with disabilities (point 8).

Does the Commission plan to support the establishment of a centre or service to facilitate the practical implementation of these principles, for example in order to promote the development of the internal market, in accordance with points 12, 23 and 46 of the report?

Are there any comprehensive professional studies or reports that comply with the requirements set out in point 70 of the report and are presented in a readily comprehensible way?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(3 April 2013)

The Commission has provided support under various projects in the Research Framework Programmes to EDeAN: European Design for all eAccessibility Network ([1]).

EDeAN is a network of approximately 160 organisations that provide support and resources on matters related to Design for All issues. In each Member State one of those organisations plays the role of a Centre of Excellence on this subject and provide for numerous reports, studies and links to knowledge and information.

Furthermore, the Commission has issued a Mandate to the European standardisation organisations (Mandate 473) to include 'Design for all' in relevant standardisation initiatives. This will contribute to the creation of a barrier free environment in Europe.

([1]) www.edean.org/.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001159/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(4 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Καρτέλ και ολιγοπώλια στην αγορά καυσίμων στην Ελλάδα

Σύμφωνα με πρόσφατη μελέτη της Τράπεζας της Ελλάδος τα καρτέλ και τα ολιγοπώλια στην αγορά καυσίμων στην Ελλάδα ευθύνονται για τις υψηλές τιμές στη βενζίνη και γενικότερα στην αγορά καυσίμων. Στην εν λόγω μελέτη διαπιστώνεται ότι οι βενζινοπώλες καθυστερούν να περάσουν τις μειώσεις όταν πέφτει η διεθνής τιμή, κάνοντας λόγο για μη ξεκάθαρο τρόπο τιμολόγησης από τις εταιρείες εμπορίας πετρελαιοειδών, ενώ παράλληλα διαπιστώνονται συνθήκες δυοπωλίου στην αγορά διύλισης. Πιο συγκεκριμένα, η ανάλυση δείχνει ότι η προσαρμογή των εγχώριων λιανικών τιμών της βενζίνης είναι ασύμμετρη. Το εύρημα αυτό πιθανώς καταδεικνύει την επιχειρηματική στρατηγική που ακολουθούν οι πωλητές της βενζίνης, με στόχο να αυξήσουν τα περιθώρια κέρδους τους. Καθυστερούν να μειώσουν τις λιανικές τιμές της βενζίνης όταν η διεθνής τιμή του πετρελαίου πέφτει ενώ, αντίθετα, σπεύδουν να τις αυξήσουν όταν αυτή ανεβαίνει.

Η μελέτη επίσης συμπεραίνει ότι η προσφορά της βενζίνης ενδεχομένως χαρακτηρίζεται από συμπράξεις, οι οποίες ευνοούνται από έλλειψη ανταγωνιστικών συνθηκών στη δομή της ελληνικής αγοράς καυσίμων.

Σύμφωνα με τα παραπάνω ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Είναι ενήμερη η Επιτροπή για τα αποτελέσματα αυτής της έρευνας; Πώς προτίθεται να συμβάλει στο να επιλυθούν τέτοιου είδους παθογένειες; Σύμφωνα με στοιχεία που διαθέτει έχουν παρατηρηθεί στην ελληνική αγορά καυσίμων ασυμμετρίες στις προσαρμογές της εγχώριας τιμής της βενζίνης σε σχέση με τις μεταβολές της διεθνούς τιμής του πετρελαίου κατά την περίοδο των τελευταίων δύο ετών;

2. Παρατηρούνται εμπόδια στην αγορά καυσίμων κυρίως όσον αφορά την είσοδο νέων επιχειρήσεων στον τομέα της διύλισης; Πώς θα μπορούσε να οδηγηθεί η ελληνική αγορά σε αύξηση του ανταγωνισμού σε αυτόν τον τομέα δημιουργώντας, κατ' επέκταση, ίσως ευνοϊκότερες τιμές για τους καταναλωτές;

3. Ποιο το ποσοστό της αύξησης της τιμής των καυσίμων στην Ελλάδα κατά τα τρία τελευταία έτη και σε τί επίπεδα κυμαίνονται οι αυξήσεις στα υπόλοιπα κράτη μέλη; Ποια θέση κατέχει η Ελλάδα στις τιμές των καυσίμων (βενζίνη, πετρέλαιο θέρμανσης και πετρέλαιο κίνησης) στην ΕΕ των 27;

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

1. Η Επιτροπή έχει υπόψη της τη μελέτη που εκπόνησε η Τράπεζα της Ελλάδος σχετικά με τις αγορές διύλισης και καυσίμων στην Ελλάδα. Είναι επίσης ενήμερη για την ύπαρξη δυοπωλίου στην εγχώρια αγορά διύλισης και για τις ασυμμετρίες όσον αφορά την ταχύτητα με την οποία οι τιμές λιανικής πώλησης προ φόρων προσαρμόζονται στις διακυμάνσεις των διεθνών τιμών των καυσίμων. Παρόλα αυτά, μέχρι στιγμής, η Επιτροπή δεν είχε ενδείξεις ότι το δυοπώλιο στην αγορά διύλισης και οι ασυμμετρίες στη διαμόρφωση των τιμών στην αγορά καυσίμων ήταν ενδεχομένως αποτέλεσμα αντιανταγωνιστικών πρακτικών. Η Επιτροπή δεν θα διστάσει να λάβει μέτρα, είτε η ίδια είτε σε συνεργασία με την Ελληνική Επιτροπή Ανταγωνισμού, εάν λάβει επαρκείς πληροφορίες που καταδεικνύουν την ύπαρξη σύμπραξης μεταξύ επιχειρήσεων ή καταχρηστικής συμπεριφοράς από μέρους μεμονωμένων εταιρειών στην ελληνική αγορά.

2. Η Επιτροπή, η Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα και το Διεθνές Νομισματικό Ταμείο έχουν εντοπίσει διάφορα προβλήματα τα οποία παρεμποδίζουν τον ανταγωνισμό στην ελληνική αγορά καυσίμων. Σε Μνημόνιο Συνεννόησης ([1]), η ελληνική κυβέρνηση δεσμεύτηκε να εξετάσει τα ζητήματα αυτά.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2012/pdf/ocp123_en.pdf, που ξεκινά στη σελίδα 189, συγκεκριμένα στο τμήμα 6.1.7.

3. Σύμφωνα με τα δεδομένα που συνέλεξαν οι υπηρεσίες της Επιτροπής ([2]), κατά την περίοδο του Φεβρουαρίου 2010-2013, οι τιμές καταναλωτή στην Ελλάδα αυξήθηκαν κατά 41% για τη βενζίνη Euro-super 97 (30% κατά μέσο όρο στη ζώνη του ευρώ), κατά 31% για το πετρέλαιο κίνησης (40% στη ζώνη του ευρώ) και κατά 119% για το πετρέλαιο θέρμανσης (57% στη ζώνη του ευρώ). Οι αποκκλίσεις μεταξύ των τιμών των καυσίμων στην Ελλάδα και στη ζώνη του ευρώ οφείλονται κυρίως στην αύξηση του ΦΠΑ και στους νέους έμμεσους φόρους που επιβλήθηκαν στο πετρέλαιο κίνησης και στο πετρέλαιο θέρμανσης τον Οκτώβριο του 2012. Στα μέσα Φεβρουαρίου 2013, καταγράφηκε στην Ελλάδα η τρίτη υψηλότερη τιμή στην ΕΕ27 όσον αφορά τη βενζίνη Euro-super 97 και η πέμπτη όσον αφορά το πετρέλαιο θέρμανσης, αλλά η τιμή του πετρελαίου κίνησης ήταν κάτω από τη μέση τιμή στην ΕΕ27.

Περισσότερες πληροφορίες είναι διαθέσιμες στον δικτυακό τόπο του Παρατηρητηρίου Ενεργειακών Αγορών ([3]).

([2]) Σύμφωνα με την απόφαση 1999/280/ΕΚ του Συμβουλίου (Εβδομαδιαίο Δελτίο Πετρελαίου).
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/energy/observatory/oil/bulletin_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001159/13
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: Cartels and oligopolies on the fuel market in Greece

According to a recent study by the Bank of Greece, cartels and oligopolies on the fuel market in Greece are responsible for high petrol and fuel prices. This particular study found that petrol stations are delaying price reductions when the international fuel price falls, referring to the unclear pricing method applied by oil companies. The study also found duopolies on the oil-refining market. More specifically, the study has revealed the asymmetric price adjustment of domestic retail petrol prices. This finding is most likely an indication of the business strategy used by petrol vendors to increase their profit margins. They delay reducing retail petrol prices when the international price falls; however, they rush to increase them when it rises.

The study also concludes that the sale of petrol may involve partnerships that benefit from the lack of competitive conditions in the structure of the Greek fuel market.

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

1. Is it aware of the results of this price survey? How does it intend to help resolve these kinds of problems? According to the Commission's information, have there been any asymmetric adjustments to the domestic retail petrol price on the Greek fuel market in relation to changes in the international price of petrol over the last two years?

2. Are there any barriers to new entry into the fuel market with regard to the oil refining sector? How can the Greek market become more competitive in this sector, thus creating more favourable prices for consumers?

3. To what extent has the price of fuel in Greece increased over the last three years and to what extent do price increases vary in the other Member States? Where does Greece stand in terms of fuel prices (petrol, heating oil and diesel oil) in relation to the EU-27?

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

1. The Commission has taken note of the Bank of Greece study on the refinery and fuel markets in Greece. It is aware of the existence of a duopoly on the domestic refinery market and of asymmetries in the speed at which pre-tax retail prices adjust to variations in international fuel prices. But, so far, the Commission has not had indications that this refinery duopoly and the asymmetries in the formation of the fuel market price could have been the result of anticompetitive practices. The Commission would not hesitate to act, either by itself or in coordination with the Greek Competition Authority, if it received sufficient information pointing to collusive behaviour of undertakings or abusive behaviour of individual companies on the Greek market.

2. The Commission, the European Central Bank and the International Monetary Fund have identified various problems which hinder the competition on the Greek fuel market. In a memorandum of understanding ([1]), the Greek Government made a commitment to address these issues.

3. According to the data collected by the Commission Services ([2]), over the period February 2010-2013, consumer prices in Greece increased by 41% for Euro-super 95 (30% on average in Euro Area), 31% for diesel oil (40% in EA) and 119% for heating gasoil (57% in EA). VAT increases and the new indirect taxes on diesel oil and heating gasoil introduced in October 2012 mainly explain these divergent price evolutions between Greece and the EA. At mid-February 2013, Greece registered the third most expensive price in EU-27 for Euro-super 95, the fifth for heating gasoil but was below the EU-27 average price for diesel oil.

More details can be obtained from the Market Observatory for Energy website ([3]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2012/pdf/ocp123_en.pdf, starting on page 189, in particular Section 6.1.7.
([2]) In accordance with Council Decision 1999/280/EC (Weekly Oil Bulletin).
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/energy/observatory/oil/bulletin_en.htm

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001160/13
an die Kommission
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Jean-Marie Cavada (PPE), Franziska Katharina Brantner (Verts/ALE) und Michael Cashman (S&D)
(4. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: Entscheidung des Europäischen Bürgerbeauftragten zur Anwendung von Artikel 17 AEUV

Am 18. Oktober wurde bei dem Europäischen Bürgerbeauftragten die Beschwerde 2097/2011/RA gegen die Kommission zum Dialog der Kommission mit Kirchen, religiösen Vereinigungen oder Gemeinschaften sowie weltanschaulichen und nichtkonfessionellen Organisationen eingereicht. Am 25. Januar 2012 schloss der Bürgerbeauftragte seine Untersuchung mit folgenden beiden Anmerkungen ab:

1. Da sie den Vorschlag des Beschwerdeführers, ein Dialogseminar durchzuführen, mit der Begründung abgewiesen hat, dass dies über Artikel 17 Absatz 1 und 2 AEUV hinausgehe, hat die Kommission Artikel 17 Absatz 3 AEUV unrichtig angewendet; nach dieser Vorschrift ist sie verpflichtet, mit den Kirchen und religiösen Vereinigungen oder Gemeinschaften sowie weltanschaulichen und nichtkonfessionellen Organisationen einen offenen, transparenten und regelmäßigen Dialog zu pflegen. Damit liegt ein Fehler in der Verwaltungstätigkeit vor.

2. Die Kommission sollte unter Berücksichtigung der Ergebnisse des Bürgerbeauftragten (i) ihre Verfahren und Bestimmungen in diesem Bereich erläutern und, sofern erforderlich, (ii) genaue Leitlinien dahin gehend aufstellen, wie sie Artikel 17 AEUV anzuwenden gedenkt.

Kann die Kommission in Anbetracht dieser Entscheidung darlegen, welche Auffassung sie zu den Anmerkungen des Bürgerbeauftragten in oben genanntem Fall vertritt?

Hat die Kommission bereits eine Entscheidung getroffen, welche Folgemaßnahmen sie nach der Entscheidung ergreifen wird?

Wird die Kommission Vorschläge für eine Überprüfung des Artikels 17 des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union im Hinblick auf den Dialog voranbringen, die sodann dem Parlament unterbreitet werden, und durch die der Anwendungsbereich auf sämtliche religiösen Auffassungen und Lebensbereiche in Europa ausgedehnt wird und der Dialog zu einer breiten öffentlichen Debatte über gemeinsame Werte in der EU werden soll?

Antwort von Herrn Barroso im Namen der Kommission
(19. März 2013)

Die Kommission möchte den Damen und Herren Abgeordneten versichern, dass sie fest entschlossen ist, den offenen, transparenten und regelmäßigen Dialog mit den Kirchen und religiösen Vereinigungen oder Gemeinschaften sowie weltanschaulichen und nichtkonfessionellen Organisationen weiter zu pflegen.

Die Kommission hat die Beurteilung des Bürgerbeauftragten im Zusammenhang mit der Beschwerde 2097/2011/RA zur Kenntnis genommen. Sie begrüßt, dass der Bürgerbeauftragte mit der Auslegung der Kommission von Artikel 17 (AEUV) weitgehend konform geht.

Insbesondere weist der Bürgerbeauftragte darauf hin, dass die Kommission einen großen Ermessensspielraum bei der Festlegung der Themen hat, die sie vor dem Hintergrund ihrer politischen Prioritäten zu erörtern wünscht. Der Bürgerbeauftragte hat zu der Behauptung des Beschwerdeführers, die Kommission diskriminiere zugunsten religiöser Organisationen, nicht Stellung bezogen. Er stellt vielmehr fest, in Artikel 17 AEUV deute nichts darauf hin, dass ein präzises Gleichgewicht zwischen den einzelnen Gruppen gefunden werden müsse, und dass sich aus der Entscheidung der Kommission, eine bestimmte Initiative nicht zu unterstützen, nicht schließen lasse, sie habe gegen ihre Verpflichtung verstoßen, in einen Dialog zu treten.

Derzeit befasst sich die Kommission mit einer anderen Anmerkung des Bürgerbeauftragten, nämlich mit seinem Vorschlag, die Praktiken und Vorschriften in diesem Bereich klarer zu fassen, und, falls erforderlich, Leitlinien für die Umsetzung von Artikel 17 AEUV zu erarbeiten.

Hinsichtlich des konkreten Vorschlags des Beschwerdeführers, ein gemeinsames Dialogseminar mit der Europäischen Humanistischen Föderation zu organisieren, wurde im Herbst 2012 beschlossen, am 15. Mai 2013 in den Räumlichkeiten der Kommission ein Seminar zum Thema Unionsbürgerschaft durchzuführen.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001160/13
à la Commission
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Jean-Marie Cavada (PPE), Franziska Katharina Brantner (Verts/ALE) et Michael Cashman (S&D)
(4 février 2013)

Objet: Décision du Médiateur européen sur la mise en œuvre de l'article 17 du traité FUE

Le 18 octobre 2011, le Médiateur européen a reçu une plainte sous la référence 2097/2011/RA concernant le dialogue de la Commission avec les églises, les associations ou communautés religieuses et les organisations philosophiques et non confessionnelles. Le 25 janvier 2012, le Médiateur a clos son enquête en formulant deux observations:

1. «En rejetant la proposition du plaignant d'organiser un séminaire sur le dialogue, au motif que cette initiative s'inscrivait au-delà de l'esprit de l'article 17, paragraphe 1 et 2, du traité FUE, la Commission n'a pas mis en œuvre correctement l'article 17, paragraphe 3, du traité FUE, selon lequel l'Union européenne est tenue de "[maintenir] un dialogue ouvert, transparent et régulier" avec les églises, les associations ou communautés religieuses et les organisations philosophiques et non confessionnelles. Il s'agit en l'occurrence d'un cas de mauvaise administration».

2. «Eu égard aux conclusions du Médiateur, la Commission devrait, dans un premier temps, clarifier les pratiques et les règles qu'elle applique dans ce domaine et, le cas échéant, dans un second temps, élaborer des lignes directrices précisant comment elle prévoit précisément de mettre en œuvre l'article 17 du traité FUE».

À la lumière de cette décision, la Commission peut-elle expliquer ce qu'elle pense des observations formulées par le Médiateur européen dans le cadre de l'affaire susmentionnée?

La Commission a-t-elle déjà décidé des suites qu'elle entend donner à la décision?

La Commission présentera-t-elle des propositions, qui seront soumises au Parlement, visant à réformer l'article 17 du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne en ce qui concerne le dialogue, dans le but d'élargir son champ d'application de manière à ce qu'il couvre toutes les opinions religieuses et philosophies de vie en Europe, et de transformer ce dialogue en un vaste débat public sur les valeurs communes au sein de l'Union européenne?

Réponse donnée par M. Barroso au nom de la Commission
(19 mars 2013)

La Commission tient à assurer les Honorables Parlementaires de sa détermination à poursuivre un dialogue ouvert, transparent et régulier avec les églises, les associations et communautés religieuses, et les organisations philosophiques et non confessionnelles.

La Commission a pris connaissance de l'examen de la plainte 2097/2011/RA auquel a procédé le Médiateur. Elle se réjouit de voir que le Médiateur approuve, dans une large mesure, l'interprétation que la Commission fait de l'article 17 du TFUE.

Le Médiateur rappelle notamment que la Commission dispose d'une large marge d'appréciation «lorsqu'il s'agit de déterminer les sujets qu'elle choisit d'examiner», en accord avec ses priorités d'action. Le Médiateur n'a pas pris position sur l'allégation du plaignant selon laquelle la Commission favorise les organisations religieuses. Il constate en fait «qu'aucun élément dans l'article 17 du TFUE ne semble indiquer qu'il faille trouver un équilibre précis entre les différents groupes» et que le fait que la Commission choisisse de ne pas parrainer une initiative spécifique «ne permet pas de conclure qu'elle a manqué à son obligation d'engager un dialogue».

La Commission s'efforce actuellement de donner suite à la seconde observation formulée par le Médiateur, dans laquelle ce dernier lui suggérait, à propos de la mise en œuvre de l'article 17 du TFUE, de «clarifier les pratiques et les règles qu'elle applique dans ce domaine, et, le cas échéant, élaborer des lignes directrices».

En ce qui concerne le problème concret soulevé par la plainte, à savoir la tenue d'un séminaire conjoint sur le dialogue avec la Fédération humaniste européenne, il a été décidé à l'automne 2012 d'organiser un séminaire sur la «citoyenneté européenne» qui se tiendra le 15 mai 2013 dans les locaux de la Commission.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001160/13
aan de Commissie
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Jean-Marie Cavada (PPE), Franziska Katharina Brantner (Verts/ALE) en Michael Cashman (S&D)
(4 februari 2013)

Betreft: Besluit van de Europese Ombudsman met betrekking tot de toepassing van artikel 17 VWEU

Op 18 oktober 2011 ontving de Europese Ombudsman klacht 2097/2011/RA tegen de Commissie betreffende gesprekken van de Commissie met kerken, religieuze verenigingen en gemeenschappen en levensbeschouwelijke en niet-confessionele organisaties. Op 25 januari 2012 rondde de Ombudsman zijn onderzoek af met twee opmerkingen:

1. Door het voorstel van de klager voor een dialoog van de hand te wijzen omdat dit zou indruisen tegen de geest van artikel 17, lid 1 en lid 2 VWEU, is de Commissie in gebreke gebleven bij de uitvoering van artikel 17, lid 3 VWEU, dat de EU ertoe verplicht een open, transparante en regelmatige dialoog te voeren met kerken en religieuze verenigingen en gemeenschappen, en levensbeschouwelijke en niet-confessionele organisaties. Bijgevolg is er op dit punt sprake van wanbeheer.

2. Gezien de bevindingen van de Ombudsman zou de Commissie (i) haar beleid en regels op dat gebied moeten toelichten en, indien noodzakelijk, (ii) richtsnoeren moeten opstellen over de manier waarop zij artikel 17 VWEU wil implementeren.

Kan de Commissie in het licht van dit besluit meedelen wat zij in dit geval denkt over de opmerkingen van de Europese Ombudsman?

Heeft de Commissie al uitgemaakt welk gevolg zij aan dit besluit wil geven?

Is de Commissie van plan voorstellen in te dienen en aan het Parlement voor te leggen voor een wijziging van artikel 17 van het Verdrag betreffende de werking van de Europese Unie, met als doel de dialoog uit te breiden tot alle godsdiensten en levensbeschouwingen in Europa, en de dialoog ook om te vormen tot een breed openbaar debat over de gemeenschappelijke waarden in de EU?

Antwoord van de heer Barroso namens de Commissie
(19 maart 2013)

De Commissie kan de geachte Parlementsleden verzekeren dat zij vastberaden is om een open, transparante en regelmatige dialoog te blijven voeren met kerken, religieuze verenigingen en gemeenschappen, en levensbeschouwelijke en niet-confessionele organisaties.

De Commissie heeft nota genomen van de evaluatie van de Ombudsman met betrekking tot klacht 2097/2011/RA. Zij is tevreden dat de Ombudsman het in grote mate eens is met de interpretatie van artikel 17 VWEU door de Commissie.

De Ombudsman herinnert er met name aan dat de Commissie over een ruime beoordelingsmarge beschikt om te bepalen welke onderwerpen zij wil bespreken in overeenstemming met haar beleidsprioriteiten. De Ombudsman heeft geen standpunt ingenomen over de bewering van de klager dat de Commissie discrimineert ten gunste van religieuze organisaties. Hij stelt immers vast dat niets in artikel 17 VWEU erop wijst dat naar een precies evenwicht moet worden gestreefd tussen de verschillende groepen en dat het feit dat de Commissie besluit om een bepaald initiatief niet te steunen niet kan leiden tot de conclusie dat zij haar verplichting om in dialoog te treden niet is nagekomen.

De Commissie is op dit moment bezig met het aanpakken van de aanvullende opmerking van de Ombudsman, namelijk zijn suggestie om haar beleid en regels op dat gebied toe te lichten, en, indien noodzakelijk, richtsnoeren op te stellen met betrekking tot de uitvoering van artikel 17 VWEU.

Wat de concrete kwestie betreft die in de klacht aan de orde werd gesteld, namelijk het houden van een dialoogconferentie met de Europese Humanistische Federatie, is in het najaar van 2012 besloten om op 15 mei 2013 een conferentie over Europees burgerschap te organiseren in de gebouwen van de Commissie.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001160/13
do Komisji
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Jean-Marie Cavada (PPE), Franziska Katharina Brantner (Verts/ALE) oraz Michael Cashman (S&D)
(4 lutego 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Decyzja Europejskiego Rzecznika Praw Obywatelskich w sprawie stosowania art. 17 TFUE

Dnia 18 października 2011 r. do Europejskiego Rzecznika Praw Obywatelskich wpłynęła skarga nr 2097/2011/RA przeciwko Komisji dotycząca dialogu prowadzonego przez Komisję z kościołami, związkami lub wspólnotami wyznaniowymi oraz z organizacjami filozoficznymi i niewyznaniowymi. Dnia 25 stycznia 2012 r. rzecznik zamknął postępowanie, formułując dwie uwagi:

1. „Odrzucając propozycję powoda dotyczącą organizacji seminarium opartego na dialogu ze względu na fakt, iż wykraczałoby to poza ducha art. 17 ust. 1 i 2 TFUE, Komisja niewłaściwie zastosowała art. 17 ust. 3 TFUE, zgodnie z którym Unia Europejska jest zobowiązana do »utrzymywania otwartego, przejrzystego i regularnego dialogu« z kościołami, związkami lub wspólnotami wyznaniowymi oraz z organizacjami filozoficznymi i niewyznaniowymi. Stanowi to przypadek złej administracji."

2. „Biorąc pod uwagę wnioski rzecznika, Komisja powinna (i) wyjaśnić praktyki i zasady, jakie stosuje w tym zakresie, oraz, jeżeli zachodzi taka potrzeba, (ii) opracować wytyczne wskazujące, w jaki dokładnie sposób zamierza ona stosować art. 17 TFUE".

Czy w świetle tej decyzji Komisja może wyjaśnić, w jaki sposób postrzega uwagi Europejskiego Rzecznika Praw Obywatelskich w omawianej kwestii?

Czy Komisja zdecydowała już, w jaki sposób odniesie się do tej decyzji?

Czy Komisja wystąpi z propozycjami (do przedłożenia Parlamentowi) dotyczącymi przeglądu odnoszącego się do dialogu art. 17 Traktatu o funkcjonowaniu Unii Europejskiej, w celu rozszerzenia jego przepisów na wszystkie poglądy religijne i postawy życiowe w Europie i przekształcenia takiego dialogu w szeroką debatę publiczną na temat wspólnie uznawanych w UE wartości?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez przewodniczącego José Manuela Barroso w imieniu Komisji
(19 marca 2013 r.)

Komisja pragnie zapewnić Szanownego Pana Posła, że zamierza kontynuować otwarty, przejrzysty i regularny dialog z kościołami, stowarzyszeniami i wspólnotami religijnymi, oraz organizacjami światopoglądowymi i niewyznaniowymi.

Komisja przyjęła do wiadomości ustalenia Rzecznika Praw Obywatelskich odnośnie do skargi 2097/2011/RA. Wyraża też zadowolenie z faktu, że Rzecznik Praw Obywatelskich zgadza się w dużym stopniu z dokonaną przez Komisję interpretacją art. 17 Traktatu o funkcjonowaniu Unii Europejskiej.

W szczególności Rzecznik Praw Obywatelskich przypomina, że Komisji przysługuje szeroki zakres swobody „w określeniu tematów, które zdecyduje się omawiać" zgodnie z priorytetami jej polityki. Rzecznik Praw Obywatelskich nie zajął żadnego stanowiska co do zarzutu skarżącego, że Komisja dopuszcza się dyskryminacji na rzecz organizacji religijnych. W rzeczywistości rzecznik „zauważa, że art. 17 TFUE nie zawiera żadnego zapisu sugerującego, że należy zachować idealną równowagę między różnymi grupami" oraz, że fakt, iż Komisja nie zdecyduje się na sponsorowanie konkretnej inicjatywy „nie może prowadzić do wniosku, że naruszyła swoje zobowiązanie do rozpoczęcia dialogu".

Komisja prowadzi obecnie prace dotyczące dodatkowej uwagi rzecznika praw obywatelskich, a mianowicie sugestii „wyjaśnienia swoich praktyk i zasad w tej dziedzinie, oraz, w razie konieczności, sporządzenia wytycznych" co do sposobu wdrażania art. 17 TFUE.

W odniesieniu do konkretnej kwestii podniesionej w skardze, a mianowicie zorganizowania wspólnego seminarium poświęconego dialogowi z Europejską Federacją Humanistyczną, informujemy, iż jesienią 2012 r. podjęto decyzję o zorganizowaniu w dniu 15 maja 2013 r. w pomieszczeniach Komisji seminarium poświęconego obywatelstwu europejskiemu.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001160/13
to the Commission
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Jean-Marie Cavada (PPE), Franziska Katharina Brantner (Verts/ALE) and Michael Cashman (S&D)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: Decision of the European Ombudsman on the implementation of Article 17 TFEU

On 18 October 2011, Complaint 2097/2011/RA against the Commission was submitted to the European Ombudsman, concerning the Commission's dialogue with churches, religious associations or communities, and philosophical and non-confessional organisations. On 25 January 2012, the Ombudsman closed his inquiry with two remarks:

1. 'By rejecting the complainant's proposal for a dialogue seminar, on the grounds that this would go beyond the spirit of Article 17(1) and (2) TFEU, the Commission failed properly to implement Article 17 (3) TFEU, according to which the EU is obliged to "maintain an open, transparent and regular dialogue" with churches, religious associations or communities, philosophical and non-confessional organisations. This constitutes an instance of maladministration.'

2. 'Taking into account the Ombudsman's findings, the Commission should (i) clarify its practices and rules in this area, and, if necessary (ii) draw up guidelines indicating how exactly it plans to implement Article 17 TFEU.'

In light of this decision, can the Commission explain how it views the remarks of the European Ombudsman in the abovementioned case?

Has the Commission already decided how it will follow up the decision?

Will the Commission put forward proposals, to be submitted to Parliament, for a reform of Article 17 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union on dialogue, with a view to broadening it to cover all religious views and life stances in Europe, and converting such dialogue into a broad public debate on shared values in the EU?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(19 March 2013)

The Commission would like to reassure the Honourable Members that it is determined to continue holding an open, transparent and regular dialogue with churches, religious associations and communities, and philosophical and non-confessional organisations.

The Commission has taken note of the Ombudsman's assessment regarding complaint 2097/2011/RA. It is pleased that the Ombudsman agrees to a large extent with the Commission's interpretation of Article 17 TFEU.

In particular, the Ombudsman recalls that the Commission enjoys a broad margin of discretion 'in terms of determining the topics it chooses to discuss' in line with its policy priorities. The Ombudsman has not taken a position as to the complainant's allegation that the Commission discriminates in favour of religious organisations. In fact, he 'notes that there is nothing in Art 17 TFEU which implies that a precise balance must be struck between the different groups' and that the fact that the Commission chooses not to sponsor a particular initiative 'cannot lead to the conclusion that it has breached its obligation to enter into dialogue'.

The Commission is currently working to address the Ombudsman's additional remark, namely his suggestion 'to clarify its practices and rules in this area, and, if necessary, draw up guidelines' as to the implementation of Article 17 TFEU.

As to the concrete issue raised by the complaint, namely to hold a joint dialogue seminar with the European Humanist Federation, the decision was taken in autumn 2012 to hold a seminar on 'European citizenship' in the premises of the Commission on 15 May 2013.

(An t-eagrán Gaeilge)

Ceist i gcomhair freagra scríofa E-001161/13
chuig an gCoimisiún
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(4 Feabhra 2013)

Ábhar: Sárú ar Choinbhinsiún Granada

Tá grúpa cónaitheoirí buartha go bhféadfadh obair forbraíochta atá beartaithe do theach cúirte i Loch Garman a bheith ina shárú ar Coinbhinsiún Granada (An Coinbhinsiún maidir le hOidhreacht Ailtireachta na hEorpa a Chosaint, 1985), atá sínithe ag Éirinn.

An bhféadfadh an Coimisiún a mheasúnú a thabhairt i dtaobh an bhféadfadh an obair forbraíochta seo atá beartaithe a bheith ina shárú ar Choinbhinsiún Granada?

An bhféadfadh an Coimisiún eolas a thabhairt maidir leis na bealaí eile ina bhféadfadh an grúpa cónaitheoirí iarracht a dhéanamh ar leibhéal an AE foirgneamh oidhreachta, mar atá ann sa chás seo, a chosaint?

Freagra ón gCoimisinéir Vassiliou thar ceann an Choimisiúin
(27 Márta 2013)

Is mian liom a chur in iúl don Fheisire Onórach nach bhfuil dlínse ag an gCoimisiún maidir leis an gceist a cuireadh toisc nach bhfuil an tAontas Eorpach ina pháirtí i gCreat-Choinbhinsiún Chomhairle na hEorpa maidir le hOidhreacht Ailtireachta na hEorpa a Chosaint (1985, ar a dtugtar Coinbhinsiún Granada). Dá bhrí sin, níl an Coinbhinsiún sin ina chuid de reachtaíocht an Aontais Eorpaigh.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001161/13
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: Breach of the Granada Convention

A residents' group is concerned that planned development work on a court house in Wexford may be in breach of the Granada Convention (Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe, 1985), which Ireland has signed.

Could the Commission provide its evaluation in relation to whether this planned development work could be in breach of the Granada Convention?

Could the Commission provide information with regard to other ways in which the residents' group could try to protect such a heritage building at EU level?

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

I would like to inform the Honourable Member that the Commission has no jurisdiction over the question posed because the European Union is not party to the Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe (1985, the so-called Granada Convention). This Convention is therefore not part of the European Union's legislation.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001162/13
alla Commissione
Paolo De Castro (S&D)
(4 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Mercato vitivinicolo: tutela e protezione in ambito comunitario delle denominazioni di origine geografica

La denominazione di origine geografica dei vini IGP «Emilia» o «dell'Emilia», riconosciuta in Italia con il Decreto ministeriale del 4 agosto 2005, modificato con DM del 30 novembre 2011, è inserita nel registro europeo delle indicazioni geografiche dei vini E-Bacchus.

Inoltre, il titolo III, capo IV del regolamento (CE) n. 479/2008 del Consiglio, del 29 aprile 2008, reca disposizioni di tutela e protezione da fenomeni di imitazioni, evocazioni ed usurpazioni per il sistema delle denominazioni di origine e indicazioni geografiche del mercato vitivinicolo.

L'Alta Corte di Madrid ha invece rovesciato il diniego dell'Ufficio Marchi spagnolo adottando due sentenze che richiamano impropriamente il disposto all'articolo 19, paragrafo 3, del regolamento (CE) n. 607/2009 per sostenere la genericità del termine «Lambrusco» giungendo conseguentemente a statuire che l'inclusione di detto nome varietale nei marchi impugnati non costituisce violazione delle pertinenti DOP e IGP, e della menzione «Lambrusco dell'Emilia», violando il disposto del regolamento (CE) n. 1234/2007, articoli 118 terdecies e 118 quaterdecies.

In un importante mercato commerciale all'interno dell'Unione, come la Spagna, sono sempre più diffusi prodotti vitivinicoli che riportano in etichetta marchi privati che includono la menzione IGP «Lambrusco Emilia» o il nome del vitigno «Lambrusco», nonché iniziative commerciali e promozionali evocative della menzione IGP «Emilia» e del celebre vitigno italiano «Lambrusco».

Tutto ciò premesso e considerato, può la Commissione far sapere se è a conoscenza della problematica illustrata? Quali iniziative urgenti intende adottare contro le sentenze sopramenzionate, al fine di tutelare la proprietà intellettuale della denominazione di origine geografica «Emilia» e al fine di contrastare, in via definitiva, il diffondersi di tali fenomeni salvaguardando, così, l'applicazione della normativa dell'UE?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(8 aprile 2013)

La Commissione non è a conoscenza delle due sentenze dell'Alta Corte di Madrid riguardanti l'uso del termine «Lambrusco» in Spagna. Secondo il sistema istituito dal trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea, l'interpretazione e l'applicazione dei regolamenti dell'Unione, come quelli cui ha fatto riferimento l'onorevole parlamentare, sono di competenza dei tribunali nazionali sotto il controllo della Corte di giustizia, conformemente all'articolo 267 di detto trattato.

Tuttavia, la Commissione chiederà di ottenere informazioni sul contenuto e sulle implicazioni delle due sentenze dell'Alta Corte di Madrid, al fine di esaminare le decisioni in questione e le successive possibili implicazioni. In ogni caso la Commissione comunicherà all'onorevole parlamentare le sue valutazioni.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001162/13
to the Commission
Paolo De Castro (S&D)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: Wine market: safeguards and protection for geographical designations of origin in the European Union

The geographical designation of origin of 'Emilia' or 'dell'Emilia' PGI wines, recognised in Italy under the Ministerial Decree of 4 August 2005, as amended by the Ministerial Decree of 30 November 2011, has been included in the E-Bacchus European register of geographical designations for wines.

Furthermore, Title III, Chapter IV of Council Regulation (EC) No 479/2008 of 29 April 2008 lays down provisions to safeguard and protect against instances of imitation, evocation and misuse in the system of designations of origin and geographical designations for the wine market.

The Madrid High Court has however overturned a refusal by the Spanish Trademark Office and adopted two judgments which refer incorrectly to the provisions of Article 19(3) of Regulation (EC) No 607/2009 to support the generic nature of the term 'Lambrusco', consequently ruling that the inclusion of the said varietal name within the contested trademarks did not constitute a breach of the relevant PDOs and PGIs, nor did the reference to 'Lambrusco dell'Emilia', thus violating Articles 118(l) and 118(m) of Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007.

In an important EU market such as Spain, wine products with private trademarks on their labels including a reference to the 'Lambrusco Emilia' PGI or the name of the 'Lambrusco' vine are becoming increasingly widespread, as are commercial and promotional initiatives evoking the 'Emilia' PGI and the renowned Italian 'Lambrusco' vine.

In view of this, can the Commission state whether it is aware of the problem illustrated? What urgent measures does it intend to take against the aforementioned judgments in order to protect intellectual property rights over the 'Emilia' geographical designation of origin and put a definitive end to the dissemination of these practices, thus safeguarding the application of EC law?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(8 April 2013)

The Commission is not aware of the two judgments of the Madrid High Court concerning the use of the term 'Lambrusco' in Spain. Under the system established by the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, national courts are competent to interpret and apply Union regulations such as those referred to by the Honourable Member under the control of the Court of Justice pursuant to Article 267 of the said Treaty.

However, the Commission will ask for information on the content and implications of the two judgments of the Madrid High Court, with the view to examining the decisions concerned and their susbequent possible implications. The Commission will in any case communicate the judgments to the MEP.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001163/13
aan de Commissie
Toine Manders (ALDE)
(4 februari 2013)

Betreft: Betere communicatie over de interne markt

Uit onderzoek van de Nederlandse Kamer van Koophandel blijkt dat dertig procent van de ondernemers in Nederland niet weet wat de interne markt is en wat de meerwaarde ervan is. Daarnaast is een zeer goed functionerende organisatie, namelijk SOLVIT, totaal onbekend. Ook bleek uit het onderzoek dat veel ondernemers nog problemen hebben met de verscheidenheid aan productvoorschriften tussen landen, het terugvragen van de btw in het buitenland of het afdwingen van contractverplichtingen. De EU geeft momenteel meer dan 200 miljoen euro uit aan communicatie, maar kennelijk zonder resultaat.

Daarom de volgende vragen:

Is de Commissie het ermee eens dat het huidige communicatiebeleid onvoldoende resultaat oplevert?

Zo ja, met welke concrete voorstellen gaat de Commissie komen om de communicatie en de bekendheid van Europese wetgeving met betrekking tot de interne markt verder te verbeteren?

Zo nee, kan de Commissie aangeven waarom steeds weer uit onderzoek blijkt dat de interne markt zo weinig bekend is bij ondernemers en consumenten?

Antwoord van de heer Barnier namens de Commissie
(5 april 2013)

De Europese Commissie bevestigt haar inzet en vastberadenheid om de voordelen van de eengemaakte markt van de EU onder de aandacht van het publiek te brengen. In deze mondiale communicatiemaatschappij moet de Commissie echter de krachten bundelen met alle belangrijke actoren ([1]) om een echte impact te hebben. De voorbije jaren heeft de Commissie samen met het Europees Parlement ad-hoccampagnes op touw gezet zoals het „Forum voor de eengemaakte markt" in 2011 en de „Week van de eengemaakte markt" in 2012, die in 2013 door een „Maand van de eengemaakte markt" worden gevolgd. Het doel van deze initiatieven was om samen met de lidstaten de eengemaakte markt dichter bij de burgers en bedrijven te brengen en een echt debat over haar ontwikkeling op gang te brengen. In 2013 zal de Commissie burgers en bedrijven nog dichter bij de eengemaakte markt betrekken door het potentieel van nieuwe communicatietechnologieën zoals online debatten, sociale media en webstreaming, aan te wenden.

De Commissie heeft de portaalsite „Uw Europa" volledig vernieuwd om tegemoet te komen aan de behoefte om burgers en bedrijven beter te informeren over en beter bewust te maken van hun rechten en mogelijkheden op de eengemaakte markt. Via deze portaalsite zijn in alle officiële talen van de EU praktische informatie en de hulp en bijstand toegankelijk die nodig zijn om op de eengemaakte markt rechten te kunnen uitoefenen. Het bezoekersaantal van het portaal neemt exponentieel toe. De Commissie wil in het najaar van 2013 een „Actieplan voor betere verstrekking van informatie over internemarktrechten" ([2]) voorstellen. Dit actieplan zal concrete stappen en doelen bevatten om het kader voor de verstrekking van degelijke informatie over de internemarktrechten te voltooien en de bekendheid met die rechten te verbeteren, op nationaal en EU-niveau. Het actieplan zal met name concrete stappen bevatten voor een gemakkelijkere informatieverstrekking en -uitwisseling tussen nationale en EU-portalen.

([1]) EU-instellingen, lidstaten, regionale en lokale overheden, politieke partijen en het maatschappelijk middenveld.
([2]) Zoals aangekondigd in haar Mededeling „Betere governance van de interne markt" — COM(2012)259/2.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001163/13
to the Commission
Toine Manders (ALDE)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: Better communication concerning the internal market

A survey by the Netherlands Chamber of Commerce indicates that 30% of entrepreneurs in the Netherlands do not know what the internal market is and what added value it possesses. In addition, a highly successful organisation, Solvit, is completely unknown. The survey also showed that many entrepreneurs still have problems with the differences in product regulations between countries, claiming VAT refunds abroad or enforcing contractual obligations. The EU is currently spending more than EUR 200 m on communication, but evidently without achieving results.

Does the Commission agree that the current communication policy is achieving insufficient results?

If so, what practical proposals will the Commission make for further improving communication and awareness of European law concerning the internal market?

If not, can the Commission indicate why, time and again, surveys show that entrepreneurs and consumers know so little about the internal market?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(5 April 2013)

The European Commission confirms its commitment and determination to communicate the benefits of the EU internal market to the public. Considering the global communications environment, it is however important that the Commission joins forces with all the key actors ([1]) in order to achieve real impact. The Commission has recently organised — together with the European Parliament — ad hoc campaigns such as the 'Single Market Forum' in 2011 and the 'Single Market Week' in 2012 which will be followed by a 'Single Market Month' in 2013. The aim of these initiatives was, together with Member States, to bring the Single Market closer to citizens and businesses and encourage a genuine debate about its development. In 2013 the Commission will involve citizens and businesses even more effectively by using the potential of new communication technologies, such as online debates, social media and web-streaming.

Responding to the need for better information and awareness of citizens and businesses about their rights and opportunities in the single market, the Commission has entirely revamped the Your Europe portal. This portal offers practical information and access to all help and assistance needed to make use of single market rights, in all EU languages. Visits to the portal are increasing exponentially. In autumn 2013 the Commission intends to present an 'Action Plan on better information on single market rights' ([2]). This Action Plan will set out concrete steps and targets to further complete the provision of good-quality information on Single Market rights and enhance awareness about them, at national and EU level. In particular, the action plan will contain concrete actions to better provide and share information content between national and EU portals.

([1]) EU institutions, Member States, regional and local authorities, political parties and civil society organisations.
([2]) As announced in its communication 'Better governance for the Single market' — COM(2012)259/2.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001164/13
aan de Commissie
Toine Manders (ALDE)
(4 februari 2013)

Betreft: Niet-meewerken van fabrikant Apple aan een standaard USB-oplader voor mobiele telefoons en smartphones

In 2009 is er onder druk van het Europees Parlement en op initiatief van de Europese Commissie met tien grote fabrikanten van hardware en software voor mobiele telefonie en smartphones, waaronder Apple, afgesproken ervoor te zorgen een nieuwe micro-USB standaard te leveren voor mobiele telefoons en smartphones. Dit is vastgelegd in een *Memorandum of Understanding* (MoU) dat op 29 juni 2009 is overhandigd aan toenmalig commissaris Günter Verheugen, verantwoordelijk voor industrie. De bedoeling was om de interne markt te verbeteren en jaarlijks een geschatte besparing te realiseren van 300 miljoen euro voor consumenten, en om ook het milieu beter te beschermen.

Recent heb ik veel klachten gekregen dat Apple zich niet aan dit MoU houdt. Bovendien is een vrijwillige overeenkomst met het bedrijfsleven niet vrijblijvend. In 2009 tekende ook fabrikant Apple het MoU, maar tot op heden is daar slechts weinig van terechtgekomen. Zo zouden nieuwe producten zoals de iPhone 5, de iPad 4 en de iPad mini niet beschikken over de standaard micro-USB-stekker. Wellicht houdt Apple zich formeel aan het MoU, maar in de praktijk blijkbaar niet. Zo heb ik ook vernomen dat Apple kennelijk een chip in de lader plaatst waardoor de interoperabiliteit wordt belemmerd.

1. Herkent de Commissie deze klachten en deelt zij mijn mening dat Apple de interne markt belemmert door concurrentie af te schermen?

2. Zo ja, welke acties gaat de Commissie ondernemen om Apple te bewegen zich te houden aan het *Memorandum of Understanding* en de interne markt te verbeteren?

E-001164/2013Antwoord van de heer Tajani namens de Commissie
(13 maart 2013)

De ondertekenaars van het memorandum van overeenstemming betreffende de harmonisatie van opladers voor mobiele telefoons (mvo) ([1]) hebben overeenstemming bereikt over de invoering van een gemeenschappelijke oplaadmogelijkheid op basis van micro-USB-technologie. Het mvo staat echter ook het gebruik van een adapter toe en stelt in dat verband geen voorwaarden vast.

De Commissie beschikt niet over bewijzen dat Apple de overeenkomst heeft geschonden. De iPhone 5 mag worden gebruikt met een adapter die de aansluiting op de gemeenschappelijke oplader mogelijk maakt. De Commissie mengt zich niet in de marketingstrategieën van de producenten.

Een recent voortgangsverslag, uitgebracht door de mvo-ondertekenaars, heeft aangetoond dat 90 % van de nieuwe toestellen die tegen eind 2012 door de ondertekenaars en door andere producenten in de handel zijn gebracht de gemeenschappelijke oplaadmogelijkheid ondersteunen. Dit wijst erop dat de vrijwillige overeenkomst voor de burgers vruchten heeft afgeworpen.

Gezien de innovaties op technologisch gebied is Commissie ervan overtuigd dat consumenten en producenten baat kunnen hebben bij een uitbreiding van het initiatief voor de harmonisatie van opladers naar nieuwe categorieën van producten, met inbegrip van de nieuwe generatie mobiele telefoons en andere kleine elektronische toestellen zoals digitale camera's, tablet-pc's en muziekspelers. De Commissie organiseert daarom de opstart van een studie om te beoordelen welke resultaten werden geboekt met het mvo en om te onderzoeken welke mogelijkheden er bestaan voor een geschikte follow-up, met inbegrip van vrijwillige overeenkomsten en wetgeving. De Commissie zal in dat verband rekening houden met de opmerkingen over het gebruik van een adapter bij de voorbereiding van nadere maatregelen die het vervolg vormen op het mvo.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/rtte/files/chargers/chargers_mou_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001164/13
to the Commission
Toine Manders (ALDE)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: Failure of the manufacturer Apple to cooperate on a standard USB charger for mobile telephones and smartphones

In 2009, under pressure from the European Parliament and at the initiative of the Commission, it was agreed with ten major manufacturers of hardware and software for mobile telephones and smartphones, including Apple, that they would supply a new micro-USB as a standard accessory for mobile telephones and smartphones. This was recorded in a memorandum of understanding (MoU) which was presented to the then Industry Commissioner Günter Verheugen on 29 June 2009. The intention was to improve the internal market and achieve an estimated saving of EUR 300 m per annum for consumers, as well as protecting the environment more effectively.

Recently I have received many complaints that Apple is not abiding by the MoU. Moreover, even if an agreement is reached with industry on a voluntary basis, this does not mean that compliance with it is optional. In 2009, the manufacturer Apple also signed the MoU, but so far it has taken very little action to carry out its obligations under it. For example, new products such as the iPhone 5, iPad 4 and iPad mini are said not to be supplied with the standard micro-USB plug. Perhaps Apple is abiding by the MoU in formal terms, but in practice it is clearly not. I have also heard, for example, that Apple evidently incorporates a chip in the charger which impedes interoperability.

1. Does the Commission recognise these complaints, and does it agree that Apple is impeding the internal market by obstructing competition?

2. If so, what action will the Commission take to induce Apple to abide by the memorandum of understanding and improve the internal market?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(13 March 2013)

The signatories of the memorandum of understanding on the harmonisation of chargers for mobile phones (MoU) ([1]) agreed to introduce a common charging solution based on Micro-USB technology. The MoU also allowed for the use of an adaptor and does not prescribe the conditions for its provision.

The Commission does not have evidence that Apple has breached the agreement. The iPhone 5 can be used with an adaptor allowing it to be connected to the common charger. The Commission does not interfere on the marketing strategies of the manufacturers.

A recent progress report provided by the MoU signatories has shown that 90% of the new devices placed on the market by the signatories and other manufacturers by the end of 2012 support the common charging capability. This indicates that the voluntary agreement has been successful in delivering benefits for citizens.

The Commission is convinced that, while taking into account technological innovations, consumers and manufacturers can benefit from an extension of the initiative on harmonisation of charger to new categories of products including the new generation of mobile phones and other small electronic devices, such as digital cameras, tablets and music players. Therefore the Commission is organising the launch of a study evaluating the results achieved with the MoU and to consider options for appropriate follow-up including voluntary agreement and legislation. In this respect the Commission will take into account comments received on the use of an adaptor in the preparation of further measures which will follow the MoU.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/rtte/files/chargers/chargers_mou_en.pdf

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-001165/13
til Kommissionen
Christel Schaldemose (S&D)
(4. februar 2013)

Om: Teststrategier for hormonforstyrrende stoffer i Europa

Parlamentets initiativbetænkning om beskyttelse af folkesundheden mod hormonsystemforstyrrende stoffer (2012/2066(INI)) behandler kriterierne for vurdering af formodede hormonforstyrrende stoffer behandlet, men det bagved liggende spørgsmål om teststrategier er ikke blevet inddraget i tilstrækkeligt omfang.

Et europæisk forskningscenter med fokus på hormonforstyrrende stoffer og udviklingen af reguleringsorienteret forskning ville styrke EU's strategi for en bedre forskningspolitik i forbindelse med hormonforstyrrende stoffer og fremme udvikling af EU-værktøjer ved at se på, hvordan toksicitet spredes ved hjælp af bl.a. in vitro-testmetoder. Dette ville i sidste instans på en meget effektiv måde kunne bidrage til en vurdering af hormonforstyrrende stoffer med henblik på at beskytte miljøet og forbrugerne.

Kommissionen bedes i denne forbindelse besvare følgende spørgsmål:

1. Hvad er Kommissionen holdning til udvikling af teststrategier for hormonforstyrrende aktivstoffer?

2. Agter Kommissionen at drage fordel af udviklingen i USA med hensyn til f.eks. screeningprogrammet Endocrine Disrupter Screening Program 21 (EDSP21) og de amerikanske nationale sundhedhedsinstitutters såkaldte Human Toxome Project (projekt til kortlægning af, hvordan toksiske stoffer spredes)?

3. Overvejer Kommissionen at oprette et europæisk forskningscenter, der fokuserer på reguleringsorienteret forskning (»regulatory sciences«)?

4. Overvejer Kommissionen fremgangmåder, der omfatter evidensbaseret toksikologi?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Janez Potočnik
(22. april 2013)

1. Kommissionen og de relevante agenturer udvikler reguleringsorienterede teststrategier i samråd med medlemsstaterne og andre interessenter ifølge de procedurer, der er indeholdt i den specifikke lovgivning. Kommissionen har dog anerkendt nødvendigheden af at udfylde hullerne i vores viden, så anvendelsen af teststrategier i lovgivningen kan forbedres yderligere. I sit forslag til et generelt EU-miljøhandlingsprogram frem til 2020 og i sin meddelelse til Rådet fra 2012 om de kombinerede virkninger af kemikalier nævner Kommissionen behovet for at udvikle en omfattende videnbase om toksicitet, så kendskabet til, hvordan kemikalier påvirker organismer, bliver større. Det vil også øge kendskabet til hormonforstyrrende stoffer. Kommissionen er i færd med at se på, hvordan en sådan videnbase bedst kan udvikles og forvaltes. En sådan indsats kræver støtte til forskningsprojekter i forbindelse med det kommende rammeprogram for forskning og innovation, Horisont 2020.

2. Kommissionens meddelelse om en EF-strategi for hormonforstyrrende stoffer (KOM(1999)0706) nævner behovet for informationsudveksling og international koordinering, og Kommissionen følger nøje den internationale udvikling på området, bl.a. i USA.

3. Kommissionen er i færd med at revidere sin EF-strategi for hormonforstyrrende stoffer, så den afspejler lovændringer og de videnskabelige fremskridt, der er gjort. I den forbindelse vil Kommissionen undersøge ideen om et virtuelt europæisk forskningscenter.

4. Udviklingen af en omfattende videnbase om toksicitet, der skal øge vores kendskab til, hvordan kemikalier påvirker organismer, jf. punkt 1, omfatter bl.a. fremgangsmåder til udvikling af evidensbaseret toksikologi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001165/13
to the Commission
Christel Schaldemose (S&D)
(4 February 2013)

Subject: Testing strategies for endocrine disrupters in Europe

Parliament's own-initiative report entitled 'Protection of public health from endocrine disrupters' (2012/2066 (INI)) discussed the criteria for assessing putative substances, but did not sufficiently address the underlying issue of testing strategies.

A European research centre focusing on endocrine disrupters and other regulatory scientific advances would strengthen the EU's strategy for better policy research on endocrine disrupters and facilitate the development of EU tools by looking at pathways of toxicity through, *inter alia*, *in vitro* testing methods. Ultimately, this would be a very effective way to help assess endocrine disrupters with a view to protecting the environment and consumers.

I would therefore like to ask the following questions:

1. What is the Commission's approach to the development of testing strategies for endocrine active substances?

2. Does the Commission plan to take advantage of US developments such as the Endocrine Disrupter Screening Program 21 (EDSP21) and the National Institutes of Health Human Toxome Project?

3. Is the Commission considering establishing a European research centre focusing on regulatory sciences?

4. Is the Commission considering approaches involving evidence-based toxicology?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2013)

1. Testing strategies for regulatory purposes are developed by the Commission and relevant Agencies in consultation with Member States and stakeholders through the procedures foreseen in specific legislation. The Commission has however recognised the need to fill knowledge gaps to further improve the application of testing strategies in legislation. The Commission in its proposal for 'a General Union Environment Action Programme to 2020' and in its 2012 Communication to the Council on the combination effects of chemicals recognised the need to develop a comprehensive toxicity knowledge base to better understand how chemicals interact with organisms. This will also include improved understanding of endocrine disruptors. The Commission is currently assessing how such a comprehensive knowledge base can best be established and managed. Such an effort would require support for research projects under the next Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Framework.

2. The Commission in its Community Strategy for Endocrine Disruptors [COM(1999) 706] recognised the need for information exchange and international coordination and is following closely the international developments in the field including those in the US.

3. The Commission is currently reviewing its Community Strategy for Endocrine Disruptors to reflect the progress achieved in science and changes in legislation. The Commission will consider the idea of a virtual European research centre in the review process.

4. The development of a comprehensive toxicity knowledge base to better understand how chemical interact with organisms referred to in paragraph 1 above includes approaches involving evidence-based toxicology.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001166/13
a la Comisión
Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto (S&D)
(5 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: Vulneración de los derechos humanos por el Parlamento ruso

En consonancia con varias regiones rusas la Duma acaba de aprobar, dentro del marco de normativas restrictivas que viene desarrollando en los últimos meses, una ley en contra de la propaganda homosexual, pasando a tipificar cualquier acto homosexual en público como delito administrativo.

La futura regulación representa un ataque absoluto al derecho fundamental a la libertad de expresión, así como al de reunión y manifestación, y rompe los compromisos internacionales del país en la defensa de los derechos humanos.

Su aprobación sólo puede suponer una mayor estigmatización en el país de las personas que componen el colectivo «LGTB» y la profundización de su discriminación no sólo en el ámbito privado, sino también por parte de las autoridades públicas.

La defensa de los derechos fundamentales de las personas es una máxima que todo gobierno democrático ha de respetar y proteger. En este sentido, la UE debe actuar como garante no sólo a nivel interno sino también externo, ya que es uno de sus pilares fundamentales.

Dado que la Unión Europea mantiene una estrecha relación de cooperación y vecindad con Rusia y que existen numerosos acuerdos en vigor sobre la materia, ¿piensa la Comisión tomar algún tipo de iniciativa para que las autoridades rusas no sigan vulnerando la libertad de expresión de este colectivo y minando el marco de derechos de sus ciudadanos?

Respuesta de la Alta Representante/Vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(4 de abril de 2013)

La Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta ha estado muy atenta a estas medidas y ha expresado abiertamente su disgusto por la aprobación de tales leyes a nivel regional y, posteriormente, luego también nacional. La UE reaccionó muy firmemente ante la adopción de la ley en San Petersburgo en 2011 mediante una gestión diplomática, una carta al Gobernador de San Petersburgo y una declaración en la OSCE.

Tras la aprobación en primera lectura de la ley sobre la propaganda homosexual por la Duma, o asamblea estatal, de la Federación de Rusia, la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta hizo pública una declaración en la que expresaba su preocupación por el hecho de que la propaganda de la homosexualidad se convirtiera en una infracción administrativa con arreglo a la legislación rusa. La Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta hizo hincapié en que la aplicación de esta ley podría agravar la discriminación contra las lesbianas, los gays, los bisexuales, los transexuales, los intersexuales y las personas que los apoyan, sobre todo al limitar su libertad de expresión y sus libertades de reunión y asociación. Catherine Ashton observó que esto se opondría a los compromisos nacionales e internacionales de Rusia en materia de defensa de los derechos fundamentales de todas las personas.

El SEAE seguirá estando muy atento a la situación en lo que respecta a los derechos de la comunidad LGBTI en la Federación de Rusia.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001166/13
to the Commission
Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto (S&D)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: State Duma decision breaches human rights

Echoing similar moves by a number of Russian regions, and against a backdrop of repressive new legislation introduced over the past few months, the State Duma recently backed a law banning 'homosexual propaganda' and classing any public act of homosexuality as an offence punishable by a fine.

The bill constitutes a serious infringement of the fundamental right to freedom of expression and association, as well as freedom to demonstrate, and reneges on Russia's international commitments on human rights.

If the law is passed, it will further stigmatise LGBT people in Russia and heighten discrimination, not only at a private level but also by the public authorities.

Every democratic government has a basic duty to safeguard fundamental human rights. Consequently, the EU must act as a guarantor of human rights, both within its own borders and beyond, particularly as respect for human rights is one of the EU's fundamental principles.

Given that the EU and Russia enjoy a close relationship based on cooperation and neighbourly relations, and that a number of EU-Russia agreements have been concluded, will the Commission take measures with a view to persuading the Russian authorities to stop curtailing the freedom of expression of LGBT people and infringing the rights of Russian citizens?

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

The HR/VP has been following these developments very closely, expressing vocally its disappointment with the passage of such bills first at regional, and now also on national, level. The EU has reacted very strongly to the bill's adoption in St. Petersburg in 2011, with a demarche, a letter to St Petersburg's governor, and a statement in the OSCE.

On the occasion of the bill on the homosexual propaganda being passed, in the first reading, by the State Duma of the Russian Federation, HR/VP issued a statement expressing her concern with the propaganda of homosexuality becoming an administrative offence under Russian law. The High Representative/Vice-President stressed that the implementation of this law could reinforce discrimination against lesbians, gays, bisexuals, transsexuals and intersex people, and those supporting them, in particular by limiting their freedom of expression and their freedom of association and assembly. Catherine Ashton noted that this would be in contradiction with Russia's national and international commitments to uphold fundamental rights of all individuals.

The EEAS will continue to follow very closely further developments with regard to the rights of the LGBTI community in the Russian Federation.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-001167/13
til Kommissionen
Bendt Bendtsen (PPE)
(5. februar 2013)

Om: Europæiske keramiske kværne og Kommissionens anti-dumping told

I forbindelse med Kommissionens planlagte anti-dumpingtold ved forordning (EU) nr. 1072/2012, som vedrører bord- og køkkenartikler af keramisk materiale, rammes også europæiske virksomheder, der eksempelvis får produceret keramiske kværne og kværnværker i Kina.

Er det Kommissionens hensigt, at anti-dumping tolden også skal gælde keramiske produktdele fra Kina, der ikke hører under »kopper og tallerkener« kategorien; som ikke sælges på det kinesiske marked i nævneværdig grad; og hvoraf der ikke er en betydelig produktion i Europa, om overhoved nogen?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Karel De Gucht
(12. marts 2013)

I forbindelse med antidumpingundersøgelsen vedrørende bordservice og køkkenartikler af keramisk materiale hævdede en række parter, at bestemte varer som f.eks. keramiske kværne og keramiske kværnværker dertil bør udelukkes fra undersøgelsens varedækning.

Den generelle regel om varedækningens definition er, at den bør omfatte alle varetyper, som har samme grundlæggende fysiske og kemiske egenskaber og samme grundlæggende anvendelsesformål. Enhver anmodning om udelukkelse af en vare undersøges i henhold til denne regel. Kommissionens tjenestegrene med ansvar for den igangværende undersøgelse er i færd med at analysere alle ovennævnte anmodninger. Den 25. februar 2013 blev et resultat af denne analyse forelagt alle de berørte parter inden for rammerne af de relevante procedurer for antidumpingforanstaltninger. Det er i denne forbindelse vigtigt, at den varedækning, der i sidste ende fastsættes, kan anvendes effektivt af toldmyndighederne, og at den sikrer foranstaltningernes effektivitet, dvs. at det ikke er let at omgå foranstaltningerne.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001167/13
to the Commission
Bendt Bendtsen (PPE)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: European ceramic grinding mills and the Commission's anti-dumping duty

The anti-dumping duty which the Commission plans to impose, through Regulation (EU) No 1072/2012 on ceramic tableware and kitchenware originating in the People's Republic of China, also affects European firms which, for example, have ceramic grinding mills and working parts for such mills produced in China.

Is it the Commission's intention that the anti-dumping duty should also apply to ceramic product components from China which do not fall within the category of 'cups and plates', which are not sold to any appreciable extent on the Chinese market, and of which there is no significant production in Europe, if indeed any at all?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(12 March 2013)

In the framework of the anti-dumping investigation on ceramic tableware and kitchenware, several parties claimed that certain products, such as ceramic mills and their ceramic grinding parts, should be excluded from the product scope of the investigation.

The general rule on defining the product scope is that it should comprise all product types that share the same basic physical and chemical characteristics and the same basic uses. Any request for product exclusion is examined under this rule. The Commission services responsible for this ongoing investigation are currently analysing the merits of all abovementioned requests. On 25 February 2013 an outcome of this analysis was presented to all interested parties in the framework of appropriate procedures applied to anti-dumping measures. Within this framework, it is important that the product scope eventually set can be properly applied by customs authorities and that it ensures the effectiveness of measures, i.e. that measures cannot be easily circumvented.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001168/13
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(5. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: Pressefreiheit im europäisch-chinesischen Dialog

Ende Januar 2013 wurde berichtet, dass Hacker aus China (angeblich nachweislich mit militärischem Hintergrund) vier Monate lang The New York Times infiltrierten, offenbar in der Absicht, die Quellen einer Berichterstattung offenzulegen, die den Wohlstand des chinesischen Premierministers und seiner Familie zum Thema hatte.

1. Wie beurteilt die Kommission diese Vorgehensweise?

2. Kann dieser offenbare Versuch, die Pressefreiheit zu unterdrücken — wenngleich er nicht gelungen ist — Konsequenzen für den Dialog EU-China haben und wenn ja, welche?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(6. Mai 2013)

In Anbetracht der besorgniserregenden Machenschaften im Cyberspace hat die EU kürzlich eine Cybersicherheitsstrategie verabschiedet, um die EU-Bürger und -Institutionen vor den Gefahren von Cyberangriffen zu schützen. Durch die Stärkung der Widerstandsfähigkeit gegenüber Cyberangriffen soll Hackern das Eindringen in IT-Syseme und der Zugriff auf Datenbanken erschwert werden.

Hackerangriffe hatten jedoch keine Einschränkung der Meinungsfreiheit in Medien in der EU oder anderen westlichen Medien zur Folge.

Der Schutz der Menschenrechte im Internet und anderer Grundrechte ist ein zentrales Thema des Dialogs zwischen der EU und China.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001168/13
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: Freedom of the press in Europe-China dialogue

At the end of January 2013 it was reported that hackers from China (allegedly with evidence of a military background) infiltrated *The New York Times* for four months with the apparent intention of revealing the sources of a report on the wealth of the Chinese Prime Minister and his family.

1. What is the Commission's opinion of this practice?

2. Could this blatant attempt to suppress the freedom of the press — even though it was unsuccessful — have consequences for the EU-China dialogue and, if so, what are these consequences?

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

The activities in cyberspace have raised concerns and the newly adopted EU Cybersecurity Strategy intends to protect the EU citizens and institutions from the negative impact of cyber attacks. Raising overall cyber resilience would make it more difficult for hackers to penetrate into the IT systems and intrude the databases.

Hacking attacks have not caused the suppression of freedom of expression in the EU or other Western media.

Protection of human rights online and other fundamental rights is a central element in EU-China dialogue.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001169/13
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(5. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: Hacker-Angriffe auf Behörden und Institutionen

Medienberichten zufolge gab es Zugriffe von Hackern auf das IAEA-Netzwerk.

1. Sind der Kommission innerhalb der Europäischen Union Angriffe ähnlicher Art auf Institutionen und/oder Agenturen bekannt?

2. Wenn ja, welche Maßnahmen hat die Kommission mit Blick auf eine verbesserte Sicherheit institutioneller Daten in der Europäischen Union ergriffen?

3. Welche Kosten fallen in diesem Bereich an und in welcher Höhe?

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

1. Wie auch einige andere EU-Institutionen und -Einrichtungen wurde die Kommission in den letzten Jahren mit Cyberangriffen auf ihre IT-Systeme konfrontiert.

2. Über die traditionellen Maßnahmen zum Schutz der Informations- und Kommunikationssysteme (IKS) der Kommission hinaus hat die Kommission einen Aktionsplan gegen Cyberangriffe erarbeitet, der Maßnahmen zur Aufdeckung und Eindämmung von Cyberangriffen sowie eine kontinuierliche Verbesserung der Gegenmaßnahmen einschließlich Schulungen und Sensibilisierungsmaßnahmen vorsieht.

Die Kommissionsdienststellen, die IT-Systeme entwickeln oder verwalten, tragen auch die Verantwortung für die Sicherheit dieser Systeme. Die Kommission tauscht in diesem Bereich über die im Jahr 2012 gegründete CERT-EU Task Force Informationen und bewährte Praktiken mit anderen EU-Organen und -Einrichtungen aus.

3. Die Mittel für die Sicherheit der Informationssysteme sind in den Gesamtmitteln für Informatik enthalten und richten sich nach der Sicherheitspolitik der Kommission; Systemeigentümer sind verpflichtet, die Kosten für Sicherheitsgegenmaßnahmen gleich zu Beginn ihrer IT-Projekte einzukalkulieren.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001169/13
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: Hacking attacks on authorities and institutions

According to media reports, hackers have attacked the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) network.

1. Is the Commission aware of any attacks of a similar nature on institutions and/or agencies within the European Union?

2. If so, what measures has it taken with a view to improving the security of institutional data in the European Union?

3. What costs arise in this area and how high are they?

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

1. Over the past few years, the Commission, like some of the other EU institutions and bodies, has had to face cyber attacks targetting its IT systems.

2. On top of the traditional measures to protect the Commission's Communication and Information Systems (CIS), the Commission established an internal action plan against cyber attacks, which includes measures aimed at detecting and stopping cyber attacks and at continuously improving countermeasures, including training and awareness.

Commission services which develop or manage IT systems, also have the responsibility for the security of these systems. The Commission exchanges information and best practices in this area with other EU institutions and bodies via the CERT-EU Task Force that was set up in 2012.

3. The cost for information system security is integrated in the global budget for informatics, and based on the Commission security policies; system owners are obliged to include the cost for security countremeasures from the beginning of their IT projects.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001170/13
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(5. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: Konsequenzen einer möglichen US-Klage gegen Standard & Poor's

Das US-Justizministerium beabsichtigt, eine Zivilklage gegen die Ratingagentur Standard & Poor's anzustrengen. Hintergrund ist der fahrlässige Umgang mit der Einstufung von Wertpapieren, welche lange Zeit mit der Bestnote versehen und beim Beginn der Krise plötzlich extrem heruntergestuft wurden.

1. Welche Konsequenzen müssen nach Ansicht der Kommission für Europa in Betracht gezogen werden, wenn die Klage des US-Ministeriums Erfolg hat?

2. Welche Folgen würden sich nach Einschätzung der Kommission aus einem Nicht-/Erfolg unmittelbar für die Europäische Union ergeben?

3. Wie beurteilt die Kommission die Rolle der Ratingagenturen zum gegenwärtigen Zeitpunkt? (Bitte um ein Update)

Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Barnier im Namen der Kommission
(5. April 2013)

Seit dem 1. Juli 2011 werden Ratingagenturen (Credit Rating Agencies, CRA) zur Gänze von der Europäischen Wertpapier- und Marktaufsichtsbehörde (ESMA) beaufsichtigt. Aus diesem Grund ist es die ESMA und nicht die Kommission, die im Rahmen ihrer Zuständigkeiten Aufsichtsmaßnahmen einleiten sollte, wenn sie dies für sinnvoll hält. Bislang liegen der Kommission keinerlei Informationen über etwaige Verstöße gegen die CRA-Verordnung vor. Nach Artikel 31 dieser Verordnung kann die zuständige Behörde eines Mitgliedstaats die ESMA ersuchen, die Nutzung von Ratings für aufsichtsrechtliche Zwecke durch Finanzinstitute auszusetzen, wenn ihrer Auffassung nach in erheblichem Umfang gegen die Verordnung verstoßen wurde und diese Verstöße den Anlegerschutz oder die Stabilität des Finanzsystems in diesem Mitgliedstaat erheblich beeinträchtigt haben. Der Kommission ist bislang kein solches Ersuchen bekannt.

Die jüngsten Entwicklungen bei der Beaufsichtigung von Ratingagenturen und insbesondere bei der Klage gegen S&P in den USA werden von der Kommission aufmerksam verfolgt. Der Kommissionsvorschlag zu Ratingagenturen sieht insbesondere eine zivilrechtliche Haftung vor, die es Anlegern und Emittenten ermöglicht, bei einem vorsätzlichen oder grob fahrlässigen Verstoß gegen die CRA-Verordnung gerichtliche Schritte gegen Ratingagenturen einzuleiten. Die Kommission ist der Auffassung, dass die zivilrechtliche Klage gegen S&P und der neue EU-Regulierungsrahmen für Ratingagenturen das Bewusstsein der Anleger und Emittenten dafür schärfen werden, dass sie Ratingagenturen zivilrechtlich zur Rechenschaft ziehen können, wenn diese aufgeblähte Ratings abgeben, die gegen die einschlägige EU-Verordnung verstoßen.

Nach Ansicht der Kommission stellen Ratings in der EU eine regulierte Dienstleistung dar, die Transparenz- und Qualitätsstandards erfüllen müssen und im Rahmen der CRA-Verordnung einer angemessenen Aufsicht unterliegen.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001593/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(14 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Processo judicial por fraude: EUA vs Standard & Poor's

Segundo a comunicação social, o governo dos Estados Unidos da América intentou uma ação judicial contra a agência de notação financeira Standard & Poor's. A administração americana terá considerado fraudulentos os ratings elevados atribuídos a obrigações hipotecárias de alto risco que espoletaram a crise financeira no país e no mundo. Tratar-se-ia da primeira ação deste tipo contra uma agência de notação financeira.

Nos termos das mesmas fontes, a agência acusada tardou em atualizar os seus modelos de classificação de risco e deliberadamente atribuiu notações excessivamente elevadas, estando consciente da sua desadequação à realidade.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Tem conhecimento deste facto?

— Contemplaria a possibilidade de tomar uma decisão semelhante a nível europeu ou constituir-se como parte no processo judicial a seguir termos nos Estados Unidos da América?

Resposta conjunta dada por Michel Barnier em nome da Comissão
(5 de abril de 2013)

Desde 1 de julho de 2011, as agências de notação de risco (ANR) são objeto de supervisão por parte da Autoridade Europeia dos Valores Mobiliários e dos Mercados (ESMA), que dispõe de todos os poderes de supervisão relativamente às ANR. Sendo assim, cabe à ESMA, que constitui a autoridade competente, e não à Comissão, adotar medidas de supervisão, sempre que tal for necessário tendo em conta as competências que lhe são atribuídas. Até ao momento, a Comissão não recebeu quaisquer informações específicas sobre eventuais infrações ao Regulamento ANR. O artigo 31.° do Regulamento ANR prevê a possibilidade de uma autoridade competente de um Estado-Membro solicitar à ESMA a suspensão da utilização das notações de crédito para fins regulamentares por parte das instituições financeiras, quando considerar que se verificaram infrações importantes ao regulamento, com um impacto significativo sobre a proteção dos investidores ou sobre a estabilidade do sistema financeiro desse Estado-Membro. Até à data a Comissão não tem conhecimento de nenhum pedido nesse sentido.

A Comissão acompanha de perto os acontecimentos recentes nos EUA no que diz respeito à supervisão das ANR e, nomeadamente, uma ação de indemnização civil contra a S&P que envolve notações de risco anteriores à crise. A proposta da Comissão relativa às ANR introduz um sistema de responsabilidade civil que permite aos investidores e aos emitentes processarem uma ANR caso esta tenha violado, com dolo ou negligência grave, as regras constantes do Regulamento ANR. Em consequência, a Comissão pensa que esta ação civil contra a S&P, bem como o novo quadro regulamentar da UE sobre as ANR, contribuirão para sensibilizar os investidores e os emitentes para o facto de que podem invocar a responsabilidades das ANR, em ações judiciais civis, relativamente às notações de risco inflacionadas que violam o Regulamento ANR da UE.

A Comissão considera que as notações de risco constituem na UE um serviço regulamentado, sujeito a normas de transparência e qualidade, e sujeito a uma supervisão proporcionada, tal como previsto no Regulamento ANR.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001170/13
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: Consequences of possible US action against Standard & Poor's

The United States Department of Justice intends to bring civil action against the credit rating agency Standard & Poor's. The reason for this is the negligent rating of securities which had for a long time received the highest rating and then at the start of the crisis were suddenly downgraded dramatically.

1. In the Commission's opinion, what implications for Europe will have to be taken into account if the action brought by the US Department is successful?

2. What, in the Commission's opinion, would be the immediate consequences for the European Union of the success or failure of this action?

3. What is its view of the role of credit rating agencies at the present time? (Request for an update)

Question for written answer E-001593/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(14 February 2013)

Subject: Fraud proceedings: the United States vs. Standard & Poor's

According to media reports, the United States Government has brought legal proceedings against the financial ratings agency Standard & Poor's. The US administration considers that the agency applied fraudulent ratings to the high-risk mortgage bonds which sparked off the financial crisis in the US and around the world. This is the first legal action of this type against a financial ratings agency.

According to the same sources, the agency is alleged to have delayed updating its risk classification models and deliberately awarded excessively high ratings, despite being aware that they did not reflect reality.

— Is the Commission aware of this case?

— Would the Commission be prepared to consider taking similar action at European level or joining the court case which has been launched in the United States?

Joint answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(5 April 2013)

Since 1 July 2011, credit rating agencies (CRAs) are supervised by the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) which has all supervisory powers towards CRAs. To this end it is up to ESMA the competent authority and not the Commission, to take supervisory action where appropriate in view of its attributed competences. Up to date the Commission has not received any specific information on any violations of the CRA regulation. Article 31 of the CRA regulation provides the possibility for a competent authority of a Member State to request ESMA to suspend the use of credit rating for regulatory purpose by financial institutions, where it considered there have been important breaches of the regulation which had a significant impact on the protection of investors or on the stability of the financial system in that Member State. Up to date the Commission is not aware of any such requests.

The Commission is following closely the recent developments in the US with regard to the CRA supervision and specifically a civil action against S&P over pre-crisis ratings. The Commission proposal on CRAs introduce a civil liability regime which allow investors and issuers to sue a CRA in case they have intentionally or with gross negligence violated the rules of the CRA regulation. As a result, the Commission believes that this civil action against S&P and the new EU regulatory framework on CRAs will increase investors and issuers' awareness to hold CRAs accountable in civil lawsuits for inflated credit ratings violating the EU CRA regulation.

The Commission considers that credit ratings are regulated service in the EU subject to transparency and quality standards and subject to proportionate supervision provided for in the CRA regulation.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001171/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(5. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: VP/HR — EU-Ressourcen im Mali-Konflikt

Derzeit führt das EU-Mitgliedsland Frankreich in Mali eine Initiative gegen Rebellentruppen durch. Es wird dabei durch andere Mitgliedsländer, darunter Deutschland, materiell unterstützt.

1. Gewährt die EU Frankreich materielle, personelle oder informationsbezogene Unterstützung betreffend den Einsatz in Mali?

2. Wenn ja, welche?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsident im Namen der Kommission
(4. April 2013)

Die EU beteiligt sich im Einvernehmen mit der internationalen Unterstützungs- und Beobachtungsgruppe zur Lage in Mali, die sie am 5. Februar in Brüssel empfangen hat, und insbesondere auf der Grundlage der einschlägigen Resolutionen des Sicherheitsrates der Vereinten Nationen an der internationalen Mobilisierung für Stabilität und Sicherheit in Mali.

In diesem Rahmen brachte der Rat (Auswärtige Angelegenheiten) am 18. Februar seine politische Unterstützung für die französische Operation Serval und die Internationale Unterstützungsmission in Mali unter afrikanischer Führung (AFISMA) zum Ausdruck. Er bekräftigte auch das Eintreten der EU für die Bekämpfung der terroristischen Bedrohung.

Die EU leistet weder in finanzieller und logistischer noch in operativer und informativer Hinsicht direkte Hilfe für die französische Operation Serval, aber sie unterstützt Mali und die AFISMA. Parallel zu den Maßnahmen der Mitgliedstaaten, die entweder auf operativer Ebene direkt (Frankreich) oder durch logistische Unterstützung des afrikanischen Einsatzes indirekt beteiligt sind, leistet die EU folgenden Beitrag:

— finanzielle und logistische Unterstützung der AFISMA durch Freigabe von 50 Mio. EUR aus der Friedensfazilität und durch Bereitstellung von Experten;

— Entsendung der Mission EUTM am 12. Februar 2013 als Beitrag zur Ausbildung und Schulung der Verteidigungs- und Sicherheitskräfte Malis;

— Verstärkung des Verbindungsbüros der Mission EUCAP SAHEL Niger in Bamako;

— Aufruf zur Einlösung aller auf der Geberkonferenz am 29. Januar 2013 in Addis Abeba eingegangenen Verpflichtungen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001171/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — EU resources in the Mali conflict

France, an EU Member State, is currently carrying out an initiative against rebel forces in Mali. Other Member States, including Germany, are providing practical support.

1. Is the EU providing France with support in the form of practical help, personnel or information for its operation in Mali?

2. If so, what kind of support is it providing?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante Ashton au nom de la Commission
(4 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, et notamment sur la base des Résolutions appropriées du Conseil de Sécurité des Nations unies, 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.

Tant au plan financier, logistique qu'opérationnel y compris de renseignement, l'UE n'appuie pas directement l'opération française Serval mais soutient le Mali et la MISMA. Ainsi, en parallèle à l'action de ses Etats-membres, impliqués au plan directement au plan opérationnel (France) ou indirectement via un soutien logistique à l'opération africaine, l'UE:

— apporte un appui financier et logistique à la MISMA, qui se traduit par le déblocage de 50 millions d'euros au titre de la facilité de Paix ainsi que la mise à disposition d'experts;

— a déployé le 12 février 2013 la mission EUTM de formation et d'entraînement des forces de défense et de sécurité maliennes;

— a renforcé le bureau de liaison à Bamako de la mission EUCAP SAHEL Niger;

— a appelé à la mise en œuvre de tous les engagements pris lors de la Conférence des donateurs d'Addis Abeba le 29 janvier 2013.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001172/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(5. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: Förderung für EADS-Drohne „EuroHawk"

Am 11.1.2013 hat die neue EADS-Drohne „EuroHawk" erfolgreich ihren ersten Testflug über Deutschland absolviert.

1. Wurden die Entwicklung oder der Bau dieser Drohne aus Mitteln des EU-Haushalts, z. B. durch das Forschungsrahmenprogramm, gefördert? Wenn ja, was genau wurde gefördert und mit welchem Betrag?

2. Wird die Entwicklung von Drohnen oder Drohnenteilen durch EADS aus Mitteln des EU-Haushalts gefördert? Wenn ja, was genau wurde gefördert, seit wann und mit welchem Betrag?

Antwort von Herrn Tajani im Namen der Kommission
(20. März 2013)

1. Die Euro-Hawk-Drohne wurde speziell für das deutsche Bundesministerium der Verteidigung entwickelt und gebaut. Für Entwicklung und Bau der Drohne wurden keine Mittel des EU-Haushalts aufgewendet.

2. Im EU-Haushalt sind keine Mittel speziell zur Entwicklung von Drohnen oder Drohnenteilen vorgesehen. Die Entwicklung spezifischer Technologien kann aber innerhalb der verschiedenen Themenbereiche des Siebten Rahmenprogramms für Forschung und technologische Entwicklung (7. RP) gefördert werden. Astrium, eine Tochtergesellschaft von EADS, ist zum Beispiel Begünstigte des Projekts EC-SAFEMOBIL, das sich, im Rahmen des Themenbereichs Informations- und Kommunikationstechnologien des 7. RP der Entwicklung von Bewegungsschätzung und Kontrolltechnologien widmet. Diese sind unter anderem für unbemannte Luftfahrzeuge (Unmanned Air Vehicles, UAV) bestimmt, welche für Katastrophenhilfe und zu Überwachungszwecken eingesetzt werden. Zu den Projektzielen gehört nicht die Entwicklung von Militärtechnologie und insbesondere Astrium ist sehr an der Ausweitung ihres Hubschrauberlandesystems interessiert. Das Unternehmen ist auch Mitglied eines Konsortiums, das zwei, von dem Gemeinsamen Unternehmen „Brennstoffzellen und Wasserstoff" geförderte, Projekte betreut. Die Projekte haben die Entwicklung eines Brennstoffzellen-Systems für Mini-UAV, die in erster Linie für die Coptercity-Plattform bestimmt sind, zum Ziel.

— Das SUAV-Projekt über kleine UAV(Small Unmanned Air Vehicle) (Gesamtkosten: 3 873 401 EUR; EU-Beteiligung: 2 109 518 EUR), Entwicklung eines Brennstoffzellen-Systems für Mini-UAV. EADS (Vereinigtes Königreich und Deutschland) erhält insgesamt 242 427 EUR. Das Projekt begann im Dezember 2011 und läuft bis November 2014.

— Das HYPER-Projekt über stationäre Anwendungen von Wasserstoff- und Brennstoffzellen (Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Stationary Applications) (Gesamtkosten: 3 916 509 EUR; EU-Beteiligung: 2 221 798 EUR), Entwicklung eines Brennstoffzellen-Range-Extenders für ein UAV. EADS Deutschland erhält 395 400 EUR. Das Projekt begann im September 2012 und läuft bis August 2015.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001172/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: Support for EADS drone 'EuroHawk'

On 11 January 2013, the EADS drone 'EuroHawk' successfully completed its first test flight over Germany.

1. Was the development or construction of this drone supported by funds from the EU budget, e.g. through the framework programme for research and technological development? If so, what exactly was supported and what amount was granted?

2. Is the development of drones or drone parts by EADS supported by funds from the EU budget? If so, what exactly has been supported, for how long has the support been provided and what amount has been granted?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(20 March 2013)

1. The EUROHAWK has been developed and built for the German Ministry of Defence. The development and construction of this drone did not benefit from any funds from the EU budget.

2. No funds from the EU budget are specifically devoted to the development of drones or drone parts. However, the development of specific technologies may be funded under different priorities of the seventh framework programme for research and technological development (FP7). ASTRIUM, a daughter company of EADS is, for example, beneficiary of the EC-SAFEMOBIL project, funded under the FP7 ICT priority, devoted to the development of motion estimation and control technologies for amongst others Unmanned Aircraft Vehicles (UAVs), which can be applied for disaster management and monitoring of events. The project does not target military technology and in particular ASTRIUM is interested in the extension of their helicopter landing system. It is also a member of the consortium of two projects, funded by the Fuel Cells and Hydrogen Joint Undertaking, developing Fuel Cell Power System for Mini-UAV, primarily aimed for the CopterCity platform:

— The SUAV project (total cost: EUR 3 873 401; EU contribution: EUR 2 109 518), developing Fuel Cell Power System for Mini-UAV. EADS (UK & Deutschland) receives in total EUR 242 427. The project started in December 2011 and will last until November 2014.

— The HYPER project (total cost: EUR 3 916 509; EU contribution: EUR 2 221 798), developing a Fuel Cell range extender for a UAV. EADS Deutschland receives EUR 395 400. The project started in September 2012 and will last until August 2015.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001217/13
an die Kommission
Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE)
(6. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: Beeinträchtigung des besonderen Schutzgebiets (BSG) Karpasin, das zum Natura-2000-AID-Programm der EU für die türkisch-zyprische Gemeinschaft gehört

Bei der Halbinsel Karpaz, auch bekannt unter dem Namen Karpasin, handelt es sich um die wertvollste Naturattraktion Nordzyperns. Dieses sehr sensible Gebiet wurde als Teil des durch die EU finanzierten Natura-2000-Netzes ausgewiesen, da dort eine Vielfalt von Tier- und Pflanzenarten beheimatet ist, die einzigartig sind. Derzeit wird das Gebiet durch Planierraupen und Lastkraftwagen zerstört, die die Straße vom Dorf Risokarpaso/Dipkarpaz bis zum Apostolos-Andreas-Kloster ausbauen.

Bislang steht nicht fest, welche Einrichtung oder Behörde für das Vorhaben verantwortlich ist. Gerüchten zufolge wird das Bauvorhaben im Auftrag der Gemeinde Risokarpaso durchgeführt, um die Infrastrukturen für ein Musikfestival, das an der sogenannten „Golden Beach", einem der schönsten und anfälligsten Ökosystem der Halbinsel, stattfinden soll, zu verbessern. Nach Angaben auf der Website des Veranstalters werden für das dreitägige Festival über 80 000 Besucher erwartet.

1. Hält die Kommission den Ausbau der Straße und das Musikfestival für damit vereinbar, dass das Gelände künftig Natura-2000-Gebiet sein wird?

2. Falls dies nicht der Fall ist: Welche Schritte unternimmt die Kommission derzeit? Welche Art von Maßnahmen wird die Kommission ergreifen, um weiteren Schaden abzuwenden?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Füle im Namen der Kommission
(15. März 2013)

Die Kommission ist zutiefst besorgt angesichts der jüngsten Entwicklungen in dem äußerst sensiblen besonderen Naturschutzgebiet von Karpasia/Karpas. Ihre diesbezüglichen Bedenken hat sie der türkisch-zyprischen Gemeinschaft seit November 2012 wiederholt im Rahmen von Kontakten auf hoher Ebene mitgeteilt.

Die Kommission erwartet, dass die türkisch-zyprische Gemeinschaft in uneingeschränktem Einklang mit den Verwaltungsplänen für die besonderen Naturschutzgebiete handelt und die von ihr bereits vorbereiteten erforderlichen Schutzmaßnahmen für die sieben ausgewählten Gebiete umsetzt.

Die von der Frau Abgeordneten genannte Problematik zeigt erneut deutlich, wie dringlich eine umfassende Lösung der Zypern-Frage ist. Dies würde unter anderem die Anwendung der EU-Rechtsvorschriften — einschließlich der Naturschutzbestimmungen — im Nordteil Zyperns ermöglichen, wo die Anwendung bis zur Erzielung einer Lösung ausgesetzt ist.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001173/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(5 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Καταστρέφουν την Καρπασία

Είναι ενθαρρυντικό το γεγονός πως, πέραν της ενεργής δράσης των Ελληνοκυπρίων στο ζήτημα της οικολογικής καταστροφής στην κατεχόμενη Κύπρο, με σωρεία καταγγελιών και ερωτήσεων από την πλευρά μας, εμφανίζονται και σημάδια ευαισθητοποίησης των Τουρκοκυπρίων. Συγκεκριμένα, η τουρκοκυπριακή εφημερίδα «Αφρίκα», σε πρωτοσέλιδο άρθρο της με τίτλο «Βιάστηκε η Καρπασία», καταγγέλλει επίσης την οικολογική καταστροφή που συντελείται στη χλωρίδα και στην πανίδα της περιοχής της Καρπασίας, η οποία βρίσκεται υπό τουρκική κατοχή από το 1974. Γράφει χαρακτηριστικά: «… αν δει κάποιος την έκταση των εργασιών που γίνονται (με τη δικαιολογία της ανάπλασης του δρόμου) θα καταλάβει ότι δεν θα μείνει παρθένο έδαφος εκεί. Οι μπουλντόζες δεν άφησαν ούτε θάμνους ούτε ελιές, ενώ κυκλοφορούν ελεύθερες στην πιο όμορφη παραλία, τη Χρυσή Αμμουδιά».

Ενόψει του γεγονότος πως τόσο οι Ελληνοκύπριοι όσο και οι Τουρκοκύπριοι καταγγέλλουν αυτή την καταστροφή, τι προτίθεται να πράξει η Επιτροπή για να εμποδίσει επιτέλους τις προκλητικές ενέργειες των «τουρκοκυπριακών αρχών» προκειμένου να τερματιστούν τέτοιες ασυδοσίες;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(15 Μαρτίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή εκφράζει τη βαθύτατη ανησυχία της για τις πρόσφατες εξελίξεις στην εξαιρετικά ευαίσθητη Προστατευόμενη Περιοχή Ειδικής Περιβαλλοντικής Προστασίας (Special Environmental Protection Areas (SEPA)) Karpasia/Karpaz και κατέστησε γνωστές τις ανησυχίες της στα ανώτερα κλιμάκια της τουρκοκυπριακής κοινότητας ήδη από τον Νοέμβριο του 2012.

Η Επιτροπή αναμένει από την τουρκοκυπριακή κοινότητα να αναλάβει πλήρη δράση σύμφωνα με τα σχέδια διαχείρισης για τις SEPAs και να εφαρμόσει τα αναγκαία μέτρα διατήρησης που είχε ήδη προετοιμάσει για αυτές τις επτά περιοχές.

Τα ζητήματα που θίγει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος καταδεικνύουν για μία ακόμη φορά την ανάγκη ταχείας και συνολικής διευθέτησης του κυπριακού προβλήματος. Αυτό θα επιτρέψει ιδίως την εφαρμογή της νομοθεσίας της ΕΕ, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της προστασίας της φύσης — στο βόρειο τμήμα της Κύπρου όπου έχει ανασταλεί εν αναμονή διευθέτησης του προβλήματος.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001173/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: Destruction of Karpasia

It is encouraging that, in addition to pro-active measures being taken by Greek Cypriots in connection with the ecological destruction of occupied Cyprus, a series of complaints and questions on our part has awakened signs of awareness among Turkish Cypriots. In fact, the Turkish Cypriot newspaper *Afrika* carried a front-page article under the headline 'Rape of Karpasia', denouncing the ecological destruction of flora and fauna in the region of Karpasia, which has been under Turkish occupation since 1974. It wrote: '… judging by the extent of works being carried out [on the pretext of widening the road], it is obvious that no virgin land will be left. Bulldozers have razed every bush and olive tree to the ground and are roaming freely along the beautiful Golden Beach.'

In the light of the fact that both Greek and Turkish Cypriots have complained about this destruction, what does the Commission intend to do at long last in order to prevent such provocative action by the 'Turkish Cypriot authorities' and put an end to such a lack of accountability?

Question for written answer E-001217/13
to the Commission
Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Damage to the Karpasia Special Environmental Protection Area (SEPA), included in the EU's Natura 2000 aid programme for the Turkish Cypriot Community

The Karpaz peninsula, also known as Karpasia, is the most precious natural treasure of Northern Cyprus. This very sensitive area has been designated as a potential protected site under the EU-funded Natura 2000 project, since it is home to a diverse range of species and unique wildlife. Now it is going to be destroyed by bulldozers and trucks upgrading the road from the village of Risokarpaso/Dispkarpaz to the site of the Apostolos Andreas (Apostle St Andrew) monastery.

Up till now it has been unclear which agency or authority is behind the road project. There are rumours that it was conceived by the local council of Risokarpaso village in order to facilitate a music festival that will take place on the so-called Golden Beach, one of the most beautiful and fragile ecosystems on the island. According to the organisers' website, this three-day festival is expected to attract more than 80 000 visitors.

1. Does the Commission consider the upgrading of the road and the music festival to be incompatible with the area being a potential Natura 2000 site?

2. If so, what action is the Commission taking? What measures will it take to prevent further damage?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(15 March 2013)

The Commission is deeply concerned by the recent developments within the extremely sensitive Karpasia/Karpaz Special Environment Protected Areas (SEPA) and has shared its concerns with the Turkish Cypriot community at a high level since November 2012.

The Commission expects the Turkish Cypriot community to act fully in accordance with the management plans for the SEPAs and to implement the necessary conservation measures it had already prepared for those seven areas.

The issues raised by the Honourable Members once again emphasise the urgency of reaching a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem. This would notably allow for implementing EC law — including on nature protection — in the northern part of Cyprus where it is suspended pending a settlement.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001177/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(5 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Παράνομη χορήγηση τουρκοκυπριακής «ιθαγένειας»

Σύμφωνα με τον κυπριακό τύπο, σε μέλη της μαφίας της Κωνσταντινούπολης έχει χορηγηθεί η «ιθαγένεια» του αποσχισθέντος καθεστώτος χωρίς καν να έχουν μεταβεί στην κατεχόμενη περιοχή της Κύπρου. Ο βουλευτής του Τουρκικού Ρεπουμπλικανικού Κόμματος (CTP) Sonay Adem δήλωσε ότι όλες αυτές οι «ιθαγένειες» είναι παράνομες και εντάσσονται στις απόπειρες υποταγής στη βούληση της τουρκοκυπριακής κοινότητας. Επιπλέον, κατηγορεί τις αυτοαποκαλούμενες «αρχές» του ψευδοκράτους ότι προβαίνουν σε ενέργειες για την αλλοίωση της δημογραφίας του νησιού οδηγώντας σε παραπλανητικές στατιστικές για τον πληθυσμό.

Ερωτάται συνεπώς η Επιτροπή:

Λαμβανομένου υπόψη ότι το τουρκικό ψευδοκράτος ενεργεί εξ ονόματος της Τουρκίας, χώρας υποψήφιας προς προσχώρηση, τί σκοπεύει να πράξει η Επιτροπή για να τεθεί τέρμα σε αυτή την παράνομη χορήγηση τουρκοκυπριακής «ιθαγένειας» στους παράνομους εποίκους των κατεχόμενων εδαφών της Κύπρου;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(27 Μαρτίου 2013)

Το ζήτημα που έθιξε το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου περιλαμβάνεται στα θέματα που συζητήθηκαν κατά τη διάρκεια των συνομιλιών για τη διευθέτηση του κυπριακού προβλήματος υπό την αιγίδα των Ηνωμένων Εθνών.

Το θέμα που τέθηκε, για άλλη μια φορά, τονίζει την επείγουσα ανάγκη να επιτευχθεί συνολική διευθέτηση του κυπριακού ζητήματος. Τον Οκτώβριο του 2012, στην ανακοίνωσή της σχετικά με τη στρατηγική διεύρυνσης και τις κυριότερες προκλήσεις κατά το διάστημα 2012-2013 ([1]), η Επιτροπή υπογράμμισε την ανάγκη επανέναρξης των διαπραγματεύσεων με στόχο την ταχεία ολοκλήρωση των συνομιλιών.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2012/package/strategy_paper_2012_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001177/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: Illegal granting of Turkish Cypriot 'citizenship'

According to the Turkish Cypriot press, members of Istanbul's mafia have been granted 'citizenship' of the breakaway Turkish Cypriot regime, without them even going to the occupied area of Cyprus. Mr Sonay Adem, a Member of Parliament from the Republican Turkish Party (CTP), has declared that all these 'citizenships' are illegal as part of an effort to subdue the will of the Turkish Cypriot Community. He also accuses the so-called 'authorities' of the pseudostate of attempting to alter the demography of the island by giving misleading population statistics.

Given that the Turkish pseudostate acts on behalf of Turkey, a candidate country for accession, what action does the Commission intend to take to put an end to this illegal granting of Turkish Cypriot 'citizenship' to illegal settlers in the occupied area of Cyprus?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2013)

The subject raised by the Honourable Member is part of the issues discussed in the Cyprus settlement talks under the auspices of the United Nations.

The issue raised, once again, emphasises the urgency to reach a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus issue. In its October 2012 Communication on the Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2012-2013 ([1]), 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/pdf/key_documents/2012/package/strategy_paper_2012_en.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001178/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(5 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Crisi del settore industriale della produzione di elettrodomestici in Italia

Il settore industriale degli elettrodomestici «*made in Italy*», che occupa circa 130 mila lavoratori nel nostro paese, è in fortissima crisi e ha visto i volumi di produzione passare da 30 milioni di pezzi del 2002 a 14 milioni nel 2012. Le aziende italiane devono fare i conti con la crisi economica, con la sempre maggiore pressione fiscale e ora anche col fenomeno della delocalizzazione. Molti gruppi, infatti, stanno spostando o valutano di spostare la loro produzione dall'Italia verso altri Stati membri, quali la Polonia o l'Ungheria, che sono le mete più vantaggiose nelle quali installare nuovi impianti, mettendo a rischio così centinaia di migliaia di lavoratori italiani.

La Commissione è a conoscenza del fenomeno? Come intende agire per sostenere il settore dei produttori di elettrodomestici che tradizionalmente ha dato lavoro a migliaia di italiani e oggi sta scomparendo?

Quali misure intende adottare per combattere il fenomeno della delocalizzazione selvaggia, ovvero la migrazione della produzione industriale da uno Stato membro a un altro a fronte di disparità fiscali e monetarie? Ha intenzione di attivare il Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione (FEG) a sostegno dei lavoratori di questo settore?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001315/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(7 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Crisi del settore industriale degli elettrodomestici in Italia — Il caso Electrolux

Il settore industriale degli elettrodomestici Made in Italy, che occupa circa 130 mila lavoratori nel nostro Paese, è in fortissima crisi e ha visto i volumi di produzione passare da 30 milioni di pezzi nel 2002 a 14 milioni nel 2012. La multinazionale svedese Electrolux ha annunciato ai sindacati 1.129 esuberi in quattro stabilimenti italiani del gruppo: 295 esuberi nello stabilimento friulano di Porcia (Pordenone), 373 in quello di Susegana (Treviso), 200 nel sito di Forlì e 261 a Solaro (Milano).

Le aziende italiane devono fare i conti con la crisi economica, la sempre maggiore pressione fiscale e l'aumento della burocrazia. Molte di queste aziende stanno spostando o valutano di spostare la loro produzione dal nostro Paese verso altri Stati membri, mete più vantaggiose per l'insediamento di nuovi impianti, mettendo a rischio così centinaia di migliaia di posti di lavoro.

1. È la Commissione a conoscenza di questo problema? Come intende agire per sostenere il settore degli elettrodomestici che tradizionalmente ha dato lavoro a migliaia d'italiani e oggi sta scomparendo?

2. Quali misure intende adottare per combattere il fenomeno della delocalizzazione interna, ovvero la migrazione della produzione da uno Stato membro ad un altro a fronte di tali disparità? Ha intenzione di attivare il Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione (FEG) a sostegno dei lavoratori di questo settore? Che cosa intende fare per correggere le distorsioni (diversa pressione fiscale, diversi trattamenti retributivi e previdenziali) esistenti nel mercato unico che mettono a rischio il posto di lavoro di tanti cittadini europei?

Risposta congiunta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(5 aprile 2013)

La Commissione segue da vicino gli sviluppi economici che intervengono nell'industria elettrica ed elettronica ed è consapevole dell'impatto della crisi economica. Nella comunicazione del 2012 sulla politica industriale ([1]) si sono delineati gli interventi da adottarsi ad opera dei decisori politici dell'UE a favore della ripresa degli investimenti e per invertire il declino dell'industria manifatturiera facendo leva sull'innovazione, su migliori condizioni di mercato, sull'accesso ai finanziamenti, sulla creazione di posti di lavoro e sulle abilità.

Inoltre, nel dicembre 2012 la Commissione ha intrapreso uno studio sulla competitività dell'industria elettrica ed elettronica per esaminarne la struttura, le catene di valore, la competitività e le sfide cui sarà esposta in futuro.

([1]) COM(2012)582 def.

La delocalizzazione non è un fenomeno nuovo nell'UE, ma tende ad acutizzarsi durante la crisi. Gli effetti combinati della pressione fiscale, della mancanza della manodopera qualificata e di un contesto normativo gravoso possono portare a delocalizzare un'attività economica.

Nella primavera del 2013 la Commissione formulerà raccomandazioni all'indirizzo degli Stati membri per promuovere la loro competitività. Inoltre, la nuova politica di coesione da attuarsi nel 2014 offrirà un sostegno finanziario alle imprese nelle regioni più povere. A sua volta il piano d'azione della Commissione «Imprenditorialità 2020» ([2]) intende incoraggiare lo sviluppo di nuove aziende per colmare i vuoti lasciati dalle delocalizzazioni.

A condizione che i licenziamenti possano essere attribuibili agli effetti della globalizzazione sul commercio, l'Italia ha la possibilità di chiedere l'intervento del Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione (FEG). La persona di contatto del FEG in Italia ([3]) può informare se è prevista un'eventuale nuova domanda ([4]) a favore dei lavoratori licenziati nel settore degli elettrodomestici.

([2]) COM(2012)795 def.

([3]) Gli estremi sono reperibili sul sito del FEG: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=it.

([4]) La Commissione ha adottato il 20 febbraio 2013 una proposta di decisione del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio sulla mobilitazione del FEG a favore dei lavoratori licenziati dalla Antonio Merloni S.p.A.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001178/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: Crisis in the electrical appliance manufacturing sector in Italy

The 'made in Italy' electrical appliances manufacturing sector, which employs some 130 000 workers in our country, has been plunged into crisis and the volume of production has fallen from 30 million units in 2002 to 14 million in 2012. Italian companies must deal with the economic crisis, with an ever increasing tax burden and now also the phenomenon of offshoring. Indeed many groups are moving or considering moving their production from Italy to other Member States, such as Poland or Hungary, which are the most profitable destinations for setting up new plants, thus putting the jobs of hundreds of thousands of Italian workers at risk.

Is the Commission aware of this phenomenon? What action does it intend to take to support the electrical appliances sector which has traditionally employed thousands of Italians and which is today disappearing?

What measures does it intend to adopt to tackle the phenomenon of uncontrolled offshoring, in other words, the moving of industrial production from one Member State to another because of fiscal and financial disparities? Does it intend to activate the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) to support the workers in this sector?

Question for written answer E-001315/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: Crisis in the electrical appliance industry in Italy — Electrolux

The Italian electrical appliance industry, which employs some 130 000 workers in our country, has been plunged into crisis and the volume of production has fallen from 30 million units in 2002 to 14 million in 2012. Electrolux, the Swedish multinational, has informed the trade unions of 1 129 redundancies in four of the group's Italian plants: 295 redundancies at the plant in Porcia, Friuli (Pordenone), 373 at the plant in Susegana (Treviso), 200 at the Forlì site and 261 in Solaro (Milan).

Italian firms are having to deal with the economic crisis, the ever-increasing tax burden and an increase in red tape. Many of these firms are moving or considering moving their production from our country to other Member States, which are more convenient destinations for setting up new plants, thus putting hundreds of thousands of jobs at risk.

1. Is the Commission aware of this problem? What action does it intend to take to support the electrical appliance industry, which has traditionally employed thousands of Italians and is now disappearing?

2. What measures does it intend to adopt to tackle the phenomenon of internal outsourcing, in other words the transfer of production from one Member State to another because of these disparities? Does it intend to activate the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) to support the workers in this sector? What does it intend to do to correct the distortions (differing tax burdens, differing approaches to salaries and social insurance) that exist in the single market and are jeopardising the jobs of so many European citizens?

Joint answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(5 April 2013)

The Commission follows the economic developments in the electrical and electronic engineering industry closely and is aware of the impact of the economic crisis. In the 2012 Industrial Policy Communication ([1]) actions to be taken by EU policy-makers were made to favour investment recovery and reverse the manufacturing decline through more innovation, better market conditions, access to finance, job creation and skills.

Furthermore, in December 2012 the Commission launched a study on the competitiveness of the electrical and electronics engineering industry to look into its structure, value chains, competitiveness and challenges ahead.

([1]) COM(2012) 582 final.

Relocalisation is not new in the EU but becomes more acute during a crisis. The combined effects of tax burden, lack of skilled labour force and burdensome regulatory environment can lead to relocalisation of an economic activity.

The Commission will make recommendations to Member States in Spring 2013 to boost their competitiveness. Furthermore, the new cohesion policy to be implemented in 2014 will offer financial support to firms in poorer regions. Finally, the Commission's Entrepreneurship 2020 action plan ([2]) aims at fostering the development of new firms to fill the gap of those relocating.

Provided that the workers' redundancies can be linked to trade related globalisation, Italy has the possibility to apply for support from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF). The EGF Contact Person ([3]) in Italy can provide information on whether any new application ([4]) is being planned in support of workers made redundant in the domestic appliances sector.

([2]) COM(2012) 795 final.

([3]) The relevant details can be found on the EGF website: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=it

([4]) The Commission adopted on 20 February 2013 a proposal for a decision of the European Parliament and of the Council on the mobilisation of the EGF concerning the workers made redundant by Antonio Merloni S.p.A.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001179/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(5 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Modifica dell'Imposta municipale unica

Nel rapporto ESDE 2012 — *Employment and Social Developments in Europe* — pubblicato di recente la Commissione europea ha rilevato che il sistema impositivo destinato ad agire in Italia sulla componente immobiliare del patrimonio dei cittadini attraverso la cosiddetta IMU ([1]), ovvero l'Imposta municipale unica, non colpisce come dovrebbe le disuguaglianze, ma aumenta invece la povertà. La Commissione in diversi passaggi sottolinea il deterioramento del tessuto economico e sociale e il peggioramento delle condizioni di vita dei cittadini italiani per i quali, osserva nel rapporto, esistono «molte probabilità di cadere nella povertà e pochissime di uscirne».

L'IMU manca di «progressività nel prelievo» e non tiene conto del valore reale del patrimonio tassato, agendo invece linearmente e colpendo allo stesso modo tutti i ceti. La stessa Commissione prende atto nel suo documento che, sebbene siano previsti degli sconti applicabili all'abitazione principale, l'imposta non tiene conto della differenza fra la misura degli sconti, il reddito dei beneficiari e il reale valore dell'immobile. L'IMU quindi non è proporzionata alla reale capacità contributiva dei cittadini a discapito dei principi che, ex articoli 3 e 53 della Costituzione italiana in tema di eguaglianza fra cittadini e di capacità contributiva, affermano chiaramente che ognuno deve pagare le tasse in base alla propria ricchezza.

La Commissione ritiene che l'imposta sulla proprietà degli immobili, così come strutturata in Italia, debba essere modificata in modo da ottemperare al criterio di progressività nel prelievo?

Considerati i rilievi fatti nel rapporto *Employment and Social Developments in Europe*, in quali modi consiglierebbe la Commissione di modificare l'attuale sistema IMU?

La Commissione non ritiene che l'imposizione dell'IMU su beni strumentali produca uno svantaggio molto grave a danno del commercio italiano tale da provocare distorsioni nel mercato interno?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(22 marzo 2013)

L'analisi contenuta nel capitolo quattro della relazione Occupazione e sviluppi sociali in Europa 2012 (ESDE) riguarda la situazione italiana nel 2006 e fa riferimento alla vecchia tassa immobiliare ICI ([2]) e non alla nuova IMU ([3]). Il passaggio citato quanto alle «molte probabilità di cadere nella povertà e pochissime di uscirne» fa riferimento a un diverso capitolo della relazione e non ha a che vedere con la tassa sugli immobili.

La relazione suggerisce che l'aggiornamento dei valori catastali per avvicinarli ai valori di mercato e un'adeguata concezione della tassa sugli immobili (detrazioni, definizione di residenza principale e secondaria…) potrebbero migliorare la progressività dell'imposta. La relazione illustra inoltre le diverse opzioni e i diversi aspetti della tassazione sugli immobili (ad esempio, imposizione del reddito in natura derivante dalla proprietà di un immobile nel contesto della base imponibile sul reddito delle persone fisiche). In questa fase di evoluzione della normativa UE gli Stati membri sono liberi di stabilire i loro regimi di tassazione diretta, a condizione che rispettino la normativa dell'UE e, in particolare, il principio di non discriminazione sulla base del principio di nazionalità.

La relazione ESDE è imperniata sulla tassazione in funzione dell'obiettivo di Europa 2020 in materia di occupazione e povertà, non si tratta di un'analisi completa che tiene conto degli effetti dell'imposizione sugli immobili sulle imprese italiane o delle distorsioni che potrebbero prodursi nel mercato interno.

([1]) L'IMU, «Imposta municipale unica», è stata introdotta dapprima con gli artt. 8, 9 e 14 del D.Lgs. n°23 del 2011, che contiene la disciplina che ha dato origine all'imposta, la cui applicazione è stata successivamente anticipata al 1°gennaio 2012 con l'art 12 del D.L. n°01 del 6 dicembre 2011, convertito in legge con modificazioni dalla Legge 22 dicembre 2011 n°214.

([2]) Imposta Communale Immobili.

([3]) Imposta Municipale Propria.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001179/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: Modifying the single municipal tax

In the Employment and Social Developments in Europe (ESDE) 2012 Review published recently, the European Commission found that the tax system in Italy, intended to apply to property components of a citizen's assets through the 'single municipal tax' ([1]), does not tackle inequality as it should, but in actual fact increases poverty. In various passages, the Commission highlights the degradation of the economic and social fabric and the worsening of the living conditions of Italian citizens for whom, the review states, there is 'a high risk of entering into poverty, and low chances of getting out of it'.

The single municipal tax is not 'progressive' and does not take into account the actual value of the assets taxed, but is instead applied in a linear fashion and thus affects all classes in the same way. The Commission also states in its document that, although there are discounts for the main residence, the tax does not take into account the difference between the size of the discounts, the income of the beneficiaries and the actual value of the property. Thus the single municipal tax is not in proportion with the citizens' actual ability to pay, which is contrary to the principles which, pursuant to Articles 3 and 53 of the Italian Constitution on the subject of equality among citizens and ability to pay, clearly state that everyone must pay taxes according to their own wealth.

Does the Commission believe that the tax on property ownership, as it stands in Italy, should be modified in order to conform to the criterion of progressivity?

In light of the remarks made in the Employment and Social Developments in Europe Review, how would the Commission advise modifying the current single municipal tax system?

Does the Commission not feel that the single municipal tax on fixed assets has a very negative impact on Italian business and is likely to cause distortions within the internal market?

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

The analysis contained chapter four of the 2012 Employment and Social Developments in Europe' review (ESDE) concerns the Italian situation in 2006 and refers to the old property tax ICI ([2]), not the new IMU ([3]). The quoted passage of the review about 'high risk of entering into poverty and low chances of getting out of it' refers to a different chapter of the review and is not linked to the property tax.

The review suggests that updating cadastral to market values and designing properly the property tax (deductions, definition of main and secondary residence…) could improve the progressivity of the tax. The review also illustrates different options and features of the taxation on property (e.g. taxing the in-kind income derived from homeownership under the personal income tax base). At this stage of the evolution of the EC law, Member States are free to design their direct taxation regimes under the condition to respect the EC law and, in particular, the non-discrimination on the basis of the nationality principle.

The ESDE review focuses on taxation from the point of view of the Europe 2020 employment and poverty target, but it is not a whole comprehensive analysis which takes into account the effects of property taxes on the Italian business or the distortions that might be generated within the internal market.

([1]) The single municipal tax was first introduced in Articles 8, 9 and 14 of Legislative Decree. No 23 of 2011, which contains the regulation from which the tax originated; its application was then subsequently brought forward to 1 January 2012 by Article 12 of Legislative Decree No 201 of 6 December 2011, which was converted into law with modifications by Law No 214 of 22 December 2011.

([2]) Imposta Communale Immobili.

([3]) Imposta Municipale Propria.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001180/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(5 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Nuovo sito di stoccaggio e lavorazione dei rifiuti nel quartiere Prè a Bassano del Grappa (VI)

Il quartiere Prè, sito nella periferia sud del comune di Bassano del Grappa in provincia di Vicenza, vive ormai da decenni confrontandosi con le problematiche legate allo stoccaggio e alla lavorazione dei rifiuti. Negli anni '70, proprio in quest'area venne realizzata una prima discarica gestita da un'azienda privata, successivamente per opera di una società di proprietà pubblica ne venne costruita una seconda a non più di 500 metri dal fiume Brenta, infine durante gli anni '90 venne costruito un impianto di digestione anaerobica in prossimità del centro abitato. Dal giorno della sua realizzazione tale costruzione ha creato numerosi disagi per i cittadini: la popolazione ha dovuto convivere anche con fughe di biogas causa di disturbi fisici, quali per esempio irritazioni all'apparato respiratorio e patologie connesse. Il 17 maggio 2012 è stato presentato alla Provincia di Vicenza un progetto, da parte di un'azienda di Bassano del Grappa specializzata in raccolta e trasporto di rifiuti, finalizzato ad ottenere i permessi necessari a trasformare un terreno di proprietà dell'azienda stessa da deposito mezzi a sito di stoccaggio e trattamento dei rifiuti. Dalla documentazione presentata si evince che non soltanto verranno trattati rifiuti quali vetro, carta, plastica, legno, ma anche oli, grassi alimentari, rifiuti biodegradabili provenienti da cucine e mense nonché rifiuti indifferenziati (codice CER 20.03.01) ai quali si lega il probabile rischio che essi includano anche rifiuti pericolosi. Nel progetto presentato non è stato previsto alcun sistema di mitigazione odorifera atta a proteggere la salute dei cittadini, non si mettono in evidenza quali possano essere le possibili interazioni pericolose tra le emissioni del nuovo sito e quelle degli altri già attivi e presenti sul territorio, né si fornisce una valutazione dell'incidenza ambientale dovuta all'aumento del traffico pesante generato dai mezzi diretti al sito attraverso l'unica via percorribile, ovvero la «Strada Cartigliana», già pesantemente congestionata dal traffico.

La Commissione ritiene che una tale concentrazione di siti che stoccano e trattano rifiuti sia in linea con le direttive 1999/31/CE e 2008/98/CE? Ritiene che una valutazione di impatto ambientale, eseguita esclusivamente sul singolo progetto, non tenendo conto delle criticità che possono emergere dall'accumularsi di inquinanti prodotti anche dagli altri siti di stoccaggio già presenti e attivi nell'area in cui esso sarà realizzato, tuteli l'ambiente e la salute dei cittadini?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(21 marzo 2013)

L'articolo 13 della direttiva quadro sui rifiuti ([1]) dispone che la gestione dei rifiuti sia effettuata, tra le altre cose, senza che i cattivi odori siano causa di disturbo.

La direttiva sulla valutazione dell'impatto ambientale, o direttiva VIA ([2]), ha come obiettivo la valutazione delle probabili conseguenze ambientali significative di alcuni progetti pubblici e privati. Nelle procedure VIA le autorità competenti degli Stati membri devono tener conto degli impatti cumulativi con altri progetti nello stesso ambito.

Poiché la Commissione non è a conoscenza dei dettagli del caso, ha chiesto alle autorità italiane di fornire ulteriori informazioni in merito e darà all'onorevole parlamentare una risposta supplementare.

([1]) Direttiva 2008/98/CE, GU L 312 del 22.11.2008.
([2]) Direttiva 2011/92/UE, GU L 26 del 28.1.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001180/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: New waste storage and treatment site in the Prè district of Bassano del Grappa (Province of Vicenza)

For decades the Prè district, located in the southern outskirts of the municipality of Bassano del Grappa in the Province of Vicenza, has faced problems linked to the storage and treatment of waste. In the 1970s, in this very area, an initial landfill site was created by a private company, a second was then created by a publicly owned company no more than 500 metres from the River Brenta and finally, during the 1990s, an anaerobic digestion plant was opened near the inhabited part of the area. This construction has caused many problems for the citizens since the day it was built: the people have had to live with biogas leaks which cause physical afflictions, such as, for example, irritation of the respiratory tract and related diseases. On 17 May 2012 a project was submitted to the Provincial Government of Vicenza by a company in Bassano del Grappa which specialises in the collection and transport of waste. The purpose of the project was to obtain the permits required to transform some land owned by the company itself from an equipment depot into a waste storage and treatment site. From the documentation submitted it is clear that not only will waste such as glass, paper, plastic and wood be treated, but also oil, edible fats and biodegradable waste from kitchens and canteens as well as unsorted waste (EWC code 20.03.01) which carries the additional risk of including hazardous waste. In the project submitted, there is no provision for an odour-reduction system to protect the health of citizens; it does not highlight possible dangerous interactions between the emissions from the new site and those from the other sites that are in operation and located in the same area, nor does it provide an assessment of the impact on the environment from the increase in heavy traffic caused by all the vehicles using the only possible access route to the site, namely the 'Strada Cartigliana', which is already extremely congested.

Does the Commission believe that such a concentration of waste storage and treatment sites is in line with Directives 1999/31/EC and 2008/98/EC? Does it believe that an environmental impact assessment, carried out on this one project alone and not taking into account the critical situations which may arise from the accumulation of pollutants from the other storage sites which are already present and in operation in the area where the facility will be built, safeguards the environment and citizens' health?

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

Article 13 of the Waste Framework Directive ([1]) provides that waste management is carried out, *inter alia*, without causing a nuisance through odours.

The Environmental Impact Assessment or EIA Directive ([2]) has the objective of assessing the likely significant environmental effects of certain public and private projects. In EIA procedures, the competent authorities in the Member States must take into account cumulative impacts with other relevant projects.

As the Commission does not know the details of the case, further information is being requested from the Italian authorities and a supplementary reply will be provided to the Honourable Member.

([1]) Directive 2008/98/EC OJ L 312, 22.11.2008.
([2]) Directive 2011/92/EU, OJ L 26, 28.1.2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001181/13
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(5 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Un'ingente spesa per un discutibile monitoraggio di opinioni

Secondo le rivelazioni del quotidiano inglese Telegraph, analizzando le proposte di spesa in alcuni documenti interni riservati della Commissione europea, emerge quella che viene definita «una campagna di propaganda senza precedenti». Obiettivo dell'iniziativa sarà quello di monitorare le conversazioni online, in modo da identificare quali dibattiti di natura politica — tra blog e social media — siano in grado di attirare l'interesse dei cittadini. «Particolare attenzione deve essere prestata ai paesi che hanno visto crescere un sentimento di euroscetticismo tra i propri cittadini», prosegue il Telegraph citando lo stesso documento, che fa inoltre riferimento alla necessità di «monitorare le conversazioni pubbliche, capire gli "argomenti trend" e reagire in modo rapido, partecipando e influenzando le discussioni online».

1. La Commissione ritiene compatibile questo monitoraggio dei dibattiti di natura politica su blog e social media con la neutralità del servizio civile che devono svolgere i funzionari europei?

2. La Commissione conferma il budget di spesa per questa discutibile campagna di propaganda indicato in ben 1,7 milioni di sterline?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001295/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(7 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Tecniche dispendiose di comunicazione sociale: influenzare il consenso politico in Europa, regole etiche e tutela della libertà di espressione e di voto dei cittadini europei

L'attuale crisi economica e finanziaria, con alti tassi di disoccupazione in particolare tra i giovani, ha portato a una diminuzione progressiva della fiducia riservata alle istituzioni europee. Contro il crescente senso d'insicurezza e di sfiducia dei cittadini europei, viene in aiuto tutto il potenziale che si cela dietro il «virtuale». Un recente articolo del Telegraph riporta la notizia sconcertante secondo cui «l'Unione europea starebbe progettando un piano di propaganda virtuale basato sull'addestramento di cosiddetti *influencer*», ossia utenti addestrati a manipolare il consenso online e incanalare le discussioni sui social network e sui forum. Sempre secondo il Telegraph, «la spesa per l'analisi qualitativa dei media crescerà fino a raggiungere una base di 1,7 milioni di sterline, con un aumento di circa 787 mila sterline». Gli *influencer* nascono dalla realtà del marketing aziendale; le società investono notevolmente nel loro intervento perché la vendita di un prodotto, o l'offerta di un servizio online, ne risulta fortemente influenzata; per quanto concerne, ad esempio, le cosiddette «mamme online», una statistica molto interessante rileva che il 96 % di tutte quelle che effettuano un acquisto negli Stati Uniti è influenzato dalle opinioni di altre mamme online, ovvero le *influencer*.

Ritenendo che l'UE non voglia cadere nel paradosso di una campagna politica europea all'insegna del marketing aziendale teso a «catturare il consenso», peraltro strumentalizzando i giovani e utilizzando le già esigue disponibilità finanziarie imposte con i tagli al budget dell'UE,

chiedo alla Commissione se intende:

1. contestare e/o confermare l'articolo in questione;

2. pubblicare i documenti giustificativi delle spese che si andranno a sostenere per gli *influencer*;

3. adottare misure di trasparenza e regole etiche sull'uso strategico delle informazioni online degli *influencer* a tutela della libertà di espressione e del diritto di voto dei cittadini europei.

Risposta congiunta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(25 marzo 2013)

L'articolo apparso sul Daily Telegraph si riferisce a un'iniziativa del Parlamento europeo e non della Commissione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001181/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: Huge expenditure on a questionable opinion-monitoring campaign

The British newspaper, *The Telegraph*, has published an article analysing the spending proposals in certain confidential European Commission internal documents, which show plans for what it describes as 'an unprecedented propaganda blitz'. The purpose of this initiative seems to be monitoring online conversations, in order to identify which political debates — on blogs and social media sites — could be of interest to European Union citizens. 'Particular attention needs to be paid to the countries that have experienced a surge in Euroscepticism', continues *The Telegraph*, quoting from the same document, which also refers to the need 'to monitor public conversation and sentiment on the ground and in real time, to understand "trending topics" and have the capacity to react quickly, in a targeted and relevant manner, to join in and influence the conversation'.

1. Does the Commission believe that this monitoring of political debates on blogs and social media sites is compatible with the neutrality of the civil service which European Union officials must perform?

2. Can the Commission confirm the spending budget for this questionable propaganda campaign which *The Telegraph* claims will cost as much as GBP 1.7 million?

Question for written answer E-001295/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: Expensive social communication techniques: influencing political consensus in Europe, ethic rules and safeguarding the freedom of expression and right to vote of European citizens

The current economic and financial crisis, with high levels of unemployment, particularly among young people, has resulted in a gradual reduction in the trust placed in the European institutions. In answer to the growing sense of insecurity and mistrust felt by European citizens, all the potential lying within the 'virtual world' can be of assistance. A recent article in *The Telegraph* revealed the worrying news that 'the European Union is planning a virtual propaganda campaign based in the training of so-called *influencers*', i.e. users trained to manipulate online consensus and direct the discussions on social networks and forums. *The Telegraph* also states that 'spending on "qualitative media analysis" is to be increased to reach a base of GBP 1.7 million, with an increase of around GBP 787 000'. The role of *influencer* has arisen from the corporate marketing world; companies invest a great deal in their activities because the sales of a product, or the provision of an online service, can be dramatically influenced; if we consider, for example, 'online mums', a fascinating statistic reveals that 96 % of those who make a purchase in the United States are influenced by the views of other online mums, i.e. *influencers*.

Since I believe that the EU has no wish to fall into the paradox of a European political campaign along the lines of corporate marketing aimed at 'manipulating consensus', while furthermore taking advantage of young people and making use of financial resources which are already meagre because of the cuts to the EU budget,

I ask the Commission whether it intends:

1. to contest and/or confirm the article in question;

2. to publish documentary evidence of the expenditure which must be borne for the *influencers*;

3. to adopt transparency measures and ethical rules concerning the strategic use of online information from *influencers* in order to safeguard the freedom of expression and right to vote of European citizens.

Joint answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2013)

The article in the *Daily Telegraph* refers to an initiative of the European Parliament not of the Commission.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001182/13
aan de Commissie
Mark Demesmaeker (Verts/ALE)
(5 februari 2013)

Betreft: Verjaringstermijn schadevergoeding voor annulering vlucht

Op grond van Verordening (EG) nr. 261/2004 kan een passagier indien een luchtvaartmaatschappij een vlucht annuleert in principe een vordering instellen om een compensatie te bekomen. In zijn arrest van 22 november 2012 in zaak nr. C-139/11 besliste het Hof van Justitie van de EU, dat die vordering niet verjaart volgens de Verdragen van Warschau of Montreal, maar, omdat Verordening (EG) nr. 261/2004 geen enkele verjaringstermijn bevat, volgens de nationale verjaringstermijnen van de lidstaten.

Daar de verjaringstermijnen in de verschillende lidstaten sterk uiteenlopen (bijvoorbeeld één jaar in België en tien jaar in Spanje) vernam ik graag van de Commissie of zij een initiatief zal nemen tot amendering van bovenvermelde verordening in de zin van een uniforme verjaringsregel voor bij nationale rechterlijke instanties ingestelde vorderingen tot betaling van compensatie als bedoeld in de artikelen 5 en 7 van Verordening (EG) nr. 261/2004, die de vliegtuigpassagiers uit de EU een gelijke bescherming zou bieden.

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

In zaak nr. C-139/11 heeft het Hof van Justitie van de Europese Unie verduidelijkt dat de verjaringstermijnen voor het instellen van compensatievorderingen wegens vluchtannulering krachtens het EU-recht worden bepaald overeenkomstig de voorschriften van de verschillende lidstaten betreffende de verjaring van vorderingen. Het arrest verduidelijkt dat passagiers zich overeenkomstig de procedurele autonomie van de lidstaten bij het aanhangig maken van een zaak bij de rechtbank overeenkomstig Verordening (EG) nr. 261/2004 inzake de rechten van vliegtuigpassagiers, kunnen beroepen op de verjaringstermijnen die op hun geval van toepassing zijn in de betrokken lidstaat.

De Commissie is niet van plan om een wijziging voor te stellen op grond waarvan in dit verband uniforme verjaringstermijnen zouden worden ingevoerd in de EU.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001182/13
to the Commission
Mark Demesmaeker (Verts/ALE)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: Statute of limitations for compensation claims for flight cancellations

Under Regulation (EC) No 261/2004, if an airline cancels a flight, a passenger may, in principle, file a claim in order to obtain compensation. In its judgment of 22 November 2012 in Case No C-139/11, the Court of Justice of the EU decided that such a claim may be statute-barred, not under the Treaties of Warsaw or Montreal, but because Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 does not prescribe any statute of limitations, in accordance with national limitation periods of the Member States.

Given the considerable variation between statutes of limitation in various Member States (for example, one year in Belgium and 10 years in Spain), I would like to hear from the Commission whether it will take an initiative to amend the abovementioned regulation with a view to a uniform statute of limitations for claims brought before national courts, so that compensation is paid as provided for in Articles 5 and 7 of Regulation(EC) No 261/2004, which would offer equal protection to airline passengers from the EU.

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

In Case No C-139/11, the Court of Justice of the European Union clarified that the time-limits for bringing actions for compensation for flight cancellation under European Union law are determined in accordance with the rules of each Member State on the limitation of actions. The ruling clarifies that when bringing a case to court under Regulation 261/2004 on air passenger rights, passengers may refer to the time-limits applicable to their situation in the Member State concerned, in accordance with the procedural autonomy of the Member States.

The Commission does not intend to propose an amendment that would introduce uniform time-limits across the EU in this respect.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001183/13
aan de Commissie
Mark Demesmaeker (Verts/ALE)
(5 februari 2013)

Betreft: Onverenigbaarheid van Facebook-verklaring van rechten en verantwoordelijkheden met Brussel I-verordening

Bij de registratie van een Facebook-account moet men expliciet instemmen met een „verklaring van rechten en verantwoordelijkheden", die algemene voorwaarden betreft waarin heel wat juridische verbintenissen vervat zijn. Artikel 19 van deze verklaring bepaalt dat „indien je geen ingezetene bent van of je voornaamste vestigingsplaats niet hebt in de VS of Canada, deze verklaring een overeenkomst is tussen jou en Facebook Ireland Limited". Wat het toepasselijke recht betreft, bepaalt artikel 16, lid 1 van deze verklaring dat eventuele claims onderworpen zijn aan de wetten van de staat Californië en wordt exclusieve jurisdictie verleend aan gerechten in Santa Clara County. Dit lijkt niet in overeenstemming te zijn met de Brussel I-verordening aangezien het gaat om een consumentenovereenkomst gesloten met een onderneming in Ierland. Volgens artikel 16, lid 1 van deze verordening heeft de consument de keuze om zijn vordering in te stellen voor de gerechten van de lidstaat op het grondgebied waarvan de wederpartij woonplaats heeft (Ierland) of voor het gerecht van de plaats waar de consument woonplaats heeft (een andere lidstaat van de Europese Unie). Ik vernam dan ook graag van de Commissie welke maatregelen zij zal nemen om deze strijdigheid van de Facebook-verklaring van rechten en verantwoordelijkheden met de Brussel I-verordening ongedaan te laten maken.

Voorts beperkt artikel 16, lid 3 van de Facebook-verklaring van rechten en verantwoordelijkheden hun aansprakelijkheid tot 100 USD (of het bedrag dat de gebruiker in de laatste 12 maanden aan Facebook heeft betaald), maar geldt er voor gebruikers in Duitsland een afwijkende gunstiger regeling. Welke maatregelen zal de Commissie nemen om Facebook aan te zetten tot een gelijke aansprakelijkheidsregeling voor alle gebruikers uit de Europese Unie?

Antwoord van mevrouw Reding namens de Commissie
(2 april 2013)

De Commissie bedankt het geachte Parlementslid om de kwestie van de „verklaring van rechten en verantwoordelijkheden" van Facebook en de mogelijke tegenstrijdigheden tussen deze verklaring van Facebook en Verordening (EG) nr. 44/2001 betreffende de rechterlijke bevoegdheid, de erkenning en de tenuitvoerlegging van beslissingen in burgerlijke en handelszaken, onder haar aandacht te brengen.

De relevante rechtsinstrumenten van de EU zijn: Verordening (EG) nr. 44/2001 ([1]) (Brussel I), Verordening (EG) nr. 593/2008 ([2]) (Rome I) en Richtlijn 93/13/EEG ([3]) van de Raad.

Indien een geschil tussen een eventuele gebruiker en Facebook Ireland Limited voor de rechterlijke instanties van de EU wordt gebracht, zouden de voorwaarden van artikel 16, lid 1, van de verklaring van Facebook niet kunnen worden ingeroepen aangezien deze strijdig zijn met de bovengenoemde rechtsinstrumenten van de EU. De consument beschikt wel over de mogelijkheid om voor de rechterlijke instanties van de EU een vordering in te stellen tegen Facebook Ireland Limited uit hoofde van artikel 16 van Verordening (EG) nr. 44/2001. Het toepasselijke recht wordt in dat geval vastgesteld overeenkomstig artikel 6, lid 1, van Verordening (EG) nr. 593/2008. Ten slotte kan de rechtbank van een lidstaat zich bevoegd verklaren op basis van Verordening (EG) nr. 44/2011, ongeacht de forumkeuzeovereenkomst in het voordeel van de rechterlijke instanties in de VS.

De voorwaarden van Facebook, met inbegrip van de beperking van aansprakelijkheid, kunnen eveneens worden beoordeeld op grond van de bepalingen van Richtlijn 93/13/EEG, overeenkomstig welke contractbedingen die het evenwicht tussen de uit de overeenkomst voortvloeiende rechten en verplichtingen van de partijen ten nadele van de consument aanzienlijk verstoren, als oneerlijk en bijgevolg ook als niet-bindend worden beschouwd. Verschillende nationale autoriteiten en rechterlijke instanties hebben reeds geoordeeld dat bedingen die de wettelijke aansprakelijkheid van de verkoper uitsluiten of beperken, met name door het bedrag waar de consument recht op heeft in geval van wanprestatie of van gebrekkige uitvoering van het contract, te beperken, als oneerlijk moeten worden beschouwd.

([1]) Verordening (EG) nr. 44/2001 betreffende de rechterlijke bevoegdheid, de erkenning en de tenuitvoerlegging van beslissingen in burgerlijke en handelszaken.
([2]) Verordening (EG) nr. 593/2008 inzake het recht dat van toepassing is op verbintenissen uit overeenkomst.
([3]) Richtlijn 93/13/EEG betreffende oneerlijke bedingen in consumentenovereenkomsten, PB L 95 van 21.4.1993, blz. 29.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001183/13
to the Commission
Mark Demesmaeker (Verts/ALE)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: Incompatibility of Facebook's Statement of Rights and Responsibilities with Brussels I Regulation

When signing up for a Facebook account, you have to agree explicitly to a 'Statement of Rights and Responsibilities', relating to general terms and conditions containing a good many legal obligations. Article 19 of this Statement provides that 'if you are not a resident of, or if your principal place of business is not in the US or Canada, this statement is an agreement between you and Facebook Ireland Limited'. As regards applicable law, Article 16(1) of this statement provides that any claims are subject to the laws of the State of California and that exclusive jurisdiction is granted to courts in Santa Clara County. This does not seem to be consistent with the Brussels I Regulation, since this is a consumer agreement that is concluded with a company in Ireland. According to Article 16(1) of this regulation, the consumer has the option of bringing his claim before the courts of the Member State in which the opposing party to the contract is domiciled (Ireland) or before the court of the place where the consumer is domiciled (another Member State of the European Union). I would therefore like to hear from the Commission what measures it will take to remove this inconsistency between Facebook's Statement of Rights and Responsibilities and the Brussels I Regulation.

In addition, Article 16(3) of Facebook's Statement of Rights and Responsibilities limits its liability to USD 100 (or the amount which the user has paid Facebook in the last 12 months), but a different, more favourable, scheme applies to users in Germany. What measures will the Commission take to urge Facebook to set up a liability scheme that will be equal for all users in the European Union?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2013)

The Commission thanks the Honourable Member for bringing this matter of Facebook 'Statement of Rights and Responsibilities' and the potential inconsistency between Facebook's statement and Regulation (EC) No 44/2001 on jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters to its attention.

The relevant EC law instruments are: Regulation (EC) No 44/2001 ([1]) (Brussels I), Regulation (EC) No 593/2008 ([2]) (Rome I) and Council Directive 93/13/EEC ([3]).

If the dispute between a potential consumer and Facebook Ireland Limited is brought before the EU courts, terms and conditions of Article 16(1) of the Facebook's Statement would not be enforceable before the EU courts as being contradictory to above EC law instruments. The consumer could bring proceedings against Facebook Ireland Limited in the EU courts under Article 16 of Regulation (EC) No 44/2001 and applicable law would be determined in accordance with Article 6(1) of Regulation (EC) No 593/2008. In conclusion, notwithstanding the choice of court agreement in favour of the US courts, the Member State's court could take jurisdiction on the basis of Regulation (EC) No 44/2001.

Facebook's terms and conditions, including the limitation of liability, may also be assessed under the provisions of Directive 93/13/EEC, which regard as unfair and as such, not binding, contract terms causing a significant imbalance between the parties to the detriment of the consumer. Terms excluding or limiting the liability of a trader, notably by limiting the amount to which the consumer is entitled in case of inadequate or non-performance of the contract have already been ruled as unfair by national authorities and courts.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 44/2001 on jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters.
([2]) Regulation (EC) No 593/2008 on the law applicable to contractual obligations.
([3]) Directive 93/13/EEC on unfair terms in consumer contracts, OJ L 95, 21.4.1993, p. 29.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001184/13
do Komisji
Artur Zasada (PPE)
(5 lutego 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wykorzystanie symulatorów jazdy w szkoleniu kierowców zawodowych

Z dostępnych mi informacji wynika, że do szkoleń kierowców wykonujących przewóz drogowy coraz częściej wykorzystywane są symulatory do prowadzenia szkolenia z jazdy w warunkach specjalnych. Rozwiązanie to jest promowane ze względu na fakt, że intensywność zajęć prowadzonych na symulatorze, a w szczególności ilość wykonywanych ćwiczeń, jest dwukrotnie większa niż podczas jazdy w faktycznym terenie (dojazdy, oczekiwania itp.).

W związku z powyższym proszę Komisję o odpowiedź na poniższe pytania:

1. Czy w świetle dyrektywy 2003/59/WE bądź innych postanowień unijnych dopuszczalne jest zmniejszanie czasu prowadzenia szkolenia praktycznego z jazdy w ramach kwalifikacji wstępnej kierowców, jeśli prowadzi się je na symulatorze jazdy?

2. Czy Komisja dysponuje danymi określającymi, w których państwach członkowskich i na jaką skalę wykorzystuje się symulatory jazdy w szkoleniu kierowców zawodowych?

3. Czy Komisja dysponuje danymi dotyczącymi skuteczności wykorzystywania symulatorów jazdy w szkoleniu kierowców zawodowych jako ekwiwalentu jazdy w terenie?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wiceprzewodniczącego Siima Kallasa w imieniu Komisji
(6 marca 2013 r.)

Dyrektywa 2003/59/WE ([1]) przewiduje 20 godzin jazdy indywidualnej podczas wstępnego szkolenia kierowców zawodowych. Z tych 20 godzin maksymalnie 8 godzin jazdy może odbyć się na wysokiej klasy symulatorze, chyba że kandydat kwalifikuje się do przyspieszonej kwalifikacji wstępnej, w którym to przypadku maksymalny czas szkolenia na symulatorze ograniczony jest do 4 godzin. Jazda na symulatorze nie daje prawa do zmniejszenia całkowitego czasu szkolenia praktycznego. Komisja nie posiada szczegółowych informacji dotyczących stopnia wykorzystania symulatorów jazdy i skuteczności tej metody szkolenia. Komisja przygotowuje jednak szeroko zakrojone konsultacje z zainteresowanymi stronami dotyczące stosowania tej dyrektywy, co ma na celu zebranie bardziej szczegółowych informacji w zakresie tego zagadnienia i innych istotnych kwestii.

([1]) Dyrektywa 2003/59/WE Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady z dnia 15 lipca 2003 r. w sprawie wstępnej kwalifikacji i okresowego szkolenia kierowców niektórych pojazdów drogowych do przewozu rzeczy lub osób, zmieniająca rozporządzenie Rady (EWG) nr 3820/85 oraz dyrektywę Rady 91/439/EWG i uchylająca dyrektywę Rady 76/914/EWG, Dz.U. L 226 z 10.9.2003 s. 4-17, z późniejszymi zmianami.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001184/13
to the Commission
Artur Zasada (PPE)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: Use of driving simulators to train professional drivers

Driving simulators are apparently being increasingly used to train professional drivers to deal with critical driving conditions. The promotion of this development is centred around the fact that lessons given using simulators — in particular the range of exercises it is possible to carry out — are twice as intensive as real-life driving (routes, expectations, etc.).

With this in mind:

1. Drivers must spend a certain amount of time receiving practical driving training in order to gain their initial qualifications. Is it permissible, under Directive 2003/59/EC or any other EU rules, for that length of time to be reduced if the training is received on a driving simulator?

2. Does the Commission have information showing in which Member States and to what extent driving simulators are being used to train professional drivers?

3. Does the Commission have information on the effectiveness of using driving simulators to train professional drivers as an equivalent to real-life driving?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(6 March 2013)

Directive 2003/59/EC ([1]) provides for 20 hours of individual driving during the initial training of professional drivers. Of these 20 hours a maximum of 8 hours can be driven on a 'top-of-the-range' simulator, unless the candidate qualifies for an accelerated initial qualification, in which case the maximum amount of time that can be driven on a simulator is reduced to 4 hours. Driving on a simulator gives no right to a reduction of the overall training time. The Commission has no precise information as regards the extent of usage of driving simulators and the effectiveness of this training method. However, the Commission is preparing a broad stakeholder consultation on the application of this directive, which is expected to provide a more detailed feedback on these and other relevant questions.

([1]) Directive 2003/59/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 July 2003 on the initial qualification and periodic training of drivers of certain of road vehicles for the carriage of goods or passengers, amending Council Regulation (EEC) No 3820/85 and Council Directive 91/439/EEC and repealing Council Directive 76/914/EEC; OJ L 226, 10.9.2003, p. 4-17, as amended.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001185/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(5 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: Colapso del crédito en el sector bancario

Según el presidente del banco BBVA, Francisco González: «El crédito ha colapsado en España porque ha colapsado gran parte del sistema financiero. BBVA y otros bancos han mantenido el crédito, pero somos una parte reducida del mercado; una gran parte, entre el 60 % y el 65 % del sistema, no está en condiciones de dar crédito y ha dejado huérfanos a sus clientes, que están acudiendo a los bancos solventes. Pero es un proceso lento porque no les conocemos y necesitamos mucha información». A su juicio, «el crédito va a seguir cayendo porque el sistema va a seguir sin funcionar al menos hasta finales de año, cuando el sistema esté equipado y pueda volver a coger velocidad» ([1]).

A la luz de lo anterior y dada la gran dependencia de la economía del Estado español de la intermediación financiera bancaria,

1. ¿Qué está haciendo la Comisión para crear o fomentar las modalidades de intermediación financiera no bancaria como, por ejemplo, *Venture Capital* o *Spin off*?

2. ¿Tiene previsto la Comisión obligar a los Estados miembros a desarrollar dichos instrumentos?

Respuesta del Sr. Barnier en nombre de la Comisión
(5 de abril de 2013)

En su Estudio Prospectivo Anual sobre el Crecimiento del año 2013 ([2]), la Comisión hizo hincapié en que el acceso a la financiación era una cuestión clave e instó a los Estados miembros a que profundizaran en las fuentes alternativas de financiación. El plan de acción para mejorar el acceso a financiación de las PYME elaborado por la Comisión había esbozado con anterioridad varias de las muchas medidas necesarias, que se refieren a aspectos tan diferentes como la fiscalidad, las ayudas estatales y un mayor acceso a los mercados de PYME en expansión ([3]).

La Comisión, que en 2011 propuso un Reglamento sobre los fondos de capital riesgo ([4]), se congratula de que el Parlamento Europeo y el Consejo le hayan dado su visto bueno. El Reglamento crea una etiqueta (EuVECA) para los fondos privados que inviertan en títulos de PYME que no coticen en bolsa. Los gestores de la EuVECA no tendrán que solicitar la autorización de las autoridades competentes en cada Estado miembro, únicamente deberán registrarse en su Estado miembro de origen.

La Comisión adoptará en breve un Libro verde sobre qué más se puede hacer para mejorar las inversiones a largo plazo en la economía europea. Una de las posibles medidas consistiría en fomentar el desarrollo de los fondos de inversión centrados en los títulos de crédito a largo plazo, como las inversiones en centros escolares, hospitales y energías renovables.

([1]) http://www.elconfidencial.com/economia/2013/02/03/se-acabo-la-crisis-de-la-banca-los-beneficios-se-dispararan-en-2013-114089/
([2]) Véase http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/annual-growth-surveys/index_en.htm
([3]) Véase la Comunicación de la Comisión al Consejo, al Parlamento Europeo, al Comité de las Regiones y al Comité Económico y Social Europeo: Un plan de acción para mejorar el acceso a financiación de las PYME, COM(2011) 870.
([4]) Véase la propuesta de Reglamento del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo sobre los fondos de capital riesgo europeos, COM(2011) 860, http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/investment/docs/venture_capital/act_en.pdf

Una utilización selectiva del erario público es asimismo importante. La Comunicación de la Comisión sobre el uso de instrumentos financieros innovadores ([5]) establece el papel fundamental que esos instrumentos pueden desempeñar. A guisa de ejemplos de estos instrumentos se incluye el mecanismo para las PYME innovadoras y de rápido crecimiento (MIC,) ([6]) que, a septiermbre de 2012, respaldaba 32 fondos de capital riesgo , y la propuesta de otros dos instrumentos financieros previstos en el próximo Marco Financiero Plurianual ([7]). El Banco Europeo de Inversiones (BEI) sigue teniendo una importancia crucial en lo que atañe a las posibilidades alternativas de financiación; entre 2008 y 2011 facilitó préstamos por un valor aproximado de 40 000 millones de euros a más de 210 000 PYME. La Política de Cohesión también respalda a las PYME, con 9 000 millones de euros para todos los Estados miembros, de los cuales más de 600 millones para España.

([5]) Véase la Comunicación de la Comisión al Parlamento Europeo y al Consejo: Marco para la próxima generación de instrumentos financieros innovadores — Plataformas de instrumentos de capital y de deuda de la UE, COM(2011) 662 final, de 19.10.2011.

([6]) Conocido como MIC, dentro del Programa Marco para la Innovación y la Competitividad 2007-2013.

([7]) El instrumento de capital para la investigación y la innovación (I+i) incluido en el Programa Marco Horizonte 2020 permite las inversiones en PYME y empresas de mediana capitalización innovadoras que se encuentren en fase inicial; el instrumento de capital para el crecimiento (EFG en sus siglas en inglés) previsto en el marco del Programa COSME permite realizar inversiones en PYME con ánimo de crecimiento que se hallen en fase de expansión y crecimiento.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001185/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: Credit collapse in the banking sector

According to the president of the BBVA Bank, Francisco González, 'credit has collapsed in Spain because a large part of the financial system has collapsed. BBVA and other banks have maintained credit, but we are a small part of the market; a large part — between 60 % and 65 % of the system — is in no condition to issue loans and has left its clients in limbo, so that they are now turning to the banks which are solvent. But it is a slow process, as they are not known to us and we need a lot of information from them.' In his opinion, 'credit will continue to fall, because the system is going to carry on being unable to function at least until the end of the year, before it can recover and manage to pick up speed again' ([1]).

In light of the above and given that the Spanish economy is heavily dependent on the financial intermediation of the banks:

1. What is the Commission doing to create or promote non-banking financial intermediation instruments, such as venture capital or spin-offs?

2. Does the Commission intend to force the Member States to develop these instruments?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(5 April 2013)

The Commission highlighted access to finance as a key issue in the 2013 Annual Growth Survey ([2]), calling on Member States to do more on alternative sources of financing. The Commission action plan on SME finance had earlier outlined many of the wide range of measures needed, on areas as different as taxation, state aid, and on widening access to SME growth markets ([3]).

The Commission proposed in 2011 a regulation on venture capital funds ([4]), and is pleased that the European Parliament and the Council have now agreed on this. This creates a European label ('EuVECA') for private funds investing in unlisted SME equity. EuVECA managers will not have to seek approval from competent authorities in individual Member States, but will simply need to register themselves within their home Member State.

The Commission will also shortly adopt a Green Paper on what more can be done to improve long term investment in the European economy. One measure would be to promote the development of investment funds focused on long-term assets, such as investments in schools, hospitals, and renewable energy.

Targeted use of public money is also important. The Commission Communication on the use of innovative financial instruments ([5]) sets out the key role they can play. Examples include the Commission's High Growth and Innovative SME Facility ([6]), which supported 32 venture capital funds by September 2012, and proposal for two equity facilities under the next Multi-annual Financial Framework ([7]). The European Investment Bank (EIB) remains vital to alternative financing; between 2008 and 2011 it provided around EUR 40 billion of lending to more than 210 000 SMEs. Cohesion policy also supports SMEs, with a total amount of EUR 9 billion for all Member States, of which more than EUR 600 million in Spain.

([1]) http://www.elconfidencial.com/economia/2013/02/03/se-acabo-la-crisis-de-la-banca-los-beneficios-se-dispararan-en-2013-114089/.
([2]) See http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/annual-growth-surveys/index_en.htm
([3]) See the communication from the Commission to the Council, to the European Parliament, to the Committee of the Regions, and to the European and Social Committee, An action plan to improve access to finance for SMEs, COM(2011) 870.
([4]) See the Commission Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on European Venture Capital Funds, COM(2011) 860, http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/investment/docs/venture_capital/act_en.pdf
([5]) See the communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council concerning a framework for the next generation of innovative financial instruments — the EU equity and debt platforms, COM(2011) 662 final, 19.10.2011.
([6]) Known as GIF, under the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme (2007-2013).
([7]) 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.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001186/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(5 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: Devoluciones del IVA

Según la organización patronal Catalana Cecot ([1]) muchos de los miembros de dicha organización no están cobrando las devoluciones de IVA en el tiempo que marca la ley, es decir, un mes, y lo están cobrando en un plazo de 4 meses ([2]).

Dada la importancia que tienen las exportaciones para una economía como la catalana y las tensiones de tesorería que muchas PYMEs tienen y los altos costes de financiación actuales:

1. ¿Qué opinión le merece a la Comisión esta financiación gratuita del Gobierno central español a cargo de sobrecostes financieros en las PYMEs españolas?

2. ¿Piensa la Comisión proponer legislación vinculante en contra de esta mala práctica?

Respuesta del Sr. Šemeta en nombre de la Comisión
(18 de marzo de 2013)

1. En el ámbito del IVA, la gestión del sistema fiscal por lo que se refiere a la evaluación, la recaudación, la auditoría y la recuperación o, por otro lado, la devolución del IVA incumbe en primer lugar a los Estados miembros, de acuerdo con el principio de subsidiariedad.

Con arreglo a la Directiva IVA, en caso de que un sujeto pasivo (con derecho de deducción) se encuentre en una posición acreedora debido al hecho de que la cuantía de las deducciones supere la del IVA adeudado, el Estado miembro interesado podrá proceder a la devolución del IVA o a trasladar el excedente al período siguiente, de acuerdo con las condiciones que determine. Por lo tanto, el Derecho europeo no establece un plazo límite concreto para este tipo de restitución, lo que no supone que se pueda pasar por alto o se imposibilite en la práctica el derecho de deducción o devolución.

A este respecto, si un ciudadano considera que una autoridad tributaria de los Estados miembros no aplica correctamente las disposiciones sobre el IVA, puede presentar una denuncia formal ante la Comisión ([3]). Sobre esta base, la Comisión puede incoar un procedimiento de infracción contra un Estado miembro. Sin embargo, solo la Comisión y dicho Estado miembro se consideran partes en este procedimiento, quedando excluidos los contribuyentes particulares. Por lo tanto, el resultado de este procedimiento no surte un efecto directo en asuntos concretos. La única manera de tratar de obtener reparación en el caso concreto al que se refiere su pregunta es, pues, utilizar las vías de recurso nacionales (administrativas o judiciales).

2. Sobre la base de los datos expuestos, la Comisión no tiene previsto presentar una propuesta legislativa en este ámbito.

([1]) http://www.cecot.org/
([2]) http://www.elpuntavui.cat/noticia/article/4-economia/18-economia/616048-iva-de-retorn-incert.html
([3]) Un modelo de impreso de denuncia figura en la página web de la Unión Europea: http://ec.europa.eu/community_law/your_rights/your_rights_forms_es.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001186/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: VAT refunds

According to the employers' organisation Catalana Cecot ([1]), many of its members are not receiving VAT refunds within the legal time limit of one month and are instead having to wait up to four months to get money back ([2]).

Given that Catalonia's economy relies heavily on exports, and in the light of the cash-flow problems that beset many small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and the high cost of borrowing, could the Commission answer the following questions:

1. What view does the Commission take of what is effectively a windfall for the Spanish Government on the back of extra financial charges for SMEs in Spain?

2. Will the Commission put forward a proposal for binding legislation with a view to putting an end to this unfair practice?

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

1. In the area of VAT, the management of the tax system as regards assessment, collection, auditing and recovery or, on the other hand, refund of VAT is primarily the responsibility of Member States on the basis of the principle of subsidiarity.

Pursuant to the VAT directive, in case a taxable person (with a right of deduction) is in a credit position because the amount of deductions exceeds the amount of VAT due, the Member State concerned may, in accordance with conditions it determines, either make a VAT refund or carry the excess forward to the next period. The European legislation does therefore not establish a specific time limit for this type of refund. This does not imply that the right of deduction or refund could be ignored or practically be made impossible.

In this context, if a citizen believes that a Member States' tax authority is not applying the European VAT provisions correctly, he can make a formal complaint to the Commission ([3]). On this basis, the Commission may initiate an infringement procedure against a Member State. However, only the Commission and that Member State are considered parties in this procedure to the exclusion of a particular taxpayer. Hence, the outcome of such a procedure does not have a direct effect on specific cases. Therefore, the only way to seek redress in the particular case referred to in the question is to have recourse to the national means of redress (administrative or judicial).

2. On the basis of the abovementioned elements, the Commission does not intend to come forward with a legislative proposal in this field.

([1]) http://www.cecot.org/.
([2]) http://www.elpuntavui.cat/noticia/article/4-economia/18-economia/616048-iva-de-retorn-incert.html
([3]) A template of a complaint form can be found under the European Union website: http://ec.europa.eu/community_law/your_rights/your_rights_forms_en.htm

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001187/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(5 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: Abonar IVA a proveedores

Según la patronal catalana, PIMEC ([1]), el sistema vigente de pagos al contado a la administración central, desde el IVA a la morosidad, está mal planteado pues muchas empresas han de adelantar el dinero al Gobierno de España, con lo que soportan unos costes y tensiones de tesorería injustificados.

A la luz de lo anterior,

¿Cree la Comisión que una manera de evitar tensiones de tesorería sería crear un registro de empresas exportadoras, de manera que estas, queden libres de abonar el IVA a sus proveedores?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001189/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(5 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: Abono de Facturas de IVA por autónomos

Según la federación de autónomos ATA ([2]), los autónomos catalanes, en el ejercicio 2012, adelantaron 178,8 millones de euros de IVA en facturas no cobradas al Gobierno del Reino de España.

A la luz de lo anterior y dada la acuciante crisis de crédito que sufre la economía productiva,

¿No cree la Comisión que los autónomos deberían de abonar sólo el IVA de las facturas efectivamente cobradas?

Respuesta conjunta del Sr. Šemeta en nombre de la Comisión
(18 de marzo de 2013)

El texto principal de la legislación sobre el IVA en el Derecho de la UE es la «Directiva del IVA» ([3]). El artículo 63 de la Directiva del IVA establece la norma general según la cual se devenga el IVA cuando se han entregado los bienes o se han prestado los servicios.

La Comisión es consciente de las dificultades a que se enfrentan las empresas obligadas a abonar a las autoridades tributarias el IVA adeudado por las entregas realizadas cuya factura no se ha cobrado todavía. A este respecto, el artículo 66, letra b), de la Directiva del IVA permite a los Estados miembros apartarse de la norma general al contemplar que el IVA sea exigible a más tardar en el momento del cobro del precio, con arreglo a las condiciones establecidas en dicha disposición. Por lo tanto, los Estados miembros pueden adoptar las disposiciones jurídicas oportunas para ayudar a los sujetos pasivos a superar las dificultades mencionadas por Su Señoría.

Las empresas exportadoras no suelen enfrentarse a los problemas mencionados de flujo de tesorería, ya que sus exportaciones están normalmente exentas del IVA y tienen pleno derecho a deducir el IVA soportado en las compras a sus proveedores, con independencia de si han pagado la factura. Además, el artículo 164 de la Directiva del IVA permite a los Estados miembros eximir del IVA a determinadas entregas de bienes y prestaciones de servicios realizadas a las empresas exportadoras cuando estas están vinculadas a su actividad de exportación en las condiciones establecidas en dicha disposición.

Así pues, la situación especial de dichas empresas ya se ha tenido en cuenta en el Derecho de la UE. Cualquier modificación de ese Derecho de la UE requeriría la adopción por unanimidad del acto legislativo correspondiente por parte del Consejo, sobre la base de una propuesta de la Comisión. La Comisión cree que los Estados miembros ya disponen de los medios jurídicos necesarios para mejorar la situación de las empresas afectadas.

([1]) http://www.pimec.es/
([2]) http://www.ata.es/
([3]) Directiva 2006/112/CE del Consejo, de 28 de noviembre de 2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001187/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: Payment of VAT to suppliers

According to the Catalan employers' organisation PIMEC ([1]), the current system of cash payments to the central administration, for everything from VAT to late payment, is badly thought out, since many companies are forced to pay VAT to the Spanish Government on the basis of unsettled invoices, which subjects them to unreasonable costs and cashflow tensions.

Does the Commission consider that one way of avoiding these cashflow tensions would be to create a register of exporting companies so that that they can be exonerated from paying VAT to their suppliers?

Question for written answer E-001189/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: Advance payment of VAT by self-employed workers

According to ATA ([2]), the Spanish federation of self-employed workers, self-employed people in Catalonia paid EUR 178.8 million in VAT on unpaid invoices to the Spanish Government during the 2012 financial period.

In light of this, and given the acute credit crisis affecting Spain's productive economy, does the Commission not consider that self-employed workers should only be required to pay the VAT due on invoices which have already been paid?

Joint answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(18 March 2013)

The main piece of VAT legislation under EC law is the 'VAT Directive' ([3]). Article 63 of the VAT Directive establishes the general rule according to which VAT becomes chargeable when the goods or services are supplied.

The Commission is aware of the difficulties businesses are facing when being obliged to pay to the tax authorities the VAT due on supplies made for which the invoice is still unsettled. In this respect, point (b) of Article 66 of the VAT Directive allows Member States to deviate from the general rule by providing that VAT is to become chargeable no later than the time the payment is received under the conditions laid down in that provision. Member States are thus able to take the appropriate legal steps to help taxable persons overcome the difficulties mentioned by the Honourable Member.

Exporting companies are in general not subject to the cash flow tensions in question as their exports are normally exempted from VAT whilst they are fully eligible to deduct the VAT borne on purchases from their suppliers, irrespective of whether they have settled the invoice. In addition, Article 164 of the VAT Directive allows Member States to exempt from VAT certain supplies of goods and services made to the exporting companies which are linked to their export business under the conditions laid down in that provision.

The special situation of those companies is hence already taken into account under EC law. Any modification of that EU legislation would need the unanimous adoption of a respective legal act by the Council, based on a corresponding proposal of the Commission. The Commission is of the opinion that the necessary legal means are already available to the Member States in order to improve the situation of the businesses concerned.

([1]) http://www.pimec.es/
([2]) http://www.ata.es/.
([3]) Council Directive 2006/112/EC of 28 November 2006.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001191/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(5 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ζήτημα αποζημίωσης των δικαιούχων του πρώην ΤΕΑΕΥΕΕΟ για τις καταβληθείσες εισφορές από τη διακοπή απονομής συντάξεων

Στο πλαίσιο των μεταρρυθμίσεων του Συστήματος Κοινωνικής Ασφάλισης στην Ελλάδα, υπό το πρίσμα του Προγράμματος Δημοσιονομικής Εξυγίανσης, αποφασίσθηκε (ν. 4093/2012) η διακοπή, από 1.1.2013, της καταβολής από το Ενιαίο Ταμείο Επικουρικής Ασφάλισης των ειδικών συντάξεων λόγω συνδικαλιστικής ιδιότητας, οι οποίες απονέμονταν στα δικαιοδόχα μέλη του πρώην Ταμείου Επικουρικής Ασφάλισης Εκπροσώπων & Υπαλλήλων Εργατικών Επαγγελματικών Ενώσεων (ΤΕΑΕΥΕΕΟ). Ανεξαρτήτως από την ορθότητα ή την αναγκαιότητα της συγκεκριμένης απόφασης και την αδιαμφισβήτητη ανατροπή του οικονομικού προγραμματισμού των δικαιούχων του, εγείρεται ένα σοβαρό ζήτημα σχετικά με την απώλεια πολύχρονων εισφορών που κατεβλήθησαν από την πλευρά των ασφαλισμένων για τη θεμελίωση του συγκεκριμένου συνταξιοδοτικού δικαιώματος, καθώς χωρίς καμία δική τους ευθύνη εξέλειψε ο λόγος και ο σκοπός για τον οποίο κατεβλήθησαν στον εν λόγω Ασφαλιστικό Φορέα. Σε αυτήν την κατεύθυνση και με δεδομένο τον προαιρετικό χαρακτήρα της ασφάλισης στο πρώην ΤΕΑΕΥΕΕΟ — σύμφωνα με τη νομοθεσία και τις καταστατικές τους διατάξεις — ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Γνωρίζει αν έχουν υπάρξει αντίστοιχες περιπτώσεις στους κλάδους Επικουρικής Ασφάλισης άλλων κρατών μελών και πώς αντιμετωπίστηκαν;

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

Η Επιτροπή δεν έχει εξετάσει τη συγκεκριμένη περίπτωση και δεν έχει πληροφορίες για ανάλογες περιπτώσεις σε άλλα κράτη μέλη.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001191/13
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: Compensation for contributions paid by beneficiaries of the defunct Working and Professional Association Representatives' and Employees' Supplementary Insurance Fund due to pension cuts

During the course of social security reforms in Greece and in the light of the Fiscal Restructuring Programme, it was decided under Law 4093/2012 to stop payment of special trade unionist pensions to beneficiaries of the defunct Working and Professional Association Representatives' and Employees' Supplementary Insurance Fund as of 1 January 2013. Regardless of whether or not this was the right or a necessary decision and the fact that it will certainly have disrupted beneficiaries' financial planning, a serious question arises in terms of the years of contributions paid by beneficiaries in order to establish this particular pension entitlement which has been lost, through no fault of their own, now that the reason for and purpose of those payments to that insurance fund no longer apply. On this basis and given that insurance with the defunct Working and Professional Association Representatives' and Employees' Supplementary Insurance Fund was voluntary under the law and its founding provisions:

Does the Commission know if similar action has been taken in the supplementary insurance sector in other Member States and, if so, how was it addressed?

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

The Commission has not examined this specific case and does not have information on similar cases in other Member States.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001192/13
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(5 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: VP/HR — Violación del derecho a la democracia en línea y a la libertad en Internet en Vietnam

Me gustaría señalar a la atención de la Alta Representante que existe en la actualidad una gran represión de la democracia en línea y la libertad en Internet en Vietnam. Según un informe del Comité Vietnamita para la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos y de la FIDH ([1]), un gran número de usuarios de Internet han sido condenados a penas muy severas por el mero hecho de expresar sus opiniones a favor de la paz. La asociación Reporteros sin Fronteras clasifica a Vietnam como el segundo país con las penas de prisión más duras para los usuarios de Internet después de China. Los siguientes asuntos son dos ejemplos recientes de esta represión:

— el 24 de septiembre de 2012, las autoridades vietnamitas condenaron a los blogueros Nguyen Van Hai (Dieu Cay), Ta Phong Tan y Phan Thanh Hai a penas de hasta doce años de cárcel, seguidas de penas de arresto domiciliario de entre tres y cinco años, por «haber hecho circular propaganda contra el Estado». La Alta Representante, Catherine Ashton, lamentó estas penas «especialmente graves» y exigió la liberación inmediata de los tres presos. A pesar de que los tres condenados alegaron ser inocentes, las sentencias contra Dieu Cay y Ta Phong Tan fueron ratificadas en un juicio de apelación celebrado el 28 de diciembre de 2012.

— el 9 de enero de 2013, catorce activistas en favor de la democracia fueron condenados a penas de cárcel que sumaban más de 100 años en total por actos relacionados con el ejercicio de la libertad de expresión. Tres de ellos fueron condenados a penas de trece años de cárcel. El Embajador de la UE en Vietnam, Franz Jessen, declaró que dichas sanciones «especialmente severas» entraban «en conflicto con las obligaciones internacionales de Vietnam» y formaban parte de una «tendencia negativa que promueve la condena de blogueros y de defensores de los derechos humanos».

Sin embargo, la UE sigue reforzando sus relaciones con Vietnam. El año pasado se firmó un nuevo acuerdo de colaboración y cooperación UE-Vietnam, y se están manteniendo negociaciones con objeto de alcanzar un acuerdo de libre comercio que concederá ventajas comerciales significativas a Vietnam.

¿Podría explicar la Alta Representante por qué la UE sigue premiando a Vietnam y contradiciendo su promesa de que «los derechos humanos, la democracia y el Estado de derecho son los valores fundamentales de la UE» y «los elementos esenciales» de todos los acuerdos de comercio y cooperación?

¿No está de acuerdo en que la UE debería respetar sus propia legislación, así como los artículos de los acuerdos de asociación pertinentes en lo que concierne al respeto de la democracia y de los derechos humanos antes de iniciar sus negociaciones sobre el acuerdo de libre comercio?

Además de defender teóricamente los derechos humanos, ¿qué otras acciones ha emprendido la UE con objeto de poner fin a la violación de los derechos humanos en Vietnam?

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

La Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta está al corriente de las restricciones a la libertad de expresión y de los medios de comunicación en Vietnam y está muy preocupada por las mismas. Tras la sentencia dictada el 24 de septiembre de 2012, la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta expresó públicamente su gran inquietud. El Jefe de Delegación de la UE al que hace referencia su Señoría reiteró la preocupación de la UE, que expresó de nuevo el 7 de febrero con motivo de las gestiones de la UE en relación con la pena de muerte.

La mejora de la relación bilateral a través del Acuerdo de Asociación y Cooperación UE-Vietnam firmado el pasado mes de junio también incluye una cooperación más estrecha en materia de derechos humanos y es, por lo tanto, un paso adelante respecto a la situación anterior a dicho acuerdo. Partiendo de ahí, la UE y Vietnam acordaron en enero de 2012 reforzar el diálogo sobre los derechos humanos. Se han celebrado dos reuniones desde entonces, lo que ha facilitado un amplio y profundo intercambio de puntos de vista e información sobre los temas de especial interés para la UE.

([1]) http://www.queme.net/eng/doc/Bloggers_behind_Bars_FIDH-VCHR_2013.pdf

La UE también plantea las cuestiones relativas a los derechos humanos en su reuniones bilaterales con las autoridades vietnamitas, de las cuales la más reciente y al más alto nivel fue la celebrada por los Presidentes Van Rompuy y Barroso con el Secretario General del Partido Comunista el 17 de enero.

La Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta está convencida de que, aunque la apertura comercial a través de un acuerdo de libre comercio entre la UE y Vietnam no garantiza automáticamente por sí sola el pleno respeto de los derechos humanos, el aumento de los intercambios comerciales y de los ingresos propicia mejores condiciones para el desarrollo y el crecimiento. A su vez, el desarrollo sostenible durante un largo período mejora realmente la situación en materia de derechos humanos.

La UE seguirá promoviendo el respeto de los derechos humanos en Vietnam mediante el nuevo diálogo mejorado, declaraciones públicas y gestiones, la interacción con los defensores de los derechos humanos y proyectos como los financiados por la Iniciativa Europea para la Democracia y los Derechos Humanos.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001192/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Violations of online democracy and Internet freedom in Vietnam

I wish to draw to the High Representative's attention the existence of an ongoing crackdown on online democracy and freedom of the Internet in Vietnam. According to a report by the Vietnam Committee on Human Rights and the International Federation of Human Rights (FIDH) ([1]), scores of Internet users have been condemned to very harsh sentences solely for expressing their peaceful views. The organisation Reporters Without Borders classes Vietnam as the world's second worst prison for netizens after China. The following cases are two recent examples:

— on 24 September 2012, the Vietnamese authorities sentenced bloggers Mr Nguyen Van Hai (Dieu Cay), Ms Ta Phong Tan and Mr Phan Thanh Hai to prison terms of up to 12 years, to be followed by between three and five years' house arrest, for 'circulating anti-State propaganda'. High Representative Lady Ashton deplored these 'particularly severe' sentences and called for the immediate release of the three. Despite their claims of innocence, the sentences against Dieu Cay and Ta Phong Tan were upheld at an appeal trial held on 28 December 2012;

— on 9 January 2013, 14 pro-democracy activists received prison terms totalling over 100 years for acts related to the exercise of freedom of expression. Three of them received 13-year jail terms. The EU Ambassador to Vietnam, Franz Jessen, declared that these 'particularly severe' sentences were 'inconsistent with Vietnam's international obligations' and were part of a 'negative trend with the sentencing of bloggers and human rights defenders'.

Despite this, the EU continues to upgrade relations with Vietnam. A new EU-Vietnam Partnership and Cooperation Agreement was signed last year, and a Free Trade Agreement is under negotiation which would grant Vietnam significant commercial advantages.

Can the High Representative explain why the EU persists in rewarding Vietnam, in contradiction with its pledge that 'human rights, democracy and the rule of law are core EU values' and 'essential elements' of all trade and cooperation agreements?

Does she not agree that the EU should respect its own rules, as well as the relevant articles in the association agreement, with regard to respect for democracy and human rights before discussing FTA negotiations?

Apart from paying lip-service to human rights, what else is the EU doing to put an end to human rights violations in Vietnam?

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

The HRVP is aware of and highly concerned about the ongoing restrictions on freedom of expression and media in Vietnam. Following the sentencing on 24 September 2012 the HRVP publicly expressed her serious concerns. The EU's concerns were reiterated by the EU Head of Delegation as mentioned by the Honourable Member and expressed again on 7 February at the occasion of an EU Demarche on the Death Penalty.

The upgrading of the bilateral relationship through the EU-Vietnam Partnership and Cooperation Agreement signed last June also includes closer cooperation on human rights and is thus a step forward as compared to the pre-PCA situation. On that basis the EU and Vietnam agreed in January 2012 to establish an enhanced human rights dialogue. Two sessions were held since, allowing for a substantial and in-depth exchange of views and information on issues of particular concern to the EU.

The EU also raises human rights concerns in its bilateral meetings with the Vietnamese authorities, most recently and at highest level, during the meetings with the General-Secretary of the Communist Party and Presidents van Rompuy and Barroso on 17 January.

([1]) http://www.queme.net/eng/doc/Bloggers_behind_Bars_FIDH-VCHR_2013.pdf

The HRVP firmly believes that while trade openness through an EU-Vietnam Free Trade Agreement alone does not automatically guarantee full respect of human rights, increased trade and income generate better conditions for development and growth, and sustainable development over a longer period does render improved human rights conditions.

The EU will continue to promote respect for human rights in Vietnam, through the new enhanced dialogue, public statements and demarches, interaction with human rights defenders and projects such as those funded by the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001193/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)
(5 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Le Guardie della Rivoluzione islamica e il presunto contrabbando di armi antiaeree

Il Segretario alla Difesa uscente, Leon Panetta, ha dichiarato che le Guardie Rivoluzionarie dell'Iran hanno intensificato la loro campagna per destabilizzare il Medio Oriente con il contrabbando di armi antiaeree dette «MANPADS» (Man portable air defence systems) (Sistema missilistico antiaereo a corto raggio trasportabile a spalla) agli alleati militanti. Secondo il Wall Street Journal, le MANPADS possono essere trasportate da una sola persona e sono una grave minaccia per i velivoli sia civili che militari. Si riferisce che le armi in questione sono state inviate ai ribelli appartenenti all'organizzazione Zaidi Shia Houthi nello Yemen, impegnati in una campagna contro il governo centrale di Sana'a. Il governo degli Stati Uniti ritiene inoltre che dette armi siano state contrabbandate verso la Siria, Hezbollah in Libano e Hamas a Gaza. Gli Stati Uniti saranno a capo di un'esercitazione multinazionale negli Emirati Arabi Uniti il 7 febbraio 2013, con l'obiettivo di compiere progressi sulla messa al bando delle armi iraniane. Il Segretario Panetta asserisce che è necessario impartire una formazione che permetta agli altri stati arabi di fermare la minaccia costituita dai trasferimenti di armi iraniane.

1. La Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante è a conoscenza delle preoccupazioni del governo degli Stati Uniti quanto al traffico di MANPADS da parte delle Guardie Rivoluzionarie iraniane?

2. L'UE è disposta ad effettuare passi volti a migliorare le misure di intercettazione onde impedire che materiale antiaereo dall'Iran cada nelle mani di gruppi estremisti militanti come Hamas e Zaidi Shia Houthi? La VP/HR ha intenzione di affrontare la questione con il nuovo Segretario alla Difesa USA?

3. La VP/HR è pronta ad adottare misure simili a quelle adottate dal governo degli Stati Uniti, e a lavorare con i governi amici nel quadro del Consiglio di cooperazione del Golfo e più in generale in Medio Oriente, per migliorare le tecniche di sorveglianza onde porre un limite alle spedizioni di carichi di armi iraniane?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(22 aprile 2013)

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente è ben a conoscenza delle segnalazioni concernenti spedizioni illegali di armamenti da parte dell'Iran e condivide le preoccupazioni dell'onorevole deputato. Il gruppo di esperti istituito con la risoluzione 1929 (2010) del Consiglio di Sicurezza delle Nazioni Unite allo scopo di assistere il comitato per le sanzioni dell'ONU ha ricevuto segnalazione di diversi fatti di questo tipo sui quali sta ora indagando. Se confermati, costituirebbero una chiara violazione dell'embargo sulle esportazioni di armi previsto dalla risoluzione 1747 (2007) del Consiglio di Sicurezza delle Nazioni Unite.

La prevenzione della diffusione illegale di armi ad altri soggetti della regione resta una priorità fondamentale per l'AR/VP e il SEAE sta ricorrendo a tutti gli strumenti diplomatici disponibili per affrontare questo problema. A tal fine sono state introdotte sanzioni volte a garantire che l'Iran non possa importare tecnologia o materiali utilizzabili a scopi militari. A questo proposito, è opportuno inoltre ricordare che l'UE sostiene pienamente, con l'adesione e la partecipazione attiva degli Stati membri, le attività dei regimi internazionali di controllo delle esportazioni che mirano a contenere l'accesso dell'Iran a tali beni e tecnologie. La responsabilità di individuare e intercettare le spedizioni illegali di armi incombe principalmente alle autorità locali che l'UE continua, tuttavia, ad esortare perché attivino controlli adeguati.

Finora da parte del Consiglio di cooperazione del Golfo non sono giunte richieste di cooperazione con l'UE volte a un miglioramento delle tecniche di sorveglianza.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001193/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — The Islamic Revolutionary Guards and alleged smuggling of anti-aircraft weapons

The outgoing US Secretary of Defence, Leon Panetta, says that Iran's Revolutionary Guards have intensified their campaign to destabilise the Middle East by smuggling anti-aircraft weapons called 'manpads' to militant allies. According to the *Wall Street Journal*, manpads can be carried by a single person and are a serious threat to both civil and military aircraft. The weapons concerned have reportedly been sent to rebels in Yemen belonging to the Zaidi Shia Houthi organisation who are engaged in a campaign against the central government in Sana'a. The US Government also believes that weapons have been smuggled to Syria, to Hezbollah in Lebanon and to Hamas in Gaza. The US will be leading a multinational exercise in the United Arab Emirates on 7 February 2013, with the aim of making progress on banning Iranian arms. Mr Panetta says it is necessary to provide training to enable other Arab states to halt the threat posed by Iranian arms transfers.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the US Government's concerns regarding the smuggling of manpads by Iran's Revolutionary Guards?

2. Is the EU prepared to take measures to improve interception measures to prevent anti-aircraft equipment from Iran falling into the hands of militant extremist groups such as Hamas and Zaidi Shia Houthi? Is the VP/HR planning to address this issue with the new US Secretary of Defence?

3. Is the VP/HR prepared to adopt measures similar to those adopted by the US Government, and to work with friendly governments in the framework of the Gulf Cooperation Council and in the wider Middle East in order to improve surveillance techniques for curtailing Iranian weapons shipments?

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

The HR/VP is fully aware of reports on illegal arms shipments by Iran, and shares the Honourable Parliamentarian's concerns. A number of such incidents have been reported to the Panel of Experts, established by UNSC resolution 1929 (2010) in order to assist the UN Sanctions Committee, and are under investigation in this forum. If confirmed, they would constitute a clear violation of the weapons export embargo under UNSC resolution 1747 (2007).

Preventing the illegal spread of weapons to other actors in the region remains a high priority for the HR/VP, and the EEAS is using all diplomatic tools available in countering this problem. Sanctions have been put in place to this end, ensuring that Iran cannot import technology or material that could be used for military purposes. In this regard, it is also worth mentioning that the EU fully supports the activities of international export control regimes, in which Member States take part and actively participate. These regimes aim at curbing Iran's access to such goods and technologies. The responsibility to detect and intercept illegal shipments of weapons rests mainly with the concerned local authorities but the EU continues to reach out to said authorities to ensure proper checks.

So far there have been no requests by the Gulf Cooperation Council for cooperation with the EU on improving surveillance techniques.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001194/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)
(5 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Instabilità politica in Iraq

Ai primi di febbraio 2013, è stato riferito che a seguito delle dimissioni per malattia del Presidente iracheno, Jalal Talabani, il paese ha dovuto affrontare una crescente incertezza politica. Fino al recente colpo apoplettico, Talabani era riuscito a ottenere l'appoggio dei vari gruppi etnici e religiosi del paese. È allarmante, che i curdi del nord dell'Iraq stiano ora inviando milizie nelle regioni ricche di petrolio del paese dove contestano il governo centrale per controversie in materia di contratti petroliferi nella regione di Kirkuk. Nel contempo, il Primo ministro iracheno, Nouri al-Maliki, è accusato di discriminazione contro i sunniti, e ci sono state numerose richieste per le sue dimissioni. Si suggerisce anche che nel paese non c'è spazio per il dissenso, e si teme che al-Maliki tenti di andare al di là dei suoi poteri costituzionali. I cristiani si sentono particolarmente vulnerabili e premuti da ogni parte.

Diplomatici statunitensi hanno affermato che la presenza di Talabani aveva agito da contrappeso politico al primo ministro. Dal momento della partenza delle truppe americane nel 2011, si è avuto un aumento dell'insorgenza sunnita in Iraq, e si teme che la nazione possa ancora una volta frammentarsi in fazioni. Talabani aveva lavorato per disinnescare le tensioni tra il governo regionale del Kurdistan e il governo centrale di al-Maliki. Talabani aveva il sostegno della maggior parte degli iracheni, e si teme che senza di lui emerga un vuoto politico.

1. Quali passi intende effettuare la Vice Presidente/Alto Rappresentante per monitorare le crescenti tensioni in Iraq a seguito della partenza del presidente Jalal Talabani? Le risorse assegnate alla delegazione dell'Unione europea a Baghdad sono state incrementate?

2. Qual è la valutazione dei funzionari dell'UE a Baghdad quanto ai timori che l'Iraq sia vulnerabile a lotte di fazione e addirittura a rischi di una possibile frammentazione?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(2 aprile 2013)

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente segue da vicino la situazione in Iraq ed è preoccupata per il clima di crescente tensione politica nel paese. L'AR/VP ha più volte sollecitato il governo e i gruppi politici iracheni a impegnarsi in un dialogo autentico e partecipativo volto ad appianare le divergenze politiche ribadendo, nella dichiarazione del 25 gennaio 2013, l'importanza di garantire a tutto il territorio dell'Iraq un governo democratico, efficace ed inclusivo, fondato sullo stato di diritto e sul rispetto della Costituzione.

L'AR/VP ha avviato una discussione sull'Iraq al Consiglio «Affari esteri» del 18 febbraio nella cui occasione i ministri degli esteri dell'UE hanno convenuto sull'importanza di promuovere la stabilità politica in Iraq e di intensificare l'impegno dell'Unione nei confronti del paese.

L'UE ha sempre sostenuto gli sforzi dell'Iraq verso la democrazia promuovendo la riconciliazione nazionale come premessa di un effettivo sistema democratico aperto alla partecipazione di tutti. L'Unione europea continuerà a seguire attentamente gli sviluppi interni in Iraq.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001194/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Political instability in Iraq

In early February 2013, it was reported that since the resignation due to illness of Iraq's President, Jalal Talabani, the country has been facing increasing political uncertainty. Until his recent stroke Talabani had been successful in winning the support of the country's various ethnic and religious groups. Alarmingly, the Kurds in the north of Iraq are now sending militias to the contested oil-rich parts of the country, as there are disputes over oil contracts in the Kirkuk region. At the same time, Iraq's Prime Minister, Nouri al-Maliki, is accused of discriminating against Sunnis, and there have been numerous calls for his resignation. There are also suggestions that there is no space for dissent in the country, and fears that al-Maliki may attempt to exceed his constitutional powers. Christians feel particularly vulnerable and squeezed from all sides.

US diplomats have said that the presence of Talabani has acted as a political counterweight to the Prime Minister. Since the departure of the US troops in 2011, there have been a rise in Sunni insurgency in Iraq, and there are fears that the nation could once again break up into factions. Talabani had been working to defuse tensions between the Kurdistan regional government and the al-Maliki central government. Talabani had the support of most Iraqis, and there are fears that without him a political vacuum will emerge.

1. What steps is the Vice-President/High Representative taking to monitor the growing tensions in Iraq following the departure of President Jalal Talabani? Are increased resources being allocated to the EU delegation in Baghdad?

2. What is the assessment of EU officials in Baghdad regarding the fears that Iraq is vulnerable to factionalism and even a possible breakup?

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

The HR/VP follows the situation in Iraq very closely. She is concerned by the increased political tensions in Iraq. She has called repeatedly on the Government and Iraqi political groups to engage in an inclusive and genuine dialogue to address political differences. In her statement of 25 January 2013, she stressed again the importance of ensuring effective and inclusive democratic governance in all of Iraq, underpinned by rule of law and respect of the Constitution.

The HR/VP initiated a discussion on Iraq at the 18 February Foreign Affairs Council where EU Foreign Ministers agreed on the importance of promoting political stability in Iraq and enhancing EU's engagement with the country.

The EU has consistently supported Iraq's democratic endeavours and encouraged national reconciliation as a prerequisite for an inclusive and effective democratic system. The EU will continue to follow the internal developments in Iraq very closely.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001195/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)
(5 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Minacce islamiste in Tunisia

Il 31 gennaio 2013 un certo numero di fonti di informazione ha riferito che la polizia tunisina aveva tenuto una protesta davanti all'ufficio del Primo ministro, chiedendo una migliore retribuzione, equipaggiamenti e protezioni, onde contrastare la minaccia di attacchi provocati da elementi islamisti.

Il governo tunisino ammette che gruppi legati ad al-Qaeda hanno accumulato armi, onde fare pressioni per la creazione di uno stato islamico fondamentalista. Molti di loro stanno sfruttando l'instabilità in Libia per prepararsi al confronto con il governo di Tunisi, e la polizia lamenta di essere impreparata ad affrontare la minaccia per mancanza di risorse e di formazione.

Tremila agenti di polizia si sono riuniti davanti alla sede del Primo ministro Hamadi Jebali. Le loro richieste comprendevano anche il diritto alla tutela legale ove vengano ad usare le armi nell'espletamento delle loro funzioni. Il Segretario generale del sindacato degli agenti di polizia, Montassar Materi, ha detto: «Questa protesta si propone di portare all'attenzione del Primo ministro tutti i rischi per le forze di sicurezza […] compresa la minaccia di al-Qaeda».

Nel dicembre 2012, almeno 16 islamisti sono stati arrestati per deposito abusivo di armi di contrabbando, e il governo ha anche schierato truppe ai confini con l'Algeria e la Libia.

1. La Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante è a conoscenza di siffatte proteste della polizia a Tunisi?

2. Quali passi è disposta ad effettuare la Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante per sostenere il governo tunisino nel suo tentativo di difendere la sicurezza del paese e le forze di polizia contro gruppi affiliati ad al-Qaeda?

3. Qual è la valutazione dei funzionari europei a Tunisi quanto ai rischi posti dai gruppi di militanti jihadisti islamici?

4. La VP/HR sta attualmente lavorando a un strategia più ampia per la regione del Nord Africa, onde dar sostegno ai governi che sono vulnerabili agli attacchi di fazioni jihadiste islamiche?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(18 aprile 2013)

1. L'Unione europea è pienamente a conoscenza degli avvenimenti descritti nella domanda.

2. L'UE intende sviluppare un dialogo con le autorità tunisine sulla riforma del settore della sicurezza; in tale contesto, è attualmente in discussione una valutazione *inter pares* del settore stesso.

3. L'UE è pienamente consapevole dei rischi creati dai gruppi jihadisti in Tunisia; la sua politica di sostegno alla transizione democratica in Tunisia, compreso il potenziamento di istituzioni democratiche e responsabili, fa parte della sua strategia globale volta a contribuire alla stabilità, alla sicurezza e allo sviluppo del paese.

4. Come previsto nella strategia dell'Unione europea per la sicurezza e lo sviluppo del Sahel, l'Unione si impegna ad affrontare questi problemi a livello globale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001195/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Islamist threats in Tunisia

On 31 January 2013 a number of media sources reported that Tunisian police had held a protest outside the office of the Prime Minister, demanding better pay, equipment and protection in order to confront the threat of attacks incited by Islamist elements.

The Tunisian Government admits that al-Qaeda-linked groups have been stockpiling weapons in order to push for the creation of an Islamic fundamentalist state. Many of them are taking advantage of the instability in Libya to make preparations to confront the government in Tunis, and the police have complained that they are ill-prepared to tackle the threat for lack of resources and training.

Three thousand police officers gathered in front of the office of Prime Minister Hamadi Jebali. Their demands included the right to legal protection if they fire their weapons in the line of duty. The Secretary-General of the police officers' union, Montassar Materi, said: 'This protest aims to bring to the attention of the Prime Minister all the risks to the security forces […] including the threat from al-Qaeda'.

In December 2012 at least 16 Islamists were arrested for illegally stockpiling weapons, and the government has also deployed troops to its borders with Algeria and Libya.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of these protests by police in Tunis?

2. What steps is the VP/HR prepared to take to support the Tunisian Government in its bid to defend the country's security and police forces against al-Qaeda-affiliated groups?

3. What is the assessment of EU officials in Tunis regarding the risks posed by militant jihadi Islamist groups?

4. Is the VP/HR currently working on a broad strategy for the North African region in order to support governments that are vulnerable to attacks by Islamist jihadi factions?

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

1. The EU is fully aware of the events described in the question.

2. The EU is willing to develop a dialogue with the Tunisian authorities on the reform of the security sector reform; in this framework, a 'peer review' of the sector is currently under discussion.

3. The EU is fully aware of the risks posed by jihadi groups in Tunisia; the overall EU policy of support to the Tunisian democratic transition, including the reinforcement of democratic and accountable institutions, are part of the global EU strategy aimed at contributing to stability, security and development of the country.

4. As indicated in the EU Strategy for Security and Development in the Sahel, the EU is committed to tackle these issues at a global level.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-001196/13
a Bizottság számára
Göncz Kinga (S&D)
(2013. február 5.)

Tárgy: Az irodalmi műfordítások részletes nyilvántartása

Az Oktatási, Audiovizuális és Kulturális Végrehajtó Ügynökség 2007–2013-as időszakra szóló Kultúra programjának köszönhetően (1.2.2. terület: Műfordítási projektek – EU) jelentős számú, az Európai Unióban született, magas színvonalú irodalmi művet fordítottak le az Unió különböző nyelveire, ezzel hozzáférhetővé téve azokat polgáraink számára, előmozdítva Európa kulturális integrációját.

A támogatás egyes kedvezményezettjeitől kapott tájékoztatás szerint valamennyi műfordítást el kell juttatni a Bizottság illetékes osztályához. Nem tudtuk azonban megállapítani, hol található ezen irodalmi műfordítások nyilvántartása.

Meg tudja-e a Bizottság mondani, hogy

1. létezik-e részletes nyilvántartás vagy összefoglalás azon irodalmi művekről, melyeket e támogatások igénybevételével fordítottak le;

2. amennyiben ilyen nyilvántartás nem létezik, tervez-e pályázatot kiírni e szövegek hozzáférhetőségének biztosítására?

Andrula Vasziliu válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. március 15.)

Az EU 2007–2013 közötti időszakra szóló Kultúra programja többféle módon igyekszik ösztönözni az irodalom lehető legszélesebb körű terjesztését szerte Európában, megkönnyíteni a hozzáférést más országok kultúrájához és előmozdítani a kultúrák közötti párbeszédet. A program 1.2.2. területe irodalmi művek fordítását finanszírozza az Unió valamely hivatalos nyelvéről (plusz a latinról és az ógörögről) egy másikra. 2007 óta európai szerzők több mint 2700 könyvét fordították le több mint 30 nyelvre. Ennek a támogatásnak az éves költségvetése mintegy 3 millió EUR.

Az Oktatási, Audiovizuális és Kulturális Végrehajtó Ügynökség (EACEA) feladata a Kultúra program e területének irányítása az Oktatásügyi és Kulturális Főigazgatóság felügyelete alatt. Az EACEA a honlapján közzéteszi, hogy mely műfordítások kaptak támogatást a program keretében. Az információk évek szerint vannak rendezve (az adott évben kiválasztott művek szerint), és olyan adatokat foglalnak magukban, mint például a kiadó és a szerző neve, a forrás- és célnyelv és a könyvek címe eredeti nyelven. A 2012. évre vonatkozó információk elérhetők az Oktatási, Audiovizuális és Kulturális Végrehajtó Ügynökség honlapján:
http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/culture/funding/2012/selection/selection_strand_122_2012_en.php

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001196/13
to the Commission
Kinga Göncz (S&D)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: A detailed register of translated literature

Thanks to the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency's Culture Programme 2007-2013 (Strand 1.2.2 — Literary Translation Projects — EU), a significant number of high-quality works of literature produced in the European Union have been translated into different EU languages, and have thus been made accessible to our citizens, fostering cultural integration within Europe.

According to the information provided by some of the grant recipients, all translated works have to be sent to the relevant unit at the Commission. However, we have not been able to establish where a register of these translated works of literature can be found.

Can the Commission state:

1. whether there exists a detailed register or summary of the works of literature translated in the framework of these grants;

2. should such a register not be available, whether it intends to launch a tender with a view to safeguarding the accessibility of these texts?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(15 March 2013)

The EU Culture Programme 2007-2013 seeks in several ways to stimulate the widest possible circulation of literature across Europe, to facilitate the access to other countries' cultures and promote intercultural dialogue. Strand 1.2.2 of the programme funds translations of literary works from an official European language (plus Latin and ancient Greek) into another. Since 2007, more than 2 700 books by European authors have been translated, involving more than 30 languages. The annual budget devoted to this kind of support is around EUR 3 million.

The Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA) is responsible for the management of this strand of the Culture Programme under supervision from its parent Directorate-General for Education and Culture. On its website, the EACEA publishes information about literary translations that have been granted support from the programme. The information is sorted by year (by the annual selection rounds) and includes e.g. names of publishers and authors, source and target languages and titles of books in the original language. The information for 2012 is accessible on the website of EACEA at
http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/culture/funding/2012/selection/selection_strand_122_2012_en.php

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001198/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(5 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Situazione delle concessioni balneari: ulteriori precisazioni circa l'applicabilità del modello spagnolo in Italia

Rispondendo alla mia interrogazione E-010266/2012, concernente la direttiva Servizi e l'applicabilità del progetto di legge spagnolo sulle concessioni balneari al contesto italiano, la Commissione ha precisato che l'obiettivo della Spagna nella formulazione del nuovo quadro normativo è di garantire la certezza del diritto dei proprietari, indebolita da «ambiguità riscontrate nel vigente quadro giuridico sui fabbricati situati nella fascia costiera in Spagna».

È la Commissione consapevole del fatto che la proroga delle concessioni prevista dal progetto spagnolo ha per oggetto tutte le concessioni demaniali marittime, quali definite all'art. 66 della Ley de Costas n. 22 del 28 luglio 1988, e non solo quelle accordate ai proprietari per uso di fabbricati di loro proprietà, siti in aree ritornate al demanio marittimo?

Preso atto che nell'attuale quadro giuridico italiano l'attività delle aziende balneari e delle loro infrastrutture fisse è strettamente connessa alle sottostanti concessioni, non ritiene la Commissione che anche nel nostro paese si sia creata una situazione di forte ambiguità normativa a fronte della quale l'applicazione della direttiva Servizi pregiudicherebbe la tutela del legittimo affidamento (avuto con la previgente legislazione) e la salvaguardia del diritto di proprietà delle aziende balneari che hanno realizzato nel tempo grandi investimenti basandosi su una durata ben maggiore delle concessioni?

Come intende agire la Commissione per far fronte all'ambiguità normativa creatasi in Italia nel settore oggetto dell'interrogazione?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(10 aprile 2013)

La Commissione è a conoscenza delle ambiguità generate in Italia e Spagna dai regimi normativi in vigore precedentemente.

Il progetto di riforma della normativa spagnola mira a garantire la certezza del diritto per i proprietari di fabbricati, viste le ambiguità riscontrate nel vigente quadro giuridico per le proprietà situate sul litorale spagnolo.

Come la Commissione ha spiegato nella sua recente risposta all'interrogazione E-010266/2012, la concessione non riguarda le autorizzazioni rilasciate a prestatori che forniscono servizi sulle spiagge avvalendosi di infrastrutture mobili, come bar e chioschi. Per le autorizzazioni all'uso delle spiagge a questi scopi, il progetto di riforma stabilisce una durata massima di quattro anni.

La Commissione continua a monitorare l'adozione del progetto di riforma per assicurare che esso sia conforme alla normativa dell'UE.

Come recentemente indicato dalla Commissione nella risposta all'interrogazione E-1017/2013, spetta agli Stati membri e non alla Commissione fissare opportunamente la durata delle autorizzazioni qualora il numero di tali autorizzazioni sia limitato per via della scarsità delle risorse naturali o delle capacità tecniche utilizzabili (articolo 12, paragrafo 1, della direttiva Servizi). Le suddette autorizzazioni, ai sensi dell'articolo 12, paragrafo 2, della direttiva Servizi, sono rilasciate per una durata limitata adeguata e non possono prevedere la procedura di rinnovo automatico. La durata dovrebbe essere tale da garantire l'ammortamento degli investimenti e una remunerazione adeguata. Spetta altresì agli Stati membri fissare la procedura di rilascio delle autorizzazioni ai sensi degli articoli 9, 10 e dell'articolo 12, paragrafo 1, della direttiva Servizi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001198/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: The situation of seaside concessions: further details about the applicability of the Spanish model to Italy

In response to my Question E-010266/2012, concerning the Services Directive and the applicability of the Spanish seaside concessions bill to the situation in Italy, the Commission stated that Spain's goal in drawing up a new legislative framework is to ensure legal certainty for owners of buildings in view of the 'ambiguities found in the current legal framework for shoreline property in Spain'.

Is the Commission aware of the fact that the extension of concessions in the Spanish bill applies to all public maritime concessions, in accordance with Article 66 of the *Ley de Costas* No 22 of 28 July 1988, and not only to those granted to owners for the use of their own property, located in areas that now revert to the public maritime domain?

Given that in the current Italian legal framework the activities of seaside companies and their fixed infrastructure are closely linked to the underlying concessions, does the Commission not believe that in our country too we now have a situation of real legislative ambiguity, based on which the application of the Services Directive would jeopardise the protection of legitimate expectation (existing under the previous legislation) and the protection of the right of ownership for seaside companies which have, over time, made considerable investments in anticipation of a much greater length of time of the concessions?

How does the Commission intend to act to tackle the legislative ambiguity created in Italy in the sector in question?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2013)

The Commission is aware of the ambiguities created in Italy and Spain by previously existing regimes.

The draft reform of the Spanish law seeks to ensure legal certainty for owners of buildings in view of the ambiguities found in the current legal framework for shoreline property in Spain.

As the Commission explained in its recent reply to Question E-010266/2012, the concession does not concern authorisations granted to service providers who provide services from portable infrastructure in beaches, such as bars and kiosks. For authorisations for the use of beaches for that purpose, the draft reform establishes a maximum length of four years.

The Commission continues to monitor the adoption of the draft reform to ensure that it complies with EC law.

As the Commission explained in its recent reply to Question E-1017/2013, it is for the Member States and not for the Commission to set the appropriate duration of the authorisations, when the number of such authorisations is limited, because of the scarcity of available natural resources or technical capacity (Article 12, paragraph 1 of the Services Directive). Those authorisations, according to Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Services Directive, shall be granted for an appropriate limited period and may not be open to automatic renewal. This period should be of such duration as is necessary to enable the provider to recoup the cost of investment and generate a fair return. It is also for the Member States to determine the procedure for the granting of authorisations in accordance with Articles 9, 10 and 12 paragraph 1 of the Services Directive.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001200/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(5 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Desenvolvimento Guiné-Bissau

Na resposta E-010965/2012, de 1 de fevereiro de 2013, o senhor comissário responsável pelo Desenvolvimento, Andris Piebalgs, explicou que, em 2011, a Parceria Global para a Educação (GPE) «afetou um montante de 12 milhões de dólares à Guiné-Bissau com vista a melhorar o contexto de ensino e de aprendizagem no ensino básico. No entanto, devido à situação política atual, o apoio externo à Guiné-Bissau tem vindo a estagnar.»

Assim, e num contexto mais abrangente, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Se reconhece que a situação na Guiné-Bissau tem vindo a estagnar, não considera reavaliar e reformatar o plano de apoio ao país de uma forma mais abrangente, nomeadamente no enquadramento social e político que condiciona diretamente o seu desenvolvimento?

2. Se pensa intervir junto dos seus parceiros doadores, no que aos planos de ação diz respeito, no sentido de estabilizar um país que serve como porta estratégica, de entrada e de saída, para a região do Sahel?

Resposta dada por Andris Piebalgs em nome da Comissão
(21 de março de 2013)

A evolução da política da UE relativamente à Guiné-Bissau depende, em primeiro lugar, dos progressos realizados pelo governo de transição no restabelecimento da ordem constitucional.

A UE só reconhecerá um governo legítimo que saia de eleições abrangentes e transparentes e, com base em programas de reforma pormenorizados a apresentar pelo governo e nas realizações concretas a nível de execução dos mesmos, a UE retomará progressivamente a cooperação, em conformidade com as Decisões 2011/492 e 2012/387 do Conselho, em conformidade com o artigo 96.° do Acordo de Cotonu.

Em consonância com estas decisões, a Comissão continua a prestar apoio direto à população, com especial ênfase nos setores sociais, em particular nos domínios da educação e da saúde. Neste contexto, a Comissão trabalha com a sociedade civil e com as organizações internacionais através de vários instrumentos de desenvolvimento.

A UE, juntamente com outros doadores, está empenhada na estabilização da Guiné-Bissau. A este respeito, a Comissão está a elaborar ações destinadas a promover uma transição democrática e o processo de reconciliação. A Comissão trabalhará com a sociedade civil para promover os direitos humanos e lutar contra a impunidade.

Além disso, a UE apoia projetos regionais destinados a combater o tráfico de drogas e o branqueamento de capitais, bem como reforçar a paz e a segurança na África Ocidental.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001200/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: Development in Guinea-Bissau

In his answer to Written Question E-010965/2012 of 1 February 2012, Commissioner for Development Andris Piebalgs explained that in 2011 the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) 'allocated an amount of USD 12 million to Guinea-Bissau to improve the learning and teaching environment in primary education. But due to the political situation, external support to Guinea-Bissau has stalled.'

In light of this, and looking further afield, can the Commission answer the following:

1. If the Commission recognises that the situation in Guinea-Bissau is stagnating, does it not see a need to reassess the aid plan for the country and reformulate it in a broader way, specifically within the social and political framework which directly determines its development?

2. Is it considering taking action, together with its donor partners, in the form of an action plan aimed at stabilising a country which serves as a strategic point of entry and exit for the Sahel region?

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

The evolution of the EU policy with Guinea-Bissau depends in the first place on the progress made by the transition government in the restoration of constitutional order.

The EU will only recognise a legitimate government resulting from inclusive and transparent elections and, on the basis of detailed reform programmes to be presented by the government and on the basis of concrete achievements in their implementation, progressively resume cooperation, as per Council Decisions 2011/492 and 2012/387 in the framework of Art. 96 of the Cotonou Agreement.

In line with these decisions, the Commission continues to provide direct support to the population with a specific emphasis on social sectors, in particular education and health. In this context, the Commission works with civil society, international organisations through various development instruments.

The EU, together with other donors, is committed to the stabilisation of Guinea- Bissau. In this respect, the Commission is designing actions aiming at promoting a democratic transition and the reconciliation process. The Commission will work with civil society in order to support human rights promotion and fight against impunity.

Moreover, the EU is supporting regional projects aiming at fighting drug trafficking, money laundering and improving peace and security in Western Africa.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001201/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(5 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Educação Guiné-Bissau

Na resposta E-010965/2012, de 1 de fevereiro de 2013, o senhor comissário responsável pelo Desenvolvimento, Andris Piebalgs, esclareceu que a UE não apoia diretamente o setor da educação na Guiné-Bissau através da cooperação bilateral, por não caber na sua responsabilidade no quadro da repartição de funções entre os doadores. No entanto, fá-lo por interposta(s) entidade(s).

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Como avalia, na generalidade, o setor da educação da Guiné Bissau e a sua importância no contexto sociopolítico do país?

2. Como é que se vai desencadear o processo de escolha das duas ONG que ficarão encarregadas dos dois subsídios para o financiamento de projetos de educação primária num montante total de 1,3 milhões de euros, que menciona na sua resposta?

Resposta dada por Andris Piebalgs em nome da Comissão
(26 de março de 2013)

1. A situação do setor da educação da Guiné-Bissau é muito grave. O setor enfrenta diversos problemas, como a falta de equipamentos e material adequados (salas de aula, carteiras para os alunos, livros, mapas), a fraca qualidade do ensino (a formação dos professores está longe de ser regular e eficiente) e a falta de vontade política para melhorar a situação. Os salários não são pagos com regularidade, o recrutamento não é equitativo nem transparente e há greves com frequência. As tensões assim geradas contribuem para a deterioração do contexto social.

Até à data, a assistência internacional teve caráter paliativo. É necessário um verdadeiro investimento público. Além da participação de 12 milhões de dólares americanos do programa da Parceria Global para a Educação, é necessário um esforço orçamental significativo por parte das autoridades nacionais.

2. Os dois subsídios referidos na resposta à pergunta escrita E-010965/2012 ([1]) serão concedidos no seguimento do convite à apresentação de propostas publicado em 2012 (rubrica orçamental «Intervenientes não estatais»). Foram recebidos 55 pedidos, dos quais sete passaram à seleção final, entre eles os apresentados pelas duas organizações não-governamentais que receberão os subsídios.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001201/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: Education in Guinea-Bissau

In his answer to Written Question E-010965/2012, of 1 February 2013, Commissioner for Development Andris Piebalgs pointed out that the EU does not directly support the education sector in Guinea-Bissau through its bilateral cooperation, as this is not one of its responsibilities under the division of labour amongst donors. It does however, provide support through other bodies.

Can the Commission answer the following:

1. What is its overall assessment of the education sector in Guinea-Bissau and its importance within the country's socio-political context?

2. What process will be used to select the two NGOs which are to receive two grants, with a total value of EUR 1.3 million, with which to fund primary education projects, as referred to in the answer to the above question?

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

1. The education sector in Guinea-Bissau is in a dramatic situation. It faces several problems like the lack of proper infrastructure and material (class rooms, books, maps, desks), the poor quality of teaching (teachers' training is far from being regular and efficient), and the lack of political will to improve the overall situation. Salaries are not paid on a regular basis, recruitment is not fair and transparent and strikes occur often. This tense climate contributes to the deterioration of the social context.

So far international assistance has provided a stopgap, but real public investment is needed. Beyond the USD 12 million that will be contributed by the Global Partnership for Education Programme, an important budget effort is needed from national authorities.

2. The two grants referred to in the answer to previous Written Question E-010965/2012 ([1]) will be awarded through a call for proposals (Non States Actors budget line) launched in 2012. 55 applications have been received, seven have been finally selected, among which the two non-governmental organisations (NGO's) who will receive the grants.

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

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-001202/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(5 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: Cumplimiento de los mecanismos de apoyo del Reino de España a las Energías Renovables

El Considerando 25 de la Directiva 2009/28/CE establece que uno de los medios imprescindibles para lograr los objetivos de la misma será el garantizar el correcto funcionamiento de los sistemas nacionales de apoyo, a fin de mantener la confianza de los inversores.

En el Reino de España, desde finales del ejercicio 2010, han entrado en vigor, con carácter retroactivo, las siguientes normativas contrarias a los Productores fotovoltaicos:

— Real Decreto 1565/2010, que limita en el tiempo las ayudas a las plantas fotovoltaicas ya construidas.

— Real Decreto-Ley 14/2010, que limita el número de horas con derecho a prima para las plantas ya construidas.

— Real Decreto 1003/2010, por el cual se le retiró la tarifa cautelarmente durante meses a cientos de productores, por supuestas infracciones que únicamente se acreditaron en un 2 % de los casos.

— Ley 15/2012, con una imposición fiscal del 7 % para toda la generación energética, teniendo en cuenta que los productores de energía convencional repercutirán el coste en el consumidor final y los fotovoltaicos no podrán, por tener un precio fijo.

— Real Decreto-Ley 2/2013, que impide la revisión de las tarifas con arreglo al IPC a las instalaciones fotovoltaicas.

A la luz de lo anterior,

¿Considera la Comisión que debe actuar exigiendo al Reino de España que cese en el hostigamiento a los productores fotovoltaicos al vulnerar flagrantemente las disposiciones de la Directiva 2009/28/CE?

Respuesta del Sr. Oettinger en nombre de la Comisión
(5 de marzo de 2013)

Sobre la base de la información de la que disponemos en la actualidad, la Comisión no observa ninguna vulneración de la Directiva sobre la energía renovable (Directiva 2009/28/CE). Con todo, la Comisión está examinando las medidas aprobadas recientemente en España y, en caso necesario, estudiará si deben tomarse medidas desde la UE o a escala de ella.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001202/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: Compliance with Spain's support mechanisms for renewable energies

Recital 25 of Directive 2009/28/EEC establishes that one important means of achieving the aim of said directive is to guarantee the proper functioning of national support schemes in order to maintain investor confidence.

In Spain, the following laws prejudicial to producers of solar energy have come into force since the end of 2010:

— Royal Decree 1565/2010, which sets a time limit for aid to already existing solar energy plants;

— Royal Decree-Law 14/2010, which limits the number of hours entitled to premiums for already existing plants;

— Royal Decree 1003/2010, which suspended the tariff over a period of several months from hundreds of producers, for alleged infractions which were only found to have existed in 2 % of cases;

— Law 15/2012, applying a 7 % tax on all power generation, bearing in mind that producers of conventional energy are able to pass on the increase to customers, whereas solar energy producers are unable to do so, as they are paid a fixed rate;

— Royal Decree-Law 2/2013, which rules out any review of tariffs in line with the retail price index (RPI).

In light of the above:

Does the Commission consider that it should take action by requesting Spain to stop harassing solar energy producers by blatantly infringing the terms of Directive 2009/28/EC?

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

On the basis of the information available to us at the present time, the Commission does not see an indication of a violation of the Renewable Energy Directive (2009/28/EC). However, the Commission is currently assessing the recent policy measures adopted in Spain and it will consider further action from or at EU level, if necessary.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-001203/13
do Komisji
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(5 lutego 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Zablokowanie unijnych środków na budowę dróg

Polska prasa, powołując się na rzeczniczkę Komisji Europejskiej Shirin Weeler, podała informacje, że Polska nie otrzyma należnych dotacji na budowę dróg i autostrad, dopóki nie wyjaśni oskarżeń o nielegalne praktyki tzw. ustawianie przetargów pod konkretnych wykonawców. Ponieważ media podają różne kwoty oraz pojawiają się pewne nieścisłości informacyjne, proszę o odpowiedź na następujące pytania:

1. Jaką kwotę zablokowała Komisja i jakich dokładnie projektów owa blokada dotyczy? Czy obejmuje ona również finansowanie projektów, co do których Komisja nie miała dotychczas zastrzeżeń?

2. Jaki jest faktyczny powód decyzji Komisji (jakie nieprawidłowości po stronie polskiej były przyczyną decyzji)?

3. Jakie warunki musi spełnić strona polska, aby środki te zostały odblokowane?

4. Czy w obecnym stanie prawnym i faktycznym możliwe jest, by zablokowana kwota w ogóle przepadła?

5. Ministerstwo Rozwoju Regionalnego podaje, iż od sierpnia 2010 r. informowało Komisję o problemach, dlaczego dopiero teraz podjęto decyzje o wstrzymaniu środków na budowę dróg? Kiedy dokładnie Komisja została poinformowana o problemach, kiedy przedstawiła stronie polskiej informacje o zablokowaniu środków?

6. Dlaczego na ewentualną zmowę cenową nie reagowały wcześniej Trybunał Obrachunkowy oraz Europejski Urząd ds. Zwalczania Nadużyć Finansowych?

7. Jak Komisja ocenia przygotowanie administracyjne i uregulowania prawne przetargów w Polsce na tle innych krajów europejskich?

8. Czy próby tzw. ustawiania przetargów pod budowę dróg były wykrywane w innych krajach europejskich? Jeśli tak, to w jakich? Proszę o dokładne dane. Czy aktualnie toczą się jakiekolwiek postępowania w stosunku do Polski, które grożą utratą lub zatrzymaniem dotacji unijnych?

9. Jaki, według ocen Komisji, wpływ miało ustawianie przetargów na falę bankructw firm budujących autostrady? Czy Komisja widzi związek pomiędzy preferowaniem pewnych firm oraz falą bankructw podwykonawców polskich dróg i autostrad?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Johannesa Hahna w imieniu Komisji
(7 marca 2013 r.)

1. Łączna kwota wstrzymanych płatności wynosi 941 mln EUR. Komisja nie wstrzymuje płatności w stosunku do pojedynczych projektów, w związku z czym wstrzymano wszystkie płatności dotyczące realizacji dróg.

2. i 3. Komisja odsyła Szanownego Pana Posła do swojej odpowiedzi na zapytanie pisemne P-1067/13 i P-1131/13.

4. Nie. Wstrzymanie płatności nie oznacza zmniejszenia środków finansowych.

5. Komisja wstrzymała płatności i poinformowała o tym władze polskie w dniu 21 grudnia 2012 r., po tym jak wcześniej tego samego miesiąca dowiedziała się, że rozpoczęte w 2010 r. dochodzenia zakończyły się postawieniem zarzutów 11 osobom, w tym byłemu dyrektorowi GDDKiA.

6. Europejski Urząd ds. Zwalczania Nadużyć Finansowych (OLAF) dąży do reagowania w odpowiednim czasie na wszelkie zarzuty dotyczące nadużyć finansowych lub nieprawidłowości i w przedmiotowej sprawie również zareagował. Śledztwo prowadziły właściwe organy krajowe, co stanowiło najbardziej odpowiednie rozwiązanie.

Pytanie do Trybunału Obrachunkowego należy skierować bezpośrednio do tej instytucji.

7. Komisja nie wykryła żadnych poważnych przypadków niezgodności z prawem zamówień publicznych w Polsce, ponieważ w październiku 2008 r. władze polskie zmieniły krajowe przepisy prawa zamówień publicznych, aby dostosować je do dyrektyw UE.

8. OLAF nie udziela informacji na temat toczących się dochodzeń, a Komisji nie są znane żadne podobne próby ustawiania przetargów. W przeszłości Komisja dokonała korekt finansowych ze względu na nieprawidłowości w zamówieniach publicznych w kilku państwach członkowskich, w tym we Włoszech i w Grecji.

Mechanizm korekty finansowej został uruchomiony w stosunku do programu województwa mazowieckiego w wyniku ustaleń audytowych dotyczących nieprawidłowości w zakresie zamówień publicznych w przypadku jednego z projektów.

9. Komisja traktuje obie kwestie oddzielnie i nie posiada dowodów na to, że są one powiązane.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001203/13
to the Commission
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: Blocking of EU funds for road building

Referring to comments by Commission spokeswoman Shirin Wheeler, the Polish press has reported that Poland will not receive the subsidies it is due for the construction of roads and motorways until it explains accusations of illegal practices, such as rigging tenders for specific contractors. As different amounts are being quoted in the media and there are certain inconsistencies in the information being given, could the Commission answer the following questions:

1. What amounts have been blocked by the Commission, and what specific projects are involved? Does it also extend to the financing of projects in respect of which the Commission has not had reservations?

2. What is the actual reason for the Commission's decision (what irregularities on the Polish side led to the decision)?

3. What conditions must Poland meet in order for these funds to be unblocked?

4. Might it be the case that, at this stage, legally and in fact, the blocked amounts have been foregone?

5. The Ministry of Regional Development says that it has been informing the Commission of the problems since August 2010. Why has the decision to withhold road-building funds only now been taken? When exactly was the Commission informed of the problems, and when did it inform the Polish authorities of the decision to block the funds in question?

6. Why did the Court of Auditors or the European Anti-Fraud Office not react earlier to any alleged price-fixing?

7. What is the Commission's assessment of the administration and regulation of invitations to tender in Poland compared with other EU countries?

8. Have attempts to rig tender procedures for road-building projects been uncovered in other EU countries? If so, in which countries? Please provide precise details. Are any procedures currently underway in relation to Poland which could lead to the loss or withholding of EU subsidies?

9. What impact, in the Commission's opinion, did tender rigging have on the wave of bankruptcies among companies involved in motorway building? Does the Commission see a link between the preference given to certain firms and the wave of bankruptcies among subcontractors working on Polish roads and motorways?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(7 March 2013)

1. The interrupted payments total EUR 941 million. The Commission does not interrupt by project, so all road-related payments are interrupted.

2, 3. The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answers to written questions P-1067/13 and P-1131/13.

4. No. Interruption does not mean a reduction of funds.

5. The Commission interrupted payments, and informed the Polish authorities on 21 December 2012 after being made aware earlier the same month that the investigations launched in 2010 had been concluded with charges against 11 people, including one former director of the Road Agency.

6. OLAF seeks to react timeously to any allegation of fraud or irregularity and did react in this case. An investigation was carried out by the responsible national authorities, as they were best placed to do so.

The question for the Court of Auditors should be addressed to that institution.

7. The Commission has not detected any serious cases of non-compliance with public procurement law in Poland since the Polish authorities amended the national act on public procurement in October 2008 to align it with EU directives.

8. OLAF does not give out information on ongoing investigations and the Commission is unaware of any similar tender rigging attempts. In the past, the Commission has made financial corrections due to public procurement irregularities in several Member States, including Italy and Greece.

A financial correction is currently under way for the Mazowieckie programme following an audit finding about a public procurement irregularity in one project.

9. The Commission treats the two issues separately and has no evidence linking them.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001204/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(5 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: Colapso del crédito en el sector bancario II

En Estados Unidos aproximadamente el 50 % de la deuda empresarial se adquiere mediante intermediación no bancaria. En cambio, en Estados europeos como el Reino de España dicha intermediación no bancaria no llega al 10 % del total ([1]).

A la luz de lo anterior y dada la acuciante crisis de crédito que sufre la economía productiva en el Estado español:

1. ¿Cree la Comisión que hay relación entre intermediación financiera no bancaria y más crédito para las PYMES?

2. ¿Preparará la Comisión alguna regulación que favorezca alternativas a la financiación bancaria para PYMES, *startups*, emprendedores y microempresas?

Respuesta del Sr. Tajani en nombre de la Comisión
(11 de abril de 2013)

En España se ha deteriorado el acceso a la financiación bancaria tradicional a raíz del estallido de la burbuja inmobiliaria y crediticia: las PYME españolas informan de un empeoramiento de la disponibilidad de créditos bancarios ([2]), de un aumento de los índices de denegación de sus solicitudes de préstamo ([3]) y de unos tipos de interés crecientes, que en 2012 alcanzaron más del 6 %.

Las actividades bancarias paralelas o en la sombra pueden ser una herramienta útil del sistema financiero porque constituyen una fuente alternativa de financiación de la economía real, lo que resulta especialmente útil cuando los canales tradicionales de la banca o del mercado atraviesan dificultades de carácter temporal.

Sin embargo, el sistema bancario en la sombra también entraña una potencial amenaza para la estabilidad financiera a largo plazo. Por ello, la Comisión está examinando con todo detalle los problemas que plantean las actividades bancarias en la sombra con respecto a las reflexiones del G-20, a su Libro Verde de 2012 ([4]) y al informe del Parlamento realizado por iniciativa propia.

Además, a finales de 2011 la Comisión presentó una serie de propuestas sobre los fondos de capital riesgo y sobre los fondos de emprendimiento social, que pronto serán aprobadas por el Parlamento Europeo. Dichas propuestas permitirán distribuir fondos profesionales en toda la UE y crear una plataforma jurídica común que prestará apoyo a empresas jóvenes e innovadoras y permitirá que los inversores encuentren fondos de inversión diseñados para ser invertidos en empresas sociales. Con la introducción de una serie de normas comunes, dichos fondos se caracterizarán por su potencial para atraer más inversión.

Por otra parte, la Comisión está estudiando fuentes alternativas de financiación si bien, antes de adoptar ninguna regulación a nivel europeo, será necesario evaluar con todo detenimiento si un reglamento europeo es realmente necesario, útil, proporcionado y respetuoso del principio de subsidiariedad.

([1]) http://www.economist.com/news/briefing/21568365-europes-banks-are-shrinking-what-will-take-their-place-filling-bank-shaped-hole

([2]) Según la última encuesta del BCE sobre el acceso de las PYME a la financiación del pasado mes de noviembre, dicho acceso ha empeorado un 29 % con respecto al 26 % de la encuesta anterior.

([3]) Esa misma encuesta revela que el índice de denegación a las PYME españolas de sus solicitudes de préstamo es de un 19 % frente al 16 % de la encuesta anterior.

([4]) Publicado en 2012 por la Comisión con el fin de examinar su evolución. El análisis de las observaciones recibidas indica que contaría con un amplio apoyo toda normativa en la materia en la EU siempre que se respetara una serie de principios fundamentales. Tras la consulta relativa al Libro Verde y la conferencia pública celebrada en abril de 2012, la Comisión ha iniciado una serie de debates con las partes interesadas y una serie de consultas específicas, por ejemplo, sobre los organismos de inversión colectiva en valores mobiliarios (OICVM) y sobre la resolución o liquidación de entidades no bancarias. A la hora de desarrollar propuestas políticas compatibles con las recomendaciones presentadas por las organizaciones internacionales se tendrá en cuenta toda la información disponible. Está prevista para el primer trimestre de 2013 una comunicación de la Comisión en la que se ofrecerán más detalles de los ámbitos en los que se podrían hacer propuestas jurídicas, con sus respectivos calendarios.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001204/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: Credit collapse in the banking sector II

In the United States, approximately half of all corporate debt is acquired through non-bank intermediaries (shadow banking). In contrast, in European states such as Spain, non-bank finance accounts for less than 10 % of the total ([1]).

In light of the above and in view of the acute credit crisis affecting the productive economy in Spain:

1. Does the Commission see any relationship between shadow banking and increased credit for small and medium-size enterprises (SMEs)?

2. Does the Commission intend to draft a regulation encouraging alternatives to bank financing for SMEs, start-ups, entrepreneurs and microenterprises?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(11 April 2013)

In Spain, access to traditional bank finance has deteriorated in the aftermath of the bursting of the housing and credit bubble: Spanish SMEs report a worsening in the availability of bank loans ([2]), higher rejection rates for their loan applications ([3]) and growing interest rates which have reached more than 6% in 2012.

Shadow banking activities can be a useful part of the financial system, since they constitute alternative funding for the real economy, which is particularly useful when traditional banking or market channels become temporarily impaired.

Yet, shadow banking can also pose potential threats to long-term financial stability. For this reason, the Commission is examining in detail the issues posed by shadow banking activities and entities, in line with the G-20 reflections, following its Green Paper ([4]) of 2012 and the own initiative report by the Parliament.

In addition, at the end of 2011 the Commission presented some proposals concerning venture capital funds and social entrepreneurship funds, soon to be voted by the European Parliament. They will allow the distribution of professional funds throughout the EU and build a common legislative platform, thus supporting young and innovative enterprises and allowing investors to identify investment funds that are aimed at investing on social enterprises. By introducing common rules, these funds will have the potential to attract more investment.

In addition, the Commission is looking on alternative sources of finance, noting however that before taking regulatory steps at European level, it needs to carefully assess whether European regulation would be necessary, useful, proportionate and in respect of subsidiarity.

([1]) http://www.economist.com/news/briefing/21568365-europes-banks-are-shrinking-what-will-take-their-place-filling-bank-shaped-hole

([2]) The latest ECB survey results on SME access to finance published last November report a worsening of -29%, compared with -26% in the previous survey round.

([3]) The same survey reports a 19% rejection rate for Spanish SMEs, up from 16%.

([4]) It was issued in 2012 by the Commission to take stock of its developments. The analysis of comments received suggests that there is support for regulatory measures in the EU subject to key principles. Following the Green Paper consultation and a public conference in April 2012, the Commission has initiated a number of discussions with stakeholders and has launched specific and targeted consultations, e.g. on UCITS and on the resolution of non-banks. All information available will be taken into account for the development of policy proposals, which should be compatible with recommendations put forward by international organisations. A Communication by the Commission is planned for the first quarter 2013 and will provide further details regarding areas for which legal proposals might be developed and their respective timing.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001205/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Persecution of Christians in Iran: the case of Farshid Fathi Malayeri and Saeed Abadini

Is the High Representative aware of the case of the Iranian Christian pastor Farshid Fathi Malayeri and Iranian-American Christian leader Saeed Abadini, who have been sentenced to long prison sentences for their Christian ministry work in Iran and who are both detained in Evin prison?

The state's accusation against these two Iranian Christians ranged from actions against national state security to cooperating with foreign organisations and Christian evangelism.

Allegedly, there was also a significant lack of legal due process during the trial as, for example, the court did not release any official document confirming the verdict, all decisions were apparently made only verbally in the case of Mr Malayeri and, in the case of Mr Abadini, his lawyers were only allowed once at the very start to present their client's defence and were barred from attending and participating in further proceedings during the trial.

Can the High Representative or one of her officials raise these cases at her next official encounter with representatives of the Iranian Government, as the EU has no delegation in Tehran?

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

The HR/VP follows the case of Saeed Abedini and other members of religious minorities imprisoned in Iran closely. She is very concerned about the 8-year sentence handed down to Mr Abedini, as well as reports that his lawyers were not allowed to present his defence in a proper manner.

The HR/VP has expressed concern regarding the freedom of religion for Christians, Baha'i and other religious minorities in Iran on several occassions. She continues to call upon the Iranian authorities to guarantee human rights for all of its citizens, including the freedom of religion or belief. The current repression of religious minorities contravenes the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, which Iran has signed and ratified.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001207/13
à la Commission (Vice-Présidente / Haute Représentante)
Louis Michel (ALDE)
(5 février 2013)

Objet: VP/HR — Projet de loi d'exclusion des ex-responsables de l'ancien parti RCD en Tunisie

En janvier 2011, un mouvement de protestation populaire contraint le président tunisien Zine el-Abidine Ben Ali à quitter le pays. Après sa fuite en Arabie saoudite, un gouvernement d'union nationale est mis en place. Les électeurs accordent alors à l'assemblée constituante un mandat d'une durée limitée n'excédant pas une année et dont l'objectif principal est la rédaction de la constitution qui sera suivie de nouvelles élections. La nouvelle constitution doit être approuvée d'ici fin mars 2013. Or, vu la lenteur des travaux, le projet de constitution ne pourra pas être approuvé dans les temps, ce qui fait dire à l'opposition que les partis de la majorité, la coalition d'Ennahdha, d'Ettakatol et du Congrès pour la République (CPR), sont bien décidés à rester le plus longtemps possible au pouvoir.

Rached Ghannouchi, président d'Ennahdha, a présenté un projet de loi d'exclusion des ex-responsables de l'ancien parti RCD des plus hautes fonctions de l'État, appelé «Immunisation politique pour la révolution». Cette loi vise à exclure de la vie politique toute personne ayant eu une fonction au sein de l'ancien régime, et ce, pour une durée d'au moins cinq ans. Des dizaines de milliers de personnes sont concernées: ministres, secrétaires d'État, membres des cabinets présidentiels, directeurs administratifs de la sécurité nationale, etc.

L'argument principal invoqué par le président pour justifier le dépôt de ce projet de loi est la sauvegarde des acquis de la révolution. Or, le processus démocratique est par essence inclusif et intègre tous les partis politiques désirant participer à la bonne gouvernance du pays.

Est-ce à l'assemblée constituante de prendre une décision visant à priver les citoyens de leurs droits civiques et politiques sans qu'ils ne soient condamnés par la justice?

L'Union européenne ne devrait-elle pas insister sur l'importance de la stricte séparation des pouvoirs et sur l'importance du respect des Droits de l'homme?

Réponse donnée par la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante Ashton au nom de la Commission
(4 avril 2013)

Tout en respectant pleinement la souveraineté tunisienne, l'Union européenne, dans le cadre de son dialogue politique avec la Tunisie, a noué de nombreux contacts et entamé de multiples démarches visant à faire connaître aux autorités tunisiennes et aux différentes forces politiques le point de vue de l'Union en ce qui concerne le projet de loi mentionné dans la question parlementaire. Lors de ces contacts, l'Union a insisté sur l'importance que revêt le respect par la législation tunisienne du droit international, y compris le respect des Droits de l'homme et du principe de non-discrimination.

Ledit projet de loi n'a pas encore été examiné par l'Assemblée nationale constituante.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001207/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Louis Michel (ALDE)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Draft law excluding civil service managers belonging to the former RCD party in Tunisia

In January 2011, popular protests forced the Tunisian president Zine el-Abidine Ben Ali to leave the country. After his flight to Saudi Arabia a government of national unity was established. Voters then granted the constituent assembly a limited mandate of no more than a year to draft the constitution and call fresh elections. The deadline for approval of the draft constitution is the end of March 2013 but, given the slow progress being made, it is unlikely to be approved within the allocated time, leading the opposition to believe that the majority parties, the coalition of Ennahdha, Ettakatol and the Congress for the Republic (CPR), are determined to stay in power for as long as possible.

Rached Ghannouchi, president of Ennahdha, has presented a draft law, entitled 'Political immunisation for the revolution', which excludes past civil service managers belonging to the former RCD party from senior government positions. In fact it would exclude anyone involved in the former regime from political life for a period of at least five years. Tens of thousands of people are affected: ministers, secretaries of state, presidential cabinet members, national security executive directors, etc.

The main argument put forward by the president to justify the introduction of this draft bill is to protect the gains made by the revolution. However, the nature of the democratic process is inclusive and incorporates all the political parties wishing to participate in good governance of the country.

Is it right for the constituent assembly to make a decision aimed at depriving citizens who have been convicted of no crime in court of their civic and political rights?

Should the European Union not stress the importance of the strict separation of powers and the importance of respecting human rights?

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

In the framework of the political dialogue between the EU and Tunisia, and in full respect of Tunisian sovereignty, numerous contacts and demarches have taken place to express to the Tunisian authorities and to the different political forces the EU's point of view on the draft law mentioned in the parliamentary question. In its contacts, the EU has insisted on the importance for Tunisian legislation to respect international law, including respect for human rights and non-discrimination.

The draft law has not yet been discussed by the National Constituent Assembly.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001208/13
alla Commissione
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(5 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Sicurezza aerea

Nel settore dei trasporti aerei il continuo verificarsi di incidenti che hanno avuto conseguenze più o meno rilevanti, comportando il rischio di perdite di vite umane e notevoli danni economici, rende cruciale e attuale rafforzare l'approccio comunitario alla tutela della sicurezza dei trasporti aerei. Facendo riferimento all'incidente che poteva avere conseguenze ben più gravi, avvenuto il 2 febbraio 2012 presso lo scalo aeroportuale di Fiumicino, che ha visto coinvolto un velivolo ATR-72 della compagnia Carpatair, ritorna all'attenzione della Commissione la questione delle concessioni delle licenze di volo per compagnie europee e non europee che operano sul territorio comunitario, in quanto la stessa compagnia è detentrice di regolari autorizzazioni di volo EU-OPS1 e IOSA.

L'Unione dovrebbe attivarsi in maniera ancora più puntuale per mettere al bando le compagnie di volo inadempienti verso le direttive di sicurezza vigenti all'interno del suo spazio aereo, rivedendo le condizioni per la concessione di tali permessi. Le autorità dell'aviazione civile degli Stati membri dell'Unione sono abilitate a ispezionare soltanto i vettori aerei di compagnie che volano da/verso aeroporti comunitari; dato il carattere aleatorio di tali controlli, effettuati a campione, non è possibile esaminare tutti gli aeromobili che atterrano in ogni aeroporto comunitario. Che una compagnia aerea non figuri nell'elenco comunitario non significa quindi automaticamente che essa soddisfi i criteri di sicurezza vigenti. Ritornando al già citato caso della Carpatair, solo la prontezza del personale di terra dell'aeroporto di Pisa ha impedito che nel dicembre scorso avvenisse un altro incidente (questa volta in fase di decollo) a un altro aeromobile della medesima compagnia.

Ciò premesso, si chiede alla Commissione di rispondere al seguente quesito:

reputa la Commissione che sia auspicabile una revisione delle condizioni necessarie alla concessione delle licenze IOSA e EU-OPS, al fine di rendere più sicuro il settore dei trasporti aerei nell'Unione europea?

Risposta di Siim Kallas a nome della Commissione
(13 marzo 2013)

Nell'Unione europea, le autorità competenti degli Stati membri sono responsabili della certificazione dei vettori aerei stabiliti nel loro territorio. I certificati dei singoli operatori aerei sono rilasciati in base a norme di sicurezza comuni (le cosiddette EU-OPS) che garantiscono un livello uniforme di sicurezza per i viaggiatori e parità di condizioni per gli operatori commerciali nell'intera UE.

L'autorità competente di uno Stato membro ha inoltre il compito di assicurare una sorveglianza continua del vettore aereo al quale ha rilasciato un certificato, indipendentemente dal luogo in cui il vettore in questione fornisce servizi aerei, e di adottare le misure necessarie a prevenire violazioni delle norme di sicurezza.

Occorre sottolineare che l'Agenzia europea per la sicurezza aerea (AESA) verifica, mediante un intenso programma di attività di normalizzazione, l'effettivo rispetto di detto sistema.

Il vettore aereo deve garantire l'impiego sicuro dell'aeromobile, in conformità del suo certificato di operatore aereo, e il mantenimento dell'aeronavigabilità della sua flotta, secondo le prescrizioni applicabili.

Nel 2012 la Commissione, desiderosa di rafforzare ulteriormente le norme dell'UE in materia di certificazione e di sorveglianza, ha adottato il regolamento (UE) n. 965/2012 al fine di sostituire le UE-OPS. Scopo del nuovo regolamento è migliorare ulteriormente il livello di sicurezza negli Stati membri, che attualmente è già uno dei migliori al mondo.

Il programma IOSA (IATA Operational Safety Audit) è stato sviluppato dall'Associazione internazionale del trasporto aereo (IATA) per le compagnie aeree aderenti. Questo non esime tuttavia le autorità competenti degli Stati membri o le compagnie aeree dall'obbligo di rispettare le norme UE in precedenza indicate.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001208/13
to the Commission
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: Air safety

In the air transport sector, the continued occurrence of accidents, some with serious consequences, including the risk of loss of human life and significant economic repercussions, make strengthening the EU approach to protecting air transport safety a crucial and timely exercise. With reference to the accident which could have had much more serious consequences, which happened on 2 February 2012 at Fiumicino Airport involving a Carpatair ATR-72, the Commission's attention will focus once again on the question of granting licences to European and non-European airlines which operate within the European Union, insofar as the same airline holds the appropriate EU-OPS 1 and IOSA flight authorisations.

The Union should take an even more targeted approach in order to ban airlines which fail to comply with the safety directives in force within their own airspace, by reviewing the conditions for granting such licences. The civil aviation authorities of EU Member States are authorised to inspect only air carriers from airlines which fly to/from European Union airports; given the random nature of these checks, conducted on a sample, it is impossible to examine all the aircraft which land at every European Union airport. The fact that an airline does not appear on the EU list does not therefore automatically mean that it satisfies the safety criteria in force. Returning to the aforementioned Carpatair case, only swift action on the part of the ground crew at Pisa Airport prevented another accident from occurring in December (this time during take-off) with another aircraft from the same airline.

In light of the above, can the Commission answer the following:

Does the Commission consider it desirable to review the conditions that must be met in order to be granted IOSA and EU-OPS licences, so that the air transport sector in the European Union can be made safer?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(13 March 2013)

In the EU, competent authorities of the Member States are responsible for the certification of air carriers established in their territory. Individual air operator's certificates are issued on the basis of common safety standards (the so called EU-OPS) which guarantee a uniform level of safety for the traveling public and a level playing field for the commercial operators across the EU.

The competent authority of a Member State is further responsible for the continuous oversight of an air carrier to which it has granted a certificate, regardless of the place where this carrier provides air services, and for taking the necessary action to prevent violation of safety standards.

It is to be noted that, through an intense program of stansardisation activities, the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) checks whether this system is effectively adhered to.

In turn, the air carrier is responsible for the safe operation of aircraft according to its air operator's certificate and for the continuous airworthiness of its fleet in accordance with the applicable requirements.

In 2012 the Commission, desiring to further strengthen the EU certification and oversight rules, adopted Regulation (EU) 965/2012 to replace EU-OPS. The new regulation aims at improving even further the safety record in the Member States which is already one of the lowest in the world.

The IOSA program has been developed by the International Air Transport Association (IATA) for its member airlines. It does not, however, relieve Member States' competent authorities or air carriers from their obligation to abide by the EU rules, as explained above.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-001209/13
a Bizottság számára
Bauer Edit (PPE)
(2013. február 5.)

Tárgy: Fogyasztóvédelem és diszkrimináció

Az elmúlt időszakban Szlovákiában, de más „új" tagországban is felháborodást keltettek azok a gyakori esetek, hogy az azonos márkájú termékek (pl. húsipari termékek, mosópor, mosogatószerek, pelenka) minősége eltér az egyes tagállamokban. Nyugat-Szlovákiából például sokan a határ túloldalára, Ausztriába járnak bevásárolni, mert az ott megvásárolt termékeknek nemcsak az ára alacsonyabb, hanem a minőségük is sokkal jobb a Szlovákiában vásárolt azonos márkájú és kiszerelésű termékekkel összehasonlítva. Hasonló helyzet tapasztalható egyes szolgáltatások esetében is, amikor például egyes mobilszolgáltatók vagy bankok, előnyösebb szolgáltatást kínálnak a régi tagországokban alacsonyabb áron, mint az új tagországokban.

Nem ritka, hogy egyes tagállamokban árusított azonos nevű, azonos márkájú termékek között lényeges minőségbeli különbségek vannak. Ez a gyakorlat egyértelműen egyes tagállamok (elsősorban a 2004 után csatlakozottak) fogyasztóit diszkriminálja más tagállamok fogyasztóival szemben. Előbbiek ezáltal csak alacsonyabb minőségű termékekhez jutnak hozzá, gyakran magasabb áron. Ráadásul a fogyasztók átlagkeresete ezekben az országokban messze elmarad a nyugati fejlett tagállamok lakosságának bevételétől, ezáltal még jobban elmélyítve a különbséget, negatív hatást gyakorolva a szociális kohézióra.

Készül-e az Bizottság a fogyasztók védelmében egyértelmű és egységes rendszer kidolgozására, mely az Európai Unióban egyformán védené a különböző tagországokban élő fogyasztókat?

Nem tervezi a Bizottság egy összehasonlító tanulmány kidolgozását, mely ezekre az elfogadhatatlan különbségekre és a fogyasztók csoportjainak diszkriminációjára fókuszálna?

Tonio Borg válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. március 27.)

Az egyazon márkanévvel különböző tagállamokban értékesített termékek közötti minőségbeli eltéréseket illetően a Bizottság a Tisztelt Képviselő figyelmébe ajánlja az E-4962/2009, E-004388/2011, E-005055/2011, E-005563/2011, E-005756/2011, E-001581/2012 és E-005217/2012 sz. írásbeli választ igénylő kérdésekre adott válaszait ([1]).

Az uniós fogyasztóvédelmi szabályok valamennyi tagállamban egyaránt alkalmazandók (noha esetenként a nemzeti szabályozás túlléphet azon, ami az uniós szinten minimálisan előírt harmonizációhoz szükséges). Elsősorban a tagállami hatóságok és bíróságok hatáskörébe tartozik annak vizsgálata, hogy az egyes gazdasági társaságok betartják-e az uniós szabályozást. Ezenkívül a Bizottságnak – miként arra az E-00676/2012 sz. írásbeli választ igénylő kérdésre adott válaszában is utalt – több közelmúltbeli vagy jelenlegi kezdeményezése is azt a célt szolgálja, hogy a fogyasztók tudatosan élhessenek az egységes piac valamennyi előnyével, s ezáltal olcsóbban juthassanak jobb minőségű termékek szélesebb választékához.

A Bizottság jelenleg nem tervezi, hogy összehasonlító tanulmányt készít a különböző országokban értékesített termékek minőségéről. A fogyasztói piacokról rendszeresen készülő eredménytáblák ([2]) révén azonban valamennyi tagállamban folyamatosan figyelemmel kíséri a fogyasztói körülményeket ötven szolgáltatási piacon, illetve árupiacon. Noha egyes piacok megítélése kedvezőbb az EU-15 fogyasztói körében, más piacok (beleértve a távközlési szolgáltatások piacát is) az EU-12 országaiban érnek el jobb eredményt. Az eredménytábla közel 200 áru és szolgáltatás árának az Unión belüli szóródását is nyomon követi.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/hu/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/consumer_research/editions/cms8_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001209/13
to the Commission
Edit Bauer (PPE)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: Consumer protection and discrimination

Instances of the quality of products with the same brand name (e.g. meat products, washing powder, washing-up liquids, nappies) varying across the Member States have recently caused outrage in Slovakia and other new Member States. Many people from western Slovakia, for example, cross the border to Austria to go shopping not only because the prices of products are lower but also because the quality of products of the same brand and with the same packaging is much better than if they were purchased in Slovakia. The same is true of some services, for example when mobile phone companies or banks offer better services at lower rates in the old Member States than in the new ones.

There are often considerable discrepancies in quality between products with the same name and the same brand name purchased in some Member States. This practice clearly discriminates against consumers in some Member States — primarily those which joined the EU after 2004 — who can only acquire lower-quality products at what are often higher prices. Moreover, consumers in these countries earn on average far less than their counterparts in the more developed Member States of Western Europe, a factor which widens the gap and has a negative impact on social cohesion.

Is the Commission working to develop a clear and uniform consumer protection system which would protect consumers equally in all Member States?

Is the Commission not drawing up a comparative study which would focus on these unacceptable differences and on the discrimination between groups of consumers?

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

With regard to differences in the quality of products sold under the same brand name in different countries, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to written questions E-4962/2009, E-004388/2011, E-005055/2011, E-005563/2011, E-005756/2011, E-001581/2012 and E-005217/2012 ([1]).

EU rules on consumer protection apply uniformly to all Member States (even though, in some cases, national legislation may go beyond the EU minimum harmonisation). National authorities and courts have the primary responsibility to investigate the conduct of individual companies in the light of EU legislation. In addition, as indicated in its reply to Written Question E-006776/2012[1], several recent and ongoing Commission initiatives aim at empowering consumers to take full advantage of the Single Market, thus enabling them to benefit from lower prices, better quality and wider choice of products.

At the moment, the Commission is not planning a comparative study on the quality of products sold in different countries. However, through its regular Consumer Markets Scoreboards ([2]), it has been monitoring consumer conditions in over 50 services and goods markets in all Member States. While most markets are assessed more positively by consumers in EU-15 countries, some markets (including telecommunication services) score higher in EU12. The Scoreboard also tracks price dispersion across the EU for almost 200 goods and services.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/consumer_research/editions/cms8_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001210/13
to the Commission
Nicole Sinclaire (NI)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: Hill Wheeler School, Kenya

The Hill Wheeler School in Mtwapa, Kenya, is maintained by a British charity, the Hill Wheeler Charity, and is a beacon of hope for 200 underprivileged children.

The Commission is providing 75 % of the funding for a new road that will encroach on the school boundary, which means that five classrooms, as well as the school's kitchen, wall and gate, and other infrastructure, will have to be destroyed.

The school will receive no compensation for this disastrous loss.

1. Could the Commission please advise me as to what impact assessment was made before the decision to grant this funding was taken, and by whom it was carried out?

2. Also, would the Commission consider withholding funding in this case until it is satisfied that this small and vulnerable community is adequately protected, and that either the road will be rerouted or the school will be adequately compensated?

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

The Commission is following with particular attention the impact that the construction of a new road in Mtwapa will have on the Hill Wheeler School. The Commission's development strategy for Kenya is pro-poor oriented, and attaches great importance to promoting the rights and opportunities of the most vulnerable population, including the right of children to education.

The Commission would like to clarify that it has not and it is not providing EU funds for the construction of this new road, which is wholly financed by the Kenyan authorities. The Commission nevertheless has raised this matter with the Kenyan Ministry of Local Government. The Commission has been assured that the ongoing construction works are being carried out with the knowledge and overall support of the resident community, which has been engaged in this project from its inception through an inclusive and participatory process. In the specific case of the Hill Wheeler School, the Commission is informed that negotiations are taking place between the Hill Wheeler Charity and the Project Committee (consisting of residents of Mtwapa) with a view to reaching an amicable solution.

The Commission will continue to follow these negotiations, as it considers it vital that the benefits that the new road, and accompanying drainage works, will bring in terms of neutralising the effects of floods and allowing greater urban access are reconciled with no less important rights such as children's education.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001211/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Nicole Sinclaire (NI)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — EU-India negotiations concerning the military occupation of Kashmir

1. Could the Vice-President/High Representative please advise me of the current state of negotiations with the government of India regarding the continued military occupation of Kashmir?

2. Could she please also assure me that in future negotiations with the Indian government, Kashmiri representatives will be present at the table? If this is for any reason not possible, could I please have an explanation why?

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

The EU is not engaged in negotiations with the Government of India on issues related to Kashmir. The situation in Kashmir is reviewed in the context of EEAS regular political dialogues with both the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and the Pakistani Ministry for Foreign Affairs, where the EU encourages both parties to pursue their dialogue (political, trade, visas, etc.) and to continue cooperation on regional matters. Inclusiveness in the process, through involvement of Kashmiri representatives, is systematically highlighted as a key condition for a sustainable solution. The EU further encourages people-to-people initiatives in that regard.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001212/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(5 februarie 2013)

Subiect: Tariful de îmbunătățiri funciare din România

Potrivit unui proiect recent, autoritățile române intenționează să introducă o taxă denumită „tarif de îmbunătățiri funciare", care ar urma să fie plătită de către beneficiarii direcți sau indirecți ai amenajărilor pentru irigații, desecări sau de combatere a eroziunii solului.

Proiectul prevede că neachitarea la termenul scadent a obligației de plată a tarifului conduce la plata de către debitor de penalități, dobânzi, majorări, iar sumele datorate statului „vor fi compensate cu sumele de orice natură cuvenite acestora din partea unor instituții române", în această categorie intrând și subvențiile.

Comisia este rugată să precizeze dacă această „compensare" poate viza plățile directe acordate agricultorilor români în cadrul pilonului I al PAC.

Răspuns dat de dl Cioloş în numele Comisiei
(26 martie 2013)

În conformitate cu articolul 11 din Regulamentul (CE) nr. 1290/2005 al Consiliului privind finanțarea politicii agricole comune ([1]) și cu articolul 29 din Regulamentul (CE) nr. 73/2009 al Consiliului de stabilire a unor norme comune pentru sistemele de ajutor direct pentru agricultori ([2]), plățile legate de finanțarea sistemelor UE de ajutor direct sau de sumele corespunzătoare contribuției financiare publice în conformitate cu programele de dezvoltare rurală trebuie să fie efectuate integral către beneficiari.

Statele membre au posibilitatea ca, în condițiile specifice stabilite de Curtea de Justiție a Comunităților Europene în cauza C-132/95 Jensen ([3]) să compenseze sumele care le sunt datorate și neachitate cu plățile agricole.

Chiar dacă, în contextul actual, nu este oportună furnizarea de către Comisie a unei evaluări definitive asupra unei măsuri fiscale precum cea descrisă de distinsul membru ca fiind de competența statului membru, se poate concluziona că măsura de compensare a creanțelor statului membru cu plățile de primit din partea Uniunii Europene în temeiul sistemului de ajutor direct pentru agricultori este ilegală în cazul în care se stabilește că aceasta afectează buna funcționare a organizării comune a piețelor agricole.

([1]) JO L 209, 11.8.2005.
([2]) JO L 30, 31.1.2009.
([3]) Cauza C-132/95 Bent Jensen/ Korn- og Foderstofkompagniet A/S.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001212/13
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: Romanian land improvement levy

The Romanian authorities have recently announced plans for the introduction of a 'land improvement levy' payable by direct or indirect beneficiaries of irrigation or drainage works or works to prevent soil erosion.

Under the projected measure, non-payment of the levy by the due date will incur penalties, interest and supplements, any amounts outstanding being deducted by the State from funding of any kind, including subsidies, payable to those concerned by any Romanian organisation.

Can the Commission say whether the amounts in question may also be deducted from direct payments to Romanian farmers under the first pillar of the CAP?

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

According to Article 11 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1290/2005 ([1]) on the financing of the common agricultural policy and Article 29 of Council Regulation (EC) No 73/2009 ([2]) establishing common rules for direct support schemes for farmers, payments relating to the financing of EU direct support schemes or to amounts corresponding to the public financial contribution under the rural development programmes have to be disbursed in full to the beneficiaries.

Member States have the possibility under the specific conditions set out in the European Court of Justice Case C-132/95 Jensen ([3]) to set-off agricultural payments against outstanding debts to the Member State.

While it is inappropriate in the present context for the Commission to provide a definitive appraisal of a tax measure such as the one described by the Honourable Member falling under the competence of the Member State, it follows that the offset of Member State credits with Union payments resulting from the direct support scheme for farmers may be unlawful if it is established that it interferes with the proper functioning of the common organisation of the agricultural markets.

([1]) OJ L 209, 11.8.2005.
([2]) OJ L 30, 31.1.2009.
([3]) Case C-132/95 Bent Jensen and Korn- og Foderstofkompagniet A/S.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001213/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(5 februarie 2013)

Subiect: Utilizarea acidului lactic pentru decontaminarea carcaselor bovine

Comisia Europeană a aprobat la începutul lunii februarie utilizarea acidului lactic pentru decontaminarea carcaselor bovine precum și importul de porci vii proveniți din SUA, ca un gest de deschidere față de autoritățile de la Washington înaintea unei posibile lansări a negocierilor pentru un acord de liber schimb transatlantic.

Comisia a arătat într-un comunicat că „posibilitatea utilizării acidului lactic nu trebuie să fie considerată un substitut al practicilor corecte și al normelor igienice din abatoare".

Comisia este rugată să precizeze cum va asigura respectarea principiului menționat mai sus.

De asemenea, Comisia este rugată să precizeze dacă are în vedere renunțarea la alte reguli europene în scopul de a facilita încheierea de noi acorduri comerciale internaționale.

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

Normele specifice privind utilizarea acidului lactic pentru reducerea contaminării microbiologice de suprafață a carcaselor de bovine stabilite prin Regulamentul (UE) nr. 101/2013 al Comisiei din 4 februarie 2013 ([1]) se bazează pe articolul 3 alineatul (2) din Regulamentul (CE) nr. 853/2004 al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului de stabilire a unor norme specifice de igienă care se aplică alimentelor de origine animală.

Nu există nicio modificare a normelor de igienă pe care operatorii din sectorul alimentar trebuie să le respecte în conformitate cu Regulamentele (CE) nr. 178/2002 ([2]), 852/2004 ([3]) și 853/2004 ([4]). Soluțiile de acid lactic trebuie să fie aplicate în condiții controlate și verificabile, integrate într-un sistem de gestionare bazat pe HACCP. Autoritățile competente trebuie să verifice conformitatea cu bunele practici de igienă și cu procedurile de operare, inclusiv în ceea ce privește HACCP. În plus, utilizarea acidului lactic nu reduce obligațiile în ceea ce privește conformitatea cu legislația UE în domeniul alimentar. Posibilitatea este mai degrabă un instrument suplimentar care contribuie la reducerea riscului de contaminare cu agenți patogeni importanți, cum ar fi „*Escherichia coli* producătoare de verocitotoxină" (VTEC) și „*Salmonella*" în anumite condiții de producție.

În plus, Comisia se va asigura că această posibilitate a fost pusă în aplicare în mod corect prin auditurile efectuate de serviciul de inspecție al Comisiei (Oficiul Alimentar și Veterinar), atât în țări terțe, cât și în statele membre.

Comisia confirmă faptul că nu intenționează să renunțe la nicio normă UE pentru a facilita încheierea de acorduri internaționale. Negocierile comerciale privind acordul cuprinzător între UE și SUA nu vor avea ca rezultat compromiterea sănătății consumatorilor pentru a obține profit comercial și nici diminuarea standardelor înalte ale UE privind siguranța alimentelor din prezent.

([1]) JO L 34, 5.2.2013.
([2]) JO L 31, 1.2.2002.
([3]) JO L 139, 30.4.2004.
([4]) JO L 139, 30.4.2004.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001213/13
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(5 February 2013)

Subject: Use of lactic acid to decontaminate bovine carcases

In early February, the Commission approved the use of lactic acid in decontaminating bovine carcases and the import of live pigs from the US, as a goodwill gesture to the Washington authorities with a view to the possible launching of negotiations on a transatlantic free-trade agreement.

The Commission has pointed out in a press release that 'the possibility to use lactic acid should in no way be considered as a substitution for good hygienic slaughtering practices and operating procedures'.

Can the Commission say how it will guarantee that this principle is complied with?

Can the Commission also say whether it is considering abandoning other European rules in order to facilitate the conclusion of new international trade agreements?

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

Specific rules on the use of lactic acid to reduce microbiological surface contamination of bovine carcases which are laid down in Commission Regulation (EU) No 101/2013 of 4 February 2013 ([1]) are based on Article 3((2) of Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 of the European Parliament and the Council on specific hygiene rules for food of animal origin.

There is no change in any of the hygiene rules that food business operators have to comply with in accordance with Regulations (EC) Nos 178/2002 ([2]), 852/2004 ([3]) and 853/2004 ([4]). Lactic acid solutions must be applied under controlled and verifiable conditions integrated in a HACCP-based management system. Competent authorities must verify compliance with good hygiene practices and operational procedures, including HACCP. In addition the use of lactic acid does not reduce obligations for compliance to EU food law. The possibility is rather an additional tool to help reducing the potential contamination by important pathogens, such as 'verocytotoxin producing Escherichia coli' (VTEC) and 'Salmonella' in certain production situations.

In addition, the Commission will guarantee that this possibility has been correctly implemented through the audits performed by the Commission inspection service (Food and Veterinary Office), both in third countries and in Member States.

The Commission would like to reassure that it does not intend to abandon any EU rules to facilitate the conclusion of international agreements. Trade talks on the comprehensive agreement between the EU and the US are not about compromising the health of consumers for commercial gains, nor to lower the existing high EU food safety standards.

([1]) OJ L 34, 5.2.2013.
([2]) OJ L 31, 1.2.2002.
([3]) OJ L 139, 30.4.2004.
([4]) OJ L 139, 30.4.2004.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001214/13
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Road conditions

One method of reducing the number of deaths occurring on European roads each year must be to ensure that roads are in good condition and of a drivable standard.

1. Does the Commission agree that it is paramount that European roads are of a standard whereby they do not create extra difficulties for drivers travelling on them or cause unnecessary damage to vehicles?

2. What research has the Commission done on the contribution of damaged roads, potholes and other such features to road accidents?

3. Could the Commission outline any guidelines it may have on a minimum road quality standard?

4. If no such guidelines exist, does the Commission intend to create any?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(13 March 2013)

1. Yes.

2. The Commission has consistently supported research projects on road maintenance within the context of the 5th, the 6th and 7th Framework Research Programmes ([1]).

3 and 4. The Commission wishes to recall that Directive 2008/96/EC on road safety infrastructure management ([2]) aims to ensure a uniform framework for safety management, including periodical inspections of roads in operation. The directive applies to the TEN-T network but the Commission encourages Member States to broaden the application of the same principles.

In addition, EU Regulation 305/2011 laying down harmonised conditions for the marketing of construction products ([3]) and repealing Council Directive 89/106/EEC (as of 1 July 2013) will offer a common technical framework for construction products (by means of harmonised European Standards). Road equipment manufacturers can declare the performance of their products in a harmonised manner, enabling road authorities to choose the most appropriate solution for construction and maintenance of their network.

([1]) http://cordis.europa.eu/home_en.html
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32008L0096:EN:NOT
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/Notice.do?val=568627:cs&lang=en&list=696730:cs,696478:cs,568627:cs,561079:cs,554247:cs,524642:cs,524777:cs,523079:cs,519928:cs,502777:cs,&pos=3&page=1&nbl=33&pgs=10&hwords=

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001216/13
an die Kommission
Horst Schnellhardt (PPE)
(6. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: Kontrollen in Schlachthöfen in Polen

Innerhalb der Intergruppe für den Schutz und das Wohlergehen von Tieren hielt Prof. Andrzej Elżanowski von der Polnischen Akademie für Wissenschaften einen Vortrag über Schlachtmethoden in Polen. Dabei wurde festgestellt, dass auch die veterinärmedizinischen Kontrolleure nach der Stückzahl der Schlachttiere bezahlt werden.

1. Kann die Kommission mitteilen, ob ein solches Vorgehen im Einklang mit den europäischen Kontrollvorschriften steht und ob die Bezahlung nach Quantität die Qualität beeinflusst?

2. Besteht in Polen eine institutionelle Unabhängigkeit der Tierärzte im Schlachtbetrieb bzw. kann die Kommission Auskunft darüber geben, wer für die Bezahlung der kontrollierenden Tierärzte aufkommt?

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

1. Die Verordnung (EG) Nr. 882/2004 über amtliche Kontrollen ([1]) enthält keine Angaben über die Berechnung der Löhne und Gehälter von Amtstierärzten, und die Verfahren unterscheiden sich von Mitgliedstaat zu Mitgliedstaat. Laut den Artikeln 26 bis 29 dieser Verordnung sind die Mitgliedstaaten verpflichtet, diese Löhne und Gehälter bei der Berechnung der Gebühren zu berücksichtigen, die von den zuständigen Behörden erhoben werden, bei denen diese Tierärzte angestellt sind, so dass sichergestellt ist, dass diese Gebühren die Kosten der amtlichen Kontrollen decken. Der Lohn/das Gehalt eines Amtstierarztes errechnet sich daher grundsätzlich unabhängig von der Anzahl der Tiere, die in dem kontrollierten Schlachtbetrieb verarbeitet werden. Die Berechnungsmethoden dürfen in keiner Weise die Integrität und Unabhängigkeit der Amtstierärzte oder die Wirksamkeit ihrer Arbeit beeinträchtigen. Der Kommission liegen keine Informationen darüber vor, wie sich die Löhne/Gehälter von Amtstierärzten in Polen im Einzelnen errechnen; sie wird diese Frage mit den polnischen Behörden klären.

2.Die Vorschriften der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 882/2004, darunter die Anforderung, dass das Personal der zuständigen Behörden unabhängig und frei von jeglichem Interessenkonflikt ist, gelten auch für die von den polnischen Behörden beschäftigten Amtstierärzte.

Amtliche Kontrollen von tierischen Erzeugnissen werden in Polen von der Kreisveterinäraufsicht (Poviat Veterinary Inspectorate — PVI) durchgeführt, die der allgemeinen Veterinäraufsicht Polens (General Veterinary Inspectorate GVI) unterstellt ist. Das GVI erhält seine Mittel, aus denen die Amtstierärzte letztlich bezahlt werden, aus dem Staatshaushalt.

([1]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 882/2004 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 29. April 2004 über amtliche Kontrollen zur Überprüfung der Einhaltung des Lebensmittel- und Futtermittelrechts sowie der Bestimmungen über Tiergesundheit und Tierschutz, ABl. L 191 vom 28.5.2004, S. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001216/13
to the Commission
Horst Schnellhardt (PPE)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Inspections in slaughterhouses in Poland

Professor Andrzej Elżanowski of the Polish Academy of Sciences gave a talk to the Intergroup on the Welfare and Conservation of Animals on slaughter methods in Poland, from which it emerged that veterinary inspectors too are paid per head of animals slaughtered.

1. Can the Commission say whether this accords with EU inspection rules and whether payment by quantity affects quality?

2. Does institutional independence exist in Poland for vets working in slaughterhouses, or can the Commission provide information on who is responsible for paying veterinary inspectors?

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

1. Regulation 882/2004 on official controls ([1]) is silent on how official veterinarians' salaries are calculated and methods may vary between Member States. Articles 26 to 29 of that regulation oblige Member States to include the cost of those salaries when calculating mandatory fees collected by the competent authorities which employ the veterinarians, so as to ensure that, through these fees, the costs incurred in performing the official controls are recovered. Thus, as a norm, an official veterinarian's salary is calculated independently of the volume of animals processed in the slaughterhouse which is subjected to the official control. In any case, calculation methods should in no way have the potential to negatively affect his or her integrity or independence, or the effectiveness of his or her work. The Commission has no information on the detailed method(s) used in Poland to calculate the official veterinarians' salaries; it will clarify these points with the Polish authorities.

2. The rules laid down in Regulation 882/2004, including those requiring that staff of the competent authorities be independent and free from conflict of interest, also apply to official veterinarians employed by the Polish authorities.

Official controls on products of animal origin are performed, in Poland, by the Poviat Veterinary Inspectorate (PVI), answerable to the General Veterinary Inspectorate (GVI). The GVI receives its funding, from which the official veterinarians are ultimately paid, from the state budget.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and the Council of 29 April 2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of the compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules (OJ L 191, 28.5.2004, p. 1).

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001218/13
do Komisji
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(6 lutego 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Smog w Krakowie

Kraków to historyczna, architektoniczna i kulturowa, perła wśród polskich miast. Niestety przez ponad 200 dni w roku miasto to jest zasnute mgłą spalin oraz pyłów wydobywających się z tysięcy opalanych węglem pieców. W połączeniu z położeniem w niecce Wisły powoduje to silne zanieczyszczenie powietrza. Dobowa ilość pyłów zawieszonych wielokrotnie przekracza unijne normy dopuszczalne dla ludzkiego zdrowia. Według raportu Katedry Epidemiologii i Medycyny Zapobiegawczej UJ CM oraz Fundacji Zdrowie i Środowisko silne zanieczyszczenie powietrza powoduje znacznie większą ilość zachorowań na choroby układu oddechowego oraz osłabia odporność organizmu. Jedną z propozycji jest całkowity zakaz palenia w domowych piecach. Niestety wprowadzenie takiego zakazu uderza w finanse osób średnio zamożnych oraz biednych, których nie stać na podłączenie do miejskiej sieci ciepłowniczej oraz na pokrycie wysokich opłat za ogrzewanie.

1. Czy Komisja zna alarmujące dane z Krakowa dotyczące jakości powietrza w mieście oraz ilości pyłów zawieszonych?

2. Czy Kraków objęty jest programem badania powietrza AirMonTech realizowanym w ramach 7. programu ramowego? Jak oceniana jest jakość powietrza w stolicy Małopolski oraz jakie formułowane są wnioski w celu jego poprawy?

3. W ramach programu Horyzont 2020 oraz pakietu energetyczno-klimatycznego Komisja zapisała wsparcie dla miast oraz realizację założeń tzw. inteligentnego miasta. Czy w związku z tym Komisja planuje przygotowanie oraz realizację nowego programu umożliwiającego finansowe wsparcie dla miast takich, jak Kraków?

4. Jak Komisja zamierza pomóc takim metropoliom jak Kraków w walce z zanieczyszczeniami powietrza bez nakładania dodatkowych obciążeń na przemysł, a tym bardziej na mieszkańców?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Janeza Potočnika w imieniu Komisji
(23 kwietnia 2013 r.)

1. Komisja zna sytuację w Krakowie, ponieważ Polska co roku przekazuje jej dane na temat jakości powietrza zgodnie z wymogami dyrektywy 2008/50/WE ([1]).

2. Jakość powietrza w Krakowie jest mierzona zgodnie z wymogami dyrektywy 2008/50/WE.

AirMonTech (www.airmontech.eu) jest projektem badawczym UE polegającym na harmonizacji obecnych pomiarów zanieczyszczenia powietrza w celu rozpoznania przyszłych potrzeb w zakresie monitoringu oraz zalecenia odpowiednich technik i strategii. AirMonTech nie ma polskiego partnera, ale jego wyniki są rozpowszechniane w ramach międzynarodowych warsztatów i za pośrednictwem publicznie dostępnej ogólnoeuropejskiej bazy danych.

3. Kraków może uzyskać finansowanie unijne dla projektów „inteligentnych miast" w formie dotacji w wyniku udanego uczestnictwa w jednym z najbliższych zaproszeń do składania wniosków. Więcej informacji będzie dostępnych po sfinalizowaniu programu prac na 2014 r.

4. UE udziela już w ramach funduszy strukturalnych znaczącego wsparcia finansowego w szczególności na rzecz polskich miast w zakresie propagowania zrównoważonego transportu miejskiego, oszczędnego ogrzewania gospodarstw domowych oraz dostosowania przemysłu do norm UE, a tym samym zmniejszania zanieczyszczenia powietrza. Takie wsparcie będzie prawdopodobnie nadal udzielane w okresie programowania 2014-2020.

([1]) Dyrektywa Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady 2008/50/WE z dnia 21 maja 2008 r. w sprawie jakości powietrza i czystszego powietrza dla Europy, Dz.U. L 152 z 11.6.2008.

Nadrzędna zasada polityki ochrony środowiska – „zanieczyszczający płaci" – zobowiązuje przemysł do uczestnictwa w zapewnianiu rozwiązań i dzielenia się kosztami usuwania zanieczyszczeń. Jeżeli zasada ta nie będzie przestrzegana, a przemysł nie będzie ponosił kosztów, rozwiązywanie problemu niskiej jakości powietrza potrwa dłużej i będzie prawdopodobnie bardziej kosztowne z punktu widzenia całego społeczeństwa.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001218/13
to the Commission
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Smog in Kraków

Kraków is a pearl among Polish cities in historical, architectural and cultural terms. Unfortunately, for around 200 days a year it is covered by a haze of exhaust fumes and dust from thousands of coal-burning stoves, which, in view of the city's location in the Vistula river basin, results in serious air pollution. The daily volumes of air-suspended dust are several times higher than the quantity permitted by EU health standards. According to a report by the Department of Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine of the Jagiellonian University and the Foundation for Health and the Environment, the serious air pollution has considerably increased the incidence of respiratory complaints and is weakening people's immune systems. A complete ban on the use of domestic stoves has been suggested. However, the introduction of such a ban would be a financial blow to people of average means and to the poor, who cannot afford to be connected to the municipal heating network and to pay the high heating bills this would entail.

1. Is the Commission aware of the alarming situation in Kraków as regards the air quality and suspended dust levels?

2. Is Kraków included in the AirMonTech research project being carried out under the 7th Framework Programme? How is the air quality in the city measured? What proposals are there to improve it?

3. The Commission has already provided for cities and implementation of the Smart Cities initiative under the Horizon 2020 programme and the Climate and Energy Package. In this context, is it planning to draw up or implement a new programme which will enable financial support to be made available to cities like Kraków?

4. How does the Commission intend to help cities such as Kraków fight air pollution without imposing an additional financial burden on industry and, in particular, on local people?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(23 April 2013)

1. The Commission is aware of the situation in Krakow as Poland submits every year the data on air quality to the Commission in line with the requirements of Directive 2008/50/EC ([1]).

2. The air quality in Krakow is measured in line with the requirements of Directive 2008/50/EC.

AirMonTech (www.airmontech.eu) is an EU research project to harmonise current air pollution measurements, to identify future monitoring needs and to recommend suitable techniques and strategies. AirMonTech has no Polish partner, but the results are disseminated via international workshops and through a publicly accessible Pan-European database.

3. The pathway for Kraków to receive EU funding for Smart Cities projects is via a grant following a successful participation in one of the coming calls for proposals. Further details will only be available when the Work Programme for 2014 is finalised.

4. Considerable financial support is already being granted by the EU through the Structural Funds, in particular to Polish cities, for promoting sustainable urban transport, efficient domestic heating and adjustment of industry to EU standards, thus reducing air pollution. Such support is likely to continue in the 2014-2020 programming period.

The overarching principle of the environmental policy — the polluter pays principle — obliges industry to participate in providing solution and share the clean-up cost. Without this principle being applied and costs borne by the industry, the poor air quality situation will take longer to be remedied and will probably be even less cost effective from the overall society point of view.

([1]) Directive 2008/50/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 May 2008 on ambient air quality and cleaner air for Europe, OJ L 152, 11.6.2008.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001219/13
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(6 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: VP/HR — Intolerancia religiosa y detención arbitraria en Vietnam

Las noticias sobre la existencia de graves atentados a la libertad religiosa en Vietnam son alarmantes. De acuerdo con informaciones cursadas por el Comité de Derechos Humanos con sede en París y otras ONG internacionales bien informadas, el Gobierno de Vietnam está recrudeciendo el acoso policial y las acciones de intimidación, vigilancia e incluso detención contra miembros de grupos religiosos y ha adoptado nuevas disposiciones legales sobre control y limitación de actividades religiosas.

El Decreto 92, que ha entrado en vigor el 1 de enero de 2013, establece un conjunto de restricciones a la celebración de actos religiosos e introduce nuevos requisitos exigibles a «extranjeros» que deseen organizar acontecimientos religiosos en Vietnam. El nuevo Decreto refuerza la Ordenanza sobre Religión y Fe, que establece que solo religiones «reconocidas» y grupos religiosos auspiciados por el Estado están autorizados a celebrar actos religiosos y que considera ilegales cualesquiera grupos «no reconocidos».

La Iglesia Budista Unificada de Vietnam (UBCV) no está reconocida por las autoridades, y como consecuencia, sus miembros sufren represión y sus actividades son prohibidas. El líder de la UBCV, Thich Quang Do, de 85 años de edad y candidato al Premio Nobel de la Paz, se encuentra recluido desde 2003 bajo arresto domiciliario en el Monasterio Thanh Minh Zen, sin imputación o acusación alguna. No goza de libertad de movimiento y permanece día y noche bajo vigilancia policial; todas sus visitas y comunicaciones son vigiladas. La predicación ante sus discípulos en el monasterio le ha sido prohibida.

En respuesta a mi pregunta escrita anterior, presentada en 2010 (E-7418/2010), la Alta Representante/Vicepresidenta informó de que Vietnam se había comprometido a entrar en conversaciones con el Relator Especial de las Naciones Unidas sobre la Libertad de Religión o de Creencias. Este compromiso no se ha cumplido. ¿Qué medidas adoptará la UE con carácter urgente en favor de la puesta en libertad de Thich Quang Do y de otros miembros de grupos religiosos detenidos por sus convicciones pacíficas?

Acogemos favorablemente el compromiso con la libertad religiosa de que ha dejado constancia el Servicio Europeo de Acción Exterior con la presentación de su proyecto de orientaciones de la UE en materia de derechos humanos con respecto a la libertad religiosa o de creencia y la constitución de un Grupo de trabajo del PE sobre la libertad religiosa o de creencia. Pero este compromiso no adquiere sentido hasta tanto no se traduzca en hechos tangibles y devuelva la libertad a quienes están privados de ella por motivo de su fe.

Respuesta de la Alta Representante/Vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(25 de abril de 2013)

Los atentados contra la libertad de religión o de creencia en Vietnam siguen siendo motivo de preocupación para la UE, que sigue muy de cerca la situación, en particular los debates actualmente en curso sobre el nuevo proyecto de Constitución. En enero de 2012, la UE respondió a estas preocupaciones reforzando el diálogo sobre los derechos humanos en el marco del Acuerdo de Asociación y Cooperación firmado el pasado mes de junio. Desde entonces, se han celebrado dos reuniones, una en Hanoi en enero de 2012 y otra en Bruselas en octubre de 2012. La libertad de religión y de creencia fue uno de los puntos clave del orden del día de ambas reuniones, en las que también se plantearon casos particulares como el del líder de la UBCV, Thich Quang Do. Durante estos diálogos se informó a la UE de que el Sr. Thich Quang Do no se encontraba bajo arresto domiciliario y que era posible reunirse libremente con él en cualquier momento. Los embajadores de Australia y Estados Unidos en Vietnam, que le visitaron el año pasado, comprobaron, no obstante, que no le está permitido abandonar las dependencias de la pagoda en la que reside.

Durante el diálogo reforzado mantenido en octubre de 2012, Vietnam respondió positivamente al llamamiento que le hizo la UE para que volviera a entablar contacto con el Relator Especial de las Naciones Unidas sobre la Libertad de Religión o de Creencias ante la posible visita de éste al país. La UE continuará presionando para conseguir la liberación de aquellas personas que han sido encarceladas, detenidas o acosadas por motivo de sus creencias religiosas, especialmente en el marco del diálogo sobre los derechos humanos y durante los contactos bilaterales. Además, dada la aparente discrepancia que existe entre la información facilitada por las autoridades y la situación real, también se abordará dentro de este contexto el caso de Thich Quang Do. Si Vietnam no cursa enseguida una invitación al Relator Especial de las Naciones Unidas, la UE tiene la intención de abordar de nuevo la cuestión.

Actualmente, la UE está analizando el nuevo Decreto 92 («Disposiciones específicas y medidas para la aplicación de la Ordenanza sobre Religión y Fe»), que también se tratará en la próxima reunión del diálogo reforzado sobre los derechos humanos, programada provisionalmente para octubre de 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001219/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Religious intolerance and arbitrary detention in Vietnam

I am alarmed by reports of grave abuses of religious freedom in Vietnam. According to the Paris-based Vietnam Committee on Human Rights and other well-informed international NGOs, the Vietnamese Government is intensifying police harassment, intimidation, surveillance and imprisonment of religious followers and adopting new legislation to control and limit religious activities.

Decree 92, which came into force on 1 January 2013, imposes a wide range of restrictions on religious practice, including new requirements for 'foreigners' organising religious events in Vietnam. It reinforces the Ordinance on Religion and Belief, which states that only 'recognised' religions and state-sponsored religious groups are allowed to practise religious activities, and that all 'non-recognised' groups are illegal.

The Unified Buddhist Church of Vietnam (UBCV) is not recognised by the authorities, and as a result its members are repressed and its activities banned. UBCV leader Thich Quang Do, aged 85 and a 2013 Nobel Peace Prize nominee, has been detained under house arrest at the Thanh Minh Zen Monastery in Saigon since 2003 without any justification or charge. He is denied freedom of movement and subjected to round-the-clock police surveillance, and all visits and communications are monitored. He is even forbidden from preaching to his disciples inside the monastery.

In response to my previous written question, submitted in 2010 (E-7418/2010), the Vice-President/High Representative said that Vietnam had promised to engage with the UN Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief. This promise has not been upheld. What urgent steps will the EU take to obtain the release of Thich Quang Do and other religious followers detained for their peaceful beliefs?

We welcome the commitment to religious freedom shown by the European External Action Service with the drafting of the EU human rights guidelines on freedom of religion or belief and the creation of an EP working group on freedom of religion or belief. But this commitment is meaningless unless it is translated into reality and brings freedom to those who are deprived of their liberty because of their faith.

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

Violations of Freedom of Religion or Belief remain a concern in Vietnam, the EU is monitoring the situation notably in the context of the ongoing debates regarding the new draft constitution. The EU addresses these concerns through the enhanced human rights dialogue established in January 2012 under the partnership and cooperation agreement signed last June. Two sessions were held in January 2012 in Hanoi and October 2012 in Brussels. Freedom of Religion and Belief was a key element on both agendas and individual cases such as the one of UBCV leader Thich Quang Do were also raised. The EU was informed during these dialogues that Mr Thich Quang Do was not under house arrest and could be met freely anytime. He was visited last year by AU and US ambassadors to Vietnam, who found, however, that he is not allowed to leave the premises of the Pagoda where he lives.

In the enhanced dialogue in October 2012 Vietnam answered positively to the EU's call to re-engage with the UN special rapporteur on Freedom of Religion or Belief in view of a possible visit to the country. The EU will continue to push for the release of persons held in prison, detained or harassed for their religious beliefs, notably in the framework of the Human Rights Dialogue and in bilateral contacts. The case of Thich Quang Do shall also be addressed in this context given the apparent mismatch between the information provided by the authorities and the actual situation. The EU intends to raise again the issue of the UN Special Rapporteur's visit to the country if the announcement to extend an invitation is not followed up.

The EU is at present analysing the new Decree 92 ('Specific provisions and measures for the implementation of the Ordinance on Belief and Religion'), which shall also be discussed at the next session of the enhanced Human Rights Dialogue, tentatively scheduled for October 2013.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001220/13
à la Commission (Vice-Présidente / Haute Représentante)
Robert Goebbels (S&D)
(6 février 2013)

Objet: VP/HR — Situation dramatique des réfugiés syriens et palestiniens au Liban

La guerre civile qui ravage la Syrie a fait fuir des centaines de milliers de citoyens de ce pays vers des pays voisins, où ils sont accueillis dans des conditions diverses.

L'Union européenne a contribué financièrement à l'accueil de ces réfugiés dans divers pays. Néanmoins la situation empire continuellement, notamment au Liban, pays politiquement fragile.

Parmi les résidents syriens qui ont fui les combats meurtriers, on trouve un nombre élevé de Palestiniens. Leur état de doubles réfugiés rend leur situation particulièrement difficile.

Que compte faire l'Union européenne pour soutenir les 300 000 réfugiés de Syrie au Liban, dont quelque 30 000 Palestiniens, qui s'ajoutent aux 300 000 autres Palestiniens parqués depuis des années dans douze camps?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Georgieva au nom de la Commission
(26 mars 2013)

En ce qui concerne la crise en Syrie, l'UE a été en première ligne des actions humanitaires au Liban. Au total, elle a déjà alloué 27,9 millions d'euros à des fins humanitaires. Cette aide a principalement servi à financer l'enregistrement, la fourniture d'aide d'urgence et d'abris et la préparation aux conditions hivernales de toutes les personnes touchées par le conflit, c'est-à-dire les réfugiés syriens, les Palestiniens de Syrie, les Libanais rapatriés ainsi que les Libanais vulnérables.

Afin de répondre aux besoins à plus long terme des réfugiés syriens au Liban, 15 millions d'euros ont été alloués en 2012, par l'entremise de l'Instrument européen de voisinage et de partenariat, à l'éducation, aux moyens de subsistance et au renforcement des capacités des autorités et des ONG locales. Nous examinons actuellement avec les autorités libanaises la possibilité d'octroyer une aide supplémentaire.

En ce qui concerne les réfugiés palestiniens de Syrie, la Commission a alloué 2 millions d'euros à l'UNRWA et à des ONG pour soutenir la coordination de l'aide, garantir l'accès équitable aux services de santé et répondre à leurs besoins d'urgence. L'UNRWA bénéficie également d'un appui de l'Instrument de stabilité à hauteur de 2,5 millions d'euros pour financer, au moyen de subventions, les aides locatives.

En raison de la détérioration de la situation en Syrie, une nouvelle enveloppe de 18 millions d'euros est prévue pour répondre aux besoins humanitaires du nombre croissant de réfugiés enregistrés au Liban, en matière de santé, de distribution de produits non alimentaires, de protection, de bons d'alimentation, et pour fournir une aide d'urgence, en particulier un abri, aux nouveaux arrivants.

En outre, depuis 1996, la Commission fournit une aide aux autres réfugiés palestiniens qui vivent dans 12 autres camps et regroupements. Elle a notamment versé 2 millions d'euros à l'UNRWA pour 2012 et 2013 afin qu'il fournisse une aide alimentaire aux Palestiniens déplacés après la destruction du camp de Nahr El Bared en 2007.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001220/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Robert Goebbels (S&D)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Tragic situation of Syrian and Palestinian refugees in Lebanon

The civil war ravaging Syria has forced hundreds of thousands of citizens to flee to neighbouring countries, where they are hosted under varying conditions.

The European Union has contributed financially to hosting these refugees in different countries. However, the situation is steadily deteriorating, particularly in Lebanon, a politically fragile country.

Among the Syrian residents who have fled the deadly conflict there are many Palestinians. Their dual refugee status makes their situation especially difficult.

What does the European Union intend to do to support the 300 000 Syrian refugees in Lebanon, including some 30 000 Palestinians, in addition to the other 300 000 Palestinians now penned in twelve separate camps for many years?

Answer given by Ms Georgieva on behalf of the Commission
(26 March 2013)

With regards to the Syria crisis, the EU has been at the forefront of humanitarian efforts in Lebanon with a total of EUR 27.9 M already allocated for humanitarian purposes mainly focusing on registration, provision of emergency assistance, shelter and winterization to all people affected by the conflict, i.e. Syrian refugees, Palestinians from Syria, Lebanese returnees as well as vulnerable Lebanese.

To address the longer term needs of Syrian refugees in Lebanon, EUR 15 M have also been allocated in 2012 under the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument for Education, support to livelihoods and capacity building of authorities and local NGOs. Further support is currently being discussed with the Lebanese authorities.

With regards to Palestine refugees from Syria, the Commission has allocated EUR 2 M to UNRWA and to NGOs to support the coordination of assistance, to secure equal access to health services, and to meet their emergency needs. UNRWA is also supported by the Instrument for Stability with EUR 2.5 M for in cash subsidies towards rental assistance.

Due to the deteriorating situation inside Syria, another EUR 18 M is foreseen to address the humanitarian needs of the increasing number of registered refugees in Lebanon, in terms of health, non-food items distribution, protection, food vouchers, and to provide emergency assistance, mainly shelter, to all new arrivals.

Moreover, since 1996, the Commission has been providing assistance to the other Palestinian refugees living in 12 camps and gatherings. This includes support to UNRWA for food assistance to the Palestinians displaced after the destruction of Nahr El Bared camp in 2007, with EUR 2 M for 2012 and 2013.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001221/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(6 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Νέος νόμος στην Τουρκία περί αποφυλάκισης βίαιων συζύγων

Ο νέος νόμος περί αποφυλάκισης που ψηφίστηκε από το Τουρκικό Κοινοβούλιο και ο οποίος συνεπάγεται την αποφυλάκιση βίαιων συζύγων, έχει προκαλέσει φόβους για αύξηση της βίας κατά των γυναικών. Οργανώσεις γυναικών και ακτιβιστές προειδοποιούν ότι οι σύζυγοι αυτών των αντρών διατρέχουν κίνδυνο. Τραγική απεικόνιση της κατάστασης αποτελεί το γεγονός ότι πολλές γυναίκες έχουν χάσει τη ζωή τους αμέσως μετά την αποφυλάκιση των συζύγων τους.

Ερωτάται επομένως η Επιτροπή:

1. Συνάδει ο νέος αυτός νόμος προς τη νομοθεσία της ΕΕ;

2. Παρακολουθεί η ΕΕ τα μέτρα που λαμβάνει η Τουρκία για την πρόληψη και καταπολέμηση της βίας κατά των γυναικών;

3. Γνωρίζει η ΕΕ εάν υπάρχει επαρκής αριθμός διαθέσιμων καταφυγίων για γυναίκες που υφίστανται τέτοιας μορφής βία στην Τουρκία;

4. Σε ποιες περαιτέρω ενέργειες προτίθεται να προβεί η Τουρκία, ως χώρα υποψήφια προς ένταξη, ώστε να εξασφαλίσει ότι μια γυναίκα που έχει πέσει θύμα βίας μπορεί να συνεχίσει να ζει με ασφάλεια και χωρίς τον κίνδυνο να υποστεί εκ νέου επίθεση από την πλευρά του συζύγου της;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(26 Μαρτίου 2013)

Η τροποποίηση του Άρθρου 105/Α του Νόμου 5275 του Ιανουαρίου 2013 σχετικά με την αποφυλάκιση κρατουμένων υπό όρους στοχεύει στη μείωση του αριθμού των τροφίμων στο σωφρονιστικό σύστημα της Τουρκίας. Η τροποποίηση εξομαλύνει τις συνθήκες της μεταφοράς κρατουμένων από τις ανοικτές φυλακές και της αποφυλάκισής τους υπό όρους. Σύμφωνα με το άρθρο, αποκλείονται όσοι έχουν καταδικαστεί για τρομοκρατικά εγκλήματα, για εγκλήματα που σχετίζονται με σεξουαλική επίθεση, κακοποίηση και παρενόχληση και για εγκλήματα που διεπράχθησαν στο πλαίσιο κάποιας εγκληματικής οργάνωσης. Περίπου δέκα χιλιάδες αιτήσεις αποφυλάκισης υπό όρους έχουν υποβληθεί για την περίοδο έως τις αρχές Φεβρουαρίου 2013.

Η Επιτροπή λαμβάνει υπόψη το θέμα που επισημαίνει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος και πρόκειται να το θίξει στις συζητήσεις της με τις τουρκικές αρχές.

Η ισχύουσα νομοθεσία προβλέπει τη δημιουργία καταλυμάτων για γυναίκες σε δήμους με πληθυσμό από 50 000 και πάνω. Σύμφωνα με πληροφορίες που διαβίβασαν οι τουρκικές αρχές, το 2012 υπήρχαν 111 καταλύματα. Ο αριθμός καταλυμάτων δεν ανταποκρίνεται στις ανάγκες και δε συμμορφώνεται με τη νομοθεσία.

Παράδειγμα της προόδου που πραγματοποίησε η Τουρκία είναι ο Νόμος για τη προστασία της οικογένειας και την πρόληψη της βίας σε βάρος των γυναικών, με τον οποίο προστατεύονται από τη βία μέλη της οικογένειας και όσοι βρίσκονται σε εξωσυζυγικές σχέσεις. Επιπροσθέτως, το Υπουργείο για την οικογένεια και τις κοινωνικές πολιτικές ενέκρινε ένα εθνικό σχέδιο δράσης με στόχο την καταπολέμηση της βίας εναντίων των γυναικών (2012-2015). Το σχέδιο εστιάζει σε 5 τομείς: τη νομοθεσία, την ευαισθητοποίηση και την αλλαγή στάσης, την χειραφέτηση των γυναικών και τις υπηρεσίες πρόληψης, την ιατροφαρμακευτική περίθαλψη και τη συνεργασία μεταξύ των ενδιαφερομένων.

Η Επιτροπή αποδίδει τη μέγιστη σημασία σε θέματα που αφορούν τα δικαιώματα των γυναικών και την ισότητα των φύλων και τα θίγει στις συζητήσεις της με τις τουρκικές αρχές σε κάθε κατάλληλη περίσταση.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001221/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: New probation law in Turkey for abusive husbands

The new probation law passed by the Turkish parliament, which is resulting in the release of abusive husbands from jail, has led to fears of an increase in violence against women. Women's organisations and activists have warned that the wives of these men are in danger. A tragic illustration of this is the fact that many women have been killed as soon as their husbands were released from jail.

We therefore ask the Commission:

1. Is this new law in line with EU legislation?

2. Is the EU monitoring Turkey's measures to prevent and combat violence against women?

3. Does the EU know whether there is a sufficient number of shelters available to victims of such violence in Turkey?

4. What further action is Turkey, as a candidate country for accession, expected to take in order to ensure that a victim of violence can continue to live in security and without danger of again being attacked by her husband?

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

The amendment to Article 105/A of Law 5275 of January 2013 regarding probation aims at reducing the number of inmates in the Turkish penitentiary system. The amendment softens the conditions for transferring convicts from open prisons and putting them under probation. It excludes those convicted of terror crimes, of crimes related to sexual assault, abuse or harassment and of crimes committed in the framework of a criminal organisation. Approximately ten thousand applications for probation have been submitted up to early February 2013.

The Commission takes note of the issue highlighted by the Honourable Member and will raise it with the Turkish authorities.

Existing legislation provides for the establishment of shelters for women in municipalities with a population of 50 000 or more. According to information provided by the Turkish authorities, in 2012 there were 111 shelters. The number of shelters falls short of needs and does not comply with the legislation.

An example of progress that has been made by Turkey includes the Law on the Protection of Family and Prevention of Violence against Women, protecting family members and those in relationships outside marriage from violence. In addition, a National Action Plan to combat Violence against Women (2012-2015) was adopted by the Ministry for Family and Social Policies. The plan focuses on five areas: legislation, awareness raising and change of attitudes, empowerment of women and preventive services, healthcare and cooperation among stakeholders.

The Commission attaches the utmost importance to women's rights and gender equality and raises them with the Turkish authorities on all appropriate occasions.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001222/13
al Consejo
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(6 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: Productos financieros especulativos sobre los precios de los alimentos

Recientemente, bancos de diversos Estados miembros, como Dinamarca, Alemania, el Reino Unido o Austria, han retirado de las carteras de productos de las entidades financieras aquellos que permiten a los inversores especular sobre los precios de los alimentos alegando razones morales. Sin embargo, en el Estado español continúa existiendo este tipo de prácticas, a pesar de que organismos como la FAO, la Unctad, el Alto Comisionado para la crisis alimentaria, el Relator de Naciones Unidas sobre el derecho a la alimentación, y más de un centenar de estudios científicos independientes, han demostrado que este «modo de operar» genera volatilidad en los precios agrícolas y tiene efectos devastadores sobre el hambre y la pobreza.

Después de la firma del Memorándum de Entendimiento por el préstamo del Mecanismo Europeo de Estabilidad otorgado a España, la Comisión Europea participa, junto con el BCE y el FMI, en el control y la supervisión de la reestructuración del sistema financiero español. Así mismo, el Consejo emitirá próximamente sus recomendaciones específicas sobre la economía española dentro del semestre europeo.

1. ¿Qué medidas ha implementado el Consejo dirigidas a frenar la especulación alimentaria en nuestro sistema financiero?

2. ¿Hará recomendaciones a España para que limite la especulación alimentaria en su sistema financiero, como lo han hecho los otros Estados de la UE? ¿Hará llegar esta misma recomendación al BCE para que transmita esta política en aquellos países donde actúa como supervisor?

3. ¿Tiene la intención el Consejo de trasladar en futuras reuniones del G20 la urgencia de impulsar las medidas necesarias para evitar los movimientos de carácter exclusivamente especulativos en el mercado de alimentos?

Respuesta
(15 de abril de 2013)

En octubre de 2011, la Comisión presentó sus propuestas ([1]) de Directiva y Reglamento sobre mercados de instrumentos financieros (DMIF y RMIF) ([2]) al Consejo y al Parlamento Europeo.

El Consejo se encuentra todavía en el proceso de debate de su orientación general sobre las propuestas de la Comisión, que también se refieren a los derivados de materias primas.

La asistencia financiera facilitada a España tras su solicitud del 25 de junio de 2012 está supeditada a condiciones específicas del sector financiero, según lo dispuesto en el Memorando de Entendimiento y en la Decisión del Consejo dirigida a España sobre medidas concretas para reforzar la estabilidad financiera ([3]). Este Memorando de Entendimiento no contiene ningún elemento que específicamente aborde la negociación de instrumentos donde los alimentos sean el componente subyacente.

En cuanto a las futuras recomendaciones del Consejo sobre la economía española, se debatirán en el marco del Semestre Europeo en junio/julio de 2013.

([1]) COM(2011) 652 final (15938/11) y COM(2011) 656 final (15939/11).
([2]) Directiva 2004/39/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 21 de abril de 2004, relativa a los mercados de instrumentos financieros, por la que se modifican las Directivas 85/611/CEE y 93/6/CEE del Consejo y la Directiva 2000/12/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo y se deroga la Directiva 93/22/CEE del Consejo (DO L 145 de 30.4.2004, p. 1), Directiva 2006/73/CE de la Comisión, de 10 de agosto de 2006 , por la que se aplica la Directiva 2004/39/CE (DO L 241 de 2.9.2006, p. 26) y Reglamento de la Comisión (CE) n° 1287/2006 de 10 de agosto de 2006 por el que se aplica la Directiva 2004/39/CE (DO L 241 de 2.9.2006, p. 1).
([3]) Doc. 12450/12.

Las alzas de precios en los productos alimenticios son un tema importante de debate en el foro del G-20. La UE, en su calidad de miembro del G-20, y junto con los Estados miembros de la UE que participan en mismo, apoya la adopción de nuevas medidas colectivas del G-20 para analizar la forma de responder al reto a largo plazo del suministro de materias primas, y la manera de facilitar las inversiones en un entorno de precios cada vez más elevados y volátiles, a partir del informe de la Conferencia de las Naciones Unidas sobre el Comercio y el Desarrollo (Unctad) sobre el impacto macroeconómico en el crecimiento de la volatilidad excesiva de los precios de los productos básicos ([4]).

([4]) g20russia.ru/load/780978827

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001222/13
to the Council
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Financial products speculating on food prices

Banks in several Member States, including Denmark, Germany, the United Kingdom and Austria, have recently withdrawn from their investment portfolios those products which allow investors to speculate on food prices, alleging moral grounds. However, these practices continue to exist in Spain, although organisations such as the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the UN High Level Task Force on the Global Food Security Crisis, the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food and over a hundred independent scientific studies have shown that this 'modus operandi' causes fluctuations in food prices and has devastating effects on hunger and poverty.

Following the signature of the memorandum of understanding on the European Stability Mechanism loan granted to Spain, the Commission is jointly responsible, together with the European Central Bank and the International Monetary Fund, for monitoring and overseeing the restructuring of Spain's financial system. The Council is also on the point of issuing its specific recommendations on the Spanish economy within the European Semester.

1. What steps has the Council taken in order to put an end to food speculation in our financial system?

2. Will it recommend to Spain that it limit food speculation in its financial system, in line with other EU states? Will it forward this recommendation to the ECB so that it can promote this policy in those countries where it has a supervisory role?

3. Does the Council intend to raise at future G20 meetings the need to urgently take necessary steps to prevent purely speculative movements on the food markets?

Reply
(15 April 2013)

In October 2011, the Commission submitted its proposals ([1]) for a directive and regulation on markets in financial instruments (MiFID and MiFIR) ([2]) to the Council and to the European Parliament.

The Council is still in the process of discussing its general approach on the Commission proposals, which also relate to commodity derivatives.

Financial assistance provided to Spain following its request of 25 June 2012 is subject to specific financial sector conditionality, as provided for in the memorandum of understanding and in the Council Decision addressed to Spain on specific measures to reinforce financial stability ([3]). This MU does not contain any elements which would specifically address trading in instruments where food is the underlying component.

As for the forthcoming Council recommendations on the Spanish economy, these will be discussed within the framework of the European Semester in June/July 2013.

Price hikes in food commodities are a focus of discussion in the G20 forum. The EU, in its capacity as a G20 member, and together with EU Member States participating in the G20, is supportive of further collective G20 action to investigate how to respond to the long-term challenge of commodity supply, and how to facilitate investments in an environment of higher and more volatile prices, building on the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) report on the macroeconomic impact of excessive commodity price volatility on growth ([4]).

([1]) COM(2011) 652 final (15938/11) and COM(2011) 656 final (15939/11).
([2]) Directive 2004/39/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 April 2004 on markets in financial instruments, amending Council Directives 85/611/EEC and 93/6/EEC and Directive 2000/12/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council and repealing Council Directive 93/22/EEC (OJ L 145, 30.4.2004, p. 1), Commission Directive 2006/73/EC of 10 August 2006 implementing Directive 2004/39/EC (OJ L 241, 2.9.2006, p. 26) and Commission Regulation (EC) No 1287/2006 of 10 August 2006 implementing Directive 2004/39/EC (OJ L 241, 2.9.2006, p. 1).
([3]) 12450/12.
([4]) g20russia.ru/load/780978827.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001223/13
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(6 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: Productos financieros especulativos sobre los precios de los alimentos

Recientemente, bancos de diversos Estados miembros, como Dinamarca, Alemania, el Reino Unido o Austria, han retirado de las carteras de productos de las entidades financieras aquellos que permiten a los inversores especular sobre los precios de los alimentos alegando razones morales. Sin embargo, en el Estado español continúa existiendo este tipo de prácticas, a pesar de que organismos como la FAO, la Unctad, el Alto Comisionado para la crisis alimentaria, el Relator de Naciones Unidas sobre el derecho a la alimentación, y más de un centenar de estudios científicos independientes, han demostrado que este «modo de operar» genera volatilidad en los precios agrícolas y tiene efectos devastadores sobre el hambre y la pobreza.

Después de la firma del Memorándum de Entendimiento por el préstamo del Mecanismo Europeo de Estabilidad otorgado a España, la Comisión participa, junto con el BCE y el FMI, en el control y la supervisión de la reestructuración del sistema financiero español.

1. ¿Qué medidas ha recomendado la Comisión a España a fin de frenar la especulación alimentaria en el sistema financiero? ¿Considera la Comisión una prioridad la limitación de la especulación alimentaria en el mercado español? ¿Es esta opinión compartida por la troika?

Respuesta del Sr. Barnier en nombre de la Comisión
(12 de abril de 2013)

La Comisión considera de la máxima prioridad la necesidad de abordar la excesiva volatilidad de los precios en los mercados internacionales de materias primas. Su preocupación se extiende a las actividades financieras de todos los Estados miembros, incluida naturalmente España. En su Comunicación de febrero de 2011 ([1]), la Comisión reclamó nuevas medidas para mejorar la integridad y la transparencia de esos mercados. En consonancia con los compromisos del G-20, la Comisión ha puesto en marcha una serie de iniciativas de regulación dirigidas a aumentar la integridad y la transparencia de los mercados de derivados sobre materias primas, lo que incluye propuestas tendentes a aclarar los tipos de negociación en los mercados de materias primas que constituyen abuso del mercado ([2]), así como propuestas para exigir que los productos derivados sobre materias primas se negocien exclusivamente en foros de negociación regulados y que estas actividades comerciales sean transparentes, además de una supervisión completa de las posiciones en derivados sobre materias primas, incluida la fijación de límites a las posiciones de los participantes en el mercado o mecanismos alternativos de efecto equivalente, tales como la gestión de posiciones con umbrales de revisión automática ([3]).

([1]) Abordar los retos de los mercados de productos básicos y de las materias primas, febrero de 2011 [COM(2011) 25 final].

([2]) Reglamento sobre las operaciones con información privilegiada y la manipulación del mercado (abuso de mercado) [COM(2011) 651 final] y Directiva sobre las sanciones penales aplicables a las operaciones con información privilegiada y la manipulación del mercado [COM(2011) 654 final de 20.10.2011].

([3]) Propuesta de Directiva relativa a los mercados de instrumentos financieros, por la que se deroga la Directiva 2004/39/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo (Refundición) [COM(2011) 656 final] y Reglamento relativo a los mercados de instrumentos financieros y por el que se modifica el Reglamento [EMIR] relativo a los derivados OTC, las entidades de contrapartida central y los registros de operaciones [COM(2011) 652 final de 20.10.2011].

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001223/13
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Financial products speculating on food prices

Banks in several Member States, including Denmark, Germany, the United Kingdom and Austria, have recently withdrawn from their investment portfolios those products which allow investors to speculate on food prices, alleging moral grounds. However, these practices continue to exist in Spain, although organisations such as the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the UN High Level Task Force on the Global Food Security Crisis, the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food and over a hundred independent scientific studies have shown that this 'modus operandi' causes fluctuations in food prices and has devastating effects on hunger and poverty.

Following the signature of the memorandum of understanding on the European Stability Mechanism loan granted to Spain, the Commission is jointly responsible, together with the European Central Bank and the International Monetary Fund, for monitoring and overseeing the restructuring of Spain's financial system. The Council is also on the point of issuing its specific recommendations on the Spanish economy within the European Semester.

1. What steps has the Commission taken in order to put an end to food speculation in our financial system? Does the Commission consider it a priority to limit food speculation in the Spanish market? Does the Troika share this opinion?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(12 April 2013)

The Commission considers the need to address the excessive price volatility on the world's commodity markets a high priority. Its concerns extend to financial activities in all Member States, obviously including Spain. In its communication of February 2011 ([1]), the Commission called for further action to improve integrity and transparency on these markets. In line with G20 commitments, the Commission has launched a number of regulatory initiatives to increase the integrity and transparency of commodity derivatives markets. This includes proposals to clarify the types of trading in commodity markets that constitute market abuse ([2]), as well as proposals to require that commodity derivative products are traded exclusively on regulated trading venues, that these trading activities are transparent and a comprehensive oversight of commodity derivative positions, including the imposition of position limits by market participants or alternative arrangements with equivalent effect such as position management with automatic review thresholds ([3]).

([1]) Tackling the challenges in commodity markets and on raw Materials, February 2011, COM(2011) 25 final.
([2]) Regulation on insider dealing and market manipulation (market abuse), COM(2011) 651 final, and Directive on criminal sanctions for insider dealing and market manipulation, COM(2011) 654 final, 20.10.2011.
([3]) Proposal for a directive on markets in financial instruments repealing Directive 2004/39/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council (Recast) COM(2011) 656 final, and a regulation on markets in financial instruments and amending Regulation [EMIR] on OTC derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories, COM(2011) 652 final, 20.10.2011.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001224/13
a la Comisión
Dolores García-Hierro Caraballo (S&D)
(6 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: Pesca ilegal en la isla de Cabrera

Esta Diputada ha tenido conocimiento de que se podrían estar llevando a cabo actividades de pesca ilegal en los alrededores de Cabrera y sur de Mallorca, y por tanto incumpliendo el Reglamento (CE) n° 1967/2006 para la gestión de los recursos pesqueros del Mediterráneo. En su artículo 4, el Reglamento establece medidas para la protección de hábitats esenciales para la pesca, como el coralígeno y los mantos de rodolitos de maërl.

La importancia del coralígeno y los mantos de rodolitos radica en que son formaciones tridimensionales de algas rojas calcáreas que dan cobijo a cientos de especies, muchas de ellas pesqueras, que aprovechan estos recovecos para refugiarse, desovar y hallar alimento. A pesar de su importancia ecológica y de tratarse de hábitats protegidos, pudieran estar siendo destrozados por artes de pesca prohibidas por la normativa europea en ese tipo de fondos.

Por ello, esta diputada quisiera saber si la Comisión es conocedora de que se pudiera estar infringiendo la normativa comunitaria, y en caso de que así fuera, si piensa tomar medidas al respecto.

Respuesta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(8 de abril de 2013)

La Comisión coincide con Su Señoría en que la protección de hábitats tales como los lechos de vegetación marina de *Posidonia oceanica* y otras fanerógamas marinas reviste una importancia capital. Por esa razón, es fundamental que los planes de gestión adoptados por los Estados miembros mediterráneos cumplan todos los requisitos aplicables a los hábitats protegidos en virtud del Reglamento del Mediterráneo.

El control de las actividades pesqueras que tienen lugar en las aguas de los Estados miembros es competencia nacional. La UE ha adoptado un conjunto de normas para controlar esas actividades pesqueras y combatir la pesca ilegal, pero corresponde a los Estados miembros garantizar su correcta aplicación y sancionar las infracciones. A este respecto, la Comisión ha transmitido a las autoridades nacionales la denuncia de Su Señoría, instándolas a que adopten las medidas necesarias para poner fin a los posibles casos de incumplimiento.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001224/13
to the Commission
Dolores García-Hierro Caraballo (S&D)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Illegal fishing off the islet of Cabrera

I have recently received reports of suspected instances of illegal fishing around the islet of Cabrera and off the southern coast of Majorca. This represents a breach of Regulation (EC) No 1967/2006 concerning management measures for the sustainable exploitation of fishery resources in the Mediterranean Sea, Article 4 of which lays down measures to protect habitats that are central to the fishing sector, such as coralligenous habitats and mäerl beds.

Coralligenous habitats and mäerl beds are composed of multidimensional formations of calcareous red algae and constitute an important habitat for hundreds of species, including many types of fish, which use the beds to hide, lay eggs and feed. Under EC law, certain types of fishing gear are banned in such areas. However, in spite of this and the fact that coralligenous habitats and mäerl beds are vital, protected marine ecosystems, these habitats are at risk of being destroyed by the use of illegal fishing gear.

Is the Commission aware that EC law is potentially being violated around the islet of Cabrera and off the southern coast of Majorca? If so, is the Commission planning to take measures to address the problem?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(8 April 2013)

The Commission agrees with the Honourable member that the protection of habitats such as seagrass beds of *Posidonia oceanica* and other marine phanerogams is essential. This is why it is important that the Management Plans adopted by Mediterranean Member States comply with all the requirements concerning protected habitats foreseen in the Mediterranean Regulation.

The control of fishing activities performed in the Member States' waters is a matter of national competence. The EU has adopted a comprehensive set of rules to deal with the control of fishing activities and to combat illegal fishing but it is the responsibility of the Member State to ensure that they are correctly applied and that infringements are sanctioned. In this perspective, the Commission has transmitted the allegations to the national authorities and asked them to take the necessary measures to address any potential cases of non-compliance.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. P-001225/13
Komisijai
Laima Liucija Andrikienė (PPE)
(2013 m. vasario 6 d.)

Tema: Lietuvos privačių universitetų eliminavimas iš ES septintosios bendrosios programos (7BP)

Lietuvos privatūs universitetai eliminuoti iš ES septintosios bendrosios programos (7BP).

ERA-NET *EuroNanoMed II* paskelbė ketvirtą bendrą kvietimą teikti pasiūlymus dėl paramos tarptautiniams inovaciniams nanomedicinos moksliniams tyrimams. Šešiolika šalių ir regionų, tarp jų ir Lietuva, teikia paraiškas pagal šį kvietimą. Rekomendacijose paraiškų teikėjams nurodyta, kad paraiškos turi atitikti tos šalies *EuroNanoMed II* finansavimą teikiančios organizacijos atrankos kriterijus. Lietuva nustatė taisyklę, kad tik valstybiniai universitetai, valstybiniai mokslinių tyrimų centrai, valstybinės universitetinės ligoninės ir kitos valstybinės ligoninės laikomos šio projekto reikalavimus atitinkančiomis įstaigomis, ir taip eliminavo privačius universitetus, privačius mokslinių tyrimų centrus ir privačias ligonines.

Kokia Komisijos pozicija dėl šios taisyklės? Ar ši taisyklė dera su strategija „Europa 2020“ ir Bolonijos procesu? Ar galima laikyti, kad tokia reglamentavimo sistema, diskriminuojanti kai kurių valstybių narių privačius universitetus, padeda siekti bendro ES tikslo – aukštojo mokslo modernizavimo, kuris turėtų padėti ekonomikai išbristi iš krizės stipresnei (pasiūlymų pateikimo terminas pagal šį kvietimą yra 2013 m. kovo 4 d.)?

M. Geoghegan-Quinn atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2013 m. kovo 5 d.)

EuroNanoMed II yra ERA-NET projektas, kuriam teikiama parama pagal Mokslinių tyrimų, technologinės plėtros ir demonstracinės veiklos septintąją bendrąją programą (2007-2013 m.) vien padengti išlaidoms, susijusioms su gavėjų, t. y. nacionalinių ir regioninių finansavimo agentūrų ir ministerijų, vykdomos veiklos koordinavimu. ERA-NET *EuroNanoMed II* mokslinių tyrimų veiklos nefinansuoja. Mokslinių tyrimų veiklą, vykdomą pagal *EuroNanoMed II* skelbiamus kvietimus, finansuoja vien tik nacionalinės ir regioninės finansavimo organizacijos, taikydamos savo taisykles ir atsižvelgdamos į savo teisinį ir politikos kontekstą.

Komisija negali reikšti pretenzijų dėl finansavimo taisyklių, kurios nustatytos nacionaliniu ar regioniniu lygmeniu, todėl manant, kad tokios taisyklės nėra teisingos, klausimą reikia kelti jas nustačiusiai vyriausybei.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001225/13
to the Commission
Laima Liucija Andrikienė (PPE)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Elimination of private Lithuanian universities from the EU's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7)

Private universities in Lithuania have been eliminated from the EU's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7).

The ERA-NET EuroNanoMed II has launched a Fourth Joint Call for Proposals to support transnational innovative research projects in nanomedicine. Sixteen countries / regions, including, in particular, Lithuania, are participating in this call for proposals. The guidelines for applicants indicate that applications are subject to the eligibility criteria of the relevant EuroNanoMed II funding organisations of the respective country. Lithuania has set a rule that only public universities, public research centres, public university hospitals and other public hospitals are considered eligible institutions for this project, thus eliminating private universities, private research centres and private hospitals.

What is the position of the Commission regarding this rule? Is it in line with the EU2020 strategy and the Bologna process? Can such a regulatory framework involving discrimination against private universities in certain Member States be considered to contribute to the shared objective of the EU, namely the modernisation of its higher education, aimed at helping its economy emerge stronger from the crisis (the deadline for the submission of proposals under this call is 4 March 2013)?

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

EuroNanoMed II is an ERA-NET project which receives support under the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013) only to cover costs related to the coordination of the actions being carried out by the beneficiaries, i.e. the national and regional funding agencies and ministries. The ERA-NET EuroNanoMed II does not fund the research activities. Research activities resulting from the calls that EuroNanoMed II launches are funded exclusively by the national and regional funding organisations according to their own rules, taking into account their own legal and policy context.

The Commission cannot interfere with the funding rules that have been established at national / regional level and therefore, if such rules are felt to be unfair, the matter should be taken up with the government which has established them.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-001226/13
à la Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(6 février 2013)

Objet: Publication du rapport sur l'incidence de l'augmentation de la demande de biomasse sur les secteurs exploitant la biomasse

D'après l'article 23, paragraphe 5, point d), de la directive 2009/28/CE du 23 avril 2009 relative à la promotion de l'utilisation de l'énergie produite à partir de sources renouvelables et modifiant puis abrogeant les directives 2001/77/CE et 2003/30/CE, la Commission doit analyser, dans ses rapports, «l'incidence de l'augmentation de la demande de biomasse sur les secteurs exploitant la biomasse».

1. Quand la Commission compte-t-elle publier le premier rapport qui était attendu pour fin 2012?

2. L'évaluation d'impact abordera-t-elle la question du possible conflit d'usage de la ressource bois par les différents secteurs industriels?

Réponse donnée par M. Oettinger au nom de la Commission
(12 mars 2013)

La Commission parachève actuellement une analyse d'impact relative à la durabilité de la biomasse. En fonction des résultats de cette analyse, la Commission étudiera s'il est nécessaire et approprié de mettre au point des critères de durabilité communs au niveau de l'UE. Le calendrier provisoire de cette initiative est le 2e trimestre de 2013.

Bien que l'analyse d'impact considère l'incidence de l'augmentation de la demande de biomasse sur les secteurs exploitant la biomasse comme un des éléments à prendre en compte, elle se concentre avant tout sur les aspects liés à la biomasse qui ont trait au marché et au développement durable.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001226/13
to the Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Publication of a report on the impact of increased demand for biomass on biomass using sectors

Article 23(5)(d) of Directive 2009/28/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2009 on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources and amending and subsequently repealing Directives 2001/77/EC and 2003/30/EC obliges the Commission to analyse in its reports 'the impact of increased demand for biomass on biomass using sectors'.

1. When does the Commission intend to publish its initial report, which was scheduled for the end of 2012?

2. Will the impact assessment address the issue of possible disputes over the use of forestry resources by various industrial sectors?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(12 March 2013)

The Commission is currently finalising an Impact Assessment on biomass sustainability. Depending on the results of the impact analysis, the Commission will consider whether establishment of common sustainability criteria at EU level would be necessary and appropriate. The tentative timing for this initiative is the 2nd quarter of 2013.

While the impact of increased demand for biomass on biomass-using sectors is one of the elements considered in the analysis, the main focus of the impact assessment is on market and sustainability issues associated with biomass.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-001231/13
till kommissionen
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(6 februari 2013)

Angående: Varför används Nortons statistik i samband med Europeiska it-brottscentrumet?

Starten för Europeiska it-brottscentrumets verksamhet har meddelats av kommissionen i pressmeddelanden ([1]) och på hemsidan för kommissionens generaldirektorat för inrikes frågor (GD HOME) ([2]). I detta sammanhang har det också angetts att den globala kostnaden för it-brottslighet kan vara sammanlagt 388 miljarder US-dollar årligen.

Enligt den genomförbarhetsstudie som gjordes av RAND på uppdrag av GD HOME våren 2012 ([3]) och enligt kommissionens egna pressmeddelanden ([4]) är denna statistik för det första framtagen av Norton, ett världsföretag inom it-säkerhet, och för det andra inte tillförlitlig. Exakt vilka kriterier använde kommissionen, i samband med inrättandet av Europeiska it-brottscentrumet, för att fastställa att siffrorna i Nortons rapport om it-brottslighet var de lämpligaste för att demonstrera kostnaderna för it-brottslighet?

Svar från Cecilia Malmström på kommissionens vägnar
(3 april 2013)

I kommissionens texter om inrättandet av Europeiska it-brottscentrumet nämndes de uppgifter som lagts fram av Norton om it-brottslighetens sammanlagda kostnader för att visa problemets storleksordning. Det framgick tydligt att uppgifterna kom från ett privat företag. I meddelandet om inrättandet av it-brottscentrumet ([5]) varnar kommissionen för att sådana studier måste användas med försiktighet ”eftersom olika sätt att definiera vad it-brottslighet innebär kan leda till en variation av kostnadsberäkningar”. Eftersom it-brottslighet definieras olika i olika länder, och eftersom det finns en tendens att underrapportera it-brottslighet, finns det inga oberoende vetenskapliga rapporter som ger en sammanlagd siffra. Det bör noteras att de siffror som Norton anger ger en försiktigare bild av situationen än vad som är fallet med en rad andra privata aktörer.

I den genomförbarhetsstudie som ligger till grund för kommissionens inrättande av it-brottscentrumet undersöktes statistik från näringslivet och det straffrättsliga systemet, som visar att it-brottsligheten ökar. Inga källor ger en tillförlitlig bild av det sammanlagda antalet it-brott, men de ger en föreställning om hur fenomenet utvecklas, eftersom uppgifterna för varje enskild undersökning eller näringslivsrapport har samlats in på ett relativt samstämmigt sätt över tiden. Allmänhetens uppfattning stöder statistiken. En Eurobarometerundersökning som genomfördes i juli 2012 visar att 74 % av EU-befolkningen anser att it-brottsligheten ökar och att internetanvändarna är mycket måna om it-säkerhet.

Tillsammans tyder dessa siffror och analyser på en klar ökning av it-brottsligheten, vilket ger stöd för inrättandet av it-brottscentrumet och, mer allmänt, kommissionens insatser för att bekämpa sådan brottslighet.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-12-317_sv.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-is-new/news/news/2013/20130109_01_en.htm
([3]) http://www.rand.org/pubs/technical_reports/TR1218.html
([4]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-6_en.htm
([5]) Meddelande från kommissionen till rådet och Europaparlamentet, Brottsbekämpning i vår digitala tidsålder: inrättande av ett Europeiskt centrum mot it-brottslighet, KOM (2012) 140 slutlig.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001231/13
to the Commission
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Why are Norton figures being quoted in connection with the EC3?

The Commission has widely publicised the launch of the European Cybercrime Centre (EC3) ([1]) ([2]), along with the estimated costs for cybercrime globally, put at USD 388 billion.

According to the feasibility study conducted by RAND on behalf of the Commission's Directorate-General for Home Affairs in spring 2012 ([3]) and statements made by the Commission itself ([4]), this statistic is, firstly, a figure quoted by Norton, a global cybersecurity firm, and secondly, unreliable. What specific criteria did the Commission use to establish that the Norton Cybercrime Report figures were the most appropriate statistics on cybercrime costs to quote in connection with preparations for the launch a European Cybercrime Centre?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(3 April 2013)

In Commission documents related to the launch of the European Cybercrime Center (EC3), the data put forward by Norton on the global cost of cybercrime was mentioned to illustrate the order of magnitude of this phenomenon and was clearly presented as emanating from a private company. In the communication on the establishment of EC3 ([5]), the Commission made a caveat about the need to treat such studies with caution 'as different ways of defining what cybercrime entails might lead to varying cost estimates'. Due to disparate ways of classifying cybercrime in different countries as well as a tendency to underreport cybercrime offences, there are no independent scientific reports that provide a total figure. It should be noted that the figure published by Norton is a more conservative assessment of the situation than that being put forward by a number of other private actors.

The feasibility study on the basis of which the Commission decided to establish the EC3 analysed industry and criminal justice statistics that show an increase in cybercrime. Whilst neither of these sources provides a robust account of the absolute number of cybercrimes, they do provide an indication of trends over time — on the grounds that in each survey or industry report, data has been collected in a fairly consistent way over time. The perceptions of EU citizens are in line with statistics. A July 2012 Eurobarometer Survey found that 74% of EU citizens consider that cybercrime is increasing and that Internet users are very concerned about cyber security.

Cumulatively, these figures and analysis point towards a definite surge in cybercrime and this underpins the creation of the EC3 and more generally Commission's action in the area of the fight against cybercrime.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-12-317_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-is-new/news/news/2013/20130109_01_en.htm
([3]) http://www.rand.org/pubs/technical_reports/TR1218.html
([4]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-6_en.htm
([5]) Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament Tackling Crime in our Digital Age: Establishing a European Cybercrime Centre , COM(2012) 140 final.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001233/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(6 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Menções tradicionais — vinho do Porto

Fomos alertados para o facto de que os Estados Unidos da América (EUA) terão pedido à Comissão Europeia a proteção das designações *Vintage*, *Ruby*, *Tawny*, *Vintage Character*, *Crusted* e *Crusting* para vinhos produzidos no seu território. Sendo que todas estas designações são objeto de proteção legal segundo a lei portuguesa e usadas para o vinho do Porto, Portugal apresentou a sua oposição ao pedido apresentado pelos EUA. Na sua argumentação Portugal afirma que o uso destas expressões, para além de violar uma designação legalmente protegida, irá lançar confusão no mercado e induzir os consumidores em erro, falseando a concorrência.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Tem conhecimento desta situação?

2. É verdade que a Comissão pretende autorizar o uso das designações *Vintage*, *Ruby*, *Tawny*, *Vintage Character*, *Crusted* e *Crusting* para vinhos produzidos nos EUA?

3. Ponderou a Comissão nos impactos negativos que tal decisão pode ter para os consumidores (levados a adquirir produtos que mascaram a sua origem, características e qualidades usando designações enganosas) e para os produtores de vinho do Porto (que terão que lidar com uma concorrência francamente desleal)?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(12 de março de 2013)

Em 22 de junho de 2010, duas organizações profissionais representativas estabelecidas nos Estados Unidos da América — a *Wine America* e a *California Export Association* — apresentaram à Comissão pedidos de proteção das menções tradicionais «Vintage», «Vintage Character», «Ruby», «Tawny», «Crusted» e «Crusting». Estas menções já são protegidas a título de menções tradicionais e constam da base de dados «E-Bacchus» (http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/markets/wine/E-Bacchus) para os vinhos originários de Portugal. Após a publicação dos referidos pedidos no *Jornal Oficial da União Europeia*, Portugal transmitiu pedidos de oposição relativamente a cada uma destas menções.

A Comissão está ainda a avaliar os pedidos em causa em conformidade com o procedimento e os critérios enunciados no capítulo III do Regulamento (CE) n.° 607/2009 da Comissão que estabelece normas de execução do Regulamento (CE) n.° 479/2008 no que respeita às denominações de origem protegidas e indicações geográficas protegidas, às menções tradicionais, à rotulagem e à apresentação de determinados produtos vitivinícolas ([1]).

No contexto dessa análise, a Comissão terá igualmente em consideração a necessidade de garantir condições de concorrência equitativas e de evitar induzir os consumidores em erro.

([1]) JO L 193 de 24.7.2009, p. 3.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001233/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Traditional descriptions — port wine

It has been brought to my attention that the United States has asked the Commission to protect the designations Vintage, Ruby, Tawny, Vintage Character, Crusted and Crusting applied to wines produced in its territory. Since all these descriptions are legally protected under Portuguese law and used to refer to port wine, Portugal has declared its opposition to the request put forward by the United States. Portugal argues that the use of these terms will not only infringe a legally protected designation but will create confusion in the market and mislead consumers, thereby distorting competition.

1. Is the Commission aware of this situation?

2. Is it true that the Commission intends to authorise the use of the designations Vintage, Ruby, Tawny, Vintage Character, Crusted and Crusting for wines produced in the United States?

3. Has the Commission given thought to the possible negative impact of such a decision on consumers — who may be led to acquire products whose origin, characteristics and quality are disguised though the use of false designations — and on port wine producers, who will have to face unfair competition?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(12 March 2013)

On 22 June 2010, two representative professional organisations established in the United States of America, Wine America and California Export Association, submitted to the Commission applications for protection of the traditional terms 'Vintage', 'Vintage Character', 'Ruby', 'Tawny', 'Crusted' and 'Crusting'. Those terms are already protected as traditional terms and listed in the 'E-Bacchus' database (http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/markets/wine/e-bacchus) for wines originating from Portugal. Following the publication of those applications in the *Official Journal of the European Union*, Portugal submitted requests of objection for each of those terms.

The Commission is still evaluating the concerned applications in accordance with the procedure and the criteria laid down in Chapter III of Commission Regulation (EC) No 607/2009 laying down certain detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 479/2008 as regards protected designations of origin and geographical indications, traditional terms, labelling and presentation of certain wine sector products ([1]).

Within the context of this examination, the Commission will take into account notably the need to ensure fair competition and to avoid misleading consumers.

([1]) OJ L 193, 24.7.2009.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001236/13
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(6 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Necessità che l'UE incentivi l'assunzione di personale «in loco»

La pratica del personale «in affitto» a cui ricorrono imprese europee e agenzie interinali, che consiste nel distaccare personale in altri paesi UE, rischia di creare discriminazioni nei confronti dei lavoratori locali. La convenienza di tali operazioni è dovuta al fatto che, mentre la retribuzione del lavoratore è tutelata, dovendo essere parificata a quella del paese ospitante, le prestazioni fiscali e previdenziali vengono versate nel paese di provenienza del lavoratore. Questo può creare però gravi squilibri nelle casse della previdenza sociale del paese ospitante, oltre alla discriminazione dei lavoratori del paese dove la prestazione viene svolta, che si vedono rimpiazzati da lavoratori di altri paesi europei grazie alle economie a danno del fisco e della previdenza sociale dovuta alle diverse tassazioni vigenti.

La Commissione intende proporre, a tal proposito, un sistema correttivo per le problematiche legate ai contributi previdenziali dei lavoratori «in affitto»?

La Commissione, pur nell'ottica della tutela della mobilità del lavoro, intende incentivare le aziende ad assumere personale in loco anche per tutelare i sistemi previdenziali nazionali?

Risposta di Laszlo Andor a nome della Commissione
(26 marzo 2013)

In forza delle regole unionali sul coordinamento dei regimi di sicurezza sociale i lavoratori che si spostano all'interno dell'UE devono essere assoggettati ad un'unica legislazione in materia di sicurezza sociale. Il regime di sicurezza sociale applicabile a coloro che si spostano da uno Stato membro a un altro per motivi di lavoro è, in generale, quello fissato dalla legislazione dello Stato membro di occupazione.

Per incoraggiare la libera circolazione dei lavoratori e dei servizi, evitare oneri amministrativi inutili e costosi e altre complicazioni che non sarebbero nell'interesse dei lavoratori, delle imprese e delle autorità, le disposizioni unionali in vigore consentono certe eccezioni al principio generale menzionato sopra.

L'eccezione principale consiste nella disposizione volta a mantenere un lavoratore nel regime di sicurezza sociale dello Stato membro in cui l'impresa che gli dà lavoro opera di norma (lo Stato che lo distacca) mentre il lavoratore in questione è inviato da tale impresa in un altro Stato membro (lo Stato ospitante) per un periodo di tempo che è limitato a priori (massimo 24 mesi) a patto che continuino ad applicarsi certe condizioni.

Tali situazioni, che esonerano dal pagamento dei contributi assicurativi nello Stato ospitante, meglio note quali distacco dei lavoratori, sono disciplinate dall'articolo 12 del regolamento (CE) n. 883/2004. Poiché la persona distaccata rimane per l'intero periodo del distacco nel regime di sicurezza sociale dello Stato da cui è stato distaccato e non riceve prestazioni dallo Stato ospitante tale regola non può causare gravi squilibri sul finanziamento della sicurezza sociale dello Stato ospitante.

La Commissione non intende proporre cambiamenti delle regole attualmente in vigore sull'affiliazione alla sicurezza sociale dei lavoratori distaccati né incoraggiare le imprese ad assumere personale locale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001236/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: The need for the EU to promote the recruitment of local staff

The practice employed by European companies and temping agencies of recruiting temporary staff and posting them to other EU countries, risks discriminating against local workers. The advantage of such measures arises from the fact that, while a worker's wages are safeguarded and must be equal to those of the host country, tax and social security contributions are paid in the worker's country of origin. However, this can cause a serious imbalance in the social security funds in the host country, as well as discrimination against workers from the country where the service is provided, who are replaced by workers from other EU countries because of their economies, with a negative impact both on the tax authorities and on social security contributions, owing to the different applicable taxes.

Does the Commission intend to propose, in this regard, a corrective system to address the problems connected with social security contributions for temporary staff?

Albeit in the context of safeguarding job mobility, does the Commission intend to encourage companies to recruit local staff in order to safeguard national social security systems?

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

Under EU rules on the coordination of social security schemes, workers moving within the EU must be subject to a single social security legislation. The social security scheme applicable to those who move from one Member State to another for reasons of work, is, generally speaking, that established by the legislation of the Member State of employment.

In order to encourage the freedom of movement of workers and services, to avoid unnecessary and costly administration and other complications which would not be in the interests of workers, companies and authorities, the EU provisions in force allow for certain exceptions to the general principle referred to above.

The main exception is the requirement to maintain the attachment of a worker to the social security scheme of the Member State in which the undertaking which employs him/her normally operates (the posting State), whenever the worker concerned is sent by that undertaking to another Member State (the host State) for a period of time which from the outset is limited (max. of 24 months), and provided that certain conditions continue to apply.

These situations — which give exemption from the payment of insurance contributions in the host State — better known as posting of workers, are governed by Article 12 of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004. As the posted person remains attached throughout the posting period to the system of the posting State and does not receive any benefits from the host State, this rule cannot cause a serious imbalance in the social security funds of the host State.

The Commission does not intend to propose any changes to the current rules on social security affiliation of posted workers or to encourage companies to recruit local staff.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001237/13
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(6 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Controlli da parte dell'UE sui suini di provenienza USA

Da autorevoli fonti di stampa si apprende che la Commissione europea ha deciso di autorizzare, a partire dal prossimo 25 febbraio, l'importazione di suini vivi dagli Stati Uniti da destinare all'allevamento in Europa.

La Commissione ha dichiarato che le condizioni d'importazione poste dall'UE comprendono, tra l'altro, test individuali per la stomatite vescicolare, una malattia infettiva che colpisce diverse specie di animali e della quale sono stati individuati focolai negli Stati Uniti, seppur sporadici e limitati a determinate aree.

La Commissione può specificare dettagliatamente quali sono i test ai quali saranno sottoposti i suini, si presume prima della loro importazione nell'UE, per verificare la presenza di stomatite vescicolare?

La Commissione può comunicare per quale motivo è stata autorizzata l'importazione di questi animali in Europa e perché, per la loro destinazione nei paesi extra-UE, i suini devono transitare dall'Europa?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(18 marzo 2013)

Tenuto conto della distribuzione della malattia negli USA e delle pratiche di suinicoltura, la Commissione è giunta alla conclusione che il rischio di introduzione della stomatite vescicolare nell'UE in seguito all'importazione di suini vivi dagli Stati Uniti è minimo e può essere mitigato da misure sanitarie. Gli animali devono provenire da un allevamento esente da stomatite vescicolare in cui hanno soggiornato per almeno 21 giorni. Essi sono quindi confinati nel periodo di pre-esportazione per almeno 30 giorni in locali esenti dalla malattia e vengono esaminati prima di essere inviati nell'UE in linea con il codice dell'Ufficio internazionale delle epizoozie (OIE).

Sulla base della legislazione sanitaria UE applicabile alle importazioni, gli animali vivi che soddisfano le regole unionali di salute animale e che sono dichiarati ammissibili all'esportazione verso l'UE sono anche ammissibili al transito attraverso l'Unione durante il viaggio per raggiungere la destinazione finale in paesi terzi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001237/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: EU checks on swine from the USA

Reliable press sources have revealed that the European Commission has decided to authorise, from 25 February, the import of live swine from the United States for livestock farming in Europe.

The Commission has stated that the import conditions stipulated by the EU include, among other things, individual tests for vesicular stomatitis, an infectious disease which affects a range of animal species, outbreaks of which have been detected in the United States, albeit sporadic and confined to specific areas.

Can the Commission provide details about the tests to which the swine will be subjected, presumably prior to their being imported into the EU, to check for the presence of vesicular stomatitis?

Can the Commission state why the import of these animals to Europe was authorised and why, when intended for countries outside the EU, the swine must pass through Europe?

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

Taking into account the distribution of the disease in USA and the pig farming practices, the Commission concluded that the risk of introducing vesicular stomatitis into the EU through importing live pigs from the United States was minimal and can be mitigated by sanitary measures. The animals have to come from a vesicular stomatitis free holding, where they stay for at least 21 days. Then they are confined during the pre-export residence period, at least 30 days, in premises free of the disease and tested before they are sent to the EU in line with the world Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) Code.

According to the EU import legislation on health, live animals fulfilling the EU animal health rules and declared eligible for export to the EU, are also eligible for transit through the Union on their way to reach the final destination in third countries.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001239/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(6 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Reprogramação de verbas do Fundo de Coesão para a Madeira

Tendo em conta que:

— A Lei Orgânica n.° 2/2010, de 16.6.2010, que fixou os meios que asseguram o financiamento das iniciativas de apoio e reconstrução na Região Autónoma da Madeira na sequência da intempérie de fevereiro de 2010, prevê, no capítulo respeitante a Financiamento e limites de endividamento, no seu artigo 3.°, sob a epígrafe «Comparticipação do Governo», que o Governo de Portugal vai comparticipar com um valor total de 740 milhões de euros, entre os quais, parte será concretizada através de «b) reforço das verbas do Fundo de Coesão afetas à Região Autónoma da Madeira»;

— A mesma lei prevê, no seu artigo 5.°, o reforço das verbas previstas no Fundo de Coesão destinadas à Madeira no montante de 265 milhões de euros, através de reprogramação dos programas operacionais;

— Na sua resposta E-010436/2012, de 3.1.2013, refere-se que «*na sequência do atual exercício de reprogramação do Quadro de Referência Estratégico Nacional de Portugal (QREN), a região da Madeira receberá uma alocação total do Fundo de Coesão no valor de 235 milhões de euros para o período de 2007-2013 (contrariamente aos 100 milhões de euros inicialmente previstos)*»;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Quais são os projetos em concreto que se encontram abrangidos na citada reprogramação do Fundo de Coesão?

2. Quais são os montantes do investimento total a efetuar em cada um deles e qual é a parte que é objeto de financiamento comunitário através do Fundo de Coesão?

3. Os projetos que foram objeto da citada reprogramação são enquadráveis nas obras de reconstrução e requalificação na sequência do temporal de 20 de fevereiro de 2010?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(12 de março de 2013)

1. Na sequência da reprogramação do programa do Fundo de Coesão (Programa Operacional temático «Valorização do Território» — POVT), foram acrescentados vários novos projetos para o financiamento, na Madeira, no domínio da prevenção e gestão de riscos, tais como intervenções destinadas à correção do caudal dos principais cursos de água do Funchal (incluindo a reabilitação e a regularização das secções intermédias e finais), à regularização da enseada da Ribeira Brava, e estabilizaram-se outros cursos de água, nomeadamente as enseadas de Vasco Gil, São Vicente e da Ribeira Grande, e alargou-se ainda o cais no Funchal para melhorar a capacidade do porto da cidade.

Três novos grandes projetos foram incluídos no programa, a saber: a correção e a reorganização das secções finais dos caudais das principais enseadas do Funchal (Santa Luzia, João Gomes e S. João), a reorganização e a correção do caudal da enseada de Santa Luzia e a regularização da enseada de Ribeira Brava. Estão disponíveis informações mais pormenorizadas em linha: www.povt.qren.pt

2. Para os novos projetos de maior envergadura, os montantes indicativos são de 62 milhões de euros, 41 milhões de euros e 64 milhões de euros, respetivamente. Para outros projetos de menor envergadura, só pode ser indicada uma verba quando os projetos forem apresentados para aprovação à autoridade de gestão. A taxa de cofinanciamento relativa ao financiamento do Fundo de Coesão na Madeira é de 85 %.

3. A resposta a esta pergunta é afirmativa.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001239/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Reprogramming of cohesion fund allocation to Madeira

Organic Law No 2/2010 of 16 June 2010, which sets out the financing regulations for support and reconstruction initiatives in the Autonomous Region of Madeira following the storm of February 2010. In the chapter on financing and borrowing limits (Article 3), under the heading 'Government Co-financing', it stipulates that the Portuguese Government will co-finance EUR 740 million, of which part shall be applied by '(b) adding to the Cohesion Fund allocation to the Autonomous Region of Madeira'.

Article 5 of the same law increases the allocation to Madeira from the Cohesion Fund to EUR 265 million, by reprogramming the operational programmes.

In its answer to Written Question E-010436/2012, the Commission states that 'the region of Madeira, following the current strategic reprogramming of the Portuguese National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF), will be allocated a total of EUR 235 million from the Cohesion Fund for the 2007-2013 period (whereas it had initially been allocated EUR 100 million)'

Can the Commission say:

1. What specific projects are covered by the abovementioned reprogramming of the Cohesion Fund?

2. What is the total amount to be invested in each project and what part will be covered by Community funding through the Cohesion fund?

3. Whether the projects included in the abovementioned reprogramming come within the scope of reconstruction and rehabilitation work following the storm of 20 February 2010?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(12 March 2013)

1. Following the reprogramming of the Cohesion Fund programme (OP 'Valorização do Território'), several new projects were added for financing in Madeira in the field of prevention and risk management , such as interventions aiming at flow correction of the main streams of Funchal (including the rehabilitation and regularisation of intermediate and final sections), regularisation of the 'Ribeira Brava' creek, stabilising other streams such as the creeks of Vasco Gil, S. Vicente and Ribeira Grande and extending the wharf to improve the capacity of the harbour of Funchal.

Three new major projects are included in the programme, namely the correction and stream reorganisation of the final sections of the main Funchal creeks (Santa Luzia, João Gomes and S. João), reorganisation and stream correction of the creek of Santa Luzia and regularisation of the creek 'Ribeira Brava'. Further information is available online at: www.povt.qren.pt

2. For the new major projects, the indicative amounts are EUR 62 million, EUR 41 million and EUR 64 million respectively. For other projects that are not major projects, an indication can be given only when projects are submitted for approval to the managing authority. The co-financing rate for Cohesion Fund financing in Madeira is 85%.

3. Yes.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-001240/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(6 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Κίνδυνος κατάσχεσης νησιών και βραχονησίδων λόγω της εμπορικής αξιοποίησής τους

Νησιά και βραχονησίδες προς εμπορική αξιοποίηση δήλωσε ότι έχουν εντοπιστεί ο εκτελεστικός διευθυντής του Ταμείου Αξιοποίησης Ιδιωτικής Περιουσίας του Δημοσίου (ΤΑΙΠΕΔ), Ανδρέας Ταπραντζής, στο πρακτορείο ειδήσεων Bloomberg. Επισήμανε επιπλέον ότι αυτό θα γίνει με τη μορφή μακροχρόνιας ενοικίασης των νησιών από 30 έως 50 χρόνια με το ισχύον δίκαιο, όπως τόνισε, να μην επιτρέπει στο Ταμείο την ολοκληρωτική πώληση των νησιών. Το δημοσίευμα του πρακτορείου έκανε λόγο για σχετική λίστα 40 ακατοίκητων νησιών και βραχονησίδων. Ο διευθυντής του Ταμείου επιβεβαίωσε την ύπαρξη της λίστας προσθέτοντας ότι ο στόχος είναι να κατασκευαστούν σε αυτά ολοκληρωμένες τουριστικές κατοικίες και άλλες τουριστικές δραστηριότητες.

Η δήλωση αυτή έρχεται σε συνέχεια των δημόσιων παραινέσεων από πλευράς του τότε εκπροσώπου της στην τρόικα Σερβάζ Ντερούζ, τις οποίες είχα θέσει με τη P-001864/2011 ερώτησή μου υπόψη της Επιτροπής. Συγκεκριμένα, μετά από συνομιλίες του με τους «πιο σημαντικούς ανθρώπους της Ελλάδας που βρίσκονται εκτός πολιτικής» όπως ο ίδιος είχε τονίσει στις δημόσιες δηλώσεις του, ο κ. Ντερούζ υποστήριξε δημόσια την καθολική ιδιωτικοποίηση της δημόσιας περιουσίας και την πώληση παραλιών για την ανάπτυξη της τουριστικής κατοικίας.

Δεδομένου α) ότι μέσω της εμπορικής τους αξιοποίησης, τα συγκεκριμένα νησιά και βραχονησίδες θα παύσουν να αποτελούν τμήμα της δημόσιας περιουσίας (domaine public) και θα γίνουν κομμάτι της ιδιωτικής περιουσίας του δημοσίου και β) ότι το ελληνικό δημόσιο, στο πλαίσιο ομολογιακών και δανειακών συμβάσεων, δεν δικαιούται να χρησιμοποιεί τις ρήτρες προνομίων και ασυλιών που απολαμβάνει στο ελληνικό δίκαιο σχετικά με διεκδικήσεις επί της ιδιωτικής του περιουσίας, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Η εμπορική αξιοποίηση των νησιών με μακροχρόνια ενοικίαση για κατασκευή τουριστικών κατοικιών και άλλων τουριστικών δραστηριοτήτων, εκθέτει τα νησιά αυτά στον κίνδυνο κατάσχεσης από δανειστές της Ελλάδας, είτε κράτη είτε ιδιώτες, σε περίπτωση που ανακύψουν οικονομικές διαφορές με το ελληνικό δημόσιο;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(12 Μαρτίου 2013)

Τα κράτη μέλη οφείλουν να τηρούν την υποχρέωση που υπέχουν, βάσει της Συνθήκης, περί αποφυγής των υπερβολικών ελλειμμάτων, όπως προβλέπεται στο άρθρο 126 της ΣΛΕΕ και στις συναφείς αποφάσεις του Συμβουλίου. Η απόφαση σχετικά με τον τρόπο διόρθωσης των δημοσιονομικών ανισορροπιών και, στο ίδιο πλαίσιο, σχετικά με το ποιά περιουσιακά στοιχεία του Δημοσίου ή ποιές δημόσιες επιχειρήσεις θα ιδιωτικοποιηθούν και σε ποιό βαθμό, εμπίπτει στην αποκλειστική αρμοδιότητα των κρατών μελών.

Το ταμείο ιδιωτικοποιήσεων (ΤΑΙΠΕΔ) [«Ταμείο Αξιοποίησης Ιδιωτικής Περιουσίας του Δημοσίου»] δημιουργήθηκε με αποκλειστικό στόχο την εφαρμογή του προγράμματος που θεσπίστηκε από την κυβέρνηση, το οποίο προβλέπει την προσφορά ακινήτων για μακροχρόνια παραχώρηση και ανάπτυξη, με επαγγελματικό και διαφανή τρόπο. Οι εν λόγω μακροχρόνιες συμβάσεις παραχώρησης και ανάπτυξης ακινήτων συνάπτονται σε ανταγωνιστική βάση, σύμφωνα με προδιαγραφές που προβλέπουν ανοικτές διαδικασίες δημόσιων συμβάσεων και προσφορών και λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τρέχουσες διεθνείς βέλτιστες πρακτικές, καθώς και βασικά στοιχεία που χορηγούν, στο πλαίσιο της ως άνω διαδικασίας, εντεταλμένοι χρηματοοικονομικοί, νομικοί και τεχνικοί σύμβουλοι. Το ταμείο ιδιωτικοποιήσεων (ΤΑΙΠΕΔ) έχει την αποκλειστική αρμοδιότητα να εξασφαλίσει την ελαχιστοποίηση των κινδύνων που συνδέονται με τις εν λόγω συμβάσεις και να συστήσει κατάλληλο μηχανισμό διαιτησίας για την αποσόβησή τους.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001240/13
to the Commission
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Danger of islands and islets being appropriated following development projects

Andreas Taprantzis, Executive Director of the Hellenic Republic Asset Development Fund (TAIPED), has informed the Bloomberg News Agency that a number of islands and islets have been identified as suitable for development and that they could be leased on a long-term basis for periods of between 30 and 50 years, given that, under current legislation, TAIPED is not authorised to sell them outright. Bloomberg indicates that 40 uninhabited islands and islets have been listed as possible sites for projected tourist resorts and related facilities and this has been confirmed by Mr Taprantzis.

This comes in the wake of public pronouncements by Mr Servaas Deroose (at the time Commission representative to the Troika), to which I referred in my Question P-001864/2011 to the Commission. Following talks with the 'most important non-political figures in Greece', Mr Deroose publicly called for the comprehensive privatisation of public assets and the sale of beaches for tourist development purposes.

The development of the islands and islets in question will mean that they will cease to belong to the public domain and will instead enter into direct state ownership. Regarding claims on such property, the Greek Government will accordingly no longer be entitled to avail itself of statutory privilege and immunity clauses under bond and loan agreements.

In view of this:

Will the development and long-term lease of islands for projected tourist resorts and related facilities expose them to the dangers of appropriation by either state or private creditors should any disputes between them and the Greek Government arise?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(12 March 2013)

Member States have to comply with the Treaty obligation to avoid excessive deficits as expressed in Article 126 TFEU, and with the related Council decisions. The choice on how to correct the budgetary imbalances and, in this context, of what and how far public assets or companies should be privatised remains entirely with the Member States.

The privatisation fund (HRADF) was created with the sole objective of implementing the privatisation program established by the government, including the offering of real estate for long term concession and development, in a professional and transparent manner. These long term concession and development contracts for real estate are concluded on a competitive basis respecting open public procurement and bidding standards and taking into account current international best practices including key input given in the process by hired technical, legal and financial advisors. The privatisation fund (HRADF) has the exclusive responsibility to ensure that the risks associated to these contracts are minimised and to build an adequate arbitration mechanism in case such risks materialise.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001242/13
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: EU salaries

Antony Gravili, a spokesman for the Commission, recently told a news conference that comparing the salaries of some EU officials to that of German Chancellor Angela Merkel was unfair.

Can the Commission indicate what a fair comparison is?

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

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-1243/2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001243/13
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: EU salaries II

A recent article in the *New York Times* stated that President Barroso is paid a monthly base salary of EUR 25 351, while Chancellor Merkel is paid a base salary of EUR 21 000 per month.

Does the Commission agree that spokesman Antony Gravili's comment that 'No [EU] official earns more than Chancellor Merkel' is misleading?

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

The article in the *New York Times* ([1]) relates to an earlier article in *Die Welt* ([2]) which makes a comparison between the salaries of officials of the European Union and German federal officials and the German chancellor.

The German newspaper article which triggered the debate to which the Spokesman Antony Gravili had to reply referred explicitly to officials falling under the Staff Regulations with examples of functions fulfilled by officials like Head of Unit or Director and does therefore clearly not refer to members of the institutions like commissioners.

Therefore, the spokesperson's reply was clear and correct.

([1]) http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/05/business/global/eu-officials-salaries-draw-fire.html?_r=0
([2]) http://www.welt.de/wirtschaft/article113330591/4365-EU-Beamte-verdienen-mehr-als-die-Kanzlerin.html

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001246/13
an die Kommission
Ulrike Rodust (S&D)
(6. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: Lebendrupf bei Gänsen

Die Kommission hat bereits einige Male auf ähnliche Anfragen reagiert; allerdings liegen die letzten Anfragen hierzu schon eine Weile zurück, und daher soll erneut auf dieses Thema eingegangen werden. Besorgte Bürger haben mehrfach mitgeteilt, dass nach wie vor und trotz des auf Artikel 3 der Richtlinie 98/58/EG beruhenden Verbotes in der EU Lebendrupf bei Gänsen vorgenommen wird.

1. Hat die Kommission Erkenntnisse darüber, ob und in welchen Ländern Lebendrupf bei Gänsen vorgenommen wird?

2. Was unternimmt die Kommission, um dafür Sorge zu tragen, dass das Verbot von allen EU-Mitgliedstaaten eingehalten wird?

3. Laut der Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage P-2735/05 hat die Kommission im Jahr 2005 erwogen, ein Vertragsverletzungsverfahren gegen Ungarn einzuleiten, da die nationale Gesetzgebung zum Lebendrupf nicht mit den EU-Vorschriften im Einklang stand. Hat die Kommission derartige Schritte unternommen? Wie sieht die rechtliche Situation heute in Ungarn aus?

4. Wann hat die Kommission das letzte Mal Kontrollen zur Einhaltung des Verbotes durchgeführt, und was waren die Ergebnisse?

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

Die Kommission verweist auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftlichen Anfragen E-11289/2012 und E-011524/2012 ([1]) zur Rechtslage und den von der Kommission zur Beobachtung getroffenen Maßnahmen.

Zum jetzigen Zeitpunkt möchte die Kommission ihre Bemühungen auf die Durchsetzung der in der Strategie der EU für den Schutz und das Wohlergehen von Tieren 2012-2015 verankerten EU-Tierschutzvorschriften konzentrieren.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001246/13
to the Commission
Ulrike Rodust (S&D)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Live plucking of geese

The Commission has already responded several times to similar questions in the past, however this was some time ago and the time has come to revisit this issue. Concerned citizens have pointed out several times that geese are still being plucked alive in the EU, despite the ban based on Article 3 of Directive 98/58/EC.

1. Does the Commission have any information as to whether the practice of the live plucking of geese is still ongoing and, if so, in which countries?

2. What steps is the Commission taking to ensure that the ban is observed by all EU Member States?

3. According to the answer to Written Question P-2735/05, in 2005 the Commission considered initiating infringement proceedings against Hungary because national legislation in relation to the live plucking of poultry did not conform to EU legislation. Has the Commission taken such steps? What is the legal situation in Hungary at present?

4. When did the Commission last carry out checks on compliance with the ban and what were the results?

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

The Commission would refer to its answer to Written Question E-11289/2012 and E-011524/2012 ([1]) regarding the legal situation and the steps taken by the Commission to monitor the situation.

At this stage, the Commission wants to concentrate its efforts on improving enforcement of the EU animal welfare legislation as stated in the EU strategy on the protection and welfare of animals 2012-2015.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001251/13
to the Commission
Kay Swinburne (ECR)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Amber alert early warning system for missing children

In 2008 Members of the European Parliament adopted a declaration on emergency cooperation in recovering missing children, which supported the development of an early warning system for cases of child disappearances within the European Union.

I have recently been contacted by a Welsh constituent who has requested further information on the development of an EU early warning system for missing children, and in particular on how EU funding allocated to this cause has been spent.

Could the Commission provide further details of any funding it has allocated to the development of a Europe-wide alert scheme for missing children since the adoption of this European Parliament declaration in 2008?

Could the Commission also indicate whether it has carried out any analysis to assess the impact that this funding has had upon the handling of cases of missing children in Member States? If not, would it be willing to consider carrying out such analysis in the future?

Finally, as this College of Commissioners has always demonstrated a strong focus on the child rights agenda, can it outline what steps it intends to take going forward to support Member States in tackling cases of missing children?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2013)

The Commission has been promoting child abduction alert systems since its 2008 Staff working document entitled 'Best practice for launching a cross-border child abduction alert' ([1]). National systems are currently in place in one way or another in 11 Member States. Furthermore, funding has been provided for cooperation as well as creating new national abduction alert systems starting with EUR 1 million, allocated in 2009 to 4 projects to enhance cross-border cooperation and 2 (Romania, Belgium) to set up new national systems. Funding of EUR 600 000 was earmarked in 2012 and the same amount will be again available in 2013 for which a call for proposals will be published in the second quarter of 2013.

In addition, the Commission has awarded EUR 2.1 million in 2012 and set aside EU funding of EUR 4.5 million for 2013-2014 to set up new 116 000 hotlines as well as improve the services of existing ones. Currently 22 Member States have operational hotlines (3 of which were set up with EU funding), with a further 4 expected to be set up in 2013-2014 with the support of EU funding.

In order to assess the full extent of the issue of missing children, the Commission is carrying out an EU-wide study entitled: 'Mapping, data collection on missing children in the European Union' with the support of the European Parliament. The study will gather all official data available in the 27 Member States for the years 2009-2012 (where available), which will provide a better insight into the scale of the issue, trends over time and gather good practices to be shared with the Member States in shaping policy to address the issue. Results of the study are expected to be published by July 2013.

([1]) SEC(2008) 2912 final, http://ec.europa.eu/justice/funding/rights/call_10014/ramc_ag_annex_5_2008_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001252/13
to the Commission
Kay Swinburne (ECR)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: The import of 'stun guns' into the UK

The import of high-voltage electric 'stun guns' into the UK is prohibited. This notwithstanding, a BBC documentary, broadcast in the UK on 7 January 2013, suggests that stun guns are still being imported into the UK. The makers of the documentary claim that they successfully ordered a pair of stun guns from a German website and had them delivered to the UK.

I find the idea of stun guns being imported illegally into the UK incredibly alarming, especially as they seem to be originating in other EU countries, and I would like to know whether the Commission is aware of this problem.

I would also be grateful if the Commission could indicate whether it plans to investigate the possible import of stun guns into Member States in which they are prohibited.

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

Council Regulation (EC) No 1236 of 27 June 2005 strictly regulates the import, the export and the transfer within the European Union of portable electric shock devices. Annex II, point 2.1.2 of that regulation, does not require an authorisation for the export of stun guns when accompanying their user for the user's own personal protection.

The Commission is not aware of illegal imports and for the moment it is not planning investigation on the possible import of stun guns into Member States in which they are prohibited.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001253/13
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Sale of escape hoods for use by citizens

I have been contacted by a constituent who has manufactured an escape hood for use by EU citizens confronted by chemical, biological or radiological threats from terrorists, in accordance with the European Committee for Standardisation (CEN) guidelines contained in document CWA 16106:2010.

He has been threatened with prosecution by his local trading standards officers if he does not stop selling the product, on the grounds that citizens are not covered by the Personal Protective Equipment at Work (PPE) Regulations 1992, which only apply to workers, even though he is not marketing the hood to workers.

Is the Commission able to clarify that the PPE Regulations apply to workers only, and that no EU legislation exists to prevent citizens from purchasing escape hoods manufactured in accordance with CEN guidelines for themselves and their families?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2013)

The use of personal protective equipment (PPE) by workers at the workplace is subject to the minimum requirements of Directive 89/656/EEC ([1]) (implemented in the United Kingdom by the Personal Protective Equipment at Work Regulations 1992). This directive, which concerns the obligations of employers, must be distinguished from the EU legislation relating to the placing on the market of PPE that concerns the obligations of manufacturers.

The design, manufacture and placing on the market of escape hoods is subject to the PPE Directive 89/686/EEC ([2]) that applies to all types of PPE in its scope with no distinction between PPE intended for use by workers and PPE intended for use by consumers.

If PPE is in compliance with the provisions of the PPE Directive and bears the CE marking attesting its conformity, the Member States may not restrict its placing on the market.

Escape hoods intended for respiratory protection are classified as category III PPE subject to EC type-examination by a notified body and one of two procedures to ensure the quality of production.

The guidance provided in CEN Workshop agreement CWA 16106:2010 does not provide requirements for the design of PPE but refers to existing European harmonised standards that provide a presumption of conformity with the basic health and safety requirements of the PPE Directive that they cover.

([1]) European Directive 89/656/EEC on the minimum health and safety requirements for the use by workers of personal protective equipment at the workplace (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:1989:393:0018:0028:EN:PDF).

([2]) European Directive 89/686/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to personal protective equipment (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:1989L0686:20031120:EN:PDF).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001254/13
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: F-Gas Regulation

I have been contacted by a SME in my constituency that is concerned about the Commission proposal to review the Fluorinated Greenhouse Gases Regulation (COM(2012)0643).

My constituent is worried that the Commission proposal to ban hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) with a global warming potential (GWP) of 150 or more in domestic refrigerators by 1 January 2015 is too stringent for smaller businesses. The proposal may force small players out of business, as they do not have the resources to switch to alternative refrigerants in time.

1. Has the Commission taken into account the impact of the proposed HFC ban for domestic refrigerators (Annex III to the proposal) on small businesses, and will it consider an extension of the deadline for very small businesses?

2. In addition, can the Commission confirm that the ban on pre-charging equipment (Article 12 of the proposal) will not apply to products that fall under the ban on domestic refrigerators, and that manufacturers will still be able to fill domestic refrigerators with HFCs with a GWP of under 150 once the ban on domestic refrigerators applies? Can the Commission clarify the link between the two articles of the proposal?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(25 March 2013)

1. The vast majority of EU domestic refrigerators and freezers are produced without containing any HFC (98.5% in 2010 and likely to be even higher today). Hence a phase-out of HFCs is already nearly achieved in this sector. According to the Commission's assessment ([1]), the current abatement costs to substitute for HFC systems in new equipment are very low (EUR 1.04 per tonne of CO_2 equivalent). SMEs are not forced to replace existing equipment ahead of time but only when the old equipment breaks down and a new investment must be made anyway. Slightly higher investment costs (2%) are compensated by energy savings so that additional annual costs for the end-user are practically nil (EUR 0.004 per item of equipment). Therefore this ban should not pose particular problems to smaller businesses with regard to resources for switching to alternatives. Hence, there is no reason for an extension of the proposed deadline.

2. The proposed ban on pre-charging equipment only applies to equipment that is not hermetically sealed. Domestic refrigerators are produced as hermetically sealed systems which means that the refrigerant circuit is already closed during production in the factory and is not refilled afterwards. Therefore, there is no overlap between the two measures.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/f-gas/legislation/docs/swd_2012_364_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001255/13
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Alleged anti-competitive practices of hoteliers in Rhodes

I have been contacted by a constituent who owns a villa on the island of Rhodes, where the Greek national tourism organisation (EOT) is changing the locks and repossessing the properties of those owners who do not have a valid EOT licence, which they must obtain if they intend to let their property to holidaymakers.

The conditions for being issued with an EOT licence are so strict that most private villa owners do not qualify (these requirements include having a lifeguard in attendance at your pool, the villa not being in a complex of several other properties, and having rooms of a certain size).

My constituent believes that this is an attempt by hoteliers, who occupy all the seats on the EOT panel in Rhodes, to force holidaymakers into using their hotels.

What requirements are there under European law to allow free competition between villa owners and hoteliers, and what measures would the Commission be willing to propose in order to prevent competition being restricted in these ways?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(16 April 2013)

Article 101 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) prohibits agreements between undertakings, decisions by associations of undertakings and concerted practices which prevent or restrict competition in the EU internal market.

Moreover, Article 102 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) is aimed at preventing undertakings who hold a dominant position in a market from abusing that position.

The requirement to obtain a licence to rent out a holiday home in Greece is set by law. The conditions for obtaining such a license are designed to ensure that holiday accommodations are of a sufficient standard, which is a legitimate public interest objective. The Greek national tourism organisation (EOT) is the state agency for the tourism sector, which is supervised by the Ministry for Culture and Tourism. It has been given the responsibility to issue licences according to the applicable standards. It appears therefore that the conditions for obtaining an EOT license reflect the exercise of public authority, which cannot be addressed under EU competition rules, as such rules apply in principle only to the behaviour of undertakings ([1]).

([1]) See Case C-113/07P, *Selex Sistemi Integrati* SpA v *Commission*, ECR I-02207.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-001256/13
alla Commissione
Patrizia Toia (S&D)
(6 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Gasdotto tra la Sicilia e Malta

Il governo di Malta sta esaminando un collegamento tramite gasdotto con Ragusa, in Sicilia. I costi sono elevati e, secondo la stampa di Malta, sono disponibili finanziamenti UE.

1. La Commissione ha approvato detto progetto? In caso affermativo, in quale fase si è giunti e quando si prevede di iniziare e finire?

2. Può la Commissione far sapere quale sarà il costo di siffatto progetto? I finanziamenti sono già stati resi disponibili?

3. Ove non lo siano, può la Commissione indicare un calendario realistico per la loro assegnazione?

4. Quando avrà inizio la relativa procedura di appalto?

5. Quale quota del progetto sarà cofinanziata dall'Unione europea? In quale programma rientra?

Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(4 marzo 2013)

Il progetto di gasdotto in questione non è stato ancora avviato e la Commissione non ha finora fornito alcun finanziamento.

Tuttavia, la Commissione sta considerando la possibilità di offrire alcuni finanziamenti nell'ambito dell'attuale programma TEN-E, per uno studio di fattibilità e per un'analisi costi/benefici in merito a un gasdotto tra Malta e l'Italia (Sicilia).

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001256/13
to the Commission
Patrizia Toia (S&D)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Gas pipeline between Sicily and Malta

The government of Malta is considering a gas pipeline link with Ragusa in Sicily. Costs are high and, according to the press in Malta, EU funding is available.

Has the Commission approved this project? If so, what stage has it reached and when is it envisaged to start and finish?

Can the Commission say how much this project will cost? Have the funds already been made available?

If they have not, can the Commission give a realistic timeline for their availability?

When will the tendering process for the project begin?

How much of the project will be co-financed by the EU? Under which programme does it fall?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(4 March 2013)

The gas pipeline project in question has not started and the Commission has provided no funding up to the present time.

The Commission is, however, considering providing some funding, under the current TEN-E scheme, for a Feasibility Study and Cost-Benefit Analysis of a gas pipeline between Malta and Italy (Sicily).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001748/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(20 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — L'UE tuteli i diritti di proprietà dei cittadini europei in Egitto

Premesso che in un recente articolo il Sunday Telegraph segnala come un decreto — approvato a settembre dal governo egiziano dei Fratelli Mussulmani — imponga ai proprietari con doppia nazionalità di vendere entro sei mesi gli immobili posseduti a Sharm El Sheik e nel Sinai a cittadini «nati da genitori egiziani». Il decreto rappresenta una spada di Damocle sospesa sulle teste dei 600 italiani proprietari di appartamenti o villette nella località turistica del Sinai.

Da settembre, molti proprietari non egiziani presenti a Sharm El Sheik ricevono richieste pressanti di vendere le loro proprietà.

Da riunioni svolte, anche alla presenza di personale diplomatico UE, sarebbe emerso che le attuali norme non dovrebbero avere carattere retroattivo e che quindi coloro che hanno acquistato prima del 2005 dovrebbero avere diritto di usufrutto per 99 anni; ma, dato il clima di instabilità politico-istituzionale, la situazione è tutt'altro che tranquillizzante per i proprietari europei.

Il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante non intende intervenire a difesa dei diritti di proprietà acquisiti dai cittadini europei in Egitto, ottenendo non solo assicurazioni verbali in tal senso dalle competenti autorità del Cairo, ma anche un riconoscimento formale e burocratico attraverso la remissione degli atti e un decreto che stabilisca in maniera inequivocabile «erga omnes» il principio di non retroattività delle norme in questione?

Risposta congiunta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(24 aprile 2013)

L'AR/VP segue con la massima attenzione la questione dei diritti di proprietà in Egitto.

Il 3 febbraio 2013 l'UE ha presentato al ministero degli Esteri egiziano una nota verbale in cui chiedeva chiarimenti in merito al decreto legge n. 14/2012 sullo sviluppo integrato della penisola del Sinai e alla decisione n. 959, pubblicata nella Gazzetta ufficiale il 13 settembre 2012, che introduce i regolamenti esecutivi del decreto legge.

In risposta alla nota verbale, il ministero degli Esteri egiziano ha confermato che il decreto legge n. 14/2012 è stato convertito e che i suoi regolamenti esecutivi non hanno effetto retroattivo. Poiché la decisione è stata adottata il 13 settembre 2012 ed entra in vigore dopo sei mesi, il decreto si applica dal 13 marzo 2013.

Il pacchetto di 5 miliardi di euro annunciato il 14 novembre 2012 nell'ambito della task force UE-Egitto è costituito dagli impegni combinati provenienti dai finanziamenti bilaterali 2012-2013 dell'UE a titolo della politica europea di vicinato, dall'assistenza macrofinanziaria dell'Unione, la cui erogazione è subordinata a un accordo tra l'Egitto e l'FMI, e da eventuali assegnazioni della BEI e della BERS.

In linea di massima tutti i programmi di cooperazione dell'UE possono essere sospesi se il paese beneficiario viola un obbligo connesso al rispetto dei diritti umani, dei principi democratici e dello Stato di diritto e nei casi di corruzione gravi. L'UE assicura pertanto un monitoraggio e un'analisi costanti della situazione in loco mediante stretti contatti e un intenso dialogo con governo, opposizione, rappresentanti della società civile e altre parti interessate.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001258/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Discrimination by the Egyptian Government against property owners deemed not to be 'pure' Egyptian

I have been contacted by a constituent whose husband has dual British and Egyptian nationality. They have both worked hard to earn the money to buy a residence in Sinai, but now face the prospect of being forced from their homes by a decree that was passed on 13 October 2012 forbidding anyone but 'pure' Egyptians from owning property in Sinai (including resorts such as Sharm el-Sheikh) from April 2013.

Will the High Representative protest to the Egyptian Government in the strongest possible terms about this discrimination against those deemed not to be 'pure Egyptians'?

What action is the EU taking to protect its citizens who currently own properties in Egypt from being forced to make a disorderly and unfairly imposed exit from the region, with a flood of properties being put on the market over the next few months?

Will the High Representative consider blocking aid payments and loans to Egypt (such as the recently agreed EUR 5 billion loan) until that country commits itself to respecting the property rights of EU citizens?

Question for written answer E-001748/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(20 February 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Need for the EU to protect European citizens' property rights in Egypt

According to a recent *Sunday Telegraph* article, a decree issued in September by Egypt's Muslim Brotherhood-led government requires dual nationals who own property in Sharm el-Sheik and the Sinai Peninsula to sell it within six months to citizens 'born to Egyptian parents'. The decree is a sword of Damocles hanging over the heads of the 600 Italians who own apartments or villas in Sinai's tourist communities.

Since September, many non-Egyptian owners in Sharm el-Sheik have been receiving urgent requests for them to sell their property.

From meetings that have been held, including with EU diplomatic staff present, it would seem that the current rules should not be applied retroactively and hence that anyone who bought property before 2005 should have the right of usufruct for 99 years; however, given the climate of political and institutional instability, the situation is anything but reassuring for European property owners.

Will the Vice-President/High Representative not intervene in order to protect the property rights acquired by European citizens in Egypt, obtaining not only verbal assurances along those lines from the competent authorities in Cairo, but also a formal acknowledgement through the withdrawal of suit and the issuing of a decree establishing on an unequivocal *erga omnes* basis the principle of non-retroactivity of the rules in question?

Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(24 April 2013)

The HR/VP has followed closely the issue on property rights in Egypt.

The EU presented a verbal note on 3 February 2013 to the Egyptian Ministry of Foreign Affairs asking for clarifications concerning the Decree-Law No 14/2012 regarding the Integrated Development of the Sinai Peninsula and Decision No 959 published in the Official Gazette on 13 September 2012 introducing the Executive regulations for this Decree-Law.

The Egyptian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in reply to the verbal note, confirmed that the Decree-Law No 14/2012 is confirmed and its executive regulations are not enforceable retroactively. Accordingly, given that the decision was adopted on 13 September 2012 and enters into force after six months it is applicable from 13 March 2013.

Regarding the EUR 5 billion package that was announced in the framework of the EU-Egypt Task Force on 14 November 2012, it consists of the combined commitments for 2012-13 from the EU bilateral ENP funding, EU Macro-Financial Assistance — for which an Egypt-IMF arrangement is a precondition — and the possible allocations of the EIB and the EBRD.

In principle all EU cooperation programmes can be suspended if the beneficiary country breaches an obligation relating to the respect for human rights, democratic principles and the rule of law and in serious cases of corruption. Accordingly, the EU is continuously monitoring and analysing the situation on the ground in close contact and dialogue with the government, opposition, civil society representatives and other key stakeholders.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001259/13
à la Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(6 février 2013)

Objet: Gestion des sites Natura 2000 forestiers: éligibilité des communes forestières à l'article 31 du projet de règlement de développement rural

En France, les 11 000 communes propriétaires de forêts sont responsables de la mise en œuvre de la gestion multifonctionnelle de leur patrimoine forestier visant à la fois la valorisation économique de la ressource bois, et la fourniture de services sociaux et environnementaux.

L'article L 121-2 du code forestier stipule que la politique forestière privilégie les mesures incitatives et contractuelles, notamment par la recherche de contreparties pour les services rendus en assurant les fonctions environnementale et sociale lorsqu'il en résulte des contraintes ou des surcoûts d'investissement et de gestion, faisant écho à l'action 11 de la stratégie de la biodiversité pour 2020 de l'Union européenne selon laquelle «[les] États membres et la Commission favoriseront des mécanismes novateurs (par exemple, les paiements en contrepartie des services écosystémiques), en vue de financer le maintien et le rétablissement des services écosystémiques fournis par les forêts multifonctionnelles».

Les communes propriétaires de forêts contribuent largement au réseau de sites Natura 2000 forestiers (26 % de la forêt communale en France). En tant que responsables de la gestion des sites forestiers, elles supportent des surcoûts de gestion et d'exploitation, liés à la mise en œuvre des directives Natura 2000 en forêt, lesquels compromettent les fragiles équilibres des filières de valorisation des bois et, donc, le maintien d'emplois et d'activités dans les territoires ruraux.

Les surcoûts d'exploitation engendrent des méventes des bois issus de parcelles sous statut de protection Natura 2000. Les mesures incitatives pour la gestion des sites sont en outre supportées par les communes, du fait du système d'exonération de la part communale et intercommunale de la taxe sur le foncier non bâti pour les propriétaires qui s'engagent à respecter les bonnes pratiques de gestion des sites.

En Allemagne, une évaluation des impacts de la gestion des sites Natura 2000 forestiers sur la gestion durable forestière a estimé le surcoût à une moyenne de 50 €/ha/an. L'article 31 du projet de règlement relatif au soutien au développement rural par le Feader prévoit de compenser ce surcoût, mais uniquement lorsqu'il s'agit de propriété privée.

Une exclusion de la forêt communale des dispositions prévues à cet article risquerait de compromettre en même temps la gestion multifonctionnelle et la préservation des sites Natura 2000 forestiers. Ne conviendrait-il pas de rendre les communes forestières éligibles audit article, pour une mise en œuvre effective des directives Natura 2000 en forêt, avec l'implication pleine et entière des collectivités locales?

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(10 avril 2013)

La Commission signale que l'article 31 de sa proposition de nouveau règlement relatif au développement rural ([1]) concerne les opérateurs privés et accorde une importance particulière à la protection des sites Natura 2000 du secteur forestier, des paiements étant prévus à cette fin au titre de Natura 2000.

Comme c'est le cas actuellement, il est proposé que les paiements au titre de Natura 2000 compensent les coûts supplémentaires supportés et les pertes de revenus subies dans les sites Natura 2000 en raison des désavantages et des obligations particulières découlant de la mise en œuvre des directives applicables en la matière.

Toutefois, la Commission a proposé que les municipalités puissent être admises au bénéfice de l'aide au titre d'une série d'autres mesures liées au secteur forestier, dont la mesure intitulée «services forestiers, environnementaux et climatiques et conservation des forêts». Cette dernière pourrait être utilisée pour compenser les engagements volontaires pris par les municipalités qui vont au-delà des obligations juridiques dans les sites Natura 2000.

([1]) Proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil relatif au soutien au développement rural par le Fonds européen agricole pour le développement rural (Feader) — COM(2011)627 final: (http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-post-2013/legal-proposals/com627/627_fr.pdf).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001259/13
to the Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Management of Natura 2000 forest sites: eligibility of forest municipalities under Article 31 of the draft regulation for rural development

France's 11 000 forest-owning municipalities are responsible for the multifunctional management of their forests, designed to allow commercial use of the timber resources and provide social and environmental services.

Article L 121-2 of the forestry code stipulates that forestry policy favours incentive and contractual measures, which include the sourcing of counterparts to provide the services, while municipalities perform environmental and social functions where they result in constraints or additional investment or management costs, echoing action 11b of the European Union Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 which states that '[the] Member states and the Commission will foster innovative mechanisms (e.g. Payments for Ecosystem Services) to finance the maintenance and restoration of ecosystem services provided by multifunctional forests.'

Forest-owning municipalities make a significant contribution to the Natura 2000 forest sites network (26 % of communal forests in France). As the parties responsible for the management of forest sites, they bear the additional management and operational costs related to the implementation of Natura 2000 forest directives which compromise the fragile balance of wood value chains and, consequently, the preservation of jobs and businesses in rural areas.

Additional operational costs result in poor sales of wood from plots of land protected by their Natura 2000 status. Incentives for the management of these sites are also supported by the municipalities on account of the exemption from the municipal and inter-municipal portion of tax for owners who undertake to observe good site management practice.

In Germany, an evaluation of the impact of the management of Natura 2000 forest sites on sustainable forest management set the average additional cost at EUR 50/ha/year. Article 31 of the draft regulation to provide support for rural development through the EAFRD plans to offset these additional costs, but only where private property is concerned.

The exclusion of municipal forests from the provisions of this article would risk jeopardising the multifunctional management and preservation of Natura 2000 forest sites. Would it not be more appropriate to make forest-owning municipalities eligible under this article for effective implementation of the Natura 2000 forest directives, with the full and complete involvement of local authorities?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2013)

The Commission notes that Article 31 of its proposal for a new Rural Development Regulation ([1]) concerns private operators and attaches due importance to ensuring protection of forest-related Natura 2000 areas through Natura 2000 payments.

As in the current period, it is proposed that Natura 2000 payments will offer compensation for additional costs and income forgone arising from disadvantages and specific obligations in Natura 2000 areas related to the implementation of the relevant Directives.

However, the Commission has proposed municipalities as eligible beneficiaries for support under a range of other forestry-related measures, including 'Forest-environmental and climate services and forest conservation'. This measure could be used to compensate municipalities' undertaking voluntary commitments going beyond legal obligations in Natura 2000 areas.

([1]) Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) (COM(2011) 627 final/2): http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-post-2013/legal-proposals/com627/627_en.pdf

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001260/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(6 février 2013)

Objet: Nanoparticules — effet du nano-argent in vitro et in vivo

Une étude publiée en 2012 dans *Toxicological Sciences* a testé l'effet du nano-argent in vitro et in vivo, injecté dans le sang de rats. Conclusion: les nanoparticules ont été retrouvées jusque dans le noyau des hépatocytes, des cellules du foie, et sont hautement cytotoxiques (altérant des cellules) dans cet organe vital. «Cette étude présente des preuves de la toxicité et du caractère inflammatoire potentiel des nanoparticules d'argent dans le foie, après ingestion».

1. Quelles est la position de la Commission concernant les résultats de cette étude et sur cesnanoparticules spécifiques?

2. La Commission peut-elle garantir qu'elles sont sans aucun danger pour le citoyen?

Réponse donnée par M. Potočnik au nom de la Commission
(11 avril 2013)

L'étude mentionnée ([1]) fait partie d'un ensemble de travaux visant à mieux comprendre les nanoparticules d'argent, et plus généralement le degré de toxicité des nanoparticules pour l'homme. Sa contribution se situe principalement au niveau de la mise au point et de la vérification de méthodes in vitro pour des nanomatériaux permettant de diminuer, de perfectionner et de remplacer les études chez l'animal. Les résultats de l'étude peuvent difficilement être mis en rapport avec l'exposition réelle.

La présence de nanoparticules d'argent sur le marché de l'Union européenne et les aspects de sécurité qui y sont liés sont présentés dans le document de travail des services de la Commission ([2]) accompagnant le deuxième examen réglementaire relatif aux nanomatériaux ([3]). Il subsiste certaines inquiétudes concernant les nanoparticules d'argent, et la Commission a mandaté le CSRSEN ([4]) pour qu'il évalue leurs effets sur la sécurité, la santé et l'environnement ainsi que leur rôle dans la résistance antimicrobienne ([5]). Les nanoparticules d'argent seront également évaluées dans le contexte de l'évaluation des substances de l'argent, qui aura lieu dans le cadre du Plan d'action continu communautaire ([6]) du règlement de l'UE sur les substances chimiques ([7]).

([1]) «Effects of Silver Nanoparticles on the Liver and Hepatocytes In Vitro» (incidence des nanoparticules d'argent sur le foie et les hépatocytes in vitro) Toxicol. Sci. (2013) 131 (2): 537-547. Doi: 10.1093/toxsci/kfs306.
([2]) SWD(2012) 288 final: http://ec.europa.eu/nanotechnology/pdf/second_regulatory_review_on_nanomaterials_-_staff_working_paper_accompanying_com(2012)_572.pdf, pour l'évaluation des nanoparticules d'argent, voir p. 57.
([3]) COM(2012) 572 final, disponible sur le site: http://ec.europa.eu/nanotechnology/policies_en.html
([4]) Comité scientifique des risques sanitaires émergents et nouveaux.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific_committees/emerging/docs/scenihr_q_027.pdf
([6]) http://echa.europa.eu/fr/information-on-chemicals/evaluation/community-rolling-action-plan.
([7]) REACH, JO L 396 du 30.12.2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001260/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Nanoparticles — effects of nanosilver *in vitro* and *in vivo*

In 2012, a study published in the journal *Toxicological Sciences* tested *in vitro* and *in vivo* the effects of nanosilver injected into the bloodstream of rats. Conclusion: nanoparticles were found to be present even inside the nuclei of hepatocytes, the cells of the liver. Furthermore they are highly cytotoxic and liable to cause damage to the cells in this vital organ. 'This research provides proof of the toxicity and potential inflammatory nature of silver nanoparticles in the liver following ingestion.'

1. What is the Commission's position on the results of this study and on these specific nanoparticles?

2. Can the Commission guarantee that they pose no danger to people?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(11 April 2013)

The referenced study ([1]) is one of many that contribute to the better understanding of nanosilver, as well as the more general nanoparticle toxicity in humans. Its contribution lies primarily in the further development and verification of *in vitro* methods for nanomaterials that supports future reduction, refinement and replacement of animal studies. The results of the study are difficult to link with actual exposure.

The presence of silver nanoparticles on the EU market, as well as the related safety aspects are presented in the Commission staff working paper ([2]) accompanying the 2nd Regulatory Review on nanomaterials ([3]). Certain concerns with nanosilver remain, and the Commission has issued a mandate to SCENIHR ([4]) to assess safety, health and environmental effects of nanosilver and its role in antimicrobial resistance ([5]). Nanosilver will also be evaluated as part of the substance evaluation of silver under the Community Rolling Action Plan ([6]) of the EU chemicals regulation ([7]).

([1]) 'Effects of Silver Nanoparticles on the Liver and Hepatocytes In Vitro', *Toxicol. Sci.* (2013) 131 (2): 537-547. Doi: 10.1093/toxsci/kfs306
([2]) SWD(2012) 288 final, http://ec.europa.eu/nanotechnology/pdf/second_regulatory_review_on_nanomaterials_-_staff_working_paper_accompanying_com(2012)_572.pdf, for nanosilver assessment see p. 57.
([3]) COM(2012) 572 final, available at http://ec.europa.eu/nanotechnology/policies_en.html
([4]) Scientific Committee on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific_committees/emerging/docs/scenihr_q_027.pdf
([6]) http://echa.europa.eu/en/information-on-chemicals/evaluation/community-rolling-action-plan
([7]) REACH, OJ L 396, 30.12.2006.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001261/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(6 février 2013)

Objet: Textile indonésien et conditions de travail en Asie

Dans le textile, les délocalisations sont un phénomène ancien. Les usines textiles du Nord de la France et de Belgique ont fermé tout d'abord au profit du Portugal, de la Tunisie, de la Turquie, puis de l'Indonésie, du Viêt Nam, du Cambodge, en passant par le Bangladesh et la Chine. À la fin des années 1990, au moment de la chute de Suharto, l'Indonésie a été traversée par de grandes grèves dans les usines textiles. Aujourd'hui, beaucoup de ces usines ont fermé, délocalisées vers d'autres pays d'Asie où le coût du travail était moindre. Et cela continue, chaque pays subissant à son tour la délocalisation vers un autre pays.

Si économiquement, certaines multinationales, leurs patrons et leurs actionnaires y voient un grand profit, il en va tout autrement des travailleurs européens, mais aussi des travailleurs asiatiques. En raison des hausses de prix des biens de consommation courante, les ouvriers ne peuvent plus subvenir à leurs besoins de base. Ils réclament non seulement un salaire minimum, mais un salaire décent, c'est-à-dire le minimum vital pour eux et leur famille, car il leur devient impossible de se nourrir, même en faisant des heures supplémentaires. En 2009, les revenus étaient estimés à 1 USD par jour au Bangladesh, à 2 USD en Inde, au Viêt Nam, au Cambodge et au Pakistan, et de 2 à 4 USD en Chine, en Indonésie et en Thaïlande.

1. La Commission encourage-t-elle, lors des échanges bilatéraux, les autorités des divers pays asiatiques à fixer le salaire nécessaire pour assurer le minimum vital?

2. La Commission est-elle aussi partisane de fixer un salaire minimum commun en Asie en fonction du coût de la vie et de la taille des familles dans chaque pays? Partage-t-elle l'avis selon lequel cette revendication est légitime pour résister à la concurrence entre pays d'Asie et au chantage à la délocalisation fait par les donneurs d'ordre?

3. La révolte des travailleurs du textile correspond à la violence de leur exploitation. La Commission, dans la série d'accords qu'elle conclut en ce moment avec les pays asiatiques, inclut-elle un respect strict des conditions de travail des personnes qui fabriquent les produits exportés en Europe?

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

L'Union européenne s'emploie avec ses partenaires asiatiques ainsi qu'au sein de l'OIT et de l'ONU à la promotion d'un travail décent pour tous, comprenant des emplois productifs et librement choisis, qui assurent des moyens de subsistances durables, des droits au travail, une protection sociale et un dialogue social. Ces questions sont abordées au sein de l'ASEM, la rencontre Asie-Europe. La Commission n'est cependant pas en position de soutenir l'introduction, en Asie, d'un salaire minimum commun en tant que tel.

La Commission encourage la ratification et l'application effective des normes fondamentales du travail de l'OIT ainsi que des conventions de l'OIT en matière de santé et de sécurité des travailleurs et elle a également mené à bien des projets en collaboration avec cette même organisation dans ces domaines.

L'UE pousse les entreprises à adopter les normes les plus élevées en matière de conduite commerciale responsable, dans le respect des instruments en faveur de la responsabilité sociale des entreprises, en particulier ceux qui ont été adoptés par l'ONU, l'OIT et l'OCDE.

L'UE a pour objectif d'inclure un chapitre sur le commerce et le développement durable dans les négociations en cours sur l'accord de libre-échange, afin de fournir un cadre général, reposant sur des normes et accords reconnus au niveau international, dont font partie les normes fondamentales du travail de l'OIT.

La Commission soutient également les partenaires sociaux européens du secteur textile dans leur dialogue social sectoriel qui a pris position sur la sous-traitance responsable et elle applique leur accord-cadre, le code de conduite européen incitant les entreprises et les travailleurs de l'UE à respecter les normes de l'OIT.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001261/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Indonesian textile industry and working conditions in Asia

Offshoring has long been common practice in the textile industry. Portugal, Tunisia and Turkey were the first countries to benefit from the closure of textile factories in Northern France and Belgium. Then it was the turn of Bangladesh and China, followed later by Indonesia, Vietnam and Cambodia. In the late 1990s, at the time of the fall of President Suharto, major strikes took place in Indonesian textile factories. Many of these factories have now closed and relocated to other Asian countries with lower labour costs. And so it continues, with each country in turn suffering the effects of offshoring to a different country.

Although some multinationals, together with their bosses and shareholders, see great economic benefits in this, it is a completely different matter for both European and Asian workers. Because of the rising price of everyday consumer goods, blue-collar workers are no longer able to meet their basic needs. They are demanding not only minimum pay, but decent pay, in other words the essential minimum which they and their families need to survive, as it is becoming impossible for them to feed themselves, even by working overtime. In 2009, incomes were estimated to be USD 1 a day in Bangladesh, USD 2 in India, Vietnam, Cambodia and Pakistan, and USD 2-4 in China, Indonesia and Thailand.

1. During bilateral exchanges, does the Commission encourage the governments of various Asian countries to fix pay in such a way as to ensure there is enough to live on?

2. Does the Commission also favour setting a common minimum wage in Asia according to the cost of living and the size of families in each country? Does it share the opinion that this is a legitimate demand in order to resist competition between Asian countries and counteract blackmailing by outsourcers that forces suppliers to offshore production?

3. Rebellion on the part of textile workers matches the violence with which they are exploited. In the series of agreements now being concluded with Asian countries, does the Commission include strict compliance with working conditions for people manufacturing products exported to Europe?

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

The EU works with its Asian partners and within ILO and UN to promote decent work for all including productive and freely chosen employment with jobs allowing sustainable livelihoods, rights at work, social protection and social dialogue. These issues are addressed within ASEM, the Europe and Asia meeting. The Commission, however, is not in a position to support introduction of a common minimum wage in Asia as such.

The Commission promotes the ratification and effective implementation of the ILO core labour standards as well as ILO Conventions dealing with occupational health and safety and has carried out joint projects with the ILO to this regard.

The EU encourages companies to adopt the highest standards of responsible business conduct in accordance with internationally recognised Corporate Social Responsibility instruments, particularly those adopted within UN, ILO and OECD.

The EU aims at including a chapter on trade and sustainable development in ongoing Free Trade Agreement (FTA) negotiations, to provide an overall framework based on internationally recognised standards and agreements, including the ILO's core labour standards.

The Commission also supports European social partners of the textile sector in their sectoral social dialogue which has taken position on responsible subcontracting and implements their European code of conduct framework agreement encouraging EU companies and workers to comply with ILO standards.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001262/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(6 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Έρευνα για απάτη σε συγχρηματοδοτούμενο έργο

Από τις ελληνικές εισαγγελικές αρχές ασκήθηκαν ποινικές διώξεις κατά προσώπων, τόσο της αναθέτουσας δημόσιας επιχείρησης όσο και της αναδόχου εταιρίας, έργου που αφορά τη διάνοιξη της σήραγγας Λιανοκλαδίου-Δομοκού στη Φθιώτιδα. Οι κατηγορίες σε βάρος των προσώπων αυτών είναι ότι συνέπραξαν σε πληθώρα αντισυμβατικών ενεργειών και παραλείψεων, στις οποίες περιλαμβάνονται, καταβολή αρκετών δεκάδων εκατομμυρίων ευρώ για διπλοπληρωμένες εργασίες, καταβολή παρανόμων αποζημιώσεων, παράλειψη είσπραξης ποινικών ρητρών, οι οποίες τελικά κατέπεσαν, κ.λπ.

Με δεδομένο ότι το έργο ήταν συγχρηματοδοτούμενο, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Μπορεί να παρουσιάσει την πρόοδο του συγκεκριμένου έργου, όσον αφορά στα χρηματοοικονομικά του στοιχεία (δεσμεύσεις, απορροφήσεις, κ.λπ.) και την αντίστοιχη πρόοδο του φυσικού αντικειμένου;

2. Έχει ενημερωθεί για τη συγκεκριμένη υπόθεση; Σε ποιο στάδιο βρίσκεται η δικαστική διαδικασία σε εθνικό επίπεδο; Έχουν στοιχειοθετηθεί κατηγορίες στις εταιρίες ως νομικά πρόσωπα;

3. Ερευνά την περίπτωση να έχει διπλοπληρώσει έργα ή και τις άλλες παραβάσεις; Τι προβλέπουν οι σχετικοί κανονισμοί για ανάλογες περιπτώσεις;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(26 Μαρτίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει την κατάσταση που έχει προκύψει. Με βάση τα τρέχοντα στοιχεία, δεν μπορεί ακόμη να κρίνει κατά πόσον η δυνητικά παράνομη δραστηριότητα αποτελεί μέρος των έργων που έχουν χρηματοδοτηθεί κατά το παρελθόν ή χρηματοδοτούνται σήμερα. Για τον λόγο αυτό η Επιτροπή έχει ζητήσει από τις ελληνικές αρχές να της διαβιβάσουν όλα τα απαραίτητα στοιχεία που μπορεί να συνδέουν τις κατά τους ισχυρισμούς παραβάσεις με έργα που συγχρηματοδοτούνται από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Επίσης, έχει ζητηθεί από τις ελληνικές αρχές να ενημερώσουν την Επιτροπή σχετικά με τις ενέργειες και τα μέτρα που πρόκειται να λάβουν προκειμένου να αποφευχθεί στο μέλλον ο κίνδυνος τέτοιων περιστατικών σε συγχρηματοδοτούμενα έργα.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001262/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Co-financed project fraud investigation

The Greek prosecution service has initiated criminal proceedings against persons attached both to the contracting authority and the contractor of the Lianokladi-Domoko Tunnel project in Fthiotida. The charges against these persons are that they jointly committed a series of actions and omissions in breach of the contract, including double payment of work amounting to several tens of million euros, illegal compensation, failure to collect liquidated damages, which were ultimately forfeited and so on.

Given that this was a co-financed project, will the Commission say:

1. Can it supply a progress report on the financing of this particular project (commitments, disbursements etc.) and corresponding progress in the physical object?

2. Has it been informed of this particular case? What stage have the national court proceedings reached? Have charges been substantiated against the companies as legal entities?

3. Is it investigating double payment of work and/or other infringements? What do the relevant regulations provide for in such circumstances?

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

The Commission is aware of the situation that has arisen. On the basis of the current information it cannot yet judge whether the potential illegal activity is part of projects that have been or are currently co-financed. The Commission has therefore asked the Greek authorities to provide all the information needed as to whether the alleged infractions concern projects co-financed by the European Union. The Greek authorities have also been requested to inform the Commission on the actions and measures that are to be taken in order to avoid the risk of such occurrences in co-financed projects in the future.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001263/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(6 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Referendum per l'indipendenza del popolo veneto

Il diritto all'autodeterminazione dei popoli, come codificato in numerose fonti normative di rilievo internazionale e come testimoniato dalle prassi storicamente consolidate, coincide non solo con il diritto di scegliere il proprio regime politico, economico e sociale, ma anche con la libertà di staccarsi da uno Stato per aderire a un altro o per formarne uno nuovo. Scozia e Catalogna hanno già annunciato ufficialmente la decisione di avvalersi di questo diritto e avviare la consultazione referendaria delle rispettive popolazioni per la creazione di entità statuali autonome con parlamenti sovrani.

In queste settimane migliaia di cittadini veneti hanno chiesto al Consiglio regionale del Veneto di indire un analogo referendum per proclamare l'indipendenza della Regione Veneto dall'Italia. Quello veneto è, infatti, un popolo riconosciuto come tale dalla Legge regionale statutaria n. 1 del 17 aprile 2012 e dalla Legge italiana n. 340 del 22 maggio 1971, che stabiliscono chiaramente che «il Veneto è costituito dal popolo veneto» e «l'autogoverno del popolo veneto si attua in forme rispondenti alle caratteristiche e tradizioni della sua storia». Preso atto della risposta del presidente Barroso alla mia interrogazione E-007453/2012 in cui afferma che «nel caso ipotetico di una secessione in uno Stato membro, si dovrà trovare e negoziare la soluzione ricorrendo all'ordinamento giuridico internazionale»; posto che la Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'UE afferma chiaramente nel suo preambolo che «[l'Unione] si basa sul principio della democrazia e sul principio dello Stato di diritto. […] L'Unione contribuisce alla salvaguardia e allo sviluppo di questi valori comuni nel rispetto della diversità delle culture e delle tradizioni dei popoli d'Europa»; considerando che la stessa annessione del Veneto all'Italia è avvenuta dopo la consultazione diretta del popolo veneto attraverso il referendum del 1866 storicamente noto come «referendum truffa», può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se ha valutato di proporre una modifica dei trattati europei affinché in essi sia garantito il diritto all'autodeterminazione di quei popoli che ne facciano richiesta anche all'interno dell'Unione europea;

2. se intende aprire dei tavoli di confronto per trovare soluzioni non ancora presenti nei trattati europei e nel diritto derivato e per creare un dialogo fra le proprie istituzioni, gli Stati membri e quei popoli europei che, pur avendo cittadinanza in uno Stato membro ed essendo quindi cittadini dell'Unione (conformemente all'articolo 20 del TFUE), rivendicano il loro diritto all'autodeterminazione da ottenere attraverso un referendum libero e democratico?

Risposta di José Manuel Barroso a nome della Commissione
(15 marzo 2013)

1. No.

2. No.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001263/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Referendum on independence for the people of Veneto

The right to self-determination, as codified in a number of key sources of international law and as evidenced by historically established practice, coincides not only with the right to choose one's own political, economic and social system, but also with the freedom to break away from one State to join another or to form a new one. Scotland and Catalonia have already officially announced their decision to exercise this right and to hold a referendum among their respective populations with a view to creating autonomous state entities with sovereign parliaments.

In recent weeks, thousands of citizens of Veneto have called upon the Veneto Regional Council to hold a similar referendum to proclaim the Veneto region's independence from Italy. Venetians are, in fact, recognised as a separate people by statutory Regional Law No 1 of 17 April 2012 and by Italian Law No 340 of 22 May 1971, which clearly establish that 'the Veneto is made up of the Venetian people' and 'the self-government of the Venetian people shall be implemented in forms corresponding to the characteristics and traditions of its history.' Having noted the response from President Barroso to my Question E-007453/2012 in which he states that 'in the hypothetical event of a secession of a part of an EU Member State, the solution would have to be found and negotiated within the international legal order'; given that the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union clearly states in its preamble that '[the Union] is based on the principles of democracy and the rule of law. […] The Union contributes to the preservation and to the development of these common values while respecting the diversity of the cultures and traditions of the peoples of Europe'; and given that the annexation of Veneto to Italy occurred after direct consultation of the Venetian people through the referendum of 1866 historically known as the 'fraudulent referendum', can the Commission say:

1. whether it has considered proposing an amendment to the European Treaties such that the right to self-determination be guaranteed for those peoples who so request it even within the European Union;

2. whether it will set up a forum for discussion to seek solutions that are not currently covered either by the European Treaties or by the secondary legislation and to create a dialogue between its institutions, the Member States and those European peoples who, despite having citizenship in a Member State and thus being citizens of the Union (in accordance with Article 20 of the TFEU), claim their right to self-determination through a free and democratic referendum?

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

1. No.

2. No.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001264/13
a la Comisión
Esther Herranz García (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE) y Veronica Lope Fontagné (PPE)
(6 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: Indicación del origen y manufactura del calzado

La Directiva 94/11/CE, modificada por la Directiva 2006/96/CE , sobre el etiquetado de los materiales utilizados en los componentes principales del calzado destinado a la venta al consumidor, sólo hace referencia a la obligación de dar información sobre al menos el 80 % de superficie del empeine, el forro del artículo del calzado y al menos el 80 % del volumen de la suela.

¿No considera la Comisión que sería necesario, para la mejora de la normativa y para su mejor aplicación, indicar el origen de los materiales y el lugar o lugares donde haya tenido lugar la manufactura del calzado? Así se conseguiría el doble objetivo de dar a los consumidores una mayor información del producto y una mayor transparencia acerca del mismo.

Respuesta del Sr. Tajani en nombre de la Comisión
(18 de marzo de 2013)

Los Estados miembros están aplicando la Directiva 94/11/CE sobre el etiquetado de los materiales usados en los principales componentes del calzado destinado a la venta al consumidor ([1]).

En la propuesta de la Comisión relativa a un Reglamento sobre la seguridad de los productos de consumo de 13 de febrero de 2013 ([2]), se ha tenido en cuenta la información acerca del origen de un producto y sus lugares de fabricación a la que hacen referencia Sus Señorías. Esta propuesta afecta a un gran número de productos no alimenticios destinados a los consumidores, entre los que se encuentra el calzado, en los que deberá indicarse obligatoriamente la procedencia del producto, el nombre del fabricante, el nombre o la marca comercial registrados, así como la dirección de contacto del fabricante.

La propuesta de la Comisión se está debatiendo actualmente en el Parlamento Europeo y en el Consejo de acuerdo con el procedimiento legislativo ordinario.

([1]) Directiva 94/11/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 23 de marzo de 1994, relativa a la aproximación de las disposiciones legales, reglamentarias y administrativas de los Estados miembros en relación con el etiquetado de los materiales utilizados en los componentes principales del calzado destinado a la venta al consumidor, modificada (DO L 100 de 19.4.1994, pp. 37-41).

([2]) Propuesta de Reglamento del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo relativa a la seguridad de los productos de consumo y por la que se derogan la Directiva 87/357/CEE y la Directiva 2001/95/CE, COM(2013) 78.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001264/13
to the Commission
Esther Herranz García (PPE), Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE), Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE) and Verónica Lope Fontagné (PPE)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Labelling to indicate the origin of material used in footwear and the place where the footwear was manufactured

Directive 94/11/EC on the labelling of the materials used in the main components of footwear for sale to the consumer, as amended by Directive 2006/96/EC, only requires manufacturers to provide information on the material which constitutes at least 80 % of the surface area of the upper and the lining, and at least 80 % of the volume of the outersole.

In order to improve the existing legislation and achieve better implementation, does the Commission not agree that labelling should contain additional information indicating the origin of the material used in footwear and the place/s where the footwear was manufactured? Additional labelling would help achieve the double objective of, firstly, ensuring that consumers have access to better information about the footwear they are buying and, secondly, improving transparency in the industry.

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(18 March 2013)

Directive 94/11/EC on the labelling of the materials used in the main components of footwear for sale to the consumer ([1]) is being implemented by the Member States.

The aspects of information indicating the origin of a product and the place(s) where it was manufactured, as mentioned by the Honourable Member, have been taken on board in the Commission proposal for a regulation on consumer products safety of 13 February 2013 ([2]). This proposal addresses a large number of manufactured non-food products intended for consumers, thus including footwear. It requires mandatory indication of origin as well as the manufacturer's name, registered trade name or registered trade mark and the address at which the manufacturer can be contacted on the product.

The proposal presented by the Commission is currently being discussed in the European Parliament and the Council, in the ordinary legislative procedure.

([1]) Directive 94/11/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 March 1994 on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States relating to the labelling of materials used in the main components of footwear for sale to the consumer (OJ L 100, 19.4.1994 p. 0037-0041), as amended.

([2]) Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on consumer products safety and repealing Council Directive 87/357/EEC and Directive 2001/95/EC, COM(2013) 78/3.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001265/13
à la Commission (Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante)
Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE) et Véronique De Keyser (S&D)
(6 février 2013)

Objet: VP/HR — Politique européenne sur le Proche-Orient

Dans sa résolution du 5 juillet 2012 sur la politique de l'Union européenne à l'égard de la Cisjordanie et de Jérusalem-Est, le Parlement a invité le Conseil et la Commission à s'assurer que l'engagement d'Israël, à savoir celui de respecter ses obligations envers la population palestinienne au titre du droit international en matière de Droits de l'homme et du droit humanitaire international, soit pleinement pris en compte dans les relations bilatérales de l'Union avec le pays. L'article 2 de l'accord d'association UE-Israël indique également que «les relations entre les parties (…) se fondent sur le respect des Droits de l'homme et des principes démocratiques qui guide leurs politiques intérieures et internationales et qui constitue un élément essentiel de cet accord». Le rapport intitulé «La paix au rabais: Comment l'Union européenne renforce les colonies israéliennes illégales», publié en octobre 2012, conclut que la position de l'Union est très claire: en plus d'être illégales, ces colonies israéliennes constituent un obstacle à la paix et menacent de rendre impossible une solution fondée sur la coexistence de deux États. Cependant, la politique de l'Union européenne en vigueur contribue au maintien de ces colonies. On estime que le montant des importations de l'Union européenne en provenance des colonies illégales s'élève à environ 230 millions d'euros.

1. La Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante a-t-elle connaissance du rapport intitulé «La paix au rabais: Comment l'Union européenne renforce les colonies israéliennes illégales?»

2. Que pense la Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante des conclusions du rapport, selon lesquelles la politique de l'Union européenne contribue au maintien de ces colonies?

3. Est-il exact, comme l'indique le rapport, que les produits importés par l'Union européenne en provenance de ces colonies représentent un montant d'environ 230 millions d'euros? Quelles mesures la Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante envisage-t-elle de prendre pour s'assurer qu'aucun produit en provenance de colonies illégales ne soit importé vers l'Union européenne?

4. En 2012, nous avons été témoins de l'intensification de la politique de colonisation israélienne. À la lumière de l'article 2 de l'accord d'association UE-Israël en particulier, quelle influence une telle évolution aura-t-elle sur la politique de l'Union à l'égard d'Israël ?

5. Dans quelle mesure l'Union européenne prend actuellement en compte, dans ses relations bilatérales avec Israël, l'absence de volonté du pays de respecter ses obligations contractées au titre du droit international? Pourriez-vous citer des exemples spécifiques de la manière dont les relations bilatérales ont été modifiées, par exemple, en réaction à la poursuite de la politique de colonisation israélienne?

Réponse donnée par la Vice-présidente/Haute représentante Ashton au nom de la Commission
(12 avril 2013)

La Vice-présidente/Haute représentante a connaissance du rapport en question, mais ne partage pas l'avis selon lequel la politique de l'Union européenne renforce les colonies israéliennes illégales.

Dans ses conclusions de mai 2012 sur le processus de paix au Moyen-Orient, le Conseil «Affaires étrangères» a réaffirmé la «détermination [de l'UE] à mettre en œuvre effectivement et pleinement la législation de l'UE en vigueur et les accords bilatéraux applicables aux produits des colonies». Les efforts actuels ne visent pas à élaborer de nouvelles mesures législatives, mais à mettre en œuvre la législation existante. Il n'est pas prévu de prendre des mesures pour interdire l'importation de produits des colonies.

Les statistiques officielles d'Israël concernant les échanges commerciaux ne font pas la distinction entre les données obtenues à l'intérieur et à l'extérieur des frontières israéliennes reconnues d'avant 1967. Dès lors, il est impossible d'établir des chiffres exacts concernant les produits des colonies importés dans l'UE.

En 2012, l'UE a exprimé une position claire concernant l'expansion des colonies, soulignant sa vive opposition à celles-ci. Lors du Conseil «Affaires étrangères» de décembre, elle a précisé qu'elle suivrait l'évolution de la situation et ses implications et agirait en conséquence. L'UE met tout en œuvre pour faire en sorte que la concrétisation de ses politiques soit conforme à sa position sur les colonies. Dans ses réponses à des questions écrites antérieures (E-009975/2011, E-007076/2012 et E-007066/2012) ([1]), la Commission s'est engagée à élaborer des lignes directrices opérationnelles précises concernant la non-participation des entités basées dans les colonies aux actions financées par l'UE au cours de la période 2014-2020.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001265/13
aan de Commissie (Vicevoorzitter / Hoge Vertegenwoordiger)
Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE) en Véronique De Keyser (S&D)
(6 februari 2013)

Betreft: VP/HR — Het EU-beleid ten aanzien van het Midden-Oosten

In zijn resolutie van 5 juli 2012 over het EU-beleid ten aanzien van de westelijke Jordaanoever en Oost-Jeruzalem worden de Raad en de Commissie door het Parlement opgeroepen de naleving van de verplichtingen die Israël krachtens de internationale mensenrechten- en humanitaire wetgeving ten opzichte van de Palestijnse bevolking heeft een belangrijk beoordelingselement te laten zijn in de betrekkingen tussen de EU en dat land. In artikel 2 van de associatie-overeenkomst EU-Israël staat dat „de betrekkingen tussen de partijen gebaseerd zullen zijn op eerbiediging van de mensenrechten en de democratische beginselen, die leidend zijn bij hun binnenlandse en internationale beleid, en een wezenlijk onderdeel vormen van deze overeenkomst". Het in oktober 2012 gepubliceerde rapport „Trading away peace: How Europe helps sustain illegal Israeli settlements" concludeert dat de Europese positie volledig helder is: Israëlische nederzettingen zijn illegaal, vormen een obstakel voor vrede en dreigen in de weg te staan van een tweestaneoplossing. In de praktijk helpt het beleid van de EU evenwel de nederzettingen in stand te houden. De waarde van de EU-importen van producten uit illegale nederzettingen bedraagt naar schatting 230 miljoen EUR.

1. Kent de VV/HV het rapport „Trading away peace: How Europe helps sustain illegal Israeli settlements"?

2. Hoe beoordeelt de VV/HV de conclusie in het rapport dat het EU-beleid helpt de nederzettingen in stand te houden?

3. Klopt de schatting in het voornoemde rapport dat de waarde van de EU-importen van producten uit illegale nederzettingen 230 miljoen EUR bedraagt? Welke maatregelen gaat de VV/HV voorstellen om te bewerkstelligen dat er een eind komt aan de import in de EU van producten uit de illegale nederzettingen?

4. In 2012 heeft het Israëlische nederzettingenbeleid nog een tandje bijgeschakeld. Op welke wijze zal dit, met name tegen de achtergrond van artikel 2 van de associatie-overeenkomst EU-Israël, van invloed zijn op het beleid van de EU ten aanzien van Israël?

5. In welke mate houdt de EU op dit moment in de bilaterale betrekkingen met Israël rekening met het feit dat Israël zich onvoldoende houdt aan zijn verplichtingen krachtens het internationale recht? Kunt u enkele concrete voorbeelden geven van de wijze waarop de bilaterale betrekkingen zijn gewijzigd, bijvoorbeeld ten gevolg van de voortzetting van het Israëlische nederzettingenbeleid?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(12 april 2013)

De hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter is bekend met het vermelde rapport maar is het niet eens met het standpunt dat het EU-beleid de illegale Israëlische nederzettingen in stand helpt te houden.

In de conclusies van de Raad Buitenlandse Zaken van mei 2012 over het vredesproces in het Midden-Oosten is herhaald dat de EU zich blijft „beijveren voor de volledige, doeltreffende uitvoering van de bestaande Uniewetgeving en bilaterale overeenkomsten die op uit de nederzettingen afkomstige producten van toepassing zijn". De huidige inspanningen zijn niet gericht op de ontwikkeling van nieuwe wetgeving, maar op de uitvoering van de bestaande wetgeving. Er zijn geen stappen voorzien om de invoer van producten uit de nederzettingen te verbieden.

De officiële Israëlische handelsstatistieken maken geen onderscheid tussen gegevens die werden verkregen binnen en buiten de erkende grenzen van Israël van vóór 1967. Om die reden is het dus niet mogelijk om exacte gegevens te krijgen over producten uit de nederzettingen die in de EU worden geïmporteerd.

De EU heeft in 2012een duidelijk standpunt ingenomen over de uitbreiding van de nederzettingen, door haar verzet ertegen duidelijk te onderstrepen, en in de Raad Buitenlandse Zaken van december, door te benadrukken dat zij de ontwikkelingen en de gevolgen van die ontwikkelingen zal blijven volgen en dienovereenkomstig zal handelen. De EU stelt alles in het werk om te garanderen dat haar beleidsmaatregelen worden uitgevoerd op een wijze die in overeenstemming is met haar standpunt over het nederzettingenbeleid. In haar antwoorden op eerdere schriftelijke vragen (E-009975/2011, E-007076/2012 en E-007066/2012) ([1]), heeft de Commissie zich ertoe verbonden om nauwkeurige operationele richtsnoeren in verband met de niet-deelname van in de nederzettingen gevestigde entiteiten aan door de EU voor de periode 2014-2020 gefinancierde activiteiten.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/nl/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001265/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE) and Véronique De Keyser (S&D)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — EU policy on the Middle East

In its resolution of 5 July 2012 on EU policy on the West Bank and East Jerusalem, Parliament called on the Council and the Commission to make sure Israel's commitment to respect its obligations towards the Palestinian population under international human rights and humanitarian law is taken into full consideration in the EU's bilateral relations with the country. Also, Article 2 of the EU-Israel Association Agreement states that 'Relations between the Parties (…) shall be based on respect for human rights and democratic principles, which guides their internal and international policy and constitutes an essential element of this Agreement'. The report entitled 'Trading away peace: How Europe helps sustain illegal Israeli settlements', published in October 2012, concludes that the European position is absolutely clear: Israeli settlements are illegal, constitute an obstacle to peace and threaten to make a two-state solution impossible. However, EU policy in practice actually helps sustain the settlements. It is claimed that the value of EU imports from illegal settlements is EUR 230 million.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative familiar with the report entitled 'Trading away peace: How Europe helps sustain illegal Israeli settlement'?

2. How does the Vice-President/High Representative evaluate the report's conclusion that EU policy helps sustain the settlements?

3. Is the report correct in claiming that the EU imported products from the settlements to the value of EUR 230 million ? What measures will the Vice-President/High Representative propose in order to make sure that no products from the illegal settlements are imported to the EU?

4. In 2012 we witnessed an intensification of Israeli settlement policy. How will this, particularly in light of Article 2 of the EU-Israel Association Agreement, influence EU policy towards Israel?

5. To what extent does the EU currently take Israel's lack of commitment to respecting its obligations under international law into consideration in its bilateral relations with Israel? Could you provide some specific examples of how bilateral relations have been modified, for instance as a consequence of the continuation of Israeli settlement policy?

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

The HR/VP is aware of the report referred to but does not share the view that EU policy helps sustain illegal Israeli settlements.

The May 2012 Foreign Affairs Council conclusions on the Middle East Peace Process reaffirmed the EU's 'commitment to fully and effectively implement existing EU legislation and the bilateral arrangements applicable to settlement products'. The current efforts are directed not at developing new legislation but on implementing existing legislation. No steps towards banning the import of settlement products are foreseen.

Official Israeli trade statistics do not distinguish between data obtained within and beyond the recognised pre-1967 borders of Israel. Therefore, it is not possible to establish exact figures about settlement products imported into the EU.

The EU expressed a clear position on the expansion of settlements in 2012, underlining its deep opposition to these and, in the December Foreign Affairs Council, underlining that it will monitor developments and their implications and act accordingly. The EU makes every effort to ensure its policies are implemented in a manner consistent with its position on settlements. In replies to previous written questions (E-009975/2011, E-007076/2012 and E-007066/2012) ([1]), the Commission has committed to preparing precise operational guidelines addressing the issue of non-participation of settlement-based entities in EU-funded activities for the 2014-2020 period.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001266/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(6. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: Auswirkungen der Fazilität „Connecting Europe“ auf die sektorenübergreifende Kombination von Infrastrukturprojekten

In seiner Antwort auf die Anfrage E-009116/2012 von Hans-Peter Martin zu der Kombination von Energie- und Verkehrsinfrastrukturprojekten erklärte Kommissar Oettinger, dass der Verordnungsvorschlag zur Fazilität „Connecting Europe“ Projektträgern Anregung geben soll, „sektorenübergreifende Synergien zu suchen und auszuschöpfen“. In der Antwort auf die Anfragen E-009220/2012 und E-009221/2012 von Hans-Peter Martin schreibt Oettinger, die künftige Infrastrukturfazilität „Connecting Europe“ könnte die Träger zur Nutzung von „Synergien bei der sektorübergreifenden Projektentwicklung anspornen“.

Hat die Kommission Studien in Auftrag gegeben, um die Auswirkungen der Infrastrukturfazilität „Connecting Europe“ auf die sektorenübergreifende Kombination von Infrastrukturprojekten zu analysieren?

Gibt es im Rahmen der transeuropäischen Netze (TEN) bereits Infrastrukturprojekte aus den Sektoren Verkehr, Energie und/oder Breitband-Telekommunikation, bei denen mindestens zwei Sektoren kombiniert werden? Wenn ja: Bei welchen konkreten Projekten wurden vom jeweiligen Projektträger Anträge zur Kombination von Projekten gestellt?

Wie viele konkrete Projekte, in denen Infrastrukturprojekte aus verschiedenen Sektoren kombiniert werden, werden im Rahmen der TEN in Österreich umgesetzt oder befinden sich in der Planungsphase?

Wie viele konkrete Projekte, in denen Infrastrukturprojekte aus verschiedenen Sektoren kombiniert werden, gibt es im Rahmen der TEN in Deutschland?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001319/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(7. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: Synergien bei Energie- und Verkehrsinfrastrukturprojekten

In seiner Antwort auf die Anfrage E-009116/2012 von Hans-Peter Martin zur Kombination von Energie- und Verkehrsinfrastrukturprojekten erklärte Kommissar Oettinger, dass der Verordnungsvorschlag zur Fazilität „Connecting Europe“ Projektträger dazu anspornen soll, „sektorenübergreifende Synergien zu suchen und auszuschöpfen“.

Welchen prozentualen Anteil des TEN-Kernnetzes machen Infrastrukturprojekte aus, bei denen Verkehrsinfrastruktur mit Energie- oder Telekommunikationsinfrastruktur kombiniert ist, um Synergieeffekte zu erreichen? Welchen finanziellen Anteil am TEN-Budget machen die Projekte aus?

Welchen prozentualen Anteil des erweiterten transeuropäischen Netzes (TEN) machen Infrastrukturprojekte aus, bei denen Verkehrsinfrastruktur mit Energie- oder Telekommunikationsinfrastruktur verknüpft ist, um Synergieeffekte zu erreichen? Welchen finanziellen Anteil am TEN-Budget machen diese Projekte aus?

Erwartet die Kommission durch die Umsetzung der Infrastrukturfazilität „Connecting Europe“ einen größeren Anteil (sowohl bei der Anzahl der Projekte als auch beim finanziellen Anteil) von kombinierten Infrastrukturprojekten an den gesamten transeuropäischen Netzen?

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

Bislang wurde der Aufbau der transeuropäischen Energie-, Verkehrs- und Telekommuni-kationsnetze im Rahmen getrennter Programme verwaltet und überwacht, so dass keine robusten statistischen Daten zum Anteil der sektorenübergreifenden Projekte am TEN-V-Gesamtnetz zur Verfügung stehen.

Die Kommission führte 2006 eine Studie zum Thema „Synergien zwischen transeuropäischen Netzen, Bewertungen von Bereichen mit potenziellen Synergieeffekten" durch. Die Ergeb-nisse sind in der Mitteilung „transeuropäische Netze: Entwicklung eines integrierten Konzepts" ([1]) dargelegt.

Ziel der Fazilität „Connecting Europe" ist es natürlich, Effizienzgewinne bei der Durch-führung großer Infrastrukturprojekte zu fördern. Die Nutzung von Synergien zwischen einzel-nen Sektoren stellt hierbei anerkanntermaßen eine wichtige Maßnahme dar.

([1]) KOM(2007)135 endg.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001266/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Impact of the Connecting Europe Facility on cross-sector infrastructure projects

In his answer to my Written Question E-009116/2012 on combining energy and transport infrastructure projects, Commissioner Oettinger states that the proposed regulation on the Connecting Europe Facility should encourage project promoters 'to look for and explore cross-sector synergies'. In his answer to my written questions E-009220/2012 and E-009221/2012 Commissioner Oettinger says that '[t]he future Connecting Europe Facility could encourage promoters to exploit synergies in cross-sector project development'.

Has the Commission ordered studies to be carried out into the impact of the Connecting Europe Facility on cross-sector infrastructure projects?

With reference to the trans-European networks (TEN), are infrastructure projects already being implemented in the transport, energy and/or broadband sectors which combine at least two sectors? If so, for which specific projects did the promoters concerned file cross-sectoral applications?

How many specific projects combining TEN infrastructure projects from different sectors are being implemented in Austria or are in the planning phase?

How many specific projects combining TEN infrastructure projects from different sectors are being implemented in Germany?

Question for written answer E-001319/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: Synergies in energy and transport infrastructure projects

In his answer to my Question E-009116/2012 on combining energy and transport infrastructure projects, Commissioner Oettinger stated that the proposed regulation on the Connecting Europe Facility sought to encourage project promoters to 'look for and explore the cross-sector synergies'.

What percentage of the core Trans-European Network (TEN) is made up of infrastructure projects in which transport infrastructure is combined with energy or telecommunications infrastructure to achieve synergy effects? What proportion of the TEN budget do these projects account for?

What percentage of the extended Trans-European Network is made up of infrastructure projects in which transport infrastructure is linked to energy or telecommunications infrastructure to achieve synergy effects? What proportion of the TEN budget do these projects account for?

Does the Commission expect the implementation of the Connecting Europe infrastructure facility to result in combined infrastructure projects forming a greater proportion of the Trans-European Networks as a whole, both in terms of numbers of projects and as a proportion of the budget?

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

Until now the development of the trans-European energy, transport and telecommunications networks has been managed and monitored under separate programmes and therefore no robust statistical data is available on the share that cross-sector projects constitute in the overall TEN-T network.

The Commission carried out a study in 2006 on 'Synergies between Trans-European Networks, Evaluations of potential areas for synergetic impacts'. Its conclusions are included in the communication on 'Trans-European networks: Towards an integrated approach' ([1]).

([1]) COM(2007) 135 final.

It is indeed the objective of the Connecting Europe Facility to promote efficiencies in the way major infrastructure is built. Exploiting synergies between sectors is recognised as an important measure to this end.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-001267/13
a Bizottság számára
Göncz Kinga (S&D), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE) és Charles Tannock (ECR)
(2013. február 6.)

Tárgy: Szabadkereskedelmi megállapodás a Kínai Köztársasággal, Tajvannal

A Bizottság Vállalkozási és Ipari Főigazgatósága az alábbiakat fogalmazta meg: a 2006-os Globális Európa: nemzetközi versenyképesség című közlemény kiemeli, hogy a kereskedelempolitika hozzájárulhat a növekedéshez és a munkahelyteremtéshez Európában. Amellett érvel, hogy a mások iránti nyitottságunk és mások felénk való nyitása kulcsfontosságú és egymást kölcsönösen erősítő tényezők az európai versenyképesség szempontjából. A kereskedelem akadályainak felszámolására hagyományosan a vámtarifák csökkentését alkalmazták. Azonban Európának ahhoz, hogy a 21. században nyitott piacokat létesítsen, tovább kell tekintenie a vámtarifák csökkentésénél, és figyelembe kell vennie a határok mögötti kereskedelmi akadályokat is. A vámtarifák csökkenésével ezek az akadályok – úgymint a kereskedelmet korlátozó rendeletek vagy szabványok – egyre fontosabbakká válnak. Ezért fokozni kell a legfontosabb fellendülőben lévő gazdaságokkal folytatott együttműködésünket, különösen Ázsiával, amely növekedési lehetőségeket hordoz magában. Ezért az Európai Bizottság a kulcsfontosságú partnerekkel a versenyképességre irányuló kétoldalú szabadkereskedelmi megállapodások egy új generációját javasolta, amelyekben a gazdasági kritériumok elsődleges fontosságúak.

A Bizottság Kereskedelmi Főigazgatósága a következőket fogalmazta meg: „Az EU és Tajvan közötti kereskedelem több mint nyolcszorosára nőtt az utóbbi két évtizedben. … Kína, az Amerikai Egyesült Államok és Japán után az EU Tajvan negyedik legfontosabb kereskedelmi partnere. 2011-ben Tajvan az EU hetedik legnagyobb kereskedelmi partnere volt Ázsiában."

A fent részletezett célok és tények alapján tud-e a Bizottság információkkal szolgálni a javasolt EU–Tajvan szabadkereskedelmi megállapodás jelenlegi állásáról, és ismertetné-e, hogy az érdekelt főigazgatóságok milyen jövőbeli intézkedéseket terveznek?

Karel De Gucht válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. március 22.)

A Bizottság elismeri Tajvan gazdasági jelentőségét. Tajvan – az évente mintegy 40 milliárd EUR összegben értékesített termékek és szolgáltatások révén – az EU 19. legfontosabb kereskedelmi partnere. Az EU és Tajvan között már most is teljes mértékben működik a kereskedelmi párbeszéd. Az évente megrendezett kereskedelmi konzultációkhoz félidős értékelések társulnak. Négy technikai munkacsoport évente kétszer ülésezik. Az átfogó párbeszéd eredményes, különösen a nem vámjellegű kérdésekben.

Az EU szabadkereskedelmi megállapodásokat célul kitűző tárgyalási menetrendje Ázsia (Japán, India és több ASEAN-tagállam) és egyéb országok, illetve régiók tekintetében is nagyon intenzív és forrásigényes. A tárgyalások átfogó és ambiciózus szabadkereskedelmi megállapodásokra irányulnak, ahogy azt az Európa 2020 stratégia keretében kialakítandó új európai kereskedelempolitikáról szóló, 2011. szeptember 27-i parlamenti állásfoglalás körvonalazta, mely kereskedelempolitika az Európai Tanács 2013. február 7–8-i ülésének következtetéseiben hangoztatottak szerint a „legfőbb partnerekre" összpontosít és „megkülönböztetett figyelmet szentel azoknak a tárgyalásoknak, amelyek a növekedés és a foglalkoztatás szempontjából a leggyümölcsözőbbek lesznek".

A Tajvannal való kapcsolatokat illetően az egyedülálló politikai helyzetet is figyelembe kell venni. Az EU „egy Kína" elvet hirdető politikája támogatja a Tajvani-szoros két partja közötti párbeszédet, amely az elmúlt öt évben a Kína és Tajvan közötti kapcsolatok javulását eredményezte. Úgy tűnik, hogy Tajvan előnyben részesíti szabadkereskedelmi megállapodások tárgyalását azon harmadik országokkal, amelyekkel Kína korábban hasonló megállapodást kötött.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001267/13
do Komisji
Kinga Göncz (S&D), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE) oraz Charles Tannock (ECR)
(6 lutego 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Umowa o wolnym handlu z Republiką Chińską (Tajwan)

Dyrekcja Generalna Komisji ds. Przedsiębiorstw i Przemysłu stwierdziła, co następuje: „Komunikat Globalny wymiar Europy: konkurowanie na światowym rynku z 2006 r. stanowi, iż polityka handlowa może przyczynić się do wzrostu gospodarczego i tworzenia miejsc pracy w Europie. Stwierdza się w nim, że nasza otwartość na innych i ich otwartość na nas są decydującymi oraz wzajemnie wzmacniającymi się czynnikami stymulującymi konkurencyjność Europy. Tradycyjnie bariery w handlu pokonywane były poprzez obniżanie stawek celnych. Jednakże, aby tworzyć w XXI wieku otwarte rynki, Europa powinna przewidywać nie tylko obniżanie stawek celnych, lecz także dostrzegać bariery handlowe niezwiązane z granicami państw. W miarę spadku stawek celnych bariery te, takie jak przepisy ograniczające, czy normy, stają się coraz ważniejsze. Należy więc pogłębić nasze zaangażowanie we współpracę z najszybciej rozwijającymi się gospodarkami, głównie azjatyckimi, gdzie zaobserwować możemy potencjał wzrostu. Z tego względu Komisja Europejska zaproponowała nową generację opartych na konkurencyjności dwustronnych umów o wolnym handlu z kluczowymi partnerami, w których uwzględniane są przede wszystkim kryteria ekonomiczne".

Dyrekcja Generalna Komisji ds. Handlu stwierdziła: „W ciągu ostatnich dwudziestu lat handel pomiędzy UE a Tajwanem wzrósł ponad ośmiokrotnie". Tajwan jest czwartym co do wielkości partnerem handlowym UE po Chinach, Stanach Zjednoczonych i Japonii. Spośród państw azjatyckich w 2011 r. Tajwan był siódmym pod względem wielkości partnerem handlowym UE.

Czy na podstawie wyżej wyszczególnionych celów i faktów Komisja może udzielić informacji na temat aktualnej sytuacji dotyczącej proponowanej umowy o wolnym handlu pomiędzy UE a Tajwanem oraz przyszłych działań planowanych przez zainteresowane Dyrekcje Generalne?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Karela De Guchta w imieniu Komisji
(22 marca 2013 r.)

Komisja uznaje gospodarcze znaczenie Tajwanu. Wartość rocznego obrotu towarami i usługami wynosi ok. 40 mld EUR, co czyni Tajwan 19. największym partnerem handlowym UE. Między UE a Tajwanem odbywa się już w pełni funkcjonalny dialog handlowy. Prowadzone są coroczne konsultacje handlowe, po których następuje przegląd śródokresowy. Dwa razy do roku odbywa się spotkanie czterech technicznych grup roboczych. Ten kompleksowy dialog przynosi rezultaty, szczególnie w kwestiach pozataryfowych.

EU ma w Azji bardzo intensywny i wymagający znacznych zasobów kalendarz negocjacji umów o wolnym handlu (z Japonią, Indiami i kilkoma państwami członkowskimi ASEAN), jak również z innymi państwami i regionami. Celem tych negocjacji jest zawarcie wszechstronnych i ambitnych umów o wolnym handlu, jak wskazano w rezolucji Parlamentu Europejskiego z dnia 27 września 2011 r. w sprawie nowej polityki handlowej dla Europy w ramach strategii „Europa 2020", ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem „kluczowych partnerów" oraz przy „priorytetowym traktowaniu tych negocjacji, które zapewnią największe korzyści pod względem wzrostu gospodarczego i zatrudnienia", jak podkreślono w konkluzjach Rady Europejskiej z 7-8 lutego 2013 r.

Relacje z Tajwanem należy również oceniać w kontekście jego wyjątkowej sytuacji politycznej. Unijna polityka jednych Chin wspiera dialog między ChRL a Tajwanem, dzięki któremu w ciągu ostatnich pięciu lat nastąpiła poprawa stosunków po obu stronach cieśniny. Należy zauważyć, że wydaje się, że Tajwan wykazuje większą wolę negocjowania umów o wolnym handlu z państwami trzecimi, z którymi Chiny zawarły już wcześniej podobną umowę.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001267/13
to the Commission
Kinga Göncz (S&D), Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Free Trade Agreement with the Republic of China, Taiwan

The Commission's DG Enterprise and Industry has stated the following: 'The communication Global Europe: Competing in the World from 2006 sets out that trade policy can contribute to creating growth and jobs in Europe. It argues that our openness to others, and their openness to us, are critical and mutually reinforcing factors in European competitiveness. Traditionally, barriers to trade were addressed mainly through reductions in tariffs. But to create open markets in the 21st century, Europe needs to look beyond tariff reduction to the trade barriers that lie behind borders. As tariffs fall, these barriers — such as restrictive regulations or standards — become increasingly important. There is therefore a need to step up our engagement with the major emerging economies, particularly in Asia, where there is potential for growth. This is why the European Commission proposed a new generation of competitiveness-driven bilateral free trade agreements with key partners, in which economic criteria is a primary consideration.'

The Commission's DG Trade has said: 'Trade between the EU and Taiwan has increased more than eightfold over the past two decades. … The EU is Taiwan's fourth trade partner after China, the USA and Japan. In 2011, Taiwan was the EU's seventh largest trading partner in Asia.'

On the basis of the above-detailed goals and facts, can the Commission provide information on the state of play concerning the proposed EU-Taiwan Free Trade Agreement, and state what future action is planned by the DGs concerned?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(22 March 2013)

The Commission recognises Taiwan's economic importance. With around EUR 40 billion of goods and services traded annually, Taiwan is the EU's 19th largest trading partner. The EU and Taiwan already have a fully functional trade dialogue in place. Annual trade consultations are held, followed by a mid-term review. Four technical working groups meet twice a year. This comprehensive dialogue is delivering results, especially on non-tariff issues.

The EU has a very intense and resource demanding Free Trade Agreement (FTA) negotiating agenda in Asia (with Japan, India and several ASEAN Member States), but also with other countries and regions. These negotiations aim at comprehensive and ambitious FTAs as outlined in the Parliament Resolution of 27 September 2011 on a New Trade Policy for Europe under the Europe 2020 strategy focusing on 'key partners' and 'prioritising those negotiations that will provide most benefit in terms of growth and jobs' as stressed in the Conclusions of the European Council of 7/8 February 2013.

Relations with Taiwan also have to be seen in terms of its unique political situation. The EU's one-China policy is supportive of the cross-strait dialogue, which has led to improvements in cross-strait relations over the past five years. It should be noted that Taiwan seems to show a preference for negotiating free trade agreements with third countries with which China already has concluded a similar agreement.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001268/13
alla Commissione
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(6 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Riutilizzo non corretto degli imballaggi destinati ai prodotti ortofrutticoli in Italia

Confagricoltura, la Confederazione italiana degli agricoltori, ha lamentato un uso improprio di imballaggi ortofrutticoli che contrasta con la legislazione europea. In particolar modo è stato denunciato il riutilizzo di imballaggi di plastica senza un'adeguata sanificazione preventiva, dato che lo stesso imballaggio spesso contiene prodotti differenti, e senza una conforme etichettatura di provenienza.

Questo meccanismo crea un grave danno alle ditte che, per correttezza commerciale, acquistano l'imballaggio nuovo in quanto «usato» costa molto meno ed inoltre spesso l'etichettatura sovrapposta all'originale si altera e si rovina tanto da creare incertezza sulla vera provenienza del prodotto e sulle responsabilità delle aziende coinvolte (tracciabilità, rischi sanitari, adempimenti fiscali).

Il regolamento di esecuzione (UE) n. 543/2011 della Commissione, del 7 giugno 2011, recante modalità di applicazione del regolamento (CE) n. 1234/2007 nei settori degli ortofrutticoli freschi e degli ortofrutticoli trasformati recita, all'articolo 5, paragrafo 1: «le indicazioni previste dal presente capo sono riportate a caratteri leggibili e visibili su uno dei lati dell'imballaggio, mediante stampatura diretta indelebile o mediante etichetta integrata nell'imballaggio o fissata ad esso».

Lo stesso regolamento enuncia, al considerando 9: «la lealtà commerciale implica che gli ortofrutticoli venduti in uno stesso imballaggio siano di qualità omogenea. […] Per i miscugli di specie diverse di ortofrutticoli nello stesso imballaggio è opportuno stabilire disposizioni in materia di etichettatura».

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se sia a conoscenza di questo problema;

2. se e quali provvedimenti si possano adottare per limitare questa pratica fortemente pregiudizievole verso il consumatore e verso le aziende agricole che operano correttamente?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(18 marzo 2013)

1) La Commissione non è al corrente della questione esposta.

2) La Commissione desidera informare l'onorevole parlamentare che la corretta applicazione delle norme di commercializzazione degli ortofrutticoli è di competenza degli Stati membri.

3) Inoltre sono applicabili le disposizioni generali in materia d'igiene di cui al regolamento n. 852/2004, del 29 aprile 2004, in particolare all'allegato I e all'allegato II (Capitolo X) al fine di evitare una contaminazione dei prodotti alimentari, ad esempio, dal confezionamento e dall'imballaggio ([1]).

([1]) Regolamento n. 852/2004 del 29 aprile 2004 (GU L 139 del 30 aprile 2004).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001268/13
to the Commission
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Improper reuse of packaging for fruit and vegetable products in Italy

Confagricoltura, the Italian Farmers' Confederation, has complained about the improper use of fruit and vegetable packaging which contravenes European legislation. In particular, there have been reports of the reuse of plastic packaging which has not been sanitised properly beforehand, given that the same packaging often contains different products, and which does not bear compliant labelling of origin.

Since 'second-hand' packaging costs much less, this arrangement causes serious harm to enterprises which buy new packaging for fair trading reasons; moreover, labels superimposed on existing ones often become misshapen and ruined, which in some cases can cause uncertainty regarding the true origin of the product and the responsibility of the enterprises involved (traceability, health risks, tax obligations).

Article 5(1) of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 543/2011 of 7 June 2011 laying down detailed rules for the application of Council Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 in respect of the fruit and vegetables and processed fruit and vegetables sectors reads: 'The information particulars required by this Chapter shall be shown legibly and obviously on one side of the packaging, either indelibly printed directly onto the package or on a label which is an integral part of the package or affixed to it.'

Paragraph 9 of the same regulation states: 'Fair trading requires that fruit and vegetables sold in the same package are of uniform quality. […] Labelling requirements should be laid down for mixes of different species of fruit and vegetables in the same package.'

In light of the above, can the Commission say:

1. whether it is aware of this problem;

2. whether and what measures can be taken to limit this practice that is highly detrimental to the consumer and to farms which comply with the relevant rules and regulations?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(18 March 2013)

1. The Commission is not aware of this issue.

2. The Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that the correct application of marketing standards of fruit and vegetables falls under Member States' responsibility.

3. In addition the general hygiene provisions laid down of the regulation 852/2004 of 29 April 2004 namely in Annex I and in Annex II (Chapter X) are applicable to avoid any contamination of food eg wrapping and packaging materials ([1]).

([1]) Regulation 852/2004 of 29 April 2004 (OJ L 139/1 of 30 April 2004).

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001269/13
aan de Commissie
Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
(6 februari 2013)

Betreft: Verkoop van nieuwe mobiele producten standaard zonder batterijoplader

In 2009 tekenden tien producenten van mobiele telefonie een memorandum of understanding dat een harmonisering van batterijopladers in de EU vooropstelt om zo de onnodige productie van elektronisch afval tegen te gaan. Ondertussen hebben 14 bedrijven een akkoord gesloten om een universele lader te introduceren, wat een stap in de goede richting is, maar dan nog ontvang je als klant bij elke nieuwe aankoop van een mobiele telefoon ook een nieuwe lader, terwijl de oude lader het meestal nog prima doet.

In februari 2012 kondigde een mobiele-netwerkoperator aan dat klanten bij aankoop van een nieuwe gsm standaard geen nieuwe batterijoplader bijgeleverd zullen krijgen, met als doel de elektronische afvalberg in te perken en de energie-efficiëntie te verbeteren ([1]).

De netwerkoperator kwam na een jaar en een testperiode van drie maanden tot de vaststelling dat 82 % van de klanten die een nieuwe gsm kochten geen oplader wenste ([2]). Uiteraard is de oplader wel nog afzonderlijk te verkrijgen tegen een gewone kostprijs.

Zou de Commissie het initiatief kunnen nemen om producenten van producten (mobiele telefonie, digitale camera's, pc's, draagbare muziekspelers en dergelijke) die een batterijoplader nodig hebben en netwerkoperatoren aan te sporen hun klanten de mogelijkheid te geven deze producten zonder batterijoplader aan te kopen?

E-001269/2013Antwoord van de heer Tajani namens de Commissie
(4 april 2013)

De Commissie spreekt haar tevredenheid uit over de door bedrijven genomen — en door het initiatief voor de harmonisatie van opladers mogelijk gemaakte — maatregelen om te voorkomen dat klanten onnodig worden voorzien van extra opladers voor mobiele telefoons. Het loskoppelen van de verkoop opladers en nieuwe mobiele telefoons maakt het mogelijk zowel de kosten voor EU-burgers als de hoeveelheid elektronisch afval te verminderen. Deze initiatieven zijn tevens in overeenstemming met de doelstelling van Richtlijn 2012/19/EU betreffende afgedankte elektrische en elektronische apparatuur, namelijk bij te dragen aan duurzame productie en consumptie door, als eerste prioriteit, afgedankte elektrische en elektronische apparatuur te voorkomen.

Gezien de innovaties op technologisch gebied is de Commissie ervan overtuigd dat consumenten en producenten baat kunnen hebben bij een uitbreiding van het initiatief voor de harmonisatie van opladers naar nieuwe categorieën van producten, met inbegrip van de nieuwe generatie mobiele telefoons en andere kleine elektronische apparaten zoals digitale camera's, tablet-pc's en muziekspelers. De Commissie is een onderzoek gestart naar de resultaten die geboekt werden met het memorandum van overeenstemming en is voornemens te onderzoeken welke mogelijkheden er bestaan voor een geschikte follow-up, met inbegrip van vrijwillige overeenkomsten en wetgeving. Ter voorbereiding op dit onderzoek zal de Commissie in samenwerking met fabrikanten en exploitanten de situatie herzien wat betreft het aanbieden van apparaten en opladers.

([1]) http://www.businessgreen.com/bg/news/2144286/o2-cuts-mobile-phone-chargers-ewaste-crack.
([2]) http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2013/jan/17/o2-rivals-chargers-new-phones?CMP=twt_fd.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001269/13
to the Commission
Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Sale of new mobile telephony products without a battery charger as standard

In 2009, ten mobile phone manufacturers signed a memorandum of understanding asking for priority to be given to the harmonisation of battery chargers in the EU in order to address the unnecessary production of electronic waste. Since then 14 companies have signed an agreement to introduce a universal charger, which is a step in the right direction. However, as a customer you still receive a new charger with every new purchase of a mobile phone, though the old charger in most cases still works perfectly well.

In February 2012, a mobile network operator announced that customers would not receive a new battery charger as standard when purchasing a new mobile phone, the objective being to cut down the mountain of electronic waste and improve energy efficiency ([1]).

A year and a three month test period later, the network operator concluded that 82% of the customers who bought a new mobile phone did not want a charger ([2]). Obviously, the charger is still available separately at a normal price.

Could the Commission take the initiative to encourage manufacturers of products that require a battery charger (mobile phones, digital cameras, PCs, portable music players and the like) and network operators to give their customers the option of purchasing these products without a battery charger?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(4 April 2013)

The Commission welcomes steps taken by companies to avoid providing customers with unnecessary additional chargers for mobile phones, steps enabled by its initiative on the common charger. In this case, decoupling the sale of new mobile phones from their charger makes possible to reduce costs for EU citizens and associated electronic waste. Such initiatives are also in line with the purpose of Directive 2012/19/EU on Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE), which is to contribute to sustainable production and consumption by, as a first priority, the prevention of WEEE.

The Commission is convinced that, while taking into account technological innovations, consumers and manufacturers can benefit from an extension of the initiative on harmonisation of chargers to new categories of products including the new generation of mobile phones and other small electronic devices, such as digital cameras, tablets and music players. Therefore the Commission is preparing the launch of a study evaluating the results achieved with the MoU, and intends to consider options for appropriate follow-up including voluntary agreement and legislation. In the course of the preparation of these measures, the Commission will review with manufacturers and operators the situation with regard to the offer of devices and their chargers.

([1]) http://www.businessgreen.com/bg/news/2144286/o2-cuts-mobile-phone-chargers-ewaste-crack.
([2]) http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2013/jan/17/o2-rivals-chargers-new-phones?CMP=twt_fd.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001270/13
aan de Commissie
Saïd El Khadraoui (S&D)
(6 februari 2013)

Betreft: Mogelijke aansprakelijkheid van ratingbureaus

Zowel de Amerikaanse federale overheid als verschillende deelstaten gaan een klacht indienen tegen ratingbureau Standard & Poor's (S&P). Alles draait rond de kredietratings die S&P toekende aan aan hypotheken gelinkte obligaties in de aanloop naar de uitbraak van de financiële crisis in 2008. Naar schatting werden tussen 2002 en 2007 voor 3 200 miljard dollar leningen verschaft aan eigenaars die niet kredietwaardig bleken. De herverpakte rommelkredieten lagen aan de basis van de financiële crisis. Na jarenlange onderhandelingen over een schikking, gaan de Amerikaanse overheden nu over tot een rechtszaak.

In de EU werd in 2009 Griekenland geplaagd door politieke onrust en financiële tegenslag. Investeerders maakten zich zorgen, maar in december rapporteerde Moody's dat angsten over de Griekse kortetermijnfinanciering „ongegrond" waren. Enkele weken later verláágde Moody's echter de Griekse kredietwaardigheid — na Fitch en S&P. De negatieve reactie van de markt noopte de kredietbeoordelaars tot een stroom van afwaarderingen: eerst voorzichtig, daarna steevast neerwaarts, tot de „junkstatus".

In november 2011 maakte S&P een technische fout waardoor de rating van Frankrijk werd verlaagd.

1. Heeft de Commissie zicht op de negatieve impact van dergelijke adviezen van ratingbureaus in de Europese schuldencrisis? Beschikt de Commissie over concrete cijfers van schade veroorzaakt door de foutieve ratingverlaging van Frankrijk in 2011 en de impact van de adviezen van Moody's op Griekenland? Volgt de Commissie de stelling dat het hier niet om louter vrijblijvende meningen van ratingbureaus gaat?

2. Is de Commissie van plan om het Amerikaanse voorbeeld te volgen en de ratingbureaus aansprakelijk te stellen voor de door hun ratings veroorzaakte schade in de verschillende lidstaten? Bestaat er bij de Commissie de bereidheid om ook naar de uitschuivers van de ratingbureaus in het verleden te kijken en hen daarover aan te spreken?

Antwoord van de heer Barnier namens de Commissie
(5 april 2013)

Sinds 1 juli 2011 ([1]) staan ratingbureaus onder toezicht van de Europese Autoriteit voor effecten en markten (*European Securities and Markets Authority* — hierna „ESMA" genoemd) die over volledige toezichtbevoegdheden voor ratingbureaus beschikt. Gezien haar toegewezen bevoegdheden is de ESMA de bevoegde autoriteit om, waar nodig, passende toezichtmaatregelen te nemen. De Commissie heeft tot op heden geen concrete informatie ontvangen over beweerde schendingen van de verordening inzake ratingbureaus met betrekking tot de impact van de ratingverlaging van Frankrijk in 2011 of het advies van Moody's over Griekenland.

In de EU zijn kredietratings gereguleerde diensten die zijn onderworpen aan transparantie, kwaliteitsnormen en evenredig toezicht, zoals voorzien in de verordening inzake ratingbureaus.

Daarnaast kan een bevoegde autoriteit van een lidstaat krachtens artikel 31 van de verordening inzake ratingbureaus de ESMA verzoeken om het gebruik van kredietratings voor reguleringsdoeleinden door financiële instellingen op te schorten als zij van mening is dat de verordening ernstig geschonden is en die schending een significante impact op de bescherming van beleggers of op de stabiliteit van het financiële stelsel in die lidstaat heeft. De Commissie is tot op heden niet op de hoogte van dergelijke verzoeken.

Met het voorstel van de Commissie inzake ratingbureaus ([2]) wordt bovendien een regeling voor burgerlijke aansprakelijkheid geïntroduceerd die beleggers en emittenten de mogelijkheid biedt een ratingbureau aan te klagen indien het de regels van de verordening inzake ratingbureaus met opzet of door grove nalatigheid heeft geschonden.

([1]) Verordening (EU) nr. 513/2011 van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 11 mei 2011 tot wijziging van Verordening (EG) nr. 1060/2009 inzake ratingbureaus, PB L 145 van 31.5.2011.

([2]) Goedgekeurd door het Europees Parlement op 16.1.2013 http://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/nl/pressroom/content/20130114IPR05310/html/Tougher-credit-rating-rules-confirmed-by-Parliament%27s-vote.

Bijgevolg is de Commissie van mening dat het nieuwe regelgevingskader van de EU inzake ratingbureaus beleggers en emittenten beter bewust zal maken en beter in staat zal stellen gebruik te maken van de mogelijkheid om ratingbureaus in burgerlijke rechtszaken ter verantwoording te roepen voor te hoge kredietratings die de EU-verordening inzake ratingbureaus schenden.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001270/13
to the Commission
Saïd El Khadraoui (S&D)
(6 February 2013)

Subject: Possible liability of credit rating agencies

Both the US Federal Government and several states are going to file a complaint against the credit rating agency Standard & Poor's (S&P). This all revolves around the credit ratings which S&P awarded to mortgage-linked bonds in the lead-up to the outbreak of the financial crisis in 2008. It is estimated that between 2002 and 2007 loans worth USD 3 200 billion were granted to owners who turned out not to be creditworthy. The repackaged toxic assets were the fundamental cause of the financial crisis. After years of negotiations over a settlement, the US Government will now proceed with legal action.

In the EU, in 2009, Greece was plagued by political turmoil and financial setbacks. Investors were expressing concerns, but in December Moody's reported that fears about the Greek short-term financing were 'unfounded'. However, a few weeks later, Moody's downgraded Greece's credit rating — after Fitch and S&P. The negative market reaction forced the rating agencies into a raft of write-downs: first cautiously, then invariably downward, and then to 'junk status'.

In November 2011, S&P made a technical error as a result of which France's rating was downgraded.

1. Does the Commission have sight of the negative impact of such opinions of rating agencies in the European debt crisis? Does the Commission have specific figures as to the damage caused by the incorrect downgrading of France in 2011 and the impact of Moody's opinions on Greece? Does the Commission agree that this is not about purely non-binding opinions of credit rating agencies?

2. Does the Commission intend to follow the US example and hold the rating agencies accountable for the damage caused by their ratings in the various Member States? Is the Commission prepared also to look into the rating agencies' past *faux pas* and tackle them about it?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(5 April 2013)

Since 1 July 2011 ([1]), credit rating agencies are supervised by the European Securities and Markets Authority (hereafter referred to as ESMA) which has all supervisory powers towards credit rating agencies. Therefore, in view of its attributed competences, ESMA is the competent authority in taking supervisory action where appropriate. To date the Commission has not received any specific information on alleged violations of the CRA regulation with regards to the impact of the downgrade of France in 2011 or to the impact of Moody's opinion on Greece.

Credit ratings are regulated services in the EU, subject to transparency and quality standards and subject to proportionate supervision provided for in the CRA regulation.

In addition, Article 31 of the CRA regulation provides for the possibility for a competent authority of a Member State, to request ESMA to suspend the use of credit rating for regulatory purpose by financial institutions, where it considered there have been important breaches of the regulation which had a significant impact on the protection of investors or on the stability of the financial system in that Member State. To date, the Commission is not aware of any such requests.

In addition, the Commission proposal ([2]) on credit rating agencies introduces a civil liability regime which allow investors and issuers to sue a credit rating agency in case they have intentionally and with gross negligence violated the rules of the CRA regulation.

As a result, the Commission believes that the new EU regulatory framework on CRAs will increase investors and issuers' awareness and capacity to hold CRAs accountable in civil lawsuits for inflated credit ratings violating the EU CRA regulation.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 513/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 May 2011 amending Regulation (EC) No 1060/2009 on credit rating agencies, OJ L 145, 31.5.2011.

([2]) Approved on 16.1.2013 by the European Parliament http://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/pressroom/content/20130114IPR05310/html/Tougher-credit-rating-rules-confirmed-by-Parliament%27s-vote

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001271/13
aan de Commissie
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE)
(7 februari 2013)

Betreft: Intergouvernementele akkoorden betreffende de VS-Wet op de naleving van de belastingen bij rekeningen in het buitenland

In het kader van de Wet op de naleving van de belastingen bij rekeningen in het buitenland van de Verenigde Staten (Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act, FATCA) wordt geëist dat buitenlandse financiële instellingen zich registreren bij de Amerikaanse belastingdienst (IRS) en toezeggen om informatie over buitenlandse bankrekeningen van klanten uit de VS te identificeren en verzamelen alsmede hierover te rapporteren. Volgens het *Financial News* moeten instellingen zich vóór 25 oktober 2013 registreren teneinde te worden opgenomen in de lijst van de IRS van instellingen die aan de regels voldoen, die in december 2013 dient te worden bekendgemaakt ([1]). Om dit proces te vereenvoudigen en de administratieve last voor financiële instellingen te verlichten, zijn een aantal landen onderhandelingen gestart inzake zogenaamde intergouvernementele akkoorden (IGA's) met de Verenigde Staten over de manier waarop de FATCA-regels ten uitvoer moeten worden gelegd.

1. Kan de Commissie aangeven welke lidstaten tot nu toe IGA's over de FATCA hebben gesloten?

2. Kan de Commissie aangeven op welke rechtsgrondslag zij de bilaterale akkoorden „coördineert" en onderhandelingen voert met de Verenigde Staten? Welk mandaat heeft de Commissie voor het aangaan van onderhandelingen met de Verenigde Staten?

3. Kan de Commissie aangeven of deze IGA's unilateraal door de Verenigde Staten kunnen worden gewijzigd of opgeschort?

4. Kan de Commissie aangeven of zij van mening is dat de wederkerigheidsclausule inderdaad volstrekte symmetrie met zich meebrengt?

5. Kan de Commissie opheldering verschaffen over de situatie van buitenlandse financiële instellingen afkomstig uit lidstaten die geen IGA hebben gesloten? Lopen de buitenlandse financiële instellingen in deze landen het risico de Europese wetgeving te schenden, in het bijzonder de wetgeving inzake gegevensbescherming?

6. Kan de Commissie aangeven of de Europese Toezichthouder voor gegevensbescherming en de Groep gegevensbescherming artikel 29 (WP29) zijn geraadpleegd over de modelakkoorden en of zij deze goedkeuren?

7. Kan de Commissie uitleggen welk verband er bestaat tussen de FATCA en de IGA's enerzijds en de nieuwe voorstellen van de EU inzake de bestrijding van belastingontwijking en belastingontduiking anderzijds?

8. Kan de Commissie aangeven of de Verenigde Staten theoretisch gezien via een paar bilaterale akkoorden toegang kunnen krijgen tot gegevens afkomstig uit alle lidstaten, zodra de belastingrichtlijn voor spaartegoeden in werking treedt?

9. Kan de Commissie aangeven of zij onderzoek heeft verricht naar de financiële, administratieve en economische gevolgen van de FATCA voor Europese bedrijven, en of Europese bedrijven mogelijkerwijs een ongunstige concurrentiepositie hebben ten opzichte van hun Amerikaanse tegenhangers?

Antwoord van de heer Šemeta namens de Commissie
(11 maart 2013)

1. Tot nu toe hebben het Verenigd Koninkrijk, Denemarken en Ierland FATCA Model 1 ([2])-IGA's (intergouvernementele akkoorden) met de VS ondertekend en hebben Duitsland, Spanje en Italië dergelijke IGA's geparafeerd.

([1]) http://www.efinancialnews.com/story/2013-01-23/ten-things-you-must-know-fatca.

([2]) De VS hebben als basis voor de samenwerking met andere landen op het gebied van de FACTA twee modellen IGA's ontwikkeld. Model 1 biedt een kader voor samenwerking op basis van wederkerigheid waarbij financiële instellingen in een van de overeenkomstsluitende landen gegevens aan hun eigen belastingdiensten melden, die deze gegevens vervolgens automatisch aan de belastingautoriteiten van het andere land doorgeven. In model 2 melden de financiële instellingen de gegevens direct aan de VS en is er geen sprake van wederkerigheid van de kant van de VS.

2. De VS onderhandelen op bilaterale basis met elke lidstaat: de Commissie is niet betrokken bij deze onderhandelingen en heeft geen coördinerende rol.

3. Een FATCA IGA kan met schriftelijke wederzijdse goedkeuring van de partijen worden gewijzigd: elke partij kan het IGA beëindigen door de andere partij daarvan schriftelijk op de hoogte te stellen.

4. De wederkerigheidsclausule in het Model 1-IGA verplicht de VS tot een „gelijkwaardig" niveau van wederkerige automatische inlichtingenuitwisseling met de FATCA-partners.

5. Zie het antwoord op vraag E-2760/12.

6. De Commissie heeft de Groep gegevensbescherming artikel 29 (WP29) geraadpleegd over de FATCA en de Model-IGA's. Het oordeel van de WP29 is te vinden op de Europa-website ([3]).

7. De FACTA en de IGA's zijn initiatieven van de VS en maken geen deel uit van het onlangs verschenen actieplan van de Commissie om de strijd tegen belastingfraude en belastingontduiking te versterken ([4]). De Model 1-IGA's sluiten echter aan bij een van de voorgestelde acties, namelijk het streven om automatische inlichtingenuitwisseling te laten uitgroeien tot de Europese en internationale norm voor transparantie in belastingzaken.

8. Nee, dat zal niet het geval zijn.

9. De Commissie heeft daar geen onderzoek naar gedaan, maar verschillende EU-ondernemingen hebben dit wel gedaan ([5]). De FACTA IGA's zullen ook gevolgen hebben voor de bedrijven in de VS omdat zij verplicht worden te fungeren als instantie die de bronbelasting inhoudt en omdat zij eveneens melding moeten maken van bepaalde inlichtingen over EU-inwoners.

([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/data-protection/article-29/documentation/other-document/files/2012/20120621_letter_to_taxud_fatca_en.pdf; http://ec.europa.eu/justice/data-protection/article-29/documentation/other-document/files/2012/20121001_letter_to_taxud_fatca_en.pdf

([4]) COM(2012) 722 final van 6.12.2012.

([5]) Zie bijvoorbeeld het KPMG-verslag „FACTA and the fund industry": http://www.kpmg.com/Ca/en/IssuesAndInsights/ArticlesPublications/Documents/fatca-and-the-funds-industry-defining-the-path.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001271/13
to the Commission
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: Intergovernmental agreements on the US Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act

The United States Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act (FATCA) requires that foreign financial institutions register with the US Internal Revenue Service (IRS) and promise to identify, collect and report information on US clients' offshore bank accounts. According to *Financial News*, entities must register by 25 October 2013 in order to be included on the IRS's list of compliant institutions to be released in December 2013 ([1]). In order to facilitate this process and ease the burden on financial entities, a number of countries have embarked on negotiations on so-called intergovernmental agreements (IGAs) with the United States on how to implement FATCA rules.

1. Can the Commission clarify which Member States have to date concluded IGAs on FATCA?

2. Can the Commission clarify on what legal basis it is 'coordinating' the bilateral agreements and conducting talks with the United States? What mandate does the Commission have to engage in talks with the United States?

3. Can the Commission clarify whether these IGAs can be modified or suspended unilaterally by the United States?

4. Can the Commission clarify whether, in its view, the reciprocity clause does indeed mean complete symmetry?

5. Can the Commission clarify the situation for foreign financial institutions from Member States that have not concluded an IGA? Would the foreign financial institutions in these countries be at risk of violating European law, notably data protection law?

6. Can the Commission clarify whether the European Data Protection Supervisor and the article 29 Data Protection Working Party (WP29) have been consulted on the model agreements, and whether they approve?

7. Can the Commission explain how FATCA and the IGAs relate to the new EU proposals for fighting tax avoidance and tax evasion?

8. Can the Commission clarify whether, once the Savings Tax Directive is in force, the United States could theoretically gain access to data from all the Member States through a handful of bilateral agreements?

9. Can the Commission clarify whether it has conducted an assessment of the financial, administrative and economic impact of the FATCA on European businesses, and whether European businesses are potentially at a competitive disadvantage compared to their US counterparts?

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

1. So far, the United Kingdom, Denmark, and Ireland have signed FATCA Model 1 ([2]) intergovernmental agreements (IGAs) with the US, while Germany, Spain and Italy have initialled such IGAs.

2. The US is negotiating with each Member State on a bilateral basis; the Commission is not involved in these negotiations nor is it coordinating them.

3. A FATCA IGA may be amended by written mutual consent of the Parties; either Party may terminate the IGA by giving notice of termination in writing to the other Party.

4. The reciprocity clause included in the Model 1 IGA commits the US to achieving 'equivalent' levels of reciprocal automatic information exchange with FATCA partners.

([1]) http://www.efinancialnews.com/story/2013-01-23/ten-things-you-must-know-fatca

([2]) The US has developed two Model IGAs as a basis for cooperation with other countries on FATCA. Model 1 provides a framework for reciprocal cooperation whereby financial institutions established in one of the contracting countries would report information to their own tax administrations, which would pass this information automatically to the tax authorities of the other country. Model 2 provides for direct reporting by financial institutions to the US and would not involve reciprocity on the US side.

5. See response to Question E-2760/12.

6. The Commission consulted the article 29 Data Protection Working Party (WP29) on FATCA and the Model IGAs. The opinions provided by the WP29 can be found on the Europa website ([3]).

7. FATCA and the IGAs, as US initiatives, are not part of the recent Commission Action Plan ([4]) to strengthen the fight against tax fraud and tax evasion. However, the Model 1 IGAs are in line with one of the proposed actions i.e. promoting the automatic exchange of information as the future EU and international standard of transparency in tax matters.

8. No, that will not be the case.

9. The Commission has not conducted such an assessment but several EU businesses have done so ([5]). FATCA IGAs will also affect US businesses which will be required to act as withholding agents and also to report certain information about EU residents.

([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/data-protection/article-29/documentation/other-document/files/2012/20120621_letter_to_taxud_fatca_en.pdf
http://ec.europa.eu/justice/data-protection/article-29/documentation/other-document/files/2012/20121001_letter_to_taxud_fatca_en.pdf

([4]) COM(2012) 722 final of 06/12/2012.

([5]) See, for example, the KPMG report on 'FATCA and the fund industry' which is available at the following link: http://www.kpmg.com/Ca/en/IssuesAndInsights/ArticlesPublications/Documents/fatca-and-the-funds-industry-defining-the-path.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001273/13
al Consiglio
Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)
(7 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Designazione di Hezbollah come organizzazione terroristica

Il 5 febbraio 2013, la Bulgaria ha annunciato che il gruppo militante sciita Hezbollah era responsabile per l'attentato sull'autobus a Burgas che ha ucciso cinque turisti israeliani e il conducente bulgaro dell'autobus, il 18 luglio 2012. Il Ministro degli Interni bulgaro, Tsvetan Tsvetanov, ha asserito che i sospetti coinvolti nell'attentato esplosivo avevano vissuto in Libano per molti anni, osservando che: «Abbiamo giustificati motivi per ritenere che i due fossero membri dell'ala militante di Hezbollah». I sospetti erano in possesso di passaporti australiani e canadesi.

Il governo degli Stati Uniti, insieme ai governi di Israele e Canada, ha chiesto all'Unione europea di designare il gruppo come organizzazione terroristica. Esaminate le prove raccolte dalle autorità bulgare, il direttore di Europol, Rob Wainwright, ha dichiarato che, alla luce dell'intelligence e del modus operandi degli attentatori, ci sono forti legami con il Libano. Il direttore Wainwright ha anche avvertito che l'attacco è un'indicazione di una minaccia reale sia per gli israeliani che per i membri della comunità ebraica in generale.

L'UE considera attualmente Hezbollah come organizzazione politica legittima, distinguendo tra la sua ala civile e quella militare e proscribendo solo la seconda, sebbene Hezbollah stesso non faccia alcuna distinzione di questo genere al vertice dell'organizzazione. I funzionari governativi in vari Stati membri sono scontenti che questa politica non sia stata modificata. Philipp Missfelder, deputato al Bundestag tedesco e portavoce della politica estera per il partito del Cancelliere tedesco Angela Merkel, ha asserito che «il terrorismo è parte integrante della strategia generale di Hezbollah che mina la stabilità politica del Libano e minaccia l'esistenza dello Stato ebraico di Israele». Inoltre, il Regno Unito e i Paesi Bassi hanno incluso Hezbollah nei rispettivi elenchi nazionali dei terroristi.

1. Qual è la posizione del Consiglio rispetto all'annuncio della Bulgaria di un collegamento tra Hezbollah e l'attentato esplosivo di Burgas del 18 luglio 2012?

2. Il Consiglio incontrerà i funzionari provenienti da Bulgaria, Stati Uniti e Israele, al fine di valutare il coinvolgimento di Hezbollah in codesto attentato?

3. Quali passi sono ancora necessari perché il Consiglio esamini l'opportunità di designare tutte le ali di Hezbollah come gruppo terroristico integralista?

Risposta
(28 maggio 2013)

In una dichiarazione rilasciata il 5 febbraio 2013 l'Alto Rappresentante ha preso atto dei risultati preliminari dell'indagine sull'attacco terroristico di Burgas del 18 luglio 2012 ed ha elogiato le autorità bulgare per lo svolgimento di questa difficile indagine, che tuttora prosegue.

Le implicazioni dell'indagine dovranno essere valutate. L'UE e gli Stati membri discuteranno la risposta opportuna basandosi su tutti gli elementi individuati dagli investigatori. Le possibili linee di azione dovrebbero essere valutate nell'ottica di garantire che le persone che hanno progettato e realizzato l'attacco di Burgas siano assicurate alla giustizia e di evitare che tali attacchi si ripetano in futuro.

L'UE mantiene strette relazioni sia con gli Stati Uniti sia con Israele ed è a conoscenza delle loro posizioni.

Come previsto nella posizione comune 2001/931/CFSP del Consiglio (PC 931) relativa all'applicazione di misure specifiche per la lotta al terrorismo ([1]), affinché un'entità sia oggetto di misure restrittive autonome dell'UE si dovrebbero adottare le seguenti misure:

— un'autorità nazionale competente dovrebbe adottare una decisione attestante che l'entità interessata è coinvolta in un atto terroristico di cui all'atto PC 931 e dovrebbe avanzare la proposta di inserire il gruppo nell'elenco ai sensi del regime della PC 931;

([1]) GU L 344 del 28.12.2001, pagg. 93-96.

— a seguito della relativa proposta l'inserimento nell'elenco dovrebbe poi essere discusso dai pertinenti Gruppi del Consiglio;

— gli atti giuridici relativi all'inserimento nell'elenco dovrebbero essere decisi dal Consiglio che delibera all'unanimità.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001273/13
to the Council
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: Designation of Hezbollah as a terrorist organisation

On 5 February 2013, Bulgaria announced that the militant Shiite group Hezbollah was responsible for the bus bombing in Burgas that killed five Israeli tourists and their Bulgarian bus driver on 18 July 2012. Bulgaria's Interior Minister, Tsvetan Tsvetanov, said that the suspects involved in the bombing had lived in Lebanon for many years, noting that: 'We have well-grounded reasons to suggest that the two were members of the militant wing of Hezbollah'. The suspects carried Australian and Canadian passports.

The US Government, along with the Governments of Israel and Canada, has called for the EU to designate the group as a terrorist organisation. After looking at evidence gathered by the Bulgarian authorities, the director of Europol, Rob Wainwright, said that, in light of intelligence and the attackers' modus operandi, there were strong links to Lebanon. Mr Wainwright also warned that the attack was an indication of a real threat both to Israelis and to members of the wider Jewish community.

The EU currently regards Hezbollah as a legitimate political organisation, distinguishing between its civilian and military wing and proscribing only the latter, even though Hezbollah itself makes no such distinction at the top of the organisation. Government officials in various Member States are unhappy that this policy has not been amended. Philipp Missfelder, member of the German Bundestag and foreign policy spokesman for German Chancellor Angela Merkel's party, has said that 'terrorism is an integral part of Hezbollah's overall strategy that undermines the political stability of Lebanon and threatens the existence of the Jewish state of Israel'. Also, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands have included Hezbollah on their national terrorist lists.

1. What is the Council's position regarding Bulgaria's announcement of a link between Hezbollah and the 18 July 2012 bombing in Burgas?

2. Is the Council meeting with officials from Bulgaria, the United States and Israel in order to assess Hezbollah's involvement in the bombing?

3. What steps are still required in order for the Council to consider designating all wings of Hezbollah as an integral terrorist group?

Reply
(28 May 2013)

In a statement issued on 5 February 2013, the High Representative took note of the preliminary results of the investigation into the Burgas terrorist attack of 18 July 2012 and commended the Bulgarian authorities on the demanding investigation process. The investigations continue.

The implications of the investigation will need to be assessed. The EU and Member States will discuss the appropriate response based on all elements identified by the investigators. The range of possible courses of action should be considered with a view to ensuring that the persons who planned and carried out the Burgas attack are brought to justice, and that such attacks are prevented in the future.

The EU maintains close relations with both the United States and Israel and is aware of their positions.

For any entity to become subject to EU autonomous restrictive measures, as provided for in Council Common Position 2001/931/CFSP (CP931) on the application of specific measures to combat terrorism [1], the following steps would need to be taken:

— A decision would have to be taken by a national competent authority in respect of the entity concerned that it had been involved in a terrorist act as defined in the CP931 act and a proposal made to list the group under the CP931 regime.

[1] OJ L 344, 28.12.2001, pp. 93-96.

— The listing would then need to be discussed in the relevant Working Parties of the Council once it has been proposed.

— The legal acts on the listing would need to be decided by the Council acting unanimously.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001274/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)
(7 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Progetto di codice penale della Tunisia

Il 22 novembre 2012, una proposta di legge relativa al progetto di codice penale della Tunisia è stata presentata da 36 deputati dell'Assemblea costituente tunisina alla commissione dell'Assemblea per i diritti, le libertà e le relazioni esterne. Il disegno di legge renderebbe reato penale qualsiasi forma di normalizzazione con l'«Entità sionista». L'articolo 1 della proposta di legge recita: «Tutte le forme di normalizzazione politica, economica, finanziaria e culturale, per mezzo di qualsiasi contatto con l'Entità sionista, saranno considerate reato punibile dalla legge». L'articolo 2 precisa: «Chiunque viola le disposizioni legislative di cui all'articolo 1 è sottoposto alle pene seguenti: reclusione non inferiore a sei anni e revoca dei diritti civili elettorali attivi e passivi alle elezioni naturali e locali. L'articolo 3 conferma: "La presente disposizione entrerà in vigore immediatamente alla sua approvazione"».

1. La Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante è a conoscenza di questo progetto di legge controverso, dato che Israele è un paese amico e un importante partner commerciale dell'UE?

2. La Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante è disposta a discutere la questione con il governo tunisino?

3. Dato il ruolo dell'Unione europea nella transizione della Tunisia verso la democrazia e considerati i principi della politica del «di più per di più», la VP/HR è disposta ad esaminare l'opportunità di prendere misure attive, se e quando siffatto disegno draconiano sia stato convertito in legge?

4. Qual è la valutazione dei funzionari dell'UE della delegazione di Tunisi quanto al disegno di legge presentato il 22 novembre 2012?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(22 marzo 2013)

Il 23.11.2012 il partito Wafa (un'ala scissionista guidata dall'ex Segretario generale del partito CPR del presidente Marzouki) ha presentato una proposta di legge per rendere reato penale le relazioni con Israele. Tale proposta è stata firmata da 36 membri dell'Assemblea costituente tunisina (NCA).

Non è chiaro quando tale proposta sarà discussa presso le commissioni «diritti, libertà e relazioni esterne» e «leggi generali» prima di essere presentata al Parlamento in seduta plenaria.

L'UE si è mantenuta ferma nei suoi sforzi diplomatici per evitare che fosse menzionata la criminalizzazione delle relazioni con Israele o con qualsiasi altro paese nel progetto di Costituzione poiché tali disposizioni sarebbero in contrasto con la tradizionale tolleranza della Tunisia e con il suo ruolo costruttivo dal punto di vista internazionale.

Il progetto di articolo sulla criminalizzazione delle relazioni con Israele attualmente non figura più nel progetto di Costituzione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001274/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Tunisia's draft criminal code

On 22 November 2012, a proposed bill for Tunisia's draft criminal code was submitted by 36 MPs in the Tunisian Constituent Assembly to the Assembly's Committee for Rights, Liberties and Foreign Relations. The bill would criminalise any form of normalisation with the 'Zionist entity'. Article 1 of the bill states: 'All forms of political, economic, financial or cultural normalisation, by means of any contact whatsoever with the Zionist entity, will be considered a crime punishable by law.' Article 2 notes: 'Anyone violating the laws in Article 1 will be subject to the following punishments: Imprisonment for no less than six years and civil rights relating to voting and being a candidate in national and local elections will be revoked.' Article 3 confirms: 'The law will enter into force immediately upon passage.'

Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of this controversial bill, given that Israel is a friendly country and a major trading partner for the EU?

Is the Vice-President/High Representative prepared to discuss this topic with the Tunisian Government?

Given the EU's role in Tunisia's transition to democracy and the principles of the 'more for more' policy, is the VP/HR prepared to consider taking active measures if and when this draconian bill is passed into law?

What is the assessment of EU officials in the Tunis delegation regarding the bill submitted on 22 November 2012?

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

A draft bill to criminalise relations with Israel was introduced on 23.11.2012 by the Wafa party (a splinter group led by the former Secretary-General of President Marzouki's CPR party) and signed by 36 Members of the Tunisian National Constituent Assembly (NCA).

It is not clear when it will be discussed in the 'Rights, Freedoms and Foreign Affairs' and in the 'General laws' committees before being presented to the full House.

The EU has been steadfast in its diplomatic endeavours to avoid any mentioning of criminalisation of relations with Israel or any other country in the draft Constitution since such provisions would contradict Tunisian traditional tolerance and constructive international role.

The draft article on the criminalisation of relations with Israel has now disappeared from the draft Constitution.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001275/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)
(7 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Giro di vite del governo vietnamita contro il dissenso

Il 4 febbraio 2013, varie fonti di informazione hanno riferito che un tribunale nella provincia vietnamita di Phu Yen ha condannato 22 persone con l'accusa di tentativo di rovesciare il governo. Gli imputati erano membri di un'organizzazione buddhista illegale chiamata Consiglio per le leggi e gli affari pubblici di Bia Son [una montagna di Phu Yen], in tutto 21 uomini e 1 donna, accusati di aver complottato per creare un nuovo stato chiamato «Regno del Grande Vietnam». Il gruppo è stato condannato a pene detentive comprese tra i 10 e 17 anni. Tuttavia, fino ad ora il gruppo era poco conosciuto all'interno del paese. I media statali vietnamiti affermano che i documenti prodotti dall'organizzazione distorcono le politiche del nuovo partito comunista e dello Stato. Nel gennaio 2013, 14 persone, tra cui cattolici, blogger e studenti, sono stati giudicati colpevoli e condannati a pene detentive che vanno da 3 a 13 anni.

Secondo la Relazione mondiale 2013 di Human Rights Watch, ad almeno 40 attivisti sono state comminate pene detentive in Vietnam nel 2012, e altri gruppi per i diritti umani affermano che questo numero indica che la repressione è stata incrementata per mantenere sotto controllo il crescente dissenso. Questo recente processo ha avuto luogo nonostante la situazione di maggiore controllo da parte della comunità internazionale. In precedenza, Human Rights Watch osservava che il Vietnam sopprimeva «sistematicamente la libertà di espressione, di associazione e di riunione pacifica, e perseguitava coloro che mettono in discussione le politiche del governo».

1. Qual è la posizione della Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante quanto all'ultima serie di arresti effettuati dal governo vietnamita?

2. Durante l'ultimo dialogo sui diritti umani con il Vietnam, quali passi si sono effettuati per affrontare le questioni dei diritti umani della libertà di parola e della tolleranza dei gruppi politici e religiosi?

3. Qual è la valutazione dei funzionari dell'UE nella delegazione di Hanoi, quanto al trattamento inflitto dal governo vietnamita ai soggetti condannati con l'accusa di sovversione, il 4 febbraio 2013?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(27 marzo 2013)

L'Unione europea è preoccupata per i chiari segni di un approccio più restrittivo adottato dal Vietnam nell'ambito dei diritti umani ed ha espresso più volte tali preoccupazioni alle autorità, da ultimo con l'iniziativa sulla pena di morte intrapresa il 7 febbraio dal capo della delegazione UE, che ha affrontato anche il tema delle restrizioni ai diritti umani e della libertà di espressione.

Per quanto riguarda questo caso specifico, il gruppo in questione è poco conosciuto. Dalle informazioni ottenute dalla delegazione UE di Hanoi risulta l'esistenza di elementi concreti, forniti anche da un attivista per i diritti umani in Vietnam considerato attendibile, secondo i quali il gruppo non limiterebbe le sue attività esclusivamente ad azioni pacifiche a sostegno dei diritti umani e della democrazia, e non avrebbe collegamenti con movimenti «pacifici» a favore dei diritti umani e della democrazia. Nettamente diversi sono i casi di altri attivisti o blogger processati recentemente in Vietnam, in cui militanti dei diritti umani o semplici cittadini vietnamiti hanno dimostrato il loro sostegno radunandosi fuori dai tribunali sede dei processi.

Per quanto riguarda il trattamento inflitto alle 22 persone, esso sembra essere conforme alle procedure giuridiche vietnamite. Tuttavia, l'UE ha da sempre espresso alle autorità, anche in occasione del dialogo annuale sui diritti umani, le sue preoccupazioni riguardanti la durata della carcerazione preventiva e lo svolgimento regolare dei processi, incoraggiando il Vietnam ad allinearsi con gli standard internazionali in materia di diritti umani.

Le libertà di espressione, di religione e di credo sono state anche elementi chiave della seconda sessione del dialogo potenziato sui diritti umani, tenutosi lo scorso ottobre, in cui l'UE ha espresso nuovamente le sue preoccupazioni, sollevato casi specifici e, per quanto riguarda la libertà di religione e di credo, incoraggiato ancora una volta le controparti vietnamite a dialogare nuovamente con il Relatore speciale delle Nazioni Unite per la libertà di religione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001275/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Vietnamese Government crackdown on dissent

On 4 February 2013, various media sources reported that a court in the Vietnamese province of Phu Yen had sentenced 22 people on charges of trying to overthrow the government. The individuals were members of an illegal Buddhist organisation called the Council for the Laws and Public Affairs of Bia Son [a mountain in Phu Yen]. In all, 21 men and 1 woman were accused of plotting to set up a new state called 'Great Vietnam Kingdom'. The group received prison sentences of between 10 and 17 years. However, until now the group was little-known inside the country. The Vietnamese state-run media say the organisation produced documents distorting the policies of the new communist party and state. In January 2013, 14 individuals, including Catholics, bloggers and students, were convicted and received prison sentences ranging from 3 to 13 years.

According to Human Rights Watch's World Report 2013, at least 40 activists were given prison terms in Vietnam in 2012, and other human rights groups say that this number indicates that repression has been increased to keep rising dissent in check. This recent trial took place under increased scrutiny by the international community. Previously, Human Rights Watch noted that Vietnam was 'systematically suppressing freedom of expression, association, and peaceful assembly, and persecuting those who question government policies'.

1. What is the position of the Vice-President/High Representative regarding the latest string of arrests carried out by the Vietnamese Government?

2. During the latest Human Rights Dialogue with Vietnam, what steps were taken to address the human rights issues of free speech and tolerance of political and religious groups?

3. What is the assessment of EU officials in the Hanoi delegation regarding the Vietnamese Government's treatment of the individuals sentenced on charges of subversion on 4 February 2013?

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

The EU is concerned about clear signs of a more restrictive approach to human rights in Vietnam and repeatedly raises these concerns with the authorities, most recently through a demarche delivered by the EU Head of Delegation on 7 February on the Death Penalty, where human rights restrictions as well as freedom of expression were also addressed.

As regards the specific case in question, little is known about the background of the group. According to information obtained by the EU Delegation in Hanoi, there are credible indications — also received from established human rights activist in Vietnam — that the group would not limit its activities exclusively to peaceful human rights and democracy advocacy actions and seems not to be linked to 'peaceful' human rights or democracy movements. This is in stark contrast to cases of other activists or bloggers tried in Vietnam recently, where Vietnamese HR activists/individuals showed support by gathering outside the courthouses where trials were held.

As for the treatment of the 22 individuals, it appears to be in line with Vietnamese legal procedures. The EU has however consistently raised its concerns with the authorities, including during the annual Human Rights Dialogue, concerning the length of pre-trial detention and trials' due process, encouraging Vietnam to bring them in line with international human rights standards.

Freedom of Expression and of Religion and Belief were also key elements of the 2nd session of the enhanced Human Rights Dialogue held last October, where the EU reiterated its concerns, addressed specific cases and — with regard to Freedom of Religion and Belief — encourage Vietnam counterparts yet again to re-engage with the UN Special Rapporteur for Freedom of Religion.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001276/13
aan de Raad
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI), Lucas Hartong (NI) en Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(7 februari 2013)

Betreft: Hezbollah verantwoordelijk voor bomaanslag

De EU Observer van 6 februari 2013 meldt dat de Libanese Hezbollah achter de aanslag zit die vorig jaar is gepleegd op een Bulgaarse bus in Burgas ([1]). Bij die aanslag zijn vijf Israëlische toeristen en de Bulgaarse buschauffeur gedood. De Bulgaarse minister van Binnenlandse Zaken heeft op 5 februari jl. verklaard dat twee van de drie verdachten leden van de militante vleugel van Hezbollah zijn. De verklaring van de Bulgaarse minister heeft tot gevolg gehad dat Israël en de Verenigde Staten de Europese Unie hebben opgeroepen Hezbollah als een terroristische organisatie te bestempelen, temeer omdat de aanslag plaatsvond op het grondgebied van een EU-lidstaat.

Op 5 september 2012 heb ik de Raad vragen gesteld over deze aanslag (E-007850/2012) en aangedrongen op het opnemen van Hezbollah in de lijst van terreurgroepen. De Raad heeft toen geoordeeld dat zij Hezbollah pas op de terreurlijst wil plaatsen als welbepaalde inlichtingen of dossierlijsten aantonen dat door een bevoegde instantie een beslissing is genomen ten aanzien van deze organisatie.

1. Vindt de Raad dat de verklaring van de minister van Binnenlandse Zaken van Bulgarije voldoende reden is voor het plaatsen van Hezbollah op de terreurlijst van de EU?

2. Zo neen, acht de Raad een Bulgaarse minister dan geen bevoegde instantie?

3. Vindt de Raad dat terreuraanslagen op onschuldige burgers, zoals in Bulgarije, zo snel als mogelijk de kop in moeten worden gedrukt en dat daarom Hezbollah onmiddellijk op de terreurlijst moet worden geplaatst?

Antwoord
(15 mei 2013)

De Raad neemt nota van de eerste resultaten van het onderzoek naar de terroristische aanslag in Burgas van 18 juli 2012, dat op 5 februari door de Bulgaarse minister van Binnenlandse Zaken werd aangekondigd. Het onderzoek loopt nog. Zodra het onderzoek is afgerond, zullen de implicaties ervan moeten worden besproken. De EU en haar lidstaten zullen zich op basis van alle elementen die door de onderzoekers in kaart zijn gebracht, beraden op een passende reactie.

Voor de opneming van een organisatie in de lijst uit hoofde van Gemeenschappelijk Standpunt 2001/931/GBVB van de Raad betreffende de toepassing van specifieke maatregelen ter bestrijding van het terrorisme ([2]) moet er een beslissing zijn genomen door een bevoegde instantie, die volgens het gemeenschappelijk standpunt een rechterlijke instantie of een gelijkwaardige op dat terrein bevoegde instantie moet zijn. De Raad zal bezien of er door een bevoegde instantie een beslissing is genomen als in het kader van de beperkende maatregelen een opneming in de lijst wordt voorgesteld.

Aangezien er gewerkt wordt aan de follow-up van deze kwestie en de Raad alleen zal nagaan of er door een bevoegde instantie een beslissing is genomen als een opneming in de lijst wordt voor-gesteld, zou het ongepast zijn om in dit verband commentaar te leveren op de verklaring van de Bulgaarse minister.

De Raad veroordeelt alle terroristische aanslagen, waar die zich ook voordoen, en benadrukt dat de EU en haar lidstaten vastbesloten zijn om terrorisme te bestrijden, wie er ook verantwoordelijk voor is. De terroristen die de aanslag in Burgas hebben beraamd en uitgevoerd, moeten voor de rechter worden gebracht.

([1]) http://euobserver.com/justice/118962.
([2]) PB L 344 van 28.12.2001, blz. 93-96.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001276/13
to the Council
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI), Lucas Hartong (NI) and Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: Hezbollah responsible for bombing

The EU Observer reported on 6 February 2013 that the Lebanese Hezbollah had been responsible for the bombing of a Bulgarian bus in Burgas last year ([1]). Five Israeli tourists and the Bulgarian bus driver died in the attack. On 5 February 2013, Bulgaria's Minister of the Interior stated that two of the three suspects had been members of the military wing of Hezbollah. As a result of the statement by the Bulgarian minister, Israel and the USA called on the European Union to classify Hezbollah as a terrorist organisation, particularly bearing in mind that the attack had taken place within the territory of an EU Member State.

On 5 September 2012, I put questions to the Council concerning this attack (E-007850/2012) and urged it to add Hezbollah to the list of terrorist groups. At that time the Council took the view that it would be prepared to place Hezbollah on the list of terrorist organisations only 'on the basis of precise information or material which indicates that a decision has been taken by a competent authority in respect of the organisation'.

1. Does the Council consider that the statement by Bulgaria's Minister of the Interior constitutes adequate grounds for placing Hezbollah on the EU's list of terrorist organisations?

2. If not, does the Council not regard a Bulgarian minister as a competent authority?

3. Does the Council consider that an end should be put to terrorist attacks on innocent civilians, such as occurred in Bulgaria, as soon as possible and that Hezbollah should therefore immediately be placed on the list of terrorist organisations?

Reply
(15 May 2013)

The Council takes note of the preliminary results of the investigation into the Burgas terrorist attack of 18 July 2012 announced by the Bulgarian Minister of the Interior on 5 February. The investigation continues. Once completed, its implications will need to be assessed. The EU and Member States will discuss the appropriate response based on all elements identified by the investigators.

For the designation of an organisation under Council Common Position 2001/931/CFSP (CP931) on the application of specific measures to combat terrorism ([2]), there needs to be a decision of a competent authority which, according to the Common Position, must be a judicial authority or an equivalent competent authority in the area. The Council will consider whether a decision of a competent authority has been taken if a listing is proposed under the CP931 restrictive measures regime.

Given that follow-up work is being undertaken, and that the Council will only consider whether there has been a decision of a competent authority when a listing is proposed, it would be inappropriate to comment in this regard on the statement made by the Bulgarian Minister.

The Council condemns all terrorist acts, wherever they take place, and emphasises that the EU and Member States are committed to the fight against terrorism, whoever stands behind it. The terrorists who planned and carried out the Burgas attack must be brought to justice.

([1]) http://euobserver.com/justice/118962.
([2]) OJ L 344, 28.12.2001, pp. 93-96.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001277/13
aan de Raad (Voorzitter Europese Raad)
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(7 februari 2013)

Betreft: PCE/PEC — 5 miljard subsidie aan Egypte

Zondag 13 januari jl. werd door de heer Van Rompuy aan de Egyptische president Morsi bekendgemaakt dat de Raad voornemens is 5 miljard euro ter beschikking te stellen aan Egypte in het kader van „het democratiseringsproces".

Kan de voorzitter van de Europese Raad aangeven wie hem het mandaat heeft gegeven om 5 miljard euro toe te kennen aan Egypte? Is de budgettaire autoriteit hiervan op de hoogte en zo ja, uit welke begrotingslijnen en programma's wordt dit gefinancierd?

Antwoord
(27 februari 2013)

Persberichten als zou de Raad voornemens zijn 5 miljard EUR aan Egypte te beschikking te stellen, zijn onjuist. De voorzitter van de Europese Raad verwees naar de totale financiële inspanning (subsidies en leningen) die onder voorwaarden ter beschikking wordt gesteld via verschillende financiële mechanismen waarover de Commissie en financiële instellingen (zoals de EIB en de EBRD) beschikken. De voorzitter heeft niet op eigen initiatief middelen toegekend of toezeggingen gedaan, doch slechts op het hoogste politieke niveau de aangeboden steun bevestigd die in beginsel reeds door de bevoegde instanties is goedgekeurd.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001277/13
to the Council (President of the European Council)
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: PCE/PEC — EUR 5 billion subsidy to Egypt

On Sunday, 13 January 2013, Mr Van Rompuy informed President Morsi of Egypt that the Council intended to make EUR 5 billion available to Egypt to promote the 'democratisation process'.

Can the President of the European Council indicate who gave him the authority to allocate EUR 5 bn to Egypt? Is the budgetary authority aware of this, and if so, from which budget headings and programmes will this be financed?

Reply
(27 February 2013)

Press reports that the Council intended to make EUR 5 billion available to Egypt are inaccurate. The President of the European Council was referring to the total financial effort (grants and loans) being made available, subject to conditionality, through different financial mechanisms at the disposal of the Commission and financial institutions (such as the EIB and EBRD). The President was not allocating resources or making commitments at his own initiative, but repeating, at the highest political level, offers already approved in principle by the appropriate authorities.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001278/13
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(7 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: Demoras en el desarrollo de investigaciones científicas

El Centro Nacional de Microbiología del Instituto de Salud Carlos III recibió en julio del pasado año 2012 la concesión de un proyecto de investigación financiado por el Séptimo Programa Marco de la Unión Europea. Se trata del proyecto AIM-HIV, en el que participan científicos franceses e italianos bajo la dirección del Centro español, y que persigue el desarrollo de un nuevo microbicida contra el VIH.

Los científicos españoles han denunciado públicamente que todavía no han podido iniciar muchas actividades ante la lentitud de los procedimientos administrativos y la inseguridad en el régimen jurídico de la contratación de investigadores. Según estos científicos, la demora, que es común en muchos proyectos de investigación, les obligará a devolver un porcentaje significativo de las ayudas públicas además de comprometer la viabilidad de los proyectos.

Por ello, pregunto a la Comisión:

1. ¿Tiene noticia de los retrasos y problemas para el adecuado desenvolvimiento de investigaciones científicas en los países miembros de la Unión Europea, vistas la paralización de contratación de nuevos investigadores o las demoras en la puesta a disposición de los recursos económicos por parte de muchas Administraciones públicas?

2. ¿Pedirá la Comisión información sobre la situación actual de los proyectos de investigación financiados por el Programa Marco?

3. ¿No considera la Comisión que la trascendencia de las investigaciones científicas exige atender a las circunstancias concretas en las que se desarrollan y permitir prórrogas cuando hayan aparecido causas sobrevenidas que imposibilitan cumplir los plazos?

Respuesta de la Sra. Geoghegan-Quinn en nombre de la Comisión
(20 de marzo de 2013)

1. La Comisión no desempeña ningún papel en la contratación de los investigadores. En el caso de los proyectos que se financian al amparo de un programa marco, la contratación de los investigadores que realizarán la investigación descrita en el acuerdo de subvención es responsabilidad de los beneficiarios. La Comisión, en realidad, solo tiene conocimiento de las dificultades que plantea la contratación de investigadores cuando así se lo comunican los coordinadores de proyecto. En el caso del proyecto AIM-HIV, la finalización de la negociación y la firma del acuerdo de subvención (firmado en noviembre de 2012, y no en julio de 2012 como menciona Su Señoría) sufrieron un retraso como consecuencia de los problemas legales y financieros (quiebra) de uno de los beneficiarios propuestos.

2. La Comisión sigue de cerca la evolución de los proyectos de investigación financiados por los programas marco en todos los aspectos —científicos, administrativos y financieros— relacionados con el acuerdo de subvención. Ese seguimiento lo efectúa de tres maneras: evaluando los informes que le presentan los coordinadores de proyecto al final de cada período de información, participando en las reuniones de los proyectos y velando por que haya una comunicación permanente entre ella y los coordinadores.

3. Es posible cambiar la duración de los proyectos indicada en el artículo 3 de los acuerdos de subvención. Esto se hace por medio de una modificación oficial. A tal efecto, los coordinadores de proyecto deben presentar a la Comisión una solicitud formal, acompañada de una carta en la que se expongan los motivos que justifiquen el cambio. La Comisión evalúa entonces las solicitudes y, si están justificadas, autoriza y otorga la prórroga de los acuerdos de subvención.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001278/13
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: Delays in the development of scientific research

In July 2012, Spain's National Centre for Microbiology at the Carlos III Health Institute was awarded a contract for a research project funded by the EU's Seventh Framework Programme. The project in question, AIM-HIV, involves French and Italian scientists working under the leadership of the Spanish centre with the aim of pressing ahead with the development of a new anti-HIV microbicide.

The Spanish scientists have publicly expressed concern that they have not yet been able to make much headway as a result of the slow pace of the administrative procedures involved and of the legal uncertainty surrounding the recruitment of researchers. They say that the delay — a common feature of many research projects — will force them to pay back a large percentage of public money, as well as compromising the viability of the projects themselves.

With this in mind:

1. Is the Commission aware of the delays and problems surrounding the conduct of scientific research in the Member States, in the light of the standstill in the recruitment of new researchers and the untimely manner in which many public authorities make funding available?

2. Will the Commission be asking for information on the current state of play with regard to research projects funded by the framework Programme?

3. Does the Commission agree that the importance of scientific research means that the specific circumstances in which it is carried out need to be taken into account and that extensions should be authorised when it is established that there are reasons why deadlines cannot be met?

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

1. The Commission does not play a role in the recruitment of researchers. In projects receiving funding from the framework Programmes (FP), the recruitment of researchers carrying out the research described in the grant agreement is a responsibility of the beneficiaries. However, the Commission is aware of the difficulties in the recruitment of researchers only in specific cases which are presented by the project coordinators. In the case of the AIM-HIV project, the finalisation of the negotiation and signature of the grant agreement (signed in November 2012 and not in July 2012 as mentioned by the Honourable Member) was delayed due to legal and financial issues (bankruptcy) of one of the proposed beneficiaries.

2. The Commission follows up closely the research projects funded under the FPs, for all aspects related to the grant agreement: scientific, administrative and financial issues. This is done through the assessment of the reports submitted by project coordinators to the Commission at the end of each reporting period, through the participation of the Commission in the project's meetings and through a continuous communication between the Commission and the project's coordinators.

3. The duration of the project which is indicated in Article 3 of the grant agreement can be changed. This is done through an official amendment. Project coordinators submit to the Commission a formal request accompanied by a justification letter. The Commission assesses the requests and if justified, it authorises and grants the extensions to the duration of the grant agreements.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001279/13
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(7 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: Anulación de las ayudas para el ahorro energético

El Instituto para la Diversificación y Ahorro de la Energía (IDAE) es un organismo público español que debería realizar, entre otras funciones, actuaciones para mejorar la eficiencia energética, así como otras para promover la diversificación y ahorro de energía (así se dispone en el Real Decreto de 11 de abril de 1986, que establece su estatuto jurídico, varias veces modificado para ampliar sus funciones).

Sin embargo, el pasado día 31 de enero publicó el Boletín oficial del Estado del Reino de España varias resoluciones de dicho Instituto que dejan sin efecto convocatorias de programas de ayuda dirigidas, precisamente, a contribuir al ahorro de energía y a la eficiencia en el uso de los recursos. Tal es el caso de «la promoción del uso de lámparas de alta eficiencia energética», de las ayudas a los ayuntamientos para el ahorro energético mediante «la sustitución de ópticas de semáforos a la nueva tecnología LED», así como de otras líneas de «apoyo económico e incentivación a la participación de las empresas de servicios energéticos en el Plan de activación de la eficiencia energética en los edificios de la Administración General del Estado».

Sé que la Comisión Europea ya ha requerido con anterioridad al Gobierno de España ante el incumplimiento de disposiciones del Derecho comunitario dirigidas al ahorro energético y la eficiencia en el uso de los recursos (por ejemplo, el recurso ante el Tribunal de Justicia por incumplir las Directivas relativas a la eficiencia energética de los edificios).

Por ello, pregunto a la Comisión:

1. ¿Considera ajustado al Derecho comunitario europeo, en concreto a las disposiciones de la política energética, así como al principio de confianza legítima, la anulación de las convocatorias públicas de ayudas para contribuir al ahorro de energía?

2. ¿Adoptará la Comisión alguna medida para evitar que la Administración española retrase el necesario avance en el ahorro de energía y en la eficiencia en el uso de los recursos?

Respuesta del Sr. Oettinger en nombre de la Comisión
(19 de marzo de 2013)

1. La Comisión no tiene jurisdicción sobre las convocatorias nacionales de propuestas destinadas a la obtención de ayudas. Se trata esta de una cuestión que incumbe a las autoridades nacionales competentes.

2. Por lo que se refiere a la aplicación de la normativa de la UE en materia de ahorro energético, la Comisión se encarga de evaluar si esa normativa se transpone y aplica correctamente. En caso contrario, se toman las medidas oportunas. La Directiva 2012/27/UE (Directiva de la eficiencia energética) establece que los Estados miembros transpongan la mayoría de sus disposiciones no después del 5 de junio de 2014. Al igual que en cualquier otra directiva, los Estados miembros disponen aquí de un margen suficiente para garantizar la correcta aplicación de esa Directiva. Corresponde a las autoridades nacionales competentes evaluar si los programas de financiación nacionales cumplen o no el objetivo que en ella se fija.

Para más información, véase http://ec.europa.eu/energy/efficiency/eed/eed_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001279/13
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: Decision to scrap energy-saving grants

Spain's Institute for Energy Diversification and Saving (IDAE) is a public body tasked with, among other things, implementing measures to improve energy efficiency and promote energy diversification and saving (as stipulated in the Royal Decree of 11 April 1986, which established the statute of the IDAE and which has since been revised several times in order to expand its list of functions).

However, on 31 January 2013, a series of IDAE resolutions were published in Spain's Official Gazette to the effect that the IDAE was withdrawing calls for proposals for schemes aimed at promoting energy saving and the efficient use of resources, which had previously been eligible for grants. The programmes involved include a scheme promoting the use of energy-efficient light bulbs, energy-saving grants for local authorities intending to replace traditional bulbs in traffic lights with new LED technology, as well as other types of financial support and incentives intended to encourage firms providing energy services to take part in the IDAE's plan for promoting energy efficiency in government buildings.

The Commission has taken the Spanish Government to task on a number of occasions over violations of EU legislation on energy saving and the efficient use of resources. For instance, the Commission has previously referred Spain to the Court of Justice of the European Union for breaching the directives on the energy performance of buildings.

In the light of the above, could the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Does the Commission believe that scrapping public calls for proposals for energy-saving grants is consistent with EC law — particularly EU energy policy — and the principle of legitimate expectation?

2. Will the Commission take action to prevent the Spanish Government from holding back the implementation of much-needed measures intended to promote energy saving and the efficient use of resources?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(19 March 2013)

1. The Commission has no jurisdiction on national calls for grant proposals. It is a matter for the relevant national authorities.

2. With regards to the implementation of EC law on energy saving, the Commission evaluates the timely transposition and adequate implementation. Action will be taken if these are not fulfilled. The Energy Efficiency Directive (2012/27/EU) (the directive) requires Member States to transpose most of its provisions by latest 5 June 2014. As with any directive, Member States have room for manoeuvre in ensuring its adequate implementation. It is a matter for the relevant national authorities to assess whether national funding programmes meet the directive's objective.

For more information, see http://ec.europa.eu/energy/efficiency/eed/eed_en.htm

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001280/13
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD), Charles Tannock (ECR) y Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(7 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: VP/HR — El boicot de la Liga Árabe a los productos israelíes

Desde la fundación de Israel en 1948, la Liga Árabe ha mantenido un boicot oficial a las compañías israelíes y a los productos elaborados en Israel. La administradora del boicot es la Oficina Central del Boicot, una agencia especializada de la Liga Árabe situada en Damasco.

De acuerdo con las investigaciones del Congreso de los Estados Unidos, el boicot comprende tres niveles distintos. El boicot primario prohíbe a los ciudadanos de los Estados miembros de la Liga Árabe la compraventa y la firma de contratos comerciales con el Gobierno o los ciudadanos israelíes. El secundario extiende los efectos del primario a cualquier compañía del mundo que haga negocios en Israel. Las multinacionales que comercian con Israel forman parte de una lista negra que elabora y hace llegar luego a los Estados miembros de la Liga Árabe la Oficina Central del Boicot. Por último, el boicot terciario impide a los Estados miembros de la Liga Árabe y a sus ciudadanos entablar negocios con ninguna compañía que establezca relaciones con las que figuran en la lista negra.

El Gobierno de los Estados Unidos ha protestado contra este boicot en negociaciones bilaterales y multilaterales con Estados miembros de la Liga Árabe. La legislación estadounidense penaliza a las empresas que se unen al boicot. Si bien la Liga Árabe admite que es complicado mantener el boicot, estas normas se han convertido en el modelo para varias leyes puestas en vigor en ciertos Estados miembros de la Liga Árabe.

1. ¿Cuál es la postura de la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante en relación con la imposición del boicot de la Liga Árabe a Israel, que es un país democrático y amistoso, además de un socio comercial habitual de la UE?

2. ¿Qué medidas ha tomado ya la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante para debatir este asunto con la Liga Árabe?

3. ¿Está dispuesta la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante a cooperar con el Gobierno de los Estados Unidos para exigir que se ponga fin oficialmente al boicot?

Respuesta de la Alta Representante/Vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(25 de abril de 2013)

La AR/VP considera positivo que el boicot de la Liga Árabe se haya ido atenuando con el tiempo hasta tal punto que hoy en día resulta casi inapreciable el impacto al que ustedes se refieren en su pregunta. También celebra que la Iniciativa Árabe de Paz traiga consigo la esperanza de la plena normalización de las relaciones árabe-israelíes y mantiene, asimismo, un estrecho contacto con la Liga Árabe y los gobiernos de distintos países para contribuir a la consecución de tal objetivo. En su última reunión, celebrada en noviembre de 2012, los ministros de asuntos exteriores de la UE y de los países de la Liga Árabe reafirmaron su compromiso de seguir respaldando la Iniciativa Árabe de Paz. La AR/VP mantendrá, por tanto, un compromiso personal con la región y otros países, entre ellos los Estados Unidos, con el fin de conseguir que el proceso de paz en Oriente Próximo llegue a buen término y que las relaciones entre Israel y el mundo árabe se normalicen.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001280/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD), Charles Tannock (ECR) e Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(7 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Boicottaggio dei prodotti israeliani da parte della Lega araba

La Lega araba mantiene un boicottaggio ufficiale delle aziende israeliane e dei beni prodotti in Israele fin dalla fondazione di Israele nel 1948. Il boicottaggio è gestito dal Central Boycott Office a Damasco (Ufficio centrale di boicottaggio), ufficio specializzato della Lega araba.

Secondo una ricerca condotta dal Congresso degli Stati Uniti, il boicottaggio ha tre livelli. Con il primo si vieta ai cittadini di uno Stato membro della Lega araba di acquistare, vendere o stipulare contratti d'affari con il governo israeliano o con cittadini israeliani. Il secondo estende il primo boicottaggio a qualsiasi entità nel mondo che faccia affari con Israele. Vi è una lista nera mondiale delle imprese che svolgono attività con Israele tenuta dal Central Boycott Office, e diffusa a tutti gli Stati membri della Lega araba. Il boicottaggio terziario vieta a uno Stato membro della Lega araba ed ai suoi cittadini di fare affari con una società che interagisce con aziende iscritte nella lista nera della Lega araba.

Il governo statunitense ha protestato contro detto boicottaggio nei negoziati bilaterali e multilaterali con gli Stati membri della Lega araba. Secondo il diritto degli Stati Uniti, le aziende aderenti al boicottaggio sono soggette a sanzioni. Mentre la Lega araba ammette che è difficile mantenere il boicottaggio, i regolamenti sono diventati il modello per varie leggi attuate da singoli Stati membri della Lega araba.

1. Qual è la posizione della Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante quanto all'imposizione del boicottaggio della Lega araba a Israele, che è un paese amico e democratico e un partner commerciale stabile dell'Unione europea?

2. Quali passi ha già effettuato la Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante per discutere la questione con la Lega araba?

3. La Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante è disposta a lavorare con il governo degli Stati Uniti per chiedere l'abrogazione ufficiale del boicottaggio?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(25 aprile 2013)

L'AR/VP si compiace che il boicottaggio della Lega araba si sia talmente ridotto nel tempo da sortire ben poco degli effetti descritti nell'interrogazione. Esprimendo soddisfazione per l'iniziativa di pace araba quale elemento propulsivo dell'auspicata normalizzazione totale delle relazioni arabo-israeliane, l'AR/VP mantiene peraltro stretti contatti con la Lega araba e i governi dei singoli paesi a sostegno di questo obiettivo. In occasione dell'ultima riunione di novembre 2012, i ministri degli Esteri dell'UE e della Lega degli Stati Arabi hanno ribadito il proprio sostegno all'iniziativa di pace araba. L'AR/VP continuerà pertanto a impegnarsi personalmente nella regione e in altri paesi, tra cui gli Stati Uniti, affinché il processo di pace in Medio Oriente vada a buon fine e si arrivi alla normalizzazione delle relazioni tra Israele e mondo arabo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001280/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD), Charles Tannock (ECR) and Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Arab League boycott of Israeli products

The Arab League has maintained an official boycott of Israeli companies and Israeli-made goods since the founding of Israel in 1948. The boycott is administered by the Damascus-based Central Boycott Office, which is a specialised bureau of the Arab League.

According to research by the US Congress, the boycott comprises three tiers. The primary boycott prohibits citizens of Arab League member states from buying from, selling to, or entering into business contracts with, either the Israeli Government or Israeli citizens. The secondary boycott extends the primary boycott to any entity worldwide that does business in Israel. A blacklist of global firms that engage in business with Israel is maintained by the Central Boycott Office and disseminated to Arab League member states. The tertiary boycott prohibits Arab League member states and their nationals from doing business with any company that deals with companies blacklisted by the Arab League.

The US Government has protested the boycott in both bilateral and multilateral negotiations with Arab League member states. Under US law, companies adhering to the boycott are subject to penalties. While the Arab League admits that it is difficult to maintain the boycott, the regulations have become the model for various laws implemented by individual member states of the Arab League.

1. What is the position of the Vice-President/High Representative regarding the imposition of the Arab League's boycott on Israel, which is a friendly democratic country and a stable trading partner of the EU?

2. What steps has the Vice-President/High Representative already taken to discuss this issue with the Arab League?

3. Is the Vice-President/High Representative prepared to work with the US Government to call for an official end to the boycott?

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

The HR/VP welcomes the fact that the Arab League boycott has been eroded over time to such a significant degree that little of the impact set out in the question can today be seen. She also welcomes the fact that the Arab Peace Initiative holds out the promise of complete normalisation in Arab-Israeli relations, and maintains close contact with the Arab League and the governments of individual countries with the aim of supporting such an objective. At the latest EU-League of Arab States Foreign Ministers' meeting in November 2012, EU and Arab League Ministers reaffirmed their continued support for the Arab Peace Initiative. The HR/VP will therefore continue her personal efforts with those in the region and elsewhere, including the US, to seek a resolution of the Middle East peace process and normalisation of relations between Israel and the Arab world.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001282/13
an die Kommission
Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE)
(7. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: Genehmigung der Kapitalzuführung für Flughafen Berlin-Brandenburg

Am 28. November 2012 meldeten die Bundesrepublik Deutschland und die Länder Berlin und Brandenburg eine geplante Kapitalzuführung in Höhe von 1,2 Mrd. EUR für den Bau des neuen Flughafens Berlin-Brandenburg (BER) bei der Kommission an. Diese Kapitalzuführung wurde unter anderem wie folgt begründet: „Zudem hatte ein deutsches Gericht im Juni 2012 unerwartet angeordnet, dass der Flughafen den Schallschutz für die Anwohner erheblich verbessern musste. […] Infolge der zuletzt genannten Verzögerung und des unerwarteten Gerichtsurteils musste die FBB ihre Bau- und Finanzplanung ändern; dabei zeigte sich, dass auf den Flughafen Zusatzkosten in Höhe von 1,2 Mrd. EUR zukommen würden“ ([1]).

Am 19. Dezember 2012 genehmigte die Kommission die von den öffentlichen Gesellschaftern des neuen Flughafens Berlin Brandenburg geplante Kapitalzuführung in Höhe von 1,2 Mrd. EUR.

Ich frage die Kommission, mit Bitte um einzelne Beantwortung:

1. Hält die Kommission das Argument der Antragsteller für zutreffend, ein „unerwartetes Gerichtsurteil“ sei mitverantwortlich für einen gestiegenen Kapitalbedarf der Flughafengesellschaft?

2. Wie bewertet es die Kommission, dass das besagte Urteil des Oberverwaltungsgerichts Berlin-Brandenburg vom 15. Juni 2012 ([2]) nicht fordert, den Schallschutz „erheblich zu verbessern“, sondern vielmehr einen Widerspruch des geplanten Schallschutzes mit geltendem Recht erkennt und zu dem Schluss kommt: „Das gegenwärtige Schallschutzprogramm der Vorhabenträgerin beruht auf der unzutreffenden Annahme, dass der Maximalpegel von 55 dB(A) im Rauminnern pro Durchschnittstag der sechs verkehrsreichsten Monate bis zu sechs Mal überschritten werden dürfe (NAT-Kriterium 6). Es verfehlt das planfestgestellte Tagschutzziel auch insoweit, als es bis zum Jahr 2015 zu einer durchschnittlichen Überschreitung des maßgeblichen Maximalpegels von ‚weniger als einmal täglich‘ (NAT-Kriterium 1) führt und in der Konsequenz eine stufenweise Umsetzung des baulichen Schallschutzes bedingt.“?

3. Hält die Kommission die Genehmigung der Kapitalzuführung vor dem Hintergrund des Widerspruchs zwischen dem Gerichtsurteil und den Angaben der deutschen Antragsteller weiterhin für gerechtfertigt? Wenn ja: warum? Wenn nein: Warum nicht, und welche Maßnahmen wird sie ergreifen?

Antwort von Herrn Almunia im Namen der Kommission
(10. April 2013)

Die Kommission traf ihre Entscheidung auf der Grundlage der Angaben Deutschlands. Aufgrund von notwendigen zusätzlichen Schallschutzmaßnahmen, Kosten für zusätzliche Bauarbeiten und Risikovorsorge sowie infolge der verzögerten Eröffnung wurde eine Kapitalzuführung für die Flughafengesellschaft Flughafen Berlin Brandenburg (FBB) notwendig.

Deutschland erklärte, dass Schallschutzvorschriften, wie sie in der (im April 2012 beantragten) einstweiligen Anordnung des Oberverwaltungsgerichts vom Juni 2012 gefordert wurden, im Jahr 2009 nicht vorausgesehen werden konnten. Die FBB hatte in ihrer Planung Rückstellungen für Risiken vorgesehen, doch die Umstände, die zu einer Kostensteigerung geführt hatten, waren nicht vorhersehbar. In der vorangegangenen Planung basierte das Schallschutzbudget auf den seinerzeit geltenden Vorschriften. Die Anordnung sah jedoch ein beispiellos hohes Schallschutzniveau vor.

Weder zum Zeitpunkt des Entwurfs des Investitionsplanes für den BER-Flughafen noch zum Zeitpunkt, als die Kommission 2009 die Entscheidung erließ, hätte die FBB vorhersehen können, dass zusätzliche Mittel für Schallschutzmaßnahmen notwendig sein würden. Die FBB konnte im Jahr 2009 auch nicht vorhersehen, dass Rechtsmittel eingelegt werden würden.

([1]) Siehe Seite 2, C(2012)9469 endg. vom 19.12.2012 unter: http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/cases/246863/246863_1395913_177_1.pdf

([2]) OVG 12 S 27.12, siehe: http://www.gerichtsentscheidungen.berlin-brandenburg.de/jportal/portal/t/27lf/bs/10/page/sammlung.psml?doc.hl=1&doc.id=MWRE120001909&documentnumber=153&numberofresults=1727&showdoccase=1&doc.part=K&paramfromHL=true#focuspoint

Daher hat die Kommission den Schluss gezogen, dass die 2012 angemeldete Maßnahme von derjenigen aus dem Jahr 2009 getrennt werden kann.

Die Kommission hat die wirtschaftliche Begründung der Anmeldung geprüft. Die Bauarbeiten am neuen BER-Flughafen waren zu 95 % abgeschlossen. Es musste daher geprüft werden, ob entweder eine Einstellung der Bauarbeiten oder aber eine weitere Kapitalzuführung für die Fertigstellung des BER-Flughafens wirtschaftlich sinnvoller wäre (Kriterium des marktwirtschaftlich handelnden Kapitalgebers). Nach Auffassung der Kommission wäre es nach dem Kriterium des marktwirtschaftlich handelnden Kapitalgebers sinnvoller, den Bau zu Ende zu führen. Aufgrund der Ergebnisse dieser Prüfung zog die Kommission den Schluss, dass die in Rede stehende Maßnahme keinen Verstoß gegen die Vorschriften über staatliche Beihilfen darstellt.

Aus diesen Gründen sieht die Kommission keinen Widerspruch zwischen ihrer Entscheidung bezüglich der einstweiligen Anordnung und der Anmeldung Deutschlands.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001282/13
to the Commission
Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: Approval of capital injection for Berlin-Brandenburg airport

On 28 November 2012, the Federal Republic of Germany and the *Länder* of Berlin and Brandenburg notified the Commission of a planned EUR 1.2 billion injection of capital into the construction of the new Berlin-Brandenburg airport. It was explained that this had become necessary for reasons including the following: 'Moreover, in June 2012 a national court unexpectedly ruled that the airport must significantly improve noise protection for its neighbours. […] As a result of […] delay and the unexpected court ruling, FBB [the airport management company] had to revise its construction and financing plans and it thereby became apparent that the airport would incur additional costs of EUR 1.2 billion.' ([1])

On 19 December 2012 the Commission approved the EUR 1.2 billion injection of capital by the airport's public-sector shareholders.

I would like the Commission to answer each of the following questions separately:

1. Does it accept the applicant's argument that the increase in the airport company's capital requirement resulted in part from an 'unexpected court ruling'?

2. How does the Commission view the fact that the ruling in question, delivered by the Berlin-Brandenburg Higher Administrative Court on 15 June 2012 ([2]), does not require the airport to 'significantly improve' its noise protection, but rather finds the planned noise protection arrangements to be inconsistent with the applicable law, concluding that: 'The developer's current noise protection programme is based on the mistaken assumption that the 55 dB(A) maximum daily average indoor sound level for the six busiest months may be exceeded up to six times (NAT criterion 6). It also fails to meet the daytime noise protection target set as a condition of planning approval inasmuch as it provides for the critical maximum sound level to be exceeded on average "less than once a day" (NAT criterion 1) in the period to 2015, thus necessitating a phasing-in of structural noise protection.'?

3. Given the discrepancy between the court ruling and the information supplied in the German application for approval of the capital injection, does the Commission still consider that the approval was justified? If so, why? If not, why not, and what steps does it intend to take?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2013)

The Commission based its decision on Germany's submission. The need to increase Flughafen Berlin Brandenburg's ('FBB') capital was due to demands for noise protection, additional construction work costs and delayed opening and provision for risk costs.

Germany stated that noise protection obligations, as called for in the OVB's preliminary injunction of June 2012 (initiated in April 2012), could not have been foreseen in 2009. FBB had included risk provisions in its planning, but the circumstances, causing the rise in costs, were unforeseen. In its previous planning, the noise protection budget was based on rules applicable at the time. But the injunction required a new, unprecedentedly strict level of noise protection.

FBB could not have foreseen the need for an increased noise protection budget when the BER investment plan was drafted, nor when the Commission took its 2009 decision. FBB could also not have predicted in 2009 legal action.

Thus, the Commission concluded that the measure notified in 2012 was severable from the one of 2009.

([1]) See page 2, C(2012) 9469 final, 19.12.2012 at: http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/cases/246863/246863_1395913_177_1.pdf
([2]) OVG 12 S 27.12, see http://www.gerichtsentscheidungen.berlin-brandenburg.de/jportal/portal/t/27lf/bs/10/page/sammlung.psml?doc.hl=1&doc.id=MWRE120001909&documentnumber=153&numberofresults=1727&showdoccase=1&doc.part=K&paramfromHL=true#focuspoint.

The Commission assessed the commercial rationale of the notification; 95% of the construction for the new BER airport was already completed. It was thus necessary to assess whether stopping this construction or injecting further capital to finalise BER made more sense economically (market economy investor test, 'MEIT'). In the Commission's view, the MEIT showed that it was better to finalise the construction. The results of this test were the basis for the Commission's conclusion that the measure does not infringe state aid rules.

In light of the above, the Commission does not recognise any discrepancy between its decision concerning the preliminary injunction and notification by Germany.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001283/13
an die Kommission
Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE)
(7. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: EU-Mittel für Feste Fehmarnbelt-Querung

Die EU beteiligt sich im Rahmen des Vorrangigen Vorhabens 20 der Transeuropäischen Verkehrsnetze (TEN-T) an der Finanzierung der Festen Fehmarnbelt-Querung.

1. Wie viele Euro sind in welchem Jahr von der EU für dieses Projekt bereits ausgezahlt worden?

2. Wie viel Geld steht in der laufenden Haushaltsperiode 2007-2013 noch maximal zur Verfügung?

3. Wurden EU-Mittel aus anderen Quellen als den TEN-T-Mitteln genutzt?

Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(12. März 2013)

Im aktuellen mehrjährigen Finanzrahmen 2007-2013 wurden von 2008 bis 2012 für die feste Fehmarnbelt-Querung aus dem TEN-V-Programm insgesamt 143 846 790,50 EUR aufgewendet. Dem Anhang können Sie die Aufschlüsselung nach Jahren entnehmen.

Nach dem derzeitigen Änderungsbeschluss ([1]) steht im Rahmen des aktuellen mehrjährigen Finanzrahmens noch ein Höchstbetrag von 49 390 790,50 EUR zur Verfügung. Die Projektkosten, die im Rahmen des aktuellen Finanzrahmens durch das TEN-V-Programm gedeckt sind, belaufen sich auf insgesamt 486 101 000 EUR für Studien und Vorarbeiten.

Der Kommission ist nicht bekannt, dass für dieses Projekt andere Mittel als Mittel aus dem TEN-V-Haushalt vorgesehen sind.

([1]) Beschluss K(2012)8552 endg. vom 19. November 2012 zur Änderung der Entscheidung K(2008)7998 vom 11. Dezember 2008, zuletzt geändert durch den Beschluss K(2012)453 vom 23. Januar 2012, bezüglich der Gewährung eines Gemeinschaftszuschusses für Vorhaben von gemeinsamem Interesse „Bauarbeiten und Studien für den Bau der festen Straßen- und Eisenbahnverbindung über den Fehmarnbelt" — 2007-EU-20050-P — auf dem Gebiet der transeuropäischen Verkehrsnetze (TEN-V).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001283/13
to the Commission
Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: EU funding for the fixed-link Fehmarn Belt crossing

As part of Priority Project 20 of the Trans-European Transport Networks (TEN-T), the EU is providing part of the funding for the fixed-link Fehmarn Belt crossing.

1. How many euros has the EU already spent on this project, and in which year?

2. What is the maximum sum of money which will be available in the remainder of the current budgetary period, 2007-2013?

3. Have any EU funds from sources other than the TEN-T funds been used?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(12 March 2013)

In the current multi-annual financial framework 2007-2013, the fixed-link Fehmarn Belt crossing has received EUR 143.846.790.50 from the TEN-T Programme in total, from 2008 to 2012. Please see the annex for the yearly distribution.

According to the current amending decision ([1]), a maximum of EUR 49.390.790.50 remains available under the current multi-annual financial framework. The total project costs covered by the TEN-T Programme under the current financial framework amount to EUR 486.101.000 covering studies and preparatory works.

The Commission has no knowledge of other funding apart from the TEN-T funds attributed to this project.

([1]) C(2012) 8552 final of 19.11.2012, amending Decision C(2008)7998 of 11 December 2008, as already amended by Decision C(2012) 453 of 23 January 2012, concerning the granting of Community financial aid for projects of common interest 'Studies and Works for the construction of Fehmarn Belt Fixed Rail-Road link' — 2007-EU-20050-P — in the field of the trans-European transport networks (TEN-T).

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001284/13
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(7. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: Neue Entwicklungen in Pakistan — Auswirkungen auf die EU

Jüngst wird eine Annäherung der pakistanischen politischen Strategie an westliche Werte und internationale Normen angedeutet.

Insbesondere im Bereich der Menschenrechte erscheint eine solche Veränderung wünschens- und unterstützenswert.

1. Hat die Kommission Kenntnis von dieser Entwicklung? Wenn ja, wodurch? Auf welche Berichte/Übermittlungen kann sich die Kommission dabei stützen?

2. Sollte eine solche Entwicklung in der Tat stattfinden, wie wirkt sich diese allenfalls auf EU-Fördergelder und von der EU finanzierte humanitäre Hilfe für Pakistan aus? Sind eventuell neue/ergänzende Projekte geplant, um unterstützend einzuwirken?

3. Wie wirken sich diese Entwicklungen auf die Außenpolitik der EU gegenüber Pakistan aus?

4. Sieht die Kommission dies als Chance für einen verstärkten Menschenrechtsdialog mit Pakistan?

5. Welche Maßnahmen sieht die Kommission vor, um 2014 nach dem Abzug der internationalen Truppen die Stabilität in der Region zu bewahren? Welche Überlegungen/Einschätzungen gibt es hierzu?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(27. März 2013)

2012 haben die EU und Pakistan einen neuen politischen Rahmen für Dialog und Zusammenarbeit, den „Fünf-Jahres-Maßnahmenplan“ (5-Year Engagement Plan) vereinbart, dessen Ziel es ist, durch eine auf gemeinsamen Werten, Grundsätzen und Verpflichtungen beruhende Partnerschaft ein strategisches Verhältnis aufzubauen. Der „Fünf-Jahres-Maßnahmenplan“ wird vom Strategischen Dialog auf Ministerebene überwacht, der im Juni 2012 von der Hohen Vertreterin und Vizepräsidentin Ashton und Außenministerin Khar in Islamabad eingeleitet wurde.

Der Maßnahmenplan sieht einen intensiveren Dialog, unter anderem über die Staatsführung, vor. Die Programmierung der Hilfe dürfte diese Prioritäten unterstützen, doch ist es noch zu früh, um sagen zu können, ob die verfügbaren Beträge beibehalten oder erhöht werden können. Die humanitäre Hilfe der EU ist nicht von politischen Überlegungen geleitet.

Im Rahmen des Strategischen Dialogs wurde vereinbart, dass auf dem bestehenden Menschenrechtsdialog aufgebaut und dieser ausgeweitet wird. Die EU geht ferner von einer Vertiefung ihres politischen Dialogs mit Pakistan, nicht zuletzt in Fragen der regionalen Zusammenarbeit, aus.

Die globale Stabilität der Region wird sowohl von der erfolgreichen Übertragung der Verantwortung für Sicherheit und Entwicklung in Afghanistan als auch von der Unterstützung des Friedensprozesses durch wichtige Akteure wie z. B. Pakistan abhängen. Zu den relevanten Gesichtspunkten zählen unter anderem die Fähigkeit der Geber zur Durchführung von Maßnahmen in Afghanistan und Pakistan, das entsprechende Niveau der internationalen Zusammenarbeit und der politische Wille der Regierungen zur Umsetzung der mit EU-Unterstützung finanzierten Maßnahmen nach den anstehenden Wahlen in beiden Ländern. Das herrschende Sicherheitsniveau ist ebenso ein entscheidender Faktor wie die Verfügbarkeit personeller und finanzieller Ressourcen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001284/13
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: New developments in Pakistan — implications for the EU

Pakistan has recently shown signs of bringing its political strategy more in line with Western values and international standards.

In the area of human rights in particular, such a change would be desirable and worthy of our support.

1. Is the Commission aware of any such developments? If, so how did it find out? What reports or sources can it cite?

2. Should such developments actually take place, what would the implications be for EU aid and EU-funded humanitarian assistance for Pakistan? Are any new or expanded projects planned to support such developments?

3. How would these developments affect EU policy towards Pakistan?

4. Would the Commission see them as an opportunity for stepping up human rights dialogue with Pakistan?

5. What measures does Commission intend to take to maintain stability in the region following the withdrawal of international troops in 2014? What considerations or calculations come into play here?

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

In 2012 the EU and Pakistan agreed on a new political framework for dialogue and cooperation, the 5-Year Engagement Plan, the aim of which is to build a strategic relationship by forging a partnership rooted in shared values, principles and commitments. The 5-Year Engagement Plan will be overseen by the ministerial level Strategic Dialogue which was launched in Islamabad by HRVP Ashton and Foreign Minister Khar in June 2012.

The Engagement Plan provides for deeper dialogue on, amongst other issues, governance. Programming of assistance should support these priorities, although it is too early to say whether the amounts available can be maintained or increased. The EU's humanitarian aid is not subject to political considerations.

As part of the Strategic Dialogue it has been agreed to build on and expand the existing dialogue on human rights. The EU also expects to deepen its political dialogue with Pakistan, not least on issues affecting regional cooperation.

The overall stability of the region will depend both on the successful transfer of responsibility for security and development in Afghanistan, and on the support for the peace process of key players such as Pakistan. Among relevant considerations are the ability of donors to carry out operations in Afghanistan and Pakistan, the level of international cooperation in so doing, and the political will of the governments formed after the forthcoming elections in both countries to implement policies supported by EU funding. The prevailing level of security will be a key determinant as will the availability of human and budgetary resources.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001286/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(7 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Giornata mondiale contro il cancro: quattro leggende da sfatare

L'Organizzazione mondiale della sanità, in occasione della giornata mondiale contro il cancro, ha riportato che il cancro è responsabile del 20 % delle morti che avvengono in Europa: ogni anno sono oltre 3 milioni i nuovi casi e 1,7 milioni i decessi provocati da questa malattia, che rimane la principale causa di morte e invalidità, dopo le patologie cardiovascolari. Il cancro, ricorda l'OMS, in molti casi è però prevenibile e una diagnosi precoce aumenta in modo significativo le possibilità di cura. Sono quattro i miti che è indispensabile sfatare nella società moderna: «il cancro è solo un problema di salute», «è una malattia dei paesi ricchi, sviluppati e "vecchi"», «una diagnosi di tumore equivale a una condanna a morte», «è una questione di destino». Il cancro ha importanti e pesanti implicazioni di vasta portata sociale, economica e nell'ambito dei diritti umani e colpisce in massa, dai bambini agli anziani, dalle persone sane a quelle già affette da altre patologie, ma fa riflettere che nel mondo oltre il 70 % delle morti per cancro si verifica nei paesi a basso e medio reddito, che hanno poche o inesistenti risorse per la prevenzione, la diagnosi e il trattamento. Basti pensare che il tumore al collo dell'utero, trattato e il più delle volte sconfitto nei paesi occidentali grazie a un vaccino, fa registrare l'85 % dei decessi mondiali esclusivamente in paesi in via di sviluppo, dove il vaccino non arriva. Oggi sono sempre di più le strategie terapeutiche che permettono di combattere la malattia, sconfiggerla e guarire, o conviverci per lungo tempo allungando di molto la sopravvivenza. La parola che traccia un filo rosso è prevenzione: uno stile di vita corretto si deve associare a frequenti controlli di screening mirati, spesso offerti gratuitamente.

Considerando che attualmente è possibile prevenire un terzo di tutti i tumori semplicemente grazie alla prevenzione e all'intervento sugli stili di vita, quindi evitando di fumare, adottando una dieta salutare, consumando poco alcol e facendo attività fisica, può la Commissione far sapere se ritenga prioritario instaurare con gli organi sanitari di ogni Stato membro una campagna informativa atta a sfatare i quattro miti cui fa riferimento l'OMS?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(25 marzo 2013)

La prevenzione dei tumori è al centro della politica sanitaria europea. Nel Codice europeo contro il cancro ([1]) la Commissione ha in particolare sottolineato l'importanza di uno stile di vita salutare. Il Codice comprende undici consigli, facilmente traducibili in pratica e fondati su solide basi scientifiche, che suggeriscono ai cittadini come prevenire alcuni tumori grazie all'adozione di uno stile di vita salutare e seguendo programmi del settore sanitario pubblico (quali lo screening) per aumentare le prospettive di guarigione. Il Codice vuole trasmettere due concetti principali: alcuni tumori possono essere evitati adottando uno stile di vita salutare; se vengono diagnosticate in tempo tali patologie possono inoltre essere curabili o presentare maggiori prospettive di guarigione.

Il Codice è attualmente in corso di aggiornamento, e viene promosso regolarmente, non da ultimo durante la Settimana europea contro il cancro che si tiene ogni anno nel mese di Maggio.

Al fine di aiutare gli Stati Membri a mettere in pratica le raccomandazioni del Consiglio riguardo allo screening dei tumori ([2]) la Commissione ha pubblicato le Linee Guida Europee per la garanzia della qualità relative allo screening dei tumori al seno, cervicali e colorettali. La Commissione verifica anche che gli Stati Membri rispettino la raccomandazione.

La Commissione si occupa altresì dei principali fattori di rischio, ad esempio tramite campagne contro il tabagismo e strategie e piattaforme riguardanti alcool, nutrizione e attività fisica che portano gli Stati membri a collaborare con una vasta gamma di organismi interessati, ivi comprese ONG e alcune imprese.

In aggiunta alle suddette attività la Commissione non intende attualmente organizzare ulteriori campagne di sensibilizzazione in questo campo.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/major_chronic_diseases/diseases/cancer/index_en.htm#fragment2.
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2003:327:0034:0038:EN:PDF.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001286/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: World Cancer Day: four cancer myths that need to be dispelled

According to figures released by the World Health Organisation (WHO) on World Cancer Day, one in five deaths in Europe are caused by cancer — there are more than three million new cases and 1.7 million cancer deaths every year. After cardiovascular disease, cancer is the main cause of death and illness in Europe. However, the WHO also reminded us that cancer can often be prevented and that an early diagnosis increases significantly the chances of treatment being successful. There are four cancer myths in society today which need to be dispelled — 'cancer is only a health problem', 'it is a disease found in rich, developed and "old" countries', 'a tumour is effectively a death sentence', and 'whether you get cancer or not is a matter of fate'. Cancer has significant and serious implications for society, the economy and human rights and affects everybody — the young and the old, the healthy and people with pre-existing conditions. However, it is a sobering fact that more than 70 % of global cancer deaths occur in low and middle-income countries, which lack the resources needed for prevention, diagnosis and treatment. Eighty-five per cent of the deaths caused by cervical cancer, which has been eradicated to a large extent in western countries through a vaccination programme, occur in developing countries, where the vaccine is not currently available. Nowadays more and more treatments are available which can cure cancer or prolong considerably the life of patients. Prevention is the key to fighting the disease — a healthy lifestyle and regular, targeted screening programmes, wherever possible provided free of charge, are the two main components.

Given that it is now possible to cut the incidence of tumours by a third simply through prevention and healthy lifestyle choices (no smoking, a healthy diet, limited alcohol intake and enough physical exercise), can the Commission say whether it considers it a priority to launch an awareness campaign involving the health authorities of each Member State in order to dispel the four cancer myths highlighted by the WHO?

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

Addressing the prevention of cancer is a cornerstone of the EU health policy. The Commission has specially addressed the issue of raising awareness of healthy lifestyle choices in the European Code Against Cancer ([1]). The Code comprises 11 evidence-based user-friendly recommendations to citizens on how to help avoid certain cancers by adopting healthier lifestyles, and how to improve prospects of cure by taking part in public health programmes such as screening. The Code seeks to pass across two clear messages: certain cancers may be avoided by adopting healthier lifestyle; and cancers may be cured, or the prospects of cure greatly increased, if they are detected early.

The Code is promoted regularly including during the European Week Against Cancer, held annually in May, and is currently being updated.

To assist the Member States in implementing the Council Recommendation on cancer screening ([2]), the Commission has issued European Guidelines for quality assurance for breast, cervical and colorectal cancer screening. The Commission also monitors the implementation of the recommendation by the Member States.

Moreover, the Commission addresses the key risk factors e.g. through tobacco control policy, strategies and platforms on alcohol, nutrition and physical activity bringing together Member States and a wide range of stakeholders including NGOs and industry.

Further to these activities, the Commission does not currently intend to launch an awareness raising campaign in this area.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/major_chronic_diseases/diseases/cancer/index_en.htm#fragment2.
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2003:327:0034:0038:EN:PDF.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001287/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(7 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Malattie cerebrovascolari — cure e interventi negli Stati membri

Le malattie cerebrovascolari rappresentano uno dei maggiori problemi sociosanitari in quanto seconda causa di morte e prima causa d'invalidità a livello mondiale. In Italia si verificano 200 000 nuovi casi/anno di malattia cerebrovascolare, quindi di ictus, dei quali circa l'80 % è rappresentato da casi ischemici (e di questi un quarto è costituito da recidive); le emorragie sono invece meno frequenti, ma la relativa mortalità è molto più elevata. Per l'ictus ischemico la mortalità nelle prime 4 settimane è del 20 %, che sale al 30 % se si considerano i primi 12 mesi.

In una cittadina piemontese una bambina di soli tre anni è stata colpita da ictus ischemico all'arteria basilare del cervello; la piccola è arrivata in ospedale già tetraplegica e con un elevato rischio di non sopravvivere. In un ospedale specializzato nel trattamento dei bambini è stata sottoposta d'urgenza a un intervento chirurgico che è stato eseguito impiegando un catetere venoso dall'inguine al cervello e, mediante un'operazione di trombectomia, è stato rimosso il trombo. La bambina è ricoverata nel reparto di pediatria e ha ripreso sia a parlare che a mangiare, nonostante alcune difficoltà a una parte del corpo per la quale si auspica un recupero grazie a un attento programma di riabilitazione.

Una ricerca condotta in una regione del centro Italia ha rilevato che un ormone prodotto naturalmente durante la gravidanza, la Relaxina, si candida come nuova terapia per l'arteriosclerosi, per il recupero funzionale nei casi di ictus cerebrale e per i pazienti con insufficienza cardiaca.

Considerando che:

— è rarissimo che un ictus ischemico colpisca un bambino in tenera età e che l'operazione sopradescritta è la prima che viene svolta al mondo su un paziente pediatrico;

— in Italia solo il 25 % dei pazienti sopravvissuti a un ictus ischemico guarisce completamente, mentre altri convivono con un deficit che nel 50 % dei casi è talmente grave da determinare una perdita di autosufficienza e quindi, spesso, la necessità di vivere in strutture per degenti cronici;

— in Europa sono in corso trial clinici per valutare gli effetti di una forma sintetica di Relaxina su pazienti con gravi scompensi cardiaci acuti,

l'interrogante desidera chiedere alla Commissione se:

1. sono in corso ricerche sugli effetti di un ictus su un corpo in crescita come quello di un bambino;

2. intende creare omogeneità nei livelli di assistenza e di prevenzione tra i vari Stati membri in riferimento alle malattie cerebrovascolari;

3. ritiene opportuno proporre uno studio di *best practice* che possa indirizzare gli operatori del settore verso centri di eccellenza nel campo in questione come quello presente nel Nord Italia.

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(18 marzo 2013)

1. La Commissione non sostiene attualmente attraverso il Settimo programma quadro di ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico progetti che affrontano in modo specifico la problematica dell'ictus nei bambini e nei giovani. Tuttavia, circa 129 milioni di euro sono consacrati a 45 progetti di ricerca sull'ictus. I principali ambiti trattati comprendono la ricerca sulla fisiopatologia nonché lo sviluppo di strumenti diagnostici e di nuove terapie. Circa 6 milioni di euro sono consacrati in modo specifico al progetto in corso NEUROPT ([1]) che sta sviluppando uno strumento a immagine ottica diffusa da applicarsi su adulti e bambini.

2. L'erogazione di assistenza alle vittime di ictus rientra nella responsabilità degli Stati membri. A sostegno degli Stati membri la Commissione finanzia il progetto SITS EAST (2007-2010) condotto dal Karolinska Institute, Svezia, con partner associati nella Repubblica ceca, in Estonia, Ungheria, Lituania, Polonia, Slovenia, Turchia e Slovacchia. Il progetto contribuisce alla prevenzione su base esperienziale e alla terapia acuta dell'ictus nelle cliniche ed ha aumentato considerevolmente il numero dei pazienti che hanno ricevuto una terapia collaudata, con conseguente riduzione della mortalità e della morbilità dei pazienti che hanno ricevuto tale trattamento.

Per quanto concerne la prevenzione delle malattie cerebro-vascolari, la Commissione affronta i determinanti di base di tali patologie attraverso le sue politiche in tema di fumo, alimentazione, attività fisica e alcool.

3. Esistono già compilazioni di pratiche ottimali relative alla prevenzione e al trattamento acuto dell'ictus che prendono le mosse da una salda base esperienziale. Un esempio di diffusione di buone pratiche è la rete «Safe Implementation of Treatments in Stroke» (Applicazione sicura delle terapie contro l'ictus, rete SITS) ([2]), che è una rete collaborativa internazionale non-profit di ispirazione accademica con sede presso il Karolinska Institute in Svezia.

([1]) NEUROPT Non-invasive imaging of brain function and disease by pulsed near infrared light/ http://www.neuropt.eu/project.html
([2]) https://sitsinternational.org/homefoldercontent/organisation/organisation.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001287/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: Cerebrovascular disease — treatment and surgery in Member States

Cerebrovascular diseases are a major social and health problem — they are the second most frequent cause of death and the primary cause of disability in the world. There are 200 000 new cerebrovascular cases (strokes) in Italy every year, around 80 % of which are ischaemic cases (a quarter of them relapses). Brain haemorrhages, meanwhile, are less common, but the mortality rate is much higher. Twenty per cent of people who suffer an ischaemic stroke die within the first four weeks, a figure which rises to 30 % over the first 12 months.

A three-year-old girl from a small town in the Piedmont region of Italy suffered an ischaemic stroke when the blood supply in the main artery leading to her brain was disrupted. When she arrived at hospital, she had already lost all movement in her arms and legs and doctors thought it unlikely that she would survive. The child was taken to a specialist paediatric hospital for emergency surgery in the course of which an intravenous catheter was threaded through her body from the groin to the brain in order to remove the blood clot. She was then admitted to the hospital's paediatric ward and is now talking and eating again. She still has some paralysis, but it is hoped that with an intensive rehabilitation programme she will make a full recovery.

A study carried out in a region in central Italy has shown that the hormone relaxin, which is produced naturally during pregnancy, could be used as a new treatment for patients with atherosclerosis or heart problems and for people recovering from strokes.

Bearing in mind that:

— it is extremely rare for such a young child to suffer an ischaemic stroke and that she was the first child in the world to undergo the surgical procedure described above;

— only one in four ischaemic stroke victims in Italy makes a full recovery, and that of those who do not, half are so physically impaired by the stroke that they can no longer look after themselves and often have no choice but to move into care homes;

— clinical trials are under way in Europe to evaluate the effects of a synthetic form of relaxin on patients suffering from acute cardiac decompensation,

1. Can the Commission say whether any research is being carried out into the effects that strokes may have on children and young people, whose bodies are not yet fully developed?

2. Does it intend to harmonise the arrangements for the provision of assistance to stroke victims and prevention of cerebrovascular diseases in the Member States?

3. Will it propose a best practice study to encourage healthcare professionals to draw on the expertise offered by centres of excellence in cerebrovascular care, such as the one in northern Italy?

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

1. The Commission is not currently supporting projects specifically addressing stroke in children and young people through the 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development. However, some EUR 129 million are devoted to 45 projects on stroke research. The main areas addressed include research on physiopathology as well as the development of diagnostic tools and new treatments. EUR 6 million is specifically devoted to the ongoing NEUROPT project ([1]) which is developing a diffuse optical imaging device that can be applied in adults and in children.

2. The provision of assistance to stroke victims is the responsibility of Member States. To support Member States, the Commission has been financing the project SITS EAST (2007-2010) lead by the Karolinska Institute, Sweden with associated partners in the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, Slovenia, Turkey, and Slovakia. The project contributed to evidence-based prevention and acute stroke treatment in clinics, substantially increased the number of patients who were given evidence-based stroke treatment and led to lower mortality and morbidity from stroke for patients given such treatment.

With regard to the prevention of cerebrovascular diseases, the Commission is addressing the underlying determinants of the disease through its policies on smoking, nutrition, physical activity, and alcohol.

3. There are already compilations of best practices of evidence-based prevention and acute stroke treatment in place. An example of dissemination of good practices is the 'Safe Implementation of Treatments in Stroke' network (SITS Network) ([2]), which is an academic-driven, non-profit, international collaboration with a base at Karolinska Institute in Sweden.

([1]) NEUROPT Non-invasive imaging of brain function and disease by pulsed near infrared light/ http://www.neuropt.eu/project.html
([2]) https://sitsinternational.org/homefoldercontent/organisation/organisation.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001288/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(7 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Mutilazioni genitali femminili: la risoluzione ONU del dicembre 2012 apra la strada della concretezza anche in Europa

Il 20 dicembre 2012 l'Assemblea generale dell'ONU ha adottato la risoluzione di messa al bando universale della pratica delle mutilazioni genitali femminili (MGF). La risoluzione esorta inoltre gli Stati membri dell'ONU a intraprendere tutte le misure necessarie ad approvare normative che proteggano le donne e le ragazze da questa forma di violenza inaudita. Sono previste non solo misure punitive, ma anche assistenza sanitaria e psicologica alle donne vittime. A livello internazionale, dunque, è stato raggiunto un grande obiettivo nella lotta con le MGF.

Il valore essenziale di tale risoluzione — che abolisce le mutilazioni genitali femminili a livello mondiale — consiste nel gettare le basi per un'armonizzazione delle azioni intraprese dai paesi membri. Alla luce della recente risoluzione ONU e della risoluzione del Parlamento europeo del 14 giugno 2012, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. Se e con quali tempistiche intende intraprendere raccomandazioni e orientamenti per lo sviluppo e il potenziamento degli strumenti giuridici nazionali e internazionali esistenti, oltre che per l'elaborazione di norme rafforzate nella lotta contro le MGF?

2. Se ritiene opportuno o addirittura necessario inserire le mutilazioni genitali femminili nel quadro di una strategia prioritaria generale di lotta alla violenza nei confronti delle donne, che comprenda azioni congiunte?

3. Se intende destinare nuove risorse finanziarie e intensificare i programmi mirati all'interno dell'Unione europea e nei paesi terzi?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(3 aprile 2013)

La Commissione intende continuare a sviluppare iniziative efficaci e coerenti per sostenere gli Stati membri nella lotta alla violenza nei confronti delle donne, compresa la lotta contro le mutilazioni genitali femminili (MGF), avvalendosi di tutte le competenze dell'UE.

Nel 2013 la Commissione darà il via ad una serie di attività sulle MGF. L'8 marzo il commissario responsabile per la Giustizia, i diritti fondamentali e la cittadinanza ha tenuto una tavola rotonda sul problema. Lo stesso giorno è stata lanciata una consultazione pubblica, i cui risultati saranno utili alla Commissione per elaborare la propria strategia in materia. La Commissione inoltre sosterrà non solo le attività di informazione e comunicazione intraprese dagli Stati membri per porre fine alla violenza sulle donne, ivi comprese le MGF (mediante il programma Progresso), ma anche i progetti di organizzazioni locali volti a contrastare questa e altre pratiche nefaste (mediante il programma Daphne).

Sul fronte dell'assistenza esterna ai paesi terzi, la Commissione adotta un duplice approccio: da un lato appoggia ogni manifesto sforzo teso a migliorare la legislazione nazionale e a sviluppare politiche nazionali adeguate che promuovano e tutelino i diritti delle donne e vietino le pratiche nefaste, dall'altro sostiene sia le iniziative che puntano a rafforzare le competenze dei funzionari pubblici sia le azioni volte a far conoscere il problema e a sensibilizzare tutti i settori della società.

La Commissione finanzia peraltro progetti nei paesi più poveri in cui la società civile svolge spesso un ruolo fondamentale. È anche grazie ad un progetto innovativo UE-UNICEF, ad esempio, che in paesi quali Egitto, Eritrea, Etiopia, Senegal e Sudan è mutata la percezione che l'opinione pubblica ha delle mutilazioni genitali femminili e si è arrivati alla loro messa al bando.

La lotta contro ogni forma di violenza nei confronti delle donne e delle bambine continuerà ad essere una delle priorità del prossimo programma di cooperazione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001288/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: Female genital mutilation: the UN resolution of December 2012 also offers a chance for concrete measures in the European Union

On 20 December 2012, the UN General Assembly adopted the resolution imposing a universal ban on the practice of female genital mutilation (FGM). In addition, the resolution urges the UN Members States to implement all the measures necessary for approving legislation to protect women and girls from this unthinkable form of violence. Provision is made not only for punitive measures, but also for healthcare and psychological assistance for the victims. This therefore represents a considerable achievement at international level in the fight against FGM.

The fundamental value of this resolution — which outlaws female genital mutilation across the world — consists in laying the foundations for a harmonisation of the measures implemented in the Member States. In the light of the recent UN resolution and the European Parliament resolution of 14 June 2012:

1. Does the Commission intend to issue recommendations and advice for the development and reinforcement of existing national and international legal instruments, as well as for the drafting of stronger legislation in the fight against FGM, and if so what will the time frame be?

2. Does it believe it appropriate or even necessary to include female genital mutilation within the framework of a general strategy focusing on the fight against violence towards women, which will include joint actions?

3. Does it intend to allocate new financial resources and intensify targeted programmes within the European Union and third countries?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(3 April 2013)

The Commission intends to continue developing effective and consistent initiatives to support Member States in eradicating violence against women, including female genital mutilation (FGM), making full use of EU competences.

In 2013, the Commission will launch a series of activities to address FGM. On 6 March, the Member of the Commission responsible for Justice, Fundamental Rights and Citizenship hosted a Round-Table on FGM. The results of a public consultation launched the same day will feed into the Commission's policy development on FGM. The Commission will also support Member States' information and communication activities aiming at ending violence against women including FGM (through the Progress program) and grass-root level organisations for projects aiming at fighting FGM and other harmful practices (through the Daphne program).

In its external assistance to third countries, the Commission adopts a two-pronged approach. It supports advocacy for the improvement of national legislation as well as the development of adequate national policies for the promotion and protection of women's rights and the prohibition of harmful practices. It also supports capacity-building initiatives for government officials and advocacy and awareness-raising for all sectors of society.

The Commission also funds projects in the poorest countries with civil society often playing a crucial role. For instance, an innovative EU and Unicef project has contributed to change attitudes and to progress towards ending female genital mutilation in Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Senegal and Sudan.

The fight against all forms of violence against women and girls will remain among the priorities of the future cooperation programme.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001289/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(7 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Recupero del cibo sprecato dalle mense: quale futuro per la risoluzione del Parlamento europeo del 19 gennaio 2012?

Semplici interventi dei consumatori e dei dettaglianti possono contribuire a tagliare 1,3 miliardi di tonnellate di cibo che ogni anno vanno sprecate: questo l'obiettivo della campagna internazionale «Think. Eat. Save.» lanciata dall'UNEP, dalla FAO e da altri partner contro gli sprechi alimentari. La campagna nasce all'interno dell'iniziativa «Save Food» per ridurre le perdite e gli sprechi alimentari lungo l'intera catena della produzione e del consumo alimentare. Dall'analisi dei dati della FAO, circa un terzo di tutto il cibo prodotto, per un valore approssimativo di mille miliardi di dollari, va perduto o sprecato lungo la produzione e il consumo. Lo sviluppo di un programma per il settore alimentare è un elemento centrale del quadro programmatico decennale per modelli di consumo e produzioni sostenibili (SCP) nato da Rio+20, e, al riguardo, la stessa Commissione ha fissato l'obiettivo di una riduzione del 50 % degli sprechi alimentari entro il 2020.

Considerato che:

— la risoluzione del Parlamento europeo del 19 gennaio 2012 «invita la Commissione, allo scopo di dare l'esempio, ad affrontare il problema dello spreco alimentare all'interno delle istituzioni dell'Unione e ad adottare con urgenza le misure necessarie per ridurre l'enorme quantità di derrate alimentari gettate ogni giorno nelle mense delle varie istituzioni europee»;

— esiste un gap normativo a livello europeo per quanto riguarda lo spreco alimentare che crea, peraltro, notevoli difficoltà di attuazione delle normative nazionali in questo settore;

— in Italia, ad esempio, la legge 155/2003 «disciplina la distribuzione dei prodotti alimentari a fini di solidarietà sociale» e consente alle Onlus di carattere sociale di recuperare gli alimenti deperibili e distribuirli agli indigenti;

— tuttavia, tale normativa ha spesso trovato difficile attuazione a causa degli ostacoli imposti dalla cosiddetta «responsabilità di percorso», che rendeva responsabili le aziende del cibo donato anche dopo la consegna agli enti non profit;

si chiede alla Commissione:

— quali misure legislative e azioni specifiche di promozione intende intraprendere per favorire il recupero da mense, supermercati, aziende alimentari e aziende di ristorazione collettiva di beni alimentari (e non solo) ad alta deperibilità (cibo cotto, alimenti freschi) rimasti invenduti nel circuito della ristorazione, al fine di distribuirli a enti no profit attivi nell'assistenza di persone bisognose;

— come intende rimuovere gli ostacoli burocratici fiscali e sanitari imposti dalle normative nazionali che impediscono l'attuazione concreta delle azioni finalizzate alla riduzione dello spreco di alimenti attraverso il canale solidaristico.

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(14 marzo 2013)

La Commissione sta analizzando, in stretta cooperazione con gli stakeholder, come ridurre gli sprechi alimentari senza compromettere la sicurezza alimentare e intrattiene discussioni sulle possibili misure unionali atte a integrare le misure nazionali.

L'ultima riunione del Gruppo di lavoro sulle perdite e gli sprechi alimentari nel contesto del Gruppo consultivo per la catena alimentare e per la salute animale e vegetale, tenutasi l'8 febbraio 2013, era imperniata su soggetti specifici come ad esempio gli ostacoli alla donazione di eccedenze alimentari alle banche alimentari, fraintendimenti sulla data riportata sull'etichetta (da consumarsi preferibilmente entro/data limite di consumo), ostacoli legali nel settore dei mangimi, valore aggiunto delle filiere alimentari corte, sviluppo della politica UE in tema di bioenergia correlata alla prevenzione degli sprechi alimentari, ecc.

Per quanto concerne gli ostacoli alla donazione dei surplus alimentari alle banche alimentari, sono state menzionate la direttiva sull'IVA e la legislazione UE in tema di igiene alimentare (la relazione della riunione figura sul sito web della Commissione consacrato agli sprechi alimentari ([1])). Quale sequela diretta della riunione la Commissione ha pubblicato sul suo sito web consacrato agli sprechi alimentari le linee guida del comitato IVA ([2]) indirizzate agli Stati membri per armonizzare l'applicazione della direttiva sull'IVA; in particolare, per quanto concerne la donazione di alimenti esse interpretano gli articoli pertinenti. La Commissione ha pubblicato anche un manualetto user-friendly di buone pratiche in tema di iniziative per la riduzione degli sprechi alimentari contenente una sezione sulla ridistribuzione degli alimenti. Gli stakeholder sono invitati a continuare a inviare esempi di tali buone pratiche.

I risultati delle riunioni del Gruppo di lavoro alimenteranno le riflessioni in tema di alimentazione sostenibile, nonché ulteriori consultazioni pubbliche.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/sustainability/index_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/sustainability/docs/guidelines-vat-committee_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001289/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: Salvaging food wasted by canteens: what future for the European Parliament resolution of 19 January 2012?

Simple measures taken by consumers and retailers can help to cut the amount of food wasted every year by 1.3 billion tonnes: this is the goal of the international 'Think. Eat. Save.' campaign launched by UNEP, FAO and other partners to combat food wastage. The campaign is part of the 'Save Food' initiative to reduce the amount of food lost and wasted along the entire food production and consumption chain. FAO data analysis reveals that around a third of all food produced, valued at approximately USD 1000 billion, is lost or wasted along the food production and consumption chain. The development of a programme for the food sector is a key element of the 10-year framework programme for sustainable consumption and production (SCP) models launched as a result of the Rio+20 conference. With this in mind, the Commission has set the goal of reducing food wastage by 50 % by 2020.

Given that:

— the European Parliament resolution of 19 January 2012 'calls on the Commission to set an example by addressing food waste within the EU institutions, and to take the necessary measures as a matter of urgency to reduce the particularly large quantity of food discarded every day in the canteens of the various EU institutions';

— there is a legislative gap at European level concerning food waste which creates considerable difficulties in implementing national legislation in this sector;

— in Italy, for example, Law 155/2003 'regulates the distribution of food products for the purposes of social solidarity' and allows charities to salvage perishable foodstuffs and distribute them to the needy;

— it has often been difficult to implement this law because of the obstacles caused by the so-called 'routing responsibility', which makes companies who donate food responsible for it even after it has been delivered to non-profit bodies;

Can the Commission say:

— what legislative action and specific promotional measures it intends to take to promote the salvaging, from canteens, supermarkets, food companies and catering companies of (among other things) highly perishable foodstuffs (cooked food, fresh food) left unsold in catering establishments, in order to distribute them to non-profit bodies which assist people in need;

— how it intends to remove the bureaucratic, fiscal and hygiene obstacles imposed by national legislation which prevent the implementation of measures aimed at reducing, through social solidarity, the amount of food wasted?

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

The Commission is analysing, in close cooperation with stakeholders, how to reduce food waste without compromising food safety and is discussing possible EU measures to complement national measures.

The most recent meeting of the Working Group on Food Losses and Food Waste in the context of the Advisory Group on the Food Chain, Animal and Plant Health on 8 February 2013 focused on specific topics such as obstacles in donation of surplus food to food banks, misunderstandings of date labelling (best before/use by), legal barriers in the feed sector, added value of the short food supply chains, development of the EU bio-energy policy related to food waste prevention, etc.

Concerning the obstacles in donation of surplus food to food banks the EU VAT Directive and the EU Food Hygiene legislation were mentioned (meeting report on the Commission's food waste website ([1])). As a direct outcome of the meeting the Commission published on its food waste website the EU VAT Committee Guidelines ([2]) to Member States to harmonise the application of the VAT Directive; specifically on food donation it interprets the relevant articles. The Commission also published a user-friendly compilation of good practices on food waste reduction initiatives, including a section on food redistribution. Stakeholders were invited to continue sending such good practices.

The results of the Working Group meetings will feed into further reflections on Sustainable Food, including further public consultation.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/sustainability/index_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/sustainability/docs/guidelines-vat-committee_en.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001290/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(7 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Kit per la fabbricazione di falsi vini in polvere in vendita sul web — Richiesta di ulteriori precisazioni

Con riferimento alla risposta E-011274/2012 del Commissario Dacian Ciolos alla mia interrogazione sui «Kit per la fabbricazione di falsi vini in polvere in vendita online», è la Commissione in grado di specificare se tutti gli Stati membri hanno comunicato le misure prese dalle rispettive autorità di controllo per mettere fine a queste pratiche illegali? Può specificare quali misure sono state prese e come le valuta in termini di efficacia ed efficienza?

Considerato che il commercio online non ha confini, come pensa la Commissione di procedere nell'eventualità che uno Stato membro non abbia preso le misure necessarie per mettere fine a tali pratiche?

Preso atto che l'agropirateria all'intera filiera del «Made in» corrisponde ad almeno 165 milioni di euro al giorno, ha la Commissione intenzione di costituire una task force europea che identifichi e denunci tutti i comportamenti scorretti dei produttori che nei mercati extra UE vendono e diffondono, anche sfruttando il commercio elettronico, prodotti contraffatti?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloș a nome della Commissione
(26 marzo 2013)

In occasione della riunione del comitato di gestione tenutasi il 29 gennaio 2013, gli Stati membri hanno confermato che le rispettive autorità di vigilanza hanno adottato provvedimenti per vietare pratiche illegali riguardanti l'etichettatura di kit per la fabbricazione di falsi vini in polvere. In particolare, il Regno Unito ha chiesto agli importatori e ai distributori di ritirare tali prodotti dal mercato. È stata evidenziata la necessità di adottare provvedimenti anche contro le aziende che si occupano di commercio elettronico e, a tal fine, è stato richiesto un intervento da parte degli Stati membri in cui queste aziende hanno sede.

Al momento la Commissione non intende adottare misure supplementari.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001290/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: Online sale of kits for manufacturing fake wines from powder — request for further clarification

With reference to answer E-011274/2012 by Commissioner Dacian Cioloş to my question on the 'online sale of kits for manufacturing fake wines from powder', can the Commission say whether all the Member States have notified it of the measures taken by the relevant regulatory authorities to put an end to these illegal practices? Can it detail the measures taken and say how effective and efficient it believes they have been?

Given that online trade has no borders, how does the Commission intend to act if a Member State has not taken the measures required to put a stop to these practices?

Considering that agricultural piracy affecting the whole supply chain of products with a designation of origin is worth at least EUR 165 million per day, does the Commission intend to set up a European task force that will identify and take action against all wrongful acts by producers who sell and distribute counterfeit products in markets outside the EU, including via *e*-commerce?

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

At the meeting of the management Committee of 29 January 2013, Member States have confirmed that their control authorities have taken actions to prevent the illegal practices as regards labelling of kits for manufacturing fake wines from powder. In particular, the United Kingdom has requested importers and distributors to withdraw such products from the market. It was highlighted that actions must also be taken against e-commerce companies. Member States where those companies are based were requested to take action.

For the time being, the Commission does not intend to take supplementary measures.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001291/13
à Comissão
Ana Gomes (S&D), Edite Estrela (S&D), Elisa Ferreira (S&D), Luís Paulo Alves (S&D), Luis Manuel Capoulas Santos (S&D) e António Fernando Correia de Campos (S&D)
(7 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Precariedade dos professores contratados pelo Governo português

Existem em Portugal 37 565 professores contratados com 4 ou mais anos de tempo de serviço e 11 526 com 10 ou mais anos de tempo de serviço. Ano após ano, veem os seus contratos terminados a 31 de agosto para depois lhes ser celebrado novo contrato a partir de 1 de setembro.

A última proposta do Governo português não dá resposta à gravíssima situação de precariedade dos professores contratados. Foi recentemente publicado um aviso de abertura de vagas a preencher, confirmando-se o total de 603.

Muitos destes professores têm vindo a apresentar junto da Comissão Europeia denúncias individuais no sentido desta ser alertada para a alegada violação, por parte do Governo português, da Diretiva 1999/70/CE do Conselho, de 28 de junho de 1999, relativamente ao desempenho de funções docentes por parte dos professores contratados.

1. Que comentário tem a Comissão a fazer relativamente à violação sistemática da Diretiva em epígrafe por parte do Governo português?

2. Que medidas já tomou, porventura, a Comissão relativamente ao Governo português para que pare de violar a Diretiva e corrija a situação?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(26 de março de 2013)

A Comissão lançou investigações e enviou uma carta de notificação para cumprir às autoridades portuguesas em 30 de setembro de 2011. A resposta suscitou novos aspetos adicionais que justificaram o envio de uma notificação complementar para cumprir em 1 de outubro de 2012. A resposta está atualmente a ser avaliada e cotejada com as queixas e materiais apresentados em diversas queixas e numa petição. Uma vez concluída a avaliação, serão tomadas as medidas adequadas no quadro das competências da Comissão, a fim de garantir a correta aplicação do direito da UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001291/13
to the Commission
Ana Gomes (S&D), Edite Estrela (S&D), Elisa Ferreira (S&D), Luís Paulo Alves (S&D), Luis Manuel Capoulas Santos (S&D) and António Fernando Correia de Campos (S&D)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: Insecurity of teachers employed by the Portuguese Government

Portugal has 37 565 teachers on fixed-term contracts with four or more years' service and 11 526 with 10 or more years' service. Year after year, their contracts expire on 31 August and are reissued on 1 September.

The Portuguese Government's latest proposal has done nothing to resolve the alarmingly precarious situation of teachers employed on successive fixed-term contracts. A recent announcement of permanent vacancies on offer listed a total of 603 posts.

Many of the teachers involved have already presented individual complaints to the Commission, to draw its attention to the Portuguese Government's alleged infringement of Council Directive 1999/70/EC of 28 June 1999, in relation to the teaching conditions of teachers on fixed-term contracts.

1. How does the Commission view the systematic infringement of the above directive by the Portuguese Government?

2. What steps, if any, has the Commission already taken to encourage the Portuguese Government stop infringing the directive and rectify the situation?

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

The Commission has launched investigations and sent a Letter of Formal Notice to the Portuguese authorities on 30 September 2011. The reply gave rise to new and additional aspects that required the sending of an Additional Letter of Formal Notice on 1 October 2012. The reply is currently being assessed and compared to the claims and materials submitted in various complaints and a petition. Upon completion of the assessment, the appropriate action will be taken in line with the competence of the Commission in ensuring the correct application of EC law.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001292/13
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(7 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: 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 quedó *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. inició contra él un proceso penal en el podía haber sido condenado a una pena de más de 30 años de prisión y en el que se le exigió una fianza de 1 millón de dólares. Esta gravísima condena supone un proceso de persecución política que la familia ha denunciado en un comunicado en el que acusaba a los jueces y al MIT, institución donde estudiaba y donde cometió el supuesto delito, del suicidio de su joven familiar y afirmaba que su muerte fue «el producto de un sistema de justicia penal plagado de extralimitaciones en intimidación y persecución».

¿Considera justificada la Comisión la actividad del portal JSTOR, que consigue beneficios gracias a los textos producidos por profesores e investigadores financiados con fondos públicos europeos?

Respuesta de la Sra. Kroes en nombre de la Comisión
(26 de marzo de 2013)

La Comisión recibió con profunda tristeza la noticia del trágico fallecimiento del Sr. Aaron Swartz.

En lo que se refiere a JSTOR y, más en general, a la cuestión del fomento del acceso abierto (acceso en línea gratuito para el usuario) a las publicaciones científicas resultantes de la financiación pública de la investigación, la Comisión es perfectamente consciente de la necesidad de introducir mejoras. Está convencida de que, en muchos casos, los científicos, la industria y los ciudadanos saldrán beneficiados de la apertura y la puesta en común en la investigación y la innovación.

Por este motivo, la Comisión viene trabajando en el ámbito del acceso abierto desde 2006. La novedad política más reciente es la publicación en 2012 de una Comunicación de la Comisión (COM(2012) 401) y de una Recomendación a los Estados miembros (C(2012) 4890) sobre la información científica. Estas iniciativas anuncian que el acceso abierto se erigirá en principio general para las publicaciones científicas resultantes de Horizonte 2020, futuro Programa Marco de investigación e innovación. También instan a los Estados miembros a tomar medidas encaminadas a elaborar y aplicar medidas en materia de acceso abierto que sean coherentes con el enfoque de la Comisión. Se encontrará una completa información sobre los trabajos de la Comisión relativos al acceso abierto a las publicaciones científicas en:
http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/index.cfm?fuseaction=public.topic&id=1301&lang=1

El compromiso de la Comisión con el acceso abierto no se limita a las publicaciones científicas. En el campo de la educación y la formación, la Comisión está trabajando en una iniciativa sobre «Apertura de la educación» que propone, entre otros elementos, un acceso abierto a los materiales educativos financiados por Erasmus para todos. Se está explorando asimismo una posible Recomendación para hacer extensiva dicha propuesta a todos los recursos educativos de financiación pública.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001292/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: 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, who are supported by public funding. Following his arrest for this act of defiance, the United States legal system instigated criminal proceedings against him which could have resulted in him being sentenced to over 30 years in prison, and set bail at over USD 1 million. 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, saying that his death was 'the product of a criminal justice system rife with intimidation and prosecutorial overreach'.

Does the Commission consider the activity of the JSTOR website to be justified, when it makes a profit from texts produced by professors and researchers funded by European public money?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(26 March 2013)

The Commission was deeply saddened to learn of the tragic death of Mr Aaron Swartz.

Regarding JSTOR and, more generally, the question of furthering open access (free or charge online access for the user) to scientific publications resulting from public research funding, the Commission is well aware that improvements are necessary. It is convinced that, in many cases, scientists, industries and citizens stand to gain from openness and sharing in research and innovation.

This is why the Commission has been working in the area of open access since 2006. The most recent relevant policy development is the 2012 publication of a Commission Communication (COM(2012)401) and a recommendation to the Member States (C(2012)4890) on scientific information. This policy package announces that open access will become the general principle for scientific publications resulting from Horizon 2020, the future Framework Programme for Research and Innovation. It also encourages Member States to take steps to develop and implement policies on open access that are consistent with the Commission's approach. Comprehensive information on the Commission's work regarding open access to scientific publications can be found here: http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/index.cfm?fuseaction=public.topic&id=1301&lang=1.

The commitment of the Commission to open access goes beyond scientific publications. In the field of education and training, the Commission is working on an 'Opening up Education' initiative which proposes, amongst other elements, open access to educational materials funded by Erasmus for All. A Recommendation for extending such a proposal to all publicly-funded educational resources is currently being explored.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001293/13
to the Commission
Peter Skinner (S&D)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: Future of the Joint European Torus (JET) facility

The Joint European Torus (JET) facility at Culham in Oxfordshire has been operational for more than 50 years and employs more than 300 of the best fusion scientists in Europe or anywhere in the world. Much of the work being carried out prepares the way for the functioning of the ITER fusion reactor project.

Given that the operational lifespan of the JET project is due to come to an end in 2018 and that many of the most recent estimates suggest that 2020 may be an ambitious start date for ITER, can the Commission provide detailed information as to what support will be available to the scientists involved should there be a gap between the ending of one project and the commencement of another?

Can it also give some indication as to what future is planned for the world-class facility at Culham once the JET programme has come to an end, whenever that may be?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(27 March 2013)

The Joint European Torus (JET) has been in operation since 1983. Its lifetime has been extended several times because new knowledge and upgrades have led to new missions. Following the recent upgrade to install the 'ITER-like wall' (ILW) ([1]), JET operation is now entirely devoted to the preparations for ITER and should be considered to continue as long as it can still make an important contribution in this regard. However, a definitive date of closure has yet to be proposed and will depend on a number of factors still under consideration. European fusion scientists will also have access to the JT60-SA device ([2]), a JET-sized machine under construction in Japan within the Broader Approach framework that should start operation in 2019 and has features that go beyond those of JET. Furthermore, Europe has a number of other key devices, e.g. ASDEX-Upgrade located near Munich, which also support a significant level of cross-border participation in experiments as part of the coordinated European fusion programme.

The Culham Centre for Fusion Energy (CCFE) is a world class research centre, extending beyond the hosting and operation of JET. The Commission will endeavour to provide CCFE with sufficient notice of closure of JET in order to minimise the impacts, in particular enabling transfers of services and permanent staff to other facilities at CCFE.

([1]) https://www.efda.org/jet/jet-iter/iter-like-wall-project/
([2]) http://www.jt60sa.org/b/index.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001294/13
to the Commission
Alyn Smith (Verts/ALE)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: Food safety regime and country of origin labelling

The Commission will be aware that tests conducted by the Food Safety Authority of Ireland (FSAI) have discovered traces of horse DNA in beefburgers and lasagne sold in various supermarkets and dog DNA in dog food. There have also been reports that products labelled as halal have contained pork DNA.

Incidents such as these undermine the faith of EU consumers in the safety of the food chain and lend support to calls for a more robust, precise and compulsory food labelling system which would clearly identify the origin of the product. It is clear that in the current marketplace, with concerns over the precise content of processed foods as well as carbon emissions and food miles, consumers want to know where their food comes from.

Can the Commission outline what plans are in place to strengthen the food safety and testing regime in the EU, and can it confirm what steps will be taken to ensure greater clarity with regard to the origin and content of food products? Would the Commission now agree that a mandatory country of origin label on meat products in particular is required? Does it agree that these steps must be taken with great urgency if we wish to avoid further loss of public confidence in the existing food safety processes and checks?

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

The Commission would like to reassure the Honourable Member that, to date, there is no indication on the subject which raises a safety issue. However, falsifying labels on foods, thereby misleading consumers on their content and nature, constitutes fraud in food labelling.

The Commission has recently adopted a recommendation on a coordinated control plan ([1]) calling for EU-wide controls on foods marketed as containing beef to detect fraudulent labelling and on horse meat destined for human consumption to detect phenylbutazone, a veterinary drug whose use in food producing animals is illegal. A summary of all findings will be available by mid April 2013. The plan will be co-financed by the Union at a rate of 75%.

The geographical origin indication should not be confused with fraudulent practices in food labelling and cannot be considered as a tool to prevent the latter. This fraud could have occurred, even if there was a mandatory indication of origin on the foods concerned. Today, the indication of origin of foods is required on the labelling ([2]) in all cases where its omission could mislead the consumer. Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 on the provision of food information to consumers ([3]), which enters into application on 13 December 2014, maintains and strengthens this principle. In addition, it introduces mandatory indication of origin for unprocessed sheep, goat, poultry and pig meat and it requires the Commission to submit a report to the European Parliament and the Council on the need to extend mandatory indication of origin to meat used as an ingredient by 13 December 2013. The Commission will do its utmost to deliver this report before that date, based on the findings of an external study, expected to be finalised by June 2013.

([1]) Commission Recommendation on a coordinated control plan with a view to establish the prevalence of fraudulent practices, (2013/99/EU) of 19 February 2013, OJ L 48, 21.2.2013, p. 28.

([2]) Directive 2000/13/EC of the European Parliament and the Council of 20 March 2000 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the labelling, presentation and advertising of foodstuffs, OJ L 109, 6.5.2000, p. 29.

([3]) Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 on the provision of food information to consumers, amending Regulations (EC) No 1924/2006 and (EC) No 1925/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council, and repealing Commission Directive 87/250/EEC, Council Directive 90/496/EEC, Commission Directive 1999/10/EC, Directive 2000/13/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council, Commission Directives 2002/67/EC and 2008/5/EC and Commission Regulation (EC) No 608/2004, OJ L 304, 22.11.2011, p. 18.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-001296/13
till kommissionen
Marita Ulvskog (S&D), Göran Färm (S&D), Åsa Westlund (S&D), Jens Nilsson (S&D), Anna Hedh (S&D) och Olle Ludvigsson (S&D)
(7 februari 2013)

Angående: DG Hälso och konsumentfrågors produktion av spelet ”Farmland”: ett roligt sätt för barn att lära sig om djurhållning

Vi har uppmärksammat det spel som kommissionen producerat för att barn i åldrarna 9–12 år ska kunna lära sig mer om djurhållning och respekt för djurs välmående. Liksom svensk media reagerar vi starkt på den illustration av en halvnaken flicka som används i spelet. Medan spelets manliga karaktärer uppträder iförda vad som bör anses vara traditionella arbetskläder, är flickan Berenice iförd minishorts och en uppknuten blus.

Anser kommissionen det lämpligt att lansera ett spel och läromedel för barn i åldrarna 9–12 år innehållande uppenbart sexistiska stereotyper?

Vad drar kommissionen för slutsatser av denna, och sina tidigare för sexism starkt kritiserade marknadsföringskampanjer?

Vilka åtgärder ämnar kommissionen ta för att åtgärda de återkommande problemen med sexistiska stereotyper i sin utåtriktade informations- och kommunikationsverksamhet?

Svar från Tonio Borg på kommissionens vägnar
(14 mars 2013)

EU-kommissionen tackar parlamentsledamöterna för att ni uppmärksammar den här frågan och håller uppsikt över hur spelet Farmland tas emot av barn.

Farmland är EU:s webbplats för barn om djurs välmående. Webbplatsen lanserades av EU-kommissionen 2008 i syfte att göra barn mer medvetna om vikten av att bedriva djurhållning på ett respektfullt och humant sätt. Det interaktiva och informativa dataspelet på webbplatsen riktar sig till barn i åldrarna 9–12 år.

EU-kommissionen respekterar åsikten att användare kan uppfatta karaktären Berenice som stötande. Vi ser för närvarande över spelet Farmland och kommer då att ta hänsyn till den här synpunkten. Anledningen till att karaktären Berenice användes i spelet från första början var att barn som tillfrågades under spelets utvecklingsfas valde ut den bland flera olika bildförslag.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001296/13
to the Commission
Marita Ulvskog (S&D), Göran Färm (S&D), Åsa Westlund (S&D), Jens Nilsson (S&D), Anna Hedh (S&D) and Olle Ludvigsson (S&D)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: The 'Farmland' game produced by DG SANCO: a nice way for children to learn about livestock farming

Our attention has been drawn to the game produced by the Commission to help children aged 9 to 12 to learn more about livestock farming and respect for animal welfare. The Swedish media have reacted forcefully, as do we, to the illustration of a half-naked girl used in the game. While the male characters in the game appear dressed in what may be regarded as traditional work clothes, the girl Berenice is dressed in mini-shorts and a knotted blouse.

Does the Commission consider it appropriate to launch an educational game for children aged 9-12 which contains blatant sexist stereotypes?

What conclusions does the Commission draw from this, and from its earlier marketing campaigns which have been sharply criticised on the grounds of sexism?

What measures does the Commission propose to take to prevent the recurrent problems with sexist stereotypes in its information and communications activities aimed at the general public?

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

The European Commission would like to thank the Honourable Member for raising this issue and for vigilance on children's reception of the 'Farmland' game.

In an effort to raise awareness among children about the importance of treating farmed animals in a respectful and humane way, the European Commission launched in 2008 'Farmland'; the European children's website on animal welfare. 'Farmland' is an interactive and informative online computer game targeting children aged between 9 and 12.

The European Commission respects the opinion that users might find the Berenice cartoon character objectionable. I would like to inform the Honourable Member that the 'Farmland' game is currently being reviewed and this issue will be addressed. The reason why the character was used in the game in first place was that — in the consultation phase — it was selected by children from several graphical proposals presented to them.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001298/13
to the Commission
Julie Girling (ECR)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: Horsemeat burgers

Last week a number of UK retailers removed processed burger products from sale after analysis revealed the presence of undeclared horsemeat and equine DNA. This presents problems for consumers, who need to have confidence that the information they are given is accurate. This situation also exposes problems in food chain traceability which could have public health and safety implications if replicated under different circumstances.

Could the Commission comment on how it works, and will work, with European processing plants to ensure that consumers are guaranteed processed food items which meet European safety standards and comply with European regulations on traceability?

This issue has also reignited the debate within the horse welfare community about the long journey times to slaughter endured by horses across Europe.

Could the Commission comment on whether it intends to propose a legal instrument to ensure that horse journey times are brought into line with European Food Safety Authority guidelines?

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

The Commission would like to reassure the Honourable Member that, to date, there is no indication on the subject which raises a safety issue. However, falsifying labels on foods, thereby misleading consumers on their content and nature, constitutes fraud in food labelling.

Food business operators are primarily responsible for ensuring that the products placed on the market comply with Union food law requirements, while the national competent authorities are responsible for enforcing them by conducting appropriate controls and imposing dissuasive and effective penalties. A comprehensive system of food safety rules is already in place at Union level, including traceability requirements for foods of animal origin which enabled authorities to trace back the origin of the fraudulently labelled meat.

Notwithstanding the above, the role of the Commission has been instrumental in actively coordinating — both at political and technical level — the ongoing investigations in the Member States. As an additional measure, the Commission has recently adopted a recommendation on a coordinated control plan ([1]) calling for EU-wide controls on foods marketed as containing beef to detect fraudulent labelling and on horse meat destined for human consumption to detect phenylbutazone, a veterinary drug whose use in food producing animals is illegal. A summary of all findings will be available by April 2013.

Regarding the issue of travelling time, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-011234/2012 ([2]).

([1]) Commission Recommendation on a coordinated control plan with a view to establish the prevalence of fraudulent practices, (2013/99/EU) of 19 February 2013, OJ L 48, 21.2.2013, p. 28.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001299/13
to the Commission
Julie Girling (ECR)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: Eggs

I understand that having eliminated 'European refunds' on eggs and egg products, the Commission has negotiated a deal with Ukraine, a non-EU Member State, to allow it to export eggs and egg products into the EU at zero tax. Egg producers in Ukraine do not comply with EU regulations on the welfare of battery hens.

Can the Commission confirm if this is in fact correct?

If so, could it clarify why a non-EU Member State has been given such a dispensation, which is putting consumers at risk of unknowingly purchasing 'low-welfare eggs'?

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

The Commission finalised negotiations of the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement (DCFTA) with Ukraine last year. However, the Agreement has not been signed yet. The draft Agreement foresees a zero duty access for eggs and egg products only within the limits of 3 000 tonnes for egg products and 3 000 tonnes for eggs in shell.

Under the SPS chapter of the Agreement, the Ukrainian authorities committed to approximate, among others, the EU legislation on animal welfare after an interim period. However, for the duration of the interim period, equivalence with EU animal welfare legislation will not be a precondition to export to the EU the quantities of eggs and egg products within preferential trade.

The reduction of refunds for EU exports and the market access for eggs and egg products from Ukraine into the EU are not linked. The export refunds for egg products are fixed regularly every three months taking into account the market situation. In a market situation with high prices, the use of refunds is not needed as it was required in the past to assure market balance. Thus, the EU has reduced the export refunds for certain egg products successively over the last year.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001300/13
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(7 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: Ley de Costas en España

Pese a las declaraciones del Gobierno español acerca del nuevo texto de la Ley de Costas de 1988, sobre el que considera que «protegerá mejor el litoral frente a los excesos urbanísticos y generará confianza y mayor actividad económica», organizaciones ecologistas como Greenpeace o WWF consideran, contrariamente, que dicha reforma no solo supondría un impacto profundo en la protección del litoral español, sino que además contraviene pilares básicos defendidos por la legislación de la UE en materia de medio ambiente.

La nueva Ley de Costas vulnera en particular al menos cuatro Directivas europeas, entre ellas la Directiva 2007/60/CE en materia de riesgo de inundaciones; la reforma conllevaría la ocupación de zonas susceptibles de inundarse, ignorando las previsiones realizadas por los expertos sobre el cambio climático en los próximos 75 años (período ampliado a las concesiones a particulares e industrias en la costa).

Dicha reforma también incumpliría la obligación de garantizar la buena calidad de las aguas (Directiva 2000/60/CE), desprotegiendo la franja costera y poniendo en riesgo ecosistemas litorales como salinas, dunas y marismas. La Ley tampoco ha respetado la Directiva 91/271/CEE sobre el tratamiento de aguas residuales urbanas. Tampoco se ha permitido a las ONG el acceso a la cartografía ni a los criterios usados por el Gobierno para excluir del dominio público los diez núcleos urbanos y Formentera, vulnerando con ello la Directiva 2003/4/CE relativa al acceso del público a la información medioambiental.

La Ley de Costas se encuentra en trámite parlamentario y su aprobación se prevé inminente. Así, ¿estudiará la Comisión en detalle la nueva ley y su conformidad a la legislación comunitaria tras su aprobación?

Una vez adoptada la ley, ¿qué mecanismos adoptará la Comisión para velar por el cumplimiento de las Directivas europeas mencionadas?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(22 de marzo de 2013)

La Comisión valorará la necesidad de adoptar medidas particulares cuando entre en vigor la legislación a que se refiere Su Señoría.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001300/13
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: Spain's Coastal Law

Despite the Spanish Government's declarations concerning the new text of the 1988 Coastal Law, which it claims 'will better protect the coast from excessive development, generate trust and increase economic activity', environmental organisations such as Greenpeace or WWF beg to differ. They believe the reform will not only seriously impair the protection of the Spanish coast, but that it contradicts the fundamental precepts of the EU's environmental legislation.

In particular, the new Coastal Law infringes at least four European directives, including Directive 2007/60/EC on the assessment and management of flood risks. It will lead to the occupation of zones liable to flooding, disregarding the forecasts made by experts on climate change for the next 75 years (the extended period for coastal permits to individuals and companies).

This reform will also contravene the obligation to guarantee good water quality (Directive 2000/60/EC), remove protection from the coastal strip and endanger coastal ecosystems such as salt flats, dunes and marshes. Neither has the law respected Directive 91/271/EEC on urban waste-water treatment. NGOs have also been refused access to the cartography and criteria used by the government to exclude 10 urban settlements and the island of Formentera from the public domain, thereby infringing Directive 2003/4/EC on public access to environmental information.

The Coastal Law is now before parliament and is due to be approved imminently. Will the Commission study the new law in detail, once it has been passed, to establish whether it complies with Community legislation?

Once the law has been passed, what measures will the Commission take to ensure that the abovementioned European directives are respected?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(22 March 2013)

The Commission will assess whether any particular action is needed once the legislation referred to by the Honourable Member enters into force.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001302/13
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(7 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: El lobo de Ávila

Ávila y otros municipios de la provincia han aprobado una petición para solicitar a la Consejería de Agricultura y Ganadería de Castilla y León el exterminio del lobo en Ávila. Esta petición está promovida por los sindicatos agroganaderos, que perciben subvenciones agroambientales por conservar el ecosistema. Sin embargo, quieren asesinar los lobos de Ávila y así lo promueven.

Dicha petición es completamente ilegal, ya que el lobo (Canis lupus) es una especie prioritaria de interés comunitario al sur del Duero, y se encuentra dentro de la Red Natura 2000, fuertemente protegida por la Directiva 92/43/CEE, por la que, en virtud de su artículo 2, los Estados miembros se comprometen a conservar y garantizar la fauna y flora silvestres en el territorio donde se aplique el Tratado.

En virtud de la misma, ¿tiene conocimiento la Comisión de las acciones que están llevando a cabo estos sindicatos? En caso afirmativo, ¿qué medidas de protección del lobo piensa tomar?

¿Es consciente de que dichos sindicatos perciben subvenciones provenientes del dinero público y que se están destinando a fines ilícitos?

¿Es posible que a la vez se estén beneficiando de fondos europeos?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(15 de marzo de 2013)

La Comisión es consciente de que algunos sindicatos agroganaderos han planteado una propuesta para declarar la provincia de Ávila «zona libre de lobos». Según la información de que dispone la Comisión, las autoridades regionales competentes no han adoptado ninguna decisión sobre dicha propuesta por el momento. La Comisión hará un seguimiento de este asunto y adoptará todas las medidas necesarias para garantizar el cumplimiento de las disposiciones de la Directiva de Hábitats ([1]).

De acuerdo con las autoridades españolas, no se han utilizado fondos públicos españoles ni fondos europeos para financiar la exterminación de los lobos.

([1]) Directiva 92/43/CEE del Consejo, de 21 de mayo de 1992, relativa a la conservación de los hábitats naturales y de la fauna y flora silvestres (DO L 206 de 22.7.1992).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001302/13
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: Wolves in the province of Avila

Avila and other municipalities in its province have approved a petition asking the Castile and Leon department of agriculture and livestock to exterminate wolves in Avila. The petition is being put forward by the agricultural and livestock unions, which receive agro-environmental grants for ecosystem conservation. They want, however, to exterminate wolves in the Avila area and their campaign is phrased in these terms.

This petition is totally illegal, as the wolf (*Canis lupus*) is a priority species of Community interest south of the river Duero. It is listed in the Natura 2000 network and firmly protected under Directive 92/43/EEC, in which the Member States undertake to conserve and maintain the wild fauna and flora in the territory to which the Treaty applies (Article 2 thereof).

In light of this, is the Commission aware of the action being taken by these unions? If so, what steps does it intend to take to protect wolves?

Is it aware that these unions receive grants from public funds, which are being used for illicit purposes?

Is it possible that they may also be making use of European funding?

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

The Commission is aware that some agricultural and livestock unions have raised a proposal to declare the province of Ávila as a free of wolves area. According to the information available to the Commission, the competent regional authorities have not taken any decision concerning this proposal for the time being. The Commission will follow up on this issue and will take all the necessary measures to ensure compliance with the provisions of the Habitats Directive ([1]).

Aaccording to the Spanish authorities, neither Spanish public funds, nor European funds have been used to finance the extermination of wolves.

([1]) Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora. (OJ L 206, 22.7.1992).

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001304/13
a la Comisión
María Muñiz De Urquiza (S&D)
(7 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: Lucha contra los paraísos fiscales y relaciones UE-Suiza

Teniendo en cuenta que la cooperación entre Suiza y la UE se basa actualmente en más de 120 acuerdos bilaterales y sectoriales que proporcionan un alto nivel de integración y que el Acuerdo sobre lucha contra el fraude y fiscalidad del ahorro está vigente desde 2009, la evasión fiscal a Suiza sigue siendo uno de los temas más preocupantes de la actualidad política y económica en ciertos países de la UE.

Como dato, el informe de la Red para la Justicia Fiscal de julio de 2012 denuncia la existencia de 32 billones de dólares que permanecen ocultos en paraísos fiscales. La política financiera actual favorece que haya esta enorme evasión fiscal que no permite que los Estados puedan aumentar sus ingresos.

El Plan de Acción de la Comisión Europea para reforzar la lucha contra el fraude y la evasión fiscal, adoptado el pasado 6 de diciembre de 2012, establece una serie de medidas a nivel comunitario, pero persiste el problema principal en relación con Suiza: el Gobierno helvético rehúsa el intercambio automático de información fiscal con otros países.

Por tanto:

1. ¿Considera la Comisión que son compatibles las estrechas relaciones con Suiza con la política comunitaria de lucha contra el fraude fiscal, el blanqueo de dinero y los paraísos fiscales?

2. ¿Qué medidas piensa tomar la Comisión ante la falta de cooperación de las autoridades helvéticas en relación con el secreto bancario y la evasión fiscal?

3. Dentro del plan de supervisión bancaria de la UE, ¿está prevista la inclusión de los bancos europeos con sede administrativa en Suiza?

Respuesta del Sr. Šemeta en nombre de la Comisión
(9 de abril de 2013)

1. La Recomendación de la Comisión sobre la aplicación de normas de buena gobernanza en el ámbito fiscal por parte de terceros países ([1]) se basa en las normas aplicadas dentro de la UE. La Comisión es partidaria de un enfoque internacional coordinado para combatir el blanqueo de dinero y está colaborando satisfactoriamente con Suiza en el seno del Grupo de Acción Financiera Internacional. La Comisión está resuelta a progresar por esa vía en la EU, pero subraya también la necesidad de un proceso similar en el plano internacional, especialmente en lo que respecta al intercambio de información.

2. Pese a lo dispuesto en el artículo 26 del Modelo de Convenio Fiscal de la OCDE, que no permite a un Estado contratante negarse a proporcionar información amparándose exclusivamente en el secreto bancario, el intercambio de información previa solicitud aún puede plantear dificultades. Tal como se anuncia en su plan de acción, la Comisión promoverá el intercambio automático de información como nueva norma internacional de cooperación administrativa, al estar convencida de que constituye el medio más eficaz de garantizar la adecuada tributación en el país de residencia del contribuyente.

3. Con arreglo a la propuesta de Reglamento sobre el mecanismo único de supervisión, se otorgarán al BCE competencias específicas de supervisión. En el ámbito definido por dicho Reglamento, y en el marco del mecanismo único de supervisión, el BCE ejercerá una supervisión centralizada sobre las entidades de crédito establecidas en la zona del euro o en otros Estados miembros participantes. Su labor comprenderá la supervisión consolidada de los grupos bancarios, incluso, a estos efectos, en relación con sus actividades en terceros países. Cuando se trate de grupos bancarios con sede en un tercer país, como Suiza, el BCE llevará a cabo únicamente tareas específicas de supervisión de las filiales que dichos grupos posean en la zona del euro o en otros Estados miembros participantes, lo cual se ajusta al ámbito de aplicación de la legislación bancaria de la UE en su conjunto.

([1]) Recomendación 2012/771/UE de la Comisión, de 6 de diciembre de 2012, relativa a las medidas encaminadas a fomentar la aplicación, por parte de terceros países, de normas mínimas de buena gobernanza en el ámbito fiscal, DO L 338 de 12.12.2012, p. 37.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001304/13
to the Commission
María Muñiz De Urquiza (S&D)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: Combating tax havens and EU-Switzerland relations

Despite the fact that cooperation between the EU and Switzerland is currently based on over 120 bilateral and sectoral agreements which provide a high degree of integration and that the anti-fraud and savings taxation agreement has been in force since 2009, tax evasion to Switzerland continues to be one of the most politically and economically worrying issues in some EU countries.

By way of illustration, the July 2012 report by the Tax Justice Network revealed that EUR 32 billion remains concealed in tax havens. Present financial policy favours this massive tax evasion, which prevents states from increasing their revenue.

The Commission's Action Plan to strengthen the fight against tax fraud and tax evasion, which was adopted on 6 December 2012, establishes a series of measures at Community level, but the main problem with Switzerland remains unresolved: the Swiss Government rejects the automatic exchange of tax information with other countries.

1. Does the Commission consider the EU's close relationship with Switzerland to be compatible with Community policies to combat tax fraud, money laundering and tax havens?

2. What steps does the Commission intend to take in response to the Swiss authorities' lack of cooperation on bank secrecy and tax evasion?

3. Are European banks which have their headquarters in Switzerland to be included in the EU plan for banking supervision?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2013)

1. The Commission's Recommendation regarding the application of good governance in tax matters by third countries ([1]) is based on standards applied within the EU. The Commission supports a coordinated international approach to combat money laundering and is cooperating well with Switzerland in the context of the Financial Action Task Force. The Commission is determined to make progress in the EU, but also underlines the need for similar developments to take place at international level, especially as regards the exchange of information.

2. Despite Article 26 of the OECD model tax convention, which does not permit a Contracting State to decline to supply information solely because of banking secrecy, difficulties may still be encountered with exchange of information on request. As announced in its Action Plan, the Commission will promote automatic exchange of information as the new international standard for administrative cooperation, being convinced that it provides the most effective means of ensuring proper taxation in the taxpayer's state of residence.

3. According to the proposed SSM regulation specific supervisory tasks will be conferred on the ECB. The ECB will within the scope of the SSM Regulation and as part of the SSM exercise centralised supervision over credit institutions which are established in the Euro area or in other participating Member States. It will include supervision on a consolidated basis over banking groups, including for these purposes over their activities in third countries. For banking groups headquartered in third countries such as Switzerland ECB will only carry out specific supervisory tasks as regards subsidiaries of these groups in the Euro area or in other participating Member States. This is in line with the scope of application of EU banking legislation in general.

([1]) Commission Recommendation 2012/771/EU of 6 December 2012 regarding measures intended to encourage third countries to apply minimum standards of good governance in tax matters, OJ L 338, 12.12.2012, p. 37.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001305/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(7 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Direttiva 2009/12/CE in materia di aeroporti e di riscossione dei diritti aeroportuali — Deroga da parte dello Stato italiano

Con riferimento alla risposta fornita dal Commissario Sim Kallas alla mia interrogazione E-010841/2012, concernente l'approvazione di una nuova deroga da parte dello Stato italiano alla direttiva 2009/12/CE volta a stabilire principi comuni per la riscossione dei diritti aeroportuali negli aeroporti aperti al traffico aereo commerciale, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. da chi è stata informata la Commissione delle ulteriori misure prese dalle autorità italiane in ordine al recepimento della direttiva in questione?

2. L'Italia ha poi proceduto a fornire chiarimenti, comunicazioni o spiegazioni ufficiali?

3. Qual è la posizione attuale dell'Italia rispetto al provvedimento comunitario in questione?

4. Qualora esistano gli estremi di una violazione, come pensa la Commissione di procedere?

Risposta di Siim Kallas a nome della Commissione
(14 marzo 2013)

A seguito delle denunce ricevute nel 2012 i servizi della Commissione hanno esaminato il recepimento in Italia della direttiva relativa ai diritti aeroportuali.

In conseguenza di tale indagine i servizi della Commissione hanno chiesto alle autorità italiane informazioni aggiuntive e sono in attesa di una risposta. Essi esamineranno tutte le risposte ricevute dalle autorità italiane e decideranno se chiudere il caso, chiedere ulteriori informazioni o avviare un procedimento di infrazione. Qualsiasi procedimento di infrazione, se ritenuto necessario, si svolgerà a norma dell'articolo 258 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001305/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: Directive 2009/12/EC on airports and the levying of airport charges — exemption adopted by Italy

With reference to the answer given by Commissioner Siim Kallas to my Question E-010841/2012, on the adoption by the Italian Government of a further exemption to Directive 2009/12/EC, which sets out to establish common principles for the levying of airport charges at airports that are open to commercial air traffic, could the Commission answer the following questions?

1. Who informed the Commission of the further measures taken by the Italian authorities regarding the transposition of the directive?

2. Has Italy since provided any official clarifications, communications or explanations?

3. What is Italy's current position with regard to the EU provision at issue?

4. If the facts point to an infringement, how does the Commission plan to proceed?

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

Following complaints received in 2012, the Commission Services have examined the transposition in Italy of the Airport Charges Directive.

As a result of this investigation, the Commission services have requested further information from the Italian authorities and are awaiting a response. The Commission services will examine any response received from the Italian authorities and will decide on whether to close the case, request additional information or initiate an infringement procedure. Any infringement procedure, if deemed necessary, will proceed as set out in Article 258 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-001306/13
a Bizottság számára
Bauer Edit (PPE)
(2013. február 7.)

Tárgy: Az EU alapelveinek sérelme

A Szlovák Köztársaság műsorsugárzásért és továbbközvetítésért felelős tanácsa (Rada pre vysielanie a retransmisiu) 2013. január 29-i ülésén úgy határozott, hogy a Fun Rádió kereskedelmi rádióadót szankcionálja, amiért az 2012. szeptember 14-én, délután, 15.53 órakor az adó losonci frekvenciáján az OTP Banka magyar nyelvű reklámját sugározta. Az indoklás szerint ezzel a kereskedelmi adó megsértette a 270/1995-ös államnyelvről szóló törvényt, amely az indoklás szerint továbbra is érvényes a műsorszolgáltatókra, és amely szerint „a televíziós és rádiós műsorsugárzás a Szlovák Köztársaság egész területén államnyelven történik". A médiatanács pénzbírságot nem szabott ki, de úgy döntött, figyelmezteti a törvényszegésre a Fun Rádiót.

Az Európai Bizottság egy korábbi kérdésemre 2010. december 17-én kelt válaszában már megfogalmazta aggályait a szlovák államnyelvtörvény „egyes rendelkezéseinek az európai uniós joggal való összeegyeztethetőségével kapcsolatban", illetve felvette a kapcsolatot a szlovák hatóságokkal. Ennek ellenére a jogszabály továbbra is érvényben van, sőt továbbra is jogalapul szolgál a szlovák hatóságok számára, amit az aktuális határozat is alátámaszt.

A kereskedelmi adó egy szlovákok és magyarok által vegyesen lakott területen a kisebbség nyelvén reklámozta a megrendelő bank szolgáltatását, amiért megrovásban részesült.

A Bizottság szerint nem sérti-e ez a döntés, illetve az 1995-ös törvény ezen rendelkezése az áruk és szolgáltatások szabad mozgásának elvét?

Tekintettel arra, hogy a Bizottság már egy korábbi válaszában is megállapította a lehetséges törvénysértést, és aggályának adott hangot, valamint tekintettel arra a tényre, hogy a szlovák hatóságok továbbra is az adott törvény paragrafusai szerint járnak el, nem veszi-e a Bizottság fontolóra kötelezettségszegési eljárás indítását az uniós jog megsértésének tárgyában?

Michel Barnier válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. április 8.)

A Bizottság a továbbiakban is szorosan együttműködik a szlovák hatóságokkal annak érdekében, hogy sor kerüljön az államnyelvről szóló 1995. évi törvény azon módosítására, amely révén az összeegyeztethetővé válik az uniós joggal. A Bizottság 2012 végén üdvözölte a szlovák hatóságok által kidolgozott törvénymódosítási javaslatokat, amelyeket azonban a szlovák parlament végül nem fogadott el. A szlovák hatóságok nemrégiben újabb javaslatot terjesztettek a Bizottság elé, amelynek vizsgálata folyamatban van.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001306/13
to the Commission
Edit Bauer (PPE)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: Violation of the fundamental principles of the EU

In a meeting held on 29 January 2013, the Council for Broadcasting and Retransmission of the Republic of Slovakia passed a decision to sanction the 'Fun Rádió' commercial radio station for broadcasting, at 15.53 on 14 September 2012, an advertisement for OTP Bank in Hungarian on its Losonc frequency. According to the justification, the radio station thereby violated Law No 270/1995 on the State Language, which it states also applies to broadcasters and which stipulates that television and radio broadcasting throughout the Republic of Slovakia shall take place in the state language. The Media Council did not impose a fine but decided to caution 'Fun Rádió' for breaking the law.

In its reply, dated 17 December 2010, to a previous question of mine, the Commission expressed its concerns at the 'compatibility of certain provisions with EC law'. It also contacted the Slovak authorities. In spite of this, the law remains in force and in fact serves as a legal basis for the Slovak authorities, as is borne out by this latest decision.

The commercial broadcaster advertised the services of a bank in the language of the minority population in a region inhabited by Slovaks and Hungarians, and for this it was reprimanded.

Does the Commission not consider that this decision and this provision of the 1995 law are in violation of the principle of the free movement of goods and services?

In view of the fact that the Commission identified a possible violation of the law and expressed its concerns in an earlier reply, and given the fact that the Slovak authorities continue to proceed in accordance with the provisions of the law in question, is the Commission not planning to launch infringement proceedings for a breach of EC law?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(8 April 2013)

The Commission is continuing to work closely with the Slovak authorities to ensure that the 1995 law on the State language is amended so that it is compatible with EC law. In late 2012, the Commission welcomed proposals, prepared by the Slovak authorities, to amend the law. However, these proposals were not adopted by the Slovak Parliament. The Slovak authorities have recently forwarded a new proposal which is currently being examined by the Commission.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001307/13
aan de Raad
Peter van Dalen (ECR)
(7 februari 2013)

Betreft: Hezbollah en de EU-lijst van terroristische organisaties

Op 2 februari 2013 deelde de Bulgaarse minister van Binnenlandse Zaken mee dat twee leden van de Libanese organisatie Hezbollah betrokken waren bij de zelfmoordaanslag op Israëlische toeristen op 18 juli 2012 in Burgas (Bulgarije). Tevens is in het verleden reeds de betrokkenheid aangetoond van Hezbollah bij talrijke aanslagen op doelen binnen en buiten Libanon.

Hezbollah staat al vele jaren op de Amerikaanse en Canadese lijsten van terroristische organisaties. Sinds 2008 beschouwt ook Nederland Hezbollah als een terroristische organisatie. Het Verenigd Koninkrijk classificeert de militaire tak van Hezbollah als een terroristische organisatie.

1. Deelt de Raad mijn analyse dat Hezbollah al dertig jaar aanslagen pleegt, onder meer op Israëlische, Amerikaanse, Franse en Duitse doelen; dat Hezbollah steun ontvangt uit Syrië en Iran; dat Hezbollah verantwoordelijk is voor de dood van vele burgers en militairen, binnen en buiten Libanon?

2. Is de Raad het met mij eens dat de bevindingen van het Bulgaarse onderzoek naar de zelfmoordaanslag in Burgas moeten leiden tot een heroverweging van de status van Hezbollah? Is de Raad voornemens enige actie te ondernemen teneinde de capaciteit tot het plegen van aanslagen en militaire acties van Hezbollah in te perken?

3. Is de Raad het met mij eens dat, in navolging van de Verenigde Staten, Canada, het Verenigd Koninkrijk, Nederland en andere landen, Hezbollah op de Europese lijst van terroristische organisaties moet komen?

4. Is de Raad voornemens om haar relaties met de Libanese regering, waarin ook Hezbollah zitting heeft, te herzien?

Antwoord
(24 juni 2013)

Om een organisatie te kunnen opnemen in de lijst uit hoofde van Gemeenschappelijk standpunt 2001/931/GBVB van de Raad (GS 931) betreffende de toepassing van specifieke maatregelen ter bestrijding van het terrorisme ([1]) moet er een beslissing zijn genomen door een bevoegde instantie. De Raad besluit of er door een bevoegde instantie een beslissing is genomen als in het kader van de regeling inzake beperkende maatregelen (GS 931) een opneming in de lijst wordt voorgesteld. Deze procedure is gevolgd met betrekking tot de plaatsing van Hamas op de lijst. Wat betreft de Hezbollah wordt na de aanslag in Burgas nog verder onderzoek verricht, en de mogelijke toevoeging van de Hezbollah aan de lijst van personen, groepen en entiteiten die betrokken zijn bij terroristische daden, wordt actief overwogen. De Raad zal alleen wanneer een opneming in de lijst wordt voorgesteld, nagaan of er door een bevoegde instantie een beslissing is genomen. Om de Hezbollah in de lijst van terroristische organisaties op te nemen, moet de Raad met eenparigheid van stemmen een besluit nemen.

([1]) PB L 344 van 28.12.2001, blz. 93-96.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001307/13
to the Council
Peter van Dalen (ECR)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: Hezbollah and the EU list of terrorist organisations

On 2 February 2013, the Bulgarian Minister of the Interior announced that two members of the Lebanese organisation Hezbollah had been involved in the suicide attack on Israeli tourists on 18 July 2012 in Burgas (Bulgaria). Moreover, it has already been demonstrated in the past that Hezbollah was involved in numerous attacks on targets both inside and outside Lebanon.

Hezbollah has been on the American and Canadian lists of terrorist organisations for many years. Since 2008, the Netherlands too has regarded Hezbollah as a terrorist organisation. The United Kingdom classifies the military wing of Hezbollah as a terrorist organisation.

1. Does the Council agree with my analysis that Hezbollah has been carrying out attacks for 30 years, *inter alia* on Israeli, American, French and German targets, that Hezbollah receives support from Syria and Iran, and that Hezbollah is responsible for the death of many civilians and military personnel, both inside and outside Lebanon?

2. Does the Council agree that, in view of the findings of the Bulgarian investigation into the suicide attack in Burgas, Hezbollah's status should be reviewed? Will the Council take any action to reduce Hezbollah's capacity to carry out attacks and military action?

3. Does the Council agree that the example of the USA, Canada, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and other countries should be emulated by placing Hezbollah on the European list of terrorist organisations?

4. Will the Council review its relations with the Lebanese Government, of which Hezbollah is also a component?

Reply
(24 June 2013)

For the designation of an organisation under Council Common Position 2001/931/CFSP (CP931) on the application of specific measures to combat terrorism ([1]), a decision needs to be taken by a competent authority. The Council decides whether a decision has been taken by a competent authority if a listing is proposed under the CP931 restrictive measures regime. This was the procedure that was followed in relation to the listing of Hamas. Regarding Hezbollah, follow-up work is being undertaken following the Burgas attack, and the possible addition of Hezbollah to the terrorist listing remains under active consideration. The Council will consider whether a decision has been taken by a competent authority only when a listing is proposed. The addition of Hezbollah to the list of terrorist organisations will require a decision by the Council acting unanimously.

([1]) OJ L 344, 28.12.2001, pp. 93-96.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris P-001308/13
adresată Comisiei
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(7 februarie 2013)

Subiect: Programe transfrontaliere

Interesul pentru programul de cooperare transfrontalieră între România, Ucraina și Republica Moldova destinat proiectelor din domeniile dezvoltării economice și sociale, infrastructurii de frontieră, mediului, situațiilor de urgență sau „people to people" a fost foarte mare în rândul posibililor beneficiari din Republica Moldova, dovadă fiind și numărul mare de cereri depuse.

Acest gen de proiecte permite crearea de punți de legătură între comunitățile din zonele de frontieră, dar și stabilirea unor relații directe între organizații din toate cele trei țări participante la program.

Din păcate, numărul proiectelor admise pentru finanțare a fost mult prea mic în comparație cu numărul de solicitări și necesitățile comunităților interesate.

Ce soluții întrevede Comisia pentru a crește numărul de proiecte de cooperare transfrontalieră între România, Ucraina și Republica Moldova care primesc finanțare europeană, având în vedere nevoile de finanțare și gradul de interes pentru acest program?

Răspuns dat de dl Füle în numele Comisiei
(8 martie 2013)

Comisia cunoaște problema semnalată și este hotărâtă să o abordeze în următoarea perioadă de programare.

Comisia intenționează să ia măsuri pentru a se asigura că prioritățile diferitelor programe CTF sunt restrânse la un număr rezonabil, ceea ce ar trebui să aibă drept consecință primirea unui volum mai mic și mai bine direcționat de cereri de finanțare, ducând la creșterea procentului de cereri admise pentru finanțare în viitor.

De asemenea, Comisia ar dori să aducă la cunoștința distinsei membre faptul că, din cauza dificultăților recurente legate de gestionarea programului cu care se confruntă cele trei țări, programul CTF România – Ucraina – Republica Moldova a cunoscut o perioadă destul de lentă de implementare în cursul perioadei curente.

Prin urmare, în următorul cadru financiar multianual, este probabil ca programul să fie împărțit în două programe bilaterale („România-Ucraina" și „România-Republica Moldova"). Se speră astfel că se va contribui și la creșterea eficacității în alocarea fondurilor pentru proiectele care urmează să fie puse în aplicare în regiunile de frontieră vizate.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001308/13
to the Commission
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: Cross-border programmes

The cross-border cooperation programme between Romania, Ukraine and the Republic of Moldova involving projects in the fields of economic and social development, border infrastructure, the environment, emergencies and 'people-to-people' cooperation has met with intense interest among potential beneficiaries in the Republic of Moldova, as can be seen from the large number of applications submitted.

This type of project makes it possible to create ties among communities in border areas and establish direct links between organisations in all three participating countries.

Unfortunately, the number of projects accepted for financing has been very small by comparison with the number of applications made and the needs of the communities involved.

What solutions does the Commission have in mind to boost the number of cross-border cooperation projects between Romania, Ukraine and the Republic of Moldova that will receive European funding, bearing in mind the financing needs and level of interest in this programme?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(8 March 2013)

The Commission is aware of the issue and is determined to address it in the next programming period.

The Commission intends to take measures to ensure that the different CBC programmes narrow down their priorities to a manageable set which should result in fewer and more targeted applications being submitted for funding, which in turn will increase the percentage of successful applications being funded in future.

The Commission would also like to inform the Honourable Member that due to the recurrent difficulties of the three countries in dealing with programme management issues, the Romania — Ukraine — Republic of Moldova CBC programme has experienced a rather slow implementation during the current period.

Therefore, under the next Multiannual Financial Framework, the programme is likely to be split into two bilateral programmes ('Romania — Ukraine' and 'Romania — Republic of Moldova') which it is hoped will also contribute to increasing the efficiency in allocating funds for projects to be implemented in the concerned border regions.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001309/13
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: Youth unemployment and the Youth Guarantee Scheme

The ongoing economic crisis in Europe has led to 5.5 million young people being unemployed, and the European Youth Guarantee Scheme is of paramount importance in remedying this matter. Could the Commission outline what steps have been taken to encourage Member States to implement this scheme and ensure that it is of real and measurable benefit to Europe's young unemployed?

Young people are not a homogeneous group and as such require personalised assessment in their own Member States. In this context, could the Commission say what guidance and cooperation is being offered to Member States to enable them to formulate specifically tailored services?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(2 April 2013)

Negotiations started in the Council in December 2012 with a view to reaching political agreement on the Commission proposal for a Council recommendation on establishing a Youth Guarantee, which formed part of the Youth Employment Package ([1]) adopted on 5 December 2012. At its meeting on 28 February 2013, the EPSCO Council approved the Commission proposal with some minor modifications.

The recommendation provides for the Member States to assess and continuously improve their Youth Guarantee schemes, which the Commission will monitor via EMCO in the context of the multilateral surveillance process with a view to issuing, if necessary Country Specific Recommendations on this matter. The Youth Employment Initiative approved as part of the MFF will provide EUR 6 billion for youth employment activities to be implemented via ESF Managing Authorities, including the Youth Guarantee. An annual questionnaire to the European Network of Public Employment Services will gather further implementation evidence at Member State level.

The recommendation asks of Member States to tailor and adapt the measures to the needs of the beneficiaries in as far as possible. Young people coverred by the Youth Guarantee scheme have very diverse backgrounds and needs, thus due attention needs to be taken as to the diversity of this group and this should be reflected in the range of measures developed.

([1]) COM(2012) 727-728-729 final of 5 December 2012.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001310/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(7 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Επιβολή έκτακτου τέλους στα ακίνητα στην Ελλάδα μέσω των λογαριασμών ηλεκτρικού ρεύματος

Δραματική είναι η κατάσταση των Ελλήνων πολιτών από τις συνεχείς επιβολές επιβαρύνσεων στα ακίνητα, με χαρακτηριστικό παράδειγμα την έκτακτη εισφορά που επιβάλλεται μέσω των λογαριασμών ηλεκτρικού ρεύματος. Ο Επίτροπος κ. Oettinger έχει τοποθετηθεί δημοσίως δηλώνοντας ότι έχει αποστείλει ερωτηματολόγιο για το θέμα στις ελληνικές αρχές οι οποίες και του απάντησαν.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Ποιο ερωτηματολόγιο υπεβλήθη στις Ελληνικές αρχές;

— Ποιες ήταν οι απαντήσεις των Ελληνικών αρχών και από πού προήλθαν; Πώς τις κρίνει η Επιτροπή και σε ποιες ενέργειες θα προβεί;

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

Η Επιτροπή υπέβαλε μια σειρά ερωτημάτων στις ελληνικές αρχές σχετικά με το ειδικό τέλος ακινήτων που εισπράττεται μέσω των λογαριασμών ηλεκτρικού ρεύματος, έπειτα από καταγγελίες ελλήνων καταναλωτών. Τα εν λόγω ερωτήματα αναφέρονται κυρίως στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και το εθνικό νομικό πλαίσιο σχετικά με το ειδικό τέλος και υποβλήθηκαν προκειμένου να αποσαφηνιστούν τα θέματα τα οποία έθεσαν υπόψη της Επιτροπής οι καταγγέλλοντες.

Ορισμένα από τα θέματα αυτά, όπως η διακοπή της σύνδεσης ηλεκτρικού ρεύματος στην περίπτωση που οι καταναλωτές καθυστερούν να καταβάλουν την εισφορά, επιλύθηκαν μετά την έκδοση της απόφασης του Συμβουλίου της Επικρατείας (απόφαση αριθ. 1972/2012). Η Επιτροπή εξετάζει επί του παρόντος τα εκκρεμή θέματα βάσει των απαντήσεων των ελληνικών αρχών.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001310/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(7 February 2013)

Subject: One-off property tax charged with Greek electricity bills

Greek citizens are in dire straits as a result of a series of property taxes, one typical example of which is the one-off tax charged with electricity bills. Commissioner Oettinger has taken a public stand on this, having apparently sent a questionnaire on the subject to the Greek authorities, which they have answered.

— What was the questionnaire sent to the Greek authorities?

— What were the replies by the Greek authorities and who gave them? How does the Commission rate them and what action does it intend to take?

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

The Commission submitted a number of questions to the Greek authorities with respect to the special levy on immovable property collected through electricity bills, after receiving complaints from Greek electricity consumers. The questions mainly refer to the European Union and national legal framework on the special levy and seek to clarify issues brought to the Commission's attention by the complainants.

Some of these issues, such as the disconnection of electricity supply in the case of consumers with overdue levy payments, have been resolved following the judgment of the Hellenic Council of State (judgment No 1972/2012). The Commission is currently assessing the remaining issues based on the answers submitted by the Greek authorities.